



December 14, 2018

Kevin Graulich
Senior Safety Engineer
DOSH Research & Standard Unit
495-2424 Arden Way
Sacramento, CA 95825

Sent Via Email

Re: Workplace Violence Prevention Standard- General Industry

We would like to extend our appreciation to the Advisory Committee for providing us with the opportunity to provide comments. We appreciate the tremendous amount of work done by all stakeholders and government agencies involved in creating this proposed standard. We are eager to move the process along towards adopting a strong and effective standard that has a broad scope to protect all workers in all industries from workplace violence.

We appreciate your consideration and inclusion of much of our recommended language from our previously submitted written and oral comments. We are particularly encouraged by the inclusion of suggested language in the following areas:

- multiemployer and dual employer responsibilities;
- anti-retaliation for reporting violence to an employer;
- active shooter requirements within the plan; and
- employer requirement to maintain a workplace violence incident log.

These key changes are shared priority areas of concern for Worksafe and our allies and reflect a strong commitment by the agency and all stakeholders to create a strong and workable WVP standard for general industry.

We thank the Advisory Committee for incorporating language to address multi and dual employer settings under (c)(3)(A)&(B). This language is important because it provides clear guidance to multi and dual employers on their responsibilities to address workplace violence.

We are pleased to see the inclusion of anti-retaliation language for reporting workplace violence to an employer. For many workers, especially low wage and immigrant workers, the fear of reprisal serves as a serious deterrent to reporting workplace violence. Retaliation is rampant with workers and/or their loved ones facing continued harassment and violent behavior after they have complained about workplace violence. Explicitly including an anti-retaliation provision is critical to ensuring that workplaces are free of retaliation.

We thank the Advisory Committee for including active shooter language. Sadly, California has experienced several workplace shootings with our three most recent ones occurring close in time to the latest draft comments. The diversity of these workplaces, YouTube's San Bruno campus, The Oaks mall

in Thousand Oaks, and a law firm in Long Beach, demonstrate the fact that workplace violence can occur anywhere.¹ They illustrate a clear need for protective workplace protocols regardless of the type of industry/place of employment.

Lastly, we are extremely pleased to see the inclusion of the violent incident log in this current draft. Requiring employers to keep a log and investigation records allows the employer to have a central location to track workplace violence and violence indicators instead of in personnel files where they may get lost or become hard to monitor. Moreover, requiring employers to record *all* incidents in the log rather than limiting reporting to only recordable injuries ensures that a broader scope of conduct will be covered under the standard. This is a priority area for workers in the field of education which is exempt from maintaining records of any injuries for the Log 300.

While we appreciate all of the above, we were disappointed with several elements that were missing from the draft. **We believe key changes and additions in the following sections will enhance the preventative measures in the standard: (1) definitions for “workplace violence”, “threat of violence”, “injury”, and “representative”; (2) environmental risk factors and engineering and control measures; and (3) worker education.**

I. Definitions

A. “Workplace Violence” and “Threat of Violence”

This current draft’s definition of “workplace violence” is not broad enough to ensure coverage of all workers. Sexual violence, domestic violence, and stalking are pervasive in all demographics and impact every workplace.² Certain workers such as those without a fixed location, at non-traditional worksites, in work-related travel such as employer-provided or arranged transportation and lodging, or who are in work-related situations that might not be considered a “worksite” (i.e. stalking incidents) are left out of the current definition. For example, while “place of employment” is broader than “worksite,” it may still leave out some of the above work situations. See our comments,³ dated April 28, 2018 for certain types of workplace situations that the current definition may exclude.

Without a doubt, “stalking” should be included in the definition of workplace violence. Stalking has been identified as the most prevalent form of abuse at work.⁴ An estimated 15.2% of women have experienced stalking behavior that made them fearful or made them believe that they or someone close to them would be harmed or killed during their lifetimes.⁵

¹Hill, *California has seen several workplace shooting in last several years*, Sacramento Bee (April 3, 2018) <<https://www.sacbee.com/news/nation-world/national/article207850729.html>> (as of Dec. 9, 2018).

²Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, National Center for Injury Prevention and Control, *Intimate Partner Violence: Consequences* (Aug. 22, 2017) <<https://www.cdc.gov/violenceprevention/intimatepartnerviolence/consequences.html>> (as of Dec. 5, 2018); Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, National Center for Injury Prevention and Control, *NISVS Infographic* (Apr. 28, 2017) <<https://www.cdc.gov/violenceprevention/nisvs/infographic.html>> (as of Dec. 5, 2018).

³See Worksafe Comments submitted to advisory committee, p.3-4 (April 28, 2018).

⁴Reeves & O’Leary-Kelly, *A Study of the Effects of Intimate Partner Violence on the Workplace* (2009) pg. 3.

⁵Centers for Disease Control, National Center for Injury Prevention and Control, *Prevalence and Characteristics of Sexual Violence, Stalking, and Intimate Partner Violence Victimization - National Intimate Partner and Sexual Violence Survey, United States, 2011* (Sep. 5, 2014) Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report <https://www.cdc.gov/mmwr/preview/mmwrhtml/ss6308a1.htm?s_cid=ss6308a1_e#Table4> (as of Dec. 5, 2018).

Therefore, we recommend the following language:

“Workplace violence” means any act of violence or threat of violence that occurs at the place of employment ~~worksite or while using employer supplied or arranged transportation or any threat of violence by a supervisor that occurs at employer supplied lodging.~~ The term workplace violence shall not include lawful acts of self-defense or defense of others. Workplace violence includes the following:

(A) The threat or use of physical force against an employee that results in, or has a high likelihood of resulting in, injury, psychological trauma, or stress, regardless of whether the employee sustains an injury;

(B) An incident involving the threat or use of a firearm or other dangerous weapon, including the use of common objects as weapons, regardless of whether the employee sustains an injury;

(C) Stalking of an employee that results in, or has a likelihood of resulting in material harm to the physical safety and health of such employee when such stalking has arisen through and in the course of employment or occurs at the worksite.

(D) Four workplace violence types:

(1) "Type 1 violence" means workplace violence committed by a person who has no legitimate business at the work site, and includes violent acts by anyone who enters the workplace with the intent to commit a crime.

(2) "Type 2 violence" means workplace violence directed at employees by customers, clients, patients, students, inmates, or visitors.

(3) "Type 3 violence" means workplace violence against an employee by a present or former employee, supervisor, or manager.

(4) "Type 4 violence" means workplace violence committed in the workplace by someone who does not work there, but has or is known to have had a personal relationship with an employee.

We thank you for changing the words ‘his or her’ to ‘their’ in the definition of “threat of violence,” however, this definition also needs to be broadened to ensure that *predictors* of violent behavior as well as *specific violent behaviors* are covered, regardless of whether an “injury” as defined in Title 8 results or not. (See discussion below.) This is particularly important for the purposes of recordkeeping and flagging predictive violent behavior.

Therefore, we recommend enhancing the current definition of threat of violence with the following language:

“Threat of violence” means a statement or conduct that has a reasonable possibility of resulting in, injury, psychological trauma, or stress, regardless of whether the employee sustains an injury;

that causes a person to fear for their safety ~~because there is a reasonable possibility the person might be physically injured~~, and that serves no legitimate purpose.

B. Injury definition

The narrow scope of the rule's definition of injury as *injuries reportable under the Log 300* as defined in Title 8, Section 14300.7(b)(1)⁶ is problematic because the word "injury" is presented in such a way as to have the end effect of serving as the **only way** to evaluate the effectiveness of the plan. That is, a review of the WVP plan's effectiveness will only occur after a recordable injury takes place. Similarly, periodic reviews of the plan's effectiveness, although important, are also insufficient to ensure a truly effective prevention plan.

Title 8 defines a reportable injury as one that results in first aid, days away from work or a "significant" injury diagnosed by a physician. Not all instances of workplace violence, however, no matter how egregious, result in an "injury." Thus, if an employee is punched in the face but only required an ice pack but no days away from work and no physician time, the incident would not qualify as a "reportable injury" and thus would not trigger an employer to take steps to evaluate the efficacy of their existing plan. Similarly, if an employee gets held down and groped but the sexual assault does not result in a "recordable injury" that would also not trigger an evaluation. We believe, however, that regardless of the degree of physical injury suffered by the survivor, *any* threat of violence should trigger an evaluation of the employer's plan since all of these incidents may lead to greater violence in the workplace. In fact, all of these instances in themselves are examples of problematic behavior and certainly warrant an employer's immediate attention. Relying on degree of injury is a poor criteria to prompt evaluating the effectiveness of the employer's plan, especially when the purpose of the plan is prevention. Language regarding "periodic" review of the WVP plan will not resolve this issues and is also insufficient.

Therefore, the term "injury" in the definitions should be eliminated and instead, the employer should be required to evaluate the plan's effectiveness after any incident of workplace violence:

(c)(12) Procedures to review the effectiveness of the Plan periodically and after any workplace violence incident ~~that results in an injury~~, and to revise the Plan as needed.

C. Representative definition

Finally, although the current draft includes "union representative," the definition of "representative" should be broader to permit employees to elect a representative even where there is no collective bargaining agent. Worker-designated representatives play a key role in increasing safety and health in California's workplaces. Their role is especially important when workers are disempowered and not protected by a union.

In fact, a broader definition of an employee-designated representative would be more consistent with existing definitions in both federal and California law. We need only look to the Federal Hazard Communication Standards and the California employee exposure records regulations for examples on

⁶ Cal. Code Regs., tit. 8, § 14300.7, subd. (b)(1)(A)-(F) requires employers to report injuries resulting in death, days away from work, restricted work or transfer to another job, medical treatment beyond first aid, or significant injury or illness diagnosed by a physician or other licensed healthcare professional or loss of consciousness.

clear definitions of an employee representative.

The Federal Hazard Communication Standard⁷ defines “Designated Representative” as: “any individual or organization to whom an employee gives written authorization to exercise such employee's rights under this section,” and provides that “[a] recognized or certified collective bargaining agent shall be treated automatically as a designated representative without regard to written employee authorization.”

The California Access to Employee Exposure and Medical Records⁸ regulation defines a “Designated Representative” as:

“[a]ny individual or organization to whom an employee gives written authorization to exercise a right of access. A recognized or certified collective bargaining agent shall be treated automatically as a designated representative for the purpose of access to employee exposure records and analyses using exposure or medical records, but access to an employee's medical records requires the employee's written consent.”

In addition, as we mentioned in previously submitted comments, there should be built in safeguards to ensure a representative is qualified and authorized by the workers.

Therefore, we recommend using any of the following definitions and we request that you remove the term “union” from all references to a worker representative:

“Employee Representative” means any individual or organization to whom an employee gives written authorization to exercise such employee’s right under this standard. Where there is a recognized or certified collective bargaining agent, that individual shall be treated automatically as a designated employee representative without regard to written employee authorization.

“Qualified Representative” an authorized employee representative selected by two or more employees which representative shall be an attorney, a health or safety professional, union representative, or a representative of a community organization such as a worker center or worker advocacy organization.

We also suggest including the requirement that representatives have **access** to the plan in the standard. In the current draft, the term “representative” is used in Recordkeeping, section (f), and Workplace Violence Prevention Plan, section (c)(2).

Under Recordkeeping section (f), representatives are given access to the *records* as it relates to hazard identification, evaluation and correction, training and violent incident log. However, the type of access workers and their representatives must have needs clarification. Clarifying the type and form of access to the plan to **both** workers and their representatives will ensure that they have critical information about the employer’s plan. This is especially important where workers are disempowered and non-unionized. We

⁷ 29 CFR 1910.1200(c); See also the Mine Safety and Health Act, 30 C.F.R. § 40.1(b): “(b)Representative of miners means: (1) Any person or organization which represents two or more miners at a coal or other mine for the purposes of the Act, and (2) Representatives authorized by the miners, miners or their representative, authorized miner representative, and other similar terms as they appear in the Act.”

⁸ Cal. Code Regs., tit. 8, § 3204(c)(3).

suggest adopting the below language which clarifies what type of access workers and their representative should have to the plan.

Likewise, Workplace Violence Prevention Plan, section (c)(2) requires employers to obtain the active involvement of employees and “representatives”, in developing and implementing as well as identifying, evaluating, and correcting issues. Thus, it makes sense to also allow representatives access to such plan. Thus, we propose inserting “and qualified representative(s)” under subsection (c) to ensure that representatives also have access to the plan.

Thus, we recommend the following language:

(c) Workplace Violence Prevention Plan. The employer shall establish, implement and maintain an effective workplace violence prevention plan (Plan). The Plan shall be in writing and shall be available to employees **and qualified representative(s)** at all times

(f)(6) All records required by this subsection shall be made available to employees and their representatives, on request for examination and a single copy of any record must be provided free of charge. If the employee or their representative agrees to receive the record electronically, the employer may provide the record electronically.

II. Environmental Risk Factors, Engineering and Control Measures & Other Important Measure

A. Plan must include Environmental Risk Factors Assessment

While we appreciate the inclusion of language to generally require procedures to evaluate workplace violence hazards, evaluation of environmental factors such as physical space is also extremely important to an effective WVP plan. As we know, some of the most vulnerable workers, like janitors, often work at night and in isolation. This isolation from co-workers and the public reduces the likelihood that anyone will intervene or witness assaults against them, and allows harassers to exert even greater control over workers. Lilia Garcia-Brower, Executive Director of the Maintenance Cooperation Trust Fund (MCTF), a California multi-stakeholder janitorial industry watchdog group, stated that “in her experience, as many as three quarters of janitors experience sexual harassment.”⁹ Thus, an employer should be required to identify and evaluate and ultimately implement necessary control measures to eliminate or reduce such environmental risks.

Therefore, we recommend the following language:

(c)(9) Procedures to identify and evaluate workplace violence hazards and environmental risk factors, including scheduled periodic inspections to identify unsafe conditions and work practices; and procedures to evaluate workplace violence hazards identified through periodic inspections, employee concerns, workplace violence incidents, and whenever the employer is made aware of a new or previously unrecognized hazard.

B. Plan must include Engineering and Workplace practice controls

⁹ *Id.*

Language requiring engineering and workplace practice controls is not included in this current draft and we believe it should be. An effective WVP plan must identify the engineering and workplace practice controls the employer will implement to help prevent or reduce the risk of workplace violence. This is important because once the employer has done an effective hazard assessment the next logical step is to develop controls to either eliminate or reduce the risk of the hazard.

Workers in janitorial, agricultural, hotel, fast food/convenience stores and other industries like warehousing, often work at times when natural illumination may be poor like early in the morning or late at night. Workers in these industries are often isolated for hours with very little contact with other employees and are required to cover large physical spaces or tend to transient customers. Engineering controls such as alarms or panic buttons can reduce a workers' risk for workplace violence. The City of Oakland, for example, recently enacted Measure Z which requires panic buttons for hotel housekeepers.¹⁰

Other examples of feasible workplace controls are a buddy system so that no worker is in isolation, improved lighting, adequate staffing such that sufficient workers are on staff to cover a wide area or assign workers to a smaller area to work.

The additional language outlined above ensures that the employer engages in a deeper analysis of the risk of workplace violence in order to consider engineering and workplace practice control measures to prevent and reduce workplace violence. These basic steps ensure employers and workers understand the hazard of workplace violence. It also ensures workers, if given adequate training, understand the employers' control measures to prevent and reduce the risk of a workplace violence incident. A specific timeline by which employers must take corrective action after identifying the hazard is also important to ensure workers and employers are clear on the expectations for addressing the hazard. We suggest including language similar to what is drafted in the WVP in health care regulation.

Therefore, we recommend the following language:

(c)(10) Procedures to correct workplace violence hazards in a timely manner in accordance with title 8, section 3203 (a)(6). Engineering and work practice controls shall be used to eliminate or minimize employee exposure to the identified hazards to the extent feasible. The employer shall take measures to protect employees from imminent hazards immediately, and shall take measures to protect employees from identified serious hazards within seven days of the discovery of the hazard, where there is a realistic possibility that death or serious physical harm could result from the hazard. When an identified corrective measure cannot be implemented within this timeframe, the employer shall take interim measures to abate the imminent or serious nature of the hazard while completing the permanent control measures.

¹⁰ City of Oakland Ballot Measure Z

<https://www.acvote.org/acvoteassets/02_election_information/PDFs/20181106/en/Measures/22%20-%20Measure%20Z%20-%20City%20of%20Oakland.pdf> (as of Nov. 26, 2018); McHeegan, *For New York Hotel Staff, Panic Buttons and Big Raises*, *The New York Times* (Feb. 7, 2012) <<http://www.nytimes.com/2012/02/08/nyregion/city-hotel-workers-to-be-issued-panic-buttons.html>> (as of Dec. 5, 2018); See also Assem. Bill No. 1761, (2017-2018 Reg. Sess.) § 6403.7; Daniels, *California proposes hotel 'panic button' bill to protect workers from assaults, sex harassment*, *CNBC* (Dec. 5, 2018).

C. Plan must be in effect at all times

Any WVP plan should be in effect **at all times**. This specification was in the final draft of the WVP in health care standard, and there is no reason why it should not be included in the general industry standard. Workplace violence can happen at any time, and having a plan in place at all times provides maximum protection to workers. We believe the Standards Board shares this belief since the WVP for Health Care had this language from start to finish: “shall establish, implement and maintain an effective workplace violence prevention plan (Plan) that is in effect at all times in every unit, service, and operation.”¹¹

Therefore we recommend:

As part of the Injury and Illness Prevention Program (IIPP) required by Section 3203, the employer shall establish, implement and maintain an effective workplace violence prevention plan (Plan) that is in effect at all times.

D. Plan must enable workers to report to someone other than their direct supervisor

While we were pleased to see the requirement that employers create procedures for reporting all types of violence, we are particularly concerned with the employers’ responsibility to set up procedures for reporting violence in “Type 3 violence” under (c)(4), which involves supervisor perpetrated workplace violence. It is extremely important to set up procedures for workers to report to someone other than their direct supervisor. Several recent documentaries, PBS-Frontline special *Rape on the Night Shift*, and *Rape in the Fields* show the violence these workers, who are mostly immigrant women of color, suffer at the hands of supervisors or others who held themselves out to be supervisors.¹² Moreover, it is well known that in agriculture and janitorial work, many incidents of violence are perpetrated by supervisory employees.

Workers are understandably very uncomfortable about reporting threats and incidents of sexual violence. A zero tolerance policy and a system encouraging reports of concerns to a human resources person or another office employee are much needed administrative controls in these situations. To reduce barriers to reporting we propose this language that tracks the shade provision language in the outdoor heat regulation, under the California Code of Regulations, Title 8 section 3395:

Therefore we recommend the following changes:

“(c)(4) Effective procedures for the employer to accept and respond to reports of workplace violence, in a manner that does not discourage reporting, including procedures for reporting all types of violence to a designated person, and procedures for reporting Type 3 violence to a designated person who is not a direct supervisor.”

¹¹ Cal.Occupational Safety and Health Stds. Bd., Proposed WVP in Health Care Standard <<https://www.dir.ca.gov/oshsb/documents/Workplace-Violence-Prevention-in-Health-Care-proptxt.pdf>> (as of Dec 5, 2018).

¹² Bergman et. al., *Rape in the Fields*, Frontline, Investigative Reporting Program at UC Berkeley, and the Center for Investigative Reporting (May 15, 2012) < <http://www.pbs.org/wgbh/frontline/film/rape-in-the-fields/>> (as of Dec. 5, 2018).

E. Plan must allow enable workers to report violent incidents to law enforcement w/o retaliation

While we are pleased with the inclusion of anti-retaliation language with respect to reporting workplace violence to an employer, we believe workers need to be informed of their right to report workplace violence to law enforcement without fear of retaliation. This is particularly important to ensure that workers are informed of this right given the real fear of retaliation some workers have when reporting incidents to law enforcement. Workers have reported experiencing intimidation and discouragement from their employer about reporting workplace violence. In some more egregious instances employers have retaliated against workers by calling law enforcement after workers have tried to exercise their health and safety rights. Now more than ever, ensuring protections in this regard is critical under the current Federal administration's anti-immigration stance which has instilled a mistrust of government and law enforcement agencies in immigrant and marginalized communities.

Thus, it is important to ensure that an affected employee is aware of their right to make a police report about a violent incident and to have a record of the reporting of the incident. Employers should be required to verify that they have given the affected employee a form, created by the Division with such information. This will ensure workers are given the necessary information and tools that they need to make a complaint.

Therefore, we recommend adding the following language:

(c)(6)(C) How an employee can report a violent incident or threat to local law enforcement without fear of reprisal.

Additionally, we recommend the following insertion:

(c)(11) Procedures for post incident response and investigation, including completion of a form created by the Division that explains an employee's right to make a police report about the incident and provides contact information for local law enforcement. A form must be provided to any employee who is a victim of workplace violence. The form must be provided in a language the employee understands or with translation service, including phone translation service if needed to help complete the form. Any worker who files a complaint or suffers an injury should be provided with a copy of the completed incident investigation.

F. Plan must include language on employers' responsibility to alert workers to threats

While we are pleased with the language on active shooter, the plan needs language about an employer's responsibility to create an effective means to identify and be alerted to threats. Workers need to know how the employer intends to alert them to threats in the workplace. If they are not informed of the presence, location, and nature of a security threat, workers will be left vulnerable and susceptible to workplace violence. Moreover, if alarms or process are not effective, again workers will be left vulnerable. Such alarms or alerts may include: coded notices over intercom systems, texts, or emails.

Therefore, we recommend adding the following language to this subsection:

“(c)(7)(A) How employees will be alerted about workplace violence emergencies, through an effective means by which employees can be alerted to the presence, location, and nature of a security threat.”

III. Training

We appreciate the inclusion of training covering all workers, especially the most vulnerable workers such as contingent and temporary employers. However, we are still concerned with the lack of requiring “in-person” training. “In-person” training is important because it allows for interactive and meaningful discussion, something that is not easily available in a webinar setting. In addition, not all workers can easily access and understand webinar formatted trainings.

Thus, the standard must require in-person training for optimal learning outcomes for workers. Although the standard can include webinar and e-learning training methods, as defined in Title 2 of the California Code of Regulations, section 11024(a)(2), these should only serve as supplemental tools to in-person instruction. Webinar and e-learning training methods should not, by themselves, fulfill the requirements of this subchapter.

Therefore we recommend the following language:

(e)Training. The employer shall provide effective in-person workplace violence prevention training to a covered worker or supervisor by a qualified trainer who is physically present in the room to present information, lead discussions, and respond to questions as specified in subsections (e)(1) and (e)(2).”

We thank the Advisory Committee for providing workers and their representatives with the opportunity to be meaningfully involved in the process of developing training curricula under (c)(2). Having this component as a requirement will ensure accessibility and give workers and their representatives the ability to develop worker based and practical solutions for their own workplaces.

As mentioned in prior comments, the individual providing the training must be qualified to do so. Setting parameters for trainers ensures the person conducting the training is knowledgeable in the subject matter. This is important because we have heard of examples where supervisors who are perpetrating the violence are also conducting workplace trainings or where the attorney representing the company provides a sexual harassment prevention training to workers. This is highly inappropriate, rendering the training to be compromised because the attorney has an invested interest in defending the employer from liability and thus has an inherent conflict of interest.

These scenarios pose obstacles for workers to receive unbiased training that will truly help them to navigate both the prevention and reporting incidences of workplace violence. The language we propose is consistent with the Fair Employment and Housing Act (FEHA), Title 2, § 11024 of the California Code of Regulations. It also promotes a trauma-informed training and prevention model.

Therefore, the following language should be added under a new subsection

(e)(5): A definition of qualified trainer should be added to include: Qualified trainer means a human resource professional or harassment prevention consultant, including a peer advocate, engaged as an employee or independent contractor, who is aware of

“trauma-informed approaches,” as defined by the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA)¹³ to violence prevention education and training and has a minimum of two years of practical experience in one or more of the following:

a. designing or conducting discrimination, retaliation and workplace violence and/or sexual violence prevention training;

b. responding to workplace violence complaints or other discrimination complaints;

c. conducting investigations of workplace violence and/or sexual violence complaints;

d. advising employers or employees regarding discrimination, retaliation and workplace violence and/or sexual violence prevention.

Lastly, as mentioned in prior comments, it is important for workers to understand what resources are available to them if a workplace violence incident occurs. This is important to include in the curriculum as many workers might not be aware of other rights they have under other areas of the law or resources available to them in the case of a workplace violence incident.

Therefore we recommend the following language:

(e)(2): Initial training shall address the workplace violence hazards specific to the employees’ jobs, the corrective measures the employer has implemented, an explanation of the employers’ Plan, how to seek assistance to prevent or respond to violence, strategies to avoid physical harm, and how to report workplace violence incidents or concerns to the employer without fear of reprisal. How to contact other agencies such as DFEH or law enforcement without fear of reprisal. How to contact support publically available resources for victims of violent crimes.”

**

In closing, we appreciate your efforts in establishing a strong and comprehensive WVP standard for general industry and the opportunity to be a part of this process. Please direct any questions regarding this comment letter to Worksafe’s Nicole Marquez at nmarquez@worksafe.org or (510) 922-9719.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments.

Sincerely,

/s/

Nicole Marquez
Senior Staff Attorney
Worksafe

¹³ Substance Abuse and Mental Health Svcs. Admin., (SAMHSA), Concept of Trauma-Informed Approach (April 14, 2015) <<https://www.samhsa.gov/nctic/trauma-interventions>> (as of Dec. 5, 2018) “A program, organization, or system that is trauma-informed: (1) Realizes the widespread impact of trauma and understands potential paths for recovery; (2) Recognizes the signs and symptoms of trauma in clients, families, staff, and others involved with the system; (3) Responds by fully integrating knowledge about trauma into policies, procedures, and practices; and (4) Seeks to actively resist re-traumatization. A trauma-informed approach can be implemented in any type of service setting or organization and is distinct from trauma-specific interventions or treatments that are designed specifically to address the consequences of trauma and to facilitate healing.”