



July 14, 2025

Re: Workplace Violence Prevention Standard - General Industry

Dear Eric Berg,

We appreciate the opportunity to comment on the proposed workplace violence prevention standard and commend the Division's comprehensive approach to this critical worker safety issue. The collaborative effort among stakeholders and government agencies has produced a thoughtful framework that addresses the urgent need for systematic workplace violence prevention across all industries. We support the Division's commitment to establishing a robust standard with broad applicability that will meaningfully protect workers from the serious and growing threat of workplace violence.

While we appreciate the Division's comprehensive approach, we were disappointed with several elements that unnecessarily limit the standard's protective scope and effectiveness.

First, while we do appreciate the Division now proposes that the exception will not apply to Security Services, Janitorial Services and Domestic Work pursuant to Labor Code 6303, we still are concerned about EXCEPTION 6 and would like to propose its elimination. We understand that EXCEPTION 6 limits the applicability of the standard to workplaces with fewer than 10 employees that are not accessible to the public. However, excluding the remainder of small, non-public workplaces is very problematic. These workers face the risk of violence from employers or other employees or unauthorized public access and deserve the same protections as employees in larger or public-facing settings. Whether a workplace is publicly accessible does not diminish the risk of workplace violence. Comprehensive workplace violence prevention must protect all employees, regardless of the workplace's size or level of public accessibility.

Moreover, Cal/OSHA should seize the opportunity to exceed statutory minimums with the standard. EXCEPTION 6 unnecessarily restricts the standards' reach. By encompassing all locations where employees perform work duties, Cal/OSHA can effectively protect all workers from workplace violence.

We believe that key changes in the following sections will further strengthen the standard: (1) definitions for "authorized employee representative," and "workplace violence" (2) subsection (c)(11)(C) regarding trauma counseling and (3) the exceptions to subsections (c)(11)(D) through (G).

I. Definitions.

The proposed definitions contain several problematic limitations that will undermine the standard's effectiveness and create unnecessary confusion with existing regulations.

A. "Authorized Employee Representative."

The definition of "authorized employee representative" creates significant coverage gaps. This definition is overly narrow and provides minimal representation. For example, the definition is limiting recognition to organizations with collective bargaining relationships or those "acknowledged by a public agency." This narrow approach produces troubling loopholes. If an employer refuses to bargain with employee representatives, does representation cease to exist? The definition provides no answer, potentially allowing employers to eliminate employee participation simply by declining to engage.

Notably, this definition excludes state government employees who lack collective bargaining rights under California law. Government agencies subject to this standard could effectively deny their employees any authorized representation, contradicting the standard's participatory intent.

Moreover, this restrictive approach lacks consistency with other workplace safety standards that recognize broader forms of employee representation. To illustrate, the Injury and Illness

Prevention Program regulation defines “designated representative” as “any 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 the Program.”¹ Similarly, the healthcare violence prevention standard consistently references “employees and their representatives” throughout the regulation.² Though it lacks a definition, the healthcare violence standard implies a broader interpretation that includes a personal representative chosen by the employee.

This deviation from related standards appears arbitrary and undermines employee protections precisely where they are most needed. Narrowing the definition of “authorized employee representative” in this context creates a regulatory gap, leaving workers vulnerable, particularly those in non-unionized workplaces or government agencies without collective bargaining rights. This inconsistency not only weakens worker safety protections but also fragments Cal/OSHA’s regulatory framework, creating confusion for employers and enforcement officials who must navigate different representation standards across related workplace safety requirements.

While it is true that “authorized employee representative” appears in other areas of Title 8, its use is limited to specific contexts or procedures. These include exposure to lead, coke oven emissions, formaldehyde, and food flavoring chemicals.³ The term also appears in regulatory variance procedures, which allow employers to seek exemptions from specific safety orders by demonstrating alternative protective measures that provide equivalent employee protection.⁴ In both contexts, the narrow definition serves specific purposes: ensuring that only formally recognized representatives have access to specialized technical data or participate in complex regulatory proceedings that require specialized knowledge. In contrast, workplace violence prevention involves fundamentally different considerations than chemical hazard monitoring or variance applications. Violence prevention requires broad employee participation, situational awareness, and the ability to report concerns without fear of retaliation. These objectives are undermined by artificially limiting who can represent workers.

Therefore, to ensure regulatory consistency and maximize worker participation, we recommend that Cal/OSHA adopt the broader definition from the Injury and Illness Prevention Program, which recognizes any individual or organization with written employee authorization as a

¹ Cal. Code Regs. tit. 8, § 3203(a)(8)(A)(2).

² See Cal. Code Regs. tit. 8, § 3342.

³ See Cal. Code Regs., tit. 8, § 5198; Cal. Code Regs., tit. 8, § 1532.1; Cal. Code Regs., tit. 8, § 5211; Cal. Code Regs., tit. 8, § 5217; Cal. Code Regs., tit. 8, § 5197; Cal. Code Regs., tit. 8, § 5198 App. C; Cal. Code Regs., tit. 8, § 1532.1 App. C.

⁴ See Cal. Code Regs., tit. 8, § 412.2; Cal. Code Regs., tit. 8, § 424.3; Cal. Code Regs., tit. 8, § 406; Cal. Code Regs. tit. 8, § 403; Cal. Code Regs., tit. 8, § 411.2. See also Cal. Lab. Code § 143 (authorizing employers to apply for permanent variances from occupational safety and health standards upon demonstrating alternative methods that provide equal or superior employee safety, and establishing procedures for board review and approval of such variances).

designated representative while automatically treating collective bargaining agents as authorized representatives. This approach would eliminate coverage gaps, establish uniform standards across workplace safety regulations, and ensure that all workers have meaningful representation in the development and implementation of workplace violence prevention measures.

B. “Definition of Workplace Violence.”

We appreciate that the Division has expanded the definition of violence to include “psychological trauma, or stress, regardless of whether the employee sustains an injury.” There are predictors and early indicators that contribute to violent behavior, and this will ensure that crucial factors are not overlooked. This can ensure better identification and address underlying issues before they manifest as actual violent acts.

We appreciate the Division for adding stalking to the definition of workplace violence.

However, there are still some key gaps in the definition of workplace violence.

We support the use of “place of employment” instead of “worksite”, but think the definition of “Workplace violence” should also include violence occurring on employer arranged or provided transportation and should be expanded to include any act of violence or threat of violence from supervisors or managers at employer provided housing. Farmworkers have reported threats and incidents of violence experienced both on employer arranged transportation and in employer provided housing.

In addition, while “place of employment” is broader than “worksite,” it needs to be made clear that it includes non-fixed worksites. “Location of employment” would be clearer than “place of employment”. See our comments, dated April 28, 2018 for certain types of workplace situations that the current definition may exclude.⁵

We recommend making the following changes to the definition:

“Workplace violence” means any act of violence or threat of violence that occurs at the location place of employment or while using employer supplied or arranged transportation or any threat of violence by a supervisor or employer that occurs at employer supplied housing. Workplace violence includes, but is not limited to, the following: . . .”

As shared in our letter on September 3, 2024, stalking has been identified as the most prevalent form of abuse at work.⁶ 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

⁵ See Worksafe Comments submitted to advisory committee, p.3-4 (April 28, 2018).

⁶ Reeves & O’Leary-Kelly, A Study of the Effects of Intimate Partner Violence on the Workplace (2009) pg. 3.

killed during their lifetimes.⁷ However, the proposed definition in this rulemaking proposal is to incorporate Penal Code Section 646.9, which is as follows:

“(a) Any person who willfully, maliciously, and repeatedly follows or willfully and maliciously harasses another person and who makes a credible threat with the intent to place that person in reasonable fear for their safety, or the safety of their immediate family, is guilty of the crime of stalking.”

Pen. Code, § 646.9.

However, we recommend against the language “[t]his includes the crime of stalking as defined in California Penal Code 646.9. . .” for the following reasons. Incorporating the penal code definition would be a challenge for employers because this definition is used to impose criminal liability. Employers are not equipped to assess whether actions taken against an employee were malicious, assess the intent behind the behavior, decide whether a credible threat was made, and whether the person is guilty of the crime of stalking.

Furthermore, under Penal Code 646.9, a key component is a "credible threat" made with intent to cause reasonable fear. But in a health and safety context, this creates ambiguity. How would HR or a supervisor assess from an employee's perspective what is a credible threat and what reasonable fear is? Relying on Penal Code 646.9 could lead employers to underreact, since the standard is too high (as it is for the purposes of convicting someone of a crime), and employers and employees may be unsure what conduct “counts” as stalking. Furthermore, it would be dangerous to have supervisors and HRs making determinations that in criminal law require evidence, witnesses, testimony, and legal arguments.

The aim of workplace health and safety laws is to prevent harm and promote a safe work environment. A definition that aligns with this would be best.

Therefore we recommend the following language as stalking should remain in the definition of workplace violence:

(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. This includes **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** the

⁷ Centers 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).

~~crime of stalking as defined in California Penal Code 646.9 +~~ **or that** occurs at a place of employment, or in connection with a place of employment that are brought to the attention of the employer or that the employer could otherwise be reasonably be aware of.

Therefore, the definition we have proposed would directly relate to determining whether a health and safety issue exists that must be identified, evaluated, and addressed through actions to reduce or eliminate the hazard. Furthermore it is similar to California Labor Code Section 6432, which states that a serious violation exists when “there is a realistic possibility that death or serious physical harm could result from the actual hazard created by the violation.” The definition proposed aligns with Cal/OSHA’s standard because it focuses on whether actual or likely harm triggers regulatory concern, even if no injury has yet occurred. Moreover, material harm to physical health and safety of the employee directly aligns with whether an illness or injury could occur. Finally, the proposed definition limits the employer’s obligation to act only to hazards they can control or are responsible for.

The proposed definition would focus on risk-based, preventative, and employee safety, whereas the penal code definition requires legal findings that employers are not authorized to make and sets a high threshold that may miss earlier, preventable harm and possibly discourage employees from reporting and supervisors acting on reports.

II. Post-Incident Response: Trauma Counseling Provision.

Subsection (c)(11)(C) requires employers to offer trauma counseling to affected employees following a workplace violence incident, but only “upon request.” This limitation fundamentally shifts the burden of responsibility from the employers to the employees and creates barriers to accessing critical mental health support.

The “upon request” requirement places the burden on traumatized employees to recognize their need for counseling and actively seek it. Many employees lack awareness of available resources or the psychological impact of workplace violence. This approach forces advocates and union representatives to educate workers about requesting services that should automatically be offered. This responsibility should belong to employers.

Additionally, requiring employees to request trauma counseling can create stigma and potentially labels workers as psychologically vulnerable. Employees may fear that seeking mental health support could affect their job security, advancement opportunities, or workplace relationships. This chilling effect directly undermines the provision’s protective intent.

Finally, the “upon request” language is redundant. The provision already specifies that employers must “offer” or “make available” trauma counseling, which inherently makes participation

voluntary. Employees retain the right to decline offered services. The additional “upon request” requirement serves only to create a barrier while providing no additional employee protection.

Therefore, we recommend that Cal/OSHA eliminate the phrase “upon request” from the provision, requiring employers to offer trauma counseling to all affected employees affirmatively while preserving each employee’s right to accept or decline these services.

III. Post-Incident Exceptions.

The exceptions to subsections (c)(11)(D) through (G) are excessively broad and undermine essential post-incident protections. These exceptions exempt employers from conducting debriefings, hazard evaluations, corrective measure assessments, and employee consultation for “involuntary or unintentional type 2 workplace violent incidents that are repetitive,” provided no serious injury, death, or use of weapons occurred.

This sweeping exemption essentially tells employees that if they survive repetitive workplace violence without serious physical harm, they should expect no meaningful post-incident response procedures or changes in their workplaces to prevent violent incidents. The exceptions eliminate critical safety procedures designed to prevent escalation and protect workers, creating an unacceptable statement that Cal/OSHA deems workplace violence is acceptable if it doesn’t cause visible injury.

For example, a restaurant worker repeatedly threatened by customers, a retail employee facing ongoing harassment, or a nurse experiencing recurring client aggression would lose all post-incident protections under these exceptions. Such workers deserve the same safety evaluations and preventative measures regardless of whether previous incidents caused physical injury.

Therefore, the exception should be removed. Repetitive type 2 violence even when it does not involve serious injury, death, or weapons should still prompt post-incident protections such as evaluations, as these assessments may help prevent future incidents that could result in serious harm to employees.

IV. Conclusion.

In closing, we appreciate your efforts in establishing a strong and comprehensive workplace violence standard for general industry and the opportunity to participate in the drafting process. While the standard would be a significant step forward in protecting California workers from a pervasive hazard, as currently drafted, the specific deficiencies outlined above threaten to undermine the standard’s effectiveness. These limitations create unnecessary barriers to worker participation, reduce employer accountability, and establish inconsistent regulatory frameworks that will confuse and weaken enforcement. We urge the Division to address these concerns by

adopting the broader representative definitions already established in related safety standards, eliminating procedural obstacles to mental health support, and removing exceptions that excuse inadequate responses to repetitive violence. With these revisions, California can establish a truly comprehensive workplace violence prevention standard that meaningfully protects all workers while providing clear and consistent guidance to employers and enforcement officials. If you have questions regarding this comment letter, please direct them to Worksafe's Karín Umfrey (kumfrey@worksafe.org) and California Rural Legal Aid Foundation's Anne Katten (akatten@crlaf.org). Thank you for your consideration.

Respectfully submitted,

Karín Umfrey, Worksafe

Anne Katten, California Rural Legal Aid Foundation

Elmer Lizardi, California Labor Federation

Maegan Ortiz, Instituto de Educación Popular del Sur de California (IDEPSCA)

Kristin Heidelberg, UFCW Western States Council

Ruth Silver Taube, Santa Clara County Wage Theft Coalition

Carmen Comsti, California Nurses Association/ National Nurses United

Suzanne Teran, University of California, Berkeley Labor Occupational Health and Safety Program

Navnit Puryear, California School Employees Association

Nicole Marquez, National Employment Law Project

Eddie Sanchez, Southern California Coalition for Occupational Safety and Health (SoCalCOSH)

Janice O'Malley, AFSCME, AFL-CIO

Katherine Hughes RN, Nurse Alliance of SEIU California

Michelle Warsaw, California Teachers Association

Louie Costa, SMART - Transportation Division

Ryan Snow, California State Legislative Board; IBT; BLET Division 126 in Bakersfield, California

Shane Gusman, Teamsters California

Shane Gusman, California Conference Board of the Amalgamated Transit Union

Glenn Shor, Continuing Lecturer, University of California, Berkeley School of Public Health

Barbara Berney MD PhD (Emeritus Associate Professor at CUNY School of Public Health)