STATE OF CALIFORNIA

DEPARTMENT OF INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS

OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY & HEALTH STANDARDS BOARD

PUBLIC MEETING AND BUSINESS MEETING

In the Matter of: November 19, 2020 OSH Standards Board Meeting

)

)

)

TELECONFERENCE

PLEASE NOTE: In accordance with Executive Order N-29-20, and Executive Order N-33-20, the PHYSICAL meeting location has been cancelled for November.

THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 19, 2020

10:00 A.M.

Reported by: E. Hicks

BOARD MEMBERS:

David Thomas, Chair Barbara Burgel, Occupational Health Representative Dave Harrison, Labor Representative Nola Kennedy, Public Member Chris Laszcz-Davis, Management Representative Laura Stock, Occupational Safety Representative

BOARD STAFF PRESENT AT OSHSB OFFICE:

Christina Shupe, Executive Officer Michael Nelmida, Sr. Safety Engineer Sarah Money, Executive Assistant

DIVISION OF OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY AND HEALTH STAFF:

Douglas Parker, Director Eric Berg, Deputy Chief of Health

BOARD STAFF PRESENT VIA TELECONFERENCE OR WEBEX:

Michael Manieri, Principal Safety Engineer Lara Paskins, Staff Services Manager David Kernazitskas, Sr. Safety Engineer Jennifer White, Staff Services Analyst

ADDITIONAL ATTENDEES:

John Gotcher, TKO John Roensch, TKO Maya Morsi, TKO Michael Howard, TKO

INTERPRETERS:

Susana Haikalis Julie Drucker Aimee Benavides

PUBLIC COMMENT: (Cont.)

Rob Moutrie, California Chamber of Commerce Camucha King, UNITE HERE Alma Comacho, Maintenance Cooperation Trust Fund Carlos Almarez, Garment Worker Center Rico Tamayo, California Federation of Teachers Keith Brown, Oakland Education Association Patrick Cirby, UNITE HERE Brooke Billingsley, LAANE Morgan Craig, UNITE HERE Joy Schnapper, Capistrano Educators Association Bruce Wick, CALPASC Efrain Hernandez, Garment Worker Center Nho Le-Hinds, Sacramento City Teachers Association Emma Allen-Landwehr, ROC the Bay Natasha Castro, Los Angeles Alliance for a New Economy Robert Harrison, UC San Francisco David, ROC the Bay Michael Miiller, California Association of Winegrape Growers Michael Young, California Federation of Teachers Maria Vazquez, Restaurant Opportunities Center of Los Angeles Angelica Miklos, Folsom Cordova Education Association Stan Santos, Fresno-Madera-Tulare-Kings Labor Council Rachel Reyes, Los Angeles Alliance for a New Economy Melissa Love, United for Respect Dan Leacox, Leacox & Associates Nicole Rice, CMTA Zenaida Perez Fuentes, Southern California Coalition for Occupational Safety & Health Matt Rogers, AgSocio Virgilda Romero, Garment Worker Center Elizabeth Treanor, Phylmar Regulatory Roundtable (PRR) - OSH Forum Carolyn Denise Barlage, Los Angeles Alliance for a New Economy Anne Katten, California Rural Legal Assistance Foundation Andrew J. Sommer, Conn Maciel Carey, representing the California Employers COVID-19 **Prevention Coalition** Katie Hansen, California Restaurant Association Pamela Murcell, California Industrial Hygiene Council Maggie Robbins, Worksafe Lizette Aguilar, Fight for \$15 and a Union Mitch Steiger, California Labor Federation Juvenal Solano, Mixteco Indigena Community Organizing Project/MICOP from Ventura County

Julia Garcia, Lideres Campesinas

APPEARANCES (Cont.)

PUBLIC COMMENT: (Cont.)

Helen Cleary, Phylmar Regulatory Roundtable (PRR)- OSH Forum Eric Frumin, Change to Win Michael Hall, Pacific Maritime Association

Brian Mello, Associated General Contractors of California Mike Donlon, The Construction Employers' Association Lucas Zucker, Central Coast Alliance United for a Sustainable Economy Christopher Valadez, Grower-Shipper Association of Central California Linda Kjesbu, Northern California Safety Consortium Bryan Little, California Farm Bureau Mirella Deniz-Zaragoza, Warehouse Worker Resource Center Fred Walter, Self Norma Encina, CIERTO Carolina Hernandez Espinoza, Self Honorata Carolina Garcia Torralba, Self Brualio Alonzo Pacheco, Self Sarait Martinez, Centro Binacional para el Desarrollo Indígena Oaxaqueño (CBDIO)

Kristin Hamon, San Diego Gas & Electric Jennifer Zurita, California Rural Legal Assistance, Inc. Matt Hart, United Food and Commercial Workers, Local 324 Claudia Reyes, Centro Binacional para el Desarrollo Indígena Oaxaqueño (CBDIO)

Irene de Barraicua, Líderes Campesinas Steve McCarthy, CA Retailers Association Meghan Neal, P.W. Gillibrand Cynthia L. Rice, CA Rural Legal Assistance Yardenna Aaron, Maintenance Cooperation Trust Fund (MCTF) Scott Brauninger, Build Group, Inc. Elvira Herrera, Lideres Campesinas Yesenia Gonzalez, UFCW Local 1167 Jassy Grewal, UFCW Western States Council Stacey Wittorff, Planned Parenthood Affiliates of California Regina Caldwell, Sutter Behavioral health Rachel Torres, UFCW

APPEARANCES (Cont.)

PUBLIC COMMENT: (Cont.)

Caitlin Vega, UNITE HERE Local 11 and Transport Workers Of America

Lauren Hajik, California Groceries Association Elgin Avila, Blue Green Alliance Ken Smith, University of California Elizabeth Perez, Self Gail M. Blanchard-Saiger, California Hospital Association Marilu Gonzalez, Mixteco Indigena Community Organizing Project/MICOP from Ventura County Rosalva, Self Melissa Peters, Littler AJ Rossitto, California Hotel and Lodging Association Ramon Castellblanch, California Alliance for Retired Americans Matthew Allen, Western Growers Association

Karen Tynan, Ogletree Deakins Mamula Ramirez, Farm Workers Leaders Jorge Toledano, Mixteco Indigena Community Organizing Project/MICOP from Ventura County Luz Gallegos, TODEC Ana Padilla, UC Merced Community and Labor Center Lorena Martinez, California Rural Legal Assistance, Inc. Fernando Torres, California Rural Legal Assistance, Inc. Shane Ross, California Rural Legal Assistance, Inc. Jen Hamelin, Public Risk Innovations, Solutions & Management (PRISM)

Andrew Gross Gaitan, SEIU United Service Workers West Estella M. Cisneros, California Rural Legal Assistance, Inc. Joe Duffel, United Food And Commercial Workers Union, Local 1167

Elda Brueggemann, Western Agricultural Process Association

T	Ν	D	Ε	Х

		Page
I.	CALL TO ORDER AND INTRODUCTIONS	8
11.	PUBLIC DISCUSSION (COVID-19 Prevention Emergency Regulations)	11
	A. The Board will hold a public discussion of the draft COVID-19 Prevention emergency regulations that will be considered for adoption.	
	 Presentation of Draft Proposed Text Public Comment on COVID-19 Prevention proposal Board Discussion 	
III. Pl	JBLIC MEETING (Open for Public Comment)	211
IV.	BUSINESS MEETING – All matters on this Business Meeting agenda are subject to such discussion and action as the Board determines to be appropriate.	211
	A. REPORTS	238
	 Division Update Legislative Update Executive Officer's Report 	
	B. PROPOSED VARIANCE DECISIONS FOR ADOPTION	212
	1. Consent Calendar	
	C. PROPOSED EMERGENCY SAFETY ORDERS FOR ADOPTION (GOV. CODE SEC. 11346.1)	219
	1. TITLE 8: GENERAL INDUSTRY SAFETY ORDERS Chapter 4, Subchapter 7, New Sections 3205, 3205.1, 3205.2, 3205.3 3205.4 COVID-19 Prevention	and

I N D E X (Cont.)

IV.	BUSINESS MEETING	- (Cont.)	212
	D. NEW BUSINESS		
	1. Future Age	enda Items	
	interest, the Board r or take action on an that is not included to place the matter	Member may identify a topic of nay not substantially discuss y matter raised during the meeting on this agenda, except to decide on the agenda of a future meeting. Sections 11125 & 11125.7(a).).	
	E. CLOSED SESSION		
	v. California Standards I District Cou	tates Petroleum Association (WSPA) Occupational Safety and Health Board (OSHSB), et al. United States Irt (Eastern District of Case No. 2:19-CV-01270; and	
		SHSB, et al., County of Sacramento, ^r Court Case No. 34-2019-00260210.	
	3. Personnel		
	F. RETURN TO OPEN	SESSION	
	1. Report fro	m Closed Session	
	G. ADJOURNMENT (OF THE BUSINESS SESSION	239
	Next Meeting:	December 17, 2020 Teleconference and Video-conferen (In accordance with Executive Order N-33-20) 10:00 a.m.	
Repo	rter's Certificate		240
Trans	criber's Certificate		241

CALIFORNIA REPORTING, LLC 229 Napa Street, Rodeo, California 94572 (510) 224-4476 7

Page

1	P R O C E E D I N G S
2	NOVEMBER 19, 2020 10:01 a.m.
3	CHAIR THOMAS: Good morning. This meeting of the Occupational
4	Safety and Health Standards Board is now called to order. I'm Dave Thomas, Chairman.
5	And the other Board Members present today are Ms. Barbara Burgel, Occupational
6	Health Representative; Mr. David Harrison, Labor Representative; Ms. Nola Kennedy,
7	Public Member; Ms. Chris Laszcz-Davis, Management Representative; Ms. Laura Stock,
8	Occupational Safety Representative.
9	Also present from our staff for today's meeting are Ms. Christina Shupe,
10	Executive Officer; Ms. Sarah Money, Executive Assistant; and Mr. Michael Nelmida,
11	Senior Safety Engineer who is providing technical support.
12	Supporting the meeting remotely are Mr. Michael Manieri, Principal
13	Safety Engineer; Ms. Lara Paskins, Staff Services Manager; Mr. David Kernazitskas,
14	Senior Safety Engineer and Ms. Jennifer White, Staff Services Analyst.
15	Via teleconference we are joined by Ms. Autumn Gonzalez as counsel to
16	the Board, on loan from the Occupational Safety and Health Appeals Board, and by
17	Mr. Eric Berg, Deputy Chief of Health, representing the Division of Occupational Safety
18	and Health.
19	If you have not already done so, we ask you to email oshsb@dir.ca.gov to
20	provide your name and contact information, which will become part of the official
21	record of today's proceedings.
22	Today's agenda and the other materials related to today's proceedings
23	are posted online at dir.ca.gov/oshsb/mtgsch.html.
24	In accordance with the Executive Order N-29-20, the physical meeting
25	location for today has been cancelled. Today's meeting is being held exclusively via

CALIFORNIA REPORTING, LLC 229 Napa Street, Rodeo, California 94572 (510) 224-4476

1 teleconference with an optional video component. This meeting is also being live

2 broadcast via video and audio stream in both English and Spanish.

Links to these non-interactive live broadcasts can be accessed via the
"What's New" section at the top of the main page of the OSHSB website at

5 dir.ca.gov/oshsb/oshsb.html.

Today we are going to address public comment differently than we have
in the past. I'm asking for everyone's patience as we navigate a new process. We have
limited capabilities for managing participation during public comment periods, so we're
asking everyone who is not speaking to place their phones on mute and wait to unmute
until they're called on to speak.

11 As reflected on the agenda today's meeting consists of three parts. First, 12 we will hold a public discussion on the draft COVID-19 prevention emergency 13 regulations that will be considered for adoption during our business meeting. Anyone 14 who would like to comment on the draft COVID-19 prevention emergency regulations 15 may do so at that time. Members of the public who have contacted staff either by 16 email or phone and asked to be placed in the public comment queue to comment on 17 this will be called on in turn. Additionally, those joining via WebEx may ask to join the 18 queue via the chat function. Next, we will hold a public meeting to receive public 19 comments or proposals on occupational safety and health matters. Anyone who would 20 like to address any occupational safety and health issues, including any of the items on 21 our business meeting agenda, except the draft COVID-19 prevention emergency 22 regulations, may do so at that time. Members of the public who have contacted staff 23 either by email or phone and asked to be placed in the public comment queue to discuss 24 matters other than the draft COVID-19 prevention emergency regulations will be called 25 on in turn.

Additionally, those joining via WebEx may ask to join the queue via the chat function. During both of these portions of the meeting, the WebEx chat function will be monitored exclusively by staff and is only available to send requests to join the public comment queue. It is not a method for providing public comments to Board Members. Board Members will not consider or respond to any messages delivered via the chat function, nor will such comments become part of the official rulemaking record.

8 Please listen for your name and an invitation to speak before addressing 9 the Board. And please remember to mute your phone or computer after commenting. 10 After everyone in the queue has been provided an opportunity to speak, 11 we will then open public comment to anyone on the call who was not able to enter the 12 queue. If you wish to speak more than once during either the discussion or the public 13 meeting, please contact staff and have your name placed back in the queue. Board staff 14 can be contacted by email at oshsb@dir.ca.gov or via phone at 916-274-5721 to be 15 placed on the comment queue for either the COVID-19 discussion or the public meeting. 16 If you experience a busy signal or are routed to voicemail, please hang up and call again. 17 Just want to let you know that we have 500 participants as of right now. 18 Finally, after the public meeting has concluded, we will conduct the third 19 part of our meeting, which is the business meeting to act on those items listed on the 20 business meeting agenda. The Board does not accept public comment during its 21 business meeting unless a member of the Board specifically requests public input. 22 For our commenters who are native Spanish speakers, we are working 23 with an interpreter, Susana Haikalis, to provide a translation of their statements into 24 English for the Board. At this time, Ms. Haikalis will provide instructions to the Spanish 25 speaking commenters so that they are aware of the public comment process for today's

CALIFORNIA REPORTING, LLC 229 Napa Street, Rodeo, California 94572 (510) 224-4476

1 meeting.

2	Ms. Haikalis, go right ahead. And remember to unmute yourself. Hello?
3	MS. HAIKALIS: Yes, can you hear me, Chairman?
4	CHAIR THOMAS: Yeah, I can hear you now.
5	MS. HAIKALIS: Hello?
6	CHAIR THOMAS: Go right ahead.
7	MS. HAIKALIS: Thank you.
8	CHAIR THOMAS: Can you hear me?
9	MS. HAIKALIS: Yes sir. (interpreting in Spanish).
10	CHAIR THOMAS: Go ahead.
11	MS. HAIKALIS: Should I go ahead? Thank you. (interpreting in Spanish).
12	CHAIRMAN THOMAS: Thank you, Ms. Haikalis.
13	We will now proceed with the public discussion regarding the
14	COVID-19 Prevention emergency regulations. A copy of the proposed
15	text is posted on the Board's website. Presentation of draft proposed
16	text. Ms. Shupe, will you please brief the Board?
17	MS. SHUPE: Good morning Board Members. The proposed
18	text and Finding of Emergency for the COVID-19 Prevention emergency
19	temporary standard are posted on the OSHSB website at
20	dir.ca.gov/oshsb/covid-19-prevention-emergency.html, and have been
21	since November 12th, 2020. A link for the text can also be found on the
22	OSHSB home page under the "What's New" header. In addition to
23	posting, these documents were sent to OSHSB's entire mailing list.
24	Today's agenda item has been noticed so that the Board
25	Members may fully engage in discussion on the subject of the COVID-19

Prevention ETS proposal, both with our public stakeholders and each
other. As we proceed through the public comment on this topic, Board
Members are free to engage and ask questions as they desire.
CHAIR THOMAS: Thank you, Ms. Shupe.
We will now proceed with public discussion of the draft
COVID-19 Prevention emergency regulations. Anyone who wishes to
address the Board regarding the draft COVID-19 Prevention emergency
regulations is invited to comment at this time.
Mr. Gotcher, do we have any commenters in the queue? Are
you there, Mr. Gotcher?
MS. HAIKALIS: (translating in Spanish)
CHAIR THOMAS: Are you there John?
MS. HAIKALIS: We have Ms. Camacho (indiscernible).
MR. GOTCHER: Sorry, can you hear me?
CHAIR THOMAS: Now we can. Who is the commenter, John?
As always, we seem to have a couple technical difficulties
here so.
MR. GOTCHER: Yes. Can you hear me okay still?
CHAIR THOMAS: Yes.
MR. GOTCHER: Okay. Just to announce again our first
commenter is Alma Camacho, a janitorial worker with Maintenance
Cooperation Trust Fund.
MS. CAMACHO: (Through Interpreter Haikalis.) Good
morning. My name is Alma Camacho and I have worked in the county of
Alameda for 15 years for a maintenance company. The company does not

provide any gloves or masks and they haven't trained us at work to
 protect against COVID. We have requested training and equipment, but
 they have had retaliation against us. And they had actually terminated
 some of the employees because of complaints.

I'm afraid to go home. I don't know if I'm safe at work. I
don't know if I can get sick and if I do, if I can make my family sick. So
we need regulations so that we're not afraid for the essential workers in
California. Thank you.

9 CHAIR THOMAS: Thank you.

Before we continue with our next speaker, because of the amount of speakers that we have today -- I think we're approaching probably 80 or 90 -- I would have you try and get your point across in two to three minutes if possible. I know a lot of it may get redundant toward the end, but if you could make your comments two or three minutes, that would be nice.

16 John, can you introduce the next speaker?

17 MS. SHUPE: John, you appear to be having audio issues.

18 We're unable to hear you.

19 CHAIR THOMAS: John, are you there?

20 MR. GOTCHER: Sorry, I do appear to be having audio issues.

21 Can you hear me now?

22 CHAIR THOMAS: We can. Just leave that on. Go right ahead.

- 23 MR. GOTCHER: Okay. So our next speaker is Elizabeth
- 24 Treanor, and she's from the Phylmar Regulatory Roundtable, OSH Forum.

25 CHAIR THOMAS: Thank you. Good morning Elizabeth. I can

1 see you Elizabeth, are you going to talk? 2 (Audio difficulties.) 3 CHAIR THOMAS: I can't hear you. You're muted now. Now 4 vou're not. 5 MS. SHUPE: Ms. Treanor appears to be having some 6 bandwidth issues. 7 CHAIR THOMAS: John, let's go to the next and we'll go back 8 to Elizabeth after that. John, who's our next speaker? 9 MR. GOTCHER: And he's from the Garment Workers Center. 10 CHAIR THOMAS: Who was it John? 11 MR. GOTCHER: Carlos Almarez. 12 MR. ALMAREZ: (Through Interpreter Haikalis.) 13 Do you want me to give my testimony? Should I speak now? 14 CHAIR THOMAS: Go right ahead, speaker. 15 INTERPRETER HAIKALIS: (Interprets Chair Thomas's response to Mr. Almarez.) 16 17 MR. ALMAREZ: (Through Interpreter Haikalis.) 18 Okay. Yes, I have been working for the garment industry for 19 the past 15 years. And I am very happy with this new law that you are 20 promoting for work. 21 Especially, we have problems with bathrooms. So the 22 problem, the main problem at factories is with a bathroom, with a kitchen, with the eating areas. This is in all factories. They have 23 24 problems with rats and cockroaches. 25 And now with this virus, with this pandemic COVID-19, social

CALIFORNIA REPORTING, LLC 229 Napa Street, Rodeo, California 94572 (510) 224-4476

1 distancing is nonexistent. And there's no soap, there's no distancing. 2 So I was infected with COVID-19 at the factory and I infected people. I 3 was hospitalized. I had to go to the hospital and it was an emergency. 4 And I got two more members of my family sick and I almost died. So now 5 I am very happy with this. So as I said I was very seriously sick and I 6 almost died. I made eight members of my family sick, so I'm very thankful to the doctors and the nurses. 7 8 I am very happy about this law. That it has to pass, so that it 9 keeps families and workers safe. 10 CHAIR THOMAS: Thank you. I'm going to have to cut it here, 11 I think we got the idea. 12 And I was wondering Ms. Haikalis, could you get this man's 13 employer's information from him, please? 14 INTERPRETER HAIKALIS: Yes, certainly. (Interprets Chair 15 Thomas's response to Mr. Almaraz.) 16 CHAIR THOMAS: If you could do that offline that would be 17 great. 18 MS. HAIKALIS: Oh, yes sir. Thank you. 19 CHAIR THOMAS: Thank you. 20 Thank you, speaker. 21 Mr. Gotcher, do we have another speaker in the queue? 22 MS. SHUPE: (Overlapping colloquy.) At this time, with the Chair's lead --23 24 CHAIR THOMAS: Yes. 25 MS. SHUPE: -- at this time I'd like to make a request that

CALIFORNIA REPORTING, LLC 229 Napa Street, Rodeo, California 94572 (510) 224-4476

1 anyone who has joined our WebEx, I'd like to let you know that we have 2 over 555 participants, which is about 4 times what we normally have. 3 And so at this time anyone who is not speaking, except for the Board 4 Members, if you wouldn't mind turning off your video that would be very 5 much appreciated. And we'll see if we can't resolve some of these 6 bandwidth issues that we are having. Thank you. 7 CHAIR THOMAS: John, are you there? And do we have our 8 next speaker? 9 MR. GOTCHER: Yes, I'm here. Can you hear me okay? 10 CHAIR THOMAS: Yes. 11 MR. GOTCHER: Great. Our next speaker is Rob Moutrie of 12 the California Chamber of Commerce. 13 CHAIR THOMAS: Go ahead, Rob. (No audible response.) I'm 14 not hearing anybody. Are you there, Rob? Can you unmute yourself? I 15 see your -- there you go Rob, go right ahead. 16 MR. MOUTRIE: How about now, does that work? 17 CHAIR THOMAS: Yeah. 18 MR. MOUTRIE: Sorry, I was hoping to avoid my sportscaster headset. I 19 hope (Overlapping colloquy.) 20 CHAIR THOMAS: That's all right. It looks good, looks good. 21 MR. MOUTRIE: So good morning Chair Thomas and Board Members. 22 CHAIR THOMAS: Good morning. 23 MR. MOUTRIE: So I speak to you on behalf of a broad 24 coalition of California's employers today: Businesses large, small, rural, 25 urban, across all sectors including public employers, schools and cities

1 who have a host of concerns with this regulation.

And before I get into it, I want to start by thanking the Board
staff and the Division staff for your hard work. I know you've worked
incredibly hard the last couple of weeks and months to work on this.

5 Briefly, I want to be very clear that we take this seriously. 6 I've spoken to hundreds -- well, spoken -- communicated with hundreds 7 of employers in the last five days. Not a one has said that COVID-19 isn't 8 serious and that we don't want to try to address it. The concerns have 9 all been about the feasibility and clarity of this reg. So I'll do my best to 10 move quickly through them and still be audible, but (indiscernible) have 11 questions afterward if that's necessary.

So first the concern is of course about the procedure. Looking at this regulation I know the Board had had concerns about the process at last month's meeting about moving to this regulation and putting up this text five days before the vote without any advisory committee process and a lack of stakeholder input.

17 CHAIR THOMAS: You might want to slow down just a little
18 bit. We have a -- thank you.

MR. MOUTRIE: Yes, yes of course. I know the Board expressed those concerns last month, and simply put, I think those concerns were well founded. We have here a regulation that despite the Division's best efforts, has a lot of confusing and contradictory, potentially infeasible provisions that input from stakeholders could have fixed by just one meeting, maybe two. With just one month more time this could be so much better and could be much more workable and

actually provide better benefits. So to that concern, as we go through
 these issues I hope the Board will keep in mind the trade-off that was
 made based on the Board's vote to have speed over the text.

Going to the substantive points I'll first want to focus on the authority concern. There are a couple of provisions in this regulation, which we have outstanding concerns that these provisions would exceed Cal/OSHA's statutory authority. Most notable amongst these is provision section 3204(c)(10) that requires employers to "continue and maintain employee earnings as if they had not been removed from their job." We do not believe that such wage issues and paid-time-off issues frankly, fall under Cal/OSHA's jurisdiction.

And putting that issue aside this provision has huge textual problems. If the Board and staff recall AB 1867 legislation last year, which created additional COVID-19 leave, that bill spent a lot of detail going through the things you need to work out paid leave. Who does it cover? How many hours are they guaranteed? Which employers does it cover? And how do we calculate those amounts for part-time workers or for workers in non-salaried positions? None of those details are here.

So if this regulation is passed today and OAL approves it, avoiding the authority issue, employers are not going to know exactly how to guarantee this. Except to make guesses about what these earnings are and about how long such leave is guaranteed. And that shouldn't be the place we are in for something as important as this.

23 We also have authority concerns about the transportation, 24 employer-provided transportation and employer-provided housing 25 provisions that come at the end of the draft text. I believe others will

CALIFORNIA REPORTING, LLC 229 Napa Street, Rodeo, California 94572 (510) 224-4476

speak on those in great detail who are closer to the ag community on
 that front, so I'll leave the detailed comments to them on those points.

3 Next, turning to feasibility. I think another macro issue that 4 we have to consider in this time period is this is an emergency regulation 5 that will apply incredibly broadly to almost every employer in the state, 6 right, the non-ATD covered; of all sizes, from one employee to 7 thousands. Applying that in an emergency regulation timeline means that as you look at all of these provisions we can't just say, " A) do we 8 9 think (indiscernible) more helpful? Would we like them?" We have to 10 say, "Will employers be able to do this in ten days?", right? That's when 11 this goes into enforcement as you're looking at it.

And so that's a separate question, and I'll get to how we propose solving that in a bit, but I hope you'll keep that in mind as you look at these provisions and consider the complexity that we are talking about.

16 It also appears this draft in terms of feasibility doesn't take 17 into account the differences in those workplaces, from really large to 18 really small. One example, the outbreak and major outbreak provisions, 19 3205.1 and .2. have thresholds to trigger a host of new kinds of 20 precautions that would be triggered by either three cases in 14 days, or I 21 believe it's 20 cases in 30 days, and then require two weeks with no new 22 cases in a workplace for their outbreak to technically end and those provisions to be ended. 23

If you are an employer with 100 or 200 employees in a
workplace you could easily see three cases, nothing to do with

CALIFORNIA REPORTING, LLC 229 Napa Street, Rodeo, California 94572 (510) 224-4476

workplace, due to social spread. Now you're in an outbreak. Now the
question is will you be able to have a two-week period over the holidays
as families are getting together, people are traveling, Thanksgiving and
Christmas, will you be able to have a two-week period with no new cases
due to social spread?

6 And I think that the obvious answer for a lot of large 7 employers and large workplaces is no. These provisions are going to 8 mean that we're going to be in perpetual outbreak status due to social 9 spread even if we never have a traced case of workplace spread. And 10 that requires some reallocation and consideration to find a balance 11 where an outbreak is properly identified as a workplace situation.

For larger employers that might mean incorporating a percentage trigger (indiscernible) and some of the legislation this year and detailed in our letter. But I want to flag that as one example where the provisions don't seem to analyze the differences that would apply to very large and very small employers.

A second feasibility element, the regulations provide that
 employers will, "provide testing." Regulations aren't clear on exactly
 what will --

20 MR. MOUTRIE: I'm hearing someone else's echo.

21 CHAIR THOMAS: Yeah, can we please get everybody to mute22 who is not on?

23 MR. MOUTRIE: I think it's coming through (indiscernible due 24 to overlapping colloquy). Whoever's having a conversation about Cal CPA 25 advisors, we'd appreciate a mute.

CALIFORNIA REPORTING, LLC 229 Napa Street, Rodeo, California 94572 (510) 224-4476

1 MR. THOMAS: Who is?

2 MS. SHUPE: Hang on.

MR. THOMAS: You know what, I'm going to say this one time.
No crosstalk. If you're on this meeting, stay on this meeting. If you've
got other business, get out of the room and get on another phone,
alright? We don't have time for this. Go ahead, Rob.

7 MR. MOUTRIE: Thank you, Chairman. The provisions 8 regarding providing testing are another feasibility issue, right? 9 Employers are supposed to provide testing in these outbreak scenarios 10 and in a couple of others. But if you look at potentially smaller 11 employers and potentially more remote locations right, in the Bay Area 12 we have Project Baseline and others. When you talk about more rural 13 locations where Project Baseline may not be where medical 14 infrastructure may not be. And then you talk about compelling these 15 tests to be provided there's a real feasibility problem that may confront 16 employers that I don't think the reg takes into account.

17 There are host of issues regarding clarity as well and I will 18 touch on a few briefly, but again these are examples not --

19 CHAIR THOMAS: Briefly.

25

20 MR. MOUTRIE: -- yes. We have inconsistency as to who 21 qualifies as a COVID-19 case versus the return-to-work deadlines. We 22 have ambiguities that when employers may use engineering controls to 23 address spacing and when they have to maintain six feet distances. 24 Those kind of issues can be fixed if we just have time to work on them.

And the last big substantive point I will make is privacy. We

have a number of concerns about privacy implications for employers
 gathering this data. One notable point is that the employers are
 required to verify COVID-19 case status according to 3205(c)(3)(a).

Employers don't want to be in position of grilling or quizzing an employee on their status or seeking records from health companies that we necessarily can't get. Those provisions need to be fixed to avoid privacy issues.

8 So turning to that, and I'll end with these, so what would we 9 ask out of all of these issues? The first and foremost I would ask for, 10 some time. The Board has the option here of making amendments. I 11 would ask that the implementation of this be delayed beyond the 10-day 12 threshold that's been flagged to a 30-day period. This would allow 13 plenty of time that employers need to change their training, to change 14 their internal policies, to adjust and figure out the definitions here. 15 Specifically, also for the notice obligations where this differs from 685. 16 That will take time for employers to adapt to, given that they have been 17 preparing for 685's terms. And this has different terms for similar issues. 18 And if this cannot be delayed or in addition, the last thing 19 we would ask is that the advisory committee please set -- excuse me, the 20 advisory committee be set as soon as possible. The first week of 21 December let's start having those conversations, so that these issues and 22 the host of other issues I haven't discussed can be brought to the Board 23 and addressed as soon as possible, not waiting for a March meeting. 24 Because in that timeline employers (indiscernible) California will have to 25 be guessing at compliance when we don't want that to persist.

CALIFORNIA REPORTING, LLC 229 Napa Street, Rodeo, California 94572 (510) 224-4476

1	So I'll stop there. Thank you.
2	CHAIR THOMAS: Thank you, Rob.
3	Mr. Gotcher, who do we have on the line next?
4	MR. GOTCHER: Our next speaker is Camucha King from
5	UNITE HERE.
6	CHAIR THOMAS: Hello, are you there?
7	MS. KING: Hello?
8	CHAIR THOMAS: Yeah, go right ahead.
9	MS. KING: Yes, (indiscernible). Yes, my name is Camucha
10	King and I have been working in room service for the (indiscernible) San
11	Francisco Hotel for around 15 years. I was brought back from being laid
12	off in October, and I am very concerned about the coronavirus safety. I
13	live with my 75-year-old mother and my daughter who has asthma and I
14	am worried about bringing the virus home with me. They did not train
15	me about the new coronavirus safety protocols for several days. When I
16	came back to work, that made me nervous, because I didn't know what I
17	was supposed to be doing to protect myself.
18	Another problem is that sometimes when I deliver food to a
19	guest room they just open the door without a mask on. Usually they put
20	one on when I ask them to, but there are other things that make me
21	worried too. We are a five-star hotel but we do not always clean and
22	disinfect the areas that the guests cannot see. The hotel is not
23	scheduling enough people, and I have so many (indiscernible) deliveries

24 to make that I do not have a single permanent sanitized delivery cart.

25

Also, when a guest checks out, a lot of times management

CALIFORNIA REPORTING, LLC 229 Napa Street, Rodeo, California 94572 (510) 224-4476

leaves the room service carts in the guest rooms overnight and very
 often I find them with (indiscernible).

3 And the employees' break room is not always cleaned or sanitized. On my first day back to work I tried three times to take my 4 5 break in there, but it wasn't clean. I complained to my manager and for 6 a few days they put someone on the schedule to clean it, but then they 7 stopped it. And I don't take my breaks in that room anymore, because it 8 makes me nervous. It doesn't matter how much they clean the guest 9 areas if they don't clean the worker areas. The virus doesn't care if you 10 are a guest or you are a worker, we need more protection from 11 coronavirus at work. 12 Please pass these new emergency temporary standards to 13 protect workers from these outbreaks. Thank you for listening. 14 CHAIR THOMAS: Thank you. 15 Mr. Gotcher, who do we have next on the queue? 16 MR. GOTCHER: Our next commenter is Rico Tamayo of the 17 California Federation of Teachers. 18 CHAIR THOMAS: Good morning. 19 MR. TAMAYO: Good morning. 20 CHAIR THOMAS: Go right ahead. 21 MR. TAMAYO: Yes. Good morning, my name is Rico Tamayo 22 and I'm president of the EC/TK-12 Council for the California Federation of 23 Teachers. But I'm also a former teacher from El Rancho Unified School 24 District, which is in Pico Rivera, California. I'm here today to speak on 25 behalf of the members of the California Federation of Teachers, but also

- 1 for my former students and their families to urge you to adopt the
- 2 COVID-19 Prevention emergency temporary standard.

3 Our community in Pico Rivera is a working-class community. 4 Many low-income people of color who are at greater risk for COVID-19, 5 and as of right now Pico Rivera is one of the worst COVID hot spots in the 6 state. We need these emergency standards to help in the fight against 7 COVID and we need these standards to keep our people safe. 8 Please adopt the emergency standard today. It's the right 9 thing to do, and it will mean a lot to teachers, classified staff, and 10 workers throughout the state. Thank you very much. 11 CHAIR THOMAS: Thank you. 12 Mr. Gotcher, who do we have next in the queue? 13 MR. GOTCHER: Our next commenter is Keith Brown from 14 Oakland Education Association. 15 CHAIR THOMAS: Hello, Keith. Are you with us? 16 MR. BROWN: Yes, can you hear me? 17 CHAIR THOMAS: Yes, we can. Go right ahead, thank you. 18 MR. BROWN: Thank you. Board and staff, my name is Keith 19 Brown and I represent the 3,000 educators of the Oakland Education 20 Association, a chapter of the California Teachers Association. The COVID 21 pandemic has been a public health disaster for the black and brown 22 working families of Oakland. These proposed emergency regulations are urgent and necessary to keep employees safe and help curb the spread of 23 24 COVID-19. 25 As you know, schools are a central hub for communities

CALIFORNIA REPORTING, LLC 229 Napa Street, Rodeo, California 94572 (510) 224-4476

across the state. And if there are not appropriate guidelines and
 precautions that are required then employers will continue to place
 expediency and convenience above workers' safety.

In Oakland Unified we have eight different labor unions plus
nonunion contract workers resulting in a patchwork of safety
requirements in our school buildings.

Our District Health Service Coordinator position has been
vacant since 2018, depriving us of science-informed leadership to keep
employees safe during an infectious disease pandemic.

Establishing clear enforceable regulations will protect the working parents of our students, which then indirectly reduces our risk of exposure when working with students. The emergency regulations are especially important in calling out the requirements for contact tracing, accommodating employees and distancing. And this will allow for a

15 common set of expectations that can and should be enforced.

16 I strongly urge the Standards Board to approve the proposed17 standard. Thank you.

18 CHAIR THOMAS: Thank you, Keith, appreciate your

19 comments.

20 Mr. Gotcher, who's next up?

21 MR GOTCHER: Our next speaker is Patrick Cirby of UNITE

HERE.

23 CHAIR THOMAS: Patrick, are you with us?

24 MR. CIRBY: Yes, I'm here. Good morning.

25 CHAIR THOMAS: Good morning. Go right ahead.

1 MR. CIRBY: All right, my name is Patrick Cirby and I have 2 worked as an overnight janitor for 28 years at the Westin St. Francis 3 Hotel in San Francisco. At home, I care for my 92-year-old mother who worries about me constantly at work, and she wants to know if I'm being 4 5 careful not to bring home the coronavirus to her. Well of course I'm 6 always careful, but I think we need more protections from this 7 coronavirus. And that's why I'm here to speak to you about passing the 8 new emergency temporary standard today.

Some of the reasons that I believe we need more protections
are like recently at our hotel, some workers were notified they were
exposed to coronavirus when they worked a guest party. And other
people who worked the same party were not informed that they were
exposed. I don't understand that and I don't think it's right.

Another major reason is that since I returned to work I've never been formally trained in any of the new cleaning protocols for coronavirus. I know there's a program, but I haven't been exposed to it. I know the chemicals that we need to use. And I know they need to stay wet on certain surfaces for a certain amount of time to be effective. And I really hope that the way I'm using them works.

20 We also have one of those new electrostatic disinfection 21 machines to spray disinfectants. Again, I've never been trained how to 22 use it. I was also never trained on what I'm supposed to do should I start 23 to feel sick at work. I think that's pretty important.

In general, I don't believe they have enough people
 scheduled to clean properly at my hotel, especially in the areas for

CALIFORNIA REPORTING, LLC 229 Napa Street, Rodeo, California 94572 (510) 224-4476

workers only. I am a janitor and my eyes are trained to see dirt. I can see others are not always mopping the employee break room or cleaning properly in the toilet rooms or the lockers. In our break room, bottles of sanitizer are left out and each employee is asked to clean before and after themselves, but it doesn't look like that's always happening. So I don't take breaks in the employee break room because of that cleanliness issue.

8 I'm also exposed to guests around the property. Most of our 9 guests are kind and wear their mask like they're supposed to, but not all 10 of them. At work at night I see guests go outside for smoke breaks, 11 because we are a non-smoking property, and when they return they don't 12 always have them on. And we don't always have somebody at the door 13 to check on them to see if they are wearing them.

So things like this, these are just a few of my concerns that maybe the business could be doing more to protect us. And so today please, I would ask you, we need more protections at work. I encourage you to please pass this emergency temporary standard bill and I thank you for listening.

19 CHAIR THOMAS: Thank you very much, we appreciate your20 comments.

21 John, who do we have next in the queue?

22 MR GOTCHER: Next in the queue is Brooke Billingsley from

23 LAANE.

24 CHAIR THOMAS: Brooke, are you there?

25 MS. BILLINGSLEY: Hi, yes I'm here.

1 CHAIR THOMAS: Go ahead, Brooke.

2 MS. BILLINGSLEY: Can you hear me? Ah perfect.

3 CHAIR THOMAS: Yes.

MS. BILLINGSLEY: My name is Brooke and I live in Los Angeles. And until a few weeks ago I worked at a small specialty clothing retailer in Los Angeles. My store reopened in late May when clothing retail stores were allowed to open here in L.A. County. In that time I've seen the store I work at, and most of the other stores on the block I work at, fail to comply with local health orders and make necessary changes to keep workers safe.

11 In my store the dressing rooms are open to full capacity. 12 The dressing rooms are very small with low ceilings, full doors and no 13 ventilation inside of them and are therefore an ideal environment for 14 aerosol clouds to linger. Workers can attest that most people take their 15 masks off inside the dressing rooms even when they're told they have to 16 keep them on. This is a huge risk to workers as we are required to enter 17 the dressing room to wipe down surfaces between every customer. 18 Meaning we are all repeatedly going into these small not-ventilated 19 spaces that have had many unmasked people in them briefly enough that 20 aerosolized COVID would still be in the air if an infected person had gone 21 in.

Our break room is also in the back office where I was expected to do hours of work a week while sitting within a few feet of people hanging out and eating unmasked while they were on their breaks. I made suggestions to my employer with solutions to fix these

safety issues such as improving ventilation, more PPE and relocating the
 break area, but was repeatedly dismissed.

Furthermore, speaking up about these issues caused me to be threatened with losing my job, because my employer did not agree that these were risks. I have higher risk factors for severe illness and COVID, and between my employer removing many of the safety precautions they implemented in May and the increasing COVID threat in Los Angeles, and the retaliation I was facing, I felt my only option was to leave my job.

We need this temporary emergency standard to add greater
protection to workers in more industries. And we need it immediately,
because I can attest that not enough is being done right now and workers
are dying as a result. Thank you for your time.

14 CHAIR THOMAS: Thank you, Brooke.

15 Who do we have next up, John?

16 MR. GOTCHER: Our next commenter is Morgan Craig from
 17 UNITE HERE.

18 CHAIR THOMAS: Morgan, are you with us?

19 MS. CRAIG: Yes, I am.

20 CHAIR THOMAS: Go ahead.

MS. CRAIG: All right, thank you. My name is Morgan Craig and I've been a cocktail server at the San Diego Mission Bay Resort for six years. Since they put me back on the schedule at work I've been very worried about COVID, and I hope you pass the emergency temporary standard to keep us safe.

1 I lost my health insurance because I hadn't gotten enough 2 hours at work. If I catch the virus I am worried about what will happen 3 to me. There has been a serious lack of communication from 4 management about what we are supposed to be doing to clean the 5 restaurant and we have been short-staffed. It's not clear who is 6 supposed to be sanitizing the tables between guests and it doesn't 7 always happen. I pitch in when I can, but I've never been trained in the 8 right way to do it. We don't even have a greeter out all the time. It's 9 open seating, so sometimes guests just walk in and sit there at a dirty 10 table. Or if a guest walks right up to the bar, the bartender clears the 11 table for the guest, but they don't have time to sanitize it.

12 The guests don't wear masks once they are seated and 13 nobody is keeping an eye on how many people we can safely seat in the 14 restaurant. Some of the tables are very close together. The music is 15 really loud, and I have to bend over and really get face-to-face with the 16 guests to take their order. Since they are not wearing masks that makes 17 me really uncomfortable. Even in places where people are supposed to 18 be wearing masks, they don't always or they don't wear them correctly. 19 Management never says anything about it.

I really need more protection at work. And I am asking the
 Standards Board to please pass the emergency temporary standards.

- 22 Thank you for listening.
- 23 CHAIR THOMAS: Thank you.
- 24 John, who do we have next in the queue?
- 25 MR. GOTCHER: Our next commenter is Joy Schnapper of

1 Capistrano Educators Association.

2 CHAIR THOMAS: Joy, can you hear us?

3 MS. SCHNAPPER: Yes. Thank you so much, appreciate that.
4 Good morning.

5 CHAIR THOMAS: Good morning.

6 MS. SCHNAPPER: Thank you for this opportunity to speak to 7 you today. My name is Joy Schnapper and I am the president of the 8 Capistrano Unified Education Association. We are made up of over 2,000 9 members in a district that is the second largest school district in Orange 10 County. It is also the eighth largest district in the state. As you can see, 11 I have an enormous responsibility to the staff and students in our area 12 and I believe you do too.

When the petition was submitted earlier this year, my district was closed at the time, but we worked closely with district personnel to put protections in place so that we could move forward with opening. Unfortunately, try as we might, COVID numbers are on the rise at an alarming rate. Some might say this is due to the hasty decisions to open schools and that the emergency procedures put in place need to be reassessed and tightened up to further protect our students and staff.

A specific example I can share is the language from our most recent MOU with the district. It reads, "All meetings will be available virtually when all students are 100 percent online. All meetings will meet current CDPH and Orange County Health Care Agency guidelines when held in person." Translated, this means that now while we have students on campuses, staff must be available to meet in-person. This

means we will have more people meeting in-person and we will need
 strong standards that are enforceable by law to keep everyone safe.

Furthermore, in our district's reopening and safety plan it clearly states that a student can return to school after 24 hours without a fever and symptoms, improving without a record of a COVID test. This is frightening. I fear for the lives of our teachers, students and all of their families. We need school-centered testing for students and staff to keep everyone safe and to know when it is safe to return.

9 It behooves us to promote more reporting and transparency 10 in data collection. What about a viewable document for faculty and staff 11 to ensure that accurate reporting is being done? The most up-to-date 12 data has yet to make it to district dashboards. We have a stricter policy 13 for lice. And COVID is a pandemic that kills people.

Please consider approving the proposed standards you have before you today. Just while writing this we have two new confirmed cases in our district. And this week in the cities within the boundaries of my district there has been an increase of 137 cases. We can't allow our valuable teachers and students to remain pawns in the game of COVID.

19 Thank you very much for your time today.

20 CHAIR THOMAS: Thank you, Joy.

21 John, who do we have next in the queue?

22 MR. GOTCHER: Our next commenter is Bruce Wick from

23 CALPASC.

24 CHAIR THOMAS: Bruce, how are you doing?

25 MR. WICK: Good, Chair Thomas. How are you?

CALIFORNIA REPORTING, LLC 229 Napa Street, Rodeo, California 94572 (510) 224-4476

CHAIR THOMAS: Good, good. Go right ahead.

1

2 MR. WICK: Thank you. I'm representing Specialty Contractors Association. I want to bring a few data points to hear, and 3 4 also talk about construction. The seriousness of COVID was readily 5 embraced by the construction industry, both management and labor. We 6 have worked very hard over the last few months, and I am glad to report 7 that of the total number of workers, less than 2/10ths of one percent of 8 construction workers have filed a workers' comp claim for COVID; less 9 than 2/10ths of a percent.

10 There's information from the California Workers' Comp
11 Institute through November 16th. There is WCIRB information, EDD
12 information.

13 I want to just bring a few more data points too. We know
14 that our heroes in fighting COVID are healthcare workers and our first
15 responders. I mean, just bless them, and they have a serious thing to do,
16 taking care of all of our people. They are 52 percent of all workers' comp
17 claims filed for COVID. They have a remarkable presumption
18 (indiscernible).

Just for other industries, some of those who people are calling in about today, represent another 26 percent. So, COVID-19 claims for workers' comp are five percent of the total for the state of all positive tests. When you look at the numbers then, one percent are those other industries like construction. So we've done a really good job in many industries, and to then turn around and say, "Well, we need to do more," this new reg will cause people to (indiscernible) COVID-19

CALIFORNIA REPORTING, LLC 229 Napa Street, Rodeo, California 94572 (510) 224-4476

1 response plan.

They're going to have to make, by my calculation 16
additions, three changes and four more navigations with other bills,
other guidance. You know, we've had very thorough guidance from
Cal/OSHA for every industry since early in this process.

6 So I do want to say a great majority of employers have done 7 the right thing, done very well. I'm sorry to hear from some commenting 8 today that their employers haven't.

9 But just last week Nevada, 99 percent of employers were 10 compliant on a split. So I do think it's best if we delayed this. There are 11 1.4 million small employers in California with less than 20 employees. 12 And to hand them a 21-page regulation and say, "Be in compliance in less

13 than 10 days," is just not going to work.

We should delay this so that the Division -- and I appreciate Chief Parker, Eric Berg, they worked extremely, extremely hard trying to get this done. But we need to delay it so that we get a model program out, guidance that helps people navigate the differences, the contradictions between this and AB 685. So when we say, "Here is a reg," we implement it.

Every employer has had clear guidance and knowledge of the IIPP. Cal/OSHA's been seriously enforcing seven citations in the last 14 days averaging \$39,000 per employer. Cal/OSHA is pursuing it very hard. I appreciate those efforts.

24 Delaying this would be a valuable thing if we really want 25 employers to be able to comply with the law instead of having something

on the books that small employers, especially, are not going to be able
 to incorporate anywhere near in the timeframe. So thank you for your
 time.

4 CHAIR THOMAS: Thank you.

5 John, who is next up in the queue?

6 MR. GOTCHER: Next in the queue is Efrain Hernandez from
7 the Garment Worker Center.

8 CHAIR THOMAS: Efrain, are you with us? Hello Efrain?
9 MR. HERNANDEZ: Hola? (Overlapping colloguy.)

10 CHAIR THOMAS: Do you have this, Julie?

11 MR. HERNANDEZ: (Through Interpreter Haikalis.) Should I

12 begin? Good morning, my name is Efrain Hernandez and I work for the

13 Garment Worker Center. I have been working also as a (indiscernible) for

14 20 years. I'm hoping to provide my statements about the bad conditions

15 we have in our workplace.

16 There are rats, cockroaches, the bathrooms don't clean and 17 the water filters are dirty and the bathrooms are not mopped quickly.

18 And there is no soap at the --

19 (Audio difficulties.)

20 CHAIR THOMAS: You know, Julie, at this time we are going 21 to move to our -- because we're not getting this. I can't hear. So we are 22 going to go to the next speaker.

23 John, who do we have on the queue?

24 MR. GOTCHER: Our next commenter is Nho Le-Hinds, Sac

25 City Teachers Association.
1 CHAIR THOMAS: Good morning, are you with us? 2 MS. HINDS: Yes, good morning. Can you hear me? 3 CHAIR THOMAS: Yes, we can. Go right ahead. 4 DR. HINDS: Thank you so much. My name is Dr. Le-Hinds 5 and I'm a school nurse at Sacramento City Unified School District. I am 6 also a Professor of Public Health at CSU Sacramento. And this summer I 7 led a team of case investigators and contact tracers at Sacramento 8 County Public Health, and collectively we investigated over 500 positive 9 COVID cases.

10 I represent the 3,000 number of educators, school nurses,
11 psychologists, social workers, speech therapists and program specialists
12 on behalf of SCTA, which is a local chapter of the California Teachers
13 Association.

14 As you know, schools are seen as a central hub for our 15 communities across our state. And if there are not appropriate 16 guidelines and precautions that are required, then employers will 17 continue to place expediency and convenience above worker safety. 18 In my district there have been three deaths and over 30 19 positive COVID cases. This is with minimal staff on our campuses. 20 Contact tracing and case investigation procedures have not been 21 transparent and oftentimes lacking. Staff who are on campus have felt 22 there is a lack of communication regarding possible exposure and feel 23 unsafe. The emergency regulations are especially important in calling 24 out the requirements for contact tracing, addressing outbreaks, face 25 coverings and distancing. And that this will allow for a common set of

> CALIFORNIA REPORTING, LLC 229 Napa Street, Rodeo, California 94572 (510) 224-4476

1 expectations that can and should be enforced.

2 We strongly urge the Standards Board to approve the 3 proposed standard. After the passage of this emergency standard, we 4 look forward to (indiscernible) with the Division and other stakeholders 5 to support safety for school nurses and COVID prevention in our schools. 6 Thank you. 7 CHAIR THOMAS: Thank you. 8 John, who do we have next up in the gueue? 9 MR. GOTCHER: Our next commenter is Emma Allen-10 Landwehr, from ROC the Bay worker member. 11 CHAIR THOMAS: Emma, can you hear us? 12 MS. ALLEN-LANDWEHR: Yes, can you hear me? 13 CHAIR THOMAS: I can. Go right ahead. 14 MS. ALLEN-LANDWEHR: All right. Hold on one second here, 15 pulling up my document. Okay. So my name is Emma Allen-Landwehr. 16 I'm a restaurant worker in the East Bay and I worked at a Berkeley 17 restaurant for the last eight years. Upon my rehiring in July 2020, I've 18 observed a lack of clear protocol surrounding work safety under COVID-19 19. There was a failure on the part of management to require accurate 20 training of cleaning procedures. Cleaning tasks were not prioritized 21 throughout shifts, even as management cut all janitorial staff. I observed 22 confusion amongst the staff regarding cleaning expectation and 23 protocols. Upon bringing up my safety concerns to management in the 24 middle of August, I was informed that my concerns had no basis and I 25 was dismissed for my shift without explanation. I observed the following

1 week that my shifts had been garnered as a result of my complaint.

Shortly after this I stopped receiving work schedules. A
coworker of mine who also voiced concerns relating to work safety under
COVID similarly received employer backlash, and eventually also stopped
receiving the annual work schedule.

6 Her mother, who had worked in this restaurant for over a 7 decade brought up concerns relating to work safety. And her inability to 8 adequately perform her job due to decreased staff and increased 9 workload. She was informed that if she did not do what was asked of her 10 she no longer had a job, and consequently ended her employment.

Following my separation from my long-time employer I was informed by fellow coworkers, several of my coworkers in the back of (indiscernible) had tested positive for COVID-19. There are at least four cases that I currently know about. One of the employees was hospitalized as a result of his infection, and members of his family also contracted COVID-19. Management neglected to notify staff of positive cases or to investigate potential exposure to other workers.

In response and out of concern for the safety of our
community, I and several other employees at this restaurant submitted
OSHA workplace safety complaints. Some these complaints
(indiscernible) invalidated one of which was regarding failure to report
positive COVID cases to the City of Berkeley. However, the business
remains open and people are at risk. Those of us who have spoken out
have been retaliated against.

25

We need decisive action on the part of OSHA to advocate for

CALIFORNIA REPORTING, LLC 229 Napa Street, Rodeo, California 94572 (510) 224-4476

1 the safety of restaurant workers. We need access to clear,

2 (indiscernible) and adequate training. We must have mechanisms of
3 accountability when protocols are violated. We must have assurances
4 that current COVID cases will be reported and then investigated, and that
5 contact tracing (indiscernible) will be conducted.

We must have access to clear information around paid sick
leave in the event of contracting COVID. We need to know that our
personal safety as laborers is valued and prioritized over profits.
Currently this isn't with me and my restaurant worker community. We
need decisive action now from OSHA. We cannot afford delays in issuing
of updated temporary emergency standards under COVID. The physical

12 safety of workers is in jeopardy. Thank you for hearing me today.

13 CHAIR THOMAS: Thank you, Emma. I think she was done.14 Thank you for your comments.

15 John, who do we have next in the queue?

16 MR. GOTCHER: Our next commenter is Natasha Castro of Los
 17 Angeles Alliance for a New Economy.

18 CHAIR THOMAS: Natasha, are you with us?

19 MS. CASTRO: I am, hi.

20 CHAIR THOMAS: Hi.

MS. CASTRO: Good morning, my name is Natasha Castro and I'm a worker and community organizer with the Los Angeles Alliance for a New Economy on our Fair Work Week L.A. campaign.

24 I'm speaking today on behalf of our entire coalition, which is
25 made up of over 70 organizations in support of Petition 583. We are a

coalition of laborers, community groups, health advocates and retail
 workers who, since the start of the pandemic, have been advocating for
 the health and safety of retail workers to curb the spread of COVID-19 at
 the workplace.

As for my workers, many of them have dealt with employers who are not enforcing public health orders and thus have experienced outbreaks at their jobs. Several of our retail worker members have shared that their employers are not regulating the number of customers that come in the store and so there is no social distancing.

Many workers also do not have access to the basic cleaning
 supplies that they need to disinfect the areas that they work in.

Unfortunately there have been outbreaks at some of these workplaces and employers have failed to adequately clean the stores or do anything to prevent further outbreaks. When these outbreaks occurred, it was very concerning to hear that cleaning was limited to shopping carts and registers for customers to feel safe while disregarding the health and safety of workers.

18 Many workers are also worried because they know the 19 pandemic is far from being over and their employers are not doing 20 enough to keep them safe.

We support the emergency temporary standard because all workers in California need to be protected from COVID-19 as well as any other future situations of this magnitude. Employers who are failing to comply with local health orders need to be held accountable. Thank you. CHAIR THOMAS: Thank you.

CALIFORNIA REPORTING, LLC 229 Napa Street, Rodeo, California 94572 (510) 224-4476

1	John, who do we have next in the queue?
2	MR. GOTCHER: Our next commenter is Robert Harrison MD,
3	MPH from UC San Francisco.
4	CHAIR THOMAS: Robert, are you with us?

5 MR. HARRISON: I am. Are you able to hear me? 6 CHAIR THOMAS: Yes, go right ahead. 7 DR. HARRISON: Thank you. I am Bob Harrison, clinical 8 professor at the University of California San Francisco, faculty in 9 occupational and environmental medicine. I'm talking to you not 10 obviously on behalf of the entire University of California or San 11 Francisco, but as someone who's been doing a lot of research and 12 consulting and also as a former member of this esteemed Occupational 13 Safety and Health Standards Board. I sat where you are for about three 14 years as the Occupational Safety and Health Representative, so in 15 Barbara Burgel's seat.

16 And I just really wanted to make very brief comments in 17 support of the emergency temporary standard for COVID. My reading of 18 that proposal is that it's balanced, accurate and clear. And that would be 19 extremely beneficial on three counts. First, for those employers who 20 already are largely complying with good worker protection programs for 21 COVID, I think they have little to be concerned about. I think the 22 emergency temporary standard has covered all the essential elements 23 that employers need to follow based on local, state and federal public 24 health guidance and best practice and best science. Employers who are 25 already doing a good job I think are not going to have much concern over

1 that emergency standard.

Second, the employers who are searching for best practices and guidance and consultation I think are also going to find the elements of the ETS clear and beneficial for them. And I would assume that an ETS, if and when it's passed, becomes in effect that it would be accompanied by that kind of guidance so employers can be clear about what they need to do. And I think that that when we have a standard, California is extremely beneficial.

9 And the third group are employers who either because 10 there's a complaint or they are subject to targeted inspection efforts by 11 DOSH, I think they will also have clarity about what they are expected to 12 do. And the compliance officers for DOSH will also have the tools that 13 they need to be clear what is enforceable. And I think that that's also 14 benefit to that third group of employers.

And so I applaud DOSH for really, in a very rapid period of
time, crafting what I think is a science based, very clear standard.

17 I sat in your seats when we considered the emergency 18 temporary standard for heat illness in California. And I recall that I had a 19 question, while this was done pretty quickly, should we take more time? 20 Do we need more time to debate, to get this absolutely perfect? And I 21 would say with COVID moving so quickly, so rapidly that I don't think that 22 we should make the perfect be the enemy of the good. And this standard 23 is about 90 percent spot on. So I want to thank the Division and the staff 24 who wrote and reviewed this. And thank you for all of your efforts and 25 consideration.

1	CHAIR THOMAS: Thank you.	
2	John, who do we have next in the queue?	
3	MR. GOTCHER: Our next commenter is David, and we don't	
4	have a last name for him from ROC the Bay worker member.	
5	CHAIR THOMAS: David, are you with us? (Translator	
6	speaking in Spanish to David.)	
7	DAVID: David.	
8	CHAIR THOMAS: Go right ahead.	
9	(Translator and David talk back and forth.)	
10	CHAIR THOMAS: Please tell him to go ahead and make his	
11	comments.	
12	DAVID: (Through Interpreter Haikalis) My name is David. I	
13	work in the restaurant industry. And because of this COVID situation	
14	(indiscernible) don't have the equipment to work like this.	
15	CHAIR THOMAS: Any other comments?	
16	DAVID: (Through Interpreter Haikalis) They need to check, to	
17	inspect the restaurants more often to make sure that they are compliant	
18	with the standard. And that the employees have the protection that they	
19	require.	
20	CHAIR THOMAS: Thank you. Thank you for your comments.	
21	John, who do we have next in the queue?	
22	MR. GOTCHER: So we got a Spanish-speaking commenter a	
23	few commenters ago. And I was wondering, Susana, if you remember – if	
24	we could get a clear message from Efrain Hernandez if you spoke with	
25	him before or knew what he wanted to comment?	

1 INTERPRETER HAIKALIS: Yes, you would like me to ask him 2 what? I'm sorry. 3 MR. GOTCHER: Well, if you remember. So we couldn't 4 totally understand what he was saying. And we were hoping that you 5 would remember some of your conversation with him. 6 INTERPRETER HAIKALIS: Oh, hold on. Let me look at my 7 notes here. 8 CHAIR THOMAS: (Overlapping colloguy.) Go ahead. 9 INTERPRETER HAIKALIS: He said that he was giving us 10 information about his workplace. That the employers were not cleaning 11 the workplace. That they had rats and cockroaches. They had problems 12 with the water filters and the bathrooms were not cleaned. And then 13 there was a lot of (indiscernible) and I wasn't able to hear more. 14 CHAIR THOMAS: You know, I'm going to stop those 15 comments. We get the picture, but we don't have time to do this today. 16 So John, would you move on to the next commenter please? 17 MR. GOTCHER: Our next commenter is Michael Miller from 18 the California Association of Winegrape Growers. 19 CHAIR THOMAS: Michael, are you there? 20 MR. MIILLER: Yes, I am. Good morning. 21 CHAIR THOMAS: Go right ahead. 22 MR. MIILLER: Good morning. Thank you Chair and Members, 23 appreciate your discussion this morning. My name is Michael Miiller. 24 I'm representing the California Association of Winegrape Growers. 25 Today, you're considering adoption of the COVID-19 safety

emergency standard. It would apply to each and every California
 industry, each and every California employee, and each and every person
 in California, whether they are employed or not.

There is no question that COVID is a crisis and emergency
(indiscernible) in California. But when considering an emergency
regulation like this, eight months after the declaration of a pandemic, it
begs the question of what took so long and why didn't the state act
earlier?

9 Well, we all know the answer, the state did indeed act. 10 Governor Newsom issued several executive orders. Agencies including 11 the California Department of Public Health issued several guidance 12 documents. Cal/OSHA participated and took the lead in developing and 13 enforcing many of these guidelines. Additionally, several counties and 14 cities went further and issued even more stringent local guidelines.

Every issue in this regulation is already addressed through existing guidelines. And all guidelines have been strictly enforced including substantial fines for noncompliance. We all know this.

There's no question that this regulation is far beyond the Board's statutory authority. For example, the Board has no authority to dictate compensation while an employee is away from work. To do so would (indiscernible) interests of the public good, which have been a form of a broad emergency regulation. Such a regulation would be under the Department of Public Health.

24 By and large, we all, as a community, are trying to defeat 25 COVID-19. It makes no sense to make employers responsible as a public

CALIFORNIA REPORTING, LLC 229 Napa Street, Rodeo, California 94572 (510) 224-4476

1 safety net for COVID-19, which is exactly what this regulation does.

A prior speaker asked that you not let the perfect be the enemy of the good. I agree with that intent. However, please consider another approach of first do no harm. As this regulation is being rushed through, we all know that there will be unintended consequences, and those consequences are harmful.

7 For example, this regulation would reduce safe housing for 8 essential workers. The regulation eliminates an employer's option 9 through (indiscernible) housing provided under Governor Newsom's 10 Housing for the Harvest Program. You see, because under this regulation 11 the employer would have arranged for housing that does not comply with 12 the regulation. This regulation treats all housing alike: hotel rooms, 13 apartments, single-family dwelling, etc. Therefore, this regulation 14 unintentionally requires a hotel room to be cleaned daily (indiscernible) 15 accommodations separate from others. Consequently, no employer 16 would ever refer an employee to Housing for the Harvest under this 17 regulation. This means less housing for those who need it most. 18 Additionally, if an employer provides housing for its 19 employees, spaces for beds, or the heads of the beds in the corners of 20 the room, are ordered 10 feet apart. And then with these partitions 21 between the beds, that housing does not comply with this regulation 22 either. That is because the foot of the beds are less than six feet apart. 23 However, this kind of spacing is allowed under some county guidelines, 24 which are already in place.

25

Relative to transportation, please keep in mind that many

CALIFORNIA REPORTING, LLC 229 Napa Street, Rodeo, California 94572 (510) 224-4476

employers provide bus passes for employees, a contract with the bus
company to provide transportation for those employees if they so desire
to use it. However, this regulation makes the employer of those bus
passengers responsible for all kinds of actions by the transit company,
including when the bus driver wipes down the steering wheel. Those are
beyond the control of the employer.

I appreciate that you all understand that this regulation is
riddled with problems. I would appreciate your intention to continue
working on this through an advisory committee and I volunteer to serve
on that committee if the Board so desires. However, while the advisory
committee is reviewing options, this regulation will be law that must be
enforced and complied with.

As an advocate for an industry association, I must advise our
employer members to comply with the regulation as written and
approved by this Board immediately when it becomes effective.
Consequently, an advisory committee after the fact is probably like
drying your shoes when you could have just avoided stepping in the
water puddle in the first place.

19 I allow myself (indiscernible) these comments, and I ask that
20 this be delayed for a month to identify and resolve the unintended
21 consequences which are harmful. And I will make myself available to
22 assist in that effort. Thank you so much for your time and your
23 commitment to this issue. I appreciate it.
24 CHAIR THOMAS: Thank you.

25 John, who do we have next in the queue?

MR. GOTCHER: Our next commenter is Michael Young of the
 California Federation of Teachers.

MR. YOUNG: Hi, this is Michael Young with the California
Federation of Teachers, and we're in strong support of the emergency
standard, understanding that this is a general workplace standard.

6 I want to focus a little bit on why this is important for 7 schools. We've seen studies showing that there have been an increased 8 number of children being diagnosed with COVID-19. For example, a 9 recent study released by the American Academy of Pediatrics show that 10 as of November 12th over one million children in the U.S. have tested 11 positive for COVID-19 since the pandemic began. The number of new 12 COVID child cases for COVID-19 reported last week was approximately 13 112,000. It was by far the highest weekly increase since the pandemic 14 began.

Now, lastly I want to go over a recent Center for Disease
Control Prevention study about the children between the ages of 10 and
19 spread the virus at the same rate as adults do.

This is all important, because schools are a unique type of workplace that carry unique types of risks. Schools are,number one, compulsory for children, right? We require them to -- we mandate and require their attendance. In addition to classroom education there are unique recreation and food (indiscernible) environment. And classified employees are dealing with minors that may struggle to deal with social distancing and mask-wearing and issues like that.

25 I've also mentioned this before, but I think it bears

CALIFORNIA REPORTING, LLC 229 Napa Street, Rodeo, California 94572 (510) 224-4476

repeating, that some California school districts are asking the school
employees to sign assumption-of-risk letters. Literally, there are
districts that are asking employees to sign letters that state, "I hereby
acknowledge the risk of exposure to the coronavirus and I acknowledge
the risk that I may contract the coronavirus by coming on to the school
district premises and interacting with employees, students and other
people."

8 Additionally, the state guidance regarding reopening schools 9 allows for some schools in known COVID hotspots, in those purple-tier 10 areas, to reopen for in-person instruction. In this environment I think 11 it's important to understand the risk to students, to parents, to staff, 12 really, to any family that has school-aged kids or has school employees. 13 It's imperative that we have clear enforcement, clear rules, clear 14 compliance on workplace safety, things like mandating social distancing, 15 (indiscernible) taking steps to maximize air quality, providing information 16 to reduce the spread of infection and inform workers of their rights and 17 benefits if they are exposed or test positive. And also, clear testing 18 requirements during an outbreak.

I do wish that the language included in the standard had -- I
do wish there was some language around anti-discrimination and antiretaliation protections for workers to ensure that workers are treated
fairly and aren't intimidated from coming forward when employers fail
to meet their obligations to protect workers.

Lastly, I just want to say it makes no sense for employers to say they should be allowed to have workers in unsafe workplaces now

1 and give them weeks or months before COVID-specific workplace 2 regulations apply to them. Workers are being exposed at record numbers 3 now, workers are at risk now, workers are dying now. 4 There was millions allocated in the last budget; significant 5 resources for outreach and education for employers. Cal/OSHA has 6 numerous resources to help employers comply. We can't drag our feet in 7 terms of making sure that workers and our worksites are protected 8 immediately. And I strongly urge passing this emergency standard. 9 Thank you. 10 CHAIR THOMAS: Thank you, Michael. 11 John, who do we have next in the queue? 12 MR. GOTCHER: Our next commenter is Maria Vasquez of the 13 Restaurant Opportunity Center of Los Angeles. 14 CHAIR THOMAS: Maria, are you with us? Hello? 15 (Maria speaking in Spanish.) 16 CHAIR THOMAS: Go right ahead. 17 MS. VAZQUEZ: (Through Interpreter Haikalis) I am a worker 18 of (indiscernible), it's a restaurant. And my employer has only provided 19 us a mask since this began. And they told us that we have to be careful 20 and we have to be responsible for doing this. 21 So we understand with this that they care more about the 22 job than they care about the employees. They have given us no 23 instructions, no instruction and no orders or anything to be able to take 24 care of ourselves and our families. 25 So we have learned through some coworkers that some of

1	the people here have become sick, but they have not informed us about
2	it. We have to be exposed to all this and plus take care of our jobs.
3	So we request from the employers to let us work in safe
4	areas and for them to provide us the necessary equipment. Thank you
5	for your time and for listening to us.
6	CHAIR THOMAS: Thank you very much.
7	John, who do we have next up in the queue?
8	MR. GOTCHER: Our next commenter is Angelica Miklos from
9	Folsom Cordova Education Association.
10	CHAIR THOMAS: Angelica, are you with us?
11	MS. MIKLOS: Yes, I am.
12	CHAIR THOMAS: Go right ahead.
13	MS. MIKLOS: Good morning. My name is Angelica Miklos
14	and I represent 1,100 educators as President of the Folsom Cordova
15	Education Association, which is a local chapter of the California Teachers
16	Association.
17	We appreciate the urgency in which the proposed emergency
18	regulations were developed and moved forward. As you know, the
19	COVID-19 pandemic
20	CHAIR THOMAS: Angelica, can l interrupt?
21	MS. MIKLOS: Yes?
22	CHAIR THOMAS: Can you slow down just a little bit?
23	MS. MIKLOS: Yes, absolutely. I'm sorry.
24	CHAIR THOMAS: Because we have somebody recording or
25	transcribing this, so just slow. Thank you.

1 MS. MIKLOS: That's okay. I've got to start where I left off. 2 We appreciate the urgency in which the proposed emergency regulations 3 were developed and moved forward. As you know, the COVID-19 4 pandemic is only trending worse and these emergency regulations are 5 necessary to help keep employees safe.

As you know, schools are seen as a central hub for
communities across our state and if there are not appropriate guidelines
and precautions that are required then employers will continue to place
expediency and convenience above workers safety.

10 In my area, my district opened our elementary sites in the 11 hybrid model last Thursday. Social distancing is a big concern for us. 12 Many classrooms do not allow for strict six-foot distancing between 13 students. While PPE such as masks and gloves are being provided, it's 14 done by request. It has not been made clear to all staff how to request 15 the needed supplies, and when they do they're usually only allotted five 16 masks or five sets of gloves per class, which is often not sufficient to get 17 through the week.

18 It's very concerning that we've already had half a dozen
19 positive cases since opening just last Thursday and that's just with a
20 portion of our overall population, just elementary, no secondary
21 students.

The emergency regulations are especially important in calling out the requirements for contact tracing, addressing outbreaks, face coverings and distancing. And this will allow for a common set of expectations that can and should be enforced.

We strongly encourage -- I'm sorry, we strongly urge the
 Standards Board to approve the proposed standard. Thank you so much
 for your time.

4 CHAIR THOMAS: Thank you.

5 John, who do we have next up in the queue?

6 MR. GOTCHER: Our next commenter is Stan Santos from
 7 Fresno-Madera-Tulare-Kings Labor Council.

8 CHAIR THOMAS: Stan, go right ahead.

9 MR. SANTOS: Good morning. Thank you very much for giving 10 me this opportunity.

11 CHAIR THOMAS: Good morning.

MR. SANTOS: I have a colleague by the name of Dr. Salvador Sandoval who is the head of the Merced Public Health Department that had the investigation of Livingston. And I was going to read off the chronology of events that took place per his statement, but I have to kind of deviate from that plan. But if you were to please read that statement. I sent it to be entered into the record. And it's almost like a march of death.

And it's a march of death of unwilling workers who had no opportunity to make any choices. And it starts in April when they become aware of the first illness. You go through May and June and somewhere in there was the first fatality, which was actually reported on July 21st through relatives, not the company.

And then all of a sudden in quick succession, listen to this, on August 23rd, you know, "We saw that the 29 recommendations had

not been followed. Then we warned the company. And that same day
 we realized another death. The next day the fourth death, the fifth,
 another death."

I can't believe that we are debating this in such a manner. By
the time it was done, it was 400 or so people infected and nine deaths.
None of the reporting was done by the company, very minimum
standards were enforced. It was done after they were brought in kicking
and screaming and after an intervention by the, I believe, the Federal
Health Administrator, or Deputy Administrator.

The only other thing I have to say is that the statements by the Chamber of Commerce individual, and some of that are so selfserving. We live in Fresno County and I've worked out in those fields. And I work for a telephone company now, but I've seen the work and the way the dynamic unfolds there. Hispanics are 54 or 55 percent of the population. We're 60 percent of the fatalities. You know, it may not matter to a lot of people, but it certainly matters to us.

So I would ask that you implement these standards and sort out the methodology and the rules for implementation in a way that is not, almost like you said, of false choices where they say, "If you implement this now it's going to kill our industry." Well, you're killing people right now. We don't have time to wait. The pandemic is going to reach its peak soon. And then long before the medicinal applications kick in it will be too late for those people.

24 So please consider this and I appreciate the time that you 25 have afforded me. Thank you very much.

1	CHAIR THOMAS: Thank you, Stan.
2	John, who do we have next up in the queue?
3	MR. GOTCHER: Our next commenter is Pamela Murcell of the
4	California Industrial Hygiene Council.
5	CHAIR THOMAS: Pamela, are you with us? Pamela? I think
6	we need to turn up your mic or hello?
7	John, I don't think she's there. Why don't we go on to the
8	next?
9	MR. GOTCHER: Okay. Our next commenter is Rachel Reyes
10	of LAANE.
11	CHAIR THOMAS: Rachel, are you with us?
12	MS. REYES: Hi, yes. Can you hear me?
13	CHAIR THOMAS: Yes, go right ahead.
14	MS. REYES: Awesome. Hello, my name is Rachel Reyes and I
15	am a worker/organizer with the Los Angeles Alliance for a New Economy
16	on the Fair Work Week L.A. Campaign.
17	I worked in retail for six years. And up until this March I was
18	working during the beginning of this pandemic at a mall in Santa Monica,
19	a nexus of travel and tourism. What my team and I experienced at the
20	lead-up to the eventual lockdown in March was an abdication of duty
21	from every single level. Mall management put the onus to protect
22	workers on the brands, and my company's corporate offices said that
23	they were deferring to mall management. No one wanted to make any
24	courageous decisions regarding our health and safety. We were left with
25	no answers or any guidance. Many workers are still in this position

CALIFORNIA REPORTING, LLC 229 Napa Street, Rodeo, California 94572 (510) 224-4476

1 today.

2 Of course, I understand that the COVID-19 pandemic is 3 unprecedented, but my issues rest solely on how little mall management 4 and corporate management cared to curb the spread of the virus. We did 5 not know how the virus was spreading at the time. Was it airborne or 6 was it through touching surfaces? But neither the mall nor my former 7 employer felt a need to make any kind of intervention. Nobody took any 8 precaution. I had to make up my own health and safety standards, 9 because there was no direction for me to reference.

10 In addition to our standard daily cleaning procedures that we 11 always implemented I asked my staff to wash their hands after every 12 interaction with a guest. I told my team to stop accepting cash. I asked 13 my staff to keep an arms-length distance between every customer. I did 14 all of this against my company's advice which was, "business as usual." It 15 was more important for me as a leader in-store to exhibit the health and 16 safety protocol that my team deserved, especially knowing that only full-17 time staff like myself were given healthcare.

18 I started stocking up on necessary supplies that I saw flying 19 off of the shelves starting in February. I over-ordered and bulk ordered 20 on cleaning supplies, hand sanitizer and toilet paper. I began portioning 21 out these items to my team in March before the lockdown. Each 22 employee received hand sanitizer, toilet paper and disinfectant that I 23 ordered the month before. I knew that taking these items paid for by the 24 company out of the store would put my job at risk, but as a manager it 25 was my job to take care of my team.

1 There are tens of thousands of people just like my former 2 staff who were asked to go back to work in shopping malls this summer. 3 They are not deemed essential, but are essential in so far as if malls 4 aren't open, our entire economy tanks. We have asked tens of thousands 5 of workers to go back to work during a health crisis. We have asked 6 workers to smile at customers under their masks and sell them shoes, 7 jackets and pretzels without providing strong Cal/OSHA standards for 8 employers to follow during this unprecedented time. We will continue to 9 lose workers lives without clear direction or guidance in place for 10 management to follow. 11 The little guidance that people have now, they are not 12 following or implementing. We know that for a fact. So I urge you to 13 please pass the emergency temporary standard so that employers that 14 don't comply with the COVID-19 guidelines are held accountable in order 15 to protect the health and safety of workers. Thank you. 16 CHAIR THOMAS: Thank you. 17 John, who do we have next up in the gueue? 18 MR. GOTCHER: Our next commenter is Melissa Love of 19 United for Respect. 20 CHAIR THOMAS: Melissa, are you with us? 21 MS. LOVE: Yes. 22 CHAIR THOMAS: Go right ahead. 23 MS. LOVE: Hi, good morning. And thank you for having me 24 today. My name is Melissa Love and I am current Walmart associate at 25 store 4101 in the City of Long Beach. I've worked at Walmart for five

years now. I've worked for myself and live with my father who has been
 out of work since the start of the pandemic.

These last nine months have taken a toll on all of us. And we cannot deny that this pandemic has been devastating to some communities over the year or over others. Working at Walmart throughout this pandemic has been stressful, unpredictable and resulted in (indiscernible) by employers. That is why I'm in support of passing the emergency temporary standards for COVID-19.

9 All of California went on a lockdown at the beginning of 10 March. Walmart did not (indiscernible) any real policies until April 17th. 11 These policies were ever only required workers to wear a mask and not 12 customers. We were still required to have to serve anyone that came 13 into the store without a mask. It wasn't until July 20th that Walmart required both associates and customers to wear masks. (indiscernible) 14 15 They were still allowing customers to come into their stores without 16 masks to avoid physical confrontations.

My coworkers and I have already experienced customers who did not properly wear masks or did not want to wear them at all. On top of that, management was not helping us to enforce mask wearing or social distancing. Due to Walmart's negligence, dozens of Walmart stores across the country have had outbreaks leading to associates' deaths.

In my store, we have had two confirmed cases, but
management did not have the decency to inform us when they found out.
I had to alert my coworkers that there were cases days after they

CALIFORNIA REPORTING, LLC 229 Napa Street, Rodeo, California 94572 (510) 224-4476

occurred. Walmart decides what is safe for associates (indiscernible).
 They should have not been allowed to put us at risk (indiscernible) lives.
 I mentioned that (indiscernible) we are left to fend for ourselves and
 possibly work alongside someone who came in contact with infected
 coworkers.

6 Walmart is still not enforcing social distancing at any of its
7 stores and we serve 300 customers at a time.

8 Around April or May they placed flooring tiles to encourage
9 social distancing in certain aisles as well as the checkout (indiscernible).

10 Customers who ask for assistance come too close and do not 11 respect personal boundaries. Over the course of the pandemic, Walmart 12 has made over \$43 billion and still has not provided us with hazard pay. 13 It seems to me that Walmart cares more about making profits, allowing

14 customers to disrespect us, while (indiscernible) associates'

15 (indiscernible).

16 I'm calling you to pass the emergency temporary standards 17 for COVID, because people like myself cannot go another day without the 18 hazard of (indiscernible) working conditions we are being forced into. I 19 shouldn't have to put my life or my father's life at risk for a company

20 that does not care about me. Thank you.

21 CHAIR THOMAS: Thank you very much.

22 John, who do we have next in the queue?

23 MR. GOTCHER: Our next commenter is Dan Leacox of Leacox
 24 and Associates.

25 CHAIR THOMAS: Dan, are you with us? Can you hear us?

CALIFORNIA REPORTING, LLC 229 Napa Street, Rodeo, California 94572 (510) 224-4476

1 MR. LEACOX: I am. Can you hear me fine? 2 CHAIR THOMAS: We can, go right ahead. 3 MR. LEACOX: Okay great. Great. Good morning Board 4 Members, staff and fellow stakeholders. My name is Dan Leacox. I'm 5 speaking again today simply as an individual. I'm not representing 6 anyone except those who might agree with me. And today I'm directing 7 my comments to the good people in this audience. The ones who can live 8 and work together, perhaps without more regulation. I think that is by 9 far most of us. We need to make sure that our efforts to manage the bad 10 people don't trample on our reasons for living. 11 To be brief, I will speak from a high level and hope it 12 connects well with the particulars stated by others.

The first thing I have to say is just in response to some of what I have been hearing in the comments. And that is there needs to be a separation between need for greater enforcement and need for more rules. This is about what this rule adds to the existing regulatory structure and what is currently enforceable and not about what already exists. And I think it's a fair question to challenge what this rule adds as necessary and how helpful it is.

I believe we have a very bright future, but this rule is not a step in that direction. The usual response when one criticizes the solution to a problem is to attack the messenger and claim the messenger doesn't care about the problem. This is a public relations tactic, but it's not the truth. The problem and the solution are not the same thing. The direction one chooses in the solution of a problem depends on one's ultimate destination. I'm concerned about the
 destination contemplated by this solution and I believe you should share
 this concern.

As our Attorney General kindly pointed out on Monday, this is a proposal to establish an enforceable legal standard applicable to workplaces to directly and comprehensively protect workers, their families and the public at large. Well this sounds great, but this agenda to press employers into the service of public health goals has taken this rule too far.

10 Certainly, workplaces are a piece of the puzzle, the public 11 health puzzle, but the agenda evident in this rule calls for employers to 12 reach into the private affairs of their employees and for employers to 13 control things beyond their control. It creates conflict between 14 employers and employees and sets up a turkey shoot of legal action 15 against good employers.

16 The economics of this are also troubling for workers as well 17 as employers. Workers can't be insulated from the economic 18 consequences of what we do, so I'm going to talk about them, but that's 19 not an uncaring act. A direct cost in lost revenues are enormous. We 20 don't have a number for that, but I think the magnitude is obvious. And 21 I'd like to put this into context for the good workers of good employers 22 with less than 500 employees.

The average regulatory burden per employee rose \$8,000 in 24 2008 to \$11,700 in 2016. And again, that's the cost per employee. This 25 represents 99 percent of all businesses and 53 percent of all employees.

CALIFORNIA REPORTING, LLC 229 Napa Street, Rodeo, California 94572 (510) 224-4476

1 The average regulatory burden per employee is even higher 2 for the smaller companies. In 2016 the burden was \$14,000 per 3 employee in businesses with one to 49 employees. That represents over 25 percent of all employees. That was in 2016 before any of this was 4 5 brought to bear. Regulatory costs are shared by employees in the form 6 of reduced pay, employers in the form of reduced profit, and consumers 7 in the form of higher prices. Of course employees and employers are 8 also consumers, so both pay twice.

9 Also employees have a stake in the viability of their 10 employer. Taxability and advancement require business profitability, so 11 employees have a stake in all three impacts.

12 I'd really like to see this Board take a tough stand against the 13 elements of this rule that go beyond reason. For example, just one, 14 section (c)(6) requires six feet of separation except where an employer 15 can demonstrate that six feet of separation is not possible. It seems to 16 me that that is a ridiculous evidentiary burden, there for the convenience 17 of enforcement and not compliance. You are the executive branch of this 18 Cal/OSHA operation, surely you can take action to separate the wheat 19 from the chaff in this proposed rule.

At the present time we are living with two prevalent hazards: COVID and fear. We can manage the virus, disease is not a new problem. We will come out of it and breathe the same air again. I am more concerned about the fear. Fear is a dark place of mistrust. People in fear harm others to protect themselves. They do rash and irrational things, so I worry about what will be left when the COVID story ends.

1 Among those things I hope we don't give up out of fear and 2 don't lose is respect for the law. Bad people live in contempt of the law. 3 Good people respect the law until the government itself breeds their 4 contempt. There are many ways this happens to name a few and you've 5 heard some examples today, but honestly do more harm than good. Laws 6 that do not conform to the spirit of more senior laws. Laws that pit good 7 people against each other. Laws that penalize good people for doing the 8 right thing. Laws that force people to choose between compliance and 9 their dreams. And those are true for the workers as well as the 10 employers. 11 There are other ways, that's an old story. But I hope that we 12 can keep an eye on the mountain and come out of this thing with a very 13 bright future and not compromise ideals that would compromise that 14 future. Thank you for your time and attention. 15 CHAIR THOMAS: Thank you. 16 John, who do we have next up? 17 MR. GOTCHER: Our next commenter is Aimee Thompson 18 from Livermore Education Association. 19 CHAIR THOMAS: Hello, Aimee. Can you hear us? (No audible 20 response.) Aimee? Can you hear us Aimee? 21 I think we'll have to go on to the next, John. 22 MR. GOTCHER: Okay. 23 CHAIR THOMAS: Sorry, go ahead. 24 MR. GOTCHER: Next up is Nicole Rice from California 25 Manufacturers and Technology Association.

 MS. RICE: Yes, I am, Mr. Chair. Can you he CHAIR THOMAS: Yes, go right ahead. MS. RICE: Perfect, thank you. Thank you N Board Members for allowing me to speak today. Once a 	
4 MS. RICE: Perfect, thank you. Thank you N 5 Board Members for allowing me to speak today. Once a	1r. Chair and
5 Board Members for allowing me to speak today. Once a	Ir. Chair and
	gain my name is
6 Nicole Rice and I'm with the California Manufacturers a	nd Technology
7 Association.	
8 CHAIR THOMAS: Can Linterrupt you for jus	t a minute,
9 Nicole? You're going to come up next, we'll come back	to you. We went
10 to the next, because we didn't have communication. So	o we have one in
11 front of you and then we will go to you next. Okay, Nic	ole?
12 MS. RICE: Okay, sounds good. Thank you.	
13 CHAIR THOMAS: All right. All right, thank	you.
14 All right, Aimee, go ahead. I think it was A	imee. (No audible
15 response.) Hello?	
16 MR. GOTCHER: Aimee Thompson?	
17 CHAIR THOMAS: Yeah, Aimee.	
18 MR. GOTCHER: From the Livermore Educat	ion Association.
19 CHAIR THOMAS: I just saw her on the scree	en. John, let's go
20 back to Nicole. She was right there ready to go.	
21 MR. GOTCHER: Okay, Nicole, are you ready	?
22 CHAIR THOMAS: Nicole, go right ahead.	
23 MS. RICE: Yes, okay. Perfect.	
24 CHAIR THOMAS: Go ahead. Thank you.	
25 MS. RICE: Thanks. So once again, my name	e is Nicole Rice.

1 I'm with the California Manufacturers and Technology Association. And 2 first I wanted to start off by saying that California manufacturers, we 3 don't disagree about the importance of keeping our workers and our workplaces safe during this crisis. As an essential industry, we were 4 5 open in the early stages of this crisis. And before anyone had a chance to 6 act, we as other essential industries had to act in order to keep our 7 workplaces safe, our workers safe and keep essential goods flowing to 8 not only Californians but also our country and our global community.

9 So our concern today as many others have pointed out is 10 about the process. I think we have demonstrated as the industry 11 community that we are willing to come to the table and have 12 conversations, trying to achieve balance of workplace safety as well as 13 operate with integrity. Because in addition to the safety component 14 being important, we also want to make sure that we keep our businesses 15 open, so that we can keep individuals working and employed during this 16 crisis to try to mitigate all impacts that could result.

17 So many who have come before me have spoken about the 18 timing and necessity of this regulation. We too want to align ourselves 19 with those comments and agree that when we are looking in the face of 20 six weeks before many of the actions that have been taken by the 21 Legislature that will go into effect, most notably AB 685, we are 22 concerned about the timing of this regulation. We do ask for the Board 23 to take more time and consideration to allow more conversation with all 24 stakeholders at the table. And as an alternative approach to make sure 25 that the advisory committee process begins immediately if this regulation

CALIFORNIA REPORTING, LLC 229 Napa Street, Rodeo, California 94572 (510) 224-4476

1 does indeed go forward.

I also wanted to point out concerns about the inconsistency.
We think that the rushed nature of this conversation has created
inconsistencies with soon-to-be-existing laws, as well as other elements
that are currently in place.

6 For instance, under CDC in the critical infrastructure 7 guideline, it provides that workers in those critical infrastructure sectors 8 like manufacturing can return to work after COVID exposure in a 9 timeframe less than 14 days after the date of the exposure provided that 10 certain additional controls are taken or are in place. Like wearing 11 surgical masks during the day, implementing the appropriate safety 12 procedures, and the like.

13 The California Department of Public Health has also 14 authorized this practice in their COVID employer playbook. However, 15 this regulation does not provide that type of consideration. So that just 16 shows that the lack of coordination is creating inconsistencies and 17 arguably as others have raised, creating this layer of mandates and 18 responsibilities on employers and manufacturers.

You have local ordinances, you have state law that's coming online. You have existing guidance that Cal/OSHA itself has put out in the early days of this crisis. Now you would have this regulation, not to mention all the federal rules and guidance that overlaps in this area. So it's not inconceivable to be hearing the concerns from the employer community, because how are we supposed to really, truly understand to achieve your objectives as well as ours about what we're supposed to

comply with. How are we supposed to comply? And all of that done
 under the threat of increased and continued enforcement, which I'd like
 to point out that there has been enforcement by Cal/OSHA and the
 Division related to the guidelines. And these unfortunate situations that
 we are hearing today are truly that, unfortunate. But Cal/OSHA has been
 active in this space.

7 Also want to point out the feasibility and flexibility. Again, 8 with all stakeholders at the table we can come together and find the 9 right balance between worker protections and operational integrity. But 10 as it's been said earlier, as I just said, we've demonstrated that we are 11 willing to come to the table with the same objectives for workers safety. 12 But passing regulations with unworkable and confusing provisions will 13 not produce the clarity that everyone has spoken of and will not produce 14 the very strategic and targeted action that everyone hopes.

15 Examples of infeasibility relate to, for instance, the provision 16 under 3205.4(f) related to employer-provided transportation. In some 17 circumstances, long-haul buses are used to transport employees to their 18 workplaces. In these types of buses, the windows are not designed to 19 open except in emergency situations. So a manufacturer who is 20 providing this service would not be able to do the ventilation prescribed 21 under this standard. So these vehicles would essentially be limited or 22 precluded from any future use. And so this just is an example of the 23 infeasibility that's contained.

In addition to that controlled manufacturing environments
 where temperature, air quality, contamination that could adversely or

CALIFORNIA REPORTING, LLC 229 Napa Street, Rodeo, California 94572 (510) 224-4476

negatively affect operational processes is a concern. However, under
 section 3205(c)(2)(e) we are required to maximize the quantity of
 outdoor air and that will be infeasible in controlled environments.

Further, to the extent that this regulation is trying to,
whether either verbatim or in spirit, to codify the guidance from CDC, it's
important to note that this, the regulation, does not achieve that goal.
Because as we have seen throughout this whole crisis, the CDC guidance
continues to evolve through this pandemic. But the regulation makes no
consideration to allow what is being prescribed in its language to evolve
when those conditions change.

11 I'll end with the fact on testing. It's been mentioned that 12 we're concerned about the testing. We see it as being overly broad and 13 excessive, which will lead to extreme costs. Testing every one of our 14 employees, that can be interpreted by this language whether or not, and 15 not focusing on whether those individuals have been exposed, will 16 essentially require manufacturers to stockpile these scarce resources. 17 Because we would have to have them on hand in order to do the 18 excessive testing that is prescribed in the outbreak sections of this 19 policy.

20 And lastly I'll conclude by saying a more broad and more 21 time for stakeholder process would allow us to offer things like in the 22 training component of this standard. Where it requires manufacturers 23 and all employers to do training on some of the basic elements of what 24 COVID-19 is, and how it's transmitted, and how to protect yourself. But 25 the Division is creating training modules, so how does that action

CALIFORNIA REPORTING, LLC 229 Napa Street, Rodeo, California 94572 (510) 224-4476

1 interact with the requirements of the standard? Perhaps they could be 2 used to do the basic training by industry sector, by occupation, while the 3 companies could use that limited training time to be able to talk about 4 those specific to their workplace and their policies. 5 (Overlapping colloguy.) 6 CHAIR THOMAS: Nicole, can you wrap up please? 7 MS. RICE: Yes, I'm sorry. 8 CHAIR THOMAS: I think three minutes passed about three 9 minutes ago, but please wrap up. 10 MS. RICE: Yeah. No, so that was my concluding statement. 11 Those are our concerns. And lastly I'd just like to align myself with 12 everything that's been said by my industry colleagues prior. Thank you 13 so much for your time and indulgence. 14 CHAIR THOMAS: Thank you, Nicole. 15 John, who do we have up next? 16 MR. GOTCHER: Our next commenter is Zenaida Perez 17 Fuentes from Southern California Coalition for Occupational HUD --18 Safety and Health, sorry. 19 CHAIR THOMAS: Zenaida, are you with us? 20 MS. PEREZ FUENTES: Yes, I am, thank you. 21 CHAIR THOMAS: Go right ahead. 22 MS. FUENTES: Hello, Board. Yeah, my name is Zenaida 23 Fuentes. I'm with SoCalCOSH. We are a nonprofit organization, it's in 24 SoCal and advocates for safe, healthy and secure workplaces for low-25 wage, immigrant, and workers of color. We're calling in support of the

COVID ETS. From the very start of this pandemic, we have worked
 closely with organizational partners and allies to best address the
 concerns of workers and community members in our region.

Every day we hear personally from workers about their fears of going to work, getting the virus and bringing it home to their families. Workers were overworked and exploited before the virus and now are hitting a breaking point. We see (indiscernible) employees ignoring guidelines, failing to install protective measures in the workplace, even saying local guidelines are suggestions rather than the law.

10 As we continue to live with this virus as and as the number 11 of COVID-19 cases continue to rise, it is crucial that we ensure workers 12 are safe and secure at their workplace. In Los Angeles County alone, 13 there have been over 7,000 deaths from COVID-19. Workers need 14 protection now, employers need accountability now, not tomorrow, not 15 next month, next year. Workers are looking to the Board to take action 16 today and have a common sense solution to ensure Cal/OSHA is able to 17 hold employers accountable, providing the COVID-19 guidelines. Board, 18 thank you for your time and consideration.

19 CHAIR THOMAS: Thank you.

20 John, who do we have up next?

21 MR. GOTCHER: Our next commenter is Matt Rogers from22 AgSocio.

23 CHAIR THOMAS: Matt, can you hear us? (No audible
24 response.) Hello, Matt? I think you need to unmute. There you go.

25 MR. ROGERS: Sorry, can you hear me now?

CHAIR THOMAS: Yeah, go right ahead.

1

2 MR. ROGERS: Great. Thanks. Good morning, Matt Rogers, 3 representing AgSocio. We are an agricultural employer in the Salinas 4 Valley and Central Coast area. Thank you for taking my comments, 5 thanks for the work that you do. I'm sure it's not easy. I submitted 6 comments in writing, which I hope you will review, so I will be brief.

First, let me say we understand and appreciate the need to
protect employees from COVID-19 exposure at work. Indeed, like many
other essential businesses, our team has been at work in crisis mode
growing food and mitigating COVID-19 risks in real time every day for the
past nine months.

We wrote our comments and I am here today to express our extreme concern about two specific phrases of the proposed emergency standard, which can be very easily resolved. But as written these two phrases threaten our ability to survive as a business literally and do not meaningfully improve worker protection from COVID-19.

We are a small agricultural labor and service provider. We employ both U.S. residents and foreign nationals with temporary work authorization via H-2A guest worker visas. As an H-2A employer, we provide both housing and transportation to our workforce and my comments will focus on those sections of the standard.

We did have two COVID-19 cases in our workforce this year. Both cases rode in our transportation service and one of them lived in our housing. Thanks to the mitigation measures we had implemented, many of which are now included in this proposed standard, we were able to identify and contain those cases and ensure that
1 those employees had access to the resources that they needed.

2 Those measures include ongoing training on symptoms, spread, 3 prevention. Education on paid leave options. Provision of and enforced use of facial 4 coverings. Multiple daily sanitations of high-touch surfaces. Multiple daily mandated 5 handwashing during breaks and meals and before and after shifts. Additional toilets and 6 handwashing facilities at all of our work sites. Professional cleaning of our housing, 7 reduced transportation density, symptom checking, staggered breaks and meal periods, 8 employer-facilitated testing, workplace contact tracing, fast-response quarantining and 9 isolation accommodations for those living in our housing. 10 All of those measures and more have been in place since April or May 11 and as an employer we are not concerned with their inclusion in this draft standard. 12 However, our concerns are with the following two sections: On employer 13 housing, specifically the section 3205.3(c)(2) where the text reads, "Ensure beds are 14 spaced at least six feet apart in all directions." The reality is that employer housing uses 15 existing housing stock. We utilize one, two or three-bedroom apartments with 16 bedrooms that are 12'x10', 12'x11', 12'x12'. But in the majority of our housing I cannot 17 physically get six feet between beds. I included a photo for you of a bedroom that's a 18 standard bedroom in our housing in my written comments. I hope you'll take a look at 19 it. 20 And the reality is these are employees who are living together in an 21 apartment, sharing a bathroom, sharing a kitchen, sharing a living room, riding 22 transportation together, working on the same crew. Considering the reality of sharing a 23 living space, and after implementing all of the other housing, transportation, and 24 workplace mitigation measures that are included in the standard; it does not add 25 meaningful additional protection to workers who are living, working and riding together

CALIFORNIA REPORTING, LLC 229 Napa Street, Rodeo, California 94572 (510) 224-4476

to require six feet of space between beds. As opposed to five or whatever the
maximum amount is allowed or all that is possible.

3 But it does have a massive impact on us as an employer and as a 4 business. The result of this language as written will be to literally cut in half our housing 5 capacity and therefore our workforce. Six feet of space between workers' heads is 6 easily achievable with head-to-toe staggering as is recommended in the standard. In 7 addition, engineering controls such as dividers in rooms can be possible, but they are 8 not allowed under the standard. Strictly speaking, six feet between beds is rigid and 9 seems arbitrary. And it will have a dramatic impact on our business. And I really don't 10 believe there is any difference in worker health between six feet between beds, or five, 11 when these folks are sharing a living situation.

Secondly, the second issue on COVID prevention in employer-provided transportation, and specifically 3205.4(c)(2) where it reads, "The vehicle operator and any passengers are separated by at least three feet in all directions."

15 I shared a couple of diagrams and photographs in my written report to 16 you all, or my written comments to you all that I hope you will review. The reality is 17 many of us in agriculture utilize 15-passenger vans through the CalVans program 18 or others. And the best practice that's emerged in our company thus far 19 has been to leave an open seat between employees in transportation. 20 We require face coverings, sanitize multiple times per day, maintain 21 same seats, same crew whenever possible unless there are personnel 22 changes.

But the way that the standard is written, "three feet
between all passengers," I provided a diagram with measurements of how
15-passenger vans are in reality. You're talking about a van with the

CALIFORNIA REPORTING, LLC 229 Napa Street, Rodeo, California 94572 (510) 224-4476

1 driver and three people in it, which is simply not economically viable 2 and the requirement may very well set back safe agricultural 3 transportation in this state. During the peak growing season there are more than 500 -- (Audio cuts out.) 4 5 CHAIR THOMAS: Did we lose him? John, I didn't hear if he 6 was done or not, but I think he was. Can we move on? Do we have one 7 more before we break? 8 MR. ROGERS: Can you hear me? 9 CHAIR THOMAS: Yeah. (Silence on the line.) Was that you, 10 John? 11 MR. GOTCHER: No, that was not me. 12 CHAIR THOMAS: Okay. Well, we lost the ag guy, I think. 13 MR. ROGERS: Can you hear me? 14 CHAIR THOMAS: Yeah, I can hear you. 15 MR. ROGERS: Sorry. 16 CHAIR THOMAS: Go ahead. Conclusion please. 17 MR. ROGERS: Many of our domestic employees ride our 18 transportation service, because it is safe and free. If 3205.4(c)(2) goes 19 into effect we will not be able to offer that transportation service to any 20 employees that we don't have to. With three people per van it's simply 21 not affordable. The alternative for these employees is to pile into 22 private cars without any employer-driven COVID safety measures such as 23 capacity limits, facial coverings, sanitation, same seats, ventilation, 24 etcetera, let alone the other safety measures that employer-driven 25 transportation bring, insured vehicles, well-maintained vehicles and

1 professional drivers.

So my hope is that you will allow some reasonable edits to those two sections, which will allow us to continuous as a viable business. It is frustrating to say the least to hear this referred to as an emergency standard when we have been living this in our workplace for nine months.

7 It's not particularly helpful to hear (indiscernible) this week 8 that this standard may pass and lose the potential to fix it later. Our 9 commitments are made for the 2021 season. And our contracts are 10 signed. And I can't string along customers and our employees on the 11 vague hope that the standard may be edited or fixed later. If this passes 12 as-is, I'll face the immediate prospect of losing clients we've struggled to 13 get and losing employees who we've invested in and who count on us. 14 Thank you very much for your consideration. I am more than 15 happy to participate in any kind of process that might result in a slightly 16

16 more workable bill, excuse me, standard. And I appreciate your Board17 taking the time.

18 CHAIR THOMAS: Thank you. We're going to have one more19 caller before we break. John, who do we have in the queue?

20 MR. GOTCHER: Our next commenter is Virgilda Romero of 21 the Garment Workers Center.

CHAIR THOMAS: Virgilda, why don't you go right ahead? Try
 and cut it to three minutes, because then we're going to break. Thank
 you.

25 (Colloquy between Interpreter Haikalis and Ms. Romero.)

CALIFORNIA REPORTING, LLC 229 Napa Street, Rodeo, California 94572 (510) 224-4476

1 CHAIR THOMAS: Go ahead. 2 MS. ROMERO: (Speaking in Spanish). 3 CHAIR THOMAS: Julie, do you want to translate that before she gets too far along? 4 5 MS. ROMERO: (Through Interpreter Haikalis.) So my name is 6 Virgilda. And I have been working for the garment industry for 15 7 (phonetic) years. I worked in the garment industry. I worked as a 8 cleaner. And in the past year I've also worked for a (indiscernible). 9 (Audio cuts in and out continuously.) 10 And I was working from 6:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. (indiscernible) 11 at the factory would shout at us if we went to the bathroom. 12 So I was off for three and a half weeks and then when COVID 13 began, I came back and (indiscernible) at the job site, they didn't have us distancing from each other. We were two feet apart from other workers. 14 15 There was no sanitizer and no ventilation. We work in the basement and 16 the bathrooms aren't clean and have no soap. 17 So I worked for one-and-a-half weeks and then I began 18 having COVID symptoms. I told the employer that I was feeling sick and 19 that I couldn't work. So they said it was okay. They told me to go to rest

20 and to come back when I felt better with no pay. They demanded I do a

21 COVID test one week after I got sick. And then one week after they

22 informed me that one of the coworkers had passed away.

23 CHAIR THOMAS: Continue please.

24 MS. ROMERO: (Through Interpreter Haikalis.) After my 25 COVID, we did have a distance of six feet between workers, but I was

CALIFORNIA REPORTING, LLC 229 Napa Street, Rodeo, California 94572 (510) 224-4476

worried to get sick again, to get my family sick. When I got sick I was
feeling pain in my lungs like bad, I had a fever. So working was difficult.
I felt I was going to die. And if we had less problems at work I would feel
better for it to be clean, have disinfectant. So I'm requesting this OSHA
pass this standard for essential workers. Thanks so much.

6 CHAIR THOMAS: Thank you.

7 MS. ROMERO: Gracias.

8 CHAIR THOMAS: At this time, before we go on break, I'm
9 going to have Christina say a few words. Go ahead, Christina.

MS. SHUPE: Hi, thank you. I just wanted to quickly address I'm seeing several questions come through the web chat about the queue itself. We are at approximately Speaker 40 of 110 in the queue. And the queue keeps changing as people ask to be added or people drop off. And we have multiple different avenues for people to join the queue, so my advice to everyone who is anxious about speaking to the Board please know that the Board will be getting to everybody who is in the queue.

17 If there is a connection issue, we are putting you back into
18 the queue although it will be much later, but we will get to everyone.
19 Thank you.

20 MR. GOTCHER: If I could actually just add that really quick. 21 Elizabeth Treanor, we've been trying to get through to you. And we're 22 hoping that you contribute on WebEx when we come back, so if you could 23 just be ready for that or contact us that would be great.

24 CHAIR THOMAS: Yeah. Be ready Elizabeth, all right?
25 Okay, so we are going to break until 1:00 o'clock. We're

CALIFORNIA REPORTING, LLC 229 Napa Street, Rodeo, California 94572 (510) 224-4476

going to have a lunch break here so we will reconvene at 1:00 o'clock
 sharp.

3 And commenters be ready. Try and be concise. I'm pretty 4 lenient, but we've got a long way to go here, so let's try and get to it in 5 two minutes and make your comments to the point. Thank you very 6 much. And we are in recess until 1:00 o'clock. Thank you. 7 (Off the record at 12:20 p.m.) 8 (On the record at 1:00 p.m.) 9 CHAIR THOMAS: All right, we are back in session, so I'll bring 10 it back in session. So John, who do we have in the queue? 11 MR. GOTCHER: The next commenter is Elizabeth Treanor 12 from Phylmar Regulatory Roundtable-OSH Forum. 13 CHAIR THOMAS: Elizabeth. 14 MS. TREANOR: Thank you so much, Mr. Chairman. I hope 15 you can hear me this time. 16 CHAIR THOMAS: We can hear you. Go right ahead. 17 CHAIR THOMAS: Thank you. 18 MS. TREANOR: Hooray. Good afternoon Mr. Chairman, 19 Board Members and Division staff. (Overlapping colloquy) I'm hearing 20 something else. 21 CHAIR THOMAS: We're trying to -22 MS. TREANOR: Okay. Thank you. I just wanted to mention 23 that the Regulatory Roundtable members are committed to advancing 24 safety and health in the workplace and they employ about 850,000 25 people. They have been boots-on-the-ground for eight months

1	protecting workers. We thank the Division and Board staff for their
2	efforts and recognize the challenges involved in this devastating disease.
3	It is clear that Cal/OSHA made considerable effort with the
4	best of intentions to create a standard to integrate current guidance,
5	CDPH needs, and the perspective of the Governor's task force. That's a
6	tall order. We appreciate that it aligns with the IIPP somewhat,
7	incorporates current guidance that PRR members have already
8	implemented and includes some of the language from our recommended
9	alternative.
10	However, it is overly complex in language and organization.
11	We have received numerous requests for clarification from our PRR
12	members. And these are safety-experienced safety and health
13	professionals. And we worry about the over one million employers that
14	do not have resources on staff.
15	I would like to just mention a couple
16	(Audio cuts out.)
17	CHAIR THOMAS: I think you muted yourself, Elizabeth. We
18	can't hear you now. Not yet.
19	We still can't hear you.
20	MR. GOTCHER: She is unmuted in WebEx, but maybe muted
21	on her headset?
22	CHAIR THOMAS: Yeah. Maybe you're –-
23	I'm not sure what you did but you just stopped all of a
24	sudden. Can you hear us, Elizabeth?
25	Yeah, we still can't It must be her Wi-Fi, must be out.

1 John, I think --

2 I'm sorry, Elizabeth, we are going to have to move on. Call
3 back when you get a chance. We'll get you back in the queue. We just
4 can't hear you.

5 John?

6 (Echo, then overlapping colloquy)

7 CHAIR THOMAS: Hello?

8 MR. GOTCHER: Our next commenter is Carolyn

9 (indiscernible). (Echo)

10 CHAIR THOMAS: Carolyn? (Echo)

11 MS. BARLAGE: Yes, hello.

12 CHAIR THOMAS: Go right ahead. (Echo)

MS. BARLAGE: Good afternoon. Thank you for the time for speaking. I'm in total support of the emergency temporary standard, because my employer is failing to comply with basic public health orders protections for this reason. We have experienced an outbreak at my job. My employer is not regulating the number of customers that come in the store, so there is no social distancing inside the store.

As a cashier, every day my manager rushes me to call the next person in line, even when the previous customer has not left the register area. I have told him numerous times that this is not okay, because customers are not at least six feet apart. And customers are pretty upset with this method but they still continue to have me do this. I need to be able to disinfect my work area, especially as I work at the register. Many of the necessities I'm supposed to have are not at need.

1 I'm also in close contact with customers.

2 Unfortunately, very recently there was an outbreak at my 3 store with six employees testing positive for COVID-19. We know the 4 pandemic is far from being over and my employer is not doing enough to 5 keep everyone safe, including customers.

6 Profits over people need to change and we need to also 7 make sure that no employee speaking on behalf of COVID-19 is not 8 retaliated against. We need the emergency temporary standard, so that 9 employers like mine are made to be held accountable for putting our 10 health and lives at risk. Thank you for letting me speak.

11 CHAIR THOMAS: Can we get your name again please before12 you leave us? (Echo)

MS. BARLAGE: It's Carolyn Barlage. I'm a cashier at a very
large chain of grocery stores.

15 CHAIR THOMAS: Thank you very much. We appreciate it.

16 (Echo in background.) I don't know why I'm getting this

17 John, but who's our next person in the queue?

18 MR. GOTCHER: Yeah, so that was coming from her line --

19 Vasquez -- she had the WebEx open as well. She was a telephone caller.

20 Next in the queue is Juvenal Solano from Mixteco Indigena

21 Community Organizing Project/MICOP from Ventura.

22 CHAIR THOMAS: All right. Are you with us speaker? (Silence 23 on the line.) Hello? I didn't get the first name, John.

24 MR. GOTCHER: Juvenal, J-U-V-E-N-A-L.

25 CHAIR THOMAS: Juvenal, are you with us?

1	(Colloquy re: audio difficulties.)
2	INTERPRETER HAIKALIS: There's no sound to translate.
3	CHAIR THOMAS: You're on.
4	Julie, are you translating?
5	UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Amy is translating.
6	CHAIR THOMAS: Go ahead.
7	SIMULCAST TRANSLATOR BENAVIDES: There is no sound to
8	translate.
9	CHAIR THOMAS: Okay we're going to move on.
10	John, can you go to the next person in the queue?
11	MR. GOTCHER: Our next commenter is Anne Katten from
12	California Rural Legal Assistance Foundation.
13	CHAIR THOMAS: Anne, go right ahead.
14	MS. KATTEN: Hi, can you hear me?
15	CHAIR THOMAS: I can. Go right ahead, Anne.
16	MS. KATTEN: Great, thank you. Good afternoon Chair
17	Thomas and members of the Board. I'm Anne Katten from California
18	Rural Legal Assistance Foundation. I strongly support the standard,
19	which is based on sound public health principles and is consistent as
20	based on my review with state guidance documents and recently adopted
21	legislation and utilizes the IIPP and other regulations as appropriate.
22	In particular, I want to draw your attention to the Finding of
23	the Emergency for the regulation that provides details on the many large
24	outbreaks of COVID-19 infections in (indiscernible) temporary
25	agricultural workers. We have also heard a frequent report of crowded

conditions with no masks provided in (indiscernible) of workers. And
 they must -- they have to rely on this transportation to get to work,
 because they don't bring cars from their countries of origin.

The specific requirements in the regulation for this employer-provided housing and employer-provided-and-arranged transportation are vital for these workers. And they are similar to requirements already in place in Washington state and Oregon.

8 And I also wanted to point out they include an exception to 9 social distancing and some of the other requirements for family members 10 and other occupants who maintain the household together before 11 residing in the employer-provided housing. But I want to point out, that 12 is distinct from employees who weren't assigned to housing once they 13 came to this country. That is not a pre-existing household.

And I also wanted to point out that the Housing for Harvest, which has been put in place for quarantined or ill workers. Either people housed to have their own kitchens in their room or have food brought in so they would be in compliance.

Other speakers will speak to other vital parts of these regulations. I do want to point out that ag workers have been disproportionately impacted by the pandemic in Monterey County where they do keep reporting by the industry. As of the end of June, workers of agriculture were at least three times as likely to have had a COVID infection as other workers.

24 I urge your support of the regulation. Thank you.

25 CHAIR THOMAS: Thank you, Anne.

John, who do we have up next?

1

2 MR. GOTCHER: Our next commenter is Andrew J. Sommer of
 3 California Employers COVID-19 Prevention Coalition.

4 CHAIR THOMAS: Go right ahead. Can you hear us? 5 MR. SOMMER: Yes, I can. Good afternoon Chairman Thomas 6 and members of the Board. We appreciate the opportunity for comment. 7 My name is Andrew Sommer. I'm Counsel with Conn Maciel Carey, 8 representing the California Employers COVID-19 Prevention Coalition. 9 This coalition consists of a broad array of employers from various 10 different sectors. Our employer members are all committed to ensuring 11 workplace safety. They all have COVID-19 prevention plans in the 12 workplace to prevent the spread of COVID-19.

13 We have, as a coalition, already submitted a letter request 14 for an extension to submit comments as well as detailed comments on 15 the proposed rule. There are several concerns we have and I will be 16 brief. Some of these have been articulated by prior speakers, but there 17 have been concerns expressed during this meeting as to COVID, whether 18 it's a problem in the workplace, and whether there needs to be some 19 guidance or rules. And there is a general consensus I believe that COVID 20 does need to be addressed. And in our case our employer members are 21 doing all of their -- that in their means to fight COVID.

But a proper focus is on the rule itself that's being proposed for adoption as well as the process that we are undertaking. We do not believe there can be a realistic consideration of this rule, which is 21 pages in length. And there have been over 100 pages submitted with this

rulemaking. And within a five-day period, that is just simply not enough
 time for the Board to meaningfully consider comments. And we have
 quite active participation today. We have over 100 speakers. I'm sorry,
 yeah about 100 speakers and over 500 members of the public that are
 participating.

6 And this process does not allow for sufficient consideration 7 of comments and to digest the comments that are being offered. We 8 propose, along with Mr. Moutrie, that there is a 30-day extension and 9 that we briefly postpone consideration of the draft rules so that the 10 Board can consider these comments and consider any possible 11 modification to the proposed rule as appropriate. That we are already 12 nine months into the pandemic, we have agency guidance and the DOSH 13 itself has recognize that that agency guidance has been used as 14 enforcement means through the IIPP. And having one more month to be 15 able to consider these comments and enact a more effective rule that is 16 less confusing and conflicting and feasible would just be more desirable 17 for everyone. There are numerous stakeholders with perspectives to 18 ensure that it is an effective rule and to avoid unintended consequences. 19 I wanted to briefly discuss a couple of issues. One is that 20 this rule cannot be static in nature to the extent that it addresses 21 particular hazards in the workplace and particular engineering, 22 administrative controls. Since the public health guidance has been 23 evolving, we've seen that with the definition of close contacts, we've 24 seen that with the use of face coverings, and if we adopt a static rule we 25 are going to find that's going to be obsolete very, very soon.

CALIFORNIA REPORTING, LLC 229 Napa Street, Rodeo, California 94572 (510) 224-4476

1 And so we propose that if the rule is adopted ultimately in 2 some form that there be a carve-out for a catchall that recognizes that 3 it's not employer liability if the employer is otherwise complying with 4 current public health guidance in that regard.

5 Also, there is a need for staggered compliance deadlines that 6 has been addressed by other speakers. And if this rule is going to take 7 effect potentially by Thanksgiving, if there is no extension and there is 8 no feasible means for employers to develop a plan that's consistent and 9 updated based on this new rule as well as train all of their employees 10 immediately upon enactment.

And so we request that regardless of the effective date that there be a 30-day deadline following the effective date to develop a written infection control plan as well as 60 days or 30 days after that date to then train employees. And there are employers that have thousands of employees within the state that just cannot who feasibly train their employees on short order.

17 There's also questions just in terms of the confusing or 18 contradictory language is, for example, mandatory COVID testing. 19 There's language about employers having to offer this during their 20 working hours. If it's intended to be in the workplace that's certainly not 21 advisable, given COVID. If that's not the point it's really a wage-and-22 hour burden. That's something that would be beyond Cal/OSHA's 23 jurisdiction in our mind.

There's also questions about language requiring respiratory
 protection where physical distancing is not feasible. And if that is

CALIFORNIA REPORTING, LLC 229 Napa Street, Rodeo, California 94572 (510) 224-4476

requiring N95 respirators or more significant respirators, then that also
 presents a concern as we've already seen in the wildfire smoke
 rulemaking process given the dire shortages of N95 masks and the lack of
 need in a non-medical or non-health care context typically.

5 Also just in terms of the definition of the workplace with an 6 exposed workplace is quite broad. And one issue that has not been 7 addressed is if you have an employer with, say it's a multi-building 8 campus with thousands of employees that do not interact. Then the 9 definition of "exposed workplace" would suggest that they need to 10 undertake certain measures under multiple COVID infections component 11 or major COVID-19 outbreaks sub-rule. And that would just not be 12 realistic given the intent of those sections and how it would affect a 13 large employer. And so we suggest that that rule to be clarified to have 14 certain thresholds recognizing that there are large and small employers 15 and there's differences in how that threshold would be affected.

And then there's also wage and hour issues related to a mandate for excluded employees to be paid compensation. We respectfully maintain that that requirement, wage and hour requirement, is more properly within the advent of the Labor Commission and the

20 Legislature and is not within the jurisdiction of Cal/OSHA.

Moreover, there is a provision on accommodations and that language is vague and ambiguous in terms of how it addresses the requirement about medical or other conditions. Even with that language being cleaned up, which is what we would request, there is a question about the jurisdiction of Cal/OSHA to exercise authority over an area that

thus far has been within the (indiscernible) and the Department of Fair
 Employment and Housing.

3 And so we request that if the Board proceeds with adopting this rule that there be some serious considerations for the unintended 4 5 consequences, the problematic language. And that stakeholders have the 6 opportunity to provide feedback. And that at a minimum we need an 7 additional 30 days for that to occur. 8 CHAIR THOMAS: Thank you. 9 John, who do we have in the queue? 10 MR. GOTCHER: Our next commenter is Katie Hansen from 11 California Restaurant Association. 12 CHAIR THOMAS: Katie, are you with us? 13 MS. HANSEN: Yes, sir. 14 CHAIR THOMAS: Go right ahead, Katie. 15 MS. HANSEN: Can you hear me? 16 CHAIR THOMAS: Yes. 17 MS. HANSEN: Good afternoon Chair Thomas and members of 18 the Board. I am Katie Hansen with the California Restaurant Association. 19 California community restaurants were closed in March for 20 (indiscernible) employment purposes by the State of California. Today 21 restaurants in all but 11 rural counties have again largely been shuttered 22 by state order. 23 In March we had roughly 1.4 million restaurant workers in 24 California, 900,000 are now unemployed. For those remaining, the 25 continued opening and closing of dining rooms is contributing to the

already fragile financial, psychological and physical health conditions of
 our workforce and small business owners. The constant oscillating of
 their well-being tied to weekly announcements from the state is not
 sustainable.

5 While the state has its own protocols for safe restaurant 6 operations, counties too have their own additional COVID-19 protocols 7 for restaurants. We believe we have some of the most stringent COVID-8 19 protocols for safe operations than probably any other industry with 9 the exception being health care.

10 We are deeply concerned about the proposed COVID-19 11 emergency regulations before you today. Definitions of employer notice 12 obligations are not consistent with AB 685, governing timelines for 13 notices to employees by state and relevant county for COVID-19 14 exposures and workplace outbreaks. Restaurants need alignment 15 between this regulation and AB 685.

16 Testing obligations in the proposed rule should be 17 eliminated. The draft regulation provides that employers must offer 18 COVID-19 testing to all employees who had potential COVID-19 exposure 19 in the workplace. Local health orders and state guidance currently drives 20 restaurant procedures as it relates to potential exposure and positive 21 cases. Furthermore, restaurants can determine exactly who was in what 22 part of a restaurant and with who based on the shift log. The testing for 23 potential exposure is unnecessary and incredibly costly to the 24 restaurants.

25

Engineering controls requiring restaurants install partitions

CALIFORNIA REPORTING, LLC 229 Napa Street, Rodeo, California 94572 (510) 224-4476

and fixed work locations like a restaurant kitchen where it is not
possible to maintain physical distancing due to the nature of food
preparation are completely infeasible. Restaurant kitchens have hot
surfaces, a variety of appliances and preparation spaces. It is not
feasible to partition off parts of the kitchen. This section of the
regulation needs to be revised to take into account the unique nature of
a commercial kitchen.

8 Section 3205(c)(10)(b) and (c) are infeasible for restaurants 9 and restaurant employees. Including a restaurant employee who has 10 been exposed to COVID-19 and tested negative for the virus from work 11 for 14 days denies the employee of the opportunity to earn income and 12 requires them to use their COVID-19 paid sick leave when they are not 13 sick. This section leaves the restaurant employee without COVID-19 paid 14 sick leave to use if they were exposed to COVID-19 and get the virus in 15 the future.

Additionally, requiring restaurants who have been financially devastated due to COVID-19 to continue to pay an employee who is excluded from the workplace, and has exhausted their paid sick leave, will financially crush the restaurants already clinging to the edge.

The current function of the EDD has been well documented in the press and legislative hearings when it comes to their inability to process employment benefits. We should not assume that the EDD will be able to efficiently process unemployment claims, so a restaurant employee can access their benefits in the 14 days they are excluded from the workplace.

Due to the nature of the restaurant workspace, it is entirely possible for all of the employees for restaurants (indiscernible) COVID-3 19.

CHAIR THOMAS: (Overlapping colloquy) Katie, excuse me for
one second. Excuse me, can you slow down your comments? I'm sorry,
it's so fast I can't really understand everything. Just slow it down a little
bit.

8 MS. HANSEN: Yes, I will.

9 CHAIR THOMAS: Thank you.

10 MS. HANSEN: Due to the nature of a restaurant workplace, it 11 is entirely possible for all of the employees at the restaurant to have 12 been exposed to COVID-19. Please consider the potential for this section 13 to close a restaurant entirely for 14 days and the ultimate economic 14 devastation for the employee and the business.

While well intentioned, the proposed emergency regulations is a one-size-fits-all approach that does not take into account the unique nature of the restaurant workspace or the fact that we are governed by state and local county health orders as it relates to COVID-19 work practices.

20 We urge you to hold off on adopting the emergency 21 regulation before you as it as the science behind COVID, and what we are 22 learning continues to evolve as evidenced by the continuing changes to 23 local and state health orders governing restaurants and their operations 24 in the midst of this pandemic.

25 CHAIR THOMAS: Thank you.

CALIFORNIA REPORTING, LLC 229 Napa Street, Rodeo, California 94572 (510) 224-4476

1 MS. HANSEN: Thank you, Chairman. 2 CHAIR THOMAS: Oh, thank you. Thank you very much. John, who do we have next in the queue? 3 MR. GOTCHER: Our next commenter is Pamela Murcell from 4 5 California Industrial Hygiene Council. 6 CHAIR THOMAS: Pamela, can you hear us? 7 MS. MURCELL: I can hear you fine. Can you hear me? 8 CHAIR THOMAS: Great, yes. Go right ahead. 9 MS. MURCELL: Technical problems fixed. Okay, good 10 afternoon Chair Thomas, Board Members, Board and DOSH staff. First of 11 all thank you for the opportunity to provide comments. And also, thank 12 you for all of your hard work on this very challenging issue. I am Pamela 13 Murcell, I'm the current President of the California Industrial Hygiene 14 Council, also known as the CIHC. We certainly appreciate this 15 opportunity to comment on the proposed emergency action. 16 Just briefly, the CIHC was founded in 1990 to represent the 17 industrial hygiene and occupational environmental health professions in 18 California. Plus, CIHC is affiliated with the National American Industrial 19 Hygiene Association and we are formally comprised of the members of 20 the five California AIHA local sections. And those are represented by the 21 CIHC Board of Directors. A little bit about our background to provide 22 context for our comments. 23 The CIHC opposes this proposed emergency action. We have 24 given very careful consideration and we certainly understand the 25 seriousness of the COVID-19 pandemic. But the proposed emergency

CALIFORNIA REPORTING, LLC 229 Napa Street, Rodeo, California 94572 (510) 224-4476

action with the proposed changes for title 8 are just not necessary. Our
state already has adequate regulations in place to address the COVID-19
hazards that potentially affect California workplaces. This is
demonstrated by the fact that the Division of Occupational Safety and
Health enforcement actions have resulted in citations being issued to
numerous and varied work environments. And presumably these
enforcement actions will continue.

8 Regulations currently being cited to require employers to 9 address COVID-related hazards do include, certainly are not limited to 10 but do include, the title 8 section 5199, Aerosol Transmissible Diseases, 11 which of course is applicable to the healthcare industry. Section 5203, 12 the Injury and Illness Prevention Program, also known as the IIPP. 13 Especially they are citing hazard identification and correction and 14 training requirements. Section 5144 on the Respiratory Protection 15 Program and its very extensive requirements. Section 5162, Emergency 16 Eyewash and Shower Equipment. And lastly, to highlight, section 3457, 17 which is a field sanitation set of requirements for the agricultural 18 industry.

Based on the provisions of the IIPP regulation, this is another of the hazards of employment that an employer should recognize, especially in the current active pandemic, that is potentially part of the workplace. As such, a separate standard is not necessary especially this proposed overly involved set of requirements that will be difficult for employers with the most sophisticated health and safety programs to meet, let alone the small businesses that may not have access to the

1 resources that will be needed to comply.

In lieu of regulatory action, CIHC recommends that DOSH
issue a guidance document for compliance with the assistance of a
stakeholder advisory panel pertinent to the title 8 sections that they are
already using to cite employers.

6 CIHC understands that other states such as Virginia,
7 Michigan and Oregon have already adopted emergency COVID-19
8 prevention regulations. However, it is important to note that these
9 states do not have the breadth and depth of existing regulations to cover
10 this novel hazard, as we have these regulations extensively in California.

11 The employers who are already implementing effective 12 procedures to assure that their employers have -- I'm sorry, to ensure 13 their employees have a safe work environment, that have been using 14 national, state and local guidance in large part to supplement their IIPPs, 15 and these employers do not need a new set of regulations. Employers 16 who are currently making changes to their safety procedures and work 17 environments in light of the COVID-19 hazard are probably not going to 18 address this hazard just because a new and onerous set of regulations is 19 adopted.

The CIHC board members have reviewed the proposed new title 8 sections and we have many concerns with the prescriptive requirements and potential costs for implementation. For example, changes that may be needed to ventilation systems. The workplaces in California are not amenable to one-size-fits-all-regulations. This emergency is in fact self-limiting, with vaccinations most likely available

CALIFORNIA REPORTING, LLC 229 Napa Street, Rodeo, California 94572 (510) 224-4476

1 in the very near future. The basic question therefore becomes is this

2 emergency regulation necessary?

3 CIHC appreciates the ability to be involved in the regulatory 4 process. We look forward to participating in future action regarding this 5 subject such as an advisory panel. And we can certainly act as a 6 technical resource for the process. Thank you for your consideration and 7 for your time today.

8 CHAIR THOMAS: Thank you.

9 John, who do we have up next?

10 MR. GOTCHER: Our next commenter is Maggie Robbins from11 Worksafe.

12 CHAIR THOMAS: Maggie, can you hear us?

13 MS. ROBBINS: Hi, yes.

14 CHAIR THOMAS: We can hear you. Go right ahead.

15 MS. ROBBINS: Excellent. Thank you for making time for me 16 to speak today. I almost don't know where to begin. Let me just say we 17 do need to control COVID transmission at work in order to control it 18 across our state. That's unquestionable, as a lot of people have 19 mentioned that. We're going in the wrong direction right now and we 20 think that this standard gives meaningful action to provide enforceable 21 expectations for protections that people expect to see in the workplace. 22 And this is not (indiscernible) for employers as well as for workers. 23 We've heard comment after comment today of people feeling

24 that they're still not being protected on the job with some of the most

25 basic things that they should be expecting, and to work with every day.

DOSH and the Board staff have put a lot of thought into the recommendations in this proposed rule. They've balanced having a performance standard with some more specific elements of what needs to be in a preventive program that would be in place. We think it's touching all the right bases in terms of current knowledge about the way to prevent transmission of COVID. And we think it was well thought through in trying to be balanced without being overly prescriptive.

8 I just want to point out this is an emergency situation. This 9 is an emergency temporary standard, it is not a permanent standard. It 10 is intended to last only through this crisis and not a day longer. We feel 11 it must be adopted quickly. And we cannot spend weeks and months 12 processing multiple drafts and language, quibbling over the applicable 13 ability some new law or new interpretation of the science.

We don't believe employers have raised any concerns that
should justify further delaying the adoption of this rule to respond to
this emergency.

We do support the comments that others have made that the advisory committee to look at implementation of this rule and determine where changes might be needed should be started as quickly as possible. And we would like to be a part of that, and then to deal with any lack of clarity or any questions that come up about interpretation during implementation.

The precautions that are very familiar to us are going to have to be with us for a long time even if we get a vaccine just around the corner. We, like everybody else, are delighted to hear the good news

CALIFORNIA REPORTING, LLC 229 Napa Street, Rodeo, California 94572 (510) 224-4476

1 from preliminary testing of new vaccines. But even if those new 2 vaccines were approved next week, it's going to take months for them to 3 get out to the field and workers to have access to them. By this summer 4 we will still surely have most of our workforce not vaccinated even if we 5 have an ideal vaccine available in short, in the near future. So 6 precautions are going to need to be in place for quite a while even as we 7 roll out an effective vaccine. And this standard is the type of precautions 8 that we need.

9 So in wrapping up I'd say we strongly encourage you to vote 10 in favor of the proposed standard today, and it is only the first step. We 11 need to urge Cal/OSHA and CDPH and everybody else who is here on this 12 call today and interested in this issue to do massive outreach and 13 education. And help people who currently are meeting guidelines for 14 effective control to (indiscernible) you. We are not going to control this 15 in our communities until we also control it in our workplaces, so thank 16 you for listening.

17 CHAIR THOMAS: Thank you.

18 John, who do we have up next?

19 MR. GOTCHER: Our next commenter is Lizette Aguilar.

20 CHAIR THOMAS: Lizette, can you hear us?

21 (Colloquy in Spanish between Ms. Aguilar and Interpreter

22 Haikalis.)

23 MS. AGUILAR: (Through Interpreter Haikalis.) Good

24 afternoon. My name is Lizette Aguilar and I am a worker at the

25 McDonald's in Los Angeles, California.

CALIFORNIA REPORTING, LLC 229 Napa Street, Rodeo, California 94572 (510) 224-4476

1I'm calling the Board to ask you to approve the emergency2standard proposition that you are talking about today. These rules are3very important for the fast-food industry, because the fast-food chains4have not complied with the rules. Not even the basic rules such as5wearing masks, social distancing or sick pay.6At the company, at the place where I work, six people were

sick with COVID-19 and the employer did not disclose this to us. We had
a strike at our store and instead of listening to our concerns they
terminated us.

10 And the companies do not back their workers as essential 11 workers. COVID-19 is spreading fast throughout California, especially in 12 the colored communities.

13 We definitely need these new standards for essential 14 workers just like us. We can stop the COVID-19 propagation in our 15 communities but we need the power of assistance of Cal/OSHA so that 16 our employers are responsible for this.

Thank you, and appreciate the time you have taken to hear
my voice as well as the voice of other workers. Thank you.

19 CHAIR THOMAS: Thank you.

20 John, who do we have next up in the queue?

21 MR. GOTCHER: Our next commenter is Mitch Steiger from

22 California Labor Federation.

23 CHAIR THOMAS: Mitch, can you hear us?

24 MR. STEIGER: Yes. Can you hear me?

25 CHAIR THOMAS: Oh, talk again.

1	MR. STEIGER: Can you hear me now?
2	CHAIR THOMAS: Yeah, go ahead.
3	MR. STEIGER: Great. Thank you very much Chair Thomas and
4	Board Members for the opportunity to testify today. I also want to thank
5	the workers who came today to speak. Obviously, this is something that
6	can be very scary to come and speak about your current employer and
7	talk about some hazards that are happening, so definitely want to
8	express our appreciation for them being here today and taking that risk.
9	We'd also like to thank the Board, Board staff, Cal/OSHA,
10	other (indiscernible0 officials for all that's been done to make this
11	happen as quickly as it has. I know that there was a lot of work involved,
12	a lot of late nights, and we definitely do appreciate everything.
13	We strongly urge adoption of the standard today. And I
14	don't think it's an exaggeration to say that this is likely the most
15	important vote that the Standards Board has ever taken. It's probably
16	the most important vote that the Standards Board will ever take, because
17	this is likely the biggest crisis that any of us have ever faced. And you
18	know, I pray to the heavens that this is the biggest crisis that we ever do
19	face.
20	But as bad as it is, we've been in this thing for long enough
21	now, it's been eight or nine months. And for a lot of us, it's just kind of
22	become normal, it's what we're used to now. And it's this weird sort of

23 low-grade depression setting in as we sit in our quarantine offices and
24 stare at screens.

25

But as bad as that is, we are the lucky ones that this

CALIFORNIA REPORTING, LLC 229 Napa Street, Rodeo, California 94572 (510) 224-4476

standard doesn't apply to us, this standard isn't about us. This is about workers who have to leave their homes, go get into crowded vans, drive to a building, sit inside that building, be close to other workers. Like they have to deal with members of the public, a lot of whom won't wear masks and think this whole thing is a hoax. And I think we need to pause on that for a second and really appreciate the fear that they have to deal with.

8 And the question they have to ask every day of, "Is today the 9 day that I get sick? Is this the day that I start showing symptoms because 10 I am exposed to this at the time at work?" By now, most workers have 11 seen their coworkers -- who are in this situation -- have seen their 12 coworkers show up, start showing symptoms, they disappear. Most of 13 them come back, but some of them don't. And the answer to that 14 question of whether or not that worker gets sick that day is largely in 15 their employer's hands. And whether they are lucky enough to have an 16 employer that's taking this thing seriously and has the partitions, has the 17 masking, is enforcing the social distancing as much as possible, is doing 18 the sanitation, cleaning as much as they can.

Or if they're not, if they're not taking it seriously or worse yet, is shaming workers who wear masks or retaliating against those who report hazards or sickness. And as much as I would love to live in a world that has been described by a lot of employers and our lobbyists today, the reality is a lot of workers don't. And a lot of employers really do not do what they need to, to keep workers safe during this pandemic. And that's got a lot to do with why the spread has gotten so much worse so

CALIFORNIA REPORTING, LLC 229 Napa Street, Rodeo, California 94572 (510) 224-4476

1 fast.

And those workers who have to deal with that, those employers are not doing what they need to do, they need this and they need this right now. They don't need a weaker version a month from now or three months from now, they needed this eight months ago. But getting it now is the best we can do, and that's definitely what we need to do. We think this is a very clear, very well-written, enforceable and strong standard.

9 Again, we want to express our appreciation for getting it out 10 so fast and getting the version of it out so fast that we have before us. 11 But it's important to note that the basics of this are not new. They didn't 12 reinvent the wheel with any of this. There aren't a bunch of new 13 standards in here that no one has ever heard of. The basics of this like 14 six feet of social distancing and masking and partitions and cleaning the 15 air, we've known about this mostly since day one. It's almost entirely 16 stuff that employers should already be doing. This is almost all in the 17 guidance, this is not new.

And if an employer is not doing any of this, then clearly all of the guidances at the county level, the CDC, Cal/OSHA guidances, everything else that's out there isn't doing the trick. And we need something stronger if we want to protect these workers and help deal with that fear that they have to face every day when they go to work wondering if they are going to get it.

Also important to note that this standard could be stronger.
 There's a lot in here that's a compromise from the workers' safety

CALIFORNIA REPORTING, LLC 229 Napa Street, Rodeo, California 94572 (510) 224-4476

1 perspective. Standards like keeping everyone six feet away, there's no 2 law of nature that stops an infected droplet six feet away and sends it to 3 the floor. An infected droplet can travel eight meters if someone 4 sneezes it out. That's a whole lot farther than six feet, so just putting six 5 feet in there is really not as strong as it needs to be to totally protect 6 workers. But we recognize the need to get something out there that's a 7 compromise, get something out there quickly and so let's go with that 8 and let's adopt this.

9 The major outbreak standard of 20 cases within 30 days, let's 10 think about that for a second: 20 cases in 30 days. And the standard 11 doesn't say, "Shut the doors, let's figure out what's going on." I think 12 one can definitely argue that it should. That if any of us worked someplace where there were 20 cases within a month, we'd be asking 13 14 some pretty hard questions about whether or not we want to set foot in 15 that building anymore. The standard doesn't say that. It requires those 16 employers to take some significant steps to better protect those workers, 17 but it allows them to stay open. And so that's another thing that is a big 18 compromise that one could definitely argue should be stronger.

And also the thing that we keep hearing about from our members is the lack of retaliation protection. That it is illegal to retaliate against workers who report health and safety hazards, but we all know that it happens all the time. And thus workers make the hard decision often to not report health and not report sickness so that they can keep their job, knowing that they are risking their own lives, the lives of their coworkers and the lives of their families as a result. That's another thing

CALIFORNIA REPORTING, LLC 229 Napa Street, Rodeo, California 94572 (510) 224-4476

that should really be stronger. Hopefully in this standard, but if not,
 then somewhere else is something else that we really need to take a look
 at.

And so with all of that in mind we do think the standard should be adopted today. We are very much appreciative of how quickly it was put out, how strong the language is. But we would strongly urge against any delay. This is something that needs to happen now if we are going to do what we need to help slow the spread, this is one of the most important steps that we can take and we urge the adoption of it. Thank you.

11 CHAIR THOMAS: Thank you.

12 Who do we have in the queue, John?

MR. GOTCHER: Our next commenter is Juvenal Solano from
 Mixteco Indigena Community Organizing Project/MICOP from Ventura
 County.

16 CHAIR THOMAS: Juvenal, are you with us?

17 MR. SOLANO: Yes, I need an interpreter.

18 (Through Interpreter Haikalis.) I am a community organizer
19 with the Mixteco Indigena Group. I am here from Ventura County and I
20 am here requesting to pass the emergency temporary standards for
21 COVID-19 to save lives.

Even at the beginning of the pandemic, a lot of workers here in Ventura were calling to talk about the conditions of their job. And what we were told by these people was that they were not enforcing social distancing in the field, because that was not possible to do in the

1 field.

They give us a 10-minute break time, but I think it's unfair because we need to have more time in order to be able to have that social distancing. Another thing is we have a crew of 30 or 40 people. A 10-minute break is not enough to keep up social distancing when you're washing your hands before you can go and eat your food.

7 So when I've been in the field I have seen companies that are 8 not enforcing social distancing perhaps because they don't care to 9 comply. Or perhaps because they don't care about the safety of their 10 employees. Here in the Ventura County and Central Coast, Santa Barbara 11 and Monterey, there a lot of indigenous workers who speak their own 12 language, which is Mixteco. We must consider these workers and provide 13 the information in their own language, so that we have and so that 14 workers can be better informed.

And so if we want to save all of our essential workers that work in the field, workers, restaurant workers and other essential workers who have always been essential, not just now because of the pandemic, we must make sure that we have laws to protect them.

Please make these regulations pass legislation (indiscernible)
to help these workers. Thank you.

21 CHAIR THOMAS: Thank you.

22 John, who's up in the queue?

23 MR. GOTCHER: Our next commenter is Julia Garcia from

24 Lideres Campesinas.

25 CHAIR THOMAS: Hello, Julia. Can you hear us?

CALIFORNIA REPORTING, LLC 229 Napa Street, Rodeo, California 94572 (510) 224-4476

1	MS. GARCIA: Yes.
2	CHAIR THOMAS: Buenos tardes.
3	MS. GARCIA: (through Interpreter Haikalis) Good afternoon.
4	CHAIR THOMAS: Por favor, commence.
5	INTERPRETER HAIKALIS: (Spanish translation)
6	CHAIR THOMAS: Si. (Silence on the line.) I'm not hearing
7	any comments. Translator, can you help please?
8	(Off mic colloquy regarding testimony procedure.)
9	MS. GARCIA: (Through Interpreter Haikalis.) What do I have
10	to say?
11	MR. GOTCHER: So now is the time where you would make
12	your comment. And you're live.
13	(Colloquy between Ms. Garcia and Ms. Haikalis)
14	CHAIR THOMAS: I don't think we have a trans
15	MS. GARCIA: (through Intepreter Haikalis) I'm not sure what I
16	-
17	CHAIR THOMAS: Do we have a translator?
18	MR. GOTCHER: Yeah, Susanna, are you translating?
19	MS. HAIKALIS: Yes, the translator is here.
20	CHAIR THOMAS: Okay, go ahead.
21	UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: She's translating.
22	MS. HAIKALIS: Ms. Garcia is saying she doesn't know what
23	she has to say.
24	MS. GARCIA: (through Interpreter Haikalis) I think I should
25	say my name. My name is Julia Garcia and I am affiliated with farm

1	worker leaders. And what I want to say is that we need more COVID
2	protection in the work areas.
3	CHAIR THOMAS: I'm not going to wait much longer for
4	comments here.
5	MS. GARCIA: (through Interpreter Haikalis) That is all my
6	comments.
7	MS. SHUPE: Susanna, can you please repeat your last
8	statement?
9	MS. GARCIA: (through Interpreter Haikalis) Yes, that is all
10	that I have to say. Those are all my comments.
11	CHAIR THOMAS: Okay, thank you.
12	John, who do we have up next?
13	MR. GOTCHER: Our next commenter is Helen Cleary who is
14	speaking on behalf of Elizabeth Treanor who was cut short from Phylmar
15	Regulatory Roundtable.
16	CHAIR THOMAS: Well, hello.
17	MS. CLEARY: Hi, can you hear me?
18	CHAIR THOMAS: Yes, hi for Elizabeth. No, go right ahead.
19	MS. CLEARY: Hi, Elizabeth number two.
20	My name is Helen Cleary. I am the Associate Director for the
21	Phylmar Regulatory Roundtable. Thank you for allowing me to share the
22	rest of Elizabeth Treanor's comments. As she shared, PRR agrees that
23	employers have a responsibility to protect workers from COVID-19 and
24	they're doing just that.
25	However, today we are discussing the proposed text and we

CALIFORNIA REPORTING, LLC 229 Napa Street, Rodeo, California 94572 (510) 224-4476

feel that it is overly complex in language and organization. PRR members have already asked numerous questions seeking clarity and these are experienced safety and health professionals. And we are concerned about the over one million employers without such staff resources.

6 While we were grateful for the opportunity to speak with 7 Chief Parker about the text of the proposed draft a few days prior to its 8 release, there has been no opportunity to provide stakeholder feedback 9 during its development. This is disappointing and shortsighted. The 10 normal give and take of the Cal/OSHA advisory committee process to 11 identify and resolve issues did not occur. Today's discussion may be 12 helpful for future revisions, but it definitely will not assist employers 13 now. Allowing one week to review and prepare comments is simply not 14 enough time to adequately address the multi-faceted 21-page regulation.

15 The finding of emergency claims that benefits of the new 16 standard include that it will make it "Compliance easier and more 17 straightforward and provide clear and specific requirements." With 18 respect, we disagree that the proposed draft in front of the Board today 19 will produce either of these benefits. Instead we have a complicated, 20 difficult to navigate emergency regulation that will apply to all employers 21 in the state. The FOE fails to demonstrate that this standard will actually 22 improve the situation or the current industry specific guidance at all. 23 Significantly, this standard does not allow for flexibility

when public health authorities revise guidance based on new scientific
information such as the applicability of an effective vaccine.

CALIFORNIA REPORTING, LLC 229 Napa Street, Rodeo, California 94572 (510) 224-4476
1 Many sections of the proposed standard need to be 2 clarified, so today we will highlight three of our specific concerns. One, 3 the testing requirements following an outbreak eliminate the employer's 4 ability to work with local health departments on a testing strategy as 5 current CDPH guidance advises. This will be a poor use of testing 6 resources.

7 Two, the definition of "exposed workplace" and the 8 requirement for the employer-provided testing to everyone regardless of 9 exposure, engineering and administrative controls is a concern.

10 And three, in the extremely short timeframe for employers 11 to a) assess the regulation and compare it to their existing programs; b) 12 implement the required modifications; and c) communicate those 13 changes to employees is just not feasible.

14 In conclusion, the finding of emergency states that following 15 the adoption of these emergency regulations at the direction of the 16 Board, the Division will convene an advisory committee.

17 We implore the Board, before you adjourn the meeting 18 today, please direct the Division to schedule an advisory committee 19 meeting for the first week in December. Multiple implementation issues 20 need to be addressed and the rule-revision process must begin as soon as 21 possible. We further recommend that the results of the Division's 22 findings and review from the feedback from the advisory committee be 23 communicated to the Board during its December Board Meeting. Thank 24 you for your time today and everyone please stay healthy. 25

CHAIR THOMAS: Thank you, Helen.

CALIFORNIA REPORTING, LLC 229 Napa Street, Rodeo, California 94572 (510) 224-4476

1	John, who do we have up?
2	MR. GOTCHER: Our next commenter is Eric Frumin from
3	Change to Win.
4	CHAIR THOMAS: Eric, can you hear us?
5	MR. FRUMIN: Yeah. Yes, can you hear me now?
6	CHAIR THOMAS: Yeah, go right ahead.
7	MR. FRUMIN: Okay. Thank you Chairman Thomas and the
8	members of the Board one second and certainly to the staff for the
9	Board and DOSH who did such a heroic effort to get us to this point here
10	today.
11	I want to say basically three things. First, that employers
12	who have failed to take even minimal action until now will have to do so.
13	That's a major impact that cannot be underestimated.
14	Secondly, that DOSH's efforts, their enforcement efforts,
15	however diligent and well-meaning, are far from enough to give us
16	confidence that it will be enough going forward.
17	And third, that workers still lack the rights that they could
18	use to help their employers properly comply with guidance and standards
19	and protect people.
20	Yeah, some employers will certainly have to act fast to make
21	good-faith efforts to comply with the standard. Other employers,
22	however as we have heard, have acted quickly in the last six months and
23	have achieved successful prevention outcomes. These compliant
24	employers have shown us that the managers who waited did so
25	recklessly. And these reckless employers have failed in big ways, like

CALIFORNIA REPORTING, LLC 229 Napa Street, Rodeo, California 94572 (510) 224-4476

1 failing to even inform their own workers about active cases.

The questions about implementation, however serious, by
employers who acted recklessly, those should be addressed as just that:
implementation problems.

5 What about enforcement? Well, DOSH's record for 6 intervening to help employers protect their workers has been diligent, 7 but far too small. And not only because of the state-existing staff 8 shortage. Even if DOSH were twice the size, it would have been 9 overwhelmed. The highly-limited number of DOSH enforcement actions 10 now are completely inadequate to the task of responding to the 11 thousands of worker complaints, including complaints of retaliation. And 12 the same is true for the responses from other agencies. CDPH and 13 county health department guidance are simply not enforceable, either in 14 theory or practice, as workers have sadly and repeatedly discovered 15 when they have taken their complaints to health agencies and they asked 16 them to respond.

17 We all understand that change is hard for everyone, 18 especially when it feels like it's a moving target, because our knowledge 19 is changing. Yes, our knowledge of COVID is indeed changing, but it does 20 not reassure us that current efforts are nearly enough. Even recently 21 published studies by Harvard University and other academic institutions 22 have shown us that worker complaints are extremely important to 23 predict the rise in mortality from COVID. And that people who are most 24 severely at risk of COVID are, many of them, and maybe half, are forced 25 to work and to go to work, and were not able to work at home. And

CALIFORNIA REPORTING, LLC 229 Napa Street, Rodeo, California 94572 (510) 224-4476

1 we've submitted these recent studies to the record.

2 So we understand that there is new information that 3 employers need to grapple with but that's a fact of life and we have to 4 use the advisory process to work on the implementation.

5 Finally, we are concerned that even with its many urgently 6 needed provisions, the draft ETS is still missing important protections for 7 workers like those who spoke today. People who want to help their 8 employers when the managers fail to design an adequate program -- they 9 have to implement it properly or skip the training that workers need. 10 Workers need an opportunity to take their concerns up the chain in the 11 company to a responsible official who can cut through the line of 12 authority and make sure that supervisors do what they are supposed to 13 do. And the standard does not give them that right. All they can do is go 14 to DOSH.

So to conclude we know this standard is not perfect. Yes there are important gaps in the standard, but we will deal with those gaps, those questions, those concerns in the advisory committee process. It will indeed require a good faith, the same good-faith effort that got us here thus far by workers, unions and DOSH and others.

20 We urge the Board to give us that opportunity to move 21 forward today to get there, to approve this proposal today with no 22 further extensions. Thank you very much for your work on this, we look 23 forward to your vote.

24 CHAIR THOMAS: Thank you.

25 John, who do we have up in the queue?

CALIFORNIA REPORTING, LLC 229 Napa Street, Rodeo, California 94572 (510) 224-4476

MR. GOTCHER: Our next commenter is Michael Hall from
 Pacific Maritime Association.

3 CHAIR THOMAS: Michael, can you hear us? MR. HALL: Yes. I can. How's the audio? 4 5 CHAIR THOMAS: Good, you can turn it up and get a little 6 closer. Turn up just a hair. 7 MR. HALL: Okay, I'll do my best. Good afternoon Chair 8 Thomas, Board Members and staff. My name is Mike Hall speaking on 9 behalf of the Pacific Maritime Association. We represent the world's 10 leading maritime companies, marine terminals and vessel lines who move 11 nearly one million tons of cargo through West Coast ports each day. Our 12 member companies directly employ tens of thousands of longshore 13 workers, a significant amount of those in California. 14 First I'd like to acknowledge and thank DIR, the Division and 15 the Governor's Office of GO-Biz for engaging us recently after the 16 publication of the ETS last Thursday. We are very appreciative of the 17 interaction earlier today. 18 We are hopeful that we continue working together to ensure 19 that workers are safe and the critical operations in the port can continue 20 (overlapping colloquy). 21 PMA submitted a written comment to the docket that 22 outlines our areas of concern with the ETS. I'm most certainly not going 23 to read that. PMA currently has in place an extensive collective 24 bargaining agreement with the International Longshore and Warehouse

CALIFORNIA REPORTING, LLC 229 Napa Street, Rodeo, California 94572 (510) 224-4476

25

Union, the ILWU --

1	(Colloquy from someone else interrupts testimony.)
2	CHAIR THOMAS: We have somebody that is.
3	MS. SHUPE: Sir.
4	CHAIR THOMAS: Whoever you are, you need to turn off your
5	mic. We can hear you.
6	Sorry, Michael. You still there?
7	MR. HALL: That's alright. At least other people hear the
8	voices in my head.
9	CHAIR THOMAS: He was pretty loud. I think I heard the voice
10	in your head. Go ahead.
11	MR. HALL: Let's see, I was talking about we have an
12	extensive collective bargaining agreement that's been in place for many
13	months now with the ILWU. It covers paid sick leave, contact tracing,
14	cleaning protocols, travel restrictions in between ports well, it actually
15	doesn't allow that and the use of PPE on the docks. We're currently
16	spending upwards of over \$1 million per week on sanitation and cleaning
17	and we have experienced a very low incident rate of COVID infections on
18	the docks.
19	We believe that we are in compliance with many aspects of
20	the proposed regulation. However, as applied to California marine
21	terminals, the requirement to test all employees if three or more positive
22	cases are identified is just simply not practicable.
23	For example, over a 14-day period, thousands and thousands
24	of workers pass through port facilities in Southern California working out
25	of dispatch halls on a rotational basis; basically they're day workers. If

CALIFORNIA REPORTING, LLC 229 Napa Street, Rodeo, California 94572 (510) 224-4476

there was an occurrence of three individuals with the virus, the facility would have to test thousands and thousands of workers, each during the working hours, every single week. This is just likely impossible simply due to the magnitude of testing and the testing kit supplies that would be needed. It is also unlikely that this is going to be possible in the reasonable future.

Ports and marine terminals have been deemed critical
infrastructure by both the state and federal government. And our
workforce has been deemed essential. West Coast ports contribute to
nearly 10 million American jobs and 12.5 percent of the nation's GDP
relies upon West Coast ports to get cargo coming in.

12 We need to avoid interruption of critical supply chains that 13 are desperately needed at this time to fight the pandemic. Cargo coming 14 in such as medical supplies, sanitizers, chemicals and personal protective 15 equipment such as KN95 respirators that are being used by frontline 16 personnel. Now is not the time to take employees out of production 17 when every single worker is needed to handle unprecedented cargo 18 volumes critical to the recovery of the United States in combating COVID-19 19.

With the short time that we've had to vet and consider the ETS, we hope that we can work together to pursue a revision. Or a clarification that ensures that marine terminals can continue to operate while continuing our strong and already established COVID prevention program that we've implemented with our union.

25 Thank you for your time. And have a nice Thanksgiving.

1	CHAIR THOMAS: Thank you, Michael.
2	John, who do we have in the queue?
3	MR. GOTCHER: Our next commenter is Anna Rivera from
4	Fight for \$15.
5	CHAIR THOMAS: Anna, can you hear us?
6	INTERPRETER: Yes.
7	CHAIR THOMAS: Go right ahead.
8	MS. AGUILAR: (Through Interpreter Haikalis.) (indiscernible)
9	Paz Aguilar. Good afternoon my name is Paz Aguilar. I'm a fast-food
10	worker in Oakland. So I have worked 20 years for fast-food restaurants,
11	most recently KFC, Taco Bell and Jack in the Box. I'm calling to request
12	the Board, the Standards Board to approve the emergency standards that
13	you are talking about today. These are very important standards, safety
14	standards, that could have made a difference for me.
15	My managers at the fast-food restaurants at first ignored the
16	requests for social distancing. They did not make sure that the
17	employees were wearing masks. I could not go to work. I was sick. And
18	then seven of my co-workers including me tested positive for COVID-19.
19	And it made my sister-in-law sick.
20	Because the companies where I work didn't think that my
21	health was important, they changed my life. So when I was about to take
22	quarantine I suffered a stroke. One side of my body has been paralyzed,
23	so I will be needing physical therapy for at least I do not know
24	(indiscernible) when I will be able to go back to work.
25	We need these standards. They are extremely important to
	116

CALIFORNIA REPORTING, LLC 229 Napa Street, Rodeo, California 94572 (510) 224-4476

1 fast food workers (indiscernible) basic rules for the pandemic. COVID-2 19 is spreading fast throughout California and (indiscernible) the 3 essential workers. So we can help the outbreaks stop in our community, but we need the help of Cal/OSHA to stop them. So thank you so much. 4 5 CHAIR THOMAS: Thank you. 6 Before we go on I'm going to ask that if your comments have 7 already been made by someone else, we would appreciate if you would 8 drop off. Or let John know that you are dropping off, because if we --9 either we go faster or we're not going to get through this. We still have 10 at least 50-some-odd commenters. If your points have already been 11 made by someone else we ask that you drop off. I'm not demanding it, 12 I'm just saying it would be appropriate. 13 So, John, who do we have next in the queue? 14 MR. GOTCHER: Our next commenter is Brian Mello from 15 Associated General Contractors of California. 16 MR. MELLO: Can you guys hear me?

17 CHAIR THOMAS: Yeah, go ahead Brian.

18 MR. MELLO: Mr. Chairman, members of the Board good 19 afternoon. My name is Brian Mello. I'm the Safety Manager for the 20 Associated General Contractors of California. AGC is a member-driven 21 organization with around a thousand companies statewide, specializing in 22 commercial construction.

We are asking for the California OSHA Standards Board to
 take all comments around the emergency language regarding COVID-19
 prevention into consideration.

In section 3205(a)(1)(A), employees working from home
 does not have a clear definition as to how an employee would be
 categorized in the instance of a hybrid model, partial home and field
 work.

5 In section 3205(b), "exposed workplace" is defined 6 differently than that of the Labor Code 6409.6 (d)(5)and does not take 7 into account employers which may have multiple jobsites, multiple 8 companies and workers on the jobsites over the course of a project. We 9 ask that the language remain in-line with the existing Labor Code section 10 created by AB 685.

11 In regards to multiple and major outbreaks, we are asking 12 that the compliance around this section be redefined to further guide 13 employers with multiple sites, projects and employee movement amongst 14 these jobsites. As we feel as though the regulation puts employers in a 15 position that they may not be able to comply with as testing and the 16 scheduling of the tests are not always available at the times required and 17 could be even more difficult to come by with the implementation of this 18 regulation.

Additionally this section does not incorporate any of the CDC guidelines or existing labor codes when identifying what employees and workers would fall into the "close contact" category, therefore subject to extensive testing policies.

We appreciate your time and consideration around both
these comments and written comments that were previously submitted.
Thank you Chairman.

1 CHAIR THOMAS: Thank you. 2 John, who do we have next? 3 MR. GOTCHER: Our next commenter is Mike Donlon from the 4 Construction Employers' Association. 5 CHAIR THOMAS: Michael, are you there? 6 MR. DONLON: Yes, good afternoon. 7 CHAIR THOMAS: Go right ahead. 8 MR. DONLON: Okay, so this is Mike Donlon. I'm representing 9 the Construction Employers' Association. The CEA represents most of the 10 largest (indiscernible) commercial building contractors in Northern 11 California. 12 We've read this petition or this regulation, proposed 13 regulation carefully and have many concerns with the authority of it. 14 And I'll start with our biggest concern is section 3205(c)(10)(C). It 15 requires continuation of pay and benefits to employees. This section is 16 outside of the authority of the Board to adopt, outside the authority of 17 the Division to enforce. It's not an occupational health and safety 18 regulation. It's a wage regulation, therefore it should be deleted in its 19 entirety. 20 Other regulations, we do have a problem with the definition 21 of "outbreak." It should be limited to employees of a single employer, 22 not of a place of employment, consistent with AB 685 and Senate Bill

23 1159. "Major outbreak" is just a new term that I haven't seen anywhere

24 out there, and none of us looking at this have.

25 We also believe the testing requirements, and there's three

sections, those are -- I won't read them -are just overbearing. And
 could actually hurt a community by basically gobbling up all the testing
 supplies and overloading the labs in a community.

We think the definition of "exposed workplace" is unduly broad and specifically walkways, hallways, aisles shouldn't be included in that, because if a COVID-19 case walked down the hallway, another employee walks down a week later, the probability of transmission in those places is very small.

9 And I'm trying to be brief here and I'll finish real quick, one 10 of the things we've argued quite often is whether this is a necessary 11 regulation and if it is duplicative. Well, local and state health 12 departments are referenced 33 times in this 21-page regulation. Now 13 that kind of tells me you're riding on their coattails. They're already 14 doing the work and this is just tagging on to it. That is the definition of a 15 duplicative regulation -- 33 times in 21 pages.

16 Clarity issues, there's clarity issues all throughout this 17 regulation. And this is a very basic one, it's not important but it'll point 18 out what I'm talking about. One of the training requirements is 19 employers have to train methods of distancing six feet. I can just see 20 this training. Okay, You can stay six feet away. You can stay 72 inches 21 away. You can stay two yards. Six feet is a number, it's not a method. 22 Now the second sentence in that section says, "You should 23 train employees on the importance of distancing." Now that is a critical 24 thing that is kind of overshadowed by this kind of stupid statement

25 before it. That's the kind of clarity that is missing in this regulation.

CALIFORNIA REPORTING, LLC 229 Napa Street, Rodeo, California 94572 (510) 224-4476

Some of the good stuff, and there is a lot of good stuff in here, is buried
 under well, you know what I'm going to say.

3 Another thing we're concerned with is now our members 4 have been spending exorbitant resources to try and keep their employees 5 safe from this COVID. And they've actually put together systems and 6 they've worked very well for them. Our members have seen very low 7 numbers of cases. We're worried that trying to comply with this 8 regulation, especially so quickly, is going to pull away from those 9 resources and those systems that they put into place and are working. 10 Just so we can be in technical compliance with the regulation.

11 And then the idea, well Eric Frumin earlier said yeah, well if 12 we pass this regulation employers will have to do it. That's very naive. 13 Employers that aren't complying now aren't going to comply tomorrow 14 just because you vote on this. It's just not going to happen. And in fact I 15 feel for these employees we've heard from who worked for these employers, that g*****it they just don't care, and that is terrible. But a 16 17 poorly written regulation isn't going to fix things in those workplaces. A poorly written regulation, especially with the clarity issues of this one 18 19 and some of the jurisdictional issues, is only going to lead to appeals and 20 litigation.

So strong enforcement is the key. And the Division has done a good job. And as I think Eric Frumin said not enough of it, because they were so short-handed. But they have done a good job with existing regulations. And have a case-law track record -- we know how we can cite them and how we can't -- or the Division does. There's no questions

CALIFORNIA REPORTING, LLC 229 Napa Street, Rodeo, California 94572 (510) 224-4476

on this is going to be in hearings and up for decisions by judges to figure
out what some of this stuff means. And that's going to be the biggest
problem with trying to implement any of this quickly.

4 So I urge you to take a look at this. We also supplied written 5 comments as many others have. And I just see very many flaws with this 6 regulation that are going to overshadow the good parts of it. Thank you.

7 CHAIR THOMAS: Thank you.

8 John, who do we have in the queue?

9 MR. GOTCHER: Our next commenter is Lucas Zucker from

10 Central Coast Alliance United for a Sustainable Economy.

11 CHAIR THOMAS: Can you hear us?

12 MR. ZUCKER: Good afternoon Chair Thomas and members.

13 Yeah, I can hear you. Can you hear me?

14 CHAIR THOMAS: Go right ahead, thanks.

MR. ZUCKER: Good afternoon Chair Thomas and members of the Standards Board. My name is Lucas Zucker, I'm the Policy Director of CAUSE, the Central Coast Alliance United for a Sustainable Economy, a social-justice organization in Ventura and Santa Barbara counties that works with farm workers and immigrants.

20 We urge you to vote to adopt the proposed standard. In our 21 region, we've seen major outbreaks among agricultural workers at some 22 of our region's largest employers, including Calavo's packing house in 23 Santa Paula, Reiter's H-2A farm worker labor camp in Oxnard and Bonipak 24 H-2A farmworker housing in Santa Maria. Those cities of Oxnard, Santa 25 Paula and Santa Maria are now driving by far the largest area of COVID

1 cases in Ventura and Santa Monica County.

Bonipak's labor contractor, Alco Harvesting, initially did not report its outbreak to public health officials until reported by workers. And then under-reported the spread, including threatening to retaliate against the worker who shared information with local media. This outbreak ultimately killed one worker and sickened many others. And they'd have been mitigated if the labor contractor had been required to take immediate action as the proposed regulation would require.

9 We've also received frequent reports from our farm worker 10 members about employers not complying with six-foot distancing 11 requirements, not providing PPE and not training workers on safety 12 including sick-leave availability, because current pandemic safety 13 guidelines are not adequately enforceable.

In particular, close quarters in shared housing and transportation under the H-2A temporary farmworker visa program have led to the largest outbreaks in our region and clearly need greater oversight. The proposed regulation would address many of these issues and save lives in our communities among those most impacted on the frontlines of the pandemic, essential workers and their families.

It would also help prevent the spread of COVID-19 from
irresponsible employers and labor contractors to their neighbors and
peers in the industry who are doing their best to follow safety practices,
helping the sustainability and stability of all of our local economy.
And we urge you to adopt these urgently needed standards
to protect our essential workers who put their lives on the lines all the

1 time. Thank you.

25

2 CHAIR THOMAS: Thank you. 3 John, who do we have on the queue? 4 MR. GOTCHER: Our next commenter is Christopher Valadez 5 from the Grower-Shipper Association of Central California. 6 CHAIR THOMAS: Christopher, can you hear us? 7 MR. VALADEZ: I can. Can you hear me? 8 CHAIR THOMAS: Yeah, go right ahead. 9 MR. VALADEZ: All right. Thank you, Mr. Chair, and members 10 of the Board, staff and everybody else that's weighed in thus far. Chris 11 Valadez, Grower-Shipper Association of Central California. Our regional 12 footprint is Monterey County, Santa Cruz, San Benito and Santa Clara 13 counties. And following your advice Mr. Chair, we'll attempt to be 14 different here. 15 Our difference in our commentary is in the fact that we were the creator. We were the establisher of the model for COVID-19 housing. 16 17 That was a program that was started by us and our association in April, a 18 program that on July 24th, based on the work that we had done to set up 19 the program, operate and help serve members of the farmworker 20 community. We'd worked with our partners, with CDPH and CDFA to 21 share our model, which ultimately became the state's model, which I 22 think is in at least a dozen counties now and referred to as Housing for 23 the Harvest. 24 And so, being the fact that not only were we the originator,

but we have been operating this program now for seven, eight months.

CALIFORNIA REPORTING, LLC 229 Napa Street, Rodeo, California 94572 (510) 224-4476

In addition to the fact that going back to roughly middle of June when
 the state of California, and in particular our region here in the Salinas
 Valley, was over-impacted by oversubscribed testing demand and, I think,
 an overall failure to return in a timely manner test results back to
 members of the community.

6 We created a program in conjunction with our partner, 7 Clinica De Salud, here in the region just for members of the farmworker 8 community to ensure we can guarantee both tests. And a quick turn-9 around time, which has resulted since again going back to June an 10 average of about 30 hours or less in our ability to return results.

11 And so, based on our experiences here, one in being the 12 operator of the housing program which then became the model now 13 exported to 13 or so counties in the state of California; and our testing 14 experience specifically with the farmworker community. And again at a 15 time and continuing to present day. We think we've learned a little bit 16 with respect to who's been impacted, where the disproportional impacts 17 have come or where they're not coming within this region. And why 18 might there be some differences say, in terms of the experiences here in 19 our region where there is a high use of the H-2A program and employer-20 provided housing, employer-provided transportation.

But unlike the previous commenter, in this region we have not had the case clusters or the large number of cases associated directly with employer-provided housing. And so what's different? I think partially your regulation mentions, recognizes, but doesn't necessarily connect the fact that there is an infrastructure in place today. There has

1 been one here since late March, early April that wasn't in place 2 elsewhere throughout the state. Namely where we are talking about 3 housing where employers are employing strict standards with respect to 4 dealing with those who are symptomatic. Doing testing, whether as a 5 result of protocol or a surveillance measure, our program has been there 6 to help employers. Whether it's an H-2A employer or whether it's a 7 member of the community who lives in their own personal congested or 8 crowded-living condition, be able to safely isolate or quarantine.

9 And so we have not seen any differences relating to 10 employer-provided housing or employer-provided transportation that 11 may have or is explained to be the case for other regions and other 12 areas. And I think part of the reason there -- and I can't speak to every 13 employer's practices, the aggressive nature or how strong or not that 14 they are -- but I do know that we've had here again since April an 15 infrastructure. Which throughout the duration of the pandemic and a 16 long season, which for here takes us from the spring through the fall into 17 -- excuse me, into the fall -- we haven't had the case clusters directly 18 tied back in to Salinas Valley to employer-provided housing where you 19 have a dormitory-style living condition. And in particular, in some cases, 20 use of bunk-style arrangements.

And so my comments here are basically one based on our experience and knowledge from the fact that we've built up an infrastructure, our findings and what we've seen versus what we haven't seen. And our concerns. Not over a standard or a stronger, stricter standard. I think we've proven and led by example that we don't have

CALIFORNIA REPORTING, LLC 229 Napa Street, Rodeo, California 94572 (510) 224-4476

time to wait. We act and react in a way to ensure we have the
infrastructure that's as protective as possible and in place to ensure that
the employee has the resources that they need and the employer is doing
anything and everything that they can.

5 But in our review of the standard where we see the draft 6 language utilize or allow the existence of engineering controls for a 7 fixed-site workplace, it disallows or does not allow such use of 8 engineering controls that we have provided to the Standards Board in our 9 written comment, that are in use. In some cases in employer-provided 10 transportation vehicles, whether it's a screen, where they're able, 11 maybe, aisle-to-aisle to create more than three-foot distancing between 12 passengers, but row-to-row or in-front or in-back. You know, the 13 employment of the use of a screen in addition to a face covering and 14 ventilation as measures when taken in concert to immediately lead to a 15 system that allows for a more risk-reduced environment. That, we think, 16 is not only better, preferable, but is one that should be more readily 17 employed by our sector to ensure we're doing everything possible to 18 ensure we have the greatest protections necessary to protect the 19 essential workforce.

And similarly, in housing. There was a reference made earlier to some guidance. We've seen guidance led by L.A. County with different bunk scenarios, partitions, screenings, different positions and patterns. You know, we know in some cases here based on our experience that that has been in place.

25 In addition we also believe that there is a room for

CALIFORNIA REPORTING, LLC 229 Napa Street, Rodeo, California 94572 (510) 224-4476

1 employer-provided or a partition, a screen, or the use of a	1	employer-pro	vided or a	partition, a	a screen, o	r the use of a
---	---	--------------	------------	--------------	-------------	----------------

2 engineering control --

3 CHAIR THOMAS: I hate to cut you off, Chris, but you're going
4 have to sum up.

5 MR. VALADEZ: Sure, I will. 6 CHAIR THOMAS: Thank you. 7 MR. VALADEZ: -- to reduce the risks. 8 What we want to see is a reduced-risk environment all 9 around. We think employers are there to do just that. But we think in 10 the current language, because the engineering controls are not extended 11 to employer-provided housing and transportation, we'll run into a 12 situation where we think could be very unfortunate for our employers 13 and our employer community. Thank you. 14 CHAIR THOMAS: Thank you, Chris. 15 John, who do we have next in the queue? 16 And I'm doing strict time on this now, because we're not 17 going to make it. We've still got 50 -- more people came on to talk now, 18 but I asked you not to. But that's okay. But we're going to do like a 19 minute-and-a half and that's it. So John, go ahead. 20 MR. GOTCHER: Our next commenter is Linda Kjesbu from 21 Northern California Safety Consortium. 22 CHAIR THOMAS: Linda, go ahead. 23 MS. KJESBU: Okay, can you hear me? 24 CHAIR THOMAS: Yes, go right ahead. 25 MS. KJESBU: All righty, my name is Linda Kjesbu. Good

afternoon, thank you Chairman Thomas and Board for hearing us out
today. I'm the Director of Northern California Safety Consortium. We
work with local businesses. We're in Humboldt County, a rural county.
And a large sector of our businesses are construction and service
industry and (indiscernible).

6 So I'm here to represent some of those members of our 7 companies with questions that have come to me about this new standard. 8 And they were largely what I put into my written comments were related 9 to clarification. Again, that's I think what all of us have been asking for, 10 more clarification within this emergency standard.

And having to do with a specific set of questions that my clients have are questions on return to work. Return to work is a big issue. And all the guidance so far and the standard itself, the proposed standard, there are things that are bound to come up especially in Northern California with cold, flu, wet rain season coming up. And so that is what we are seeking, at least most of my clients, is more clarity on that.

And as I heard other people speaking a couple of other things occurred to me. And that is I completely sympathize with the callers and speakers that spoke about the awful conditions that they were having to work within. And my concern with the regulation is that somebody else mentioned, I think Mr. Donlon, of being duplicative. And it seems as though in some ways it is kind of duplicative of --

24 CHAIR THOMAS: Thirty seconds.

25 MS. KJESBU: -- that point. Oh, I'm sorry.

CALIFORNIA REPORTING, LLC 229 Napa Street, Rodeo, California 94572 (510) 224-4476

1	So in any case I would ask that there be just some sort of an			
2	extension to get more clarification on this regulation.			
3	CHAIR THOMAS: Thank you.			
4	MS. KJESBU: Thank you.			
5	CHAIR THOMAS: John, who do we have next in the queue?			
6	MR. GOTCHER: Our next commenter is Scott Govenar of			
7	Governmental Advocates Incorporated on behalf of Construction			
8	Employers' Association.			
9	CHAIR THOMAS: Scott, you're on. Two minutes starting			
10	now. Better unmute yourself.			
11	Scott's not there, John, let's go to the next.			
12	MR. GOTCHER: Our next commenter is Jesus Mendoza from			
13	Central California Environmental Justice Network.			
14	CHAIR THOMAS: Jesus, two minutes, you're on right now.			
15	Jesus? Go to the next, John.			
16	MR. GOTCHER: Our next commenter is Bryan Little from			
17	California Farm Bureau.			
18	CHAIR THOMAS: Bryan, can you hear me?			
19	MR. LITTLE: Yes, I can. Can you hear me?			
20	CHAIR THOMAS: Yeah, two minutes starting right now.			
21	Thank you.			
22	MR. LITTLE: All right. I'll try to make this fast. Mr. Chair			
23	and Board Members and agency and Board staff thanks for the			
24	opportunity today. I'm Bryan Little representing California Farm Bureau			
25	Federation, the largest general interest ag organization in California.			

Just a couple of points I'd like to make. This rushed ETS process doesn't serve anyone's interests and has resulted in a proposed rule with a lot of problems. We barely had a week to consider a 21-page draft regulation explained by a 57-page document comprised of a justification for emergency action and an explanation of the proposed regulation.

7 The regulation will have to be understood and implemented 8 in the context of the ongoing pandemic and in conjunction with recent 9 legislative mandates like AB 685, AB 1867 and SB 1159. This truncated 10 process serves nobody, not the employer stakeholders, not employee 11 stakeholders, nor the agency that's going to be charged with trying to 12 enforce this.

13 I would mention parenthetically that earlier this year we 14 were suffering from a shortage of N95 respirators brought about by the 15 pandemic and the wildfire smoke season. The agency consulted with us 16 and they felt like they did something and accomplished something by 17 doing that. But the problem is with an ETS standard like this one you're 18 not going to have the opportunity for that kind of conversation. And 19 we're going to spend the next several months trying to fix what's in the 20 draft of the ETS that I think we're probably going to adopt today.

The concerns expressed by the proponents have largely already been addressed by Cal/OSHA guidance, which leaves one to wonder why it's necessary to do a regulation on this rushed timeframe that we're on right now.

25

A couple of people have already made the point that the

CALIFORNIA REPORTING, LLC 229 Napa Street, Rodeo, California 94572 (510) 224-4476

Board lacks the actual authority to do the salary preservation provision,
 the housing provisions and the transportation provisions. And I would
 echo that.

4 I just want to close without using up all of my time by saying 5 in some draft ETS today (indiscernible), the ETS process itself suffers 6 from deficiencies in the process for an emergency standard required by 7 the APA. There's certain authorities the Board does not possess and will 8 result in a defective regulation that small employers like farmers and 9 ranchers will be unable to understand and implement. Leading the 10 agency to waste resources conducting enforcement against employers 11 who are trying to protect their employees and still trying to figure out 12 how to understand the regulation.

13 CHAIR THOMAS: Ten seconds, please.

14 MR. LITTLE: And then people like me who will be unable to
15 render them any assistance to doing so.

16 And I would wrap up, Mr. Chairman, by suggesting to all of 17 us who are commenting today if we could refrain from (indiscernible) of 18 other commenters we'd be able to get a lot further figuring out what to 19 do here. Thank you.

20 CHAIR THOMAS: Thank you.

21 John, who's up next?

MR. GOTCHER: Our next commenter is Estella Cisneros from
 California Rural Legal Assistance Incorporated.

- 24 CHAIR THOMAS: Estella, can you hear me?
- 25 Estella? Estella, can you hear me? Apparently she can't

1 hear me. John, can you go to the next?

2 MR. GOTCHER: Our next commenter is Mirella Deniz3 Zaragoza from Warehouse Worker Resource Center.

4 MS. DENIZ-ZARAGOZA: Hi. Good afternoon. Can you hear 5 me?

6 CHAIR THOMAS: Yes, go right ahead, thank you. Two7 minutes.

8 MS. DENIZ-ZARAGOZA: Great. Hi everyone, my name is 9 Mirella Deniz-Zaragoza and I'm speaking on behalf of the Warehouse 10 Worker Resource Center. Thank you Chair Thomas and Board Members 11 for the opportunity to speak today. We wanted to thank you and the 12 Division for your leadership and especially for developing an emergency 13 standard to protect general industry workers from COVID-19. We 14 support the emergency standard proposed by the Division and we urge 15 you to go forward with it today without delay.

16 Since the pandemic began, the warehouse and other 17 essential workers have suffered and faced this deadly virus with 18 inadequate protection from large employers like Amazon who have 19 turned rapidly and made record profits. Our organization has 20 continuously received reports of employers providing inadequate 21 protection against COVID, including failing to ensure proper social 22 distancing, being organized or responding properly to workplace 23 outbreaks among other issues.

In the words of a delivery driver in Los Angeles area who
states, "My employer has not done enough to protect us from COVID.

CALIFORNIA REPORTING, LLC 229 Napa Street, Rodeo, California 94572 (510) 224-4476

1 Social distancing was not enforced and we've had to cluster in big 2 meeting groups every morning. They did not clean our delivery vans 3 between drivers. I didn't receive enough PPE, hardly any gloves or hand 4 sanitizer. Mary, our house worker and (indiscernible) told us it's a lot 5 more prevalent in the building. Because they hired many people, it's hot. 6 We're getting pushed to work even faster now, because the volume of 7 packages did increase with COVID. So they are really pushing for us to go faster and still even more. It's just really stressful." 8

9 The emergency standard developed by the Division addresses 10 many of the issues we have seen in the warehouse industry and will help 11 provide much-needed guidance and protection.

Although there are aspects we wish were stronger, such as
proclaim workers' rights to participate in or challenge workplace
prevention plans, the standard still strikes a good compromise between
allowing employers --

16 MS. SHUPE: That's two minutes.

17 CHAIR THOMAS: Please wrap up.

MS. DENIZ-ZARAGOZA: Okay -- to develop and implement a plan that sets specific baselines. We urge the Board to move forward with the Division's proposal on the emergency COVID-19 standard. Thank you.

22 CHAIR THOMAS: Thank you.

I'm sorry to rush. I just want everybody who wants to
comment to comment, but we do have to have a time limit if we're going
to do that.

John, who's up next?

1

2 MR. GOTCHER: Our next commenter is Shane Ross from
 3 California Rural Legal Assistance.

4 CHAIR THOMAS: Shane, can you hear us? Shane? Can you 5 unmute yourself Shane? John, go to the next if he's gone.

6 MR. GOTCHER: Our next commenter is Fred Walter from
7 Conn Maciel Carey.

8 CHAIR THOMAS: Fred, can you hear us?

9 MR. WALTER: I can, sir, thank you very much.

10 CHAIR THOMAS: Go right ahead.

11 MR. WALTER: Okay. So I am a Counsel with Conn Maciel 12 Carey, but I'm speaking for myself today. This is the first time I've 13 spoken at a Standards Board meeting despite having spent the last 35 14 years advising and representing California employers before the Appeals 15 Board.

Before anyone dismisses me as a callous shill for employers I'd like to point out that I never knew my grandfather. He was killed in a preventable industrial accident when my mother was six months old. I care about workplace safety. I care as much for the rules in workplace safety that are clear and realistic.

There can be no question that the threat of COVID-19 in the workplace must be addressed, that's not the issue. The issue is whether this regulation does that. Despite the quick work done by Eric Berg and his staff and CDPH, I cannot think of a standard which sets up employers for failure so completely as this one does. It was rushed to a vote

without adequate time for comment, but (indiscernible) expected to
 comply with it. Or for that matter, for thoughtful deliberation by this
 Board. There was time for that in Oregon and Virginia when they
 adopted their COVID regulations, but apparently not here.

5 The wildfire smoke regulation had to be revisited, because 6 the first iteration was rushed. The heat illness standard, by comparison, 7 was subject to similar arguments of urgency. That the original 8 emergency regulation was successful, because they had adequate time 9 for DOSH and the regulated community to work together to produce 10 feasible rules.

11 It's hard to see how this regulation is going to do what 3203,
12 5104 and other regs cannot do or how it will be more enforceable than
13 those are. None of the hazards spoken of by the workers who have
14 commented today --

15 MS. SHUPE: Two minutes.

16 MR. WALTER: -- cannot be addressed through existing
 17 regulations that (indiscernible) proposed reg.

18 So whether you agree with me or not we can foresee that 19 this regulation will certainly clog the Appeals Board with appeals. More 20 importantly, it is certain to close businesses and eliminate jobs 21 unnecessarily. I'm afraid this is the epitome of a feel-good exercise, and

22 nothing more. Thank you.

23 CHAIR THOMAS: Thank you.

24 John, who do we have in the queue?

25 MR. GOTCHER: Our next commenter is Sandra Aguila from

CALIFORNIA REPORTING, LLC 229 Napa Street, Rodeo, California 94572 (510) 224-4476

1 California Rural Legal Assistance Incorporated.

2 CHAIR THOMAS: Sandra, can you hear us? Sandra? Sandra, 3 going once, going twice, gone. John, go to the next. 4 MR. GOTCHER: Our next commenter is Norma Encina who is 5 on the WebEx under Edgar Pinto. And I believe that there's going to be 6 more than one person. 7 CHAIR THOMAS: Hello, can you hear us? Hello? 8 MS. ENCINA: Hello? Hi, can you hear me? 9 CHAIR THOMAS: Yes. Go right ahead. 10 Good afternoon my name is Norma Encina. 11 (Audio cuts in and out obscuring testimony.) 12 MS. SHUPE: Miss Encinas? 13 CHAIR THOMAS: Norma, can you speak a little slower? We 14 can't hear you, and your mic is going in and out. 15 MS. ENCINA: I think I was added under Edgar. I have my own WebEx under Norma Encinas. I think that's what happened. 16 17 CHAIR THOMAS: Go ahead. Go ahead, you can speak. Just 18 don't talk too fast. 19 MS. ENCINA: Okay. Among the specific goals we have is to 20 advance employment and educational opportunities for farm workers. To 21 train farm workers more effectively to carry out their work (audio 22 continues to cut in and out, and distort - indiscernible.) Our work began 23 during the early stages of the COVID-19 pandemic and has continued 24 throughout the entire (audio continues to cut in and out, and distort -25 indiscernible.) Through these measures, we were able to mitigate the

CALIFORNIA REPORTING, LLC 229 Napa Street, Rodeo, California 94572 (510) 224-4476

1	spread. We ask that you consider section (indiscernible) and
2	transportation. At this time, (indiscernible) and are back in Mexico
3	(indiscernible). They will briefly share their experiences. Thank you.
4	MS. SHUPE: We need to cut her off, nobody can hear her.
5	CHAIR THOMAS: Nora, we can't hear you. Your mic is going
6	in and out. We heard a lot of it, but it's getting incoherent. Sorry.
7	All right, John, who's up next?
8	MR. GOTCHER: Our next commenter is the Edgar Pinto line,
9	which looks like a group.
10	CHAIR THOMAS: Let's try that. Edgar are you there?
11	MR. PINTO: (Speaking in Spanish.) It's going to be in
12	Spanish.
13	CHAIR THOMAS: It's okay. Do you have a translator?
14	(Off mic colloquy.)
15	MR. PINTO: (Speaking in Spanish.)
16	CHAIR THOMAS: Translation please.
17	MR. PINTO: (Through Interpreter Haikalis.) So we would like
18	to talk about housing and about the program H-2A. There is no need for
19	us to have
20	(Sound continuously cutting in and out.)
21	MS. SHUPE: We can't hear the interpreter now.
22	CHAIR THOMAS: I'm sorry, we've lost the interpreter, I think.
23	You know what, can you guys hold on the line, Edgar?
24	MR. PINTO: Sure.
25	CHAIR THOMAS: We're having some technical difficulties

CALIFORNIA REPORTING, LLC 229 Napa Street, Rodeo, California 94572 (510) 224-4476

here, so we are going to take -- we were going to take a break anyway,
 so we're going to take it now, we'll reconvene at 3:05.

All right, so we're going to take a break. Thank you. We'rein recess.

5 (Off the record at 2:52 p.m.) 6 (On the record at 3:05 p.m.) 7 CHAIR THOMAS: And we're back. We are back in session. 8 John, I believe we left off with Edgar Pinto. And if they are 9 still there -- I see them on the screen -- would you go ahead and make 10 your comments? And I think you need to go through our translator, if 11 you're not but (overlapping colloquy). 12 MR. PINTO: (Through Interpreter Haikalis.) Good afternoon 13 my name is Edgar Pinto. And I work for the company --14 (Audio cuts in and out - indiscernible.) 15 So they were talking basically about how safe the distancing 16 required for distancing. And if these changes do take place this could be 17 too expensive and we could not be able to afford it for the people who 18 live there. 19 These workers that you (indiscernible) under the program 20 the H-2A they're going to talk about their experiences they had this year 21 working there with their other coworkers. 22 MR. PACHECO: (Speaking in Spanish.) 23 CHAIR THOMAS: Translate please. 24 MR. PACHECO: (Through Interpreter Haikalis.) It's not very

25 easy to spell my name. It's Brualio Alonzo Pacheco. I'm talking about H-

2A. I want to tell you about the experiences I had here in Ventura. We
 had to keep our distances and to do this. We did it, we did keep our
 distance and we had to wear a mask. (indiscernible.)

And the interpreter wasn't able to hear the rest because it
was choppy.

MS. HERNANDEZ ESPINOZA: (Speaking in Spanish.)
CHAIR THOMAS: Translate please.

8 MS. HERNANDEZ ESPINOZA: (Through Interpreter Haikalis.) 9 My name is Carolina and I am also working with H-2A. I want to tell you 10 about the usage of the gloves that we had to wear, use the gel for our 11 hands. And when we went to lunch we'd wear a mask and we always 12 kept our distances.

13 MS. GARCIA TORRALBA: (Speaking in Spanish.)

14 CHAIR THOMAS: Translate please.

25

MS. GARCIA TORRALBA: (Through Interpreter Haikalis.) So my name is Carolina. I am a worker with H-2A. I want to tell you about the housing where we were safe. We never knew of anybody getting sick, we were safe. They had inspections. They always took good care of us. We kept our distances when we were requested when we went shopping or to the stores and things like that.

21 MR. PINTO: Just to finish, what we want is we don't agree 22 on this six-feet business between beds. So we think that we could put 23 more people in the rooms instead of cutting the six-feet rule between 24 beds. Thank you.

CHAIR THOMAS: Thank you. Thank you for your comments,

CALIFORNIA REPORTING, LLC 229 Napa Street, Rodeo, California 94572 (510) 224-4476

1 we appreciate it.

2 John, who do we have in the queue? 3 MR. GOTCHER: Our next commenter is Sarait Martinez from 4 Centro Binacional para el Desarrollo Indígena – sorry, l'm trying my best. I know l'm 5 butchering this. Sarait Martinez would you introduce yourself please? 6 MS. MARTINEZ: Yes. 7 CHAIR THOMAS: Go ahead. 8 MS. MARTINEZ: my name is Sarait Martinez. I am the Executive 9 Director with Centro Binacional para el Desarrollo Indígena Oaxaquena. We are a 10 nonprofit organization that works in the Central Valley and Central Coast, 11 more specifically in the Fresno, Madera and Salinas Valley areas. And we 12 represent the indigenous farmworker community. We now have about 13 165,000 indigenous farmworkers. 14 Some (indiscernible) work in the fields. Many of the workers 15 have a unique language (indiscernible) in the workplace. And we've also 16 had with the pandemic there have been additional barriers that I

17 (indiscernible). And that we also know that many farm workers are

18 largely uninsured and that especially because of the different policies

19 implemented at the federal level many of them fear to seek full

20 resources. So the importance of having enforcement and to have

21 Cal/OSHA really work with employers to ensure that they get the right

22 information in critical times of this (indiscernible) crisis I think is very,

23 very important. And we have the responsibility to act now.

I think we started this back in March. And I think we're at a
point where we need to figure it out by now. We're really just having

CALIFORNIA REPORTING, LLC 229 Napa Street, Rodeo, California 94572 (510) 224-4476

this discussion of whether we implement this emergency temporary
 standard, I think we're a little too late for that and we can't wait no
 more.

4 We also know that as of June 2020 in the agricultural 5 industry, we're at least three times as likely to become infected. This is 6 among our farmworker population. And again we're talking already 7 about a very vulnerable population and we need to make sure that we 8 protect. So again we want to make sure that we (indiscernible) --9 MS. SHUPE: We're at two minutes. 10 MS. MARTINEZ: So I urge you all to really adopt this 11 emergency temporary standard to protect our farmworker community 12 and to save lives. Thank you. 13 CHAIR THOMAS: Thank you. 14 John, who do we have next in the queue? 15 MR. GOTCHER: Our next commenter is Lorena Martinez from California Rural Legal Assistance Incorporated. 16 17 CHAIR THOMAS: Hello, are you there? 18 MR. GOTCHER: Lorena Martinez. 19 CHAIR THOMAS: Lorena, can you hear us? All right, 20 apparently she can't hear us. Let's move on. 21 MR. GOTCHER: Okay. Our next commenter is Kristin Haman 22 of San Diego Gas & Electric. 23 CHAIR THOMAS: Kristin, are you there? 24 MS. HAMAN: Hi, yes I am. CHAIR THOMAS: Go ahead. 25

MS. HAMAN: Good afternoon chairman Thomas and other
 members of the Board. My name is Kristin Haman and I am representing
 San Diego Gas & Electric.

I'd like to start by saying we support an ETS for prevention of
COVID-19 in the workplace and appreciate the opportunity to provide
comments.

7 That said, I'd like to highlight a few areas of concern with 8 the proposed text. First, employers will be required to install solid 9 partitions for fixed work locations where it's not possible to maintain the 10 physical distancing requirement. We have employees who work in 11 boilers, tanks and vaults where maintaining proper physical distancing 12 may not be possible. While it is possible is to erect a barrier in a boiler 13 or a vault it's not feasible in most instances. So we recommend 14 modifying this section to add an exception to the barrier requirement for 15 work in these industrial structures.

16 The next area of concern is regarding the requirement for 17 ventilation systems to maximize the quantity of outside air unless the air 18 quality index for any contaminant exceeds 100. This will require 19 employers to monitor the AQI for all contaminants on a daily basis. For 20 most employers, this is a manual process of checking airnow.gov or other 21 websites. As background, Riverside has had AQI values above 100 for 80 22 days so far in 2020. As we've seen with the wildfire smoke regulation, 23 the AQI fluctuates hourly and there are discrepancies in the values 24 reported by different agencies.

25

Additionally, most of our facilities would require a manual

CALIFORNIA REPORTING, LLC 229 Napa Street, Rodeo, California 94572 (510) 224-4476

closing of dampers or economizers on rooftops to reduce the quantity of
 outside air if the AQI exceeds 100. This is difficult to complete on that
 day and adds the risk of working at elevation. So we recommend
 removing the air quality index provision altogether.

5 The third section I'd like to address is the requirement to 6 wear face coverings indoors with a few exceptions, including working 7 alone in a room. The standard does not define "room." We have 8 employees who need to clearly communicate with utility customers 9 reporting emergencies --

10

MS. SHUPE: Two minutes.

MS. HAMAN: We do appreciate the inclusion of the
exception which allows masks to be removed during specific tasks.
However we suggest expanding the exceptions to consider other control
measures which have been implemented to reduce the risk of exposure.

15 Employers should be able to use the hierarchy of controls 16 when assessing all hazards, and in this case, the virus. So we believe a 17 more realistic approach would be to allow the employer to implement 18 one or more controls that are at least as effective as wearing masks such 19 as making improvements to ventilation and filtration systems, enhancing 20 disinfecting and cleaning protocols, instituting temperature and symptom 21 screenings, maintaining proper physical distance and reducing building 22 occupancy. Then supplement with face coverings when those controls 23 cannot be implemented.

24 And the final area of concern I'd like to mention is the 25 requirement, which states employers shall maintain records of the steps

CALIFORNIA REPORTING, LLC 229 Napa Street, Rodeo, California 94572 (510) 224-4476
1 taken to implement --.

2 MS. SHUPE: Ms. Hamon, you're at three minutes.

3 CHAIR THOMAS: Please wrap up.

4 MS. HAMAN: Okay. Sure.

5 So it's the part on taking the steps to really maintain how we 6 came to the prevention plan. But we do support establishing this plan. 7 We just urge the Board to consider these recommended modifications 8 heard in today's proceedings and over the last week in the proposed 9 emergency temporary standard before adoption. SDG&E would be glad 10 to participate in this review process as we have we done many times in 11 the past. Thanks for the opportunity.

12 CHAIR THOMAS: Thank you.

13 John, who do we have?

MR. GOTCHER: Our next commenter is Jennifer Zurita from
 California Rural Legal Assistance Incorporated.

16 CHAIR THOMAS: Jennifer, can you hear us?

17 MS. ZURITA: Yes, I can hear you. Can you hear me?

18 CHAIR THOMAS: Yes. Go right ahead.

19 MS. ZURITA: Good afternoon. I'm going to be reading a

20 testimony on behalf of one of my coworkers, her name is Sandra Aquilar.

21 So good afternoon. My name is Jennifer Zurita. I am a

22 community worker for California Rural Legal Assistance in Santa Maria,

23 California, the Central Coast. I urge you to approve the proposed

24 emergency COVID-19 work protection regulation to prevent illness and

25 save the lives of workers, their families and our communities.

1 Santa Maria is surrounded by vineyards, strawberry fields 2 and several vegetable crops. Every year Santa Maria welcomes numerous 3 amounts of H-2A workers that form part of its workforce. While some employers try to comply with the health and safety standards provided 4 5 by the CDC, there are numerous H-2A workers being infected with COVID-6 19. In Santa Maria there were 137 known COVID cases for H-2A workers. 7 These numbers tell us that these cases are not isolated events. 8 (indiscernible) that the workers and the outbreaks and implementation 9 of protections have been haphazard at best and in many cases 10 nonexistent.

Under the H-2A program, the workers' visa, employment, housing and transportation are all arranged and controlled by the employer. As a result, many of our H-2A clients are often fearful to report any illness or any workplace health or safety violations. In addition, many don't know what their rights are. The proposed emergency COVID-19 work protection regulation would clarify the protections that employers must take.

During this global pandemic, our office conducted outreach to current H-2A housing. In Santa Maria you often see 30 H-2A workers being housed in a small 1,200-square-feet single-family home, or as many as six workers housed in one motel room.

22 While conducting the outreach, we encountered several 23 notices from different employers to highlight how the pandemic has led 24 to employers increase control over H-2A workers. These notices one: 25 mandate that after work H-2A employees are to stay in their designated

1 rooms and that any unnecessary outing is prohibited; 2 MS. SHUPE: Two minutes. 3 MS. ZURITA: Two: other notices have indicated that H-2A 4 employees are not allowed to have visitors, have strict orders to be in 5 their rooms by 10:00 p.m.; Three: these notices come along with the 6 threat that any violation will result in the termination of housing 7 employee in H-2A housing. 8 Just to take no more time I'll finish there. Thank you. 9 CHAIR THOMAS: Thank you. Thank you so much. 10 John, who's up? 11 MR. GOTCHER: Our next commenter is Matt Hart from 12 United Food and Commercial Workers, Local 324. 13 CHAIR THOMAS: Matt, are you with us? 14 MR. HART: I am. 15 CHAIR THOMAS: Go right ahead. 16 MR. HART: Thank you. Good afternoon Standards Board 17 Members. My name is Matt Hart. I'm a union representative for the 18 United Food and Commercial Workers, Local 324 in Orange County. We 19 have over 21,000 members in the grocery and drug retail, warehouse 20 distribution, Disney, medical field and cannabis industry. I speak in 21 support of adopting the emergency temporary standard before you 22 today. 23 I do find ourselves discussing the important issue of health 24 and safety practices in the world of the COVID pandemic. Our unit has 25 been witnessing a significant increase of COVID infections in our

members, all of whom define the very meaning of the frontline workers.
 As of today, 484 members of our local union have tested positive and
 these numbers are climbing daily. We just received a report today of
 nine infections from yesterday and 12 the day before.

In one warehouse facility in Brea, California, nearly eight
percent of the employees have tested positive for the virus at that
location. And tragically we have even lost one of our members in the
grocery industry due to the pandemic. In our view, that is one too many.

9 While we realize that this virus reaches into every aspect of 10 our daily lives, the plain and basic truth is that our members are most 11 vulnerable to infection in the workplace. Employees are put at risk every 12 day because of lack of PPE, the easing off of cleaning and sanitation 13 practices and social distancing practices are being completely ignored.

Attempts by the employers to address these concerns are inconsistent and fall short of real protections for workers. To put it bluntly it seems that in many cases employers are putting profit before people.

18 In the grocery retail industry, if customers refuse to wear a 19 mask despite the state mandate, they're often allowed to continue to 20 shop, placing customers and our members in harm's way. Employers 21 have even threatened employees with discipline for customer complaints 22 that have arisen because they're asking customers to wear a mask. 23 We've even witnessed customers weaponize the fear of the virus by 24 coughing and even spitting on our members. Such conditions have left 25 employees feeling abandoned and sacrificed --

CALIFORNIA REPORTING, LLC 229 Napa Street, Rodeo, California 94572 (510) 224-4476

1	MS. SHUPE: Two minutes.
2	MR. HART: with no hope in sight.
3	All of this to say, as COVID-19 cases continue to surge in
4	California, we continue to take the lives of our frontline workers and
5	essential workers. California must respond to the emergency before us
6	today by voting to adopt the emergency temporary standard. Thank you
7	very much.
8	CHAIR THOMAS: Thank you, Matt.
9	John, who do we have up next?
10	MR. GOTCHER: Our next commenter is Claudia Reyes from
11	CBDIO.
12	CHAIR THOMAS: Claudia are you with us?
13	MS. REYES: (Speaking in Spanish.)
14	CHAIR THOMAS: We can hear you.
15	MS. REYES: (Through Interpreter Haikalis.) So good
16	afternoon. My name is Claudia Reyes. I work for Binacional Center for the
17	Oaxacan Indigenous Development and my first language is Mixteco. I work in the
18	fields.
19	I have been working in the fields recently and I've had a bad
20	experience there. There is not much distancing there. You cannot keep
21	much distance in the field. You work as if it was a normal day. It's sad
22	that we're in the middle of a pandemic, we have no protection, no masks.
23	This is very worrisome since if somebody gets sick they don't have them
24	go home. They just keep them working and they don't tell them to go
25	home. So they do not tell them that they should go so that we are all

1 safe, for the workers and the families to be safe.

2 The employers don't care about the employees, it's like they don't care about their lives. So I'm asking you to please pass this new 3 4 regulation for field workers. The field workers also have families. Thank 5 you. 6 CHAIR THOMAS: Thank you. Thank you very much, I 7 appreciate it. 8 John, who do we have? 9 MR. GOTCHER: Our next commenter is Sarah Wiltfong from 10 Los Angeles County Business Federation, BizFed. 11 CHAIR THOMAS: Sarah, are you with us? Hello Sarah? I 12 don't believe Sarah is there. John can you go to the next commenter? 13 MR. GOTCHER: Our next commenter is Fernando Torres from 14 California Rural Legal Assistance. 15 CHAIR THOMAS: Fernando, are you with us? Go ahead, 16 Fernando, I can see you. You might want to unmute yourself. Oh there 17 you go. No, I can't hear you. 18 (Technical difficulties.) 19 CHAIR THOMAS: I still can't hear you. Yeah I think we have 20 a technical problem. 21 MR. GOTCHER: So Fernando you are unmuted on WebEx. 22 Maybe your headset has its own local mute? 23 CHAIR THOMAS: Yeah, we still can't hear you. I'm not sure 24 what the --25 John, why don't we let him try and figure it out and then

1 we'll try and go back. Sorry Fernando, we can't hear you. 2 John, can you go on to the next? 3 MR. GOTCHER: Yeah. Our next commenter is Irene de 4 Barraicua from Lideres Campesinas. 5 CHAIR THOMAS: Irene, can you hear us? 6 MS. DE BARRAICUA: Hi. Yes I'm here. Thank you. 7 CHAIR THOMAS: Go ahead. 8 MS. DE BARRAICUA: So my name is Irene, I'm with Lideres 9 Campesinas, which is a statewide network of women farmworker leaders. 10 We are of course in support of this regulation being passed, that's long 11 overdue in our opinion. Many individuals we hear from and work with 12 are experts in various trades in the agricultural industry and they deliver 13 on their part no matter the physical toll it takes on their bodies and risks 14 they take as essential workers. 15 They are fearful of both getting and transmitting the virus 16 and retaliation and oftentimes not having a job the next day. Many live 17 paycheck to paycheck in order to survive and support their families. Once 18 COVID-19 impacts them or their family, they tend to not have -- they 19 don't have the safety nets that many of us can lean back on. 20 Workers deserve more protection and oversight of those 21 protections. We as community members and leaders, employers, 22 government agencies and officials are indebted to our essential workers 23 for keeping us fed, keeping business afloat and for maintaining the flow

25 adequate standards to ensure their workers' safety, especially knowing

of our economy. All employers need to be responsible and meet the

24

CALIFORNIA REPORTING, LLC 229 Napa Street, Rodeo, California 94572 (510) 224-4476

full well the dynamics that exist due to longstanding issues related to
 immigration and other vulnerability that come with overall poverty.

Some employers indeed are exceptions and practice and exceed these standards, but definitely are not the majority. Also, those employers and associations whose infrastructure and services were, and continue to be modeled after, tend to often be exclusive to members of grower associations or H-2A government programs. And not as common among labor contractors, which make up a huge percentage of employers, and often release growers of all responsibility.

10 Safety measures and standards should not be exclusive. We 11 have heard and seen firsthand of proper protections not being practiced 12 or being practiced very loosely. Masks either not being provided or used, 13 social distancing not being neither encouraged or required, workers not 14 being told about sick coworkers --

15 MS. SHUPE: Two minutes.

MS. DE BARRAICUA: And we have heard of individuals with 16 17 symptoms being told to still come to work for the sake of finishing a 18 grape harvest nearing its end. Yesterday I spoke with a man who worked 19 in the garlic harvest in Fresno and became very sick and hospitalized 20 from COVID-19. His coworkers had been coming to work with symptoms 21 and two tested positive prior to himself. Having severe diabetes he fell 22 much harder, and strongly believes he contracted this in the workplace. 23 Now he can no longer work and he is still recovering. And was given only 24 one week of paid time.

25

More guidance, modeling, good behavior, education,

CALIFORNIA REPORTING, LLC 229 Napa Street, Rodeo, California 94572 (510) 224-4476

resource navigation, enforcement and possible on-site testing could
 have prevented the situation he is in today. Instead he is looking to us, a
 nonprofit community-based organization for assistance of all sorts for
 mere survival.

5 The burden of the workplace negligence or lax standards for 6 the mere sake of profit and productivity should not fall on the 7 community nor employee. We urge you to support this proposed 8 emergency standard. Thank you very much.

9 CHAIR THOMAS: Thank you.

10 John, who do we have up?

MR. GOTCHER: Our next commenter is Steve McCarthy of
 California Retailers Association.

13 CHAIR THOMAS: Steve, can you hear us?

14 MR. MCCARTHY: I can hear you.

15 CHAIR THOMAS: Go right ahead.

16 MR. MCCARTHY: Thank you for your time today Chair

17 Thomas and Board Members. Again, Steve McCarthy on behalf of the

18 California Retailers Association.

We have a number of concerns and questions regarding the
language before us, many of which are covered in our letter to the Board.
But because time is short and the urgency is so great I want to focus my
comments today specifically on the outbreak response and testing
requirements.
We are extremely concerned about this section and its

25 impact on both the state's testing capacity and the supply chain for food

and central goods. The proposed threshold of three COVID cases within
14 days does not take into account large facilities with hundreds of
employees or more, and the much higher likelihood that those facilities
reach the threshold even when there is no transmission taking place in
the workplace. Under this rule a large store or a distribution center with
hundreds of employees need only a fraction and a percent of them to
test positive before triggering facility-wide testing.

8 The requirement to test all employees within the workplace 9 furthers this burden substantially. Losing critical infrastructure like a 10 distribution center, even for a day while testing is underway, will have a 11 ripple effect backing up trucking and the ports and leaving our stores 12 short on essential items like food, medical supplies and PPE. Losing 13 multiple of these facilities across the state simultaneously could be 14 calamitous.

So is the possibility of losing capacity within other links in
the supply chain, like the ports, as Mr. Hall covered earlier. I don't think
we can begin to understand the potential consequences of such a
situation.

Furthermore, the requirement for continuous testing means
that this situation will repeat itself once or twice a week for many weeks
thereafter.

We believe this will also have significant impacts in the
 states testing capacity --

24 MS. SHUPE: Two minutes.

25 MR. MCCARTHY: -- and its lab capacity. Our request is that

CALIFORNIA REPORTING, LLC 229 Napa Street, Rodeo, California 94572 (510) 224-4476

1	this section be revised and that the definition of "outbreak" instead
2	conform to the statutory definition provided in SB 159 from earlier this
3	year. And that testing be limited to employees exposed. Thank you very
4	much for your time, I appreciate it.
5	CHAIR THOMAS: Thank you.
6	John, what have we got?
7	MR. GOTCHER: Our next commenter is Meghan Neal, from PW
8	Gillibrand, Incorporated.
9	CHAIR THOMAS: Hello. Can you hear us?
10	MS. NEAL: Yes. Hello. Can you hear me?
11	CHAIR THOMAS: Yes. Is that Meghan?
12	MS. NEAL: Yes. Good afternoon.
13	CHAIR THOMAS: Hi, Meghan. Go ahead.
14	MS. NEAL: Thank you for your time. I have a couple of points to make.
15	First, regarding the context and the text of the regulation. The definition of "COVID
16	exposure" and the references in section 10 and 11 align, at this point in time, with the
17	current CDC guidelines, but may or may not align as time goes on. Guidance has
18	changed and should continue to change as we learn more. And that information
19	included in the regulation should defer to the CDC guidelines. All workplaces should
20	align with those of the lead agency and not risk noncompliance with the proposed
21	Cal/OSHA regulation.
22	Second, the list of items included in section (8)(c) may not be feasible for
23	all employers to adequately disinfect. Mine sites, in particular, have dozens, up to miles
24	of conveyor that are equipped with handrails. And we literally are talking about tens of
25	thousands of linear feet of handrails. Additionally, it will be impossible for employers to

1 know whether one out of a thousand hand tools have been used during any given shift
2 and whether its required to be disinfected.

3 I would propose adding "where feasible" to this particular section. 4 Employees can also wear gloves as an alternative means to directly touching handrails 5 and shovel handles. And the regulation does not include allowance for equally 6 protective measures in this regard. 7 Third, regarding section (9)(e), the employer may not be aware of 8 positive cases in the workplace in order to record them. We request that our 9 employees come forward to report this information when they have contact with 10 positive persons outside of work and whether or not they had symptoms. But the truth 11 is that not all employees will report this in earnest. This provision sets some employers 12 up for failure without the ability to comply in good faith. 13 Additionally, the timeframe that employers must begin recording cases is 14 unclear. Does it begin with the adoption of the regulation? I would like to see clarity 15 regarding this requirement so we can have a level playing field. 16 Including the location – 17 MS. SHUPE: Two minutes. 18 MS. NEAL: -- where I previously worked, it is not feasible for some work 19 groups due to the nature of the job, like supervisors and maintenance that have roving 20 locations throughout their shift. 21 And lastly, regarding testing, prohibiting employers from requiring a 22 negative test result to return to work doesn't provide assurance to concerned 23 employees and coworkers. Asymptomatic people can still be positive and spread COVID 24 to others. And the majority of employees in my industry are not able to work from

25 home as essential workers. It's been widely acknowledged by public agencies that

1	testing numbers are insufficient and that employers should not be restricted by lacking
2	test kits or materials or laboratory analyses. So I would just say in closing that if nothing
3	else, essential businesses should continue to be able to require testing prior to returning
4	to work to prevent outbreaks not for more than three persons, but one or two positive
5	people can still spread illness among their coworkers. Thank you for your time.
6	CHAIR THOMAS: Thank you. John, what have you got?
7	MR. GOTCHER: Our next commenter is Cynthia L. Rice, from California
8	Rural Legal Assistance, Incorporated.
9	CHAIR THOMAS: Cynthia. Can you hear us?
10	MS. RICE: Yes. Can you hear me?
11	CHAIR THOMAS: Yes, we can. Go right ahead.
12	MS. RICE: Thank you very much. My name is Cynthia Rice. I'm from
13	California Rural Legal Assistance. I want to thank the staff for all the hard work they put
14	in to developing this regulation, which really was a labor of science and workforce
15	policy.
16	First, let me address the repeated request for delay in issuing this
17	standard. We are in an emergency situation. Despite nine months of guidance and
18	suggestions and enforcement through IIP reg, COVID cases are on the rise and all signs
19	are that this trend will continue. Essential workers, like agricultural workers who have
20	testified today, have been disproportionately affected by COVID-19 and will continue to
21	suffer that disproportionality. Waiting for an advisory committee convening and more
22	hearings before adopting a standard that provides clarity is not good health policy.
23	Implementation by employers at this time is not unreasonable. Mr.
24	Miiller and the representative from AgSocio as well as a number of industry
25	representatives have indicated that they're already in compliance with most of the

provisions. The guidances and facts have been available for months. And regulations
 largely track them.

The worker and advocate testimony demonstrates that compliance is far from universal and in many industries and areas not even the norm. So a standard is necessary and it's necessary now. The suggestion that the size of the employer should be considered is inconsistent with the regulatory structure of OSHA standards, which do not regularly include workforce size.

8 There are no distinctions generally with respect to large and small 9 workforces. Yet the regulation itself addresses that area of exposure. The standard 10 includes a definition of exposed workplace that limits the circumstances in worksites 11 where these testing requirements are triggered when there are multiple COVID-19

12 infections and COVID-19 outbreaks as defined in 3205.

13 MS. SHUPE: Two minutes.

14 MS. RICE: It takes into consideration that -- I hope that I'll be given a

15 little bit of latitude, because I'm responding to many of the comments made by industry

16 and testifiers. It takes into consideration --

17 (Cross talk from someone else - indiscernible.)

18 The regulation takes into consideration the circumstances and areas

19 where exposure has taken place and (indiscernible) --

20 (Interruption by people online talking.)

- 21 CHAIR THOMAS: Can you please mute yourself, whoever is talking about
- 22 "we can't allow two minutes or three minutes". Thank you.
- 23 MS. RICE: Thank you, Mr. Chair. The regulation takes into consideration
- 24 the areas and extent of exposure in the same way that contact tracing
- 25 recommendations are being made by health agencies, both nationally and statewide.

1	With respect to some of the specific comments about the language of
2	the regulation the use of the term "arranged or provided" in the housing and
3	transportation provisions is similar to federal law which has never been construed to
4	extend to a mere referral to a hotel or (indiscernible)
5	CHAIR THOMAS: You've got about 20 seconds to wrap up. Thank you.
6	MS. RICE: Mr. Chairman, I really ask you for a little more latitude
7	CHAIR THOMAS: No, I didn't give anybody else much latitude, so wrap it
8	up.
9	MS. RICE: Yes, you did. You gave Mr. Little, Ms. Walter and Ms. Hamon
10	CHAIR THOMAS: Would you wrap it up?
11	MS. RICE: The use of the term the requirement that the employer
12	provide testing to employers and exposed workplaces during paid time is consistent
13	with state law requirements, as are the many other requirements that have been cited
14	as being outside the jurisdiction of the agency. In fact, they are state law now and it is
15	appropriate for the agency to require notice and compliance of those when enforcing
16	health policies.
17	The by space requirements are similar, as we have heard, to those in
18	Oregon. The ventilation requirements provide alternatives that would generally apply
19	to buses and windows that do not open, as they would generally have a cabin filter
20	triggering the exception under 3205.4(d)(4).
21	Likewise, the spacing in busing and vans are reasonable and necessary to
22	prevent the type of exposure and outbreaks that we're seeing in the Santa Maria Valley
23	and in other areas, some of which were directly related to transportation.
24	I appreciate very much the sentiment of the speakers who ended their
25	comments by asking us to please stay healthy. This regulation is critical to ensuring that

1	workers have a chance to do that. And that they provide consistency, not
2	inconsistency, when looking at the various guidelines, facts and guidances that have
3	been issued. And they provide workers with the knowledge about what they can
4	enforce
5	CHAIR THOMAS: Thank you.
6	John, I need to move on to the next speaker please.
7	MS. RICE: And employers
8	CHAIR THOMAS: Thank you.
9	John, who's next up in the queue?
10	MR. GOTCHER: Our next commenter is Yardenna Aaron from
11	Maintenance Cooperation Trust Fund.
12	CHAIR THOMAS: Thank you. Can you hear us?
13	MS. AARON: Absolutely. Thank you so much for the opportunity to
14	speak to the Board today. The (indiscernible) organization (indiscernible) statewide
15	launched our group in the janitorial industry whose goal is to eliminate irresponsible
16	contracting and bring contractors who are violating the law into the light and make
17	them compliant. And to signal here during this calm the urgency for adopting these
18	emergency standards has got a lot of gravity for me. On my newsfeed, I saw that 5,000
19	cases have just been brought to light. I saw that the Governor has enacted restrictions
20	on nighttime gatherings because of the surge in the numbers.
21	So the decisions that are made here today have taken on another level of
22	weight in just the time of this particular Board Meeting. And so on the issue of what's
23	happening with janitors, I have to reinforce what Alma who opened up the conversation
24	started. We conducted a survey of almost 259 new janitors in dealing with COVID and
25	even in August 20 percent were receiving no PPE. Even after the pandemic had been

called for four months. Even in August, 40 percent of workplaces were not enforcing
 any social distancing for (indiscernible).

3 And Alma already talked about how a large percentage of these 4 employers are still not enacting training. So we know that standards go a long way. 5 Guidelines are one thing. The laws are another. And as an enforcement watchdog 6 group, that's how we're able to step in and help to make sure that this public health 7 crisis is stayed. By making sure that employers who are violating the law, who are trying 8 to cut corners and cut costs by not providing the PPE, by not providing the benefits that 9 workers deserve and that are now the law, are brought to light. So that there's an even 10 playing field and that we stave off this public health crisis.

Now I just have to say that in addition to the emergency standard, we
believe that for the janitorial industry essential workers who are front line workers
whose job is to literally stop the spread of COVID, deserve and need industry-specific
guidelines, stronger ones. And --

15 CHAIR THOMAS: Two minutes.

MS. AARON: -- they're working in our hospitals. They're cleaning our grocery stores. They're everywhere. And oftentimes when they step forward, our organization has a history that when non-union janitors report, they suffer retaliation. We already heard much testimony across all worker classes about extensive retaliation in the workplace, expected (indiscernible) help stave off a public health crisis. So this is an opportunity. With the news outlets talking about the surge --

22 CHAIR THOMAS: Can you wrap it up please? I hate to rush, but can you 23 wrap it up? Thank you.

24 MS. AARON: Absolutely. And I hope that the vote goes in favor of 25 passing these emergency standards today. This is an historic time. Thank you.

CALIFORNIA REPORTING, LLC 229 Napa Street, Rodeo, California 94572 (510) 224-4476

1

CHAIR THOMAS: Thank you.

2	Just to be clear, I'm trying to be fair to everybody. It's not a hard, hard
3	two minutes. We're just telling you when its two minutes. Please think of other people.
4	There's still almost 300 people on listening to this. And we want your comments, but
5	make them concise. Get it done. I know you can do it. John, who's up next?
6	MR. GOTCHER: Our next commenter is Scott Brauninger, from Build
7	Group Incorporated.
8	CHAIR THOMAS: Scott, can you hear us?
9	MR. BRAUNINGER: Yes. Can you hear me?
10	CHAIR THOMAS: Yes. Go right ahead.
11	MR. BRAUNINGER: My name is Scott Brauninger. And I'm the Chief
12	Operating Officer of Build Group, Inc. We do about one billion dollars a year of
13	construction contracts in the state of California. Concrete, drywall, flooring, Los Angeles
14	and the Bay Area.
15	I employ about 1,000 people and I have about 2,000 subcontractor
16	employees that work on my jobsites. We have been one of the employers that have
17	taken this COVID very seriously. I personally implemented a 100 percent testing
18	program for all workers on all of my jobsites since July. I've been testing about 800
19	people a week. And I've done more than 20,000 tests. We found out that we were
20	having about a one in 800 positivity rate, but that rate has jumped significantly in the
21	last four weeks.
22	We were getting maybe one or two hits across the state a week. Now I'm
23	getting 10 on a job sometimes. So there's no doubt about that COVID is increasing on
24	construction projects.
25	Now, I don't think that your rule goes far enough, as far as requirement

CALIFORNIA REPORTING, LLC 229 Napa Street, Rodeo, California 94572 (510) 224-4476

for testing. I don't know how employers don't see how providing testing doesn't
increase this feeling of safety and the profitability of projects. If I wasn't doing the
testing on our jobs, I honestly don't know how my employees would feel safe coming to
work. We've tried to scale back the testing because of pressure from certain people.
But we've made sure that we've continued it. Each time we've talked about scaling
back, our employees have said, "Please keep the program. Please keep the program."

Now that being said, there is a lot of talk in the media about the fact that testing is scarce. I haven't found that to be the case at all since July. We get 24-hour results on PCR, molecular PCR tests, the ones that go up through the nose. I get test results in 24 hours with a great lab that works out of Los Angeles. They come to all my projects and we can test all of my projects in one day. And I'm doing one billion dollars of work a year. So I have a lot of sites all over California. And they've been great. If you mandate increased testing, businesses –

14 MS. SHUPE: Two minutes.

15 MR. BRAUNINGER: -- are going to figure it out, for sure.

16 There's one thing in your rule, two things in your rule that I think are 17 really a problem for businesses like mine that have been implementing testing. The first 18 one is that you don't require a negative test for an employee to come back to work. 19 There are people who refuse to test on my projects. They just have to be the jerks that 20 won't play nice with all the other workers. They've got some pro-Trump thing or 21 whatever is going on in their brain and they refuse to test. And its these guys that are 22 spoiling it for the feeling of safety for all of the other people.

Now if you get an outbreak on a site, you need to know and all the other
 people need to know that everyone that comes back is clean.

25 CHAIR THOMAS: Scott, you're going to have to wrap up.

1	MR. BRAUNINGER: I understand. I have one last thing and that is that
2	mandating it as a 14-day period for someone who's been exposed that they can come
3	back to work isn't consistent with the CDC guidelines. The CDC guidelines allow people
4	who were exposed to come back to work for employers that have an active testing
5	program. And I urge the committee to consider following the CDC guidelines for
6	employers that do provide testing programs to allow people to return to work who were
7	exposed faster than the 14-day period. Thank you.
8	CHAIR THOMAS: Thank you, Scott. Appreciate it.
9	John, who do we have next up in the queue?
10	MR. GOTCHER: Our next commenter is Elvira Herrera from Lideres
11	Campesinas.
12	CHAIR THOMAS: Elvira, can you hear us?
13	MS. HERRERA: Yes, hi.
14	CHAIR THOMAS: Hi. Go ahead.
15	MS. HERRERA: Yes hi. Thank you for this space. I was just calling to
16	raise some of the concerns that we have here in the valley where I live. We have been
17	visiting many of the farm workers here where we go give out free masks to the farm
18	workers. But at the same time, they have been disclosing to us about how they've been
19	violating some of their rights about safety issues.
20	And also regarding the packinghouse when they have someone that was
21	sick. And they explained her that she had to go back to work, and that she was going to
22	lose her job. Someone else disclosed out in the field that she was feeling sick. The
23	foreman just told her to sit down and they put her back to work. And now the other
24	employees were kind of concerned if she had the virus or not.
25	But again, others rights have been violated. They're not respecting them.

If they will report to them, it's either just stay here or if you go home you're
(indecipherable). Sometimes they retaliate against them. So we were just concerned
and see if we could have these regulations be enforced, so they could give them the
training. Because we did ask those questions. We said, "Do they give you guys any type
of training in how to take care of yourselves?" And they said, "They don't talk to us
about anything like that."

There are these areas that they give them papers to sign that they are
taking the training. And I did ask, "Are they giving you the training?" They said, "No,
they just tell us to sign the papers."

(indiscernible) company that has been cited so many times for breaking their regulations
for safety. But they still continue doing it and so it's a lot of going on here. And that's
one of our concerns that we need to have this safety issue to be taking cared of to
protecting the farm workers.
CHAIR THOMAS: Two minutes. Can you wrap it up, please? Thank you.

So this is a lot of things that are going on here where I'm at. I have a

16 MS. HERRERA: (Indiscernible) concerned about that.

17 Okay. Yeah, so it's just a concern. The comment is that nobody cares

18 about what they're doing out in the field. So we're just asking please, you know, do

19 something about these regulations to be enforced while they're out there working, for

20 their own safety.

10

21 CHAIR THOMAS: Thank you.

We are going to take a break. It is two minutes to 4:00. We will be back in session at 4:10. We're in recess. Thank you.

- 24 (Off the record at 3:58 p.m.)
- 25 (On the record at 4:12 p.m.)

1	CHAIR THOMAS: All right. We are back in session. And John, who do
2	we have in the queue?
3	MR. GOTCHER: Our next commenter is Yesenia Gonzalez, from UFCW
4	Local 1167.
5	CHAIR THOMAS: Yesenia, can you hear me?
6	MS. GONZALEZ: Yes. Can you hear me?
7	CHAIR THOMAS: Yes. Go right ahead please.
8	MS. GONZALEZ: Good afternoon Standards Board Members. My name is
9	Yesenia Gonzales. And I am with United Food and Commercial Workers Union, Local
10	1167. On behalf of 20,000 essential grocery, pharmacy, retail and meat packing
11	workers, I speak in support of adopting the emergency temporary standard before you
12	today.
13	Our union, UFCW Local 1167, represents essential workers in the
14	counties of San Bernardino, Riverside and parts of Los Angeles and Imperial. Our
15	members have shown up to work every day during this pandemic so that our
16	communities can have access to public health, food, medicine and other essential items.
17	Unfortunately, many of the workplaces that our local represents have
18	experienced outbreaks and we have unfortunately lost members to the virus. In the
19	beginning of the pandemic, we had to fight very, very hard with the employers to
20	provide workers with the proper PPE needed to do their jobs. And now, as we're seeing
21	another rise in COVID-19 cases, employers are refusing to enforce social distancing
22	requirements and other guidelines that we know will help protect workers' lives.
23	More than usual, employers under-report positive cases and
24	consequently expose other workers. We need to do everything that we can to keep
25	essential workers and the general public safe in public spaces like grocery stores and

1	pharmacy stores. We are currently in the middle of the holiday season and we know
2	that these public spaces will be filled with shoppers. And this is another reason why
3	these emergency temporary standards are so urgent.
4	As COVID-19 cases continue to surge in California and continue to take
5	the lives of our frontline essential workers, California must respond to the emergency
6	before us today by voting to adopt this emergency temporary standard. There is more
7	work to be done. But this emergency temporary standard is one step closer to
8	providing our frontline workers with the protections that they need to safely continue
9	providing for all of Californians.
10	Thank you for the opportunity to speak today.
11	CHAIR THOMAS: Thank you. Short and concise. I like that.
12	John, who do we got?
13	MR. GOTCHER: Our next commenter is Angelica Preciado, from California
14	Rural Legal Assistance, Incorporated.
15	CHAIR THOMAS: Angelica, can you hear us? Angelica? Angelica? In
16	three, two, one. No Angelica. John, let's move on.
17	MR. GOTCHER: Our next commenter is Jassy Grewal from UFCW Western
18	States Council.
19	CHAIR THOMAS: Is it Jessy? (phonetic)
20	MR. GOTCHER: It's with an "a."
21	CHAIR THOMAS: Are you there, Jessy, Jassy?
22	MS. GREWAL: I am here. Can you hear me?
23	CHAIR THOMAS: Yes. Go right ahead. Thank you.
24	MS. GREWAL: Wonderful. Well good evening, Standard Board Members.
25	My name is Jassy Grewal. And I'm a legislative advocate with the United Food and

Commercial Workers Western States Council or UFCW. On behalf of our 180,000
 members in California, who work at nearly every point on the food chain and many of
 the sectors most impacted by COVID-19, including pharmacies, grocery stores, meat
 packing and food production, agriculture and food delivery drivers in the gig economy, I
 speak in strong support of adopting the emergency temporary standard before you
 today.

Essential workers and UFCW members are disproportionately Latino,
black, immigrant, women and low-wage, and have borne the brunt of workplace COVID19 outbreaks in the past eight months.

Our union has heard countless instances over the past eight months
where employers are not following Cal/OSHA guidance, not notifying workers of
workplace exposures. Workers are not being told about their sick leave rights.
Employers who do not implement (indiscernible) social distancing standards and
employers not providing workers with any personal protective equipment, or PPE, to
keep them and their families safe.
That is why we urge you to support and adopt the emergency temporary

standard before you today. There are literal lives on the line. And a failure to act will result in losing more essential workers to this pandemic, something that is avoidable by adopting the standard today. We need you to act and we need you to act now. As COVID-19 cases continue to surge in California and continue to take the lives of our frontline essential workers, California must respond to the emergency before us today by voting to adopt this emergency temporary standard.

There's more work yet to be done, but this emergency temporary standard is one step closer to providing our frontline workers with the protections they need to safely continue providing for all Californians. The current standards are not

CALIFORNIA REPORTING, LLC 229 Napa Street, Rodeo, California 94572 (510) 224-4476

1 sufficient as we continue to have large workplace outbreaks that is demonstrated in

2 continued uptick in cases. We need to act on this standard.

3 MS. SHUPE: Two minutes.

4 MS. GREWAL: I would just like to add that I have heard several

5 individuals testify that the standard is not consistent with AB 685. As one of the main

- 6 sponsors and lobbyists of AB 685, the standard is consistent with the intent of the
- 7 legislation. And we look forward to working with the Board to work on supplemental
- 8 materials related to this legislation cited in the standard. Thank you for the opportunity
- 9 to provide public comment and for your time today.

10 CHAIR THOMAS: Thank you very much.

11 John, who do we have?

12 MR. GOTCHER: Our next commenter is Tyler Blackney from the Wine

13 Institute.

14 CHAIR THOMAS: Tyler. Can you hear us? Hello, Tyler? Tyler, can you

15 hear us? In three, two, one. All right, Tyler is gone. John, why don't we go to the next.

- 16 MR. GOTCHER: Our next commenter is Stacey Wittorff, from Planned
- 17 Parenthood Affiliates of California.
- 18 CHAIR THOMAS: Stacey, can you hear us?
- 19 MS. WITTORFF: I can hear you. Can you hear me?

20 CHAIR THOMAS: Yes. Go right ahead please.

- 21 MS. WITTORFF: Alright. Wonderful. Thank you. Good afternoon Chair
- 22 Thomas and members of the Board. I'm Stacey Wittorff on behalf of Planned
- 23 Parenthood Affiliates of California, representing the seven affiliates that operate more
- than 100 health center locations.

25 Thank you for your presentation and for the work the Board and staff has

1	done to address how best to protect California workers during the COVID-19 pandemic.
2	We appreciate that the Board, in drafting these emergency regulations, has recognized
3	that healthcare providers are already subject to an extensive regulatory scheme that
4	governs how they must protect employees from aerosol transmissible diseases,
5	including COVID-19.
6	Accordingly, we would just request that the Board include in the
7	regulations the express clarification that employers that our healthcare providers are
8	exempt from these regulations.
9	We thank you for your time today.
10	CHAIR THOMAS: Thank you. Appreciate it.
11	John, who do we have up next?
12	MR. GOTCHER: Our next commenter is Regina Caldwell, from Sutter
13	Behavioral Health.
14	CHAIR THOMAS: Regina, are you on the line?
15	MS. CALDWELL: Yes.
16	CHAIR THOMAS: Go right ahead, please. Make your comments.
17	MS. CALDWELL: Okay. Yes. My name is Regina Caldwell and I'm joining
18	to ask you to vote yes on this emergency COVID prevention standard. This is important
19	at my workplace because I've also been asked to come into work while I'm sick and I had
20	told them that I wasn't feeling well but they asked me to come in anyway. I thought I
21	had the flu. I wasn't sure what I had at the time.
22	And I came in and I came in that Wednesday on the 11th and I tested
23	Friday. And then that Saturday, I tried to come in and I ended up, as soon as I clocked
24	in, I clocked right back out to go home, because I didn't feel well at all. My joints and
25	everything was aching. I had chills, sore throat and everything. So then I tested that

1 Friday. And then that Monday they called me and told me that I tested positive.

2	And also you know the workplace is not I wish we had like cleaner
3	bathrooms. At the facility, we're down to one bathroom for employees, because the
4	bathrooms, they clogged up as well as the patients' bathroom was clogged up. We have
5	the sewer being backed up in the showers. And the patients will go into the red zone,
6	any bathroom that they can find to use, that's not closed or shut down.
7	And that threatened the COVID as well, because we don't have the proper
8	bathrooms. Their bathrooms is the sewer is messed up really bad and so what
9	happens is that they'll lock the bathroom door
10	MS. SHUPE: Two minutes.
11	MS. CALDWELL: so the patients have to go down and find other
12	bathrooms to use. So they'll go into the red zone, or whatever, to relieve themselves.
13	And there's no ventilation in that building. It's a very old building. They've got fans in
14	the hallways. There's no circulation. The nursing station, when it rains
15	CHAIR THOMAS: Can you wrap up your position please? We're over two
16	minutes. What are you asking of the Board?
17	MS. CALDWELL: I'm asking that you guys will vote on the emergency
18	prevention standard so that that's why it's important for me for the vote today. And
19	thank you for your time.
20	CHAIR THOMAS: Thank you very much. I appreciate it.
21	John, who do we have up?
22	MR. GOTCHER: Our next commenter is Rachel Torres of UFCW.
23	CHAIR THOMAS: Rachel, are you on the line? Hello, Rachel? I see you.
24	MS. TORRES: Hi.
25	CHAIR THOMAS: Hi. How are you doing?

1 MS. TORRES: Hello.

2 CHAIR THOMAS: Go ahead.

MS. TORRES: Doing well. Thank you. Thank you so much. Good
afternoon, Standards Board Members. My name is Rachel Torres. I'm the Deputy
Political and Civil Rights Director with UFCW Local 770.

On behalf of the 31,000 members across the central coast and Los
Angeles County, I speak in strong support of adopting the emergency temporary
standard before you today.

9 I want to talk on two main issues that have been addressed earlier. One 10 is on the paid sick leave. The lack of full coverage of paid sick leave continues to be a 11 major problem for essential workers. Every day, grocery and retail workers must report 12 any COVID-related symptoms before entering work. If they report a cough, a headache 13 or even diarrhea, they must stay home, but they're not compensated, so thus 14 incentivizing workers to not report. If they're exposed at stores, they must quarantine, 15 but are not paid for this, once again preventing real contact tracing that will flatten the 16 curve. 17 On the lack of testing, we need on-site testing for worksites where there 18 is a COVID-19 outbreak. When low-wage workers work two to three jobs, they don't 19 have the time or the resources to get tested off site. 20 We had a case with a grocery store in Los Angeles that had 28 infections. 21 Workers pleaded with the City of L.A. and the county to provide on-site testing. We 22 eventually got two days of on-site testing, which prevented infections completely. 23 We've only had one new infection at that store in the past six months. 24 In our jurisdiction, over 1,300 workers have become infected with COVID-25 19. Eight members have died. There's no time for delay. Our house is on fire. We've

1 had eight months to get this right. These provisions will literally save lives, lives that

2 want to see the end of this pandemic. Thank you to the Board for your commitment to

3 California.

- 4 CHAIR THOMAS: Thank you.
- 5 John, who do we have up in the queue?
- 6 MR. GOTCHER: Next commenter is Caitlin Vega from United Here Local

7 11 and Transport Workers of America.

8 CHAIR THOMAS: Caitlin, can you hear us? Caitlyn, I see you. Unmute

9 yourself. Can you unmute? I'm not sure who muted. Hold on one second. We'll see.

10 There you go. Can you -- go ahead. We're still not hearing you.

- 11 MS. VEGA: Can you hear me?
- 12 CHAIR THOMAS: Go ahead.

13 MS. VEGA: Are you able to hear me now?

14 CHAIR THOMAS: Yeah, there you go. Go ahead.

15 MS. VEGA: Thank you so much (indiscernible) on behalf of the Transport

16 Workers Union of America and Unite Here Local 11. We are here in strong support of

- 17 this emergency standard. We have heard the calls for delays from some in the
- 18 employer community and we are here to say workers simply cannot wait any longer. It's
- 19 been eight months of going to work, literally risking their lives every day and risking
- 20 their families and so we think it's essential that this standard be adopted.

21 We're very grateful to all of the work that went into this. The workers,

22 the worker advocates, the unions and the work of Cal/OSHA to address the incredible

- 23 hardship and risk that workers have faced throughout this pandemic. And we believe
- 24 it's long overdue and should certainly be adopted. Thank you so much.

25 CHAIR THOMAS: Thank you very much. I appreciate it.

John, go ahead.

1

2 MR. GOTCHER: Our next commenter is Lauren Hajik, from California
 3 Groceries Association.

4 CHAIR THOMAS: Lauren, you are in the queue. Can you hear us? 5 MS. HAJIK: Yes, thank you Mr. Chair. Mr. Chair and members, Lauren 6 Hajik on behalf of California Grocers Association. Thank you for hearing our comments. 7 I'd first like to just align our comments with Cal Chamber early this 8 morning with concerns about consistency with existing laws, jurisdictional issues and 9 lack of stakeholder involvement in the regulatory process. 10 The Grocery Association was one of the first industries to have extensive 11 guidelines and adoption of partitions, PPE and a lot of other safety protocols that were 12 adopted by many other industries and are being enforced today. We think that we can 13 have input as to what has worked, what has not worked and where successes can be 14 found in protecting our essential workforce. Because we agree that we need to do what 15 we need to do to protect our essential workforce, but are concerned that these 16 regulations are rushed and will just create confusion and unnecessary negative impacts. 17 We ask the Board to pause today and really sit down and work with 18 stakeholders over these next couple months to identify what works best, and where 19 there are potential holes that this regulation could fill, to ensure that we're protecting 20 the workforce, but allowing business to continue as we live with COVID. Thank you. 21 CHAIR THOMAS: Thank you. 22 John, on to the next. 23 MR. GOTCHER: Our next commenter is El'gin Avila, from Blue Green 24 Alliance.

25 CHAIR THOMAS: Hello, are you there? Hello?

CALIFORNIA REPORTING, LLC 229 Napa Street, Rodeo, California 94572 (510) 224-4476

1	MR. GOTCHER: Elgin
2	MR. AVILA: Can you hear me now?
3	CHAIR THOMAS: Yes. Go ahead. We can hear you.
4	MR AVILA: Can you hear me now? Sorry about that. I am the Director of
5	Occupational and Environmental Health and Equity over at Blue Green Alliance. So I just
6	want to share a few of my thoughts regarding this regarding the ETS.
7	So as someone who has worked with federal OSHA previously, I highly
8	support the ETS. A lot of the standards and a lot of the guidance that we have put out
9	is, I would say, complimentary to the ETS.
10	We all know that COVID-19 has ravaged a lot of our families, our loved
11	ones. And the ETS is again not fully comprehensive and not as robust as maybe
12	everyone would like. But it is a very strong foundation that can lead to ultimately
13	influencing a national standard, and hopefully a permanent standard, that can also be
14	applied to infectious diseases generally.
15	We at BGA, we have support for Cal ETS and we hope that you will accept
16	and obviously put it in place, and ultimately lead to a more permanent standard. We
17	wanted to keep it brief, so thank you for your time and we greatly appreciate it.
18	CHAIR THOMAS: Thank you very much. Appreciate your briefness.
19	John, who's next in the queue?
20	UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Take care.
21	MR. GOTCHER: Our next commenter is Ken Smith from University of
22	California.
23	CHAIR THOMAS: Ken, can you hear us?
24	MR. SMITH: Yes, good evening, Chair Thomas. Can you hear me?
25	CHAIR THOMAS: Good evening. Go right ahead.

1 MR. SMITH: Thank you very much for the opportunity here to provide 2 comments. First, like the original petitioner in the Division, the University of California 3 recognizes the need for a specific OSHA standard aligned for COVID prevention. 4 However, we are concerned with the rushed nature of the process for two reasons. 5 One, as other commenters have provided, there was not enough time for 6 employers to fully evaluate the substance and the impact of the regulation contained in 7 the ETS. 8 Second, and most notably, the regulations, in some cases, are technically 9 inconsistent with existing law and guidance. These inconsistencies should be reconciled 10 before the regulations go into effect. As you may know, compliance with inconsistent 11 regulations always presents a significant challenge for employers like the university. To 12 illustrate that, let me just give three quick examples in the minute I have left. 13 The first is the requirement for notifications within one business day for 14 COVID exposures. The proposed regulation establishes that requirement for only 15 individuals that were within six feet of an infected individual for 15 minutes. While the 16 new Labor Code regulation that goes into effect in January 1st, from AB 685, requires 17 that that notification be provided to all employees at the worksite of that infected 18 individual. 19 The second inconsistency is with the exemption for employers that are 20 covered by the existing ATD standard. The language in the proposed ETS exempts only 21 employees covered by that standard, but not places of employment. So it's not clear 22 what the intention is. For instance, in a large hospital organization, not all employees 23 receive ATD training and fit testing requirements. Only those that are anticipated to 24 have exposure to aerosolized transmissible pathogens.

25 So for example, cooks or parking attendants or people in billing in a

CALIFORNIA REPORTING, LLC 229 Napa Street, Rodeo, California 94572 (510) 224-4476

1	hospital don't receive ATD. Was the intent of the Division and this Board to apply this
2	standard to those individuals that work at a hospital?
3	MS. SHUPE: Two minutes.
4	MR. SMITH: I'll be short on the other ones here. But the last one I think
5	is particular is there was an incorrect use of the term "isolation" for exposed individuals
6	and not sick individuals. The correct word would have "quarantined."
7	Now certainly here, we know that the decision of the Board coming up
8	here will have large impact. We do ask that perhaps there would be a delayed
9	implementation date or adoption date to allow some of these technical differences to
10	be corrected prior to the law taking affect. Thank you. That concludes my remarks.
11	CHAIR THOMAS: Thank you, Ken. Appreciate it.
12	John, who do we have in the queue?
13	MR. GOTCHER: Next commenter is Elizabeth Torez. There's no affiliation
14	here, but this will be an interpreted comment.
15	CHAIR THOMAS: All right. Elizabeth, are you with us?
16	MS. TOREZ: Yes.
17	CHAIR THOMAS: Go ahead and make your comments please.
18	MS. TOREZ: (Speaking in Spanish.)
19	MR. GOTCHER: Hi, sorry. If I could jump in here really quick. So it looks
20	like we have lost Susana Haikalis from the call, who's our interpreter.
21	CHAIR THOMAS: Okay.
22	MR. GOTCHER: So we'll try to reconnect her. I apologize.
23	CHAIR THOMAS: Then we'll go on to the next commenter and we'll try
24	and come back, okay?
25	MR. GOTCHER: Okay.

1	CHAIR THOMAS: Yeah, John. Go to the next commenter please.
2	MR. GOTCHER: Just need to move a few things around here. Okay, our
3	next commenter is Gail M. Blanchard-Saiger from California Hospital Association.
4	CHAIR THOMAS: Gail, can you hear us?
5	MS. BLANCHARD-SAIGER: Yes. Can you hear me?
6	CHAIR THOMAS: Yeah. Go right ahead. There you are.
7	MS. BLANCHARD-SAIGER: Oh excellent. I've been waiting six hours for
8	this. Thank you for the opportunity to speak. I will dispense with the formalities given
9	the time. I will try to speak slowly. I do have three points.
10	California hospital workers, all of them, from frontline workers, our
11	nurses, our environmental services, dietary, medical records, we're all on the front lines
12	of this COVID response. And their work is deeply impacted by the actions of state and
13	federal agencies. Our ability to care for our patients really depends on a very clear and
14	concise regulatory structure.
15	So later, I'll incorporate the comments made by others, but really, the
16	hospital-specific issue is one actually that was just identified, and I might have a little bit
17	different take on it. But it is that different language used in the emergency standard
18	that focuses on employees versus the scope of the aerosol transmissible disease
19	standard which focuses on facilities. And the aerosol transmissible disease standard is
20	very clear that it covers facilities and all work within the facility.
21	So actually, what I'm asking is for is not an exemption from this
22	regulatory standard. You don't need to change any language. I'm just requesting on the
23	record that you clarify that interpretation of the subsection and scope of the ETS that
24	refers to employees when covered by section 5199, which is the ATD standard that, that
25	means that anybody working in a facility identified by the ATD standard, that is

- 1 consistent. And again, hospitals are not trying to avoid any regulatory oversight. Our
- 2 point is that it already exists.
- 3 Obviously, a frontline nurse gets different ATD training than somebody in
 4 the payroll department but it is without question the ATD --
- 5 MS. SHUPE: Two minutes.

6 MS. BLANCHARD-SAIGER: -- standard covers every single employee in the 7 hospital. And it makes no sense to interpret the ETS scope in any other fashion. So that 8 is number one.

9 With respect to our members that have entities that are not covered by 10 the aerosol transmissible disease standard, if they've got offsite corporate offices and 11 other organizations like that, I incorporate or sign on to the comments made by the Cal 12 Chamber and Nicole Rice from CMTA and Andrew Sommer.

And the third point I want to make is really a public health issue. We are very concerned about the public health implications of this emergency standard. Those were articulated by Michael Hall from the Pacific Maritime Association, supply chain disruption. This is the last -- this is absolutely the (indiscernible) time to be dealing with supply chain disruption. And so closing down organizations, when you've got 20 people out of 300 –

19 MS. SHUPE: Three minutes.

20 MS. BLANCHARD-SAIGER: -- who maybe work in different locations, so it 21 wasn't necessarily an occupational exposure, really is very concerning to us.

And with respect to testing, I know there's one gentleman, a contractor, who said he was able to get tests back within 24 hours. I commend him for getting that level of service. I am personally aware of hospitals where that is not the case. It is

taking three days to get tests back. It depends on where you contract for testing. It is

1 not unlimited.

2	CHAIR THOMAS: Can you wrap it up, Gail?
3	MS. BLANCHARD-SAIGER: And you'll see increasingly from the testing task
4	force that the state has operated that there are serious concerns about the supplies. So
5	the testing requirements that are incorporated in this really raise serious public health
6	concerns. And if you haven't connected with Health and Human Services on that, I
7	strongly recommend that you do because we are very concerned about the public
8	health implications.
9	Thank you for the time, but I do want to reiterate again a real hard ask
10	just to make it clear on the record. If you do adopt this standard tonight, to make it
11	clear that it does not apply to facilities that are covered by the aerosol transmissible
12	disease standard, which would be consistent with that existing standard. Thank you.
13	CHAIR THOMAS: Thank you.
14	MR. GOTCHER: Our next commenter is Elizabeth Torez again, we have
15	her back in.
16	CHAIR THOMAS: All right. Do we have a translator? Do we have
17	everything in order here for this one?
18	MR. GOTCHER: Should be.
19	CHAIR THOMAS: Okay. Elizabeth, por favor?
20	MS. TOREZ: (Through Interpreter Haikalis.) Good afternoon, my name is
21	Elizabeth Perez and for three years I had been working in the strawberries. I work with
22	the farmer leaders and we have been helping I have been helping as a volunteer and
23	have been distributing masks for COVID-19.
24	So I'm worried at this time because the supervisors in the fields are not
25	giving the workers paper towels, disinfectant. So the workers are at high risk because
1 their bosses or the supervisors are not providing protection equipment.

2	So I was wondering if you can give the information to the supervisors, so
3	that they continue asking people to keep a social distance. At the beginning of this, they
4	did provide social distance, but now they do not. So if you could try to tell them to
5	continue providing this and so that they can continue asking for social distance between
6	people.
7	CHAIR THOMAS: It's been two minutes. Can you have her wrap it up
8	please?
9	MS. TOREZ: (Through Interpreter Haikalis.) That is all that I want to say.
10	CHAIR THOMAS: Well, thank you very much. We appreciate your
11	comments.
12	John, who's up next?
13	MR. GOTCHER: Our next commenter is Marilu Gonzalez, from MICOP.
14	And this is going to be a translated comment, Susana.
15	CHAIR THOMAS: Marilu, can you hear us? Por favor?
16	MS. GONZALEZ: Yes.
17	CHAIR THOMAS: Si.
18	MS. GONZALEZ: (Through Interpreter Haikalis.) Good afternoon.
19	CHAIR THOMAS: Buenos tardes.
20	MS. GONZALEZ: Good afternoon to the Members. I am Marilu Gonzalez
21	and I work with a Mixteco indigenous group in Ventura.
22	To most of us here, we know that agricultural workers were essential
23	workers. They've been working during this pandemic in California. So the essential
24	workers are hoping they could understand in their own language the standard, because
25	if they don't understand, they cannot follow the standards. And they're essential for us

1 to eat.

2	CHAIR THOMAS: Two minutes. Can you wrap it up please? Thank you.
3	MS. GONZALEZ: (Through Interpreter Haikalis.) So if the employers could
4	provide all the agricultural workers the masks because these are very expensive.
5	Because this is one of the points where we could avoid the spread of this disease.
6	That is all. Thank you very much. That is all.
7	CHAIR THOMAS: Gracias, Maria. Thank you.
8	John, who is next.
9	MR. GOTCHER: Our next commenter is Rosalva and there's no affiliation
10	recorded here. And this will be an interpreted comment, so Susana, if you would help
11	with the introduction?
12	MS. HAIKALIS: Thank you.
13	CHAIR THOMAS: Thank you. Buenos tardes. Senor. Por favor.
14	(Indiscernible) Senora, pardon.
14 15	(Indiscernible) Senora, pardon. ROSALVA: (Through Interpreter Haikalis.) My comment that I have
15	ROSALVA: (Through Interpreter Haikalis.) My comment that I have
15 16	ROSALVA: (Through Interpreter Haikalis.) My comment that I have (indiscernible) the farm worker leaders. So we have noted as volunteers in the
15 16 17	ROSALVA: (Through Interpreter Haikalis.) My comment that I have (indiscernible) the farm worker leaders. So we have noted as volunteers in the community that there's a need for more health and safety resources for the smaller
15 16 17 18	ROSALVA: (Through Interpreter Haikalis.) My comment that I have (indiscernible) the farm worker leaders. So we have noted as volunteers in the community that there's a need for more health and safety resources for the smaller farmers. So we have noted that they don't have the same available cash to protect us
15 16 17 18 19	ROSALVA: (Through Interpreter Haikalis.) My comment that I have (indiscernible) the farm worker leaders. So we have noted as volunteers in the community that there's a need for more health and safety resources for the smaller farmers. So we have noted that they don't have the same available cash to protect us the same way as the larger companies do. So we have noted that there are many
15 16 17 18 19 20	ROSALVA: (Through Interpreter Haikalis.) My comment that I have (indiscernible) the farm worker leaders. So we have noted as volunteers in the community that there's a need for more health and safety resources for the smaller farmers. So we have noted that they don't have the same available cash to protect us the same way as the larger companies do. So we have noted that there are many resources, but the farm workers are not getting these resources because they don't get
15 16 17 18 19 20 21	ROSALVA: (Through Interpreter Haikalis.) My comment that I have (indiscernible) the farm worker leaders. So we have noted as volunteers in the community that there's a need for more health and safety resources for the smaller farmers. So we have noted that they don't have the same available cash to protect us the same way as the larger companies do. So we have noted that there are many resources, but the farm workers are not getting these resources because they don't get the information. So somehow, if they could get that information.
 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 	ROSALVA: (Through Interpreter Haikalis.) My comment that I have (indiscernible) the farm worker leaders. So we have noted as volunteers in the community that there's a need for more health and safety resources for the smaller farmers. So we have noted that they don't have the same available cash to protect us the same way as the larger companies do. So we have noted that there are many resources, but the farm workers are not getting these resources because they don't get the information. So somehow, if they could get that information. So we have seen that the cases are rising in the winter will be tough, so

CALIFORNIA REPORTING, LLC 229 Napa Street, Rodeo, California 94572 (510) 224-4476

1	ROSALVA: (Through Interpreter Haikalis.) (indiscernible) media
2	information. If there's information that we can give to the community that we are
3	working with so (indiscernible) speak Spanish.
4	CHAIR THOMAS: Can you translate it and ask her to wrap it up please?
5	ROSALVA: (Through Interpreter Haikalis.) They have the resources. If
6	they could explain directly in person, they could explain to them in their own language.
7	Thank you.
8	CHAIR THOMAS: Thank you very much. We appreciate it.
9	ROSALVA: (Through Interpreter Haikalis.) Thank you for the opportunity
10	to participate.
11	CHAIR THOMAS: You're welcome.
12	Chris has an announcement to make.
13	MS. SHUPE: Before we go to our next speaker, we have a number of
14	users that are seeking to use the web chat as a discussion forum. And while I appreciate
15	their engagement, we would like to reserve the chat for communication to staff to
16	resolve technical issues as needed. So if you could please take your discussions off the
17	web chat. Thank you.
18	CHAIR THOMAS: Thanks.
19	John, who do we have?
20	MR. GOTCHER: Our next commenter is Melissa Peters from Littler.
21	CHAIR THOMAS: Melissa, can you hear us?
22	MS. PETERS: Hello.
23	CHAIR THOMAS: Hi. How you doing?
24	MS. PETERS: Can you hear me?
25	CHAIR THOMAS: Yes.

1	MS. PETERS: Good. How are you doing?
2	CHAIR THOMAS: Go ahead.
3	MS. PETERS: Okay, great. Thank you.
4	So my name is Melissa Peters and I'm with Littler Mendelson. Prior to
5	joining Littler, I was an attorney at Cal/OSHA for over six years, so I have a unique
6	perspective in that I understand how these regulations are enforced by the Division
7	after they are effective. And I also understand how difficult it will be for employers to
8	comply with this proposed emergency standard as it's currently drafted.
9	Since COVID-19 arrived in the U.S., I have been a member of Littler's
10	COVID task force and have assisted hundreds of clients implement processes and
11	procedures to protect their workers and assist the workforce to adjust to the pandemic.
12	I think everyone present today agrees that COVID-19 is serious. I also believe that most
13	employers care about worker safety because it's in their best interest to have a healthy
14	workforce who can show up to work and perform their jobs.
15	For this reason, we need to have a standard that is clear and can be
16	implemented by all employers, big and small alike. Right now, even the largest of
17	employers with seemingly sufficient administrative resources are struggling to comply
18	with continually changing local and state orders.
19	For small and medium employers without these resources, it is near to
20	impossible to track and comply with existing regulations. If this standard is pushed
21	through without sufficient time for the Board to review comments from the business
22	community, we are going to end up with an ineffective regulation because employers
23	are going to have to guess at how to best comply with its requirements.
24	When I worked at Cal/OSHA, I learned that it doesn't matter how great a
25	written safety program is. If it's not implemented or cannot be implemented, it's

1 ineffective. And an ineffective safety program doesn't protect employees. Similarly,

2 regardless of how comprehensive a regulation appears on its face, if its requirements

3 are unclear, it's ineffective because employers will be unable to comply.

Ultimately, such a regulation will not improve safety and health in the
workplace and will not protect workers. I echo the concerns raised by others today,
including Rob Moutrie, Bruce Wick, Andrew Sommer, Brian Mello, Michael Donlon, Fred
Walter and Karen Tynan, who I believe has not yet spoken. She was skipped.

8 MS. SHUPE: Two minutes.

9 MS. PETERS: In the interest of efficiency, I won't repeat everything that 10 has been said. But it's important to highlight a few of the more concerning issues raised 11 by this regulation. The inconsistency between the requirements in the proposed

12 standards and those contained in AB 685 and SB 1159 are very concerning.

Further, the provisions that exceed the scope of Cal/OSHA's jurisdiction are similarly concerning. These include requirements in providing benefits and protective (indiscernible) for COVID positive employees, requirements that fall under DLS's wheelhouse, not Cal/OSHA's. There has not been adequate discussion on how implementing general requirements like social distancing, face coverings, cleaning, contact tracing and notification is not currently being served by 3203.

Finally, it's critical that all stakeholders be heard. For this reason it may be necessary to delay the vote until the December 3rd advisory committee meeting at the earliest to allow all stakeholders to be able to comment. It is obvious that with the number of people who are providing comments today –

23 MS. SHUPE: Three minutes.

24 MS. PETERS: -- that there is grave concern about this regulation as its 25 currently drafted. Thank you for your time.

CALIFORNIA REPORTING, LLC 229 Napa Street, Rodeo, California 94572 (510) 224-4476

1	CHAIR THOMAS: Thank you.
2	John, who have we got?
3	MR. GOTCHER: Our next commenter is AJ Rossitto from California Hotel
4	and Lodging Association.
5	CHAIR THOMAS: AJ, can you hear us?
6	MR. ROSSITTO: I can.
7	CHAIR THOMAS: Go right ahead.
8	MR. ROSSITTO: Thank you, Board, for the opportunity to speak today.
9	My name is AJ Rossitto. I'm here on behalf of the California Hotel and Lodging
10	Association. Employee and guest safety are critical to our industry, and our members
11	deserve effective and functional protection. However, like many of the other speakers
12	and public commenters
13	MS. SHUPE: Sir, you're fading out.
14	CHAIR THOMAS: Yeah, we can't hear you very well. Can you talk louder?
15	Hello?
16	MR. ROSSITTO: Is this better?
17	CHAIR THOMAS: Yeah, can you talk a little louder? We're having trouble
18	with you. Hearing.
19	MR. ROSSITTO: Okay. Apologies.
20	CHAIR THOMAS: There you go.
21	MR. ROSSITTO: Employee and guest safety are critical for our industry.
22	And our members have taken effective precautions to protect both. However, like
23	many of the other speakers and public commenters, we are concerned with the
24	implementation timelines and the language used to identify several of the key
25	requirements, including employee health data collection requirements, how and when

- 1 testing should be provided to employees, vacations, processes, potential hazards, how
- 2 to determine who qualifies for testing and notice requirements.
- 3 We'd like to urge the Board to incorporate the clarifying suggestions 4 made in public comments and provide employers time to implement these standards. It 5 is in no one's interest to risk employee safety. And employers are working around the 6 clock to implement the latest changes. But we need to understand the full extent of the 7 changes and have enough time to implement them. Thank you. 8 CHAIR THOMAS: Thank you. 9 John, who do we have in the queue? 10 MR. GOTCHER: Our next commenter is Andrew Gross Gaitan from SEIU 11 United Service Workers West. 12 CHAIR THOMAS: Andrew. Can you hear us, Andrew? Are you there 13 Andrew? Three, two, one. Andrew is not there. 14 John, let's move on. 15 MR. GOTCHER: The next commenter is Ramon Castellblanch of California 16 Alliance for Retired Americans. 17 CHAIR THOMAS: Ramon? 18 MR. CASTELLBLANCH: Yes. Good evening, Board Members. 19 CHAIR THOMAS: Good evening. 20 MR. CASTELLBLANCH: And I commend you on all the hours you've sat 21 through. This is just great. Your commitment is really awesome. Thank you so much. 22 So I'm a public health professor, as well as representing California 23 Alliance for Retired Americans, an organization of coalitions representing over 24 (indiscernible) million people just in California. 25 If you haven't heard this point, I just want to make it. The vaccine is not

1 going to end the need for safety measures to protect us from COVID-19. The vaccine is 2 only going to -- its only being tested to make sure that the person who gets the vaccine 3 will be able to resist the bad effects of the virus. However, there's no testing, there's no 4 knowledge that it'll prevent transmission. And so transmission is going to continue to 5 be a problem even if, best case scenario, we have a vaccine for 200 million Americans by 6 May, which is the best case scenario. We still are going to need your safety rules to be 7 in place to protect the lives of Americans and Californians in particular. 8 So I commend you on your patience. I hope very much that you do go 9 forward today. A great many lives are at stake and you have the ball in your court. 10 Thank you. 11 CHAIR THOMAS: Thank you. And I just want to comment and say yeah, 12 we are amazing, the Board, we're amazing. Thanks. 13 John, who do we have in the queue? 14 MR. GOTCHER: Our next commenter is Matthew Allen of Western 15 Growers Association. CHAIR THOMAS: Matthew, can you hear us? 16 17 MR. ALLEN: Yes, can you hear me? 18 CHAIR THOMAS: Go right ahead. We can hear you. 19 MR. ALLEN: Yeah, good evening Mr. Chair and Members of the Board. 20 I'm Matthew Allen with the Western Growers Association raising concerns about the 21 EST this evening, specifically regarding the new text and new language that's not already 22 incorporated in the previously reviewed Cal/OSHA guidance documents. 23 There is great concern within our industry about the infeasibility of the 24 provisions. And we're still evaluating that, given the very, very short turnaround time 25 on the proposal. It's unfortunate that we're in this place right now and definitely would

1 have wished that we would have done the advisory committee process prior to this,

2 versus after potential approval of the regulation.

3 I want to call specific attention to the provisions in the housing section 4 and on transportation. A great deal of effort has been given to those areas within our 5 industry when it comes to engineering controls, making sure that we are doing 6 everything we can to ensure the safety of our workforce. And we notice that 7 engineering controls are not included in either one of those sections, although they 8 have been mentioned by previous commenters that there are employers out there that 9 have developed partitions and other engineering controls to ensure workforce safety. 10 Workforce safety is an absolute priority for Western Growers. And we 11 look forward to continue having conversations with the Board on COVID-19 prevention, 12 but this language is extremely concerning. And I would be remiss if I did not mention 13 the fact that there are several instances in the proposal that seem to go very far beyond 14 the scope and authority of Cal/OSHA. That's on issues of paid leave, on issues that 15 would normally be under DLSE. 16 And then also on housing provisions. Employer provided housing is 17 actually regulated through the ---18 MS. SHUPE: Two minutes. 19 MR. ALLEN: (indiscernible) Development Department, not through 20 Cal/OSHA. And at this time, we would request that this proposal not move forward. 21 Thank you. 22 CHAIR THOMAS: Do we still have you, or have you finished your 23 comments? 24 MR. ALLEN: Yes, thank you. I finished my comments. Thank you for the 25 opportunity to comment.

CALIFORNIA REPORTING, LLC 229 Napa Street, Rodeo, California 94572 (510) 224-4476

1	CHAIR THOMAS: Oh, thank you very much.
2	John, who have we got?
3	MR. GOTCHER: The next commenter is Karen Tynan from Ogletree
4	Deakins.
5	CHAIR THOMAS: Karen, are you there?
6	MS. TYNAN: Yes, I'm here. I hope you can hear me.
7	CHAIR THOMAS: I can see you. How are you doing? It's getting late, 5:00
8	o'clock.
9	MR. TYNAN: I've had to turn the lights on behind me. Thank you. I will
10	truncate my comments and add to what Ms. Peters said from Littler. I'd like to focus on
11	the inconsistent definitions and difficulties with AB 685 and SB 1159 with this new
12	proposed regulation. AB 685 has a definition of "worksite." SB 1159 refers to a "specific
13	place of employment." And this new proposed regulation refers to "workplace or
14	exposed workplace," so we've got some problematic non-dovetailing there.
15	Specifically, I'd like to talk with you briefly about the need for a revision in
16	the proposed regulation. AB 685 has a different notice requirement. Yes, the
17	timeframe is the same, but the information is different and inconsistent. And also, AB
18	685 requires notification of the exclusive representative when there is the exposure.
19	And that is contrary to this proposed regulation's 3205(c)(3)(C) language about
20	protecting personal identifying information. That's very concerning to me.
21	So what I would like to specifically request is revisions prior to any
22	adoption and that these language differences and problematic conflicts in recent
23	legislation and this regulation be addressed in an advisory committee as soon as
24	possible. Thank you. Thank you everyone for your patience. It's been seven hours.
25	CHAIR THOMAS: Has it been, Karen, seven hours? All right, well now I'm

1 really tired. Thank you for your comments.

2 John, who do we got up?

3 MR. GOTCHER: Our nest commenter is Mamula Ramirez, who works with 4 farm workers.

5 CHAIR THOMAS: Mamula, are you there? 6 MS. RAMIREZ: Yes. 7 CHAIR THOMAS: Buenos tardes. Buenos noches. 8 MS. RAMIREZ: (Through Interpreter Haikalis.) Good afternoon. My 9 name is Mamula Ramirez and like I said, I'm working with farm workers leaders. I live in 10 Coachella Valley and I have received many complaints. 11 So I know a farm worker who is bad because of the COVID situation. 12 Because she's not receiving correct information, and if they complained they will be 13 either terminated or laid off. And another farm worker, who is the mother of another 14 farm worker, was complaining because they made them take COVID tests. It was a urine 15 test and they had to take it in the public bathroom. So she was worried because of this 16 test being done in the field, so she complained about it and she was terminated. Oh, 17 she was actually not terminated. Her son was terminated because he also worked in the 18 fields, and she moved to work elsewhere. But she didn't want to do it there because 19 she thought it was not hygienic to do it there in the public bathroom. 20 MS. SHUPE: Two minutes. 21 CHAIR THOMAS: Can you have this person wrap up her comments 22 please? His comments? 23 So this is what I want. I wanted to inform you that the recent regularities 24 that are happening, that they are being threatened if they complain or they lose their 25 job if they complain. So they worry, and so many people don't know what farm

CALIFORNIA REPORTING, LLC 229 Napa Street, Rodeo, California 94572 (510) 224-4476

1	workers, what they're doing with farm workers in the field and the way they're treating
2	them.
3	CHAIR THOMAS: Can you have the person wrap up their comments
4	please and what they'd like the Board to do?
5	MS. RAMIREZ: (Through Interpreter Haikalis.) So I just wanted to know
6	how can we help those farm workers because they're being tested in some
7	(indiscernible) who is doing this.
8	MS SHUPE: Three minutes.
9	CHAIR THOMAS: All right. We'll take those comments into consideration.
10	Thank you.
11	MS. RAMIREZ: (Through Interpreter Haikalis.) Thank you. Bye.
12	CHAIR THOMAS: Thank you.
13	John, who do we have next in the queue? And I believe we have 10
14	commenters left.
15	MS. SHUPE: Approximately.
16	CHAIR THOMAS: Approximately, so John, go ahead.
17	MR. GOTCHER: Our next commenter is George, or Jorge Toledano,
18	MICOP.
19	CHAIR THOMAS: Jorge, are you there?
20	MR. TOLEDANO: (Through Interpreter Haikalis.) Yes I'm here. Good
21	afternoon.
22	CHAIR THOMAS: Yes, continue.
	CHAIR THOMAS: Yes, continue. MR. TOLEDANO: (Through Interpreter Haikalis.) Hi, I'm with
22	

and even if this standard is approved, many times, they don't get this information in
 the field.

3 So I'm very worried because there is no water. Yesterday, two people 4 came into the office and said that there's no water to wash their hands There's no 5 disinfectant, there's no soap and actually, there wasn't even water to drink. These 6 things made me feel very worried. 7 So when people speak with their supervisor, they will retaliate against 8 them. And these people do not speak Spanish well. They speak Mixteco. 9 CHAIR THOMAS: Translator, can you translate and then ask him what he 10 would like the Board to do? And please get information on his employer. Go ahead. 11 MR. TOLEDANO: (Through Interpreter Haikalis.) So I want this norm to 12 reach the field and for people to be trained in their own language. So I want the Board 13 to make the rules to be followed because many employers don't know what's 14 happening in the field. Like here in the office, we have the bathroom right next door to 15 us. We have water, we have soap, we have everything. But they don't know what they 16 need out in the field, so I would like the Board to make sure that the laws are followed. 17 CHAIR THOMAS: Gracias. Thank you for your comments. 18 MR. TOLEDANO: (Through Interpreter Haikalis.) If possible for the Board, 19 if they could go and inspect the farms so that they know what is going on in those farms. 20 Thank you. 21 CHAIR THOMAS: Thank you. And we'll take those comments in 22 consideration. Thank you very much. 23 John. who do we have next? 24 MR. GOTCHER: Our next commenter is Lorena Martinez, from California 25 Rural Legal Assistance, Incorporated.

CALIFORNIA REPORTING, LLC 229 Napa Street, Rodeo, California 94572 (510) 224-4476

1	CHAIR THOMAS: Lorena. Are you there? Lorena? Lorena, can you hear
2	us? In three, two, one.
3	John, let's go on to the next.
4	MR. GOTCHER: Okay. We're getting close to the end, so I'm looking for
5	the next person.
6	CHAIR THOMAS: Easy does it Board. Easy does it.
7	MR. GOTCHER: Sorry. Stand by.
8	CHAIR THOMAS: It's all right.
9	MS. GALLEGOS: Hi, John. I was on the queue, but the call got
10	disconnected.
11	MR. GOTCHER: That's right, I saw that.
12	MS. GALLEGOS: And I could be here.
13	MR. GOTCHER: This is even better, so you are here. You're up.
14	CHAIR THOMAS: Go ahead.
15	MS. GALLEGOS: Hello. Thank you for the opportunity. My name is Luz
16	Gallegos. I'm calling from the Riverside County. It's specifically organized in Coachella
17	Valley. And we want to elevate a lot of the issues that a lot of the workers have said in
18	other parts of the state that is possibly happening in the Coachella Valley and especially
19	in (indiscernible) Riverside County, it's all the way (indiscernible). In particular, we are
20	the administrators for the Housing for the Harvest for the State of California in this part
21	(indiscernible) region.
22	And what we have been seeing with a lot of the workers that are COVID
23	impacted, or currently COVID positive, or have been exposed to COVID at the job or
24	whatnot, a lot of the workers, they are getting threatened (indiscernible) if they stop
25	working. And this is a big concern not only for us, it should be concern for the entire

1 state.

2	There has to be accountability not from the top down. It has to be a
3	grassroot approach that (indiscernible) we tried the foreman, the supervisors
4	(indiscernible). Of course, they have to meet their end goal to get the workers and get
5	the groceries out, but our workers lives are more important than anything and we need
6	to take care of our workers. We need to make sure that not only are workers
7	(indiscernible) rights, which we're (indiscernible) at the same time (indiscernible)
8	heading and have the opportunity to have a future job. As they're being told that if they
9	go into quarantine, they're not going to have a job in the future.
10	So this is very real that we have that the Board and our state have to
11	enforce the laws to make sure that our workers are being taken care of. Especially if
12	they have symptoms of COVID that they actually have that they're not being that
13	they're not being threatened, that they will have a job in the future.
14	And this is something that's very real. We already lost a lot of our
15	workers. We can't afford to lose any more lives. A farm worker's life is more important.
16	COVID has shed the light on a lot of the inequalities of our farm worker community.
17	And we want to make sure that our workers continue to be valued, not only to the state
18	of California, but throughout the nation.
19	CHAIR THOMAS: Can you wrap up your comments and tell us what you
20	would like the Board to do, please?
21	MS. GALLEGOS: Yes, to really see on a grassroot (indiscernible) as far as
22	accountability and as the next patient at least with the growers on the top. That it
23	actually hits the ground for the folks that are foremen and supervisors (indiscernible)
24	are talking to our workers. Thank you.
25	CHAIR THOMAS: Can you restate your name please, because we didn't

CALIFORNIA REPORTING, LLC 229 Napa Street, Rodeo, California 94572 (510) 224-4476

1 get it.

2	MS. GALLEGOS: Sure. Luz Gallegos. I'm with TODEC.
3	CHAIR THOMAS: You got it? It's Luz L-U-Z. Thank you very much.
4	I don't think we have any other speakers in queue, commenters in the
5	queue. John, is that correct?
6	MR. GOTCHER: We actually have one more, Ana Padilla.
7	CHAIR THOMAS: Ana, are you there?
8	MR. GOTCHER: From UC Merced Community and Labor Center.
9	CHAIR THOMAS: Ana, are you there?
10	MS. PADILLA: Yes. I'm here.
11	CHAIR THOMAS: Go ahead, please.
12	MS. PADILLA: Hello. Good evening. My name is Ana Padilla. I'm the
13	Executive Director of the UC Merced Community and Labor Center. I'm calling today to
14	share research that indicates racial disparities and co-infections and death especially
15	impacting immigrant Latinos and suggest a need for urgent and culturally competent
16	implementation of the ETS.
17	In California, Latinos have experienced a greater increase in pandemic era
18	deaths than any other group. For Latinos, there were 35.9 percent more deaths
19	between March and August 2020 than in 2019. The increase of deaths for immigrant
20	Latinos has been twice as high as that of native-born Latinos. Fourteen counties
21	experienced an over 50 percent increase in immigrant Latino deaths, several with large
22	establishments in industries with long records of employer non-compliance, most
23	notably agriculture and meatpacking. Kings County, located in the Central Valley,
24	experienced over a 450 percent increase in immigrant Latino deaths.
25	These differences suggest greater factors driving COVID-19 deaths than

CALIFORNIA REPORTING, LLC 229 Napa Street, Rodeo, California 94572 (510) 224-4476

1 underlying health disparities or compliance with public health mandates. UC Merced 2 research has found no evidence that Latinos do not follow individual level public 3 mandates, such as wearing masks, avoiding crowds and social distancing. Rather, we 4 find that many Latinos are financially vulnerable and work in environments that are not 5 conducive to public health mandates. 6 In our study, we examined nearly 2,400 Fresno residents' experience with 7 COVID and individual level compliance with public health mandates. We found that 8 Latinos compliance with public health mandates was the same as that of other groups, 9 between 86 and 92 percent. In addition, researchers (indiscernible) have found that 10 rural immigrant Latinos who experienced financial insecurity worked in environments 11 with unsafe practices and did not speak out because of fear of retaliation. 12 In conclusion, we support the state's position in supporting the ETS to 13 mitigate the spread of COVID-19 in low-wage and racially-segregated workplaces. Thank 14 you. 15 CHAIR THOMAS: Thank you very much. I think we have a few more. 16 John, who's up next? 17 MR. GOTCHER: So the next commenter is Lorena Martinez from 18 California Rural Legal Assistance, Incorporated. 19 CHAIR THOMAS: Lorena, are you there? 20 MS. MARTINEZ: Yes. 21 CHAIR THOMAS: Go ahead. 22 MS. MARTINEZ: Good afternoon. My name is Lorena Martinez. I'm a 23 community worker with California Rural Legal Assistance and I've been with California 24 Rural Legal Assistance in the Coachella Valley in Riverside County. And I urge you to 25 support the proposal emergency COVID-19 work protection regulation to prevent illness

1 and save the lives of workers and their families and our community.

As you know, our workers are essential workers, but they're human beings and they deserve to come back to their homes safely. Just to let you know, as part of my responsibility for the last 23 years of working with California Rural Legal Assistance, I've been conducting field observations and group meetings with community members from our region regarding health and safety issues that affect our farm worker community.

8 Since the global pandemic, we have received an overwhelming amount of 9 calls from agricultural workers who fear for their lives, workers and work -- because of 10 the lack of work protection and information from growers and farm labor contractors in 11 our region. Workers have reported the loss of parents, family members, due to the 12 employers' lack of action to protect the lives of our workers and our community. 13 Employees have little or no access to personal protection equipment like masks, face

14 shields or gloves.

Workers have reported that when they have become infected at their
worksites, some employers have failed to provide sick leave as required. We also have physical distancing has been unevenly and ineffectively enforced over the past several
months.

19 The rising increase of cases in Riverside County --

20 MS. SHUPE: Two minutes.

21 MS. MARTINEZ: -- we currently have 78,552 people infected in Riverside

22 County. We have over 1,392 people who have lost their lives with lack of protection,

23 once again from growers and farm labor contractors in our county. In some packing

24 houses, the workers are required to work without social distancing, which has caused

25 the closure of some of our packing houses in Riverside again as many farm workers have

1 become infected by COVID-19.

2	Providing proper training about COVID-19 related rights and benefits that
3	workers are entitled under federal and state law, local laws are crucial. More
4	importantly, this can help prevent in any further community it spreads, even in
5	international
6	MS. SHUPE: Three minutes.
7	CHAIR THOMAS: Can you wrap up your comments please? What you'd
8	like the Board to do?
9	MS. MARTINEZ: Many farm workers have been yes so more
10	important this kind of task, this can help prevent any further community spread. Okay,
11	so basically workers don't have access to medical resources and many of our farm
12	workers in our valley have to cross the border (indiscernible) receive the medical care
13	that has not been provided by the growers or employers here in their home valley.
14	Many farm workers have been previously infected, but do not report this
15	to their employers for fear that they may not be allowed to return to work after trying
16	to. Prior to (indiscernible) we have heard several cases where employers were reluctant
17	to rehire workers that have been infected. We hope that this adoption of this proposed
18	regulation will help prevent any further employment-related
19	MS. SHUPE: Four minutes.
20	MS. MARTINEZ: (indiscernible) or deaths of many of our farm workers.
21	CHAIR THOMAS: Thank you for your comments. We appreciate it.
22	John, who do we have in the queue?
23	MR. GOTCHER: Our next commenter is Fernando Torres from California
24	Rural Legal Assistance.
25	CHAIR THOMAS: Fernando, are you there?

CALIFORNIA REPORTING, LLC 229 Napa Street, Rodeo, California 94572 (510) 224-4476

1	MR. TORRES: Yes, I'm here. Can you hear me okay?
2	CHAIR THOMAS: Yeah, please. Go ahead.
3	MR. TORRES: Okay, thank you. And thank you. My name is Fernando
4	Torres. I'm a community worker with California Rural Legal Assistance. Our office
5	assists farm workers and other low-income community members in Sonoma County.
6	I just want to voice and share my knowledge of issues related to the
7	pending regulation, which have been brought to me by farm workers and farm worker
8	advocates in the area. They each have included a lack of masks and PPE not being
9	provided to poor farm workers so they can do their job in a safe manner. I would say
10	this is the main and most common concern for farm workers since COVID-19 began as
11	they continue to work as essential workers without proper protection.
12	We at CRLA and other agencies, non-profits, have stepped up to
13	distribute these masks to fill in the void. And farm workers continue to drive to these
14	unofficial mask distribution locations, sometimes from very remote places. Farm
15	workers should not need to drive miles to receive this inexpensive crucial tool to protect
16	themselves, their coworkers and families.
17	There's also a lack of proper training in relation to how to maintain social
18	distancing and more importantly the need for majordomos to not just communicate,
19	but to enforce these important protective guidelines. Lack of training, how to sanitize
20	their tools, how to sanitize common areas, rest areas. Some employers are not
21	providing a safe distance when transporting these workers or when these workers drive
22	work-related machinery.
23	In employer provided housing, issues related to the way some employers
24	restrict the free movement of their workers rather than taking the safety measures that
25	would be required by this regulation. This includes adjusting physical distances, bed

1	spacing, better ventilation. They are actually forced to follow very strict guidelines
2	under the control of their employers, like limiting their ability to leave their housing
3	except for work matters

4	CHAIR THOMAS: Two minutes then wrap up.
5	MS. SHUPE: Two minutes.
6	MR. TORRES: I'm wrapping up by prohibiting visitors.
7	CHAIR THOMAS: We've waited this long. Go ahead.
8	MR. TORRES: These measures go well beyond the normal relationship
9	between an employer and employee.
10	To wrap it up, these are again some of the main issues coming up in
11	Sonoma County. And based on the testimony today from actual employees, these are
12	statewide issues that cannot wait any longer. I urge the Board to pay special attention
13	and listen to the voice of those employees that took the time to speak here today, after
14	seven hours. These are issues that the pending regulations will address and that again
15	cannot wait any longer. I do thank you for your time and consideration.
16	CHAIR THOMAS: Thank you so much.
17	John, what do we have?
18	MR. GOTCHER: Our next commenter is Shane Ross from California Rural
19	Legal Assistance.
20	CHAIR THOMAS: Shane, how are you doing?
21	MS. ROSS: Hi, good afternoon. Thanks for the opportunity. Can you
22	hear me okay?
23	CHAIR THOMAS: Yes, yes.
24	MS. ROSS: Okay, so I'll be brief. My name is Shane Ross and I'm an
25	attorney at California Rural Legal Assistance. I'm here to strongly urge you to support to

adopt this regulation. I can echo what my colleagues are saying in the Santa Maria
 area and the Coachella area and in Sonoma County.

I manage our statewide hotline for workers with concerns related to
COVID-19 and since we launched just a few months ago, we've fielding over 500 calls
from workers in 20 different counties. We regularly hear about lack of masks, about
lack of physical distancing, from our callers. A really important aspect of this regulation
that I also just want to highlight here is the requirement that employers provide training
on COVID-19 related benefits that are available to workers.

9 Over two-thirds of our callers to our hotline have tested positive for 10 COVID themselves or are a close contact of someone who has and on that basis, nearly 11 all of them qualify for some form of emergency paid sick leave. But most of them have 12 not been given complete and accurate information

MS. SHUPE: Ms. Ross, I'm so sorry to interrupt you, but could you slow
down just a bit. I've gotten several prompts to say something.

15 MS. ROSS: Sure.

16 MS. SHUPE: Not just for you, but for many speakers.

17 CHAIR THOMAS: (Indiscernible.)

18 MS. ROSS: Sure, I'm trying to make it fast. Maybe I was trying a little too 19 hard. I was saying that over two-thirds of the folks we speak to on our workers rights 20 hotline have either tested positive for COVID-19 or are in close contact of someone who 21 has and are therefore qualified for emergency paid sick leave. But nearly all of them 22 have not received complete and accurate information about these rights from their 23 employers. And without this information low-wage workers who are exposed to COVID-24 19 face a really awful choice to either go without pay or to endanger their coworkers 25 and themselves.

1	So it's not a surprise that when we hear from folks about health and
2	safety concerns, a full third of people are telling us that they're having colleagues
3	coming to work sick or feeling pressure to work sick themselves. So I strongly urge you
4	to support this regulation. It would make a huge difference in the middle of this crisis.
5	Thank you.
6	CHAIR THOMAS: Thank you.
7	John?
8	MR. GOTCHER: Our next commenter is Jen Hamelin, from Public Risk
9	Innovations, Solutions and Management, PRISM.
10	CHAIR THOMAS: Jen, are you there?
11	MS. HAMELIN: I am here. Good evening.
12	CHAIR THOMAS: Good. Make it brief please. Thank you.
13	MS. HAMELIN: I thank you all for hanging in there today. So thank you
14	for allowing me to speak today. I'm speaking on behalf of PRISM and CAJPA
15	representing public agencies including counties, cities, schools, special districts and JPAs
16	throughout the State of California.
17	We agree that providing a safe work environment amongst this pandemic
18	is extremely important. We're just not sure that the urgency by the emergency
19	regulations is necessary or the best course of action when employers have been
20	operating under state and local guidance for eight months and have been doing a fairly
21	good job.
22	I know we've heard a lot of testimony today about some examples of
23	employers that might not be taking steps to provide a safe work environment. And
24	that's where you guys come in to ensure that compliance. But speaking specifically to
25	public agencies and local governments this is not the case and procedures have been in

place to adhere to public health and OSHA standards and guidelines. We think rushing
is through in 14 days does not provide the desired result and is an insult to the folks that
have been working hard to keep the economy running and provide critical and essential
services to the public for the last eight months.

5 This does not take into account non-workplace exposures that the state's 6 contact tracing and data is finding is the primary causes of the spread of the virus. So 7 again, there's no reason for us to be doing this quickly. It's designed to protect workers 8 and we appreciate that. We just don't feel that it's effectively doing it for employers 9 that have already implemented these safe practices and might not be able to comply 10 with rushed and contradicting standards, which will add further delays and confusion 11 providing essential public services. And that's key for our local governments.

12 Without getting into every single detail of the --

13 MS. SHUPE: Two minutes.

MS. HAMELIN: -- thank you -- proposed regulations, I know you've heard a lot today. There's just multiple contradictions between AB 685 and SB 1159 including the timeframes, definitions, notifications, testing, various things. And most importantly

17 there's many of the items that require additional costs and funding, which is not

18 provided for within the current budget.

19 So wrapping it up for you, Chairman --

20 CHAIR THOMAS: Thank you.

21 MS. HAMELIN: -- as mentioned previously we request that the proposed

regulations not be approved today and allow for further discussion, collaboration and

23 alignment with the requirements setting forth with the recent legislative session. And

24 also request that you review the fiscal impact and lack of funding to implement and

25 comply with these additional requirements, especially for public agencies and local

1 governments --

2	CHAIR THOMAS: Wrapping up.
3	MS. HAMELIN: from which the cost to implement them come directly
4	from taxpayer dollars. Thank you for your time.
5	CHAIR THOMAS: Thank you.
6	John?
7	MR. GOTCHER: Our next commenter is Jesus Mendoza from Central
8	California Environmental Justice Network.
9	CHAIR THOMAS: Jesus, are you wish us? Jesus? Jesus, are you with us?
10	In three, two, one. On to the next, John.
11	MR. GOTCHER: Our next commenter is Angelica Preciado from California
12	Rural Legal Assistance Incorporated.
13	CHAIR THOMAS: Angelica. Angelica, are you there? Angelica? In three,
14	two, one. I don't think Angelica is there.
15	John, on to the next.
16	MR. GOTCHER: Our next commenter is Andrew Gross Gaitan.
17	CHAIR THOMAS: Andrew, are you there? Andrew?
18	MR. GAITAN: Yes, I am.
19	CHAIR THOMAS: Yes. Please make your comments brief.
20	MR. GAITAN: Sure.
21	CHAIR THOMAS: Affiliation, please.
22	MR. GAITAN: Andrew Gross Gaitan, I'm the Regional Vice President with
23	SEIU United Service Workers West. We represent about 50,000 janitors, security
24	officers, airport workers and most of the folks servicing our the major entertainment
25	venues in the state's stadiums and arenas.

1	We are urging the Board to support the emergency standard. It's not
2	perfect, but it's definitely needed. We particularly appreciate the step that was taken to
3	make sure that employers will have to notify employees about how frequently
4	disinfection is happening and what the plan is for disinfecting the places where we work
5	in the public venues where we will be frequenting. We understand aerosol transmission
6	is the primary known means of transmission. Surface transmission has not been
7	eliminated and certainly, as we have other infectious diseases to be concerned about,
8	we're in full support of transparency on the disinfection measures.
9	We do agree there's going to be need to do some work refining some of
10	the measures, but we believe that the advisory process that's set up following the
11	hopefully approval of the emergency measure will be adequate to help make sure that
12	dialogue happens.
13	So we appreciate the work that's being done here.
14	CHAIR THOMAS: Thank you.
15	John?
16	MR. GOTCHER: Our next commenter is Estella Cisneros from California
17	Rural Legal Assistance Incorporated.
18	CHAIR THOMAS: Estella, are you there?
19	MS. CISNEROS: Yes, I am. Hello, can you hear me okay?
20	CHAIR THOMAS: Yeah. Please make it brief. We're getting to the end.
21	MS. CISNEROS: I understand.
22	CHAIR THOMAS: Go ahead.
23	MS. CISNEROS: Thank you. Good evening. My name is Estella Cisneros.
24	And I'm the Legal Director of the Agricultural Worker Program at California Rural Legal
25	Assistance. I oversee the five CRLA offices that focus on representing agricultural

1 workers in Stockton, Fresno, Salinas, Oxnard and Coachella.

2	I urge the Board to approve the proposed COVID-19 emergency
3	regulations. I'd also like to commend the workers who likely took time off from their
4	jobs to participate in this public comment period. Their invaluable comments lend
5	support to what so many of us have said today. This regulation cannot wait.
6	Personally, what I find insulting is that workers have had to wait eight
7	months for this regulation to even come before the Board. The regulation is essential to
8	establishing the specificity and enforceability that workers have desperately needed
9	since the COVID-19 pandemic began. For months now, clients have called our offices
10	asking what they can do to protect themselves and prevent workplace outbreaks like
11	the ones they've been reading about in Wasco, Hanford and Merced.
12	These regulations are a starting point. For these reasons I urge the Board
13	to adopt the emergency regulations. Countless lives depend on it. Thank you.
14	CHAIR THOMAS: Thank you. Very nice. Very nice and brief.
15	John, who else do we have?
16	MR. GOTCHER: That was our last commenter.
17	CHAIR THOMAS: All right.
18	MR. GOTCHER: I'll hand it back to you.
19	CHAIR THOMAS: Thank you.
20	MR. DUFFLE: I've been on the call for seven-and-a-half hours and I've
21	asked to be in the queue and I'd like to speak please.
22	CHAIR THOMAS: Sure, go ahead.
23	MR. DUFFLE: My name is Joe Duffle. I'm with United Food And
24	Commercial Workers Union, Local 1167. We cover portions of Los Angeles County, San
25	Bernardino County, Riverside County all the way to Imperial County and the Mexican

1 border. I'm also the President of the Labor Counsel of the Inland Empire which covers

2 San Bernardino, Riverside County and that's 800,000 working men and women.

3 So I wanted to speak in favor of adopting the standards. In my 4 experience, my personal experience in stores in the retail grocery industry and our 5 packing industry, when this thing first started, everybody was in a mad rush to get 6 masks and get the proper personal protective equipment. And we finally got that. And 7 as time has progressed, the enforcement in those retail grocery stores and those 8 packing houses and those warehouses has diminished. The lack of the PPE, the wash 9 stations, the lack of enforcement by management in the company. And they've got 10 great policies in place, but yet the enforcement from the top down isn't happening. And 11 we hear these stories on and on and on again.

12 And then when a member or an employee is tested positive, in multiple 13 cases that we have found, management has brought them into a room or got them on a 14 phone or conference like this and asked them so many questions to try to minimize 15 what they've done. And all of these people that we have spoken to have said "Well, 16 they just basically wanted us to admit we didn't catch it at work." These types of tactics 17 can't be done, because what happens is the employees are not telling employers they're 18 feeling sick. And then the ones that do are being beat up over the phone, "Well, why 19 can't you come to work? You need to come to work." And we're putting other workers 20 at risk here.

21 So listen, what I'm finding out in our stores and in our packing houses is 22 that the employers are saying, "If we can't keep them healthy, let's just keep them 23 quiet."

24 MS. SHUPE: Two minutes.

25 MR. DUFFLE: This has to stop. And I hope in all of my heart that you guys

CALIFORNIA REPORTING, LLC 229 Napa Street, Rodeo, California 94572 (510) 224-4476

1	adopt these labor standards. These folks have waited long enough. And we need to
2	keep the men and women healthy that are in our supply chain, all the way from the
3	fields of the Imperial Coachella Valley and to the grocery stores and to our tables.
4	Thank you very much.
5	CHAIR THOMAS: Thank you, Andrew. (sic) Appreciate your comments.
6	John, is that it?
7	MR. GOTCHER: At this time, I have no other commenters in my queue.
8	MS. BRUEGGEMANN: I'm sorry, Chair Thomas? I know, I'm really sorry
9	about this, but I did get confirmation last night that I was going to be placed in the
10	queue. Would it be possible to make my comment or
11	CHAIR THOMAS: If you can make it brief.
12	MS. BRUEGGEMANN: I did submit my comments.
13	CHAIR THOMAS: If you could be brief, yes. Just be brief. That's fine.
14	MS. BRUEGGEMANN: Ok. Thank you very much.
15	CHAIR THOMAS: State your name and your affiliation.
16	MS. BRUEGGEMANN: My name is Elda Brueggerman, Director of
17	Environmental and Safety for Western Agricultural Process Association and California
18	Cotton Ginners and Growers Association.
19	While we understand the importance of such a regulation, we are greatly
20	concerned with the expediency of the proposed adoption of this regulation
21	MS. SHUPE: I'm sorry, not quite so fast.
22	CHAIR THOMAS: You might as well take your time now. I mean
23	MS. BRUEGGEMANN: Well, all right then. (Laughter.) There are existing
24	guidance documents provided by CDPH, local county public health, CDC and the
25	Cal/OSHA workplace guidance that employers are already implementing these

1 guidances to supplement their IIPP in regards to COVID-19 prevention.

2	Our concern is that there are many inconsistencies with this proposed
3	regulation, which can cause confusion in the implementation with current guidance on
4	COVID-19 prevention. In our opinion, the proposed regulation goes beyond its authority
5	as it pertains to wages, benefits, housing and transportation. Employers must comply
6	with the ADA, the Rehabilitation Act and other EEO laws related to COVID-19, which
7	does have restrictions on when and how such medical information may be obtained
8	from the employee. And the employer must comply with the requirements of keeping
9	these records confidential.
10	In regards to the employer to use employee's sick leave benefits to
11	continue and maintain wages, again employers must comply with current California paid
12	sick leave laws. We have numerous concerns and clarification questions and many of
13	these requirements are ambiguous or conflict with other statements within the
14	proposed regulations, which we have outlined in our written comments. Thank you.
15	CHAIR THOMAS: Thank you. Appreciate your briefness.
16	John, are you there?
17	MR. GOTCHER: Yes, I'm here. So I don't have anyone else in the queue at
18	this moment.
19	CHAIR THOMAS: All right. Is there anyone else in the queue that wants
20	to speak or anyone that hears me that wants to speak that hasn't spoken?
21	(No audible response.)
22	CHAIR THOMAS: All right, we're done. Thank you. The Board
23	appreciates your testimony. I know we had in here Board comments. We're going to
24	wait until we get to the business meeting before we do that unless there's any
25	objection, which I don't see. All right, so thank you for your comments. The public

1 discussion about the draft COVID-19 Prevention Emergency Regulation is adjourned

2 and the record is closed.

3 We will now proceed with the public meeting. Anyone who wants to 4 address the Board regarding matters pertaining to occupational safety and health is 5 invited to comment except however the Board does not entertain comments regarding 6 variance decisions. The Board variance hearings are administrative hearings where 7 procedural due process rights are carefully preserved. Therefore, we will not grant 8 requests to address the Board on variance matters. 9 At this time anyone who would like to comment on any matters 10 concerning occupational safety and health, except COVID-19, may address the Board 11 now. 12 Mr. Gotcher, do we -- John, do we have anybody in the queue for 13 anything else? 14 MR. GOTCHER: There are no public commenters in the queue. 15 CHAIR THOMAS: Thank you. At this time, since there are no commenters 16 in the queue, the Board appreciates the testimony that we -- but we had none today --17 but the public meeting is adjourned and the record is closed. 18 MS. SHUPE: We need a break. 19 CHAIR THOMAS: Ok, I hate to do this right at this point, but we're going 20 to do it. We're going to do a 10-minute break. Yeah, a 10-minute break, so that'll be 21 5:55. And then we are going to -- from that point on we're not stopping, all right? This 22 train is going, so a 10-minute break. And we are in recess. 23 (Off the record at 5:45 p.m.) 24 (On the record at 5:55 p.m.) 25 CHAIR THOMAS: We're back on the record. We will now proceed with

CALIFORNIA REPORTING, LLC 229 Napa Street, Rodeo, California 94572 (510) 224-4476

- 1 the business meeting. The purpose of the business meeting is to allow the Members to
- 2 vote on the matters before it, to receive briefings from staff regarding the issues listed
- 3 on the business meeting agenda.

4	MS. SHUPE: If I might take a moment of privilege, Chair Thomas?
5	CHAIR THOMAS: Sure.
6	MS. SHUPE: For the first report, we have a Division Update from Mr.
7	Berg. And I'd just like to suggest that we ask Mr. Berg if he has anything to report on
8	other than the COVID-19 proposal, which will be addressed later.
9	CHAIR THOMAS: Mr. Berg, are you there? Oh, I see you, Eric.
10	MS. SHUPE: You're muted, Mr. Berg.
11	MR. BERG: Sorry about that, yeah we're just going to talk about
12	(indiscernible) nothing else.
13	CHAIR THOMAS: Okay.
14	MR. BERG: Did you guys hear that? Only COVID and nothing else?
15	CHAIR THOMAS: Fine, yes. So we're going to proceed with the variance
16	decisions for adoption before we get to the, I guess the main event?
17	So Christina, Ms. Shupe?
18	MS. SHUPE: Thank you, Chair Thomas.
19	On your Consent Calendar today are 22 proposed variance decisions,
20	items A through V. I'd like to note that Item E, Department of State Hospitals, Variance
21	Application 19-V-028 and Item H, Patton Equities, LLC, Variance Application 20-V-128
22	are not currently ready for your consideration and are being withdrawn from the
23	Consent Calendar. After incorporating these changes, I'm aware of no unresolved
24	procedural matters regarding the proposed decisions for items A through G and I
25	through V.

1	CHAIR THOMAS: Are there any questions for Ms. Shupe before we	
2	proceed?	
3	BOARD MEMBER HARRISON: Motion to approve.	
4	BOARD MEMBER BURGEL: Excuse me, I have a question.	
5	CHAIR THOMAS: Go ahead.	
6	BOARD MEMBER BURGEL: I just want to note that there's a deny o	n
7	Shea/Parson's Joint Venture. So there's an accept for all the proposals except for	that
8	variance request, correct?	
9	BOARD MEMBER HARRISON: No. That proposal was a deny, and the	ıe
10	motion was to approve all of the proposals.	
11	BOARD MEMBER BURGEL: Thank you, just to clarify.	
12	CHAIR THOMAS: Okay. So we have a motion. Do we have a second	1?
13	BOARD MEMBER BURGEL: Second.	
14	CHAIR THOMAS: Okay. I have a motion and a second. Is there any	thing
15	on (indiscernible).	
16	MS. SHUPE: Sorry. The motion and a second?	
17	CHAIR THOMAS: Yes. Dave Harrison made the motion I believe it v	vas
18	MS. SHUPE: Barbara Burgel?	
19	CHAIR THOMAS: Yes. Barbara made the made the second.	
20	BOARD MEMBER BURGEL: Yes.	
21	CHAIR THOMAS: And that it was A through	
22	MS. SHUPE: It's essentially A through V excluding item E and item H	1.
23	CHAIR THOMAS: Thank you, any other questions?	
24	Hearing none, Sarah, will you lead the roll call please?	
25	MS. MONEY: Ms. Burgel?	

1	BOARD MEMBER BURGEL: Aye.
2	MS. MONEY: Mr. Harrison?
3	BOARD MEMBER HARRISON: Aye.
4	MS. MONEY: Ms. Kennedy?
5	BOARD MEMBER KENNEDY: Aye.
6	MS. MONEY: Ms. Laszcz-Davis?
7	BOARD MEMBER LASZCZ-DAVIS: Aye.
8	MS. MONEY: Ms. Stock?
9	BOARD MEMBER STOCK: Aye.
10	MS. MONEY: Chairman Thomas?
11	CHAIR THOMAS: Aye. And the motion passes, thank you.
12	Now, we will proceed to title 8, Chapter 4, Subsection 7, New Sections
13	3205, 3205.1, 3205.2, 3205.3 and 3205.4 COVID-19 Prevention.
14	Mr. Berg, will you please brief the Board?
15	MR. BERG: Thank you, Chairman Thomas. Doug Parker, Chief of
16	Cal/OSHA will do the initial briefing and I'll follow up with some more technical details.
17	CHAIR THOMAS: Thank you.
18	MR. PARKER: Good evening, everyone. I want to thank the Board for
19	their diligence and patience tonight and their actions again approving the original
20	petition. And also the great team at DOSH and Standards Board for all the hard work
21	that they've done to get this significant proposal to pass. And of course all the
22	stakeholders who have participated tonight in both the formal and informal comment
23	process to let us provide input on the rule.
24	Today, we had a sobering benchmark of reaching 250,000 deaths in the
25	nation as a result of COVID-19. Over 18,000 of those have been in California. And that's

relatively better than the rest of the country, but it's still an incredibly tragic number of
lives lost. And that has been not only in communities, but in workplaces. And it
represents the most significant workplace hazard in the history of the (indiscernible) it's
been the most significant workplace hazard that hopefully we'll ever have to address.

5 I understand that there are going to be short-term costs and burdens as a 6 result of this rule, but the human and economic costs are extremely high in not acting 7 and doing more to prevent the spread and transmission of COVID-19.

The intent and the purpose with which we've approached this rulemaking process is to create a rule that is aggressive and is up to the task and seriousness enough to address the issues that we have, but also be achievable. It's based on the best evidence available. It is protective. And it has been consistent with public health standards. We've worked closely and collaborated with CDPH in the process to make sure that we ensure consistency with their policies. And we've consulted with them closely on the feasibility of key issues.

15 While I'll let Eric get into the details of the standard, I do want to make a 16 couple of specific comments. We really tried to create a standard that was based on 17 IIPP requirements and existing guidance, state guidance, so that employers would be 18 well positioned to comply with it.

We listened closely to the concerns of the employers during the vote on
the petition itself to ensure that we took into account the need to have flexibility and
use performance standards in this rule. And that's what we've done. We've gone
beyond that in areas where we felt like there was a need to fill critical gaps.
One of the gaps was to implement AB 685. There have been a lot of
comments about 685 tonight. There's nothing inconsistent with 685 in our rule. We

25 have some additional provisions that are based on our own independent rulemaking

1 authority, but there's nothing in this rule that's inconsistent with 685. And it's

2 necessary for us to effectively implement AB 685, not all of which is self-enforcement.

There are additional progressive requirements in the rule that kick in when there are workplace outbreaks or multiple infections. And they only have to be enacted on when there are confirmed cases or exposures.

6 There are requirements for exclusion and requirements for preservation 7 of pay and benefits. Those are not outside of our jurisdiction. They're consistent with 8 longstanding health standards that already exist in our standards in title 8. And we have 9 also included another important gap filler in this standard, which is on housing and 10 transportation.

Again, there have been great concerns throughout the state about the lack of enforceable standards in these two areas, particularly with respect to agricultural workers. We are certain that we have jurisdiction of, we're not acting outside of the scope of our jurisdiction, in doing this rulemaking with respect to employer-provided housing and transportation. Federal OSHA has standards on habitability. Other states have enacted similar provisions, so we don't think that there's an issue there.

In terms of implementation, we understand that this is not going to be
any small task. But many employers should already be in a good position if they've been
following our guidance, following the requirements of their IIPP, of the IIPP standard
and following state guidance.

I want to make sure that stakeholders understand that we intend to be a resource in this process. That we are going to be providing training resources. That we're going to be providing a model program. All of these are in the works. We're working on them as we speak. We will be providing FAQs to provide clarity to stakeholders, so that they understand the rule. And of course, our consultation services
1 will be active and working with employers.

I understand that there are concerns about the complexity of the rule
that have been stated. It does have some complexity, but this is a standard that covers
infectious diseases. So it should not be any surprise to anyone if we need to write an
effective rule on it, it is going to have some complexity.

6 With respect to the issue of timing, we understand that not all employers 7 are going to have all the provisions in place within the timeframe if this is approved 8 tonight. Some employers are going to need more time. We intend to fully take that 9 into account in determining whether employers are taking -- how they're implementing 10 the rule. Whether they're taking prompt and good faith efforts to get into compliance 11 with the new rule when we're doing our enforcement. And we will continue to offer 12 compliance assistance to employers.

We've had to navigate some very difficult issues of the same sort in the current emergency with respect to things like respirator shortages. And we believe that we can work with stakeholders and continue to take those kind of actions to make sure that we can implement this rule. While giving people a little bit of flexibility to reflect the realities of what's going to be a considerable task in some cases to stand up some of these requirements if employers haven't done it already.

Finally, before I turn it over to Eric, there's a couple of key points I want to respond to. I can't respond to everything that was raised, but I want to get into this issue of large versus small employers and the testing requirements. There's a lot of misunderstanding about the language on testing requirements that we look forward to clarifying in our guidance documents.

24 The testing requirements are based on an exposed workplace. That is 25 limited to locations of the workplace where individuals with COVID-19 have been during

the specific time that they're infectious. And workers who have not been in the workplace in those timeframes are exempt from testing. So this is both location defined and its time defined. It is written in a way that's intended to be tailored to be limited to those areas where testing and other measures are actually needed. So I think that there's some misunderstanding about that and I think that some of the concerns are overblown.

But if there's going to be testing then -- and we think there has to be to
have an effective prevention program once there are COVID cases in the workplace, that
we've crafted a rule that makes sense.

10 We've heard some concerns about responsibility for community acquired 11 COVID-19. I just want to remind everyone that all workplace outbreaks begin as 12 community acquired COVID-19. It doesn't just happen in the workplace. It enters the 13 workplace via an employer, customer or other person and then once it's in the 14 workplace it's a hazard. And the fundamentals of preventing illness means that those 15 distinctions are irrelevant once it's in the workplace. We've written a standard with a 16 goal of prevention and prompt mitigation and resolution of those hazards once they're 17 in the workplace.

18 I also want to address some of the comments about employer provided 19 or arranged housing or transportation. Our intent in drafting the language the way that 20 we did, is to address housing and transportation as actually employer provided to make 21 sure that we didn't include any loopholes that would allow unscrupulous employers to 22 easily circumvent the rule through making certain kinds of arrangements. So I think 23 some of the more attenuated examples that we heard today would not be covered by 24 the rule. We certainly don't intend to cover the Housing for the Harvest for example, 25 but we're going to have to evaluate those on a case-by-case basis. And we look forward

1 to working with the stakeholders on that.

I also want to finally note, with respect to one of the comments about national security and critical infrastructure. We do have a waiver process in this rule if there's a threat to community health and safety. But we just want to make sure that there's a brief process in place, so that if employers make that application to us we can establish that exceptions to the exclusion policy -- I think exclusion requirements -- are actually necessary to preserve that health and safety.

8 And then on the issue on the fact that we've done enforcement, that we 9 have current enforcement in place, I just want to remind everyone that not a single one 10 of those cases has yet to be adjudicated. While we have confidence that we are within 11 our jurisdiction and within the scope of our authority and the citations that we have 12 there is still a level of uncertainty that we can clarify and make without doubt by passing 13 this rule.

14 So in conclusion, as I pass it on to Eric, I just want to urge the Board to act 15 on this rule by voting in favor and follow the plan that it laid out. If there are 16 imperfections in the rule, we should consider the proposed standard today and then 17 leave it to a subsequent advisory committee process to address any additional needed 18 changes, once we have more experience with the rule. Thank you for your time. 19 CHAIR THOMAS: Thank you, Mr. Parker. Eric, can you unmute yourself, 20 Eric? There you go. 21 MR. BERG: All right, sorry about that. Thank you very much, Doug. I will 22 outline the proposal for everyone and the Board. 23 So the proposed emergency regulation applies to most employees and 24 workplaces in California, except for employees that are covered by the Cal/OSHA 25 aerosol transmissible disease standard. It is consistent with existing law including AB

CALIFORNIA REPORTING, LLC 229 Napa Street, Rodeo, California 94572 (510) 224-4476

1 685.

2 Under the proposed regulations, employers must have a written COVID-3 19 prevention program. This requirement is very similar to (indiscernible) California and 4 Cal/OSHA guidelines that have been in place for many months. The COVID-19 5 prevention program must include several elements that are modeled on the existing 6 injury and illness prevention program regulation, section 3203. Employers have the 7 option of incorporating their COVID-19 prevention program into their existing IIPP or 8 having it as a separate document.

9 So the elements of the program, the COVID-19 prevention program are 10 firstly a system for communicating information to employees about COVID-19. This is 11 the same as -- or very similar to what's in their IIPP. And this would include prevention, 12 COVID-19 prevention, policies and procedures, any testing symptom and illness checks. 13 And including a system for employees to report exposures or hazards without fear of 14 retaliation.

The next element is identification and evaluation of COVID-19 hazards.
This includes screening employees for symptoms, identifying workplace conditions and
work practices that could result in employee exposure to COVID-19.

18The third element is investigating and responding to COVID-19 cases in19the workplace. This includes responding to exposures, COVID-19 exposures, by20following steps to determine who may have been exposed, which employees may have21been exposed, providing notice to employees about exposures and offering testing to22workers who may have been exposed.23The next element is correcting COVID-19 hazards. This includes24correcting unsafe conditions and unsafe work practices found through investigation of

25 COVID-19 cases at the workplace and during periodic inspections.

CALIFORNIA REPORTING, LLC 229 Napa Street, Rodeo, California 94572 (510) 224-4476

1	The next element is providing effective training and instruction to
2	employees on workplace COVID-19 prevention and policies.
3	The next element is physical distancing, which requires implementation
4	of procedures to have workers be at least six feet apart from other people, if possible.
5	And very similar to the guidelines that have been in place for many months.
6	The next element is face coverings, providing face coverings and ensuring
7	they are worn in the workplace. Again, very, very similar to existing guidelines.
8	The next element is about adopting site-specific strategies such as
9	changes to workplace and work schedules and providing personal protective equipment
10	to reduce exposures to the virus.
11	The next element is recordkeeping requirements for recording or tracking
12	positive COVID-19 cases in the workplace. And making the COVID-19 prevention plan
13	accessible to employees and authorized employer representatives.
14	The next section is the removal of COVID-19 exposed workers and COVID-
15	19 positive workers to protect the workplace from further spread of the infection. And
16	measures to protect pay and benefits.
17	There are exemptions from these requirements when removal of workers
18	would affect the community's health and safety, which would include national and
19	California security, which Doug already talked about.
20	Medical removal and protection of pay have been implemented by
21	federal OSHA and Cal/OSHA since the 1970s in the lead standards and many, many
22	other health regulations. This is nothing new and well within the authority of Cal/OSHA
23	and the Standards Board.
24	The next and last requirement of the main section is criteria for non-
25	infectious workers to return to work as quickly as possible.

CALIFORNIA REPORTING, LLC 229 Napa Street, Rodeo, California 94572 (510) 224-4476

1 Then we move on to the sections on outbreaks and major outbreaks. 2 The requirements for testing and notifying public health departments of outbreaks in 3 the exposed workplace, again as I discussed an "exposed workplace" is specifically 4 defined in the regulation and is limited to areas where cases were present. It's not the 5 entire workplace. So an outbreak is defined as three or more cases in an exposed 6 workplace in a 14-day period. And a major outbreak is 20 or more cases in an exposed 7 workplace in a 30-day period.

8 And frequent testing, at least two sections require testing, which are 9 discussed. Frequent testing is one of the most effective tools in protecting workplaces 10 from further spread of infections. Studies have shown that if testing is not frequent it is 11 not effective. Testing on working time is again within Cal/OSHA's jurisdiction and 12 consistent with many other title 8 and federal OSHA regulations.

13Testing availability is at its most robust ever at this time and continuously14increasing. Current testing capacity is over 283,000 tests per day while currently less15than 160,000 tests are being given every day. With testing, that we state in our16proposal, is not as frequent nor as widespread as recommended by some health17experts, but we believe it is a solid start.

And the next sections are on employer provided housing and employer provided transportation. We've provided some of the basic protections required as there have been outbreaks linked to those sections that include physical distancing, masking and sanitization. And we don't believe these are duplicative of local health plan orders as there have been problems of employers not following those orders and enforceability.

The Cal/OSHA, Department of Industrial Relations, the Attorney General's
 Office, many medical and public health experts, scientists, California Department of

CALIFORNIA REPORTING, LLC 229 Napa Street, Rodeo, California 94572 (510) 224-4476

1 Public Health are in agreement that this emergency regulation is needed to protect the 2 lives and health of California workers. All workers and their families deserve to be 3 protected from this deadly and disabling threat. 4 Recommend working with stakeholders and future advisory meetings, 5 and during the rotation of this regulation, make sure it is workable and usable. So we 6 urge the Standards Board to approve this proposal. Thank you. 7 CHAIR THOMAS: Thank you, Eric. 8 Do we have any questions from the Board of either Mr. Parker or Mr. 9 Berg at this time? 10 BOARD MEMBER LASZCZ-DAVIS: Is it questions or comments? What can 11 you entertain at this point? 12 CHAIR THOMAS: What? 13 MS. SHUPE: This would be the time for questions. 14 CHAIR THOMAS: Yes. I think this is a time for questions if you have them 15 to clarify a point you may want clarified. This would be the time. 16 All right, Nola? 17 BOARD MEMBER KENNEDY: I guess I would like to ask Mr. Parker to 18 again go over which gap is being covered by this regulation separate than the gap that is 19 being covered by 685? 20 MR. PARKER: Well, there's a number of them. I'll start and then Eric can 21 fill in the gaps. But all of the responses to multiple infections or outbreaks are only in 22 the standard. So all of the testing requirements, all of the reviews of hazard 23 assessments, the provisions that allow us to issue orders to take special action if there is 24 some situation that's not covered by the standard, none of that exists in any other 25 provision of law.

1	Other things include the provision for employers allowing employee and
2	employee-authorized representatives to participate in the hazard evaluation process.
2	
	Certainly all of the provisions related to employer provided housing and transportation.
4	Oh, you're talking about in 685? The specific reporting.
5	BOARD MEMBER KENNEDY: Yeah, I'm talking specifically the reporting of
6	retaliation ones, yeah.
7	MR. PARKER: So the most important thing is that let me pull up 685.
8	There are portions of it that are self-enforcing and portions that aren't. So the
9	regulation allows us to fully enforce 685, is the main issue. We have some slight
10	differences in terms of the definition, but they're non-substantive. We think they're just
11	clarifying.
12	Eric, do you have anything to add to answering this question?
13	MR. BERG: No, (indiscernible) we tried to clarify things that were vague
14	in the bill, otherwise it's completely consistent.
15	BOARD MEMBER KENNEDY: Can you give me an example?
16	CHAIR THOMAS: I'm sorry?
17	BOARD MEMBER KENNEDY: Would you mind? Can I get an example of
18	something that's clarified?
19	MR. BERG: Oh, the definition of worksite and so we called it "exposed
20	workplace" (indiscernible) definition of exposed workplace. That's an example.
21	CHAIR THOMAS: Any other questions that the Board may have? Yes.
22	BOARD MEMBER KENNEDY: I'm sorry. I have another question about
23	basically the scientific basis for using six-foot distancing in the workplace. Now, to me
24	six-foot distancing seems appropriate for brief encounters with other people. In
25	workplace, you're working with someone for eight hours typically. And so I'd like to

1 hear the scientific basis for that decision.

2 MR. BERG: Well we know six feet is not sufficient and that's in the 3 standard. And that's why there's a face mask requirement in addition to the six feet. 4 The six feet is in there so that we have a consistent message with the public health 5 messaging that's been put out for a long time now.

6 So we honestly don't think it's sufficient, but we have to have a 7 consistent message that's on target with all the other guidelines from CDPH, CDC and 8 many other well-known health authorities. We don't want to send out mixed messages 9 that causes confusion. The six feet is based on being consistent. And not necessarily in 10 the science, because we know that aerosols can transmit COVID at over 20 feet. But if 11 it's combined with mask use and other controls it can have a big effect on reducing the 12 spread of infection.

MR. PARKER: It reduces risk, but it doesn't eliminate the risk, certainly.
 MR. BERG: Yeah, that's correct. We're trying to be practical at the same
 time and balancing practicality, consistency and prevention.

16 CHAIR THOMAS: I think you had a question, Chris.

17 BOARD MEMBER LASZCZ-DAVIS: Yes I did and if now is the appropriate 18 time, let's go ahead and do that. What I found disturbing were the many comments 19 from our stakeholders about the fact that those in the following industries and market 20 sectors felt unprotected and vulnerable: retail, restaurants, schools and hotels. 21 And yet I hear the comment that the IIPP should have covered them. I 22 hear the comment that in fact many of the Cal/OSHA guidelines, the public health 23 guidelines should have been protective. Because certain employers took them up and 24 embraced them and implemented them. Do you really think that this regulation as its

25 being proposed will bridge the gap for agriculture, retail, restaurants, schools and hotels

1 if it's not entirely clear in terms of nuance, interpretation and implementation when

2 you have all this other stuff going on?

3 MR. BERG: Yes, we do think that it's going to bridge the gap. It has 4 (indiscernible) provisions in it, but testing the issues of nuance it will take some -- the 5 lines of a standard stand-alone isn't going to do that, but that's where our 6 implementation strategy kicks in terms of providing clarity to employers and to workers. 7 CHAIR THOMAS: Dave? 8 BOARD MEMBER HARRISON: I don't know if it's a guestion for Doug and 9 Eric or for Autumn. My concern is around the timeliness and the practical process of 10 approving the rule or not, whichever direction this goes in. 11 In regards to the advisory committee post rulemaking, which we've never 12 done, there were a lot of concerns from industry about this particular issue. What's the 13 practical timeliness? And again I don't know who this question goes to, but the practical 14 timeliness of moving forward. And actually a) essentially adopting a rule and then b) 15 having an advisory committee and making the rule better. What does that look like? 16 MS. SHUPE: This is Christina. So I would say that for timeliness on pulling 17 together the advisory committee, that question is best addressed to Eric. 18 CHAIR THOMAS: Eric? 19 MR. BERG: Yeah, we plan on doing an advisory committee. That's a part 20 of the emergency rule process is that it will have to be renewed on a regular basis. And 21 so before we renew it there will be advisory meetings to improve the language and 22 involving the stakeholders. 23 BOARD MEMBER HARRISON: Okay, so when, is what I'm asking. How 24 soon could we expect an advisory committee to take place and then an amendment to 25 the rule should one be adopted?

CALIFORNIA REPORTING, LLC 229 Napa Street, Rodeo, California 94572 (510) 224-4476

1 MR. BERG: We plan on following the conditions from the Standards 2 Board of four months, but generally within four months. That's the time right now. 3 CHAIR THOMAS: Any other questions? MR. PARKER: Just to elaborate on that. I think that those were the 4 5 instructions from the Board to do it within four months. 6 I think it's conceivable we could do it sooner if warranted. The concern 7 would be that it would shorten the overall length of the emergency standard, because 8 you get basically three renewals. And the first period is a set amount of time. And if 9 you -- the earlier you renew it the shorter the length of the entire emergency standard. 10 So we'd have to look at the unintended consequences of doing it sooner. But we could 11 have that discussion for sure. 12 CHAIR THOMAS: And I'm sure we will. 13 Laura? 14 BOARD MEMBER STOCK: Just to follow up quickly on that and I know 15 later we'll have an opportunity to make general comments. I'm assuming this is still in 16 the range of questions. So I just wanted to ask Doug, so we could theoretically -- I know 17 many stakeholders were really eager to have that advisory committee process started 18 right away. People were saying December. And I feel concerned about that concern 19 and would like to be able to see if we can get that scheduled in the next month. 20 That would be an immediate opportunity for people to be able to 21 continue to be able to share the concerns that they've raised and to give you and your 22 team the time that you need to assess them, to respond to the -- to explain in some 23 instances like you've done already. You've said that some of the concerns that you've 24 heard today that you think you can explain to show how in fact they may be not 25 warranted.

1 So that kind of conversation, if that kind of conversation could be 2 happening in December where that give and take would be allowed. What I hear you 3 say is that there are the -- I'm unfamiliar with this renewal timeframe that you just 4 mentioned, so that's an important concern. But it feels like those don't seem to be 5 inconsistent. But you could have a meeting very quickly to start the dialogue process. 6 You could be keeping in mind what would be the point where you would actually want 7 to make or renew with actual changes. Or where they might be adjustments that can be 8 addressed either through further explanation at a meeting like that. Or through further 9 collaboration in policies and procedures and some of the implementation rules that 10 you've already said that you're going to develop. 11 So there may be ways to address the issues that people are raising 12 outside of modifications of the rule, or not, we don't know. But I expect that there will 13 be a lot of ways to address questions short of modifying the rules. 14 So I'm just wondering, could we go ahead and encourage you to hold that 15 meeting right away to begin those kind of dialogues, so that you can hear how we 16 should implement the rules and start the process of identifying where changes are 17 needed. MR. PARKER: Yes, I mean I think that kind of discussion with an 18 19 opportunity for us to present to stakeholders the resources that we put out. But there's 20 nothing keeping us from having more than one meeting. But there's some -- I'd want to 21 talk to Eric and Christina about all the formal requirements around a formal advisory 22 committee and making sure that that's doable. As opposed to something that was 23 initially more informal that allowed a robust discussion with stakeholders where they 24 could still take that information. 25 So I want to be mindful of that and hear from them, but the spirit of it,

CALIFORNIA REPORTING, LLC 229 Napa Street, Rodeo, California 94572 (510) 224-4476

1 I'm 100 percent behind.

MS. SHUPE: This is Christina, and I just wanted to address that as well. The proposed decision that the Board adopted requested that the Division work with Board staff to convene these advisory committees. And so we do have some rigidity in what we can do with an emergency temporary standard once it's adopted. But the robust communication that we have between the Board staff and the Division staff will make that process very collaborative.

8 CHAIR THOMAS: Thank you, Christina.

9 And I just wanted to add that a lot of what Mr. Parker said added clarity. 10 And I think that the sooner that we schedule whether we call it an advisory committee 11 or informational or however we term it, the quicker we do that, I think the quicker that 12 we will allay the fears of some of the employers that they have right now.

But having gone through this document, having already put together
something similar to this for the construction industry -- and as Dave knows, Mr.

15 Harrison -- we started this back March the 16th. I remember the day. I remember

16 where I was standing when this all came down.

And we worked for a few weeks to put together a document between thousands of employers and employer groups and the unions. And let me just say there's 22 building trade unions out there in construction. We all did the same thing. And this document is similar to that, but we weren't getting into the testing, we weren't

21 getting in -- well, a little bit into it but not like this.

But I think the quicker we put an informational type meeting together that could be a quasi-advisory committee would be something that we should really try to do as soon as possible. And I will work with Christina and Eric to make sure that

25 happens.

BOARD MEMBER LASZCZ-DAVIS: Dave, can I ask another question?
 CHAIR THOMAS: No. You only get one, Chris. No, go ahead. I'm sorry.
 Go ahead. (Laughter.)

BOARD MEMBER LASZCZ-DAVIS: Okay, this is my other question. Given
all of that, is there any reason to think that we actually trigger an advisory committee, a
robust advisory committee process, even the first week in December? And for the
December Board meeting consider a revised, refined, proposed regulation that most
employers can live with?

9 What I worry about is we've got 1.4 million small employers will struggle 10 with this regardless of how it plays itself out. All we're doing is buying another 30 days 11 that I think we'd end up with a proposal that might be more applicable and clear. What 12 are we losing if we do that?

13 CHAIR THOMAS: Well, I'm going to say this, and this is just my opinion 14 that I would object to -- and again this is just my opinion and we are going to vote on 15 this presumably in the next few minutes. But the longer we wait, in my opinion, the 16 worse -- we're seeing the worst of this right now. It's not going to get anything but 17 worse. We've got to lead at some point. Nobody else is doing it. We had no leadership 18 from D.C. This supposed person who is heading the COVID-19 Taskforce, I don't know 19 when they have a meeting, but I haven't heard of them publically having a meeting for 20 months.

We're kind of left out in the cold. And we know what we need to do. And just sitting on this and waiting is not going to help; 1,750 people are dying a day. I mean we're having infections that are just -- today 300 people in Sacramento died from this. Waiting is not going to help. Waiting is not going to make anything better. It's time in my opinion.

Somebody's got to lead here. And I'm not going to sit around and say when the time came to make a decision that I sat on it and waited. I'm not doing that, not me. I don't know what the rest of you are thinking, but I'm not doing that. So I think that we should put together an advisory committee or quasi as soon as we possibly can. December is fine with me. But I don't want to have this on my conscience that we didn't do something when we actually had the chance to do it. And I would hope that the rest of you feel the same way.

8 BOARD MEMBER STOCK: I'll just jump in. Thank you, Dave. I completely 9 agree and my understanding is and we've been on the Board for a long time. We know 10 how long these things take. We have advisory committees and I don't think ever in my 11 entire six years on the Board, ever passed a regulation that everybody was happy with. 12 It just didn't happen in spite of multiple months and months of advisory committees.

13 So I'm not sure first of all that that could be accomplished in a month, as 14 you're describing, Chris. And I'm not confident that it would be very much a different 15 situation than we are right now.

And I also feel like this is an unprecedented emergency. The numbers are going up daily. It's terrible to see the news every day, the news in California. And if there's ever a situation where action is essential it's now. And the whole process of doing an emergency regulation, I can't think of another example that qualifies more to be this kind of emergency.

And with that, I think the fact that we accepted a petition and the Division and the Board staff have agreed, I think we've given a good way forward. Because we've been given an opportunity to take action now. Which I believe is absolutely essential. But it's built in (indiscernible) recognition that the science will change that experience is going to change. This is a built-in opportunity for people to

1 learn more about it and a clear need for things to be adjusted.

2 And we've also heard about the tremendous resources that's going to be 3 made available to try to further explain the requirements to support employers in 4 implementing it.

5 So I think that we've been given an opportunity to do something in a 6 responsible way. And I feel like we have heard from the agency that is in charge of 7 enforcing. That's who's telling us that they need this regulation and I feel like we can't 8 get any more important message than that.

9 And finally I agree, Dave. I urge my fellow Board Members to take action 10 now. That is what is needed. I think this is a really important vote. And I feel confident 11 that if we do that, there will be the dialogue that is needed going forward.

12 CHAIR THOMAS: Thank you Barbara. Go ahead.

BOARD MEMBER BURGEL: I wish to echo Laura and Dave Thomas's comments. First of all, I just want to commend the Division and the Standards Board staff. When I read the first draft of -- or this ETS language that we're going to vote on, I was so impressed. I mean it is complicated. It is comprehensive. We're facing the most tragic pandemic in our lifetimes.

18I think that what I'm most impressed about is how comprehensive the19standard is. I love the emphasis on engineering controls and administrative controls.20Specifically ventilation and some of the staggered breaks, emphasis on integrating all21the guidance that has been promulgated since the beginning of the pandemic.22I specifically like the fact that employer provided transportation and23housing were included. I am incredibly supportive of facing the most medical removal

24 and pay continuation. I think that is critical, because people will not report symptoms if

they lose wage. So we need individuals to be forthright about their symptoms and stay

1 home, which is very difficult if you are not getting paid. So I support those provisions.

I think yes I would have appreciated more dialog with stakeholders in
crafting the language, but this is an emergency. I am fully in support of passing the
emergency standard. And look forward to making it perfect going forward.

5 I think the testing provisions maybe difficult for employers. I think the 6 outbreak --- I think actually what might be most difficult is taking the ATD standard and 7 integrating it when you're working in a complex organization. Sort of who's going to be 8 covered by the ATD standard and who's going to be covered by the COVID standard will 9 be difficult as far as bridging and in clarifying. I know that Cal/OSHA is up to that task as 10 far as crafting implementation and supporting employers in compliance with this new 11 standard. So thank you.

12 CHAIR THOMAS: Thank you, Barbara.

13 Any other comments at this time, Dave?

14 BOARD MEMBER HARRISON: Just real quick, I concur with you guys. I

15 support the rule. I just hope that some of the comments we've heard about potential

16 conflicts, and some of the conflicting language and some legislation that's been passed

17 and this rule, doesn't create a roadblock at OAL, and that's my big fear.

18 But I support the rule and will forward it along.

19 CHAIR THOMAS: Thank you. Any others, Chris?

BOARD MEMBER LASZCZ-DAVIS: Just real quickly, and I mean I do need to say this to both Doug and Eric. I mean you guys have done an incredible job even from the last time we saw the regulation, the proposed regulation. You heard us when we said make it more performance oriented and less prescription oriented. So there were a lot of changes, so don't get me wrong. Don't misunderstand what I've said. My concern is so we have an advisory committee process after we endorse a proposed ETS

1 regulation.

25

But how quickly will this kick in? I mean three, four, five months is not adequate. And in the meantime we've got people out there who need to comply. And the confusion may preclude them from doing what needs to be done. So my concern is whatever we do, if in fact we have these robust resources from Cal/OSHA, let's apply them quickly. Let's get the processes moving and refine what we need to refine, so people in fact can implement appropriately.

8 CHAIR THOMAS: I agree, Chris. I agree.

9 BOARD MEMBER STOCK: And I just have one other comment, which I 10 wanted to say before. And I just wanted to echo the thanks to the Board staff and the 11 Division. It's unbelievable that you've accomplished at the level that has required many 12 long days and nights. And to get it in time. I know people were frustrated that it didn't 13 come earlier, but it's incredible that you got it in time. And so thank you so much for all 14 the very hard work that you've done to try to thread that needle. It's not easy.

And I just wanted to particularly -- I don't know who might be listening, but I just wanted to particularly thank those who testified today, everybody, employers and organizations. But most specifically all the workers who, as numbers of people who have said took time off from their work to speak to us. People for whom English is not their first language and Spanish is not even their first language.

And I think we heard a lot about the issue of retaliation. And I just want to highlight that as something that I hope that we can address in conversations going forward, because we've heard a lot of really terrible stories about what people have faced. And in the context of that retaliation I think the bravery of people to come forward and talk about what's happening in the workplace is really amazing.

And I want everybody to know what a huge impact your words have and

1 to thank you for participating in the process.

2 CHAIR THOMAS: Yeah, and speaking of long nights, Nola? 3 BOARD MEMBER KENNEDY: I'm so sorry, I guess this falls half way 4 between a guestion and a comment. And it's just a clarification I would like, because I 5 think for some reason I was under the impression that we were going to get some sort 6 of counsel presentation on whether or not the proposed rule does overstep our 7 authority. And I heard Eric's comment about certainly, with the lead standard and 8 medical removal, that people's wages are protected. I think it's absolutely probably 9 true, but definitely true, for someone who has COVID-19 and is removed from the 10 workplace. But when we're talking about an exposed worker who is not tested being 11 removed for 14 days, I just want to make sure that that's not an overstep of authority. 12 MR. BERG: No, (indiscernible) I have thoroughly reviewed this and it does 13 not overstep any part of it. The intent of that is to protect the workplace. But we do 14 have authority to protect the workplace whether the person has been confirmed or has 15 been exposed to a confirmed case. And that is consistent with what CDPH requires. 16 MS. SHUPE: This is Christina. And I want to assure the Board that not 17 only did the Division's legal staff review this, but we also asked Autumn Gonzales who is 18 on loan to the Board to review it with an eye towards the Board's interest. And it was 19 also reviewed by Legal at the Labor Agency. 20 So if you do have any specific questions we can absolutely have Ms. 21 Gonzalez weigh in and address those. But she did do a thorough review and even 22 addressed the comment letters that were coming in. And we are assured that this is 23 within the Board's authority. 24 MR. PARKER: I would just add that I specifically directed agency counsel 25 to the provisions you're referring to, to make sure that they had reviewed them.

CALIFORNIA REPORTING, LLC 229 Napa Street, Rodeo, California 94572 (510) 224-4476

1	CHAIR THOMAS: Thanks, Doug. Any other comments? Hearing none I'll
2	entertain a motion.
3	BOARD MEMBER BURGEL: So moved.
4	CHAIR THOMAS: Do I have a second?
5	BOARD MEMBER HARRISON: Seconded.
6	CHAIR THOMAS: I have a motion and second. Thank you. I have a
7	motion and second, I think we've done the comments. The motion was made by Barbara
8	Burgel and the second was by Dave.
9	BOARD MEMBER HARRISON: Can we clarify the motion please?
10	CHAIR THOMAS: The motion is to adopt the proposed regulation
11	emergency regulation.
12	BOARD MEMBER HARRISON: Thank you.
13	CHAIR THOMAS: All right. Can you please call the roll, Ms. Money?
14	MS. MONEY: Ms. Burgel?
15	BOARD MEMBER BURGEL: Aye.
16	MS. MONEY: Mr. Harrison?
17	BOARD MEMBER HARRISON: Aye.
18	MS. MONEY: Ms. Kennedy?
19	BOARD MEMBER KENNEDY: Aye.
20	MS. MONEY: Ms. Laszcz-Davis?
21	BOARD MEMBER LASZCZ-DAVIS: Aye.
22	MS. MONEY: Ms. Stock?
23	BOARD MEMBER STOCK: Aye.
24	MS. MONEY: Chairman Thomas?
25	CHAIR THOMAS: Aye, and the motion passes. And I'd like to thank the

1 Board for the unanimity that we showed tonight, because leadership has been vacant

2 on this in many places. And I'm really proud that we did this unanimously. It's good for
3 California. It's good for us. Thank you.

4 The next order, new business, future agenda items. Oh, wait.

5 MS. SHUPE: Executive Officer's Report.

6 CHAIR THOMAS: Executive Officer's Report, excuse me. It's been a really
7 long day.

8 MS. SHUPE: He's tried to skip past this a couple of times, but I have just a 9 few things I need to address to the Board very quickly.

First of all, and for everyone who's still on our call, which is over 200 people I want to say that we received a number of comments as well as held today's discussion. All of which served to inform the Board's consideration of the emergency temporary standard. It's important to note however that the comments delivered to the Board ahead of adoption, in writing or made during the discussion, will not be

15 forwarded to OAL. And therefore such comments directed to the Board are not

16 comments submitted to OAL for the purposes of Government Code 11349.6.

17 The adopted emergency temporary standard rulemaking package will be 18 delivered to the Office of Administrative Law tomorrow, which will trigger their 10-day 19 review of the rulemaking. Once OAL has uploaded the rulemaking to their emergency 20 regulations under review page, the public will have 5-calendar days to submit their

21 comments directly to OAL for consideration.

22 OAL's website provides further information about the emergency

23 rulemaking process. And instructions for providing comments are printed in the Notice

24 for Proposed Emergency Action.

25 Now you can find that notice on our website under the "What's New"

CALIFORNIA REPORTING, LLC 229 Napa Street, Rodeo, California 94572 (510) 224-4476

section. It was also emailed out to all of our contacts when we noticed this proposed
 action back on November 12th.

I just want to make all of that very clear to everybody, the difference
between the comments to OAL and the comments that were delivered to the Board
today and earlier.

Looking forward to next month, the Board will consider a proposed
decision for Petition 580, which seeks to clarify existing anti-restart standard as well as
add current federal OSHA language to title 8, section 4001, to better align with federal
OSHA requirement 1910.213(b)(3).

10 The Board will also consider version 2.0 of the Protection from Wildfire 11 Smoke regulation, General Industry Safety Orders 5141.1, which is substantially similar 12 to the emergency regulations adopted by the Board last July, in 2019. Version 2.0 will 13 make protections provided in section 5141.1 permanent while the Division develops the 14 third version with robust stakeholder engagement. 15 Are there any questions from the Board? As you can see, we have not 16 paused at all. We are immediately leaping into our other work. 17 CHAIR THOMAS: All right. Do we have a closed session today? 18 MS. SHUPE: The need for a closed session has not arisen. 19 CHAIR THOMAS: Therefore ---20 MS. SHUPE: And Ms. Money rightfully reminds me that we had a Leg 21 Update on the agenda. However, the Legislature is in recess right now and will not 22 resume until January 4th of 2021, at which time we will start providing leg updates 23 again. 24 CHAIR THOMAS: All right. Thank you. Is there any other business or

reports that have come before the Board at this time, Ms. Shupe? None that I can see.

1 MS. SHUPE: None at this time.

2	CHAIR THOMAS: All right, it's been a long day. And before we adjourn I
3	just want to once again thank the Board for your endurance and especially your
4	comments. I mean these are not easy decisions.
5	We all have I don't take it lightly that the way employers feel. I don't. I
6	deal with employers every day. I'm on the labor side, but I don't take any of it lightly.
7	And but I do appreciate the Division and your explanations today.
8	And I look forward to putting together as quickly as possible an advisory
9	committee where hopefully we get the right we get the players in the room. We get
10	questions answered that are bothering some of our employers. And make it clear what
11	those answers are and how to comply. That will go a long way to making this a very
12	monumental, in my opinion a monumental regulation, temporary regulation that we put
13	together, that the Division has put together.
14	And once again I'm proud that we did this unanimously. And I think this
15	is a great step. And I have a feeling that others will follow this, hopefully in other places.
16	So at this time, the next Standards Board regular meeting and hearing is
17	scheduled for December 17th, 2020 via teleconference and video conference. Please
18	visit our website and join our mailing list to receive the latest updates.
19	We thank you for your attendance today. There being no further
20	business to attend to, this business meeting is now adjourned. We look forward to
21	seeing you next month. Happy Thanksgiving everybody, have a nice evening.
22	(The Business Meeting adjourned at 6:58 p.m.)
23	000
24	
25	

CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER

I do hereby certify that the testimony in the foregoing hearing was taken at the time and place therein stated; that the testimony of said witnesses were reported by me, a certified electronic court reporter and a disinterested person, and was under my supervision thereafter transcribed into typewriting.

And I further certify that I am not of counsel or attorney for either or any of the parties to said hearing nor in any way interested in the outcome of the cause named in said caption.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand this 8th day of April, 2021.

ELISE HICKS, IAPRT CERT**2176

TRANSCRIBER'S CERTIFICATE

I do hereby certify that the testimony

in the foregoing hearing was taken at the time and

place therein stated; that the testimony of said

witnesses were transcribed by me, a certified

transcriber and a disinterested person, and was under

my supervision thereafter transcribed into

typewriting.

And I further certify that I am not of counsel or attorney for either or any of the parties to said hearing nor in any way interested in the outcome of the cause named in said caption.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set

my hand this 8th day of April, 2021.

na-

Myra Severtson Certified Transcriber AAERT No. CET**D-852