

DATE: January 7, 2022
TO: PRR Heat Illness Task Force
FROM: Helen Cleary
RE: Heat Illness Task Force Meeting Summary – January 5, 2022

On January 5, 2022, six members of the Phylmar Regulatory Roundtable – PRR Heat Task Force met to continue the discussion on the [ANPRM](#) and to discuss PRR's comments to Fed OSHA on Heat Illness and Injury Prevention. Click [here](#) for the audio / video file for the meeting.

Many thanks to the Heat Illness Task Force who have agreed to assist PRR in its involvement to date: Benita Byrd; Brian DeWitt; Brian Heramb; Christopher Gabelich; David Woodard; Derrick You; Dylan Wright; Elizabeth Schmidt; Erich Nolan; Gary Wright; Heidi Lopez; Iris Wang; Jamie Carlile; Javed Hussain; Jay Weir; Jen Shih; Jim Weber; Jo Forchione; Lessly McCarley; Majid Karimi; Marie Edson; Mark Divoky; Michelle Stewart; Mike Starkey; Ofelia Perez; and Paul Costa.

PRR Staff requested that members respond to the questions she had sent out previously, as only one member responded upon initial request. PRR Staff discussed her approach for comments on a federal rule will be to issue at a higher overview. PRR Staff suggested that more research should occur on the following:

- workers and heat illness conducted by the government
- prevention measures
- difficulties of determining individual factors
- base performance measures
- individual monitoring (currently cost prohibitive, lack of availability, lack of technology, privacy issues).

One member discussed how the military has done much work in implementing heat stress protection requirements for several years. He suggested NIOSH and the government should look at what the military is doing and informed the task force that the nuclear energy industry also conducted research on heat stress.

This task force member informed the committee that NIOSH published a document four years ago that identifies what is currently available with regards to heat stress.

PRR Staff inquired If there is sufficient research to support a Federal rule for all industries, and if there is, has the research been examined to determine how to manage all industries in all regions. One member suggested getting input from all of the PRR member companies to voice their concerns and / or commitments to regulations that protect workers from heat.

One member stated that certain aspects for a thorough assessment of heat stress are not incorporated into the current Cal/OSHA standard. However, it would be more of a barrier to protect workers making it harder for employers to comply with monitoring components. Currently, the Cal/OSHA standard does not have work/rest cycles in their standard. He recommended that we should encourage Cal/OSHA for clear and transparent sharing of information, and we should comment on the collection and availability of information of heat illness by industry and region.

One member brought up that once an employee is affected by heat illness, they become more susceptible to heat illness in the future. He stated that in his industry there are a lot of transfers from other states who are looking for a company that offers more opportunity and support. Most companies have a 14-day observation period for new employees allowing employers to prevent additional incidents of heat illness.

PRR Staff asked if a heat illness standard was needed for all industries, and she used an office environment as an example of a work environment not requiring a heat standard.

A task for member suggested that the body is where heat stress is monitored, and the real markers of heat stress are core temp and hear rate.

This member suggested that transparent sharing of the data of fatal or serious illness by Cal/OSHA including triggers is imperative.

Neat Meeting: TBD

Adjournment: 11:00 am PDT