Virginia's Heat Illness Prevention Standard 16VAC25-210

Regulatory Advisory Panel

Thursday, October 29, 2026

9:30 a.m.–1:00 p.m.

On Thursday, October 29, 2026, the Regulatory Advisory Panel (RAP) for the Heat Illness Prevention Standard held an electronic public meeting to discuss the Proposed Heat Illness Prevention Standard.

Notice of the public meeting was provided to the public as required by VA Code §2.2-3708.2. Notice was provided on the Virginia Regulatory Town Hall's website here:

Virginia Regulatory Town Hall View Meeting

RAP PANELISTS:

Rachel Henley
Virginia Farm Bureau
Agriculture Forestry
Rachel McFarland
Legal Aid Justice Center
Agriculture Migrant Worker protections
Brad Copenhaver
Lindl Corporation Virginia Nursery and Landscape Association
Agriculture Family and commercial farms Wholesale and retail nurseries Landscaping contractors Agribusiness
Trey Davis
Virginia Agribusiness Council
Agriculture Forestry Urban agriculture business (landscapers, lawn care, golf courses)
Benjamin Packett
Omega Proteins, Inc
Commercial fishing Seafood processing Maritime operations
Travis Parsons
Laborers' International Union of North America (LiUNA!) Laborers' Health & Safety Fund of North America
Construction
Danny Minnix
Branch Group - Construction
Noah Schwartz
Southland Industries
Construction - mechanical and heavy civil HVAC and plumbing services
Gordon Dixon

Virginia Transportation Construction Alliance (VTCA)
Construction and Mining - Transportation Construction Aggregate mining
Antwyne Calloway
International Union of Painters and Allied Trades: IUPAT District Council 53
Construction Skilled finishing trades
Austyn Walker
Centreville Immigration Forum
Day labor work Worker protections
Audra Lucas
American Federation of Teacher, AFT
Education
Laura Duckworth
University of Virginia
Higher education
Tommy Herbert
Virginia Restaurant and Lodging Association(VRLTA)
Hospitality and tourism
Kayla Flowers
United Steelworkers (USW)
Manufacturing and industrial operations
Stacie Gordon
Virginia Manufacturers Association (VMA)
Manufacturing and trade
Roxana Chicas
Emory University
Occupational Health Research
Regis Brett
Public School Transportation
Public schools/transportation

Gavin Driscoll
American Federation of State, County Municipal Employees (AFSCME)
Public sector
Matt Phillips
Hanover County
Public sector - local government
Charles Craddock
Communications Workers of America (CWA) 2201
Telecommunications
Deb Yenser
Comcast

Telecommunications and technology
Cynthia Lyon
Busch Gardens of Williamsburg
Tourism Outdoor recreation

Richard Hobbs-Fernie
Teamsters Local Union 822
Transportation Warehousing
Frances Mensah
International Brotherhood of Teamsters
Transportation Logistics Manufacturing
Aishah Johnson
Public Citizen
Worker protections
Charlotte Brody
BlueGreen Alliance
Worker protections
Ramon Zepeda Ramos
Virginia Interfaith Center for Public Policy
Worker protections

AGENCY STAFF: Zahra Qarni, Director of Policy & Planning
Cristin Bernhardt, Regulatory Coordinator
Ron Graham, Director of Health Compliance
Shawnai Smith, Policy Analysis
Dr. Colleen McCaffrey, Manager for Health Compliance
Lyndsey Banks, Regional Director for Health Compliance

1. WELCOME AND REVIEW OF MEETING ONE (October 15, 2026)

Zahra Qarni, Director of Policy & Planning for DOLI welcomed the RAP panel members and attendees of the meeting.

Zahra thanked everybody for joining and addressed the group with the agenda and discussed the logistics and structure of the meeting. Zahra explained that the meeting would focus on specific protections to be addressed in the standard and would include interactive small-group discussions intended to provide panel members with opportunities to share ideas, identify practical considerations, and discuss potential regulatory approaches.

Review of Meeting One

Zahra provided a summary of the first RAP meeting, held on October 15, 2026. The first meeting focused on establishing a common foundation for the panel's work. Discussions included Virginia's regulatory process, the role of the advisory panel, and the statutory requirements guiding the development of the Heat Illness Prevention Standard.

The panel also reviewed the protections required by the legislation, including temperature thresholds, access to water and rest, cooling, acclimatization, training, and emergency response. Zahra noted that the first meeting provided an opportunity to hear from panel members about practical considerations that should inform the development of the standard. Key issues and questions raised included differences between indoor and outdoor work environments, the effects of personal protective equipment (PPE) and physical workload, and the importance of considering conditions specific to individual worksites.

Panel members also raised questions concerning the application of the standard in multi-employer environments, the allocation of responsibilities when contractors are involved, and the interpretation of statutory provisions related to emergency response activities and short-duration exposures.

Additional considerations included protections for temporary workers, acclimatization, employees working alone, accessible training, and protections against retaliation. Zahra emphasized that these topics had been identified for further examination and did not necessarily represent areas of agreement among panel members.

Zahra also reviewed the presentation provided by Bob Kitchen during Meeting One concerning the health impacts of heat exposure. The presentation addressed how heat affects the body's ability to regulate temperature and may impair physical performance and cognitive function. It also highlighted that heat-related illnesses can develop rapidly, sometimes with subtle warning signs that may not be immediately recognized.

These considerations reinforced the importance of prevention, early recognition of symptoms, and clear procedures for responding when a worker experiences symptoms of heat-related illness.

Zahra noted that a major theme emerging from the first meeting was the need to develop a standard that provides meaningful worker protections while remaining practical and workable across Virginia's diverse industries and work environments.

Focus of Meeting Two

Zahra explained that Meeting Two would focus primarily on the statutory requirements and how they might be translated into practical regulatory provisions. The statutory requirements are

contained in § 40.1-44.2 of the Code of Virginia, enacted following the 2026 General Assembly session.

The meeting would include three rounds of small-group discussions:

Round One: Exposure Assessment and Triggers. Consider methods for measuring heat exposure, identifying initial temperature thresholds for protective measures, and determining when additional protections should be required.

Round Two: Water, Cooling, and Rest. Discuss access to drinking water, cooling areas, preventive rest periods, and the practical implementation of these protections across different workplaces.

Round Three: Acclimatization and Elevated-Risk Conditions. Examine protections for workers adjusting to hot conditions, alternative approaches to acclimatization, and additional measures for elevated-risk situations.

Zahra noted that discussions could also address related requirements, including training, high-heat procedures, and emergency response.

The objectives of the meeting were to identify potential regulatory approaches, understand implementation considerations, and determine where additional research, supporting documentation, or practical examples would be useful. Such information could include existing workplace practices, industry-specific considerations, scientific research, and approaches adopted by other states.

Panel members were encouraged to identify areas of agreement while also sharing differing perspectives, alternative approaches, and implementation concerns. Zahra emphasized that consensus was not required on every issue and that the goal was to develop a clear understanding of available options, the reasoning supporting different recommendations, and outstanding questions requiring further consideration. The information gathered would inform DOLI's regulatory development process and discussions at the final RAP meeting on November 12, 2026.

2. OVERVIEW OF SMALL GROUP DISCUSSION FORMAT

To help us work through these topics, two smaller groups will break into two meeting spaces. One group will stay in this main area and the other group will move to a breakout room. These

conversations will be recorded, so we'll have three rounds of discussion each focused on a different set of regulatory requirements.

Each round will include 40 minutes for small group discussion followed by 15 minutes for large group where everybody comes back to the main hall to report out on the discussion summary for the full panel. Each group will designate a spokesperson who will briefly summarize the group's discussion, including any recommendations to the full panel at the end of each round when everyone will return to larger group and there will be an opportunity for more questions and discussion with the entire group after the reports.

3. SMALL -GROUP DISCUSSION, ROUND ONE: EXPOSURE ASSESSMENT AND TRIGGERS

4. REPORTS AND PANEL DISCUSSION, ROUND ONE: EXPOSURE ASSESSMENT AND TRIGGERS

- **Bob Kitchen**
  - Initiated the debate by asking whether employers should use heat index, ambient air temperature, wet-bulb globe temperature (WBGT), or a combination to determine when protections kick in.
  - Pointed out that while California relies on simple ambient temperature due to broad resistance to WBGT, the Corey Stringer Institute demonstrates that a WBGT pole device is relatively cheap (as an example, shared that one was $68 on Amazon) and highly accurate.
  - Noted that the OSHA/NIOSH Weather Safety Tool smartphone app is a comprehensive alternative that calculates heat index and risk thresholds instantly.
  - Observed that neighboring states like Maryland, Oregon, and Washington all broadly use an 80°F initial trigger and a 90°F high heat trigger.
- **Trey Davis** (Virginia Aggregate Business Council)
  - Flagged that Virginia has far more 80°F and 90°F days with significantly higher humidity than states like California; any compared standard must account for how often agribusiness employees work outside in these conditions.
- **Deb Yenser**
  - Expressed concern that while WBGT makes perfect sense for localized, high-heat athletic fields (recalling her background in athletic training), it is logistically unfeasible for an EHS Director managing hundreds of isolated field technicians across diverse terrains (shores vs. mountains).
  - Supported using the heat index as the standard practical baseline because whole numbers are much easier for employers and field workers to remember.
- **Antwyne Calloway**
  - Emphasized that exposure assessments cannot rely on environmental temperature alone; they must factor in metabolic and clothing burdens.

Highlighted that painters, drywall finishers, and glazers doing "Hydro Blast" work inside factories face intense radiant heat from motors/generators while trapped inside full containment suits and respirators.

- **Noah Schwartz**
  - Proposed a tiered/hybrid approach: start with the heat index for standard environments, but require a transition to WBGT or task-specific assessments for high-risk environments involving severe radiant heat, intense physical labor, or heavy PPE burdens.
  - Recommended aligning Virginia's triggers strictly with Maryland (80°F initial / 90°F high heat) to make compliance easier for large contractors working across tri-state jurisdictions.
- **Tommy Herbert**
  - Supported the practical use of the heat index as a baseline starting point on behalf of the attractions and hospitality industries, noting its alignment with Maryland's model.
- **Ramon Zepeda Ramos**
  - Agreed that a 80°F/90°F heat index trigger framework makes sense, noting that even California officials admitted in recent presentations that their 95°F high-heat trigger was likely too high and should be lower.

- **Heat Exposure Assessment: Heat Index, Ambient Temperature, and Wet-Bulb Globe Temperature Bob Kitchen**
  - Opened the monitoring debate by outlining the structural scientific superiority of Wet Bulb Globe Temperature (WBGT) tracking, referencing validation data from the Corey Stringer Institute. However, due to extreme device deployment costs, noted that the official OSHA/NIOSH smartphone application serves as a highly comprehensive and accessible mobile baseline for field testing.
- **Travis Parsons**
  - Affirmed that across safety, industrial hygiene, and worker advocacy circles, WBGT is universally recognized as the absolute gold standard for tracking heat because it explicitly captures radiant heat, humidity, wind, and ambient air temperature.
- **Deb Yenser**
  - Opposed mandating WBGT monitoring for scattered field teams.
  - Shared that while a centralized WBGT pole is operationally sound for a localized sports medicine team tracking an athletic turf field, it completely falls apart for an EHS director managing hundreds of individual telecom technicians working isolated mobile shifts.
  - Endorsed using the standard Heat Index as the only feasible fleet-wide metric.
- **Noah Schwartz**
  - Proposed a layered monitoring compromise: utilize the Heat Index as the broad baseline, but require a formal escalation to localized WBGT criteria if a site hits specific high-risk environmental factors (radiant industrial heat sources, heavy physical workloads, or heavy PPE burdens).

- **Initial and High-Heat Temperature Thresholds**
  Bob Kitchen
    - Proposed discussion points on setting an initial protective awareness trigger at an 80°F Heat Index and an elevated high-heat procedural trigger at a 90°F Heat Index.
- **Noah Schwartz, Ramon Zepeda Ramos, and Deb Yenser**
    - Established a panel consensus around the 80°F/90°F tiering. Ramos confirmed that California's historical 95°F high-heat mark proved dangerously loose, while Yenser emphasized that clean, whole numbers (80/90) are vital for baseline field compliance so they are easily memorized by field hands.
- **Travis Parsons**
    - Noted that forward-thinking firms are already operating protocols at 80°F and 90°F, making it highly realistic. He recommended exploring a third extreme tier to manage historic weather anomalies.

Local Microclimate Monitoring Frequencies

- **Antwyne Calloway**
    - Stated that environmental assessments must never be treated as a static, passive "morning form" filled out at a 6:30 AM muster.
    - Argued that because weather and industrial process microclimates shift aggressively during a shift, monitoring must be codified as an active, rolling safety measure.
- **Deb Yenser**
    - Supported a tiered check-in framework, pointing out that morning ambient temperatures are naturally comfortable, but require progressive afternoon supervisor monitoring as localized microclimates change.

Zahra Qarni mentioned adding a side by side and deeper dive on existing state regulations would help in the next meeting, so that is something DOLI will work on to get that out before the next meeting.

******TEN-MINUTE BREAK******

After the break, Zahra Qarni presented the group with the next set of topics and discussion questions and two new small groups were formed for discussion.

5. SMALL -GROUP DISCUSSION, ROUND TWO: WATER, COOLING AND REST

6. REPORTS AND PANEL DISCUSSION, ROUND TWO: WATER, COOLING AND REST

- **Bob Kitchen**

    - Noted that the overall goal is providing cool, potable, free, and close water.
    - Summarized the group consensus to adopt Maryland's mandatory high-heat rest schedule as a baseline: 10 minutes of rest every 2 hours when the heat index is between 90°F–100°F, escalating to 15 minutes of rest every hour when the heat index exceeds 100°F.
- **Danny Minnix**
    - Pointed out that basic water provision is already heavily regulated by existing federal OSHA standards (such as 1910.141 for general industry and 1926.51 for construction) and warned against writing a state standard that creates regulatory conflicts.
    - Noted that modern construction operations have abandoned communal water coolers for hygiene reasons, opting instead to purchase bulk bottled water ($0.20/bottle) paired with electrolyte drink mixes.
    - Expressed concern over voluntary or preventative cooldown breaks, questioning how an employer can realistically police or prevent workers from abusing the system by sitting down for an hour under the guise of a preventative break.

- **Matthew Phillips**
    - Countered that less reputable subcontractors still try to force workers to use cheap, unhygienic communal water jugs, meaning the standard needs explicit guidelines rather than leaving water delivery completely open to interpretation.

- **Laura Duckworth**
    - Questioned whether a strict mandate for individual plastic water bottles conflicts with broader environmental sustainability goals, suggesting reusable container structures should remain an option.
    - Emphasized that "cooling areas" are much less intuitive than simple shade. Technicians working inside enclosed steam or utility tunnels face extreme heat, but walking out of the tunnel puts them into direct sun, meaning recovery zones require distinct cooling parameters (like air-conditioned vehicles or mechanical ventilation).

- **Trey Davis**
    - Shared that the standard must provide maximum flexibility for outdoor agricultural fields. Requiring permanent shade structures is an operational impossibility when farmers are moving harvesting equipment across multiple fields throughout a single day.

- **Antwyne Calloway**
    - Stated that cooling spaces must be specialized for workers in heavy PPE; if an indoor factory environment is already shaded but stagnant, a cooling zone must actively allow workers to safely remove respirators and protective suits to dump core body heat.

- **Rachel McFarland**

- Warned that field workers paid on a "piece-rate" system (by the amount harvested) face a unique systemic barrier: they are highly disincentivized from stopping to utilize water or cooling areas because taking a break directly reduces their paycheck.

Water & Hydration

- **Cynthia Lyon**
  - Noted that outdoor park workers carry large metal water bottles and have access to refilling locations throughout the park.
  - Questioned how specific a standard should be regarding the exact required distance to water.
- **Gavin Driscoll**
  - Emphasized that because some employers make water access difficult, the standard should require water to be free, potable, cool, as close to the work source as possible, and accessible without needing permission or causing a loss of pay.

- **Ramon Zepeda Ramos**
  - Stressed the importance of ensuring that water breaks are paid and that workers are not discouraged or retaliated against (such as losing hours) for taking them.

- **Frances Mensah**
  - Pointed out that the standard needs to define both the minimum quantity of water and the minimum proximity for access, though the exact prescribed distance may depend heavily on the specific work environment.

- **Noah Schwartz**
  - Supported providing sufficient, potable, and suitably cool water without permission barriers or pay loss.
  - Highlighted the OSHA proposed benchmark of one quart per employee per hour.
  - Noted that water shouldn't be kept in direct sunlight or hot vehicles, and suggested permitting designated hydration locations for secure facilities (like data centers or airports) where liquids are restricted.

- **Audra Lucas**
  - Reiterated that water must be accessible and that employers must actively encourage workers to drink it.

Cooling Areas & Environmental Controls

- **Stacie Gordon**
  - Warned that "close proximity" needs careful definition because bringing water directly into certain environments—like chemical or pharmaceutical manufacturing—can introduce contamination or safety hazards.

- **Gavin Driscoll**

    - Stated that a cooling area should be close enough to reach promptly, large enough to accommodate all workers on break comfortably with seating, and fully protected from direct sun or radiant heat.
    - Emphasized that engineering and administrative controls (like solar-powered fans for air movement) must be prioritized over personal protective equipment (PPE).

- **Noah Schwartz**
    - Agreed that shade alone indoors is irrelevant and a true "cooling area" requires protection from radiant heat, active air movement (cooling fans/towers), and space to sit or lie down.
    - Noted the operational difficulty of deploying portable evaporative cooling or mobile ACs in data center galleries where sensitive electronics cannot be near water or lack exhaust ports.

- **Cynthia Lyon**
    - Mentioned that a shade tent without air movement can actually trap humidity and make the heat index worse.
    - Expressed a preference for shaded areas with natural air movement over air-conditioned buildings during a shift, as going back and forth forces workers to constantly re-acclimatize.
    - Shared that the park provides cooling towels in ice water, neck fans, and electrolyte popsicles.

- **Ramon Zepeda Ramos**
    - Highlighted that a proper cooling area must accommodate the physical realities of the job, such as allowing workers to take off heavy gear or PPE to properly cool down.

- **Audra Lucas**
    - Reiterated the importance of utilizing the hierarchy of controls, focusing heavily on engineering and administrative solutions before relying on PPE.

Rest Breaks & Flexibility

- **Cynthia Lyon**
    - Expressed the need for policy flexibility. Theircurrent policy prescribes a 15-minute paid break for every two hours worked, they noted that strict prescriptive standard time blocks might conflict with employees who prefer combining them into a longer 45-minute or 1-hour lunch break.
    - Mentioned that some workers actively push back on taking required breaks simply out of boredom.
- **Deb Yenser**
    - Agreed on the need for flexibility due to individual susceptibility to heat.
    - suggested that while preventative cool-down breaks should remain flexible and non-penalized, strict, mandatory time blocks might be necessary during multi-day extreme heat waves when there is no overnight reprieve.

    - Noted that supervisor check-ins and adjusted quotas should ensure workers aren't penalized for taking extra breaks when the heat index is high.

- **Austyn Walker**
    - Suggested adopting a mechanism similar to "stop work authority," allowing workers to self-identify when they need a rest break to give them confidence.
    - Noted that mandating breaks strictly creates a "hairy area" regarding personal autonomy if a worker refuses, pointing out that in the immigrant populations they work with, there is a cultural stigma where workers prefer pushing through to finish early.

- **Rachel Henley**
    - Agreed that trying to strictly force mandatory breaks strips away personal autonomy and noted the extreme difficulty of setting up or maintaining close-by cooling stations in highly remote agricultural or forestry work sites lacking cell service or electricity.

- **Gavin Driscoll**
    - Reemphasized that preventative cool-down breaks must be entirely self-designated by the worker the moment they feel discomfort, because heat affects rational brain function and decision-making before physical symptoms fully show.
    - Stated that white papers show prescribed breaks actually enhance total productivity.
    - Warned against employer cultures that incentivize speed (e.g., "finish early and go home while staying on the clock"), as it encourages workers to skip breaks.

- **Ramon Zepeda Ramos**
    - Noted that rest requirements should scale based on the physical demands of the job (e.g., digging a trench vs. waiting in a line at a theme park).
    - Added that the stigma against taking breaks cuts across demographics, affecting teenagers trying to prove themselves just as much as immigrant populations.
    - Cited research from North Carolina showing that piece-rate wages and the fear of being replaced put intense pressure on agricultural workers to keep breaks dangerously short.

Sanitation and Delivery of Drinking Water

- **Brad Copenhaver & Tommy Herbert**
    - Warned against integrating rigid terms like "ice-cold" water into the legal text, stating that hyper-chilled water can shock an overheated worker's system. They suggested focusing on "suitably cool" or "fresh" water metrics.
- **Travis Parsons**
    - Defined the technical target for hydration cooling: water must be consistently maintained **under 60°F** (ideally between 50°F and 60°F).
- **Rachel McFarland**

    - raised an agricultural health priority, demanding that drinking water systems be strictly closed and structurally protected from drifting field chemicals, dust, or airborne crop pesticides.
- **Danny Minnix**
    - cautioned against regulatory redundancy, noting that existing federal OSHA standards (1910.141 and 1926.51) already explicitly govern potable water containers and ban shared cups. He noted that modern operations completely isolate hydration risks by deploying bulk pallets of individual water bottles ($0.20/unit) stored in clean, ice-filled chest coolers.

Proximate Shade and Mechanical Cooling Alternatives

- **Trey Davis**
    - Emphasized that permanent, stationary shade structures are logistically impossible for active agribusiness operations changing fields continuously.
    - Urged the validation of natural tree canopies as legally compliant shade.

- **Danny Minnix**
    - Noted that on open highways, running vehicles with active air conditioning serve as highly effective, proximate cooling alternatives to standard pop-up canopies.

- **Tommy Herbert**
    - Added that commercial hospitality sectors natively address cooling, as kitchen staff naturally cycle through walk-in coolers to rapidly drop their core thermal loads.

- **Antwyne Calloway**
    - Shared with the panel that shade is useless to an industrial blaster if they are prohibited or physically restricted from stripping down their hot, non-breathable protective suit layers during the break.

Mandated Work-Rest Schedules vs. Production Pressures

- **Travis Parsons**
    - Supported adopting Maryland's structured high-heat work-rest schedules as the baseline minimum.
    - Urged VOSH to overlay these numbers against NIOSH metabolic workload tables to dynamically scale mandatory break durations based on physical exertion levels.

- **Danny Minnix**
    - Countered that rigid, hourly work-rest schedules create severe operational bottlenecks on lean technical teams (such as a 5-person road crew), where mandating that a single worker stop automatically gridlocks the entire job.
    - shared a behavioral hurdle to rest breaks: when field workforces are tied to piece-rate pay scales or intense production incentives, the workers themselves will

actively choose to skip safety breaks because resting directly reduces their take-home paycheck.

7. SMALL -GROUP DISCUSSION, ROUND THREE: ACCLIMITIZATION AND ELEVATED-RISK CONDITIONS

Scope of Covered Workers and Transients

- **Gavin Driscoll**
  - Requested that acclimatization protocols strictly cover *all* unacclimatized personnel, defining this explicitly as new hires, temporary agency staff, workers transferred from climate-controlled to hot tasks, and employees returning from extended leaves of absence.
- **Antwyne Calloway**
  - Noted that general trade seniority does not equal biological acclimatization; a highly experienced senior painter can easily suffer a heat injury if suddenly dropped into an unventilated, high-heat industrial coating space without a gradual ramp.
- **Austyn Walker**
- Emphasized that a standard 5-to-14-day gradual acclimatization schedule is structurally impossible to apply to transient day laborers or rapid seasonal agricultural crews who are hired for single-day windows.

When the panel raised the question of what alternatives should be considered, Zahra Qarni suggested enhanced hydration and electrolyte or sodium replacement protocols as examples.

Written Heat Illness Prevention Plans (Mandate vs. Burden)

- **Gavin Driscoll, Travis Parsons, Audra Lucas, & Frances Mensah**
  - Supported requiring written heat illness prevention plans. They emphasizedthat a written, site-specific Heat Illness Prevention Plan must be mandatory across all employers.
  - Parsons shared: *"In the world of safety, if it's not written, it doesn't happen,"* noting that without a written blueprint, VOSH inspectors possess zero structural capacity to enforce compliance.
  - Stated that plans must explicitly detail site-specific emergency response protocols, buddy assignments, and designate competent persons authorized to stop work.
- **Danny Minnix**
  - Expressed concerns about a blanket written plan mandate, warning that forcing small business operations to draft custom safety documents creates a paralyzing administrative barrier for firms lacking dedicated HR staff.
  - noted that federal OSHA effectively enforces numerous health codes without requiring separate written plans.
- **Gordon Dixon & Rachel Henley**
  - raised similar concerns about the administrative burden of written plans forsmall businesses and agricultural employers.

- Henley explained that most Virginia farmers are part-time operators who act as their own labor force; forcing them to manage complex legal paperwork is overly burdensome.
- Asked that VOSH provide a simple model template that small firms can easily adopt as their baseline policy.

9. PUBLIC COMMENTS:

Zahra Qarni (DOLI) asked if there were any members of the public who wished to address the RAP panel today. No member of the public requested to speak to the panel.

Zahra explained that the agency would also accept written comments. Panelists and the general public who were listening were encouraged to submit written comments on the overall regulation, implementation considerations, industry-specific issues or other matters relevant to the development of the standard.Written comments and supporting materials could be submitted to Cristin Bernhardt at Cristin.bernhardt@doli.virginia.gov. Zahra noted that specific examples and links or citations to supporting research would help DOLI develop the supporting documentation.

10. NEXT STEPS AND ADJOURNMENT

The third and final RAP meeting was scheduled for Thursday, November 12, 2026, from 9:30 a.m. to 1:00 p.m. The final meeting would include additional small-group discussions, with a focus on emergency response procedures, implementation strategies, and potential guidance and resources that DOLI could provide to support compliance. The panel would also consider existing workplace programs and practices and circumstances in which equivalent protective approaches might be appropriate. Zahra indicated that DOLI would share the next meeting agenda and additional information concerning questions raised during Meeting Two.

All the presentation slides and the meeting minutes will be posted to the Virginia Regulatory Town Hall meeting website Virginia Regulatory Town Hall View Meeting/

The Department of Labor and Industry website has a dedicated webpage to the Heat Illness Prevention Standard and the recording of the meetings will be posted to the website.

DOLI – Virginia Department of Labor and Industry - Virginia's Heat Illness Prevention Standard

MEETING ADJOURNED: 1:01 PM

FINAL RAP MEETING:

- **Thursday, November 12, 2026 : 9:30 am – 1:00 pm**

****RAP meeting notices will be posted to Virginia Regulatory Town Hall and Commonwealth Calendar**

Virginia Regulatory Town Hall - Meetings

Commonwealth Calendar - Home