From: DIR RS
To: Christian, Stacey@DIR; Park, Keummi@DIR; Noth, Betsey@DIR
Cc: Graulich, Kevin@DIR
Subject: FW: Comments on April draft revisions for WPVP general industry
Date: Friday, May 1, 2026 1:37:48 PM

Did you guys already see this?

Thanks,
Susan

From: Michael Corwin <corwinri@mac.com>
Sent: Friday, May 1, 2026 8:40 AM
To: DIR RS <RS@dir.ca.gov>
Subject: Comments on April draft revisions for WPVP general industry

CAUTION: [External Email]
This email originated from outside of our DIR organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is expected and is safe. If in doubt reach out and check with the sender by phone.

To Whom It May Concern,

I noticed that the most recent draft revision of the workplace violence prevention law for general industry left out that acting in self-defense and in defense of others is not workplace violence, and that it reinstated language allowing employers to put in place policies that prohibit employees from engaging in self-defense or in defense of others. (California PC sections 692 and 693)

There are multiple problems with this change and the **state should revert back to the previous draft** language because 1) allowing employers to prevent employees from acting in self-defense and in defense of others **allows employers to supersede state law**, which clearly permits anyone regardless of where they are to act in proportional self-defense and in defense of others. Only the legislature can allow for a law to be superseded otherwise employers would have the discretion to permit sexual harassment, racial discrimination etc. 2) In allowing employers to prohibit employees from protecting themselves and protecting others during a violent attack opens the door to retaliating against an employee for doing so including terminating them for an act that is authorized under state law. Your previous draft revision clearly recognized that such retaliation was happening and prohibited such retaliation. 3) Allowing employers to prohibit employees from protecting themselves and others **undercuts the entire purpose behind workplace violence prevention and strategies to avoid physical harm, by taking away a lawful strategy,** and it says to employees **we'd rather you be hurt or killed because worker's comp payments for injury or death are cheaper than a civil suit filed by an attacker.**

Clearly the legislative intent was not for any of these to occur.

Also, the easiest way to clarify **the most confusing aspect of the revisions** (exception 6) is to clarify with a specific sentence that the **law applies to all employers, employees, and places of employment that are accessible to the public (clients, customers, patients, vendors, contractors and the general public)** instead of excepting those who are not accessible. That is much more clear.

And then add a sentence that says, employees, employers, and places of employment NOT accessible to the public can be exempted provided that they have less than 10 employees on the payroll (more straightforward than working at all times) AND who are in compliance with section 3202.

I would be happy to answer any clarifying questions or appear in person if that would be of benefit.

Thank you.

Michael Corwin
Help You Be Safe, LLC
505-250-0244

mike@helpyoubesafe.com
www.mikecorwin.com
My comprehensive workplace violence prevention book California Workplace Violence Prevention Manual is now available.