

Diana Good

If we insist on living in extreme environments and want to have the luxuries of eating produce not native to this area, driving on pavement that requires construction and maintenance, residing in homes that have cooling systems and driving cars that have AC (all of which exacerbate rising temps.), then we should be more than willing to provide the respite and protection to those workers who make all these things possible for our cushy lives.

Further, there is research that supports the business case for making this sound investment for safety and productivity.

"Businesses may read this as increased costs but, in truth, it provides critical savings. Things that affect human health also have a direct impact on business performance, given that 84% of the value of S&P 500 companies is in human capital. Research shows worker productivity drops by as much as 2.5% per degree when temperatures rise above 80°F. This heat-induced decline in labor productivity is costing U.S. businesses \$100 billion annually and is expected to double by 2030. There is compelling evidence that simple heat protection measures save lives and boost productivity. La Isla Network implemented a worker safety program at a sugar plantation in Nicaragua, where heat-related injuries and deaths were common. The program led to a 72% reduction in injuries, a 94% decrease in hospitalizations—and a 20% increase in productivity. These preventative measures were also more than four times more affordable than treatment, proving that the investment not only saved lives but also more than paid for itself."

<https://www.fastcompany.com/91218539/a-business-case-for-protecting-workers-from-extreme-heat>

This is not only smart from a financial perspective but is a moral imperative as we demand a lifestyle that strains our workforce and their families' wellbeing. Providing the basics of humane treatment for outdoor workers should not even be a question and there is no good reason for not passing this new rule.