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In 2017, the #MeToo movement helped reveal the rampant sexual harassment and assault afflicting the hospitality industry. To combat these staggering levels of sexual abuse, hotel labor unions have demanded that hotels supply workers with “panic buttons”—alarmed personal devices that workers can use to alert security. Over the past two years, the panic button movement has gained traction across the United States, with three states and eight cities implementing panic button policies. Unfortunately, little progress has been made in America’s most populous state. In 2018, trade groups in California were successful in lobbying against statewide panic button legislation. The state’s political landscape, however, is evolving, and the outlook for passing statewide legislation in the coming years is promising. But the manner of implementation will be essential to determining the policy's effectiveness in protecting domestic workers. The state can develop a strong implementation program by using existing municipal policies as case studies to (1) pinpoint success factors and (2) predict implementation roadblocks.
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Sexual Harassment in the Workplace: What Are the Numbers?

**Workplace sexual harassment and assault is widespread in the United States.**

- **38%** of women have experienced sexual harassment at the workplace.\(^1\)

- Only **1 in 10** people who experience sexual harassment or assault in the workplace ever report.\(^2\)

- **75%** of employees who speak out about harassment or assault face retaliation from their employers.

**Workplace sexual harassment and assault have detrimental effects on the well-being of employees.**

The most common diagnoses for victims of workplace sexual harassment are depression, anxiety, and post-traumatic stress disorder.\(^4\)

Women who have experienced sexual harassment in the workplace are **6.5 times more likely** to leave their jobs than those who have not,\(^5\) often taking new work at a lower wage.\(^6\)

**Workplace sexual harassment and assault not only harms survivors, it inflicts high costs on employers.** Sexual harassment and assault cases are extremely costly for companies. In 2017, the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) obtained $46.3 million in monetary benefits from companies on behalf of survivors of sexual harassment.\(^7\)
Sexual harassment is also damaging to both individual employee and team productivity, thus hurting businesses. One study estimated that the average cost of the loss of productivity is $22,500 per person working in a team affected by harassment.8

**Women working in isolated spaces are especially vulnerable to sexual harassment and assault.**

Isolation “leaves women vulnerable to abusers who may feel emboldened by a lack of witnesses.”9 Furthermore, hotel workers are especially vulnerable to sexual assault or harassment, in part, due the class disparity between workers, who are often low-income women of color and immigrants, and the hotel guests, who are paying hundreds of dollars for their room each night.10 In fact, research has found that working-class women in the restaurant and hospitality industries have the highest rates of workplace sexual harassment.

According to the EEOC, between 2005 and 2015, hotel and restaurant workers filed more than 5,000 sexual harassment complaints.11 The Center for American Progress reports that this rate is higher than any other industry.12

A survey conducted by UNITE HERE Chicago reveals the frequency and pervasiveness of this issue:

- **58%** of Chicago hotel workers had experienced sexual harassment.
- **49%** of hotel workers had experienced a guest exposing themselves to the worker.13

### What’s Being Done?

Currently, only six states have passed laws requiring businesses to conduct sexual harassment training.14 However, there is little evidence that sexual harassment training works. Dr. Eden King, an associate professor at Rice University, notes that the trainings tend to focus on rules, law, and procedure. King adds that “learning about the law may not actually change anybody’s behavior . . . [and that] it’s really the behavior or the culture that we want to change.”15 Given the inadequacy and ineffectiveness of these training programs, panic buttons have been embraced by workers and advocates as a better solution to address sexual harassment and assault in the workplace.

**What Is a Panic Button?**

Panic buttons can take a variety of forms, including GPS devices, smartphone apps, and simple buttons that emit an alarm. When a worker presses the panic button, hotel security is notified and provided with the worker’s precise location.16

**Why Panic Buttons?**

Most hotel workers believe that panic buttons are integral to their immediate safety. In Chicago, a survey of 487 hotel employees found that 96% of workers would feel more secure entering guest rooms if they were equipped with a panic button,17 with one housekeeper stating: “having a panic button would make me feel safer. To know I can easily call for help if something happens would be such a relief . . . We deserve to be treated with respect and to feel safe at work.”18

**Who Is Leading the Panic Button Movement?**

UNITE HERE, a labor union representing 300,000 working people throughout Canada and the United States,19 has centered its attention on promoting panic button policies, which they believe are essential to protecting hotel workers against harassment and assault. Since 2013, members of UNITE HERE Local 6
have negotiated panic buttons into their labor contracts with hotels in New York, America’s largest city.  

**How Are State and Local Governments Responding?**

Inspired by the work of local labor unions, since 2016, eight cities and New Jersey, Illinois and Washington have passed legislation requiring all local hotels to provide their workers with panic buttons.

**What’s Being Done in California: State-Level Action**

In 2018, panic button legislation was introduced to the California State Legislature by Assemblyman Al Muratsuchi. The bill (AB-1761) required that hotels provide employees with panic buttons, maintain a blacklist of all guests who had been accused of sexual harassment or assault, and provide accommodations and paid leave to employees who were the victims of harassment.  

The California Hotel and Lodging Association launched a campaign against the legislation. Their opposition was centered around three main concerns:

1. **No Pressing Need:** the bill was too extreme, offering a disproportional response to a relatively minor and manageable situation.

2. **Blacklist Provisions:** maintaining a ‘blacklist’ of guests accused of sexual harassment, without granting the right to appeal, blatantly violated their guests’ rights to due process.

3. **Industry Has it Under Control:** the hotel industry had already taken steps to address the issue.

**What’s Being Done in California: Municipal Action**

Despite the failure of state-wide legislation in 2018, over the past two years, local branches of UNITE HERE have advocated for panic button policies at the municipal level in California. Since 2018, UNITE HERE has had success in four major California cities:

1. **Long Beach:** In November 2018, the Long Beach City Council voted in favor of Measure WW, an ordinance requiring that hotels with more than 50 rooms provide panic buttons to employees.  

2. **Oakland:** In December 2018, 75% of Oakland voters voted in favor of Measure Z, a city ordinance which would provide every hotel room cleaner in Oakland with a panic button. Measure Z also raised the minimum wage for hotel workers to $15 and imposed workload restrictions.

3. **Sacramento:** In June 2019, the Sacramento City Council passed an ordinance requiring that all hotels or motels with 25 or more rooms provide their employees with panic buttons.
4. **Santa Monica**: In August 2019, the Santa Monica City Council voted to approve an ordinance requiring that all hotels provide their employees with panic buttons. The ordinance prohibited hotels from retaliating against employees for pressing the buttons and required that hotels post notices of the panic button policy to guestroom doors. Finally, the ordinance contained workload requirements, specifying that employees should not be asked to clean more than 4,000 square feet of floor space in an eight-hour day, and that hotel employers could not require hotel workers to work more than 10 hours in a workday. 29

What’s the Pushback on City Ordinances?
Local government coalitions and leaders in the hotel and tourism industries have led the opposition against these city-wide panic button policies. Pushback against the ordinances is centered around three main concerns:

1. **Redundant**
   - In Oakland, City Councilmember Larry Reid argued that Measure WW would require the creation of an entirely new city agency, which would cost millions of dollars and duplicate the federal, state, and city agencies which already provide protections to workers. 30
   - In Santa Monica, the CHLA argued that the city ordinance was unnecessary, because many Santa Monica hotels already provided their workers with panic buttons. 31

2. **Incomplete**
   - In Long Beach, four city councilmembers chose to walk out of the council chambers rather than vote on the panic button bill. Specifically, these councilmembers took issue with the measure’s lack of a retaliation clause and argued that the measure should apply to hotels with fewer than 50 rooms. 32
   - In an uncharacteristic vote in favor of panic button policies, the CHLA came out in support of the Sacramento city ordinance. However, the CHLA did not believe the ordinance went far enough, and publicly encouraged the City Council to extend the policy to hotels and motels with fewer than 25 rooms. 33

3. **Workload Restrictions**
   - In Long Beach, the CHLA filed a lawsuit against the city over Measure WW, claiming that the city was overstepping their authority with the law’s workload provisions. The CHLA argued that it is up to the California Occupational Safety and Health Administration to enforce workload provisions and workplace standards, not the city of Long Beach. 34 Moreover, Pete Hillan of the Long Beach Hospitality Alliance argued that the policy’s focus on worker safety and panic buttons simply masked a desire to “[expand] social interests.” 35

Labor Unions’ Defense of City Ordinances
While opponents of the city ordinances took the greatest issue with the workload restrictions, labor activists argued that these provisions were critical to tackling sexual harassment and assault in the hotel industry. Rachel Gumpert, a spokeswoman for UNITE HERE notes, “it’s often women of color who are [being] marginalized [by] wealthy guests who come and stay in the hotels.” 36 Thus, given this class disparity and the inherent power imbalance between workers and guests, labor activists believe that a wage increase and workload restrictions are intrinsically linked to the fight against sexual harassment.
As a representative of the Bay Alliance for a Sustainable Economy notes, the success of Measure Z in Oakland was “a step towards ending the exploitation of feminized labor.”

**What’s Being Done in California: Judicial Action**

In 2017, a housekeeper employed by Pacific Pearl Hotel Management, was brutally raped by a drunk guest. The housekeeper sued Pacific for violating the California Fair Employment and Housing Act (FEHA) and failing to prevent the assault.

*The Case:* In the case of M.F. v Pearl, the plaintiff argued that her employer should have known that her attacker was on the hotel’s premise before the assault occurred. To support this claim, the plaintiff notes that prior to her attack, her assailant inappropriately approached two other housekeepers, who reported the guest to management. Ultimately, management did not do enough to survey the premises for the guest, who subsequently cornered the plaintiff and brutally attacked her in a hotel room.

*The Decision:* The court ruled in favor of the plaintiff, noting that once the hotel was aware that a guest was harassing employees on their premises, they should have taken immediate corrective action to protect their workers. This case affirms that, under FEHA, California hotels are liable for harassment committed by guests against their employees.

**Moving Forward: What’s Next for Panic Buttons?**

**Have Trade Associations Changed their Tune?**

As panic button policies gain momentum across the country, the hotel industry is taking steps to publicly support the idea. In September 2018, the American Hotel and Lodging Association and 17 member hotel brands (including Hilton, Hyatt, and Marriott) announced the 5-Star Promise: a pledge to put panic buttons in all of their hotels by 2020. It is important to note, however, that with this promise, the AHLA is supporting responsive anti-sexual harassment policies, which arm the worker with a panic button, but not punitive policies that punish the perpetrator, such as the blacklist.

**Where Would Panic Button Legislation Be Most Impactful?**

Despite the success of panic button policies in California cities, panic button legislation would be most impactful at the state-level for a variety of reasons:

1. **Guarantee Protection to All Hotel Workers:** State-level panic button legislation would be an efficient way to guarantee every hotel worker in America’s most populous state with a basic form of protection against sexual harassment or assault.

2. **Remove Confusion:** Sweeping legislation of this nature would remove the confusion around California’s intricate web of city panic button policies.

3. **Override Trade Groups:** Though trade-groups have changed their tune slightly on the issue of panic buttons, state-wide legislation would be a powerful way for the state government to ensure that panic button policies are actually enforced. The hotel industry simply providing workers with the buttons is not enough. Hotels must provide reasonable accommodations to victims of
harassment, offer paid leave, and provide proper signage in order for the panic buttons to be effective in protecting the dignity and safety of workers.

Can State Legislation Pass?
There is a strong chance that California can achieve state-wide panic button policy in the next legislative session for several key reasons:

1. **The Power of the Social Movement:** Based on the success of panic button legislation in three U.S. states, it is clear that the #MeToo movement has thrust the issue of workplace sexual harassment onto the national agenda. Sexual harassment in the workplace is receiving national news-coverage and is being prioritized by policymakers at the state level.

2. **Success in U.S. States:** California legislators can study the success of state-wide panic button legislation in Illinois, Washington, and New Jersey and can craft legislation based on these initiatives.

3. **Learning from Prior Legislative Failure:** California policymakers can draw on lessons learned from past legislative mistakes to help ensure passage of panic button laws. The blacklist provision included in a Seattle ordinance and the 2018 California bill blocked the passage of these measures. While punishing perpetrators is vital in the pursuit of justice, it seems that lawmakers have come to a consensus: “blacklisting” is too extreme a legal authority to grant private institutions, like hotels. To provide California hotel workers with panic buttons, and protect them from immediate threats to their safety, a more targeted bill should be introduced in future legislative sessions.

4. **Success in California Cities:** The success of panic button policies in several major California cities signals that many Californians are ready and eager to support such legislation.

5. **A #MeToo Governor:** Newly elected Governor Newsom has already signed into law several anti-sexual harassment bills, previously vetoed by former-Governor Brown. Newsom’s support for #MeToo legislation indicates that he could be a key advocate for state-wide panic button legislation or could use his executive order powers to directly secure hotel workers with this protection.

Can Panic Button Legislation Be Successfully Implemented?
In 2018, both Miami Beach and Chicago implemented comparable panic button ordinances and, that same year, the Director of Economic Development in Long Beach produced a study on the implementation of Measure WW in local hotels. The challenges faced by these three cities present several major roadblocks that the state could face in successfully implementing statewide panic button policies:

1. **Financing Panic Buttons**
   - Implementing $250 GDS-enabled panic buttons is a significant financial investment, costing larger hotels (100+ rooms) up to $500,000 or more.
• Implementation would be most burdensome on smaller hotels. The Long Beach study notes that it is "costlier per unit to acquire a small number of devices, and costs will be proportionately higher for smaller properties."\(^{44}\)
• The combined cost of panic buttons and signage may make it difficult for many small California hotels to comply with these requirements and may force these smaller establishments to provide only the simpler, alarm-emitting devices to save costs. Some hotels could also close due to these financial burdens.

2. **Physical and Technological Capacities of Hotels**
   • In Long Beach, several smaller hotels reported that they found it difficult to meet the accommodations requirement, noting that "reassignment would be challenging in a smaller facility without multiple floors."\(^{45}\)
   • Moreover, smaller hotels may not have hired security staffers to intervene in these dangerous situations.
   • GPS-enabled buttons require stable Wi-Fi to function. In Chicago, large hotels were facing challenges in “establishing reliable Wi-Fi connections in every corner of their buildings.”\(^{46}\)
   To protect workers throughout an establishment, hotels can invest in wireless technology such as adaptive antennas or smart roaming, which can eliminate Wi-Fi “dead zones.”\(^{47}\)
   • Small hotels may not have Wi-Fi to begin with. Establishing a Wi-Fi connection and strengthening it with advanced wireless technologies may be too costly.
   • These roadblocks will especially effect small hotels in Santa Monica and Long Beach, where the panic button policy applies even to hotels with 50 or fewer rooms.

3. **Workload Requirements**
   • The 4,000 square foot cap on total cleaning area would mean that workers would only be able to clean 10 rooms a day (four fewer than current market standards).\(^{48}\) This could cost hotels up to $1600 per room.\(^{49}\)
   • Moreover, this restriction could actually harm workers’ financially—demoting them to part-time workers and requiring hotels to hire more part-time staffers.\(^{50}\)

**Recommendations:**

**What Should Be Excluded from State Legislation?**

1. **Blacklist Provisions:** The blacklist provision included in a city ordinance in Seattle and the 2018 California bill blocked the passage of these measures. While punishing perpetrators is vital in the pursuit of justice, it seems that lawmakers have come to a consensus: “blacklisting” is too extreme a legal authority to grant private institutions, like hotels.\(^{51}\)

2. **Workload Restrictions:** At the city level, workload restrictions have caused an uproar from the hotel industry and from the local chambers of commerce. While workload restrictions and wages increases are vital in altering the power imbalance between workers and guests, these sorts of provisions should be introduced in separate legislation in order to ensure the passage of a state-wide panic button policy.
3. **Change the Name:** The term ‘panic button’ carries a gendered weight to it. The word ‘panic’ is usually tied to female hysteria or overreaction. Thus, while these policies are not explicitly targeted towards female employees, the word ‘panic’ suggests that women are the subject of the legislation and reinforces a counterproductive gendered power dynamic. Moreover, due to this association, male employees may feel less inclined to press their buttons if they are in threatening situations. An alternative name could be “safety alert button.”

**What Can Aid Implementation?**

1. **New Regulation and Tax Breaks**
   - Pass a separate state regulation requiring hotels with 50 or more rooms to implement GPS-enabled panic buttons.
   - Offer tax breaks to hotels with 50 or fewer rooms to defray some or all of the costs of the more advanced and effective technology. Tax breaks can also be provided to help smaller hotels afford the signage for guestroom doors and a small security staff.
   - Offer smaller hotels longer periods of time to implement the policies so they can spread out the cost of procuring or installing the buttons and signage.

2. **Training Programs**
   - Ensure that all hotel workers are adequately trained on (1) their rights and (2) how to use the buttons by developing a state-run training program, which can be conducted (in both English and Spanish) by local officials in California hotels.
   - Develop a training program for hotel security staff.

3. **Routine Inspections and Civil Penalties**
   - Local government officials should perform a bi-annual inspection of hotels, checking for: (1) proper signage on guestroom doors and (2) that hotel workers at 50+ room hotels are equipped with GPS-panic buttons.
   - If state-officials are alerted of an instance of retaliation against an employee or a violation of the accommodations provision, the hotel should be civilly fined. This civil penalty should not be flexible and should be strictly enforced.

4. **Data Collection**
   - Require bi-annual hotel reports to the state. The reports should include: (1) how many times workers pressed the buttons, (2) a short summary of the events that transpired, (3) any difficulties they have encountered with the panic button technology.
   - Partner with California policy groups, such as the Women’s Policy Institute, to gather data on:
     - The best ways for hotel security to intervene in a situation with a harasser.
     - The importance of the GPS feature in panic buttons, especially in large hotels (this data can be used in the regulations mandating that hotels use GPS buttons).
     - How hotel workers feel a half year or a year after the implementation of the policies. Survey questions should include:
Do employees feel safer when they come to work?
Are workers comfortable reporting?
Have workers been subject to any form of hostility around reporting or retaliation?

Where Else Can Panic Buttons Make a Difference?
Looking forward, panic button technology could be used to protect workers in other particularly vulnerable, isolated environments. A natural extension of successful legislation would be providing panic buttons to waitresses, casino-workers, and female janitors.53

Entering new territory, panic buttons could be particularly useful in protecting female migrant farmworkers, who are predominantly undocumented immigrants. Though these women are granted immunity under the law to report such situations, these women rarely report instances of sexual harassment or assault, fearing threats to their immigration status or deportation.54 Providing them with panic buttons would offer workers recourse in the direst situations—allowing them to seek help in the moments they need it the most. Given migrant farmworkers’ deeply entrenched fears of retaliation, panic buttons may not significantly increase reporting rates. Offering women this option, however, grants them immediate access to a right they may not have otherwise known they had.
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