EMPLOYMENT LAWSCENE ALERT: THE BIDEN ADMINISTRATION TACKLES WAGE AND HOUR ISSUES

In this installment of our series discussing the new workplace initiatives under the Biden Administration, we will discuss wage and hour issues that employers should prepare for, including an increased federal minimum wage, updated enforcement priorities, and the proposed Paycheck Fairness Act.

Minimum Wage

The federal minimum wage was last increased in 2009. Since then, multiple states and municipalities have increased their minimum wages. However, the federal minimum wage, as well as the minimum wage in Wisconsin, has remained at $7.25. Organizers and activists have supported the “Fight for $15,” particularly in industries like fast food, and the Democratic Party has included support for a $15 minimum wage in its party platform since 2016. President Biden made his support of a $15 minimum wage even more clear when he signed a January 22, 2021, Executive Order directing the Office of Personnel Management to develop recommendations to pay federal employees at least $15 per hour and directing his administration to start the work that would allow him to issue an Executive Order within the first 100 days that requires federal contractors to pay a $15 minimum wage.

The Raise the Wage Act proposes a gradual increase, such that the federal minimum wage would increase in increments on a yearly basis between now and 2025 until it reaches $15 per hour. Thereafter, the minimum wage would index to median wages. The first increase, in 2021, would be to $9.50 per hour. Additionally, the Raise the Wage Act would, by 2027, eliminate the “tipped wage,” the “youth wage,” and the 14(c) wage, which can be paid to disabled individuals in certain positions. These changes would affect approximately 27 million workers, and the Congressional Budget Office has projected that it would increase the federal deficit and cost 1.4 million jobs as a result of employers scaling back due to increased costs.

However, increasing the federal minimum wage is no simple task. President Biden included a $15 minimum wage in his stimulus proposal, and the House of Representatives has included a $15 minimum wage in its most recent version of the coronavirus-relief package. However, once the bill reaches the Senate, passing an increased minimum wage will become significantly more challenging. Typically, a bill needs the votes of 60 Senators to make it to the floor, and the increase of the federal minimum wage does not currently have that support.

The coronavirus-relief package, including the increased minimum wage, could, however, be passed through a process known as budget reconciliation, which requires only a simple majority of Senators, with ties broken by the Vice President. In order to be considered part of the budget reconciliation process, the Senate Parliamentarian would have to agree that raising the minimum wage has a direct impact on the federal budget. If she does not, Vice President Harris could overrule her. If it gets past these steps, at least 50 Senators would need to vote in favor of it. At this point, it's not clear that 50 Senators would vote "yes" to increasing the federal minimum wage to $15 per hour, even if gradually. Additionally, President Biden has admitted that passing an increased minimum wage as part of the coronavirus-relief package is unlikely at this point.

Acknowledging the challenge of getting a minimum wage hike included in the coronavirus-relief package, President Biden has said that he is prepared to engage in separate negotiations on the matter, and other politicians have discussed their potential support of a lower amount, such as $12 per hour. So, while a $15 minimum wage may not be right on employers' doorsteps, this is not an issue that is likely to go away. Employers should begin evaluating the effect that a minimum wage increase would have not only on the wages of their workers who fall between the current minimum wage and a potential new minimum wage, but also on their ability to retain workers who, while now comfortably over the minimum wage, may end up below, at, or only slightly above it if there is a mandated increase.

Wage and Hour Enforcement Priorities

One of President Biden's campaign promises was to "ensure workers are paid fairly for the long hours they work and get the overtime they have earned." This will assuredly lead to an enforcement push at the Department of Labor ("DOL"). Moreover, the DOL is likely to strictly enforce penalties for non-payment of overtime wages. This new stance can already be seen by the fact that the Biden Administration eliminated the Payroll Audit Independent Determination ("PAID") program. The PAID program was a 2018 initiative that allowed employers to self-report FLSA wage and hour violations, including unpaid or miscalculated overtime. While the PAID program required employers to pay workers 100% of the wages owed, it did not assess the 100% liquidated damages penalty. However, on Friday, January 29, 2021, the DOL announced the immediate end of the PAID program, stating that the program "deprived workers of their rights and put employers that play by the rules at a disadvantage." The DOL added that it "will rigorously enforce the law, and . . . use all the enforcement tools we have available." Employers must make sure that their wage and hour policies and practices comply with the law and should consider performing audits to ensure there are no potential violations. Failure to take these proactive measures could land employers on the wrong side of a time-consuming and costly DOL investigation.

Paycheck Fairness Act

Finally, President Biden supports the Paycheck Fairness Act, which was originally passed in the House of Representatives in 2019 and was recently reintroduced in February 2021. If passed, the Paycheck Fairness Act would expand the equal pay provisions contained in the FLSA and require that any pay differential between sexes be based on “a bona fide factor other than sex, such as education, training, or experience.” Currently, federal law requires that any pay disparity between employees of different sexes performing the same job be based on a “factor other than sex.” The use of a **bona fide** factor would significantly narrow employers’ flexibility in justifying any pay differences. The Paycheck Fairness Act also prohibits employers from restricting employees’ discussions of wage information, requires additional employer reporting regarding compensation, and makes it easier for employees to pursue individual and class and collective actions alleging wage discrimination.

As always, O’Neil Cannon is here for you. We encourage you to reach out to our labor and employment law team with any questions, concerns, or legal issues you may have regarding wage and hour concerns or new policies or legislation under the Biden Administration.

EMPLOYMENT LAWSCENE ALERT: CARES ACT PROVIDES EMPLOYERS A TEMPORARY WINDOW TO ASSIST EMPLOYEES BY MAKING TAX-FREE STUDENT LOAN PAYMENTS

For the period from March 27, 2020 through December 31, 2020, the CARES Act permits employers to pay directly, or to reimburse employees for, up to $5,250 of qualifying employee student loan payments.

Like many CARES Act provisions, this new opportunity results from an expansion of an existing law or program. In this case, the ability for an employer to assist employees with student loan payments arises from an amendment to Internal Revenue Code Section 127, which governs Educational Assistance Programs (EAPs). Qualifying payments made as a fringe benefit under an EAP are excluded from the employee’s income and are deductible to the employer.

The $5,250 limit is the amount that employers are currently permitted to contribute, tax-free, for tuition assistance under an EAP. Through the end of this calendar year, it is also the combined limit for student loan repayment assistance and any other education-assistance payments that an employee may receive.

Essential business employers seeking ways to reward or retain employees during the pandemic should consider whether tax-free payment of student loan debts would meet payroll and employee-acknowledgment objectives. If your company currently sponsors an EAP, student loan payments may now be made under the current EAP document. Companies wishing to newly implement an EAP in order to take advantage of this tax-favored student loan repayment assistance opportunity can do so by properly adopting a written plan document satisfying IRS content requirements.

Existing Educational Assistance Program Requirements

The existing tax code EAP rules remain in effect. To qualify for tax (and payroll tax) exclusion under Internal Revenue Code Section 127, an EAP must:

- provide benefits exclusively to employees of the employer;
- provide only qualified educational assistance benefits (and only up to $5,250 per employee);
- be documented as a separate written program established by the employer and disclosed to employees;
- be funded solely by the employer;
- not allow employees a choice between educational assistance benefits and cash (or other taxable remuneration); and
- not discriminate in favor of highly compensated employees ($130,000 in 2020) or provide more than 5% of total benefits in any year to 5%-or-more owners.

Additional Detail

The student loan payments made under an EAP must relate to education of the employee, not of their child or spouse. Employer payments may made be for principal or interest, but employees are not permitted to deduct any interest payment made by employers. Where appropriate, employers making student loan payments under an EAP may, therefore, wish for such payments to be allocated only to principal so as to maximize the tax benefit to employees.

Employers interested in providing tax-free student loan payment assistance to employees should consider doing so, either by amending the operation of an existing, or by adopting a new, EAP. Employers who may already be providing post-tax student loan payment assistance to employees can now temporarily convert this form of compensation into a pre-tax benefit, which will permissibly reduce both employee income taxes and employer payroll tax expenses.

O’Neil Cannon remains open during this time and is here to help. We encourage you to reach out with any questions, concerns, or legal issues you may have, including those related to employee benefits and fringe benefits as impacted by COVID-19-related business changes or legislation.

EMPLOYMENT LAWSCENE ALERT: ROADMAP EMERGES FOR CLAIMING THREE TYPES OF EMPLOYER TAX CREDITS ALLOWED UNDER COVID-19 STIMULUS LAWS

Under a flurry of recent legislation, Congress has created several tax credits to reimburse employers for paying certain types of wages during the COVID-19 outbreak in 2020. Until now, the precise mechanism for claiming these tax credits has been unclear. With the March 30 IRS issuance of guidance and a draft version of Form 7200, however, the process by which employers may realize the tax relief is coming into view.

With respect to tax credits for the cost of: (1) emergency paid sick leave; (2) expanded family medical leave; and (3) employee retention payments, we now know that eligible employers can reduce the amount of employer payroll taxes otherwise required to be deposited with the IRS. Specified payroll taxes can be reduced dollar-for-dollar by the amount of credit-eligible wages paid. The reduction in employer payroll taxes will be reflected on the employer's quarterly payroll tax returns, using the appropriate form from the 941 series. To the extent that the amount of the available tax credit exceeds the total amount of payroll tax deposits, however, an employer may use Form 7200, entitled "Advance Payment of Employer Credits Due to COVID-19," to request expedited payment of the excess credit amount.

Emergency Paid Sick Leave and Expanded FMLA Leave

We have previously described the emergency paid sick leave and expanded family medical leave required to be provided to qualifying employees between April 1, 2020 and December 31, 2020. These expanded types of leave were implemented by the Families First Coronavirus Response Act (FFCRA), which also provided for employer tax credits to reimburse employers for 100% of the cost of corresponding wages paid.

Employee Retention Credit

The newer employee retention credit (described in more detail here) is available to eligible employers under the Coronavirus Aid, Relief, and Economic Security Act (CARES Act) and is designed to encourage businesses to keep employees on their payrolls.

The amount of the refundable employee retention tax credit is 50% of up to $10,000 in wages paid, per employee, between March 12, 2020 and December 31, 2020 by an eligible employer whose business has been financially impacted by COVID-19. Some limits based upon employer size apply to the number of employees for whom the credit may be claimed. The class of employers eligible for the credit *excludes* state and local government employers, as well as employers who take small business loans under the Paycheck Protection Program.

For purposes of the employee retention credit, an eligible employer of any size (including a tax-exempt organization) will be deemed to have been financially impacted by COVID-19 if:

1. the employer's business has been fully or partially suspended by government order due to COVID-19 during a 2020 calendar quarter; and
2. the employer's gross receipts are below 50% of the comparable quarter in 2019. Once the employer's gross receipts exceed 80% of a comparable quarter in 2019, then eligibility for the credit is extinguished as of the immediately following quarter.

Note that while an employer is permitted to receive tax credits for emergency paid sick leave and expanded family medical leave under the FFCRA, as well as for the CARES Act employee retention payments, these tax credits cannot be applied to the same wages.

EMPLOYMENT LAWSCENE ALERT: REVIEW YOUR COMPANY'S "TOP-HAT FILING" STATUS NOW TO AVOID INCREASED FORM 5500 PENALTIES

Companies that have entered into arrangements (1) to pay deferred compensation to key employees (including owners), or (2) to provide employee benefits specifically for apprentices or trainees should immediately determine whether a "top-hat filing" is required, and, if so, whether it has been properly filed with the Department of Labor. Two very recent legal developments—increased penalties and a new filing search tool—indicate that enforcement activity on top-hat filing compliance is increasing. Penalties for not filing can be extremely costly, and the penalties have been increased, effective January 15, 2020. Fortunately, a low-cost correction option is available for corrections made prior to a DOL assessment of penalties.

Top-Hat Overview

A top-hat filing is a short informational submission to the DOL that describes the company's contact information and the nature of the sponsored plan. It is legally required to be submitted with respect to any compensation arrangement for key management and owner employees (or employee benefit plans provided only to apprentices or trainees) that constitutes a top-hat plan. So named in apparent reference to gentility as evoked by Lincolnera fashion standards, a top-hat plan is an agreement or plan maintained by an employer primarily for the purpose of providing deferred compensation to a select group of key employees, apprentices, or trainees.

The term "select group of management or highly compensated employees" is not clearly defined, but must, instead, be determined in the context of the particular facts and circumstances that apply to the employer. Neither the IRS definition of "highly-compensated employee" or of "key employee" applies in determining whether a compensation arrangement is a top-hat plan. Instead, relevant factors include the duties and responsibilities of the employee and the level of the employee's compensation as compared to the compensation of the employer's work force, in general.

Top-Hat Filing – Required within 120 Days of Plan Effective Date

In general, all employer-provided benefits are subject to ERISA's requirements, unless an exception applies. In the case of top-hat payment arrangements, DOL guidance has expressed that "certain individuals, by virtue of their position or compensation level, have the ability to affect or substantially influence, through negotiation or otherwise, the design and operation of their deferred compensation plan, taking into consideration any risks attendant thereto, and therefore would not need [all of] the substantive rights and protections of" ERISA. The DOL also permits this lower-protection status for arrangements that provide employee benefits (including health benefits) only to apprentices or trainees, or both.

In light of the reduced need for ERISA protections for these plans, the DOL authorizes an exemption from the otherwise-applicable ERISA mandates regarding participation, vesting, funding, and fiduciary rules. Importantly, an additional exemption from ERISA's reporting and disclosure rules is also available, but *only if* a "top-hat filing" is submitted to the DOL within 120 days of the initial effective date of such plan.

Because ERISA's reporting and disclosure rules include the requirement to file an annual Form 5500 to the DOL, this annual Form 5500 filing requirement continues to apply to a top-hat plan unless a top-hat filing has been timely submitted. Alternately, an initial failure to submit a top-hat filing can generally be corrected, retroactively, for a relatively small compliance fee.

Form 5500 Penalties at an All-Time High

An employer that fails to timely file a Form 5500 may be subject to a DOL penalty of $2,233 per day (as adjusted annually for inflation). This new penalty amount of $2,233 per day is effective January 15, 2020. (For the prior year, the penalty amount had been $2,194 per day). This is not a typographical error. The law applies these penalty amounts *per day* for each day past the required filing date(s). The penalties are cumulative and become exponentially large for failures stretching over multiple years. While an aggregate penalty assessment could likely be negotiated downward by experienced ERISA legal counsel, an assessed DOL penalty for a late Form 5500 is guaranteed to be large.

The IRS imposes separate penalties for the failure to timely file a Form 5500, unless a showing of reasonable cause is made. Until recently, the IRS penalty was $25 for each day of the failure up to a maximum penalty of $15,000 per year. Under the Setting Every Community Up for Retirement Enhancement (SECURE Act) enacted on December 20, 2019, however, the IRS penalties for a late Form 5500 have increased tenfold to $250 per day, up to an annual maximum of $150,000. These increased IRS penalties apply for any Form 5500 due to be filed on and after January 1, 2020.

New DOL Top-Hat Filing Search Tool

Earlier this week, the DOL published a new online search tool to enable the public to search for top-hat filings. The search tool is available here. Results can be printed or downloaded to Excel.

Prior to the DOL making the search tool available, generally only benefits professionals and practitioners ever searched for top-hat filings, and then only via a website maintained by a private company that regularly obtained the information from the DOL through Freedom of Information Act Requests.

The issuance of the public DOL search tool is a positive development that will assist employers in confirming their top-hat filing compliance status. Of course, this increased access likely also signals increased DOL interest in enforcing late Form 5500 penalties for those employers that have not timely filed a top-hat statement. In light of the ease of searching, it will now be harder for employers to reasonably contend that they were unaware that a top-hat filing had not been submitted. Similarly, it is conceivable that plaintiffs' attorneys or disgruntled employees could use the tool themselves to determine whether a company is likely out of compliance with the top-hat filing, and therefore, the Form 5500 filing, rules. If this knowledge were used to inform the DOL, which, in turn, could trigger a penalty assessment, the penalty amounts could be devastating.

Correction Option

If you determine or suspect that your company has inadvertently failed to submit a top-hat filing for a covered top-hat plan, take steps right away to amend this oversight by submitting a delinquent filer voluntary compliance application. If you catch the error before the DOL has assessed a penalty, then you can retroactively correct the issue for a fee of only $750 for a single year (or a maximum of $1,500 for multiple years). The IRS generally accepts this same correction method as sufficient to avoid the separate IRS Form 5500 penalties, as well. Indeed, this DOL correction method often works to abate the IRS penalties after these have already been assessed.

Conclusion

It is common for companies that implement deferred compensation arrangements to consider the tax implications of such arrangement, including, for example, the application of Internal Revenue Code Section 409A. Equally important, however, is consideration of the other federal law that may govern such arrangements—ERISA. It is simply not true that all compensation agreements for key employees are exempt from ERISA's requirements. Failure to anticipate this reality—and to submit a top-hat filing when required—exposes the employer to significant Form 5500 penalties.

To avoid these penalties, check on your company's top-hat filing compliance now. The attorneys of the OCDHL Employment Law Team can assist you with assessing whether your company's key employee compensation agreements constitute top-hat plans within the meaning of ERISA, or whether an exemption may apply. If you maintain a top-hat plan for which no top-hat filing was ever submitted, we can assist in correcting the inadvertently missed prior filings, thereby potentially eliminating the existing exposure to thousands of dollars.

EMPLOYMENT LAWSCENE ALERT: NEW YEAR – NEW LABOR AND EMPLOYMENT LAW DEVELOPMENTS EVERY EMPLOYER SHOULD KNOW

In 2019, several federal agencies, including the U.S. Department of Labor, Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, and the National Labor Relations Board have either issued new regulations, new guidelines, or employer-friendly decisions that every employer should be aware of as we begin our journey into this 2020 election year. Most of the changes coming at the federal level are the result of the Trump administration's agenda to level the playing field for employers by tilting back for employers the shift that occurred in the legal landscape during the Obama administration. Here are the latest labor and employment law developments every employer should know as we venture into 2020.

U.S. Department of Labor (DOL)

New Overtime Regulations Go into Effect January 1, 2020

Effective January 1, 2020, the salary threshold necessary to exempt executive, administrative and professional employees from the Fair Labor Standard Act's minimum wage and overtime pay requirements increases from $23,660 (or $455 per week) to $35,568 (or $684 per week). The DOL's new rule is the product of the Trump administration's efforts to reset the Obama administration's 2016 final rule that established the salary threshold at $47,476 per year or $913 per week. Now is the perfect time for employers to audit their payroll data to make sure that every employee who is being treated as an exempt executive, administrative or professional employee is being paid at least the salary threshold amount of $35,568 (or $684 per week). Employees who do not meet this new minimum salary threshold should be treated as non-exempt and employers should begin to pay these newly minted non-exempt employees overtime compensation (1.5 times their regular rate) if they work over 40 hours in a workweek.

DOL Issues Final Rule Clarifying the Regular Rate of Pay

In December, the DOL announced a final rule clarifying for employers what "perks" and benefits must be included in the regular rate of pay when calculating overtime compensation. The "regular rate" is the hourly rate that is paid to employees and must not only include an employee's hourly wage rate, but it must also include in its calculation other forms of compensation received in a workweek, including bonuses, commissions, and other forms of compensation, subject to eight specified exclusions. Perplexing to employers, and exposing employers to additional risk for overtime liability, was the uncertainty as to whether certain kinds of "perks," benefits, or other miscellaneous payments must be included in the regular rate. The DOL attempted to eliminate this uncertainty in its final rule by confirming what employers may offer to employees through the following non-exhaustive list of "perks" and benefits without the risk of additional overtime liability:

- The cost of providing certain parking benefits, wellness programs, onsite specialist treatment, gym access and fitness classes, employee discounts on retail goods and services, certain tuition benefits (whether paid to an employee, an education provider, or a student-loan program), and adoption assistance;
- Payments for unused paid leave, including paid sick leave or paid time off;EEOC, EE
- Payments of certain penalties required under state and local scheduling laws;
- Reimbursed expenses including cellphone plans, credentialing exam fees, organization membership dues, and travel, even if not incurred solely for the employer's benefit; the DOL also clarified that reimbursements that do not exceed the maximum travel reimbursement under the Federal Travel Regulation System or the optional IRS substantiation amounts for travel expenses are per se "reasonable payments";
- Certain sign-on bonuses and certain longevity bonuses;
- The cost of office coffee and snacks to employees as gifts;
- Discretionary bonuses, by clarifying that the label given a bonus does not determine whether it is discretionary and providing additional examples; and

- Contributions to benefit plans for accident, unemployment, legal services, or other events that could cause future financial hardship or expense.

The DOL's final rule becomes effective on January 15, 2020.

National Labor Relations Board (NLRB)

Employers Can Cut-Off Union Dues Upon CBA Expiration

In a 3-1 ruling, the NLRB overturned an Obama-era decision (*Lincoln Lutheran of Racine*, 362 NLRB 1655 (2015)) requiring employers to continue to honor the dues checkoff provision in an expired labor contract. In *Lincoln Lutheran of Racine*, the NLRB held that an employer's statutory obligation to check off union dues continues to be enforceable under Section 8(a)(5) of the National Labor Relation Act after expiration of a collective bargaining agreement that establishes the checkoff arrangement. The Obama-era Board reasoned that the "dues checkoff" provision could not just dissipate once a contract expired, but instead could be ignored only if all parties to the contract agreed. On December 16, 2019, the NLRB reversed course in *Valley Hospital Medical Center*, 368 NLRB No. 39 (2019), holding that while dues checkoff provisions are mandatory subjects of bargaining, they also fall into a special "limited category" of unique union rights that are contractual in nature and do not necessarily relate to wages, pensions, welfare benefits, and other terms and conditions of employment. Given its special category, a dues-checkoff provision remains enforceable only during the term of the agreement in which those contractual obligations were created by the parties. Consequently, the Board held that there is no independent statutory obligation to check off and remit dues after expiration of a collective-bargaining agreement containing a checkoff provision, just as no such statutory obligation exists before parties enter into such an agreement. The Board's ruling brings more balance to the bargaining table and provides the employer some leverage when contract negotiations may extend beyond the expiration of the labor agreement. It also incentivizes the union to reach an agreement before expiration of the labor agreement to avoid loss of union dues. Of course, the right to cut-off union dues under the Board's *Valley Hospital* decision does not exist when the employer and the union agree to extend the labor agreement during the pendency of negotiations.

NLRB Provides Employers, Once Again, the Power to Control Company-Owned Email

On December 17, 2019, in *Caesars Entertainment* (368 NLRB No. 143) the NLRB overturned its 2014 controversial *Purple Communications* decision (361 NLRB No. 126) which had held that employees have the right to use their employers' email systems for non-business purposes, including communicating about union organizing. The NLRB's *Purple Communications'* decision overturned its 2007 *Register Guard* decision (351 NLRB No. 70) where the Board recognized the long-standing precedent that the NLRA generally does not restrict an employer's right to control the use of its equipment, which applies to company-owned email systems, and held that while union-related communications cannot be banned because they are union-related, facially neutral policies regarding the permissible use of employers' email systems are not rendered unlawful simply because they have the "incidental" effect of limiting the use of those systems for union-related communications. The *Purple Communications* decision upset this precedent and held, for the first time in the history of the Board, that employees do have the right to use company-owned equipment for non-work purposes. The Board's decision in *Caesars Entertainment* basically restored the standard set forth in the *Register Guard* decision before the *Purple Communications* decision stripped employers of an important property right with the only exception being those rare cases where an employer's email system provides the only reasonable means for employees to communicate with one another. Now, under the *Caesars Entertainment* decision, employers may prohibit employees from using company-owned email systems for non-work-related purposes, including communications concerning union organizing activities. Employers, however, are permitted to implement such a prohibition only if the employer's rules or policies are not applied discriminatorily by singling out union-related activities or communications.

NLRB Restores Employers' Right to Impose Confidentiality in Workplace Investigations

On December 16,2019, in a 3-1 decision, the NLRB overruled a 2015 NLRB precedent (*Banner Estrella Medical Center*, 362 NLRB 1108) that required a case-by-case determination of whether an employer may lawfully require confidentiality in specific workplace investigations. The Board had ruled that employees have a Section 7 right to discuss discipline and ongoing investigations involving themselves and other co-workers. In *Apogee Retail*, 368 NLRB No. 144 (2019), however, the NLRB returned to its previous standard, and now allows employers to implement blanket nondisclosure rules requiring confidentiality in all workplace investigations. The NLRB's ruling aligns itself with the EEOC's position against the backdrop of the #MeToo movement where confidentiality rules imposed during a workplace sexual harassment investigation encourage victims and witnesses to come forward. The standard set forth by the Board in *Apogee Retail* only applies to open and-on-going investigations and only to those employees directly involved in the investigation. Obviously, on the other hand, any confidentiality order or rule imposed by the employer cannot be imposed on employees not involved in the investigation or to an investigation that has concluded. The Board's decision in *Apogee Retail* provides employers an important tool to maintain the integrity of its internal investigations without fear that imposing the safeguards of confidentiality requirements during the pendency of an investigation violates Section 7 rights.

Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC)

EEOC Rescinds Policy Against Binding Arbitration

The EEOC voted 2-1 to rescind its 1997 *Policy Statement on Mandatory Binding* Arbitration where the EEOC had stated its position that mandatory arbitration agreements that keep workers' discrimination claims out of court clash with the civil rights laws the agency enforces.

The EEOC based its decision to rescind its policy regarding binding arbitration based on the fact that its policy statement did not reflect current law, especially given the Supreme Court's numerous and consistent decisions since 1997 that favor agreements to arbitrate employment-related disputes as being enforceable under the Federal Arbitration Act (FAA). The EEOC found that its 1997 policy conflicted with the arbitration-related decisions of the Supreme Court where the Court rejected the EEOC's previously enunciated concerns with using the arbitral forum – both within and outside the context of employment discrimination claims. It should be noted by employers, however, that the EEOC's decision to rescind its 1997 policy statement on mandatory arbitration should not be construed to mean that employees cannot file charges of discrimination with the agency if they signed an agreement to arbitrate or that the EEOC is prohibited from investigating such charges. Moreover, the EEOC makes clear that its rescission of its 1997 policy should not be interpreted as limiting the EEOC's ability, or that of the employee, to challenge the enforceability of any agreement to arbitrate. This change in the EEOC's policy position regarding mandatory arbitration of employment disputes is not surprising given the long-line of Supreme Court decisions favoring arbitration in employment disputes. Given the positive change in the EEOC's position on mandatory arbitration agreements in employment, along with strong precedent-setting federal court decisions favoring arbitration, employers should consider revisiting whether they should be utilizing agreements with their employees for mandatory arbitration of employment disputes.

EMPLOYMENT LAWSCENE ALERT: BREAKING NEWS: DOL SETS OVERTIME SALARY EXEMPTION THRESHOLD AT $35,568

On September 24, 2019, the U.S. Department of Labor announced a final rule to increase the salary threshold necessary to exempt executive, administrative and professional employees from the Fair Labor Standard Act's (FLSA) minimum wage and overtime pay requirements. The final rule raises the annual salary threshold from $23,660 (or $455 per week) to $35,568 (or $684 per week). The FLSA requires covered employers to pay employees a minimum wage and, for employees who work more than 40 hours in a week, overtime premium pay of at least 1.5 times the regular rate of pay. Section 13(a)(1) of the FLSA, commonly referred to as the “white collar” or “EAP” exemption, exempts from these minimum wage and overtime pay requirements “any employee employed in a bona fide executive, administrative, or professional capacity.” Now for an employee to qualify for one of the EAP exemptions, generally, that employee has to be paid on a salary basis and earn at least $35,568 per year or $684 per week. The final rule becomes effective January 1, 2020.

The final rule also allows employers to use non-discretionary bonuses and incentive payments (including commissions) to satisfy up to ten percent of the standard salary level as long as such payments are paid annually or on a more frequent basis. In addition, if an employee does not earn enough in nondiscretionary bonus or incentive payments in a given year (52-week period) to retain his or her exempt status, the employer may make a “catch-up” payment up to ten percent of the total salary level for the preceding 52-week period. This “catch-up” payment must be paid within one pay period following the end of the 52-week period. In plain terms, each pay period an employer must pay the EAP employee on a salary basis at least 90 percent of the standard salary level and, if at the end of the 52-week period the sum of the salary paid plus the nondiscretionary bonuses and incentive payments (including commissions) paid does not equal the standard salary level for the 52-week period, the employer has one pay period to make up for the shortfall (up to 10 percent of the required salary level). Any such catch-up payment will count only toward the previous 52-week period’s salary amount and not toward the salary amount in the 52-week period in which it was paid.

Today’s final rule is the product of the Trump administration’s efforts to reset the Obama administration’s 2016 final rule that had established the salary threshold at $47,476 per year or $913 per week. The Obama administration’s controversial final rule was struck down on November 22, 2016 by a federal district court in Texas because it “makes overtime status depend predominately on a minimum salary level, thereby supplanting an analysis of an employee’s job duties.” An appeal of that decision is still pending before the United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit. However, given the release of today’s final rule, the DOL will rescind the Obama administration’s 2016 final rule making the pending appeal moot.

The final rule also raises the total annual compensation requirement for “highly compensated employees” (HCE) from the currently enforced level of $100,000 per year to $107,432 per year. The HCE salary level of $107,432 is set at the 80th percentile of full-time salaried workers nationally using updated 2018/2019 salary data. However, Wisconsin employers should note that Wisconsin law does not recognize the HCE exemption, and, as a result, Wisconsin employers should not rely or utilize this exemption when classifying employees for wage and hour purposes.

Finally, the DOL’s proposed rule published on March 7, 2019 rejected the Obama administration’s 2016 rule that provided for automatic adjusting every three years of the salary threshold for the EAP exemptions. Instead, the DOL’s March, 2019 proposed rule rejected automatic adjusting and favored that the Secretary of Labor review the salary threshold every four years preceded by a period of public comment. The DOL's final rule, however, reaffirmed the DOL's intent to update the standard salary level and HCE total annual compensation threshold more regularly in the future using notice and comment rulemaking, but declined to make a commitment to do so every four years believing that prevailing economic conditions, rather than fixed timelines, should drive future updates.

EMPLOYMENT LAWSCENE ALERT: INTERNAL REVENUE CODE SECTION 409A SURVIVES REPEAL-AND-REPLACE ATTEMPT

Employer sponsors of nonqualified deferred compensation (NQDC) plans, as well as the executives and other service providers, who benefit from them, can breathe a sigh of relief. The ability to reward and retain key employees with incentive and compensation plans that provide a current opportunity to earn a payment to be provided (and taxed) in the future, will continue to be available, as it has been under American tax law for more than 80 years. Since late 2004, NQDC agreements have been regulated primarily by Internal Revenue Code (Code) Section 409A.

The House Tax Bill

The ongoing viability of NQDC came under direct threat in the initial draft of the Tax Cuts and Jobs Creation Act (TCJA) as proposed by the U.S. House of Representatives Ways and Means Committee on November 2, 2017 (the House Tax Bill). Section 3801 of the House Tax Bill, which was proposed in substantially similar form to the Section 409A repeal-and-replace proposal introduced in a proposed Tax Reform Act of 2014, would have drastically reduced the ability of employers to reward key employees with deferred compensation arrangements.

As drafted, the House Tax Bill would have eliminated Section 409A and supplanted it with a new Section 409B. These changes, intended to be effective for services performed on and after January 1, 2018, would have meant, as of the New Year, that all NQDC arrangements would become fully taxable upon vesting, with only very limited opportunity to defer taxation until a future year. The proposed law would have applied not only to the common elective, nonelective, incentive payment, and phantom stock forms of NQDC, but would have also expressly *included* the (currently) sometimes-exempt equity-based compensation forms such as stock options, restricted stock units, and stock and stock appreciation rights.

The Joint Tax Committee had estimated that the proposed change would increase revenues by $16.2 billion between 2018 and 2027.

2017 Senate Tax Bill

The language that would repeal section 409A and replace it with a new Section 409B was removed from the final version of the House Ways and Means Committee's Tax House Bill, as issued on November 9, 2017. The Chairman's Mark of the Senate tax reform proposal issued on the same day, however, resurrected the proposals. As unveiled on November 9, 2017 by Senator Orrin Hatch, Chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, the initial Senate version of the TCJA (the Senate Tax Bill) contained the identical Section 409A repeal-and-replace provisions.

Senate Finance Committee Mark Up

Finally, upon the successful amendment offered by Senator Rob Portman, the Section 409A repeal-and-replace proposal was stricken in its entirety from the legislation. This action preserves the current, well-established system, which would have been rendered virtually extinct by the repeal-and-replace proposal. The proposal's demise became known concurrent with the Joint Committee on Taxation's issuance of the Chairman's Modification to the Chairman's Mark of the TCJA late in the day on November 14, 2017.

Impact

The retention of the existing system of taxation for NQDC arrangements is great news for employers and key employees, who can now continue to offer (and benefit from) compensation packages as appropriate to reward and retain top talent. It is also good policy, in that it does not impose limitations on the ability to earn and save for retirement at a time when the general retirement savings rates of Americans across nearly all income levels are widely reported to be insufficient.