

# BREAKING: NEW DOL OVERTIME RULE WILL NOT GO INTO EFFECT DECEMBER 1

Yesterday, a federal judge in Texas issued a nationwide injunction ([full decision here](#)) blocking the U.S. Department of Labor (DOL) from implementing its updated overtime regulations, which would have required, among other things, that exempt employees be paid a minimum salary of \$913 per week. The judge ruled that the twenty-one states and certain business groups that had sued to block the implementation of the regulations were likely to be successful on the merits of their case and that there would be harm to the states and businesses if the rule was implemented on December 1.

The basis for the ruling is that the new salary basis test is a *de facto* salary test that no longer takes an employee's job duties into consideration. The Court found that the type of work actually performed by the employee is what Congress intended the exemption to be based on, and that the updated DOL rule supplanted the duties test with a minimum salary threshold. The Court found that this was outside the intent of Congress and, therefore, outside of the DOL's statutory authority. Additionally, the judge ruled that the DOL did not have statutory authority to implement the automatic increase provision of the rules, which would have automatically readjusted the minimum weekly salary level every three years.

Although this may not be the end of litigation over this matter, the DOL's new overtime rules will not take effect on December 1, 2016, and therefore, employers do not need to implement any changes. For those employers who have already implemented changes in preparation for the updated overtime rules, they have the option to keep those changes in place or reverse those changes and wait to see how this matter ultimately resolves. However, employers must keep in mind that, although the minimum salary level will remain, for now, at \$455 per week, to be considered exempt, employees must still meet the job duties tests.

---

## FEDERAL DISTRICT COURT TO RULE NOVEMBER 22, 2016 ON ATTEMPT TO BLOCK NEW OVERTIME RULES

As we have previously [reported](#), the U.S. Department of Labor (DOL) has issued an update to the federal overtime regulations defining the overtime exemption for executive, administrative, and professional employees, known as "white-collar" exemptions. These changes focus primarily on updating the salary level for white-collar employees including

increasing the minimum salary threshold from \$455 per week to \$913 per week, among other changes. The new rule is set to go into effect on December 1, 2016.

The new overtime regulations have been controversial and subject to various challenges. Specifically, twenty-one states and certain business groups have sued the DOL in Texas federal district court in an attempt to block the DOL from implementing the new overtime rules. Yesterday, November 16, 2016, the federal district court held a hearing on a motion to enjoin the DOL from implementing the new overtime rules. During the hearing, the federal district court judge stated that the Court would make a decision on the motion for a preliminary injunction by November 22, 2016. This is welcome news given that the new overtime rules' effective date is just two weeks away.

During the motion hearing, the business groups and states made various arguments about why the rule should not be implemented, including that the drastic increase in the salary threshold was a "fundamental, radical social policy change." It was also argued that implementation of the new overtime rules should be at least delayed until it could be reviewed by President-elect Trump's administration. In response to that argument, the Court stated that what a new administration may do with the new overtime rules is not relevant and too speculative to affect as how the Court would rule. On the other hand, the DOL argued that the agency had reached these new salary levels in a reasonable way through the rulemaking process, and as a result, agency should be entitled to deference from the Court.

The Court seemed receptive to some, but not all, of the arguments to block implementation of the new rules. The judge questioned whether the new salary basis was a *de facto* salary-only test, why the change was so drastic, and how 4.2 million employees could go from being exempt one day to non-exempt the next, despite having the same job duties. However, he did state that his role was not to get involved in policy making and he would not base his decision on whether he thought the rule was good or bad.

It is premature to state for certain as to how the Court may rule; so, the wise course of action for employers, for now, is to continue to move forward with plans on how to implement the new overtime regulations for their workforces on December 1st. We will, of course, provide you with an update regarding the Court's decision as soon as it is issued.

---

## **NINETEEN ATTORNEYS NAMED SUPER LAWYERS**

Each year, *Super Lawyers* surveys the State's attorneys and judges, seeking the State's top attorneys. The lists for 2016 were just published and, once again, a large number of our attorneys are included thereon.

Dean Laing was named one of the Top 10 attorneys in Wisconsin for the second time. He was also named one of the Top 50 attorneys in Wisconsin for the eleventh straight year. In doing so, he is one of only seven attorneys out of over 15,000 attorneys in Wisconsin — and the only commercial litigator in Wisconsin — to make the list all eleven years. Dean was also named one of the Top 25 attorneys in Milwaukee.

Seth Dizard and Patrick McBride were also named one of the Top 50 attorneys in Wisconsin. This is the fourth time that Seth has made the list. Seth and Patrick were also named one of the Top 25 attorneys in Milwaukee.

Doug Dehler, Jim DeJong, Pete Faust, Bob Gagan, John Gehringer, Joe Gumina, Greg Lyons, Greg Mager, Joe Newbold, Chad Richter, John Schreiber, Jason Scoby and Steve Slawinski were also named Super Lawyers, a recognition given to the top 5% of attorneys in Wisconsin. Jim DeJong, Pete Faust, John Gehringer and Greg Lyons have made the list for the past 10 or more years.

Megan Harried and Erica Reib were also named Rising Stars, which is limited to 2.5% of the young attorneys in Wisconsin.

In total, we had 19 of our attorneys named to the lists by *Super Lawyers*, representing more than 50% of our practicing attorneys, which is more than 10 times in excess of the 5% statewide standard.

We are extremely proud of these recognitions, but even more proud of the quality of service we provide to our clients.

---

## **EMPLOYMENT LAWSCENE ALERT: VOTING LEAVE - WHAT WISCONSIN EMPLOYERS NEED TO KNOW**

Tuesday, November 8, 2016 is Election Day. While there is no federal law that requires employers to grant employees leave to vote, Wisconsin law does require voting leave. Wis. Stat. § 6.67. What Wisconsin employers need to know:

- All Wisconsin employers are required to give employees who are eligible to vote up to three consecutive hours of leave to vote while the polls are open. Wisconsin's polls are open from 7:00 AM - 8:00 PM.
- Employers cannot deny this leave on the basis that employees would have adequate time outside of their working hours to vote while the polls are open.

- The law does not require that these hours are paid. However, employers should be cautious about reducing an exempt employee's pay.
- The employee must request the time off to vote prior to the election.
- The employer can specify which three consecutive hours an employee is permitted to utilize as voting leave.
- Employees cannot be penalized for utilizing voting leave.

Two other provisions that Wisconsin employers should be aware of are 1) they may not refuse to let employees serve as election officials under Wis. Stat. § 7.30 or make any threats or inducements to prevent employees from doing so; and 2) they cannot distribute printed materials to employees that contain a threat that if a particular party or candidate is elected that the business will shut down, in whole or in part, or that the salaries or wages of employees will be reduced. Wis. Stat. § 12.07(2)-(3).

---

## **EMPLOYMENT LAWSCENE ALERT: OSHA DELAYS ENFORCEMENT OF ANTI-RETALIATION PROVISIONS**

On October 12, 2016, the Occupational Health and Safety Administration ("OSHA") agreed to further delay the enforcement of the anti-retaliation provisions of the injury and illness tracking rule until December 1, 2016. Enforcement was originally scheduled to begin August 10, 2016 and then delayed until November 10, 2016. OSHA's agreement to once again delay enforcement of its new anti-retaliation provisions is in response to a request from the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Texas, which is currently considering a motion challenging OSHA's new rules.

Despite its self-imposed delay in enforcement of its anti-retaliation provisions, last week, OSHA released a memo with examples discussing in more detail how the new anti-retaliation amendments will be interpreted and implemented by OSHA. See [OSHA Memorandum for Regional Administrators \(10/19/2016\)](#).

OSHA explained that its purpose in including the new anti-retaliation provisions is to address workplace retaliation in three specific areas: (1) Disciplinary Policies; (2) Post-accident Drug Testing Programs; and (3) Employee Incentive Programs. Although neither employee disciplinary policies, post-accident drug testing programs, or employee incentive programs are expressly prohibited by the new rules, employers will need to be careful about how their policies or programs are drafted and enforced so as to not, in the eyes of OSHA, discourage or deter employees from reporting work-related injuries or illnesses.

---

## EMPLOYMENT LAWSCENE ALERT: EMPLOYERS MUST UPDATE THEIR FLSA POSTERS

On August 1, 2016, the Department of Labor updated its mandatory Fair Labor Standards Act Minimum Wage poster. All employers subject to the FLSA must display this newly revised poster in prominent locations in the workplace where all employees and applicants can readily see it. The updates to the newly revised poster include information on the consequences of incorrectly classifying workers as independent contractors, information relating to the rights of nursing mothers, updated information regarding DOL enforcement, and revised information relating to tip credits.

Employers must post the new poster immediately. Although employers are only required to post the poster in English, there are also versions available in Spanish, Chinese, Russian, Thai, Hmong, Vietnamese, and Korean. The new version of the poster can be found [here](#).

---

## EMPLOYMENT LAWSCENE ALERT: INCREASED OSHA PENALTIES NOW IN PLACE

Last November, we alerted you ([here](#)) that, in August 2016, OSHA penalties would be increasing significantly. Those new maximum penalties went into effect on August 1, 2016 and can be applied to any citation issued for a violation that occurred after November 2, 2015. The below chart summarizes the previous penalties and the new penalties, which were increased due to a catch-up provision and an additional increase based on the Consumer Price Index:

Type of Violation	Former Maximum Penalty	Maximum Penalty as of 8/1/2016
Willful Violation	\$70,000	\$124,709
Serious Violation	\$7,000	\$12,471
Other-The-Serious Violation	\$7,000	\$12,471
De Minimis Violation	\$7,000	\$12,471
Failure to Abate Violation	\$7,000	\$12,471
Repeat Violation	\$70,000	\$124,709

OSHA penalties will now be increased annually on January 15 based on the Consumer Price

Index. Employers must keep a keen eye on safety now more than ever because OSHA's increased enforcement is now coupled with an increase in monetary penalties.

---

## **EMPLOYMENT LAWSCENE ALERT: EEOC INTRODUCES PROPOSED CHANGES TO EEO-1 REPORTING THAT COULD REVEAL PAY DISCRIMINATION**

Employers, including federal contractors, with 100 or more employees are required to file employer information reports, called an EEO-1 with the U.S. Equal Opportunity Commission ("EEOC"). The data collected currently includes data on race, ethnicity, and gender.

However, under a revised proposal by the EEOC issued on July 14, 2016, as of March 31, 2018, companies will also need to include data on pay ranges and hours worked. This information must be reported by job category and broken down across 12 pay bands. Employers are to gather wage information from W-2 reports from the prior year, and include not only base salaries but also bonuses, incentive compensation payouts, and payments for paid time off. For non-exempt employees, calculation of hours worked will reflect only hours actually worked and not paid time off. Additionally, for exempt employees, employers can choose to either report actual hours worked if that is traced or report 40 hours per workweek for full-time employees and 20 hours per workweek for part-time employees.

Although the first reporting deadline is not until 2018, the reported information will include 2017 wage information. The EEOC plans to use this information to identify pay discrimination. Therefore, companies need to identify whether there are pay gaps between protected classes that the EEOC might consider suspicious. Companies with pay gaps will need to analyze whether these are caused by legitimate, non-discriminatory, job-related factors such as location, education, or experience. If employers cannot justify wage differences, they will need to consider how to fix the pay gap. Otherwise, there is a real possibility that they will face a pay discrimination suit.

A sample of the proposed EEO-1 Form to collect pay data can be found [here](#) and a Q&A from the EEOC regarding the proposed changes can be found [here](#).

---

# **YOUR LEASED EMPLOYEES MAY NOW JOIN A UNION WITH YOUR REGULAR EMPLOYEES - AND THEY DON'T NEED TO ASK YOUR PERMISSION**

Today, in *Miller and Anderson, Inc. v. Tradesmen International and Sheet Metal Works International Association, Local Union No. 19, AFL-CIO*, the NLRB decided that, pursuant to the NLRA, temporary or leased employees who work for an employer as joint employees under an agreement with a staffing agency or similar entity do not have to have the employer's consent to join the union that covers that employer's regular employees. The full opinion can be found [here](#). This decision overturns a 2004 NLRB decision, *Oakwood Care Center*, which held that employees who were jointly employed by an employer and a staffing agency could not be in the same bargaining unit without the employer's consent. Today's decision revives a 2000 NLRB decision, *M.B. Sturgis*, which held that both temporary and regular workers could be represented by the same union without the joint consent of the employer and the staffing agency. Under *M.B. Sturgis*, temporary staffing employees could be included in a single bargaining unit with regular employees when: (1) the staffing agency and the employer were determined to be joint employers and (2) the temporary staffing employees shared a "community of interest" with the regular employees. The *M.B. Sturgis* decision by a Clinton-appointed Board upended a 1973 NLRB decision that found that a single bargaining unit of regular employees and leased employees to be inappropriate without the consent of both employers.

The political-weighted pendulum of the Obama-appointed Board continues to swing in favor of the unions by continuing to expand the scope of the NLRA to cover additional employees and additional actions, particularly in the area of joint-employers. This inclusion of leased employees in an employer's bargaining unit is just another step down that road. Employers must be aware of this decision in any situation where they have leased employees in the same or similar positions as regular employees who are represented by a union or wish to be represented by a union.

---

# **YOUR LEASED EMPLOYEES MAY NOW JOIN A UNION WITH YOUR REGULAR EMPLOYEES - AND THEY DON'T NEED TO ASK YOUR PERMISSION**

Today, in *Miller and Anderson, Inc. v. Tradesmen International and Sheet Metal Works*

*International Association, Local Union No. 19, AFL-CIO*, the NLRB decided that, pursuant to the NLRA, temporary or leased employees who work for an employer as joint employees under an agreement with a staffing agency or similar entity do not have to have the employer's consent to join the union that covers that employer's regular employees. The full opinion can be found [here](#). This decision overturns a 2004 NLRB decision, *Oakwood Care Center*, which held that employees who were jointly employed by an employer and a staffing agency could not be in the same bargaining unit without the employer's consent. Today's decision revives a 2000 NLRB decision, *M.B. Sturgis*, which held that both temporary and regular workers could be represented by the same union without the joint consent of the employer and the staffing agency. Under *M.B. Sturgis*, temporary staffing employees could be included in a single bargaining unit with regular employees when: (1) the staffing agency and the employer were determined to be joint employers and (2) the temporary staffing employees shared a "community of interest" with the regular employees. The *M.B. Sturgis* decision by a Clinton-appointed Board upended a 1973 NLRB decision that found that a single bargaining unit of regular employees and leased employees to be inappropriate without the consent of both employers.

The political-weighted pendulum of the Obama-appointed Board continues to swing in favor of the unions by continuing to expand the scope of the NLRA to cover additional employees and additional actions, particularly in the area of joint-employers. This inclusion of leased employees in an employer's bargaining unit is just another step down that road. Employers must be aware of this decision in any situation where they have leased employees in the same or similar positions as regular employees who are represented by a union or wish to be represented by a union.