

# **EMPLOYMENT LAWSCENE ALERT: THE EEOC HAS STARTED COLLECTING REQUIRED PAY DATA: DO YOU NEED TO REPORT AND ARE YOU READY?**

On July 15, 2019, after a protracted legal battle, the EEOC began collecting employers' EEO-1 2017 and 2018 payroll data, which may be referred to as Component 2 data. The reporting requirement was originally announced by the Obama administration in 2016, but in 2017, the Trump administration stayed the collection of Component 2 data, citing the burden it imposed on employers. However, in March 2019, the U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia issued an order reinstating the requirement.

Therefore, between now and the deadline of September 30, 2019, all employers with 100 or more employees (both full-time and part-time) must submit the requisite information from calendar years 2017 and 2018 for all employees employed during the relevant "workforce snapshot period," which is an employer-selected payroll period between October 1 and December 31 of the reporting year. Employers, including federal contractors, that have less than 100 employees are not subject to these reporting requirements. Subject employers must provide the EEOC with the following data for employees in the workforce snapshot period: the employees' race/ethnicity and sex; the employee's EEO-1 job classification; the actual hours worked by non-exempt employees; actual hours worked by or proxy hours worked (e.g., 40 hours per week for full-time employees) for exempt employees; and Form W-2 payroll information. Such information does not have to be submitted for each individual employee but can be submitted by identifying, based on race/ethnicity and sex, the number of employees in each EEO-1 job category that fall into each of 12 EEO-1 compensation bands and the aggregate number of hours worked by all employees in each EEO-1 compensation band. The EEOC's stated purpose for collecting such information is to identify and remediate unlawful pay disparities in pay that are based on race/ethnicity and/or sex. Therefore, providing complete and accurate information in all categories is essential.

Employers subject to this requirement should have received correspondence via the U.S. mail and an email from NORC, the research group that is conducting the survey on behalf of the EEOC, notifying them of this obligation. Reminders are also scheduled to be sent in August and September. The EEOC has provided resources for filers at <https://eeocomp2.norc.org>.

---

# **EMPLOYMENT LAWSCENE ALERT: EMPLOYERS SHOULD CONFIRM THAT THEIR I-9S ARE IN ORDER**

Recently, President Trump announced that a new round of workplace immigration raids would be postponed until after July 4. Regardless of when or if these raids happen, all employers should take this time to ensure that they are in compliance with federal law by having proper work authorizations for all of their employees. Workplace authorization is governed by the Immigration and Reform Control Act, which allows U.S. companies to hire and employ only U.S. citizens, non-citizen nationals, lawful permanent residents, and aliens authorized to work in the U.S. Employers must have a Form I-9 on file for every current employee hired on or after November 6, 1986. I-9 forms for former employees must be kept until the later of three years from the employee's hire date or one year after their final date of employment. Such forms can be retained on paper or electronically.

To determine compliance with federal immigration laws for lawful work authorization, employers should conduct an audit of their I-9s to confirm, among other things, that each individual who should have an I-9 on file in fact has one on file; that any and all employment authorization documents are current; that all sections of the I-9 form have been fully filled out; and that any changes, such as a name change, have been properly documented. Corrections to I-9 forms must be handled carefully and in compliance with federal law. We have attorneys experienced in assisting employers with I-9 audits. Failure to properly follow the law regarding the maintenance of I-9 forms, including making corrections, can subject an employer to civil and criminal penalties.

---

# **EMPLOYMENT LAWSCENE ALERT: NEW RULE WILL PERMIT EMPLOYER REIMBURSEMENT OF EMPLOYEES' INDIVIDUAL ACA COVERAGE PREMIUMS**

Beginning January 1, 2020, employers will have the option to reimburse employees' individual ACA Exchange (or Marketplace) health insurance premiums under an employer-sponsored Health Reimbursement Arrangement (HRA).

This is a significant change from current rules, which generally permit an HRA to reimburse

only group (not individual) health insurance coverage, and which prohibit employer reimbursement of any health insurance coverage provided through the ACA Exchange.

### HRA Overview

An HRA is a type of account-based plan that an employer may use to provide pre-tax reimbursement, up to employer-determined annual limits, of certain employee medical care expenses. Under applicable law, an HRA is a self-funded health care plan, which may be funded only by employer (not employee) dollars. An HRA is subject to ERISA, HIPAA, and certain IRS rules, including the nondiscrimination requirements that prohibit discrimination in favor of highly compensated employees.

### What's Old is New Again

Under final regulations issued jointly, last week, by the United States Departments of Treasury, Labor, and Health and Human Services (the Departments), Employers can once again reimburse certain individual employee health insurance expenses on a pre-tax basis. This practice was broadly permitted under IRS rules in effect from 1961 through January of 2014, when the IRS put a sudden halt to the practice on the grounds that it violated the Affordable Care Act.

### With Some Twists

Prior to 2014, employers could directly reimburse an employee for the cost of that employee's individual insurance coverage premiums. No additional benefit plan or plan document was required. Under the new rules, employer reimbursements of individual insurance premiums may not be made directly, but must instead flow through a documented HRA program. The HRA must conform in form and operation with applicable Department rules.

Under the law in effect over the last few years, an HRA could reimburse group health plan insurance premiums only if it were "integrated with" an ACA-compliant employer-sponsored group health plan. Under the rules that will take effect January 1, 2020, HRA "integration" with ACA-compliant individual coverage will be available for the first time.

### Why are the HRA Rules Changing?

The final regulations issued jointly by the three Departments last week ultimately result from an October 2017 Presidential Executive Order intended to expand "healthcare choice" and flexibility. HRAs were one of three priorities identified in President Trump's Executive Order 13813, which directed the Departments to consider proposing regulations or revising guidance as needed "to expand employers' ability to offer HRAs to their employees, and to allow HRAs to be used in conjunction with non-group coverage."

### Key Requirements

The final regulations exceed 200 pages and provide extensive detail on the requirements applicable to the new individual coverage HRAs (ICHRAs). Among these are the following six

key conditions, which must be satisfied in order to successfully integrate an HRA with individual health insurance coverage:

- All individuals covered by an ICHRA must be enrolled in individual coverage through the Exchange.
- The employer may not offer an ICHRA to the same class of employees to whom it offers group health plan coverage. This means that an employee in a particular classification may not be given a choice between a traditional group health plan and an ICHRA. Under a related rule, employers are prohibited from steering participants with adverse health factors into individual, rather than into group, coverage.
- An ICHRA must be offered in both the same amount and under the same terms and conditions to all employees. The HRA may not be more generous or less generous to some individuals based on an adverse health factor.
- The ICHRA must offer an opt-out provision so that an employee may choose to waive ICHRA HRA coverage. This condition is intended to preserve an individual's eligibility for a premium tax credit for coverage obtained on the Exchange under certain circumstances, such as when the ICHRA offered is either unaffordable or does not provide minimum value in accordance with ACA standards.
- Claims for reimbursement under an ICHRA must be substantiated and confirmed to relate to the cost of individual Exchange health insurance premiums. An employer may rely on an employee's attestation to this effect, and model attestation forms have been provided by the Departments. If an ICHRA sponsor learns of an incorrect or false attestation, future reimbursements relating to the relevant period may be denied.
- Participants potentially eligible to participate in an ICHRA must be provided with a written notice at least 90 days before the beginning of each plan year (with some exceptions for a shorter notice period in for an initial year of eligibility). The final regulations specify the content that must be provided in the notice.

#### Limited Time to Prepare

In order for employers to reimburse employees' purchase of individual ACA-regulated health insurance by January 1, 2020, there is much work to do in relatively little time. Before the November 1 start date of the open enrollment period for 2020 ACA coverage:

- Employers must adopt (or amend existing) HRA Plan documents to comply with the new requirements;
- Employers, as well as Exchanges will need to work to communicate the changes to eligible individuals; and
- All separate State-facilitated Exchanges, as well as the Federal Exchanges must implement any required website coding and enrollment procedures.

The State-facilitated Exchanges have been concerned about a possible 2020 rollout since that date was initially mentioned in proposed rules issued late last year. This April, the administrators of all 12 State Exchanges asked the Departments to postpone the effective date. In response, the Departments have promised to provide technical assistance to the Exchanges to facilitate timely implementation of the new rules. Nonetheless, the final regulations are extremely detailed and complex. Whether, and to what extent, employers

(and Exchanges) are able to embrace ICHRA reimbursement of individual health insurance premiums remains to be seen.

The attorneys of the Employment Law team of O’Neil, Cannon, Hollman, DeJong and Laing are closely following these new developments and are prepared to discuss how the change in HRA rules may impact your strategy regarding employee benefits offerings, ACA compliance, or how to amend an existing HRA or MERP (medical expense reimbursement plan) or to adopt a new HRA document to prepare for the reimbursement of individual coverage.

---

## **EMPLOYMENT LAWSCENE ALERT: CREATION OF NEW TASK FORCE SIGNALS INCREASED STATE SCRUTINY OF WISCONSIN WORKER CLASSIFICATION**

April 15, 2019 marked not only the end of the 2018 personal income tax season, but also the beginning of a new era of enforcement of Wisconsin employment practices. On that date, Governor Tony Evers issued an Executive Order creating a Joint Task Force on Payroll Fraud and Worker Misclassification (the “Task Force”). This Task Force will focus on workers who should be classified as employees but are misclassified as independent contractors.

The Task Force will be chaired by the Secretary of the Department of Workforce Development (“DWD”) and will be staffed by representatives from the DWD, including its Worker’s Compensation and Unemployment Insurance divisions, the Department of Revenue, and the offices of the Attorney General and the Commissioner of Insurance.

### Background

Similar task forces have been implemented in recent years in Connecticut and Massachusetts (2008), New York (2016), Colorado, New Jersey, Tennessee, and Virginia (2018), and Michigan (2019).

One of the catalysts for the Wisconsin Task Force creation was the finding, under DWD audits from January 2016 through April 2019, of 5,841 misclassified employees and the related under-reporting of nearly \$70 million in gross wages and \$1.8 million in unemployment insurance taxes. Misclassification of employees also results in the underpayment of Social Security and Medicare-related employment law taxes.

Another impetus for the new interagency coordination is the concern that employers who misclassify workers as independent contractors gain an unlawful competitive advantage that

allows them to under-bid or out-compete law-abiding employers.

Prior reviews of employer practices reported by the National Employment Law Project posit that audits of Wisconsin employers have typically revealed worker misclassification in 44% of investigated cases.

### Task Force Mandates

The new Task Force is required to report annually to the Governor by March to describe its accomplishments and recommendation for the prior year. Specifically, the Task Force report must include the amount of wages, premiums, taxes, and other payments or penalties collected as a result of coordinated agency activities, as well as the number of employers cited for misclassification and the approximate number of affected workers. The Task Force must also identify administrative or legal barriers impeding more effective agency coordination. After consultation with representatives of business, organized labor, members of the legislature, and other agencies, the Task Force will also propose changes to administrative practices, laws, or regulations appropriate to:

- reduce agency coordination barriers;
- prevent worker misclassification from occurring;
- investigate potential violations of laws governing worker classifications;
- improve enforcement where such violations are found to have occurred; and
- identify successful mechanisms for preventing worker misclassification.

### Key Take-Away

The Wisconsin Task Force is being implemented at a time when recent federal decisions by the National Labor Relations Board and the United States Supreme Court appear to be permitting some gig economy companies to more easily classify workers as independent contractors, rather than as employees.

As a result of the creation of the Task Force, however, Wisconsin employers should expect increased scrutiny from the DWD and Department of Revenue regarding independent contractor relationships.

The Employment Law team of O'Neil, Cannon, Hollman, DeJong and Laing recently presented client [seminars](#) in Pewaukee and Green Bay on the many aspects of worker classification and are well-positioned to assist Wisconsin employers in reviewing current arrangements or discussing how the law applies under various circumstances.

---

# EMPLOYMENT LAWSCENE ALERT: IRS ISSUES A SECOND SET OF APRIL 2019 CHANGES TO RETIREMENT PLAN CORRECTION PROGRAM

The IRS Employee Plans division on Friday, April 19, released an updated version of its comprehensive retirement plan correction protocol. Although touted as a “limited update” to the Employee Plan Compliance Resolution System, or EPCRS, the changes contained in this new Revenue Procedure 2019-19 nonetheless offer substantial savings opportunities for certain employer sponsors of 401(k), 403(b), and profit-sharing plans, and employee stock ownership plans (ESOPs).

The update is effective immediately, and is notable for being the second change in the EPCRS rules to take effect in April 2019. Under a previously-issued update to the program, a new online-only submission requirement took effect on April 1, 2019. As of that date, plan sponsors are no longer permitted to submit EPCRS correction applications or payments by mail.

## **Bottom Line**

The effect of the April 19 update is to expand the circumstances under which a plan sponsor is permitted to correct a self-identified error under the self-correction program (SCP), rather than having to submit a formal application, and accompanying fee, to the IRS.

This expansion of the opportunities for self-correction is a welcome opportunity for plan sponsors who become aware of certain plan compliance failures involving the language of the plan document as well as particular types of errors in the operation of participant loan programs. Correction of the specified errors may now be made on a less formal basis. Provided that the proper correction protocol is followed and documented, a correction can now be completed without having to pay the usual IRS submission fee, which ranges from \$1,500 to \$3,500.

## **EPCRS Background**

The purpose of the IRS EPCRS program, generally, is to provide a system of correction programs and procedures for sponsors of tax-qualified retirement plans that have fallen outside of the qualification requirements either because of errors in the language of the plan document or because of mistakes in how the plan is operated. The EPCRS correction program permits plan sponsors to correct these errors and thereby to continue to offer retirement benefits to their employees on a tax-favored basis.

Depending on the nature and severity of a retirement plan compliance error, three different

EPCRS programs exist, each with slightly different rules:

- SCP. For the least significant errors, the Self Correction Program (SCP) permits a plan sponsor to self-correct the error without paying any fee or sanction and without submitting any documentation to the IRS. Even though no documents are submitted to the IRS under the SCP program, it is important that the proper self-correction protocols described by the IRS are followed. An improper or undocumented self-correction provides no future IRS audit protection. A proper retirement plan self-correction, however, will protect a plan sponsor from future fees or penalties related to the properly-corrected error.
- VCP. For more significant compliance failures, or for failures not corrected within a specified time period, the only way to receive approval of a correction is to participate in the Voluntary Compliance Program (VCP). This program requires that a description of the error, and of its correction, be submitted to the IRS for formal approval. To use this program, a plan sponsor must pay a fee to the IRS. Under the recently-amended fee structure, the amount of the fee depends solely on the amount of plan assets and ranges from \$1,500 (for plans with less than \$500,000 in assets) to \$3,500 (for plans with more than \$10,000,000 in assets).
- Audit CAP. If it is the IRS, rather than the plan sponsor, who identifies a compliance error, then the only permitted correction program is the more expensive Audit CAP program. Errors can be corrected under Audit CAP if the IRS identifies an error during an audit. Under Audit CAP, the penalties imposed in order to retain the retirement plan's tax-qualification will be larger than under the VCP program, and will vary, based upon the nature and extent of the compliance error, the severity of the error.

### **Potential Opportunity to Make Key Corrections at a Lower Cost**

The Treasury Department and IRS expect to continue to update the EPCRS program, in whole or in part, from time to time. Given the ever-changing and highly fact-specific nature of the IRS correction program, the severely adverse threat of plan tax-disqualification, and the need to determine the most effective correction strategy, plan sponsors who suspect or know that a retirement plan has a compliance error are advised to work confidentially with legal counsel specifically experienced in this area of practice. Because an error cannot be corrected under either the SCP or VCP programs after an IRS audit has begun, it is always best to respond to a compliance error quickly and proactively.

Now that the opportunities for self-correction have been expanded, there is no time like the present for plan sponsors to review their tax-qualified plan documentation and operations. Because more types of compliance errors can now be self-corrected, the cost of bringing an

employer-sponsored retirement plan back into good standing may now be reduced.

---

## **EMPLOYMENT LAWSCENE ALERT: IT'S TOO COLD TO WORK - HOW EMPLOYERS SHOULD HANDLE WAGE DEDUCTIONS IN INCLEMENT WEATHER**

Employers in Wisconsin may be closed this week due to the extremely cold temperatures that are predicted on Wednesday and Thursday. If an employer makes that decision, they may be wondering whether or not they need to pay their employees for the days they choose to be closed. For non-exempt employees, the answer is simple: employees must be paid only for time worked. Therefore, if the employer closes and the employee does not perform any work, the employee does not need to be paid. However, the answer is a bit more complicated for exempt employees.

Under the Fair Labor Standards Act ("FLSA"), an employee is considered exempt if they meet certain duties tests and receive compensation on a "salary basis." The FLSA regulations provide that, for an exempt employee to be paid on a "salary basis," the employee must receive his or her full salary for any week in which the employee performs any work without regard to the number of days or hours worked. An employee will not be considered to be paid on a "salary basis" for any week if deductions are made from an employee's salary for any absence occasioned by the employer or by the operating requirements of the business. However, a deduction may be made when an exempt employee is absent from work for one or more full days for personal reasons, other than sickness or disability.

So, can an employer deduct the day's wage from an exempt employee's salary when the employer closes its business due to inclement weather (e.g., extreme cold)? The short answer is no. It is the U.S. Department of Labor's ("DOL") position that an employer must pay an exempt employee his or her full salary for any week in which work was performed if the employer closes its operations due to a weather-related emergency or other emergency, such as a power outage. The DOL's position is based, in part, on the FLSA's regulation that provides that deductions may not be made for time when work is not available. When it is the employer's decision to close its business because of an emergency, including severe weather, the DOL presumes that employees remain ready, willing, and able to work. Under such circumstances, deductions may not be made from an exempt employee's salary when work is not available. If deductions are made under such circumstances, the employer risks losing the exemption, thus subjecting it to potential overtime liability. If the employer's

operation are closed for a full workweek, no salary must be paid.

Employers are permitted to require that employees utilize their available paid time off during an employer-mandated office closure, whether for a full day or a partial day. However, if the employer does not provide paid time off or if the employee does not have available paid time off, the employer may not deduct from the employee's salary for the closure. The employer may not require that the employee have a negative leave balance or make an already negative leave balance more negative as the result of requiring the employee to take paid time off for an office closure.

On the other hand, when an emergency causes an employee to choose not to report to work for the day, even though the employer remains open for business, the DOL treats such an absence as an absence for personal reasons. Consequently, an employer that remains open for business during inclement weather may lawfully deduct one full day's wages from an exempt employee's salary if that person does not report for work for the day due to adverse weather conditions or otherwise require the employee to utilize paid time off. Such a deduction will not violate the "salary basis" rule or otherwise affect the employee's exempt status. If, however, the employee works only a partial day because of weather-related issues, the employer may not make deductions from the employee's salary for the lost time because an exempt employee must receive a full day's pay for the partial day worked in order for the employer to meet the "salary basis" rule.

---

## **EMPLOYMENT LAWSCENE ALERT: COMPANY HOLIDAY PARTIES AND TIPS FOR AVOIDING LIABILITY**

The holidays are upon us, and that means holiday parties. While holiday parties are a good time to reflect on the year and gather employees to boost morale and camaraderie, they also have potential employment law pitfalls that employers should plan to avoid. If throwing a company-sponsored holiday party, employers should keep the following in mind:

1. **Prevent Sexual Harassment.** Although the #MeToo movement has not changed the legal requirements related to sexual harassment, it has certainly brought such issues to the top of employer's minds, and it should stay there during the holiday season and any holiday parties. Ensure that your employees are aware of your anti-harassment policy and that they understand that harassment involving any employee at any time, including at a holiday party, will not be tolerated. Remind your employees that, while they are encouraged to have a good time at the holiday party, it is a company-

sponsored event where all of the policies and rules of the company apply. If you become aware of inappropriate conduct that occurs at the holiday party, you should deal with it appropriately. Additionally, if you receive complaints about activities related to the holiday party, you must document the incident and do a proper investigation to deal with those issues.

2. **Reduce the Risk of Alcohol-Related Incidents.** Employers may be subject to liability for injuries caused by employees who consume alcohol at employer-sponsored events. To avoid potential liability, employers should promote responsible drinking and monitor alcohol consumption appropriately. Employers may want to consider hosting their holiday parties at a restaurant or other off-site location where alcohol is served by professional bartenders who know how to recognize and respond to guests who are visibly intoxicated.
3. **Minimize the Risk of Workers' Compensation Liability.** Workers' compensation benefits may be available to employees who suffer a work-related injury or illness. To avoid this liability at a company-sponsored holiday party, the employer should make it clear that there is no business purpose to the event, that attendance is completely voluntary, and that they are not being compensated for their attendance at the event. Illnesses caused by contaminants found in food or beverages may create legal exposure if the providers are not properly licensed, so companies should use licensed third-parties who have their own insurance coverage to provide food and beverages.
4. **Prevent Wage and Hour Claims.** Non-exempt employees must be paid for all work-related events that they are required to attend. Therefore, to ensure that the time spent at a holiday party is not considered compensable under state or federal wage and hour law, employers should make it clear that attendance is completely voluntary, hold the party outside of normal working hours, and ensure that no work is performed during the party and that employees are not under the impression that they are performing work.

---

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

With the Wisconsin general election coming up next week on November 6, 2018, now is the time for employers to brush up on their obligations surrounding voting.

All Wisconsin employers are required to provide employees who are eligible to vote up to three consecutive hours of unpaid leave to vote while the polls are open (from 7 AM until 8 PM), and employees must request the time off prior to the election. Voting leave cannot be denied on the basis that employees would have time outside of their scheduled work hours to vote while the polls are open, but employers can specify which three hours an employee is permitted to utilize. Other than the time being unpaid, employers may not penalize

employees for using voting leave. However, employers should remember that, under the FLSA, they may not deduct from an exempt employee's salary for partial day absences.

Additionally, all Wisconsin employers are also required to grant an employee who is appointed to serve as an election official 24 hours of unpaid leave for the election day in which the employee serves in his or her official capacity. Employees must provide their employers with at least seven days' notice of their need for this leave. Other than the time being unpaid, employers may not penalize employees for using election official leave.

Finally, Wisconsin employers are not permitted to make threats that are intended to influence the political opinions or actions of their employees. Specifically, employers cannot distribute printed materials to employees that threaten business shut down, in whole or in part, or reduction in salaries or wages of employees if a certain party or candidate is elected or if any referendum is adopted or rejected.

---

## EMPLOYMENT LAWSCENE ALERT: EMPLOYERS MUST REVIEW THEIR BACKGROUND CHECK PROCESSES TO ENSURE COMPLIANCE WITH NEW RULES

The Fair Credit Reporting Act ("FCRA") requires that employers who request "consumer reports," which include background checks, criminal histories, driving records, and credit reports, from a third-party service about employees and applicants follow certain rules. These rules contain specific requirements for notice, disclosure, and consent both in conjunction with obtaining a report and taking adverse employment action because of information in the report.

One requirement is that an employer must make certain disclosures **before** the employer takes an adverse action based on information discovered in the consumer report. This includes providing the employee or applicant with a written summary of consumer rights under the FCRA. Recently, the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection updated its model disclosure to reflect recent legislative changes to the FCRA, such as the consumer's right to place a security freeze or fraud alert on their credit report. The new model form can be found [here](#).

Employers must ensure that their authorizations and disclosures meet all FCRA requirements and that they are providing the correct notifications, including the updated summary of

rights.

---

## EMPLOYMENT LAWSCENE ALERT: SUPREME COURT DECIDES CLASS-ACTION WAIVERS ARE ENFORCEABLE FOR EMPLOYEES

For the last several years, employers have been operating under a cloud of confusion regarding whether provisions in employment agreements that require employees to engage in individual arbitration proceedings, as opposed to class proceedings, are enforceable. Finally, the Supreme Court, in a 5-4 decision, has given us an answer, and the answer is yes, such provisions are enforceable!

In 2012, the National Labor Relations Board (NLRB) took the stance that class waivers violated workers' rights to engage in concerted activity under Section 7 of the National Labor Relations Act (NLRA). Although the Fifth Circuit rejected that stance in *D.R. Horton and Murphy Oil* and held that such provisions were valid and enforceable, the NLRB continued to litigate the issue, claiming that such provisions were not legal. In the intervening years, the Second and Eighth Circuits have agreed with the Fifth Circuit, while the Sixth, Seventh, and Ninth Circuits have agreed with the NLRB.

On Monday, in *Epic Systems Corp. v. Lewis*, the Supreme Court finally settled the dispute. In examining the issue, the Court considered two issues: (1) whether the "savings clause" of the Federal Arbitration Act (FAA) required enforcement of the arbitration agreements as written if the agreement violated another federal law, and (2) whether the arbitration agreements that waived collective rights violated the NLRA.

In looking at the first issue, the majority found that the FAA required courts to enforce arbitration agreements and, therefore, favored arbitration agreements. Although it acknowledged the general FAA "savings clause," such clause only applies when certain *contract* defenses apply. In examining the case at hand, the majority found that no such contract defenses were applicable and that it could not override the established policy of enforcing arbitration agreements.

The Court also considered whether the NLRA's protection of employees' collective rights displaced the FAA's favored enforcement of arbitration agreement. The majority held that, although the NLRA guarantees employees the right to *bargain* collectively, it neither guarantees the right to *collective action* nor manifests intent to displace the FAA. Because the NLRA was enacted after the FAA, if Congress had intended the NLRA to override the FAA's

protections for arbitration agreements, such intent would have needed to be clear. Because it was not clear, the Court found that there was no such intent and that the NLRA's protection of collective rights could not override the FAA's policy of enforcing arbitration agreements as written.

Based on the Supreme Court's ruling in *Epic*, employers are now free to include arbitration agreements that include a waiver of class and collective actions in their employment contracts. Although Congress could amend the law to clearly state that the NLRA, or some other federal law, does not allow for waiver of class or collective actions by employees, such legislative action is unlikely at this point in time. Employers may find arbitration agreements useful as arbitration may be less expensive, faster, and more flexible than traditional litigation.