# EMPLOYMENT LAWSCENE ALERT: DOL ANNOUNCES THAT THE PAID LEAVE PROVISIONS OF THE FAMILIES FIRST CORONAVIRUS RESPONSE ACT ARE EFFECTIVE APRIL 1, 2020

In providing general guidance to employers, the U.S. Department of Labor announced that the paid leave provisions of the Families First Coronavirus Response Act ("FFCRA") are effective on April 1, 2020, and not on April 2, 2020 as widely reported. The Family and Medical Leave Expansion Act ("FMLEA") and the Emergency Paid Sick Leave Act ("EPSLA") provide that the requirements to provide paid leave under the FFCRA "shall take effect **not later than 15 days** after the date of enactment of this Act." President Trump signed the FFCRA on March 18, 2020—15 days from March 18th is April 2nd.  Obviously, the DOL has interpreted these enabling provisions of the FMLEA and the EPSLA to provide it authority to make these laws effective before April 2, 2020. Because the DOL is responsible for enforcing the paid leave provisions of the FFCRA, all covered employers should provide paid leave benefits under the FFCRA starting **April 1, 2020** to all eligible employees entitled to such paid leave.

---

# EMPLOYMENT LAWSCENE ALERT: PRESIDENT SIGNS FAMILIES FIRST CORONAVIRUS RESPONSE ACT EXPANDING EMPLOYEES' FMLA RIGHTS AND MANDATING PAID SICK LEAVE

The President signed the COVID-19 bill, H.R. 6201, into law late Wednesday night, not wasting any time during this national health emergency, after the Senate approved the bill by a vote of 90-8. Before the Senate took its vote, the House of Representatives made technical corrections to the bill from the version of the bill that the House passed early Saturday morning. The House's technical corrections actually made substantial limitations to the scope of who qualifies for expanded Family and Medical Leave Act (FMLA) rights and made clarifying changes to the portion of the bill that provides employees with two weeks of emergency paid sick leave.

On Monday, we provided our readers with a summary of the House of Representatives'

version of H.R. 6201, which can be found here. The Senate's version of H.R. 6201 limits the expanded FMLA leave entitlement to only those employees who are unable to work due to a need to care for their child under 18 years of age because the child's school is closed or the child's child care provider is unavailable due to the public health emergency caused by the coronavirus pandemic. The Senate's version also capped the amount of paid sick time at $200 per day and $2,000 in the aggregate per employee for an employee who is: (i) taking care of an individual subject to a quarantine order or who has been advised by a health care provider to self-quarantine; (ii) caring for the employee's child if the child's school or place of care has been closed due to the coronavirus or if the child care provider for the child is unavailable; or (iii) experiencing any other substantially similar condition specified by the Secretary of Health and Human Services.

The Senate's version also made significant changes to the emergency paid sick leave portion of the bill. Most noteworthy being that there is now a cap on the amount of paid sick time in the amount of $511 per day and $5,110 in the aggregate for employees who are quarantined or isolated due to coronavirus or are experiencing symptoms of COVID-19 and seeking a medical diagnosis.

This article will describe what employers need to know about the Emergency Family and Medical Leave Expansion Act and the Emergency Paid Sick Leave Act which are now part of the Families First Coronavirus Response Act (the Act) which is now law. A copy of the Act can be found here.

**Emergency Family and Medical Leave Expansion Act**

Effective April 1, 2020, employers with 500 or fewer employees will be required to provide employees, who have worked for their employer at least 30 calendar days (forget about the 1,250 hours service requirement during the preceding 12-month period for other types of FMLA leave), with up to 12 weeks of FMLA leave. These expanded FMLA leave rights extend through December 31, 2020.

Employees entitled to these expanded FMLA leave rights are limited only to those employees who are unable to work (or telework) due to a need for leave to care for their son or daughter under 18 years of age if the school or place of care has been closed, or if the child care provider of such child is unavailable because of the public health emergency caused by the coronavirus. The first 10 days for this FMLA leave will be unpaid. If the FMLA leave extends beyond 10 days for this purpose, then the employer will be required to provide up to 10 weeks of paid leave for this expanded leave.

The paid leave amount for eligible employees for the available 10-week period is based on an amount equal to not less than two-thirds of the employee's regular rate of pay multiplied by the number of hours the employee would otherwise be scheduled to work. As mentioned

above, the paid portion of the leave is now capped at $200 per day and $10,000 in the aggregate for each employee. This portion of the Act represents one of the corrections made to the House's first version of the bill so that the amount of the employer's liability for paid leave now matches the amount of tax credit available to the employer for providing such paid FMLA leave.

Currently, the Act covers all employers with 500 or fewer employees, including small employers who employ fewer than 50 employees. However, the Department of Labor is authorized to issue regulations that would exempt small employers with fewer than 50 employees from the paid leave requirements of the bill if such payment obligation would jeopardize the viability of the employer's business as a going concern. This means that if a small employer chooses not to provide the paid leave benefit for expanded FMLA leave, it does so at its own peril subject to its ability to defend itself on the basis that any such paid leave jeopardizes the employer's existence as a going concern. That burden could be high for small employers to meet.

Qualifying Need Related to a Public Health Emergency

Obviously, employees who have been diagnosed with the coronavirus and otherwise meet the definition of having a serious health condition will qualify for regular unpaid FMLA leave like any other employee with a serious health condition. Now, however, employees who have worked for an employer for a period of at least 30 days and have a "qualifying need related to a public health emergency" will qualify for expanded FMLA leave with the opportunity to have 10 out of their 12 week FMLA leave allotment to be paid. The Act defines a "qualifying need related to a public health emergency" as an employee who is unable to work (or telework) due to a need for leave to care for their child under 18 years of age if the school or place of care for such child has been closed, or if the child care provider of such child is unavailable, due the public health emergency cause by the coronavirus pandemic.

Expanded FMLA Provides for Both Unpaid and Paid Leave

The first 10 days of leave under the expanded FMLA would be unpaid. However, employees may elect, but employers cannot require employees, to substitute any accrued vacation leave, personal leave, or medical or sick leave for the unpaid portion of the leave.

After expiration of the 10 days of leave for a qualifying need related to a public health emergency, employers will be required to provide employees with paid leave. The paid leave provision of the Act will require employers to pay employees an amount equal to at least two-thirds of each employee's regular rate of pay multiplied by the number of hours the employee would otherwise be normally scheduled to work. If the employee works a varying number of hours each workweek, then the employer must base the amount of paid leave on the average number of hours that the employee was scheduled to work per day over the

previous 6-month period preceding the need for the leave. The amount of paid leave is capped at $200 per day or $10,000 in the aggregate.

Restoration Rights

Like with other types of leave provided under the FMLA, employers will be required to restore employees to their position after expiration of their leave. However, employers with fewer than 25 employees are relieved of the obligation to restore an employee to his or her position if all the following four conditions are met:

- The employee took leave for a "qualifying need related to a public emergency";
- The position that the employee held no longer exists due to economic conditions or other changes of the employer caused by the public health emergency;
- The employer makes reasonable efforts to restore the employee to an equivalent position with equivalent benefits, pay, and other terms and conditions of employment; and
- If the employer is unable to restore the employee's employment to an equivalent position, then the employer must contact the employee within a 1-year period beginning on the date the FMLA leave concludes if an equivalent position eventually becomes available within that 1-year time period.

**Emergency Paid Sick Leave Act**

Effective April 1, 2020, employers with 500 or fewer employees, through December 31, 2020, will be required to provide up to 80 hours of paid sick leave to an employee, regardless of how long the employee has been employed by the employer, if the employee is:

- Subject to a federal, state, or local quarantine or isolation order related to COVID-19;
- Has been advised by a health care provider to self-quarantine due to concerns related to COVID-19;
- Experiencing symptoms of COVID-19 and is seeking a medical diagnosis;
- Caring for an individual who is subject to an order to quarantine or isolate by a public order or self-quarantine as advised by a health care provider;
- Caring for the employee's son or daughter if the school or place of care for such child has been closed, or if the child care provider of such child is unavailable due to COVID-19 precautions; or
- Experiencing any other substantially similar condition specified by the Secretary of Health and Human Services in consultation with the Secretary of the Treasury and the Secretary of Labor.

Employers will be required to post and keep posted, in conspicuous places on the employer's premises, a notice to employees describing the requirements of the paid sick leave portion of the Act. The Department of Labor will make a model notice available no later than 7 days after enactment of the Act.

Full-time employees will be entitled to up to 80 hours of paid leave based on their normal wage. Part-time employees will be entitled to paid leave equal to the number of hours worked, on average, over a two-week period. Paid sick leave is capped at $511 per day and $5,110 in the aggregate for employees who are quarantined or isolated due to coronavirus or are experiencing symptoms of COVID-19 and seeking a medical diagnosis. The amount of paid sick time is also capped at $200 per day and $2,000 in the aggregate per employee for an employee who is: (i) taking care of an individual subject to a quarantine order or who has been advised by a health care provider to self-quarantine; (ii) caring for the employee's child if the child's school or place of care has been closed due to the coronavirus or if the child care provider for the child is unavailable; or (iii) experiencing any other substantially similar condition specified by the Secretary of Health and Human Services. However, both full-time and part-time employees will be entitled only to two-thirds of their wages, as calculated under the Act, when the paid sick leave is used for those reasons where the amount of paid leave is capped at $200 per day. Small employers employing fewer than 50 employees may be able to claim an exemption to the requirements of the paid sick leave portion of the Act if the employer can show that compliance would jeopardize the viability of its business as a going concern.

The paid sick time provided under the Act would be in addition to any other paid leave made available to the employee by the employer. Employers also cannot require an employee to use other paid time, like vacation or PTO, before using paid sick time provided under the Act. In addition, the paid sick leave can't be carried over from year to year, and the employer is not required to pay any unused paid sick leave to the employee at the time of the employee's separation of employment if the employee has not used such sick leave prior to separation.

**Tax Credits for Paid Sick Leave and Paid Family and Medical Leave**

To assist employers in paying employees either paid FMLA leave or paid sick leave, employers will be entitled to tax credits on their employer's portion of payroll taxes for wages paid to employees.

For paid FMLA leave, an employer will be entitled to a tax credit for qualified family leave wages in an amount up to $200 per day or $10,000 in the aggregate (5 days x 10 weeks x $200/day cap). If any tax `credit exceeds the amount of payroll taxes due by the employer, then such excess would be treated as an overpayment entitling the employer to a refund.

For paid sick leave, the available tax credit for each employee would be for wages capped at $511 per day while the employee is receiving paid sick leave because: (i) the employee is subject to a quarantine or isolation order by a public official; (ii) the employee has been advised by a health care provider to self-quarantine; or (iii) the employee is seeking a medical diagnosis because the employee is experiencing symptoms of coronavirus. The

available tax credit to an employer who pays paid sick leave to an employee is $200 per day if the leave: (i) is taken to care for an individual subject to a quarantine order or who has been advised by a health care provider to self-quarantine; (ii) is taken to care for the employee's child if the child's school or place of care has been closed due to the coronavirus or if the child care provider for the child is unavailable; or (iii) is taken by the employee who is experiencing any other substantially similar condition specified by the Secretary of Health and Human Services.

If you have questions regarding compliance with these new legal requirements for either expanded FMLA rights or paid sick leave, please contact one of our employment lawyers, Joseph Gumina or Erica Reib, at (414) 276-5000.

---

# EMPLOYMENT LAWSCENE ALERT: ECONOMIC RELIEF IS COMING FOR EMPLOYEES IMPACTED BY THE CORONAVIRUS–EMERGENCY FMLA EXPANSION ACT–EMERGENCY PAID SICK LEAVE ACT

On the heels of President Trump declaring a National Health Emergency, the U.S. House of Representatives passed a 110-page relief bill (HR 6201) during the early morning hours of Saturday, March 14th, to address the economic effects upon individuals negatively impacted by the coronavirus pandemic. H.R. 6201 is designed to provide affected workers expanded Family and Medical Leave Act (FMLA) protections, expansion of food assistance and unemployment insurance benefits, and up to 80 hours of paid sick leave, as well as other relief.

H.R. 6201 will be presented to the U.S. Senate this week for debate for a high-profile vote. President Trump has already indicated that he would sign the legislation in its current form. Employers should expect the U.S. Senate to act quickly so that a bill can be presented to President Trump for signature as soon as possible.

This article will describe what employers need to know about two significant provisions of H.R. 6201 as it moves forward to the Senate: The Emergency FMLA Expansion Act and the Emergency Paid Sick Leave Act.

**Emergency FMLA Expansion Act – Small Employers Beware**

Targeting that segment of the economy that will be hit the hardest by the impact of the coronavirus pandemic, employers with 500 or fewer employees will be required to provide employees, who have worked for their employer at least 30 calendar days (forget about the 1,250 hour service requirement during the preceding 12-month period for other FMLA leave), with up to 12-weeks of FMLA leave. The expanded FMLA leave rights extends through December 31, 2020. Employers may be required to provide up to 10 weeks of paid leave for their employees who qualify for this expanded leave.

Currently, the proposed legislation would cover all employers with 500 or fewer employees, including small employers who employ less than 50 employees. However, the Department of Labor would be authorized to issue regulations that would exempt small employers with fewer than 50 employees from the paid leave requirements of the bill if such payment obligation would jeopardize the viability of the employer's business as a going concern. This means that if a small employer chooses not to provide the paid leave benefit for expanded FMLA leave, it does so at its own peril subject to its ability to defend itself on the basis that any such paid leave jeopardizes the employer's existence as a going concern. That burden could be high for small employers to meet.

Qualifying Need Related to a Public Health Emergency

Forget about the concept of an employee having a "serious health condition" in order to be entitled to this expanded FMLA leave. Now, because of the public health emergency caused by the coronavirus, employees will be entitled to expanded FMLA rights if they have a "qualifying need related to a public health emergency." Under this standard, employees who have been employed by the same employer for at least 30 calendar days, regardless of the number of hours previously worked, will be entitled up to 12 weeks of leave if the employees are:

- Complying with the recommendation of a public health official or a health care provider who recommends that the employee be quarantined because of their exposure to coronavirus or because they exhibit the symptoms of coronavirus;
- Providing care for a family member who has been quarantined because of their exposure to coronavirus or because the family member exhibits the symptoms of coronavirus;
- Providing care for their son or daughter under the 18 years of age if the school or place of care has been closed, or the child care provider of such son or daughter is unavailable, due to the public health emergency.

Expanded FMLA Provides for Both Unpaid and Paid Leave

The first 14 days of leave under the expanded FMLA would be unpaid. However, employees may elect, but employers cannot require employees, to substitute any accrued vacation leave, personal leave, or medical or sick leave for the unpaid portion of the leave.

After expiration of the 14 days of leave for a qualifying need related to a public health emergency, employers will be required to provide employees with paid leave. The paid leave provision of the bill would require employers to pay employees an amount equal to at least two-thirds of each employee's regular rate of pay multiplied by the number of hours the employee would otherwise be normally scheduled to work. If the employee works a varying number of hours each workweek, then the employer must base the amount of paid leave on the average number of hours that the employee was scheduled to work per day over the previous 6-month period preceding the need for the leave.

Restoration Rights

Like with other types of leave provided under the FMLA, employers will be required to restore employees to their position after expiration of their leave. However, employers with fewer than 25 employees are relieved of the obligation to restore an employee to his or her position if all the following four conditions are met:

- The employee took leave for a qualifying need related to a public emergency;
- The position that the employee held no longer exist due to economic conditions or other changes of the employer caused by the public health emergency;
- The employer makes reasonable efforts to restore the employee to an equivalent position with equivalent benefits, pay, and other terms and conditions of employment; and
- If the employer is not able to restore the employee's employment to an equivalent position, then the employer must contact the employee within a 1-year period beginning on the date the FMLA leave concludes if an equivalent position does eventually become available within that 1-year time period.

**Emergency Paid Sick Leave Act**

H.R. 6201 will require employers with 500 or fewer employees, through December 31, 2020, to provide up to 80 hours paid sick leave to employees who:

- Are required to self-isolate because they are diagnosed with coronavirus;
- Seek medical diagnosis or care if they are experiencing the symptoms of coronavirus;
- Are required to comply with the recommendations or orders by a public health official or a health care provider because their physical presence on the job would jeopardize the health of others because of the employee's exposure to coronavirus;
- Are required to care for or assist a family member who is either self-isolating because the family member has been diagnosed with coronavirus or is experiencing symptoms of coronavirus; or
- Are required to care for their child because the child's school or place of care has been closed, or the child's care provider is unavailable due to coronavirus.

Full-time employees will be entitled up to 80 hours of paid leave based on their normal wage. Part-time employees will be entitled to paid leave equal to the number of hours worked, on

average, over a two-week period. However, both full-time and part-time employees will be entitled only to two-thirds of their wages when the sick leave is used to either provide care for a family member with coronavirus or to take care of a child whose school is closed or the child care provider is unavailable because of the coronavirus.

The paid sick leave provided under H.R. 6201 would be in addition to any other paid leave made available to the employee by the employer. Employers cannot require an employee to use other paid time, like vacation or PTO, before using paid sick time provided under H.R. 6201. In addition, the paid sick leave can't be carried over from year to year, and the employer is not required to pay any unused paid sick leave to the employee at time of the employee's separation of employment if the employee has not used such sick leave prior to separation.

**Tax Credits for Paid Sick Leave and Paid Family and Medical Leave**

Employers would be entitled to tax credits for their employer's portion of payroll taxes for wages paid to employees taking either paid sick leave or paid FMLA leave. The sick leave credit for each employee would be for wages as much as $511 per day while the employee is receiving paid sick leave to care for themselves, or $200 if the sick leave is to care for a family member or child if the child's school is closed. The amount of tax credit for qualified family leave wages for each employee is $200 per day or $10,000 in the aggregate. If any credit exceeds the amount of payroll taxes due by the employer, then such excess would be treated as an overpayment entitling the employer to a refund.

We will keep you posted on the developments of H.R. 6201 as it moves to the Senate for consideration. Stay tuned!

---

## ATTORNEY JOSEPH GUMINA FEATURED IN MERIT SHOP CONTRACTOR

Recently, the *Merit Shop Contractor* magazine featured Attorney Joseph Gumina's safety article on construction contractor compliance with OSHA's fall protection standard (29 C.F.R. § 1926.501). In his article, Attorney Gumina discusses the general requirements of OSHA's construction industry fall protection standard. Despite the simple requirements of the standard, OSHA's fall protection standard continues to be the most frequently cited OSHA standard in the construction industry. Attorney Gumina discusses methods to eliminate, prevent, and control fall hazards on the worksite with a special emphasis on fall protection training so that employees can avoid fall hazards and contractors can achieve effective

safety compliance.

Read the full article here.

---

# 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.

---

## EIGHTEEN OCHDL ATTORNEYS NAMED 2020 BEST LAWYERS IN AMERICA®

O'Neil Cannon is pleased to announce that eighteen lawyers have been named to the 2020 Edition of *Best Lawyers*, the oldest and most respected peer-review publication in the legal profession.

Best Lawyers has published their list for over three decades, earning the respect of the profession, the media, and the public as the most reliable, unbiased source of legal referrals. Its first international list was published in 2006 and since then has grown to provide lists in over 75 countries.

“For more than a third of the century,” says CEO Steven Naifeh, “Best Lawyers has been the gold standard of excellence in the legal profession.” President Phil Greer adds, “We are extremely proud of that record and equally proud to acknowledge the accomplishments of these exceptional legal professionals.”

Lawyers on *The Best Lawyers in America* list are divided by geographic region and practice areas. They are reviewed by their peers on the basis of professional expertise, and undergo an authentication process to make sure they are in current practice and in good standing.

We would like to congratulate the following attorneys named to the 2020 *Best Lawyers in America* list:

- Douglas P. Dehler – Litigation – Insurance
- James G. DeJong – Corporate Law, Mergers and Acquisitions Law, Securities / Capital Markets Law
- Seth E. Dizard – Bankruptcy and Creditor Debtor Rights / Insolvency and Reorganization Law, Litigation Bankruptcy
- Peter J. Faust – Corporate Law, Mergers and Acquisitions Law
- John G. Gehringer – Commercial Litigation, Construction Law, Corporate Law, Real Estate Law
- Joseph E. Gumina – Litigation – Labor and Employment
- Dennis W. Hollman – Corporate Law, Trusts and Estates
- Grant C. Killoran – Litigation – Health Care
- Dean P. Laing – Commercial Litigation, Personal Injury Litigation – Plaintiffs, Product Liability Litigation – Defendants
- Gregory W. Lyons – Commercial Litigation, Litigation – Insurance
- Patrick G. McBride – Commercial Litigation
- Thomas A. Merkle – Family Law
- Chad J. Richter – Business Organizations (including LLCs and Partnerships)
- John Schreiber – Bankruptcy and Creditor Debtor Rights / Insolvency and Reorganization Law, Litigation – Bankruptcy
- Steven J. Slawinski – Construction Law

Since it was first published in 1983, *Best Lawyers* has become universally regarded as the definitive guide to legal excellence. *Best Lawyers* is based on an exhaustive peer-review survey. Over 54,000 leading attorneys cast more than 7.3 million votes on the legal abilities of other lawyers in their practice areas. Lawyers are not required or allowed to pay a fee to be listed; therefore inclusion in *Best Lawyers* is considered a singular honor. *Corporate Counsel* magazine has called *Best Lawyers* “the most respected referral list of attorneys in

practice.”

---

# 20 OCHDL ATTORNEYS NAMED 2019 BEST LAWYERS IN AMERICA

O’Neil Cannon is pleased to announce that 20 lawyers have been named to the 2019 Edition of *Best Lawyers*, the oldest and most respected peer-review publication in the legal profession.

Best Lawyers has published their list for over three decades, earning the respect of the profession, the media, and the public as the most reliable, unbiased source of legal referrals. Its first international list was published in 2006 and since then has grown to provide lists in over 75 countries.

“For more than a third of the century,” says CEO Steven Naifeh, “Best Lawyers has been the gold standard of excellence in the legal profession.” President Phil Greer adds, “We are extremely proud of that record and equally proud to acknowledge the accomplishments of these exceptional legal professionals.”

Lawyers on *The Best Lawyers in America* list are divided by geographic region and practice areas. They are reviewed by their peers on the basis of professional expertise, and undergo an authentication process to make sure they are in current practice and in good standing.

O’Neil Cannon would like to congratulate the following attorneys named to the 2019 *Best Lawyers in America* list:

- Douglas P. Dehler – Litigation – Insurance
- James G. DeJong – Mergers and Acquisitions Law, Corporate Law, Securities / Capital Markets Law
- Seth E. Dizard – Bankruptcy and Creditor Debtor Rights / Insolvency and Reorganization Law, Litigation – Bankruptcy
- Peter J. Faust – Mergers and Acquisitions Law, Corporate Law
- Robert R. Gagan – Municipal Law
- John G. Gehringer – Real Estate Law, Construction Law, Commercial Litigation, Corporate Law
- Joseph E. Gumina – Litigation – Labor and Employment
- Dennis W. Hollman – Trusts and Estates, Corporate Law
- Grant C. Killoran – Litigation – Health Care
- Dean P. Laing – Commercial Litigation, Personal Injury Litigation – Plaintiffs, Product Liability Litigation – Defendants

- Gregory W. Lyons – Commercial Litigation, Litigation – Insurance
- Gregory S Mager – Family Law
- Patrick G. McBride – Commercial Litigation
- Thomas A. Merkle – Family Law
- Chad J. Richter – Business Organizations (including LLCs and Partnerships)
- Steven J. Slawinski – Construction Law
- John Schreiber – Bankruptcy and Creditor Debtor Rights/Insolvency and Reorganization Law, Litigation – Bankruptcy

Additionally, Attorney Dean P. Laing has been named the 2019 Milwaukee Lawyer of the Year in Product Liability Litigation–Defendants.

Since it was first published in 1983, *Best Lawyers* has become universally regarded as the definitive guide to legal excellence. *Best Lawyers* is based on an exhaustive peer-review survey. Over 54,000 leading attorneys cast more than 7.3 million votes on the legal abilities of other lawyers in their practice areas. Lawyers are not required or allowed to pay a fee to be listed; therefore inclusion in *Best Lawyers* is considered a singular honor. *Corporate Counsel* magazine has called *Best Lawyers* "the most respected referral list of attorneys in practice."

---

## EMPLOYMENT LAWSCENE ALERT: WAGE AND HOUR LIABILITY—THE HIDDEN DANGER IN ASSET ACQUISITIONS

One of the critical keys to a successful asset acquisition is recognizing potential liabilities and negotiating around those liabilities through a well-drafted asset purchase agreement ("APA"). However, certain liabilities that may attach to the buyer following the sale may not be apparent from the seller's balance sheet or from a typical due diligence review—making the risk a hidden liability. One such potential hidden liability in an asset acquisition is the seller's past wage and hour violations under the federal Fair Labor Standards Act ("FLSA"). Even when the potential liability is identified by the buyer and the parties have negotiated contractual terms in the APA for the buyer not to assume such liability, the buyer may still have exposure for such wage claims when it is deemed a successor under federal common law.

Wage and hour claims under the FLSA can result in significant liability to an employer. Most FLSA claims are brought as a collective action (similar to a class action) on behalf of all similarly situated employees which can result in penalties up to double back wages for up to

three years for willful violations plus the opportunity for the recovery of attorney's fees. This can oftentimes lead to hundreds of thousands of dollars in liability and even millions of dollars if the collective class is large enough and the violation involves significant underpayment of lawfully required wages. Typical claims under the FLSA include: (i) misclassification of employees as exempt; (ii) failing to pay employees for hours worked such as for travel time, donning and doffing, meals and rest periods; (iii) failure to properly calculate an employee's "regular rate" of pay in the calculation of overtime; and (iv) improperly classifying workers as independent contractors rather than as employees.

Many business people operate under the general assumption that when a company is sold in an asset sale, as opposed to a stock sale, the buyer acquires the company's assets "free and clear" of the seller's liabilities unless expressly or implicitly assumed by the buyer. However, many federal circuit courts have recognized that when liability is based on a violation of a federal statute involving labor relations or employment, then application of successor liability under federal common law is appropriate in suits to enforce federal labor or employment laws, like the FLSA, to prohibit employers who violated those laws from avoiding liability by selling, or otherwise disposing of, their assets and dissolving. For example, we previously addressed in this blog (click here for the post) the Seventh Circuit's decision in *Teed v. Thomas and Betts Power Solutions, L.L.C.* where the Seventh Circuit imposed successor liability upon the buyer in an asset acquisition for the seller's FLSA violations despite language in the APA that expressly disclaimed such liability by the buyer.

Because a buyer could be held liable as a successor for the seller's past wage and hour violations, it is incumbent upon the buyer to perform a thorough due diligence of the seller's compliance with wage and hour laws. If potential wage and hour compliance issues are detected, then the buyer can take necessary steps to protect itself by: (i) drafting appropriate representations and warranties regarding the seller's compliance with labor and employment laws; (ii) shifting the potential obligation back to the seller through a carefully drafted indemnification provision that properly defines "losses" to include all potential liabilities under the FLSA; (iii) either negotiating a reduced basket (a threshold amount of losses or damages the buyer must incur before it is entitled to indemnification from the seller) or excepting any FLSA liability imposed on the seller from the basket; (iv) negotiating an increased escrow fund to cover any potential indemnification obligation created from any past wage and hour liabilities that may be imposed on the buyer as a successor; and (v) negotiating a purchase price adjustment.

Having an experienced law firm with both transactional and employment attorneys on your side who can recognize and address a buyer's potential exposure to FLSA liability can make the difference between a successful acquisition or an acquisition where the buyer is saddled with a liability it never saw coming. Click here to meet your OCHD&L business law team.

# EMPLOYMENT LAWSCENE ALERT: NLRB'S GENERAL COUNSEL ISSUES GUIDANCE ON HANDBOOK RULES POST-BOEING

On June 6, 2018, the NLRB's General Counsel issued a memorandum (GC 18-04) to all NLRB Regional Directors providing regional offices general guidance on the new standard regarding the lawfulness of handbook rules under Section 7 as established by the NLRB in *The Boeing Co.*, 365 NLRB No. 154 (2017). In *Boeing*, the NLRB overturned the onerous "reasonably construe" standard that was previously established by the NLRB in *Lutheran Heritage Village-Livonia*, 343 NLRB 646 (2004).

In *Lutheran Heritage*, the NLRB held that employers can't maintain workplace policies that workers could "reasonably construe" as barring them from exercising their Section 7 rights. Section 7 provides that "[e]mployees shall have the right to self-organization, to form, join, or assist labor organizations, to bargain collectively through representatives of their own choosing, and to engage in other concerted activities for the purpose of collective bargaining or other mutual aid or protection, and shall also have the right to refrain from any or all of such activities…"

The *Lutheran Heritage* standard was criticized as rendering unlawful every policy, rule and handbook provision—such as rules governing workplace civility, open door policies, fraternization, use of recording devices, use of cameras, confidentiality, use of social media, interactions with media, and use of logos and trademarks—that an employee might "reasonably construe" to prohibit any type of Section 7 activity. Simply, the *Lutheran Heritage* standard was unworkable for employers in drafting legitimate and effective workplace policies.

Under the new *Boeing* standard, however, the NLRB will apply a balancing test (balancing employees' Section 7 rights with employer's legitimate business interests) in evaluating whether an employer's facially neutral policy interferes with employees' Section 7 rights by considering two things: (i) the nature and extent of the potential impact on NLRA rights, and (ii) legitimate justifications associated with the rule.

In applying this new balancing test, the NLRB will delineate three categories of facially neutral employment policies, rules and handbook provisions:

- Category 1 includes rules that the NLRB will designate as lawful to maintain, either because (i) the rule, when reasonably interpreted, does not prohibit or interfere with the exercise of NLRA rights; or (ii) the potential adverse impact on protected rights is

outweighed by justifications associated with the rule.
- Category 2 includes rules that warrant individualized scrutiny in each case as to whether the rule would prohibit or interfere with NLRA rights, and if so, whether any adverse impact on NLRA-protected conduct is outweighed by legitimate justifications.
- Category 3 includes rules that the NLRB will designate as unlawful to maintain because they would prohibit or limit NLRA-protected conduct, and the adverse impact on NLRA rights is not outweighed by justifications associated with the rule.

The above three categories will represent a classification of results from application of the new *Boeing* balancing test. The categories are not part of the test itself.

The NLRB's June 6th memorandum will assist NLRB regional offices in assessing on how to handle or process unfair labor charges alleging that a particular employer's policy or handbook rule violates employees' Section 7 rights. In addition, the NLRB's General Counsel's memorandum will guide regional offices regarding the placement of various types of rules into the three categories set out in *Boeing* providing the regional offices a balanced common sense approach in evaluating and processing such unfair labor practice charges against the new standard set forth in *Boeing*.