

“OH, NO! IT’S WAGE AND HOUR!”

UNDERSTANDING THE FAIR LABOR STANDARDS ACT OF 1938

by

Scott Warrick, JD, MLHR, CEQC, SHRM-SCP

Scott Warrick Human Resource Consulting, Coaching & Training Services

Scott Warrick Employment Law Services

(614) 738-8317 ♣ scott@scottwarrick.com ♣ WWW.SCOTTWARRICK.COM

Follow Scott’s *HR CONSULTING & EMPLOYMENT LAW SERVICES* on [FACEBOOK](#) and [LinkedIn](#)

Yellow HIGHLIGHTED areas are new for 2020

Table of Contents

I.	PURPOSE.....	7
II.	INDEPENDENT CONTRACTORS	8
A.	Employees v. Independent Contractors.....	8
III.	APPLICATION OF THE 20-FACTOR INDEPENDENT CONTRACTOR TEST.....	13
IV.	DOL OPINION LETTER ON INDEPENDENT CONTRACTORS.....	17
V.	EMPLOYEE v. VOLUNTEER: THE DOL PROVIDES GUIDANCE.....	19
VI.	WHAT DOES FLSA COVER?.....	21
A.	CHILD LABOR	21
B.	MINIMUM WAGE.....	22
C.	OVERTIME PAY	22
VII.	OVERTIME PAY.....	22
A.	Definition of Overtime	22
B.	Workweek Defined.....	23

C.	Compensatory Time	23
D.	Private Sector Compensatory Time.....	24
E.	Unauthorized Overtime	25
F.	Payments Made To Employees Which Need <i>Not</i> Be Included In Overtime Calculations	25
G.	Paying Different Rates of Pay For Different Jobs.....	26
VIII.	EXEMPTIONS	28
A.	Exempt v. Nonexempt Employees	28
B.	Standard Of Review, Burden Of Proof and Rule Of Construction For Determining Exempt Status	28
C.	Minimum Salary Test.....	29
IX.	EXECUTIVE EXEMPTION	30
A.	Bona Fide Executive Employee’s Minimum Salary and Standard Duties Test.....	30
B.	Primary Duty	30
C.	Management	31
D.	Department or Subdivision.....	31
E.	Customarily and Regularly	31
F.	Two or More.....	31
G.	“Actual Authority To Hire and Fire” and “Particular Weight”	32
X.	ADMINISTRATIVE EXEMPTION	32
A.	Bona Fide Administrative Employee’s Minimum Salary and Standard Duties Test.....	32
B.	Primary Duty	33
C.	Directly Related to Management or General Business Operations.....	33
D.	Employer’s Customers	33

E.	Discretion and Independent Judgment	33
F.	Significant Matters	35
G.	Educational Establishments and Administrative Functions	35
XI.	BONA FIDE LEARNED PROFESSIONALS	35
A.	Learned Professional Exemption.....	35
B.	Primary Duty	36
C.	Work Requiring Advanced Knowledge	36
D.	Field of Science or Learning	37
E.	Customarily Acquired by a Prolonged Course of Specialized Intellectual Instruction	37
XII.	BONA FIDE CREATIVE PROFESSIONALS	37
A.	Creative Professional Exemption	37
B.	Invention, Imagination, Originality or Talent	37
C.	Recognized Field of Artistic or Creative Endeavor	38
XIII.	HIGHLY COMPENSATED WORKERS	38
A.	Highly Compensated Test	38
B.	Total Annual Compensation	39
C.	Make-up Payments and Prorating	39
D.	Customarily and Regularly.....	39
XIV.	WAGE AND HOUR: EXEMPT STATUS FOR \$100,00.00 A YEAR EMPLOYEES IS NOT A SLAM DUNK	40
XV.	OUTSIDE SALES EXEMPTION	41
A.	Outside Sales Test	41
B.	Primary Duty	42
C.	Making Sales	42

D.	Obtaining Orders or Contracts for Services or for the Use of Facilities	42
E.	Customarily and Regularly	42
F.	Away from Employer’s Place of Business.....	42
G.	Promotion Work	43
H.	Drivers Who Sell	43
XVI.	COMPUTER PROFESSIONALS	43
A.	Computer Employee Exemption Test	43
B.	Primary Duty	44
XVII.	TEACHERS	44
XVIII.	PRACTICE OF LAW OR MEDICINE.....	45
XIX.	RETAIL OR SERVICE ESTABLISHMENT EXEMPTION	45
XX.	POLICE, FIRE FIGHTERS, PARAMEDICS & OTHER FIRST RESPONDERS	47
XXI.	OTHER EXEMPTIONS	47
XXII.	OTHER LAWS & COLLECTIVE BARGAINING AGREEMENTS	48
XXIII.	COMMISSION ONLY DRAWS	48
XXIV.	SALARY BASIS REQUIREMENT.....	50
A.	Salary vs. Hourly and Exempt v. Nonexempt.....	50
B.	Salary Test In General	50
C.	Meeting The Salary Test Requirements	51
D.	“Safe Harbor” For Damages Under The Salary Test	53
E.	Circumstances In Which The Employer May Make Deductions From Pay	54
F.	Effect of Improper Deductions from Salary	55
G.	Fee Basis.....	55
H.	One Day Suspensions For Exempt Employees	56

I.	Public Sector Employees’ Exemption To The Salary Test	56
J.	Family and Medical Leave Act (“FMLA”) and the Salary Test	56
K.	Outside Sales, Teachers, Lawyers and Physicians	57
L.	Fixed Salary For Fluctuating Workweek	57
XXV.	THE PAYMENT OF WAGES	59
A.	Making Wage Reductions	59
B.	Tipped Employees	60
C.	New Tip Pooling Rules From DOL	61
D.	Non-Cash Wages	63
E.	Time Cards	63
F.	Rounding, or Averaging, Employee Work Time	65
G.	Breaks	65
H.	6 TH Circuit Holds That Automatic Meal Break Deductions Are Permissible.....	67
I.	Call-In or Call-Back Time.....	68
J.	On Call Time	69
K.	Sleeping Time.....	69
L.	Testing and Examinations	70
M.	Training Time	70
N.	When Is Training Time Not Compensable?.....	71
O.	Travel Time	73
P.	Waiting Time.....	75
XXVI.	JOINT EMPLOYERS	76
XXVII.	U.S. SUPREME COURT: NEW DEFINITION FOR BEGINNING AND END OF WORKDAY	78

XXVIII.	DAMAGES UNDER THE FLSA	81
A.	Willful v. Nonwillful Violations	81
B.	Liquidated Damages.....	82
C.	Other Remedies	83
XXIX.	6th CIRCUIT AWARDS EMPLOYER \$55,000 IN COSTS IN FLSA ACTION.....	84
XXX.	U.S. SUPREME COURT: ORAL COMPLAINTS UNDER THE FLSA COUNT.....	85
XXXI.	U.S. SUPREME COURT HOLDS POSTWORK SECURITY SCREENINGS <i>NOT</i> COMPENSABLE	87
XXXII.	EMPLOYEE’S TESTIMONY IN OVERTIME DISPUTE IS GIVEN GREATEST WEIGHT	88
XXXIII.	FRONTLINE SUPERVISORS ACTIONS CREATE FLSA LIABILITY	89
XXXIV.	NEW DOL SELF-REPORTING PROGRAM	91

“OH, NO! IT’S WAGE AND HOUR!”

UNDERSTANDING THE FAIR LABOR STANDARDS ACT OF 1938

by

Scott Warrick, JD, MLHR, CEQC, SHRM-SCP

Scott Warrick Human Resource Consulting, Coaching & Training Services

Scott Warrick Employment Law Services

(614) 738-8317 ♣ scott@scottwarrick.com ♣ WWW.SCOTTWARRICK.COM

Follow Scott’s *HR CONSULTING & EMPLOYMENT LAW SERVICES* on [FACEBOOK](#) and [LinkedIn](#)

I. PURPOSE

At the height of the Great Depression, the Fair Labor Standards Act, or “FLSA,” (29 U.S.C. § 201, *et seq.*) was passed in an effort to prevent a “disastrous collapse of the United States’ entire economic system.” In an attempt to meet this goal, the FLSA addresses three central issues: minimum wage, the child labor and overtime pay.

Today, the FLSA basically covers all private sector employers, or enterprises, involved in interstate commerce with two or more employees and annual gross revenues of \$500,000 or more, as well as all federal, state and most local government employers, hospitals, nursing homes and schools. The FLSA is enforced by the Wage and Hour Division of the Department of Labor.

However, the FLSA allows for many exemptions from its provisions. For instance, the FLSA permits exemptions to various industries, such as to agricultural employers, amusement/recreational park employers, motor and air carriers, railroad employers, retail and service establishments, sellers of cars, trucks, boats, farm implements, aircraft and trailers, sellers of fishing or aquatic products and radio, television and newspaper employers.

The FLSA also exempts from its provisions goods that are made in foreign countries, such as clothes made by children overseas that are then shipped into the United States. Still, American-owned corporations must obey the laws of the host country. (If goods are made in violation of the FLSA in the United States, such products are referred to as “hot goods.” Employers may be held liable under the FLSA for purchasing “hot goods.”)

II. INDEPENDENT CONTRACTORS

A. Employees v. Independent Contractors

The protections of the FLSA only come into play in an employment relationship. In order for such a relationship to exist, the employer must typically have the authority to hire and fire the employee, direct and supervise the employee's work, and the employer must pay the employee for his efforts. Consequently, volunteers and independent contractors are not covered by the FLSA.

Unfortunately, determining whether an individual is an employee or an independent contractor involves much more than simply signing a contract. Instead, many different factors are considered in making such a determination, with no single factor being dispositive.

However, in 1947, the U.S. Supreme Court considered the following factors in United States v. Silk, 331 U.S. 704 (1947) and in Bartels v. Birmingham, 332 U.S. 126 (1947) in determining whether an individual was an employee or an independent contractor:

ECONOMIC REALITIES TEST

1. **The degree of control the employer exercised over the worker,**
2. **The worker's opportunity for profit or loss and the worker's investment in the business,**
3. **The degree of skill and independent initiative that is required to perform the work,**
4. **The permanence or duration of the working relationship, and**
5. **The extent to which the work is an integral part of the employer's business.**

The Court then stated that the test for determining whether a worker is an employee or an independent contractor is actually **“based on the totality of the circumstances”** and **“the ultimate concern is whether, as a matter of economic reality, the workers depend upon someone else's business for the opportunity to render service or are in business for themselves.”**

Therefore, since Silk and Bartels, determining whether a worker is an employee or an independent contractor under such factors has been referred to as the **“Economic Realities”** Test.

In 2015, the Department of Labor released Administrator's Interpretation No.

2015-1, which basically told employers that the Division of Wage and Hour was going to focus its attention on the on the following “Economic Realities” Test:

1. **Is the Work an Integral Part of the Employer’s Business?**
2. **Does the Worker’s Managerial Skill Affect the Worker’s Opportunity for Profit or Loss?**
3. **How Does the Worker’s Relative Investment Compare to the Employer’s Investment?**
4. **Does the Work Performed Require Special Skill and Initiative?**
5. **Is the Relationship between the Worker and the Employer Permanent or Indefinite?**
6. **What is the Nature and Degree of the Employer’s Control?**

Clearly, the DOL’s “Economic Realities” Test is almost identical to the test adopted by the U.S. Supreme Court back in 1947.

In the years following Silk and Bartels, the courts have considered many additional factors in making such a determination. Additionally, the IRS has developed its own 20-Factor Test that it uses to serve as guidelines in determining the status of an individual under the common law rules established by the courts. The IRS has stated that the degree of importance of each factor varies depending upon the occupation and the factual context in which the services are performed and no one factor is controlling. Instead, the relationship is to be ascertained by an overall view of the entire arrangement.

The IRS has further indicated that generally the relationship of employer and employee exists when the person for whom the services are performed has the **right to control and direct** the individual who performs the services, not only as to the results to be accomplished by the worker, but also as to the **means, time and manner** by which the job is performed. It is not necessary that the employer **actually** direct or control the means, time and manner in which the services are performed as it is sufficient if the employer has **the right** to do so.

In the end, the **form** of an arrangement designed to achieve a particular result will not obscure the **substance** of such arrangement. Therefore, the overall substance of the relationship will be determinative...not its mere formalities alone.

Specifically, when determining whether an individual is functioning as an employee or as an independent contractor, the IRS considers the following factors:

IRS Twenty Factor Test

1. **Instructions.** An arrangement may be viewed as an employment relationship if ordinarily the worker is required to comply with instructions regarding when, where, and how he is to perform his services.
2. **Training.** An arrangement may be viewed as an independent contractor relationship if ordinarily the worker uses his own methods and receives no training from the employer.
3. **Integration.** An arrangement may be viewed as an employment relationship if the worker's services have been integrated into the operations of the business.
4. **Services Rendered Personally.** An arrangement may be viewed as an employment relationship if the worker is required to perform the services personally.
5. **Hiring, Supervising, and Paying Assistants.** An arrangement may be viewed as an independent contractor relationship if the worker is responsible for the hiring, supervising and paying of his assistants pursuant to the arrangement under which the worker agrees to provide material and labor to the employer.
6. **Continuing Relationship.** If there is a continuing relationship between the worker and the employer, it may be viewed as an employment relationship.
7. **Set Hours of Work.** An arrangement will be viewed as an employment relationship if the employer has control over the establishing of set hours of work for the worker.
8. **Full Time Required.** An arrangement may be viewed as an independent contractor relationship if the worker is free to work when and for whom he chooses.
9. **Doing Work on the Employer's Premises.** An arrangement may be viewed as an independent contractor relationship if the work may be performed off the employer's premises since this indicates some freedom from control.
10. **Order or Sequence Set.** An arrangement may be viewed as an employment relationship if the worker must perform services in the order or sequence established by the employer.

11. **Oral or Written Reports.** An arrangement may be viewed as an employment relationship if the worker is compelled to account for his actions by submitting regular oral or written reports to the employer.
12. **Payment by Hour, Week, Month.** An arrangement may be viewed as an independent contractor relationship if generally the payment is for the job or is on a straight commission basis.
13. **Payment of Business and/or Traveling Expenses.** An arrangement may be viewed as an independent contractor relationship if the worker is responsible for all of his incidental expenses with respect to the services being performed. The worker's payment of his own expenses reflects that he is free to work according to his own methods and means.
14. **Furnishing of Tools and Materials.** An arrangement may be viewed as an employment relationship if the employer generally furnishes the tools and materials to the worker.
15. **Significant Investment.** An arrangement may be viewed as an independent contractor relationship if the worker must make an investment in the facilities used in performing the services.
16. **Realization of Profit or Loss.** An arrangement may be viewed as an independent contractor relationship if the worker can realize a profit or suffer a loss as a result of his services.
17. **Working for More Than One Firm at a Time.** An arrangement may be viewed as an independent contractor relationship if in fact the worker performs services, which are more than “de minimis” services, for a number of persons or entities at the same time.
18. **Making Service Available to the General Public.** An arrangement may be viewed as an independent contractor relationship if in fact the worker makes his services available to the general public on a regular and consistent basis.
19. **Right to Discharge.** An arrangement may be viewed as an employment relationship if the employer has the right to discharge the worker. The right of dismissal reflects that the employer, through the powerful threat of dismissal, has the ability to cause the worker to be responsive to the employer's requests or demands.
20. **Right to Terminate.** An arrangement may be viewed as an independent contractor relationship if the worker usually agrees to complete a specific job and is legally obligated to do so or compensate the employer for any failure to complete a job.

In applying the Twenty-Factor Test, the IRS clearly has a bias towards determining that a relationship is an employment relationship. Thus, the IRS is challenging many relationships long thought to be independent contractor relationships as now being classified as employment relationships.

In an effort to simplify this process, the IRS “collapsed” its 20-Factor Test into three major factors, which include:

- 1. Behavioral Control,**
- 2. Financial Control and**
- 3. The Relationship of the Parties.**

The IRS refers to this as the “Common Law” Test. Just as with the 20-Factor Test, the IRS will examine these factors to determine if “on the whole” the company is actually controlling or has the right to control the individual’s work. Today, either test may be applied.

In general, when considering the totality of the employer’s and the worker’s circumstances, both the IRS and the courts tend to view a worker as being more of an independent contractor than an employee when the individual:

1. Determines the means by which to perform the required work, while the employer is only concerned with the final result,
2. Stands to gain substantial profits by performing his work more efficiently and effectively, as opposed to being paid on an hourly or salary basis,
3. Does not work solely for the employer, but makes his services available to others,
4. Does not use the employer’s tools, equipment and/or premises to perform the work,
5. Is financially liable to the employer for failing to complete his assigned work,
6. Is hired to perform tasks that are not routinely part of the employer’s normal business activities,
7. Performs tasks that require a great deal of skill, as opposed to routine or menial tasks, and the individual was not trained by the employer,
8. Works when he sees fit,
9. Is not personally required to perform the contracted services,

10. Is required to hire, train, supervise and pay his own employees, as well as his other expenses, and
11. The individual does not work for the employer for a very long period of time.

III. APPLICATION OF THE 20-FACTOR INDEPENDENT CONTRACTOR TEST

In BNA Constr. Ltd. v. Ohio Dept. of Job & Family Servs., 2017-Ohio-7227, after receiving a tip that BNA Construction, Ltd. was engaging in alleged fraud, the Ohio Department of Job and Family Services began an employment audit of the company. A few months later, in March 2014, the auditor informed BNA's accountant that BNA has been misclassifying its independent contractors. As a result, ODJFA reclassified all of BNA workers who had previously been classified as independent contractors now as employees.

Six days later, the auditor participated in a phone call with the owner of BNA, Horatio Lucero.

On September 19, 2014, the auditor issued a letter informing BNA of the audit results. The auditor concluded that BNA underreported total wages by approximately \$1 million. The next day, the Ohio Office of Unemployment Compensation (OOUC) issued BNA a tax notification with the company's computed liability and contribution rate.

BNA requested reconsideration of its contribution rate, and the OOUC reconsidered the matter, with no change in the outcome. BNA appealed the reconsidered decision to the Ohio Unemployment Compensation Review Commission (OUCRC).

Over the next five months, the OUCRC held a multiday hearing, during which the auditor, Lucero and BNA workers testified. The auditor testified that during the audit, BNA did not produce any W-2s, payroll records, or reported wage records. Further, she described the March phone call with Lucero. During the call, she spoke with Lucero about his workers' standing based on the Ohio Revised Code's 20-factor test used to differentiate employees and independent contractors. The factors include who hires the workers, who furnishes the tools used by the workers, and who sets the hours during which the work is performed. Ultimately, the auditor also chose to reclassify BNA's workers as employees rather than independent contractors.

Lucero testified that:

1. He was merely a middleman between large contractors and small subcontractors,
2. He had no employees,
3. The people who worked for him could refuse work, negotiate prices, bid for projects, set their own hours, and perform work for other companies, and

4. Workers supplied their own tools, including trucks. The testimony of at least one frequent worker confirmed Lucero's testimony.

The OUCRC ultimately decided that BNA's workers were employees, not independent contractors. Although the commission recognized that certain factors, including a lack of training requirements, a lack of established work hours and the fact that workers brought their own supplies, supported an independent contractor classification, those factors were not dispositive.

Specifically, the OUCRC evaluated the 20-factor test under R.C. 4141.01(B)(2)(k) as follows:

[One] Who directs or controls the manner or method by which instructions are given to the individual(s) performing services?

The employer receives a contract through a large company like 84 Lumber. They give him the details and the specs/blueprints. He then tells the workers what needs completed and the time frame for it to be completed.

[Two] What training is required for the individual(s) performing services?

The employer only hires people who have prior experience with framing and construction. He may have to show someone how to operate the heavier, more expensive equipment when it is needed.

[Three] How are the services provided integrated into the regular business functions?

This is a framing company. Without framers/carpenters it would cease to exist.

[Four] By whom does the business require that services be provided?

The worker is not permitted to send in his own substitute. As the employer is the responsible party, he must approve of all workers on the job site in order to keep his contract and in compliance with OSHA.

[Five] Who hires, supervises and/or pays the individual(s) performing services?

The employer hires and pays all of the workers for his job sites. He stated that he oversees the work they do. The client also will do a walk through to make sure it is being completed correctly. If there are problems, the client will report back to him. The employer is ultimately responsible.

[Six] What type of relationship exists between the business and the individual(s) performing services which contemplates continuing or recurring work, even if not full time?

He will keep using workers as long as they perform well and keep showing up to work. He pays on an hourly or per job basis once a week. Workers were found in multiple weeks, months and years during a review of the records.

[Seven] Who sets the time (hours) during which the individual(s) services are to be performed?

Per the employer. There is not a set start and end time. It is dependent upon the job, location and worker. The worker is told when it needs to be completed, as long as they work within the confines determined by the client and employer, they can set their own hours.

[Eight] How much time does the business require the individual(s) performing services to devote to the business?

Per the employer, as much or as little as they want. Upon review of the records, many individuals were being paid on a full time basis.

[Nine] Where does the business require the individual(s) work to be performed?

The work must be performed at the job site location as specified by the employer.

[Ten] Who sets the order of work that the individual(s) follow while performing services for the business?

The client tells the employer, the employer tells the worker.

[Eleven] What type of reports, oral or written, does the business require the individual(s) performing services to submit?

The workers report to the employer on a daily or every other day basis. They need to report progress on the job site and any problems that they have.

They also need to keep him updated concerning completion and deadlines.

[Twelve] How are the individual(s) performing services paid?

They are paid on an hourly or by job basis, weekly.

[Thirteen] Who pays expenses for the individual(s) performing services?

There are no expenses.

[Fourteen] Who furnishes the tools & materials used by the individual(s) performing services?

**The workers have their own hand tools.
The employer or the client pays for the “expensive” equipment.**

[Fifteen] What investment do the individual(s) performing services have in the facilities used to perform the service?

None.

[Sixteen] Is there a profit or loss to the individual(s) performing services as a result of the performance of the services?

No.

[Seventeen] Do the individual(s) performing services also perform similar services for other businesses?

**Some of them do if he is slow and doesn't have work for them.
But they don't own their own businesses as far as he knows.**

[Eighteen] How do the individual(s) performing services make their services available to the general public?

Unknown.

[Nineteen] Does the business have the right to discharge the individual(s) performing services?

Yes – at will for both parties.

[Twenty] Do the individual(s) performing services have the right to end the relationship with the business without incurring liability pursuant to an employment contract or agreement?

Yes – there are no contracts between the employer and the workers.

Because the workers performed services under the Ohio Unemployment Compensation Law, the OUCRC found that BNA was liable for unemployment tax contributions.

BNA appealed to the Franklin County Court of Common Pleas, which affirmed the OUCRC's decision. BNA then appealed the lower court's decision to the Ohio Court of Appeals, 10th Appellate District.

The court of appeals held that the lower court did not abuse its discretion by concluding that the OUCRC's decision was supported by substantial, reliable, and probative evidence. The court noted that the OUCRC clearly applied the 20-factor test laid out by the Ohio Revised Code, **and more than 10 of the applicable factors supported the claim that BNA's workers were employees.**

For example, Lucero hired the workers for his jobsites, oversaw their work, and prohibited them from sending substitutes.

Further, the court held that the OUCRC's process for reconsidering BNA's appeal was fair. The commission conducted a five-month hearing that included cross-examinations of four witnesses and the use of a Spanish interpreter for Lucero.

WHAT DOES THIS MEAN FOR HR?

This case is a useful reminder that the line between employees and independent contractors may not always be as clear as one would assume. Although the OUCRC conceded that BNA's workers did not meet any specific training requirements, work a set schedule, or use the company's tools, the commission (and the courts) found that they were still employees under the law. Employers must always keep in mind that there is no predetermined formula used to decide whether a worker qualifies as an employee or independent contractor.

IV. DOL OPINION LETTER ON INDEPENDENT CONTRACTORS

Under the Trump administration, the U.S. Department of Labor (DOL) has taken a very industry-friendly approach to the independent contractor analysis. If there was any doubt before, that was made clear when it issued its 10-page opinion letter that examines the nature of the relationship between a virtual marketplace company, such as Uber, and the "gig" workers they employ, which would be the Uber drivers.

The virtual marketplace company (VMC) refers to a rising tide of companies that offer technology, which happens many times through a phone app, that uses objective criteria to help consumers connect with the service providers they need.

There has long been confusion and disagreement about exactly when it is proper to classify a worker as an independent contractor. The IRS has one test, the DOL has another, and the National Labor Relations Board (NLRB) has yet another. The agencies' interpretations and enforcement efforts can swing from one extreme to another depending on whether there is a Democrat or a Republican in the White House. Courts may disagree with the agencies about what factors to apply as well as how to weigh those factors in particular situations. Some states also have weighed in with their own laws.

This makes the whole area of classifying independent contractors very confusing.

As a general principle, employers are prohibited from classifying a worker as an independent contractor if the nature of the working relationship is, for all intents and purposes, that of “employer-employee.”

Below are some of the common factors considered in its analysis:

- Whether a company pays its supposed independent contractors on an hourly, weekly, or monthly basis, as opposed to a per-project fee,
- The extent to which the company dictates when, where, and how workers perform the work,
- Whether it is the company or the worker who bears the risk of financial success or failure,
- Whether the services provided by independent contractors are integral to the company’s success, which really refers to whether the person is actually performing the type of work the company was formed to do,
- Whether the company trains the workers to perform those services and
- Whether the worker provides services on an ongoing, but maybe not on a continuous basis.

During the Obama administration, the DOL recast the independent contractor analysis in a slightly different, but much more employee-friendly light. While the factors remained more or less the same, the agency said it would apply those factors using an underlying assumption that most workers **were likely to be employees rather than independent contractors.**

Not long into the Trump administration, the new DOL leadership abandoned that philosophy. The opinion letter is the first substantial guidance from the DOL that provides an indication of what that means for practical purposes.

The opinion letter examines the business model of an unidentified VMC to determine whether its independent contractors were properly classified. The DOL concluded the company did not exercise enough control over the workers to be considered their employer. Instead, the relationships that developed between the company and the workers did not fit into any “traditional paradigm,” with the company serving more as a referral service than an employer.

The DOL appeared to give **no weight** to the fact that the company’s entire business model was built on the services performed by the independent contractors. In other words, without these contractors, there would be no company.

Employees have many more rights and protections that independent contractors just do not have. Employees are entitled to be paid the minimum wage, overtime, and unemployment compensation. They may qualify for unpaid leave under the Family and Medical Leave Act (FMLA) and workers' compensation and Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) protections. Unlike independent contractors, employees can sue for violations of those and many other federal and state employment laws.

The potential liabilities for companies that get it wrong are tremendous. They rarely track hours worked by independent contractors, so they can't be sure, or much less prove, they are paying workers the minimum wage or any overtime they are owed. They do not offer health insurance, so they may owe substantial tax penalties under the Affordable Care Act (ACA). They do not pay employment taxes on independent contractors' pay or withhold taxes on their behalf, which could result in substantial unpaid back taxes and penalties. The list goes on and on.

For companies with a business model using many independent contractors, the new opinion letter may prove to be a true gift. In recent years, the individuals who provide services through those companies' technologies have sued, arguing they have been misclassified as independent contractors. These independent contractors have also recently started seeing some success in filing class action settlements. If nothing else, the opinion letter may drive down the settlement value of those cases.

Other companies also may rely on its broad analysis and conclusions to:

1. Claim it supports their classification of workers as independent contractors; or
2. If necessary, design their independent contractor relationships around it.

V. EMPLOYEE V. VOLUNTEER: THE DOL PROVIDES GUIDANCE

In 2005, the United States Department of Labor ("DOL") issued a series of opinion letters clarifying when a "volunteer" is truly a volunteer and therefore not entitled to compensation under the Fair Labor Standards Act. The issue generally arises when a non-exempt employee agrees to put in additional time for some civic or charitable effort sponsored by the employer. The DOL has always been somewhat suspicious of "volunteer" arrangements because of their potential use as a means to circumvent the minimum wage and overtime requirements of the FLSA.

Classifying the time an individual spends as either an "employee" or as a "volunteer" is crucial under the FLSA since non-exempt employees must generally be paid time and one half for all of their time worked in excess of forty hours in a given workweek. However, under certain circumstances, time spent by employees volunteering for their employer will not be counted as hours worked, so no additional compensation will be required for this volunteer work.

The DOL specifically recognized "the generosity and public benefit of volunteering" and sought to eliminate obstacles to "bona fide volunteer efforts for charitable and public

purposes.” Previously, the U.S. Supreme Court has defined “volunteers” as being those individuals who “**without promise or expectation of compensation, but solely for their own personal purpose or pleasure, work in activities carried on by other persons either for their pleasure or profit.**” Walling v. Portland Terminal Co., 330 U.S. 148 (1947).

Relying largely upon this decision, as well as the DOL’s own regulations, “volunteer” status will most clearly be established when the following criteria are satisfied:

1. Designation of “volunteer” status is not done unilaterally by the employer to avoid minimum wage or overtime requirements,
2. The time spent by the individual volunteering must be for a civic, charitable, or humanitarian purpose without any promise, expectation or receipt of compensation by the employee (though a nominal fee may be provided),
3. The act of volunteering truly must be voluntary, without any direct or implied coercion from the employer,
4. The employee’s volunteer activities must not be similar to the services he/she performs as part of his/her regular employment and
5. The volunteering must be performed outside the employee’s normal work hours.

The DOL permits a “nominal” payment to an employee for performing additional volunteer services without destroying the volunteer nature of that service. For example, a non-exempt school janitor can volunteer to coach track and receive a stipend without losing the volunteer exemption under the FLSA as long as the stipend was “**nominal.**” In determining what constitutes a permissible “nominal fee,” the DOL will apply a two-part test.

First, the fee cannot be a substitute for compensation. In other words, the fee should not vary as the individual spends more or less time engaged in the activity, or be dependent upon the success or failure of a particular activity. 29 C.F.R. § 553.106(e).

Second, the fee must be truly nominal. The DOL will look to see “the distance traveled and the time and effort expended by the volunteer; whether the volunteer agreed to be available around-the-clock or only during certain specified time periods and whether the volunteer provides services as needed or throughout the year” in evaluating the fee.

The DOL will also compare the fee paid to the volunteer to what it would cost the school district to compensate an employee to perform the same services. With respect to volunteer coaching, the DOL believes that a fee which is greater than 20% of what it would cost to hire a coach to provide the same services is the appropriate dividing line between a permissible nominal fee and an impermissible payment of wages. W&H Op. Letter, FLSA2005-51 (Nov. 10, 2005).

An employer who permits an employee to perform volunteer services should have a written understanding with the employee to help assure that each of the foregoing criteria are satisfied.

VI. WHAT DOES FLSA COVER?

A. CHILD LABOR

The next issue addressed by the FLSA is child labor, which is commonly referred to as the federal “child labor law.” The FLSA defines a minor as being any individual under the age of 18 years old. The FLSA specifies when minors can work, in what types of jobs they can work, and the number of hours they can work by age. A breakdown of these regulations is as follows:

1. Anyone 18 years old or older can work in any job for an unlimited number of hours.
2. Minors 16 to 17 years old can work in any nonhazardous job for an unlimited number of hours.
3. Minors 14 to 15 years old can work after school hours in any nonmanufacturing, nonmining, and nonhazardous job. These minors can also work no more than three hours on a school day, 18 hours in a school week, eight hours on a nonschool day or 40 hours in a nonschool week. These minors also cannot work before 7 a.m. or after 7 p.m. each day, except between June 1 and Labor Day when they can work until 9 p.m.

However, numerous exceptions to these child labor regulations exist, such as in the case of newspaper carriers, children who work for their parents, and children who perform on television, radio, stage or on the screen.

Additionally, most states require minors who are still enrolled in school and wish to be employed to first obtain an age and schooling certificate, previously referred to as “work permits,” as Ohio does in Ohio Revised Code § 4109.02. These age and schooling certificates typically verify the minor’s identity and age, the type of work involved, and the employer’s name and address. Age and schooling certificates are then typically approved by an authorized school official, ordinarily by the superintendent of schools, in order to grant authorization for the minor to obtain employment.

The FLSA, however, does require employers to verify the age of their minor employees. Many states also have more stringent restrictions on the use of child labor than are found under the FLSA.

B. MINIMUM WAGE

1. What is minimum wage?

Since its inception in 1938, the minimum wage provision of the FLSA has been raised by Congress several times. The federal minimum wage is \$7.25 per hour effective July 24, 2009. Many states also have minimum wage laws. In cases where an employee is subject to both state and federal minimum wage laws, the employee is entitled to the higher minimum wage.

2. Exceptions to the minimum wage requirement

Many exceptions exist to the FLSA's minimum wage standard, such as in the case of bona fide apprentices, handicapped workers, learners, messengers, and students in agriculture, retail or service establishments or institutions of higher education. However, if an employer wishes to use one of these exceptions, it must first obtain a special certificate from the Wage and Hour Division of the Department of Labor granting such permission.

C. OVERTIME PAY

Simply put, the FLSA states that if an employer requires or allows an employee to work more than **40 hours in a given week**, it must pay the employee overtime wages, which is equal to **one and a half times** the employee's regular hourly rate.

VII. OVERTIME PAY

A. Definition of Overtime

One of the most common misconceptions under the FLSA is that employees must be paid overtime wages for any hours they work over eight in a given day. This is not true.

Another common misconception under the FLSA is that an employer cannot require its employees to work more than 40 hours in a given week or more than eight in a given day. This is not true either.

The FLSA simply states that if an employer does require an employee to work more than 40 hours in a given week, it must pay the employee overtime wages, which is equal to one and a half times the employee's regular hourly rate. The FLSA says nothing about paying an employee overtime for working more than eight hours in a day, nor does it say anything about not allowing an employer to work an employee as many hours in a given day or week as it would like. In fact,

an employer may require its employees to work as many hours in a given day or as many hours in a week as it wants. All that is required of the employer under the FLSA is that employees be paid overtime wages for every hour worked over 40 in a given work week, which is one and a half times the employer's normal hourly rate.

An exception to this rule exists for health care facilities in that they have the option of paying their employees overtime based on the traditional 40-hour work week or they may adopt what is referred to as an 8/80 System. Under an 8/80 System, the health care facility may pay its employees overtime wages for any hours they work over eight in a day or over 80 in any consecutive two-week period instead of paying overtime for any hours worked over 40 in a given week.

B. Workweek Defined

Under the FLSA, one workweek is defined as being any consecutive 168-hour period, or any seven consecutive 24-hour periods. As a result, not every company's workweek is necessarily the same as another's. For instance, one employer's workweek may begin at 8 a.m. Monday morning while another's may begin at 12 a.m. Saturday night.

However, regardless of which 168-hour period an employer chooses to use for its workweek, all of the hours an employee works within that given workweek must be paid within that workweek for overtime purposes.

For example, if a nonexempt employee worked 50 hours in a given workweek, it would be illegal for the employer to pay the employee for only 40 hours of straight time for that week, have the employee only work 30 hours the next week, and then carry these extra 10 hours over into the next week in order to avoid paying the employee overtime wages. If an employee works 50 hours in one week, the employee must be paid for 55 hours of work, since any hours over 40 in a given week must be paid at the overtime rate of "time and a half." (10 hours X 1.5 overtime rate = 15 hours + 40 hours of straight time = 55 hours of pay.)

The FLSA is very clear on this issue: All of the hours worked by each employee must be accredited to the week in which these hours were worked and they cannot be "carried over" into the next week to avoid paying an employee overtime wages, even if that employee agrees to such a tactic.

C. Compensatory Time

Unlike private employers, public employers have an exception from the overtime requirement of the FLSA. Instead of paying their employees overtime wages, many public employers give their employees who work more than 40 hours in a given week what is referred to as "comp-time," or compensatory time off. Comp-time basically works the same as overtime pay, but instead of paying the employee overtime wages, the public employee is awarded additional time off at

the rate of one and a half hours off for every hour of overtime worked.

Still, public employees are not allowed to accrue more than 240 hours of comp-time. However, if the public employee's position entails aspects of public safety, then the employee is permitted to accrue up to 480 hours of compensatory time off. Once a public employee accrues the maximum amount of comp time allowed, the employee must begin receiving overtime wages until this comp time bank is reduced. Additionally, when a public employee leaves his employment, he must be paid for all of his unused accrued comp-time.

It is important for managers to understand that the ability to award comp-time to nonexempt employees in lieu of paying overtime wages belongs exclusively to public employers. Private employers are required to pay overtime wages to their nonexempt employees who work more than 40 hours in a given work week. Therefore, the option of paying comp-time to nonexempt employees in an effort to avoid paying overtime wages is not an available option for private employers.

D. Private Sector Compensatory Time

However, one exception to this rule does exist for private sector employers whose pay periods cover a span of time greater than one week, such as when an employer pays its employees every two weeks. In such instances, private sector employers are permitted to pay their employees who work more than 40 hours in a given week compensatory time off, or comp-time, in lieu of overtime wages. This comp-time must be paid at an overtime rate of one and a half times the hours worked by the employee over 40 in one week *and* the employee must use this comp-time within the same pay period in which it was earned.

(This second requirement differs from the comp-time rules that apply to public sector employers, since public sector employees are allowed to accumulate their compensatory time off and use it anytime in the future, much like vacation time. Public sector employees are not required to use their comp-time within the same pay period that it was earned, unlike private sector employees.)

For instance, consider a situation where a private employer pays its employees every two weeks and an employee works 50 hours in the first week of the pay period. The employer does not have to pay that employee overtime wages if the employee is given 15 hours of comp-time off from work that next week before the pay period ends. (10 hours of overtime X 1.5 = 15 hours.) If the employee takes 15 hours of comp-time that next week, then no overtime wages need be paid to this employee since he will have only "worked" 80 hours within the pay period. (50 hours actually worked in week one, plus 25 hours actually worked in week two, plus 15 hours of paid comp-time = 80 paid hours.)

E. Unauthorized Overtime

The question often arises as to whether or not an employer is obligated to pay employees for unauthorized overtime work. In short, if an employer does not give an employee permission to work overtime, and if the employer is genuinely unaware of the fact that the employee worked any overtime hours, then the employer need not pay the employee for these hours worked.

On the other hand, the definition of working hours requires an employer to pay its employees for any time in which they were “suffered or permitted” to perform services for the employer. As a result, if the employer knew or should have known that an employee has worked any overtime, the employee must be paid for these services he was “permitted” to perform. Consequently, an employer has an affirmative duty to determine whether or not its employees are working overtime, whether at the employer’s place of business or at home.

For instance, if an employer is aware of the fact that an employee has a basket full of work at the end of the day, yet this work is completed by the next morning, then the employer must pay the employee overtime wages for the time it took to complete this work. Even if no overtime was approved for this employee, obviously the employee performed services for the employer that required working overtime. Therefore, the employee must be paid for these services.

However, instead of refusing to pay the employee for this overtime in order to discourage employees from working unauthorized overtime, the employer’s warning or discipline system should be used.

F. Payments Made To Employees Which Need *Not* Be Included In Overtime Calculations

The following forms of remuneration need *not* be included in an employee’s overtime rate calculations:

1. Discretionary sums, such as Christmas bonuses, rewards for years of service, and other amounts **not measured by or dependent on the employee’s hours worked, the employee’s production or the employee’s efficiency,**
2. Payments made for time not worked such as due to vacation, holiday, illness, or some other similar payment,
3. Payments for traveling expenses or other expenses incurred by an employee in the furtherance of the employer’s business,
4. Payments made for an employee’s services if either:

- a) The payment was totally discretionary by the employer, as well as the amount, and the employee did not come to expect the payment due to a promise made by the employer, or
- b) The payment was made pursuant to a bona fide profit-sharing, trust, thrift, or savings plan where payment is made without regard to the employee's hours of work, production, or efficiency, or
- c) The payment was made as a talent fee.

Payments irrevocably made by an employer to a trustee or third person pursuant to a bona fide old age, retirement, life, accident, health insurance or similar benefit plan for employees.

G. Paying Different Rates of Pay For Different Jobs

The FLSA does not tell employers what rate of pay they must pay their non-exempt employees. The FLSA merely states that non-exempt employees must be paid at least minimum wage and they must be paid time and a half their hourly rate for every hour worked over 40 in a given week. Therefore, whether the employer pays its non-exempt employees minimum wage or \$20.00 an hour is irrelevant to Wage and Hour.

Therefore, if an employer wants to pay its employees different hourly rates for different jobs performed, that is also acceptable.

For instance, assume an employee worked eight hours a day on Job A Monday through Friday, which paid \$10.00 per hour. Then, on Saturday, the employee worked 10 hours on Job B, which paid \$15.00 per hour. The FLSA would permit the employee be paid two different rates since he worked on two different jobs that simply paid different rates.

The employer could then determine the employee's overtime rate of pay in two different ways.

METHOD #1: BLENDED HOURLY RATE

The employer could determine the employee's hourly rate for the week, and therefore for overtime calculations, by "blending" the different rates worked by the employee that week together as the following illustration shows:

40 (hours worked on Job A)	X	\$10.00/hour	=	\$400.00
10 (hours worked on Job B)	X	\$15.00/hour	= +	<u>\$150.00</u>
TOTAL				\$550.00

\$550.00 ÷ 50 total hours worked = \$11.00/hour "blended rate" for the week.

The employee would then receive \$440.00 in straight time earnings for the week (40 hours X \$11.00/hour blended rate = \$440.00) and \$165.00 of overtime earnings for the week (\$11.00/hour blended rate X 1.5 overtime rate = \$16.50/hour overtime rate X 10 hours of overtime = \$165.00 in overtime earnings)

TOTAL EARNINGS FOR THE WEEK

\$440.00 straight time + \$165.00 overtime = \$605.00 for the week

METHOD #2: OVERTIME RATE IS CLEAR

If an employee is paid different hourly rates for the week, and if it is clear that all of the overtime was worked at one hourly rate, then the employer need not blend the hourly rates together. Instead, the employer may pay overtime on only the hourly rate worked over 40 for the week.

For instance, consider the example used above. This employee worked all of his straight time hours for the week on Job A, which pays \$10.00/hour. All of the employee's overtime was worked on Job B, which paid \$15.00/hour. The employee's overtime for the week may therefore be paid according to the following calculation:

STRAIGHT TIME

\$10.00/hour (Job A) X 40 hours of straight time = \$400.00

OVERTIME

\$15.00/hour X 1.5 overtime rate = \$22.50/hour overtime rate X 10 hours of overtime = \$225.00 in overtime earnings

TOTAL EARNINGS FOR THE WEEK

\$400.00 straight time + \$225.00 overtime = \$625.00 for the week

Employers often pay different rates for different jobs performed by non-exempt employees. In fact, employers often pay different rates of pay, usually a lower rate of pay, for such time as travel time, time spent in training and so on. This way, even though the employer must pay their employees for such activities, the cost to the employer is greatly reduced.

Of course, while reducing an employee's pay for their time spent in such employer-required activities as training and traveling may be legal, it is very often an employee relations disaster.

VIII. EXEMPTIONS

A. Exempt v. Nonexempt Employees

When the FLSA was being debated on the floor of Congress, one of the most controversial aspects of the Act was the fact that employers were going to be required to pay all of their employees' overtime wages. Employers complained that such a requirement would be a crippling burden for them to have to carry. Therefore, in an effort to help ease this strain, and as a compromise, Congress gave employers the ability to classify certain employees "exempt" from this overtime regulation. These three classifications of exempt employees are bona fide "executive," "administrative," and "professional" employees.

Understanding what the terms "exempt" and "nonexempt" mean under the FLSA is therefore very important. "Nonexempt" employees are those employees to whom the overtime provision of the FLSA *does* apply. "Exempt" employees, on the other hand, are those employees to whom the overtime provision of the FLSA does *not* apply. As a result, employers can require their exempt employees to work as many hours in a week as they want without having to worry about paying these employees any overtime wages, since such employees are exempt from the FLSA's overtime requirements.

However, an employer cannot make just any employee it wants exempt from overtime. In order to qualify for exempt status under any one of these three classifications, employers must meet three tests, which are:

1. **The Minimum Salary Test,**
2. **The Duties Test, which includes one for bona fide executive, administrative and professional employees, and**
3. **The Salary Test.**

B. Standard Of Review, Burden Of Proof and Rule Of Construction For Determining Exempt Status

When the FLSA was first drafted back in the 1930s, no exemptions were included in the Act at all. All employees were to be classified as nonexempt under the law. However, when employers complained that paying overtime to all of their employees would put them out of business, Congress adopted the executive, administrative and professional/technical exemptions.

However, since the original legislative intent of the FLSA was to make everyone nonexempt, the law today is very clear regarding who bears the burden of proof in FLSA employee exemption cases: It is the employer, and employers must sustain

this burden by proving that their employees' exemptions "**plainly and unmistakably**" comply with the regulation's requirements by "**clear and affirmative evidence.**"

Additionally, the U.S. Supreme Court has held that the rule of construction to be applied in these cases requires judges to "narrowly construe" the FLSA exemptions **against** employers in order to further Congress' goal of providing broad federal employment protection. Consequently, today's employers have the burden of proving that their positions are exempt from the overtime provisions of the FLSA in order to overcome the presumption that their positions are in fact nonexempt under the Act, which is a very heavy burden.

C. **Minimum Salary Test**

As of January 1, 2020, the weekly minimum salary requirement for exempt employees was increased to **\$684.00** a week (or \$455 per week if employed in the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands, Guam, Puerto Rico, or the U.S. Virgin Islands by employers other than the Federal Government, or \$380 per week if employed in American Samoa by employers other than the Federal Government), exclusive of board, lodging or other facilities.

This weekly salary equates to **\$35,568.00** per year.

Therefore, to qualify for exempt status, employees must be paid on a salary or fee basis (as defined in the regulations) at a rate of at least **\$684.00** a week or **\$35,568.00** per year on a salary basis. These salary requirements do not apply to outside sales employees, teachers, and employees practicing law or medicine.

Administrative and professional employees may also be paid on a fee basis.

In the case of academic administrative employees, the compensation requirement also may be met by paying the employee on a salary basis at a rate at least equal to the entrance salary for teachers in the educational establishment by which the employee is employed.

Exempt computer employees may be paid at least **\$684.00** a week or **\$35,568.00** per year on a salary basis *or* on an hourly basis at a rate not less than \$27.63 an hour.

Employers may use nondiscretionary bonuses and incentive payments (including commissions) paid on an annual or more frequent basis, to satisfy up to 10 percent of the standard salary level. This provision does not apply to highly compensated employees.

The required amount of compensation per week may be translated into equivalent amounts for periods longer than one week. For example, the \$684-per-week requirement will be met if the employee is compensated biweekly on a salary

basis of not less than \$1,368.00, semimonthly on a salary basis of not less than \$1,482.00, or monthly on a salary basis of not less than \$2,964.00. However, the shortest period of payment that will meet this compensation requirement is one week.

The employer may use any 52-week period as the year, such as a calendar year, a fiscal year, or an anniversary of hire year. If the employer does not identify some other year period in advance, the calendar year will apply.

IX. EXECUTIVE EXEMPTION

A. Bona Fide Executive Employee's Minimum Salary and Standard Duties Test

The bona fide executive employee's Minimum Salary and Standard Duties Test under 29 C.F.R. § 541.1 are as follows:

1. The employee must be paid on a salary basis (as defined in the regulations) at a rate of at least **\$35,568.00 per year, or \$684.00 a week.**
2. The employee's primary duty (approximately 50%) must be managing the enterprise, or managing a customarily recognized department or subdivision of the enterprise;
3. The employee must customarily and regularly direct the work of at least two other full-time employees or their equivalent; and
4. The employee must have the authority to hire or fire other employees, or the employee's suggestions and recommendations as to the hiring, firing, advancement, promotion or any other change of status of other employees must be given particular weight.

B. Primary Duty

It is also important to understand what is meant by the term "primary duty of the management of the enterprise." The regulations (29 C.F.R. § 541.103) state, as a general rule, that the executive employee must spend at least 50 percent of his time engaged in such managerial duties. However, the "50% Rule" only acts as a general guideline. (These new regulations eliminated the previous 20% limitation on non-exempt work and adopted this new "primary duty" approach.)

Therefore, even if an employee does not spend 50 percent of his time performing managerial duties, the employee may still qualify for the executive exemption if it can be shown that the "primary focus" of his position is the management of the enterprise. (Both the "50%" and the "primary focus" tests also apply to the administrative and professional exemptions.)

C. Management

Generally, such duties as **interviewing, selecting, and training of employees, setting and adjusting their rates of pay and hours of work, directing the work of employees, maintaining production or sales records for use in supervision or control, appraising employees' productivity and efficiency for the purpose of recommending promotions or other changes in status, handling employee complaints and grievances, disciplining employees, planning the work, determining the techniques to be used, apportioning the work among the employees, determining the type of materials, supplies, machinery, equipment or tools to be used or merchandise to be bought, stocked and sold, controlling the flow and distribution of materials or merchandise and supplies, providing for the safety and security of the employees or the property, planning and controlling the budget, and monitoring or implementing legal compliance measures** have all been viewed as being managerial, or "executive," duties that qualify under this exemption.

However, performing the same work that is performed by the manager's employees, such as **production duties, preparing payroll, inspecting production goods, performing routine clerical duties, keeping records on another supervisor's employees, repairing machines and performing maintenance on or cleaning equipment** have not been viewed as qualifying as managerial duties under this exemption.

D. Department or Subdivision

The phrase "a customarily recognized department or subdivision" is intended to distinguish between a mere collection of employees assigned from time to time to a specific job or series of jobs and a unit with permanent status and function.

E. Customarily and Regularly

The phrase "customarily and regularly" means greater than occasional but less than constant; it includes work normally done every workweek, but does not include isolated or one-time tasks.

F. Two or More

The phrase "two or more other employees" means two full-time employees or their equivalent.

For example, one full-time and two half-time employees are equivalent to two full-time employees. The supervision can be distributed among two, three or more employees, but each such employee must customarily and regularly direct the work of two or more other full-time employees or the equivalent. For

example, a department with five full-time nonexempt workers may have up to two exempt supervisors if each supervisor directs the work of two of those workers.

G. “Actual Authority To Hire and Fire” and “Particular Weight”

The new Executive Exemption regulations adopted in 2004 **require** the employee to have the **actual authority to “hire or fire” or the authority to make recommendations that are given “particular weight.”** The new regulations also eliminated the special rule for “sole charge” executives. Instead, they require a 20% owner/employee to be “actively engaged” in the management of the enterprise.

However, executive trainees, or individuals who are in training to become executives but are not yet performing the duties of executives are not covered by this exemption.

Factors to be considered in determining whether an employee’s recommendations as to hiring, firing, advancement, promotion or any other change of status are given “particular weight” include, but are not limited to, whether it is part of the employee’s job duties to make such recommendations, and the frequency with which such recommendations are made, requested, and relied upon. Generally, an executive’s recommendations must pertain to employees whom the executive customarily and regularly directs. It does not include occasional suggestions. An employee’s recommendations may still be deemed to have “particular weight” even if a higher level manager’s recommendation has more importance and even if the employee does not have authority to make the ultimate decision as to the employee’s change in status.

X. ADMINISTRATIVE EXEMPTION

A. Bona Fide Administrative Employee’s Minimum Salary and Standard Duties Test

The bona fide administrative employee’s Minimum Salary and Standard Duties Test under 29 C.F.R. § 541.2 are as follows:

1. The employee must be paid on a salary basis (as defined in the regulations) at a rate of at least **\$35,568.00 per year, or \$684.00 a week.**
2. The employee's primary duty (approximately 50%) must be office or non-manual work **directly related to the management or general business operations** of the employer or the employer's customers; and
3. The employee's primary duty includes the exercise of **discretion and independent judgment in significant matters.**

Perhaps the most difficult test to understand and apply under the FLSA is the administrative exemption test.

It is important to note that these new Administrative Exemption regulations retain the requirement for the employee to “exercise discretion and independent judgment”; however, it has eliminated the requirement that the employee be engaged in the “management of policies.”

B. Primary Duty

“Primary duty” means the principal, main, major or most important duty that the employee performs. Determination of an employee’s primary duty must be based on all the facts in a particular case, with the major emphasis on the character of the employee’s job as a whole.

C. Directly Related to Management or General Business Operations

First, this test requires the individual primarily (“50%” or “primary focus” tests) perform duties directly related to “management policies or the general business operations” of the employer. Wage and Hour has interpreted this phrase in 29 C.F.R. § 541.205 to mean that the primary focus of the individual’s position must relate the “administrative operations” of the employer’s business, as opposed to “production operations.”

To meet the “directly related to management or general business operations” requirement, an employee must perform work directly related to assisting with the running or servicing of the business, as distinguished, for example from working on a manufacturing production line or selling a product in a retail or service establishment. Work “directly related to management or general business operations” includes, but is not limited to, work in functional areas such as **tax; finance; accounting; budgeting; auditing; insurance; quality control; purchasing; procurement; advertising; marketing; research; safety and health; personnel management; human resources; employee benefits; labor relations; public relations; government relations; computer network, Internet and database administration; legal and regulatory compliance; and similar activities.**

D. Employer’s Customers

An employee may qualify for the administrative exemption if the employee’s primary duty is the performance of work directly related to the management or general business operations of the employer’s customers. Thus, employees acting as advisors or consultants to their employer’s clients or customers — as tax experts or financial consultants, for example — may be exempt.

E. Discretion and Independent Judgment

In general, the exercise of discretion and independent judgment involves the comparison and the evaluation of possible courses of conduct and acting or making a decision after the various possibilities have been considered. The term must be

applied in the light of all the facts involved in the employee's particular employment situation, and implies that the employee has authority to make an independent choice, free from immediate direction or supervision.

Factors to consider include, but are not limited to: whether the employee has authority to formulate, affect, interpret, or implement management policies or operating practices; whether the employee carries out major assignments in conducting the operations of the business; whether the employee performs work that affects business operations to a substantial degree; whether the employee has authority to commit the employer in matters that have significant financial impact; whether the employee has authority to waive or deviate from established policies and procedures without prior approval, and other factors set forth in the regulation.

The fact that an employee's decisions are revised or reversed after review does not mean that the employee is not exercising discretion and independent judgment.

The exercise of discretion and independent judgment must be more than the use of skill in applying well-established techniques, procedures or specific standards described in manuals or other sources.

In the 2004 regulations, the Department of Labor said that the use of manuals, guidelines or other established procedures containing or relating to highly technical, scientific, legal, financial or other similarly complex matters that can be understood or interpreted *only* by those with **advanced or specialized knowledge or skills would not preclude someone from being exempt under the FLSA.**

The DOL reasoned that such manuals and procedures provide guidance in addressing difficult or novel circumstances and therefore using such reference material would not affect an employee's exempt status.

Using manuals that are simply apply well-established techniques or procedures or other sources within closely prescribed limits to determine the correct response to an inquiry or set of circumstances would not constitute the use of independent judgment and discretion.

The regulations also make it clear that employers should not confuse the fact that a position may require a high level of skill with exercising discretion and independent judgment. Many positions require a great deal of skill in performing their various functions, yet the amount of discretion and independent judgment required are minimal.

For instance, while a computer repair person must possess a high level of skill in order to perform his job, little discretion and independent judgment exists since most of his decisions are made against the pre-established guidelines of the computer's design itself.

The regulations then state functions that require the exercise of discretion and independent judgment includes advising management, planning, negotiation, representing the company, purchasing, promoting sales, and business research and control. On the other hand, the regulations also specifically state that the typical duties of a secretary, such as typing, filing and answering correspondence at the direction of her supervisor, do not qualify under this test. However, answering correspondence on her own authority, interviewing applicants and arranging meetings under her own discretion do qualify under the administrative exemption test.

F. Significant Matters

The term “significant matters” refers to the level of importance or consequence of the work performed.

Therefore, administrative duties that are clerical or routine in nature do not qualify under this test.

G. Educational Establishments and Administrative Functions

The administrative exemption is also available to employees compensated on a salary or fee basis at a rate not less than \$684.00 a week and whose primary duty is performing administrative functions directly related to academic instruction or training in an educational establishment. Academic administrative functions include operations directly in the field of education, and do not include jobs relating to areas outside the educational field. Employees engaged in academic administrative functions include: the superintendent or other head of an elementary or secondary school system, and any assistants responsible for administration of such matters as curriculum, quality and methods of instructing, measuring and testing the learning potential and achievement of students, establishing and maintaining academic and grading standards, and other aspects of the teaching program; the principal and any vice-principals responsible for the operation of an elementary or secondary school; department heads in institutions of higher education responsible for the various subject matter departments; academic counselors and other employees with similar responsibilities.

XI. BONA FIDE LEARNED PROFESSIONALS

A. Learned Professional Exemption

To qualify for the Learned Professional Exemption, all of the following tests must be met:

1. The employee must be paid on a salary basis (as defined in the regulations) at a rate of at least **\$35,568.00 per year, or \$684.00 a week.**

2. The employee's primary duty (approximately 50%) must be work requiring “advanced knowledge,” which means it's predominantly intellectual in character and requires the consistent exercise of discretion and judgment;
3. The advanced knowledge must be in a field of science or learning; and
4. The advanced knowledge must be customarily acquired by a prolonged course of specialized intellectual instruction or a combination of experience and instruction which enables the person to perform the same work as degreed professionals.

The final regulations define “work requiring advanced knowledge” (one of the three essential elements of the professional primary duties test) as “work which is predominantly intellectual in character, and which includes work requiring the consistent exercise of discretion and judgment”. The final regulations also clarify that **veteran or long-term status alone is insufficient** to satisfy the Professional Exemption.

Typically, fields of study that qualify under the professional exemption test are doctors, lawyers, bona fide accountants, and so on.

Also, the professional exemption test requires the “**consistent**” exercise of discretion and judgment, which may be interpreted as raising the degree of discretion and judgment required over what is established under either administrative exemption test. However, many courts still tend to equate this “consistent exercise of discretion and judgment” requirement of the professional exemption test to the standards used under the administrative exemption tests.

B. Primary Duty

“Primary duty” means the principal, main, major or most important duty that the employee performs. Determination of an employee’s primary duty must be based on all the facts in a particular case, with the major emphasis on the character of the employee’s job as a whole.

C. Work Requiring Advanced Knowledge

“Work requiring advanced knowledge” means work which is predominantly intellectual in character, and which includes work requiring the consistent exercise of discretion and judgment. Professional work is therefore distinguished from work involving routine mental, manual, mechanical or physical work. A professional employee generally uses the advanced knowledge to analyze, interpret or make deductions from varying facts or circumstances. Advanced knowledge cannot be attained at the high school level.

D. Field of Science or Learning

Fields of science or learning include law, medicine, theology, accounting, actuarial computation, engineering, architecture, teaching, various types of physical, chemical and biological sciences, pharmacy and other occupations that have a recognized professional status and are distinguishable from the mechanical arts or skilled trades where the knowledge could be of a fairly advanced type, but is not in a field of science or learning.

E. Customarily Acquired by a Prolonged Course of Specialized Intellectual Instruction

The learned professional exemption is restricted to professions where specialized academic training is a **standard prerequisite for entrance into the profession**. The best evidence of meeting this requirement is having the appropriate academic degree.

However, the word “customarily” means the exemption may be available to employees in such professions who have substantially the same knowledge level and perform substantially the same work as the degreed employees, but who attained the advanced knowledge through a combination of work experience and intellectual instruction.

XII. BONA FIDE CREATIVE PROFESSIONALS

A. Creative Professional Exemption

To qualify for the Learned Professional Exemption, all of the following tests must be met:

To qualify for the Creative Professional Exemption, all of the following tests must be met:

1. The employee must be paid on a salary basis (as defined in the regulations) at a rate of at least **\$35,568.00 per year, or \$684.00 a week**.
2. The employee’s primary duty must be the performance of work requiring invention, imagination, originality or talent in a recognized field of artistic or creative endeavor.

B. Invention, Imagination, Originality or Talent

This requirement distinguishes the creative professions from work that primarily depends on intelligence, diligence and accuracy. Exemption as a creative professional depends on the extent of the invention, imagination, originality or

talent exercised by the employee. Whether the exemption applies, therefore, must be determined on a case-by-case basis.

The requirements are generally met by **actors, musicians, composers, soloists, certain painters, writers, cartoonists, essayists, novelists, and others as set forth in the regulations.** Journalists may satisfy the duties requirements for the creative professional exemption if their primary duty is work requiring **invention, imagination, originality or talent.** Journalists are not exempt creative professionals if they only collect, organize and record information that is routine or already public, or if they do not contribute a unique interpretation or analysis to a news product.

C. Recognized Field of Artistic or Creative Endeavor

This includes such fields as, for example, **music, writing, acting and the graphic arts.**

XIII. HIGHLY COMPENSATED WORKERS

A. Highly Compensated Test

As of January 1, 2020, the total annual compensation requirement needed to exempt highly compensated employees (HCEs) was raised to **\$107,432.00** a year, of which **\$684.00** must be paid weekly on a salary or fee basis.

(The increase is about \$40,000.00 less than what the DOL initially proposed because it is based on the **80th percentile** of all full-time salaried workers' earnings nationwide.)

Additionally, the weekly salary amount of \$684.00 must be paid in its entirety. Employers may not use nondiscretionary bonuses and incentive payments (including commissions) to satisfy any portion of the weekly standard salary level for highly compensated employees.

A highly compensated employee is deemed exempt under Section 13(a)(1) if:

1. The employee earns total annual compensation of \$107,432.00 or more, which includes at least \$684.00 per week paid on a salary basis;
2. The employee's primary duty includes performing office or non-manual work; and
3. The employee customarily and regularly performs at least one of the exempt duties or responsibilities of an exempt executive, administrative or professional employee.

For example, an employee may qualify as an exempt highly-compensated executive if the employee customarily and regularly directs the work of two or

more other employees, even though the employee does not meet all of the other requirements in the standard test for exemption as an executive.

B. Total Annual Compensation

The required total annual compensation of **\$107,432.00** or more may consist of commissions, nondiscretionary bonuses and other nondiscretionary compensation earned during a 52-week period, but does not include credit for board or lodging, payments for medical or life insurance, or contributions to retirement plans or other fringe benefits.

There is a special rule that allows an employer to prorate the annual compensation for employees who only work part of the year.

C. Make-up Payments and Prorating

If an employee's total annual compensation does not total at least **\$107,432.00** by the last pay period of that year, then the employer may make one final payment to that employee in order to bring that employee's annual salary up to this level. This additional payment must be made within the last pay period of that year or within one month after the end of the 52-week period.

For example, let's say for the calendar year beginning January 1, 2020, an employee earns \$90,000 in base salary and the employer anticipated that the employee was going to earn an additional amount of \$17,432.00 in commissions. However, due to poor sales in the final quarter of the year, the employee actually only earned \$12,000.00 in commissions. This gave the employee an annual salary of \$102,000.00, which is below the annual minimum salary that is to be paid to highly compensated employees.

In this situation, the employer may make within one month after the end of the year a payment of at least \$5,432.00 to the employee in order to bring her annual compensation up to **\$107,432.00**. Any such final payment made after the end of the 52-week period may count only toward the prior year's total annual compensation and not toward the total annual compensation in the year it was paid.

Of course, if the employer fails to make such a payment, the employee does not qualify as being exempt under the highly compensated employee category.

Employers may also make similar payments to employees who terminate before the year ends.

D. Customarily and Regularly

“Customarily and regularly” means greater than occasional but may be less than constant, and includes work normally and recurrently performed every workweek but does not include isolated or one-time tasks.

XIV. WAGE AND HOUR: EXEMPT STATUS FOR \$100,00.00 A YEAR EMPLOYEES IS NOT A SLAM DUNK

NOTE: As of January 1, 2020, the total annual compensation requirement needed to exempt highly compensated employees (HCEs) was raised to **\$107,432.00** a year, of which **\$684.00** must be paid weekly on a salary or fee basis. However, the principles of this case are still good, even though the HCE's rate has since increased to **\$107,432.00** a year.

In Hughes v. Gulf Interstate Field Services, Case No. 2:14-cv-00432 (Sixth Cir., Dec. 19, 2017), in 2013 and 2014, Tom Hughes and Desmond McDonald worked as welding inspectors for Gulf Interstate Field Services. Both employees received an offer letter stating they would earn \$337 per day in addition to a weekly computer stipend. Inspectors were paid based on a six-day workweek at 10 hours a day. If they worked more than 10 hours a day, they did not receive additional pay. During their employment with Gulf, Hughes and McDonald earned more than \$100,000 per year.

In May 2014, Hughes and McDonald filed a lawsuit against Gulf alleging violations of the FLSA and the Ohio Minimum Fair Wage Standards Act. Gulf asked for summary judgment (dismissal without a trial), arguing that Hughes and McDonald met the definition of "highly compensated employee" and were exempt from overtime requirements under the FLSA and Ohio law. The district court granted Gulf's motion for summary judgment. The welding inspectors appealed, and the Sixth Circuit reversed the district court's decision and sent the matter back to the lower court for further proceedings.

The FLSA requires that employees receive additional compensation if they work more than 40 hours in a week. However, employees who work in an executive or professional capacity, often referred to as "highly compensated employees," are exempt from the overtime payment requirement. Three tests are used to determine whether an employee meets the exemption requirements: (1) the duties test, (2) the salary-level test, and (3) the salary-basis test.

In this case, the court evaluated whether the inspectors satisfied the salary-basis test. An employee satisfies the salary-basis test if he "regularly receives each pay period on a weekly, or less frequent basis, a predetermined amount constituting all or part of [his] compensation, which amount is not subject to reduction because of variations in the quality or quantity of the work performed." The parties disputed whether the welding inspectors' pay was calculated on a weekly or less frequent basis (such as daily or hourly). Further, the parties disputed whether the inspectors' pay was "guaranteed."

Gulf argued that the welding inspectors were exempt from overtime because their pay totaled more than \$100,000 a year. Further, Gulf's position was that the inspectors' pay was guaranteed and amounted to being paid on a weekly basis. In response, the inspectors

argued that their pay was based on hours worked and was not guaranteed, even though they earned more than \$100,000 per year.

The Sixth Circuit panel reversed Gulf's summary judgment win, finding there was a genuine issue of material fact regarding whether the inspectors were guaranteed pay that qualified as a minimum weekly salary. The court held that if the inspectors are to qualify as exempt employees under the FLSA, the determination of whether their weekly salary was guaranteed is significant. Accordingly, the Sixth Circuit sent the case back to the lower court for further evidentiary proceedings on the issue.

WHAT DOES THIS MEAN FOR HR?

Federal appellate courts recently have been split on what types of workers qualify as exempt employees. Thus, there likely will be more litigation on this issue until the U.S. Supreme Court takes it up. Until the Supreme Court provides direction, employers should evaluate whether employees whose pay is based on hours worked are entitled to overtime, even when their annual pay exceeds \$100,000.

XV. OUTSIDE SALES EXEMPTION

A. Outside Sales Test

To qualify for the outside sales employee exemption, all of the following tests must be met:

1. The employee's primary duty must be making sales (as defined in the FLSA), or obtaining orders or contracts for services or for the use of facilities for which a consideration will be paid by the client or customer; and
2. The employee must be customarily and regularly engaged away from the employer's place or places of business.

The requirements established by the FLSA in order to qualify for exempt status as an outside salesperson are relatively simple. First, unlike the other previously discussed exemptions, no Salary Test requirements exist. Instead, determining whether an individual qualifies for the outside salesperson exemption depends on where the actual work or services are performed by the employee and whether the individual was hired primarily for the purpose of making outside sales.

An employee who does not satisfy the requirements of the outside sales exemption may still qualify as an exempt employee under one of the other exemptions allowed by Section 13(a)(1) of the FLSA and the Part 541 regulations if all the criteria for the exemption is met.

B. Primary Duty

“Primary duty” means the principal, main, major or most important duty that the employee performs. Determination of an employee’s primary duty must be based on all the facts in a particular case, with the major emphasis on the character of the employee’s job as a whole.

C. Making Sales

“Sales” includes any sale, exchange, contract to sell, consignment for sales, shipment for sale, or other disposition. It includes the transfer of title to tangible property, and in certain cases, of tangible and valuable evidences of intangible property.

D. Obtaining Orders or Contracts for Services or for the Use of Facilities

Obtaining orders for “the use of facilities” includes the selling of time on radio or television, the solicitation of advertising for newspapers and other periodicals, and the solicitation of freight for railroads and other transportation agencies. The word “services” extends the exemption to employees who sell or take orders for a service, which may be performed for the customer by someone other than the person taking the order.

E. Customarily and Regularly

The phrase “customarily and regularly” means greater than occasional but less than constant; it includes work normally done every workweek, but does not include isolated or one-time tasks.

F. Away from Employer’s Place of Business

Basically, an outside salesperson is one whose point of sale is at the customer's place of business or location or, if selling door-to-door, at the customer’s home. Outside sales does not include sales made by mail, telephone or the Internet unless such contact is used merely as an adjunct to personal calls. Any fixed site, whether home or office, used by a salesperson as a headquarters or for telephonic solicitation of sales is considered one of the employer’s places of business, even though the employer is not in any formal sense the owner or tenant of the property.

Inside salespersons, which would include telephone and mail order sales, do not qualify for exempt status under this category. Of course, those duties which are in conjunction with and are incidental to the employee's outside sales, such as completing sales reports, writing contracts, and scheduling appointments, are considered exempt functions.

G. Promotion Work

Promotional work, on the other hand, either may or may not be classified as exempt work. If performing the promotional work is simply incidental to the sales that are to be made by the employee, then the work qualifies as being exempt. If such promotional work is incidental to sales being made by someone else, then the work is classified as being nonexempt.

H. Drivers Who Sell

In some instances, outside salespersons not only sell their employer's products, but they also deliver them to their customers. If the primary focus of the individual's job is to deliver the employer's products or services, then any outside sales made by the employee will be viewed as being secondary duties and the employee will therefore not qualify for this exemption. However, if in viewing the content of the job in its entirety it is determined that delivering the employer's goods or services to the customer is only incidental to the employee's position as a bona fide outside salesperson, then the exemption may be granted.

Several factors should be considered in determining whether a driver has a primary duty of making sales, including a comparison of the driver's duties with those of other employees engaged as drivers and as salespersons, the presence or absence of customary or contractual arrangements concerning amounts of products to be delivered, whether or not the driver has a selling or solicitor's license when required by law, the description of the employee's occupation in collective bargaining agreements, and other factors set forth in the regulation.

XVI. COMPUTER PROFESSIONALS

A. Computer Employee Exemption Test

1. The employee must be compensated *either* on a salary or fee basis at a rate not less than **\$684.00** per week *or*, if compensated on an hourly basis, at a rate not less than \$27.63 an hour;
2. The employee must be employed as a computer systems analyst, computer programmer, software engineer or other similarly skilled worker in the computer field performing the duties described below;
 - The application of systems analysis techniques and procedures, including consulting with users to determine hardware, software or system functional specifications;
 - The design, development, documentation, analysis, creation, testing or modification of computer systems or programs,

including prototypes, based on and related to user or system design specifications;

- The design, documentation, testing, creation or modification of computer programs related to machine operating systems; or
- A combination of the aforementioned duties, the performance of which requires the same level of skills.

Consequently, this exemption is only available to those computer professionals who have reached a high level of proficiency in computer systems analysis, programming and software engineering. This exemption does not apply to trainees, entry-level employees, or employees who do not work independently or without close supervision.

The regulations also state that if a computer professional meets the requirements of the duties test, and if this individual is paid at least \$27.63 per hour, then the salary test portion of the exemption test does not apply.

The computer employee exemption does not include employees engaged in the manufacture or repair of computer hardware and related equipment. Employees whose work is highly dependent upon, or facilitated by, the use of computers and computer software programs (e.g., engineers, drafters and others skilled in computer-aided design software), but who are not primarily engaged in computer systems analysis and programming or other similarly skilled computer-related occupations identified in the primary duties test described above, are also not exempt under the computer employee exemption.

B. Primary Duty

“Primary duty” means the principal, main, major or most important duty that the employee performs. Determination of an employee’s primary duty must be based on all the facts in a particular case, with the major emphasis on the character of the employee’s job as a whole.

XVII. TEACHERS

Teachers are exempt if their primary duty is teaching, tutoring, instructing or lecturing in the activity of imparting knowledge, and if they are employed and engaged in this activity as a teacher in an educational establishment. Exempt teachers include, but are not limited to, regular academic teachers; kindergarten or nursery school teachers; teachers of gifted or disabled children; teachers of skilled and semi-skilled trades and occupations; teachers engaged in automobile driving instruction; aircraft flight instructors; home economics teachers; and vocal or instrument music teachers.

The salary and salary basis requirements do not apply to bona fide teachers.

XVIII. PRACTICE OF LAW OR MEDICINE

An employee holding a valid license or certificate permitting the practice of law or medicine is exempt if the employee is actually engaged in such a practice. An employee who holds the requisite academic degree for the general practice of medicine is also exempt if he or she is engaged in an internship or resident program for the profession.

The salary and salary basis requirements do not apply to bona fide practitioners of law or medicine.

In the case of medical occupations, the exception from the salary or fee requirement **does not apply** to pharmacists, nurses, therapists, technologists, sanitarians, dietitians, social workers, psychologists, psychometrists, or other professions which service the medical profession.

XIX. RETAIL OR SERVICE ESTABLISHMENT EXEMPTION

Another exemption that is available to employers is the “retail or service establishment” exemption. This exemption was enacted to relieve employers in retail and service industries from the obligation of paying overtime compensation to certain employees paid primarily on the basis of commissions.

In order for an employee to be covered under this exemption:

“the regular rate of pay of such employee (must be) in excess of one and one-half times the (Act's minimum wage),” and “more than half (of the employee's) compensation for a representative period (not less than one month) (must represent) commissions on goods or services.” 29 U.S.C. 207(i).

However, the more confusing part of this exemption was in determining if the employee was employed by a retail or service establishment. In general, the DOL has interpreted “retail or service establishment” as requiring the establishment to have a “retail concept.” 29 CFR 779.316

The regulations state that typically a retail or service establishment is one which sells goods or services to the general public. It serves the everyday needs of the community in which it is located. The retail or service establishment performs a function in the business organization of the Nation which is at the very end of the stream of distribution, disposing in small quantities of the products and skills of such organization and does not take part in the manufacturing process. 29 CFR 779.318

More specifically, in order for an establishment to qualify as a “retail or service establishment,” the regulations go onto state that the business:

1. Must engage in the making of sales of goods or services; and
2. 75 percent of its sales of goods or services, or of both, must be recognized as retail in the particular industry; and
3. not over 25 percent of its sales of goods or services, or of both, may be sales for resale. 29 CFR 779.313

In addition, the establishment must meet the following three tests:

1. The establishment must be recognized as a retail establishment in the particular industry.
2. The goods which the exempt establishment makes or processes must be made or processed at the establishment which sells the goods.
3. More than 85 percent of the establishment's annual dollar volume of sales of the goods which it makes or processes must be made within the State in which the establishment is located. 29 CFR 779.346

However, in 1961, the DOL introduced into the regulations a lengthy but non-exhaustive list of 89 types of establishments that it viewed as lacking a “retail concept.”

Likewise, in 1961, the DOL established a separate non-exhaustive list of 77 types of establishments that “may be recognized as retail.”

Then, in 1970, the DOL added to the list another 45 types of establishments that it viewed as also lacking a “retail concept.”

As a result, any types of organizations that were on this “blacklist” were excluded from claiming the “retail or service establishment” exemption from overtime for its employees.

Such excluded establishments included industries such as dry cleaners, tax preparers, laundries, roofing companies, travel agencies, blue printing and photostating establishments, stamp and coupon redemption stores, and telegraph companies.

The “may be” retail list included establishment in industries such as coal yards, fur repair and storage shops, household refrigerator service and repair shops, masseur establishments, piano tuning establishments, reducing establishments, scalp-treatment establishments, and taxidermists.

These lists simply added confusion as to which industries could qualify and could not qualify under the standard “retail concept” test.

So, on May 19, 2020, the DOL removed the regulatory provisions that listed the specific types of establishments that it believed lacked “retail concept” and were therefore ineligible to claim this exemption. As a result, those establishments that had been listed as lacking a “retail concept” may now assert that they have a retail concept and may be

able to qualify as retail or service establishments in order to exempt certain employees from overtime. For these employers and workers, they could consider whether more commission-based pay is sensible.

The DOL will now apply its interpretations to determine whether establishments previously excluded from this exemption may now be classified as having a “retail concept” and satisfy the additional criteria needed to qualify as retail or service establishments.

Accordingly, the DOL will from now on apply one analysis to all establishments, thus promoting a more consistent treatment for purposes of the retail or service establishments exemption.

The DOL also withdrew the list of establishments that “may be recognized as retail.”

XX. POLICE, FIRE FIGHTERS, PARAMEDICS & OTHER FIRST RESPONDERS

These exemptions do not apply to police officers, detectives, deputy sheriffs, state troopers, highway patrol officers, investigators, inspectors, correctional officers, parole or probation officers, park rangers, fire fighters, paramedics, emergency medical technicians, ambulance personnel, rescue workers, hazardous materials workers and similar employees, regardless of rank or pay level, who perform work such as preventing, controlling or extinguishing fires of any type; rescuing fire, crime or accident victims; preventing or detecting crimes; conducting investigations or inspections for violations of law; performing surveillance; pursuing, restraining and apprehending suspects; detaining or supervising suspected and convicted criminals, including those on probation or parole; interviewing witnesses; interrogating and fingerprinting suspects; preparing investigative reports; or other similar work.

XXI. OTHER EXEMPTIONS

Additionally, it is important for employers to remember that the FLSA is a very complicated Act with many different exceptions and caveats to its rules.

For instance, an exemption for employees of retail or service establishments also exists. Specifically, the FLSA states that retail or service establishment employers are not required to pay overtime earnings to employees who:

1. Are paid a rate that is at least one and one-half times the FLSA’s minimum hourly wage and
2. More than one-half of the employee’s compensation for a representative period, which is not to be less than one month, represents commissions earned by the employee for sales of goods or services.

Therefore, even though this discussion centered on the three broad exemptions allowed under the FLSA (executive, administrative, and professional exemptions), managers should contact their legal counsel to see if a certain position can be considered exempt

from the Act if the position does not fit into one of these three broad exemptions.

XXII. OTHER LAWS & COLLECTIVE BARGAINING AGREEMENTS

The FLSA provides minimum standards that may be exceeded, but cannot be waived or reduced. Employers must comply, for example, with any Federal, State or municipal laws, regulations or ordinances establishing a higher minimum wage or lower maximum workweek than those established under the FLSA. Similarly, employers may, on their own initiative or under a collective bargaining agreement, provide a higher wage, shorter workweek, or higher overtime premium than provided under the FLSA.

While collective bargaining agreements cannot waive or reduce FLSA protections, nothing in the FLSA or the Part 541 regulation relieves employers from their contractual obligations under such bargaining agreements.

XXIII. COMMISSION ONLY DRAWS

In Stein v. hhgregg, Inc., No. 16-3364 (Sixth Cir., Oct. 12, 2017), hhgregg was an appliance, furniture, and electronics retailer has more than 25 stores in Ohio and more than 220 stores in the United States. The company's retail sales employees are paid solely on commissions. However, in pay periods in which employees' earned commissions fall below minimum wage, hhgregg pays them a "draw" to meet the minimum wage requirement. Employees are required to repay the draws based on future commissions earned. Under hhgregg's policy, employees could be subject to discipline, including termination, if they received frequent draws or accumulated too great of a balance. The written policy also stated that upon termination, employees would "immediately pay the company any unpaid deficit amounts."

Two hhgregg employees, Robert Stein and Robert Beck, filed a lawsuit in the U.S. District Court for the Southern District of Ohio, Cincinnati, on behalf of themselves and all other former and current hhgregg retail sales employees alleging that the company's compensation policy was illegal under the Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA) and Ohio law. Specifically, Stein and Beck alleged that:

1. The draw policy encouraged retail employees to work "off the clock."
2. The draw policy improperly manipulated commissions in violation of the FLSA.
3. The company failed to properly pay overtime in weeks in which overtime was worked.
4. The policy required employees to pay back deficit amounts upon termination in violation of the FLSA.

The "encouraged employees to work off the clock" claim was premised on allegations that hhgregg required employees to attend mandatory training and conferences. Because no commissions were earned during the meetings, Stein and Beck claimed

that employees, with the knowledge and approval of managers, worked “off the clock” to avoid incurring a draw based on those hours.

Rather than filing an answer to Stein and Beck’s complaint, hhgregg filed a motion to dismiss asserting that the commission payment policy was legal on its face. The district court ultimately agreed with hhgregg and dismissed all of Stein and Beck’s federal claims and declined to hear the state-law claims. Stein and Beck appealed to the Sixth Circuit.

In a 2-1 decision, the Sixth Circuit agreed with the district court on some issues but reversed the lower court’s decision on other issues. Adopting a long-standing position from the U.S. Department of Labor (DOL), the court rejected Stein and Beck’s contention that the draw structure violated the FLSA when draw advances were repaid from subsequent commissions earned during the course of employment.

The Sixth Circuit ruled differently, however, regarding the provision in hhgregg’s commission payment policy that required **terminated employees to repay deficits in their draw balances after termination**. In its ruling, the district court noted that the legality of the provision was **questionable** but granted hhgregg’s motion to dismiss because there was no evidence that hhgregg **actually enforced that aspect of the compensation plan when employees’ employment ended**.

A majority of the judges on the Sixth Circuit panel disagreed with the district court that the lack of enforcement of the payback provision made a difference. The Sixth Circuit ruled that although the provision had never been enforced, **the fact that the policy said money had to be repaid was sufficient to state a viable claim.** According to the court, “Incurring a debt, or even **believing** that one has incurred a debt, has far-reaching practical implications for individuals.”

The Sixth Circuit also ruled that Stein and Beck alleged sufficient facts to state a claim that hhgregg’s policies and practices unlawfully encouraged employees to work “off the clock” without compensation.

WHAT DOES THIS MEAN FOR HR?

The Sixth Circuit’s decision is significant in several respects. It confirms that the practice of advancing future commissions to retail and service employees during employment lawfully meets the FLSA’s minimum wage requirement. However, including post-termination repayment requirements in a commission-based compensation policy could create liability, even if the requirements are never actually enforced.

Also, the court’s decision on the off-the-clock work claim is a good reminder to implement clear policies prohibiting off-the-clock work, even for employees paid on a commission basis.

XXIV. SALARY BASIS REQUIREMENT

A. Salary vs. Hourly and Exempt v. Nonexempt

First, it is important for managers to understand that there is a difference between classifying an employee as being “exempt” from overtime and being paid on a salary basis. “Exempt” employees, as required under the FLSA, must be paid on a salary basis. “Salaried” employees, however, do not have to be made exempt from overtime.

Every so often, an employer will decide that it wants to pay its nonexempt employees on a salary basis. When such an arrangement occurs, these salaried nonexempt employees are paid their normal salary whether they work one hour, eight hours, or ten hours in a given day. Even though these nonexempt employees are paid on a salary basis, these salaried employees must be paid overtime for any hours they work over 40 in a given work week since they are not exempt from the overtime requirement of the FLSA.

Consequently, while employers are allowed to pay their nonexempt employees on a salary basis, exempt employees must be placed on salary in order to qualify for the FLSA’s exemption from overtime. Therefore, managers must understand that paying employees on either an “hourly” or “salary” basis and classifying employees as being either “nonexempt” or “exempt” are totally separate issues, aside from the fact that all exempt employees must be paid on a salary basis.

B. Salary Test In General

To qualify for exemption, employees generally must be paid at not less than \$684.00 per week on a salary basis. These salary requirements do not apply to outside sales employees, teachers, and employees practicing law or medicine.

Exempt computer employees may be paid at least \$684.00 on a weekly salary basis *or* on an hourly basis at a rate not less than \$27.63 an hour.

Being paid on a “salary basis” means an employee regularly receives a predetermined amount of compensation each pay period on a weekly, or less frequent, basis. The predetermined amount cannot be reduced because of variations in the quality or quantity of the employee’s work. Subject to exceptions listed below, an exempt employee must receive the full salary for any week in which the employee performs any work, regardless of the number of days or hours worked. Exempt employees do not need to be paid for any workweek in which they perform no work.

If the employer makes deductions from an employee’s predetermined salary, i.e., because of the operating requirements of the business, that employee is not paid on

a “salary basis.” If the employee is ready, willing and able to work, deductions may not be made for time when work is not available.

As previously mentioned, the final test employers must pass if they hope to classify any of their employees as being exempt from the overtime provision of the Act is the Salary Test, which has historically been the most obscure of the three tests. Interestingly, the Salary Test portion of the FLSA’s overtime exemption requirements does not apply to physicians, or interns or residents of a medical program, lawyers and teachers in a school or educational institution.

C. Meeting The Salary Test Requirements

Meeting the requirements of the Salary Test sounds exceedingly simple:

Salaried employees must be paid a specific daily stipend, or sometimes weekly, depending on the issue at hand, regardless of the number of hours the salaried employee works for the employee.

But exactly how the term “salary” has been defined under the regulations and interpreted by the courts has given rise to much confusion. Therefore, the specific provisions of the Salary Test should be examined in order to decipher what is meant by the term “salary.”

Under the Salary Test, employees are considered as being paid on a “salary basis” if they receive a predetermined daily wage that is **not** subject to reduction. For instance, if a salaried exempt employee is paid \$100 per day, the employee is to receive this sum irrespective of whether he works one hour or 15 hours a day.

Of course, employees need not be paid for any day in which the employee performs no work at all. (i.e., Employee misses the entire day.) In 1990, the importance of the FLSA’s Salary Test in relation to the exempt status of employees abruptly came to the attention of American management.

In Abshire v. County of Kern, 908 F.2d 438 (9th Cir. 1990), the Kern County Fire Department had historically classified its Battalion Chiefs as being salaried and exempt from the overtime provision of the FLSA. However, the Kern County Fire Department also had a policy that allowed it to dock the pay of its salaried exempt employees for a partial day absence from work if these employees had already exhausted their accrued paid leave accounts.

The Battalion Chiefs contended that this policy violated the FLSA’s Salary Test provision for exempt status. The Battalion Chiefs claimed that since the department was able to dock their pay for a partial day absence based on the number of hours they missed from work, their wages were in reality being calculated on an hourly basis. The Battalion Chiefs therefore argued that they were not really being paid on a salary basis, as required by the FLSA in order to qualify for exempt status. As a result, the Battalion Chiefs claimed that they were

in actuality nonexempt employees and were entitled to receive overtime pay.

When the court examined this issue, it first held that not only must employers satisfy the “Duties Test” and the “Minimum Salary Test” of the FLSA in order to be considered “exempt” from paying their employees overtime, as previously discussed, but employers must also satisfy the “Salary Test” requirement of the Act. The court then held that if employers fail any one of these three tests, then their employees will lose their exemption from the overtime provision of the FLSA. As a result, employers could be ordered to pay their offended employees overtime wages for as far back as the last three years.

The court in Abshire then examined the requirements of the Salary Test. Agreeing with the Battalion Chiefs, the court held that since the pay of every Battalion Chief was potentially “subject to” deductions for partial day absences due to the Kern County Fire Department’s policy, the Salary Test of the FLSA had been violated. As a result, the court found that the Battalion Chiefs were not actually being paid on a salary basis, which invalidated the exempt status of all the Kern County Fire Department’s Battalion Chiefs.

When the Kern County Fire Department defended itself by claiming that no Battalion Chief’s pay had ever actually been docked for a partial day absence in spite of this policy, the court responded by holding that this fact was “irrelevant.” The court reasoned that under the Salary Test, the sole fact that the Battalion Chiefs’ pay was even potentially “subject to” any deductions at all as a matter of policy was enough to invalidate the salaried exempt status of all the Battalion Chiefs, regardless of whether or not any such deductions were ever actually made.

Furthermore, the Abshire court also held that the fact that the Kern County Fire Department paid its Battalion Chiefs overtime in the form of compensatory time off for the work they performed beyond their regular work schedule also indicated that these Battalion Chiefs were in reality being treated as hourly employees and were not being paid on a salary basis.

Therefore, according to the Abshire court, the Kern County Fire Department’s practice of voluntarily paying its Battalion Chiefs additional wages or compensatory time off for the extra hours these employees worked also invalidated the Battalion Chiefs’ exempt status under the Act.

Before Abshire, most employers were unaware that many of the policies they were adopting would have the effect of invalidating the exempt status of their employees under the FLSA. As a result, employers’ confusion over the Salary Test portion of the Act is easily understood. First, the Salary Test is an obscure portion of the FLSA that never drew much attention before Abshire. Next, the Department of Labor’s policy on docking salaried employees’ pay is not clearly stated anywhere in its regulations.

Since Abshire, many issues regarding the Salary Test have arisen, as well as many

splits of authority regarding how this test is to be interpreted. Some of the more vital issues surrounding this test are as follows:

1. Employers are not permitted to actually dock their exempt employees' wages for a partial day absence in any federal jurisdictions even if the employee has already exhausted all of his paid time-off account. Therefore, if an exempt employee has no paid time off available to him and that employee so much as goes to work, opens his mail, and then goes home ill, this exempt employee must be paid for the entire day since exempt employees are paid on a daily salary basis, regardless of how long, or short, their work day is for the employer. Of course, if an exempt employee misses an entire day of work and has no paid time off left in his account, the employee need not be paid for the day since no services were performed for the employer.
2. Also, since Abshire was decided, the U.S. Supreme Court held in Auer v. Robbins, 117 S. Ct. 1055 (1997), that an employee's exempt status will not be invalidated simply because a general policy adopted by the employer *may* be applied to a salaried employee. However, the Court also indicated that a policy which specifically violates the Salary Test may invalidate the exempt status of an employer's exempt employees, regardless of whether the policy is actually applied or not.

The Court also reiterated that fact that employers may correct one time deductions that violate the Salary Test, even if the deduction was made pursuant to company policy and therefore not actually made inadvertently.

D. “Safe Harbor” For Damages Under The Salary Test

If employers err and make an impermissible deduction from their salaried employees' wages under the Salary Test, the regulations allow employers an opportunity to correct this error without invalidating their employees' exempt status. The regulations allow employers to correct an isolated impermissible deduction from any salaried employees' pay if the following requirements are met:

1. The employer has a clearly communicated policy in place that prohibits improper deductions from an employee's pay,
2. This policy includes a clear complaint process,
3. The employer reimburses the employee and
4. The employer makes a good faith commitment to comply in the future.

Sample Policy:

It is the Company's policy to never make impermissible deductions from an employee's pay whether the employee is classified as being exempt or non-exempt from overtime pay. Should any employee feel that the Company has made an impermissible deduction from his/her pay, the employee should contact _____ immediately.

E. Circumstances In Which The Employer May Make Deductions From Pay

Deductions from pay are permissible when an exempt employee is absent from work for **one or more full days**:

- For personal reasons,
- For absences of one or more full days due to sickness or disability if the deduction is made in accordance with a bona fide plan, policy or practice,
- To offset amounts employees receive as jury or witness fees, or for military pay,

NOTE: While an employer cannot make deductions from pay for absences of an exempt employee occasioned by jury duty, attendance as a witness or temporary military leave, the employer can offset any amounts received by an employee as jury fees, witness fees or military pay for a particular week against the salary due for that particular week without loss of the exemption.

- For penalties imposed in good faith for infractions of **safety rules of major significance**, (i.e., Smoking in explosive plants, oil refineries and coal mines.) or

NOTE: Whenever an employer is making a deduction from a salaried employee's pay for violating a major safety rule, the deduction may be in any amount. It need not be on a daily or weekly sum.

- For unpaid disciplinary suspensions of **one or more full days** imposed in good faith for workplace conduct rule infractions.

Also, an employer is not required to pay the full salary in the initial or final week of employment, or for weeks in which an exempt employee takes unpaid leave under the Family and Medical Leave Act.

When calculating the amount of a deduction that is allowed from a salaried employee's pay, the employer may use the hourly or daily equivalent of the employee's full weekly salary or any other amount proportional to the time actually missed by the employee, unless the deduction is due to the violation of a major safety rule.

Also, an employer is not required to pay the full salary in the initial or final week of employment, or for weeks in which an exempt employee takes unpaid leave under the Family and Medical Leave Act.

F. Effect of Improper Deductions from Salary

The employer will lose the exemption if it has an “**actual practice**” of making improper deductions from salary. Factors to consider when determining whether an employer has an actual practice of making improper deductions include, but are not limited to:

- The number of improper deductions, particularly as compared to the number of employee infractions warranting deductions;
- The time period during which the employer made improper deductions;
- The number and geographic location of both the employees whose salary was improperly reduced and the managers responsible; and
- **Whether the employer has a clearly communicated policy permitting or prohibiting improper deductions.**

If an “actual practice” is found, the exemption is lost during the time period of the deductions for employees in the same job classification working for the same managers responsible for the improper deductions.

Isolated or inadvertent improper deductions will not result in loss of the exemption if the employer reimburses the employee for the improper deductions.

G. Fee Basis

Administrative, professional and computer employees may be paid on a “fee basis” rather than on a salary basis. If the employee is paid an agreed sum for a single job, regardless of the time required for its completion, the employee will be considered to be paid on a “fee basis.” A fee payment is generally paid for a **unique job**, rather than for a series of jobs repeated a number of times and for which identical payments repeatedly are made.

In order to determine whether the fee payment meets the minimum salary level requirement, employers must consider the amount of time the employee worked on the job and determine whether the payment is at a rate that would amount to at least \$684.00 per week if the employee worked 40 hours. For example, an artist paid \$500.00 for a picture that took 20 hours to complete meets the minimum salary requirement since the rate would yield \$1,000.00 if 40 hours were worked.

H. One Day Suspensions For Exempt Employees

Under the 2004 regulations, employers were allowed to suspend salaried employees in full day increments for any infraction of workplace conduct rules, not just safety rules of major significance

However, such suspensions must be imposed pursuant to a written policy applicable to all employees.

I. Public Sector Employees' Exemption To The Salary Test

On September 6, 1991, the Department of Labor granted public sector employers a special exemption from the Salary Test's "no pay-docking" rule for their exempt employees. This exemption, which was made final on August 19, 1992 (29 C.F.R. § 541.5(d)), made it permissible for public employers to dock the pay of their exempt public employees for partial day absences once those employee's accrued paid leave accounts were exhausted.

This exemption also allows public employers to make "budget-required furloughs," or layoffs, of less than a week without permanently invalidating their exempt employees' salary status. The interpretation of this public sector exception may also allow for the recording of hours by public sector exempt employees.

The Department of Labor contended that this exemption for public employees was necessary since most state and local government laws prohibit public employers from paying their employees for time not worked. As of yet, however, no such relief has been granted to the private sector.

J. Family and Medical Leave Act ("FMLA") and the Salary Test

Congress has already recognized and attempted to address the many problems created by the Salary Test when it adopted the Family and Medical Leave Act ("FMLA") (29 U.S.C. §§ 2601, *et seq.*). Congress stated that one of the primary purposes of enacting the FMLA was to help American workers balance the great demands placed upon them by their home and work lives. Congress recognized the fact that it is becoming increasingly difficult for workers to balance these conflicting demands, largely due to the changing demographics of today's workforce, which include more single-parent households and dual career couples than ever before in history.

Congress then examined the problems caused by the FLSA's Salary Test for those exempt employees who need to take partial day absences from work in order to attend to the serious medical conditions of either themselves or their families. In order to help ease the burden placed on exempt employees by the Salary Test,

Congress included an exemption from the Salary Test's requirements in the FMLA that allow salaried employees to take partial day absences from work without pay and not invalidate their exempt work status.

However, this exemption Congress provided in the FMLA is a very limited one. First, the scope of the FMLA's coverage is very narrow. The FMLA only applies to employers of 50 or more employees. It also only allows for 12 weeks of coverage per year, so once this allotted time period is exhausted, the exemption ceases to operate. And finally, the FMLA only applies to either the birth or adoption of a child and to "serious health conditions" of employees or of their family members, as defined in the FMLA. Due to this narrow scope of coverage, many employers and many of the situations employees commonly encounter simply will not fall under this FMLA exemption provided by Congress.

This narrow focus of the FMLA therefore creates the opportunity for some very contradictory situations to arise. For instance, if an exempt employee who is covered by the FMLA needs to take an afternoon off from work without pay to watch over a child who has contracted a serious health condition, this employee's pay could be docked for this partial day absence and the Salary Test would not be violated. However, if another salaried employee took the same afternoon off from work to go golfing, then this employee's pay should not be docked. Therefore, when such a narrowly focused exemption exists in the law, some very inequitable results are bound to occur.

K. Outside Sales, Teachers, Lawyers and Physicians

These salary requirements do not apply to outside sales employees, teachers, and employees practicing law or medicine.

L. Fixed Salary For Fluctuating Workweek

Buried in the regulations (Section 29 CFR 778.114), the Department of Labor allows employers to pay nonexempt employees a salary pursuant to a **written agreement** that these employees will receive a fixed weekly salary amount as **straight time pay** for whatever hours they work in a workweek when those hours the employee works "fluctuate" from week to week, whether they work just a few hours or many. This written agreement with these employees **must** be in writing and it **must** state that the fixed weekly salary pays these employees for all of their straight time wages for the hours they work each workweek.

Since the employee's fixed weekly salary in the agreement is intended to compensate the employee at **straight time rates** for whatever fluctuating hours are worked in the workweek, the employee's calculated regular hourly rate will vary from week to week. The employee's hourly rate **is determined by dividing the number of hours worked in the workweek into the employee's weekly salary to determine the employee's hourly rate for that week.**

So, the more hours a nonexempt salaried employee works in a given week, the lower his/her hourly rate becomes.

In the end, since the nonexempt salaried employee's straight time wages have already been paid to him/her for the week, the employer only owes the employee half-time wages for all of the hour he/she worked over 40 in that week.

Of course, the employee's hourly wage for that week must be greater than the FLSA's minimum hourly wage rate (as well as the state's minimum hourly wage rate).

For example, consider the situation of an employee who is classified as a nonexempt fixed salaried employee at \$600.00 per week. However, that employee works 50 hours in a given week.

Fixed Salary For Fluctuating Workweek Example

\$600 per week salary

Works 50 hours in one week

Since the employee has already received straight-time compensation on a salary basis for all straight time hours worked (50), the employer only owes the employee **additional half-time pay for those hours worked over 40 in that week.**

$$\mathbf{\$600.00 \div 50 \text{ Hours} = \$12.00/\text{hr. wage}}$$

$$\mathbf{\$12.00/\text{hr. wage} \div 1/2 \text{ time overtime rate} = \$6.00/\text{hr.}}$$

$$\mathbf{\$6.00/\text{hr.} \times 10 \text{ hours of overtime} = \$60.00 \text{ overtime earnings}}$$

$$\mathbf{\text{TOTAL WEEKLY WAGE} = \$660.00}$$

In the end, the employee is paid \$660.00 for working 50 hours that week.

As you can see, moving an employee from salaried exempt status to a fixed salaried nonexempt status can give these employees additional wages over what they earned as exempt employees while providing the employer with a more affordable way to deal with this new regulation.

However, this method of paying employees is called the "fluctuating workweek" method for a reason. If an employee always works a fixed 44-hour schedule that never varies from week to week, this method cannot be used. According to the U.S. Department of Labor, not only do the employee's hours have to fluctuate, but they have to fluctuate both *above and below* 40 hours per week. So, if the employee's schedule bounces between 41 and 45 hours per week, but they never have a week below 40 hours, this is not the method for you.

However, in reality, it is hard to find a salaried person who always works a fixed schedule and who never drops below 40 hours in a given week. Still, if an employer wants to use this fluctuating workweek method, it had better make sure the employee's hours do fluctuate above and below 40 hours at some time throughout the year.

Also, if you want to pay employees a fixed salary for working a fluctuating workweek, the weekly salary has to actually be fixed.

For example, with regular salaried exempt employees, you can dock their salary if they are absent from work for a full day if they did not perform any services for you. However, this is not allowed for non-exempt employees paid on a fixed weekly salary under a Fluctuating Workweek Agreement.

If employers want to pay employees a fixed salary for working a fluctuating workweek, that also means the employer will have to pay employees their **full salary for every workweek in which they perform any work, even if it's just one day or even one hour**. You can charge their vacation or sick day accounts ... but you cannot dock their pay, even if they work one hour for the week.

Therefore, to use this method, it is best to make sure that the employee has plenty of time saved up in their sick and/or vacation banks. If absenteeism gets to be a problem with an employee paid under a Fluctuating Workweek Agreement, employers would probably want to change the employee's wage status and use a more traditional method.

And, of course, this understanding with the employee as to how they are to be paid under this Fluctuating Workweek must absolutely be in writing.

XXV. THE PAYMENT OF WAGES

A. Making Wage Reductions

4. Agreements for wage reduction

The question also arises regarding deductions made from employees' wages for damaging, losing or simply failing to return an employer's equipment or product. Employers must be cautious not to violate the overtime or minimum wage provisions of the FLSA.

First, it is always best to have employees sign agreements stating that if they lose or damage any of their employer's equipment, they give the employer permission to make any necessary deductions from their wages to cover the reasonable market value of the item, as determined by the employer. Such agreements should also be used whenever loans are made to employees in order to allow the employer to recover any monies that are owed upon the employee's departure from the company.

In fact, it is advisable for employers to use “Inventory Control Agreements” which list every item assigned to an employee. The employee then signs this agreement listing the items he is responsible for, as well as the fact that deductions may be made by the employer to pay for these items if they become damaged or lost.

If such agreements are not in place, then the employer will be limited in the amount of funds it can recover from the employee.

5. Reducing employee wages without an agreement

In every handbook and employment application disclaimer, employers should reserve the right to change the employee’s compensation whenever the employer deems appropriate. Then, should an employee lose or damage employer property, the employee’s earnings may be reduced to cover the reasonable market value of the item, as determined by the employer.

However, the employer may not reduce the employee’s wages below the current minimum wage amount.

Further, some jurisdictions have ruled that employees must also receive the full value of their overtime earnings whenever they work over 40 hours in a given week. Some courts have held that the overtime provision of the FLSA prohibits employers from making any unauthorized deductions from their employees’ earnings in those weeks that overtime earnings are to be paid.

The logic of these courts is if employers are permitted to make unauthorized deductions from their employees’ wages whenever overtime earnings exist, then the employees would not be receiving the value of their overtime earnings. Therefore, no unauthorized deductions may be made from employees’ wages in weeks that overtime earnings are to be paid.

Of course, employers must also remember that state laws also govern the law regarding minimum wage and overtime earnings. Therefore, employers should check their local laws before making unauthorized deductions from employees’ wages.

B. Tipped Employees

Employers are permitted to pay their tipped employees one half the minimum wage amount per hour as long as these employees are still earning an hourly rate that is at least equal to minimum wage once they have collected their tips. If the employee fails to earn an hourly rate that is at least as much as minimum wage after having collected their tips, then the employer must pay the employee the

difference.

(A “tipped” employee is an employee who receives at least \$30 in tips each month.)

Of course, if an employer requires its employees to turn over their tips as part of the employer’s gross receipts, then no tip credit will be allowed. Similarly, if the employer adds its employees’ tips to the customer’s bill and then turns this amount over to his employees, then such monies will not count as tips as far as the FLSA’s tip credit is concerned.

C. New Tip Pooling Rules From DOL

Under the Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA), employers are allowed to count a portion of an employee’s tips as wages to satisfy minimum wage requirements. More specifically, although the federal minimum wage is \$7.25 an hour, employers can pay tipped workers an hourly rate as low as \$2.13 per hour if the workers’ tips bring their pay up to at least the full minimum wage. This is called a “tip credit.”

It has long been accepted that employers using the tip credit could create a “tip pool” through which all tips are collected and then redistributed evenly among tipped workers who are paid the \$2.13 minimum wage (and no one else).

However, a bigger question that has arisen over the years has been how to properly distribute the tip-pool proceeds when an employer pays tipped workers the **full minimum wage** and therefore doesn’t need to use the tip credit. Courts disagreed on whether such employers could distribute the tip pool among all employees, even those who didn’t customarily receive tips, such as kitchen and maintenance staff.

In 2011, the U.S. Department of Labor’s (DOL) Wage and Hour Division (WHD) issued regulations that said no, they couldn’t. Those regulations were challenged, and some courts ruled they were invalid.

In December 2017, the DOL started the process of undoing the 2011 regulations, proposing new rules that would have allowed employers to distribute a tip pool not only to tipped workers **but also to nontipped ones.**

These new provisions:

- Allows employers to distribute money from tip pools to both tipped and nontipped employees as long as **all employees** are paid at least the full minimum wage of \$7.25 per hour and not the tipped minimum wage of \$2.13;

- Prohibits employers from distributing any part of the tip pool to **owners, managers, or supervisors**; and
- Requires employers that pay the tipped minimum wage to distribute the tip pool only to employees who contribute to the pool, just like under the 2011 regulations.

Finally, employers must remember that there is no requirement to use a tip pool at all. Employers could just allow all employees to keep the tips they individually receive, as long as their compensation after tips is at least \$7.25 per hour.

WHAT DOES THIS MEAN FOR HR?

If you have tipped employees and either currently use a tip pool or are interested in adopting or expanding one, consider these next steps:

1. First, consult your state law to see whether it has different requirements for tipped employees. Some states require all employees to receive the full minimum wage, while others may limit the percentage of tips that may be contributed to a pool. Those laws would take precedence over the FLSA.
2. If you have not done so already, decide whether to compensate your tipped employees using the tipped minimum wage (assuming your state law allows it) or the full minimum wage.
3. If you use the tipped minimum wage, decide whether you are going to require employees to share those tips through a tip pool. If you do, make sure that:
 - The tip pool is distributed only to the employees who are contributing to it; and
 - All such employees ultimately make at least the minimum wage after tips are added in.

If you want to implement a tip pool for tipped employees who are paid the full minimum wage:

4. Select which categories of nontipped employees will be allowed to benefit from the tip pool. You might want to consult with your attorney if you are interested in distributing tips to employees who conceivably could be considered a “manager” or “supervisor.” Those terms aren’t defined, and the borders between employee and supervisor can be unclear.
5. Give careful consideration to any adverse effects the change may have on your workforce morale. Employees who currently make a lot of money in

tips aren't going to be happy about being forced to share them with nontipped staff.

D. Non-Cash Wages

Employers are permitted to credit the “reasonable cost” of any board, lodging or other related facilities, which includes food, household goods, clothing, and any transportation they furnish to their employees towards satisfying the minimum wage requirements under the FLSA, as long as supplying such amenities are for the benefit of the employee and not the employer.

For instance, if an employer pays its employees \$7.00 per hour, yet it also supplies its employees with meals which equate to a “reasonable” cost of \$2.00 per hour in relation to the number of hours worked by the employee that week, the employer’s minimum wage requirement under the FLSA for that week would be satisfied.

However, it is important to understand that the “reasonable cost” of such benefits refers to the employer’s “actual cost” for the amenity in question. Therefore, when calculating the value of one of these benefits bestowed upon an employee and applying its value towards satisfying the FLSA’s minimum wage requirement, the employer must apply its actual cost of supplying the amenity to the employee, as opposed to the cost that would be charged to the general public.

For instance, if an employee is given a meal by his employer, the employer can only apply its actual cost of the meal to the employee’s wages, rather than the wholesale or “menu” cost. Any discounts employers make available to their employees regarding an employer’s merchandise may not be counted toward satisfying the minimum wage requirement of the FLSA. Of course, the cost of such services can be deducted from an employee’s wages under the FLSA if the employee’s overtime wages are not affected and the employee’s hourly rate does not fall below minimum wage.

E. Time Cards

A properly completed time card must have the exact time of clocking in and clocking out, the time period for lunch, if applicable, the employee’s name and the pay period covered by the time card.

No. 123

NAME Joanne Bloggs

Week Ending 12/8

YOU ARE YOUR OWN TIMEKEEPER,
WE PAY BY THIS RECORD,
YOUR OWN RECORDING.

MORNING		AFTERNOON		OVERTIME		Total
IN	OUT	IN	OUT	IN	OUT	
08:00	12:15	13:00	17:00			
08:00			17:00			
08:05	12:15	13:00	17:00			
08:00	12:10	13:00	16:57			
08:00	12:15	13:00			20:00	
09:00	12:00					

ORDINARY TIME					
OVERTIME					
STAT. SICK PAY					
TOTAL WAGES					
LESS NAT. INSC.					
LESS INC. TAX					
LESS DEDUCTIONS					
AMOUNT PAID					

F. Rounding, or Averaging, Employee Work Time

One of the most common questions regarding working time that arises is whether or not an employer can “round” an employee’s daily working time.

In the past, Wage and Hour has allowed employers to round its employees’ working time to the nearest **five minutes**, or to the nearest tenth of an hour, if the employer can show that this rounding still results in employees being paid for ***all of the time*** they actually work and there is a need for such rounding. Therefore, employers cannot arbitrarily decide not to pay an employee for increments as small as five minutes.

The logic here is that employees cannot clock in at the time clock and then instantly start working. Actually, when you use a time clock, employees are expected to clock into work early and then walk to their work station. So, if an employee clocks into work at 8:00 am on the time clock, that employee is going to be late to his work station.

However ...

When an employee is clocking in at his computer, that employee should be able to clock in at 8:00 am and instantly start working at 8:00 am. Therefore, the division of Wage and Hour will likely not allow any “rounding” of an employee’s time to the nearest 5 minutes.

Rounding an employee’s time must work to the employee’s benefit so that the employee’s time is **actually** being “averaged.” This is referred to as the “De Minimus Doctrine.”

Still, it is the employer’s burden to prove that the rounding of an employee’s time does not result in shortchanging the employee. Instead, the employer must be able to show that rounding an employee’s time still results in the employee being paid for all of the time he works.

For instance, if an employee leaves work at 4:58 p.m. three days a week, then leaves at 5:03 p.m. two other days that week, the employer may round the employee’s ending time to 5:00 p.m. for every day the employee worked that week.

G. Breaks

Another question that frequently arises is whether employers are required to provide their employees with breaks in the middle of the work day, and if they do, are employers required to pay their employees for these breaks?

First, the FLSA contains no provision requiring employers to give their employees lunch breaks, restroom breaks, smoke breaks, or any type of break. Of

course, not allowing employees to go to the restroom at some point throughout the day would be an employee relations disaster, not to mention the fact that such a policy could give rise to other claims against the employer, such as intentional infliction of emotional distress, for instance.

Still, as far as the FLSA is concerned, such policies are legal. (On the other hand, many state statutes require that breaks be given to employees. For instance, in Ohio, one half-hour break must be given to minors for every five hours worked.)

However, if an employer does decide to give its employees a lunch break in the middle of the day, then the employer must pay its employees for this lunch period unless it is at least **30 minutes** in length. If the lunch period is any less than 30 minutes, then the employer cannot classify it as a bona fide lunch break and the employee must be paid for this time.

Obviously, a lunch break can be longer than 30 minutes in length in order for the employer to classify it as an unpaid lunch, but the key to this issue of unpaid lunch breaks is whether it was less than 30 minutes in length. This is why ten-minute coffee breaks must be paid by the employer, but hour lunch breaks do not.

Furthermore, it is clearly dictated by Wage and Hour that not only must a bona fide lunch break be at least 30 minutes in length, but the employee must perform absolutely no services for the employer throughout this entire 30-minute time period. If an employee performs any services for the employer while on his unpaid lunch, such as answering the phones, then Wage and Hour may consider the employee as having “performed” services or as having “worked” for the employer while on his lunch.

Consequently, the employee’s entire lunch period may be invalidated. If this happens, the employee may have to be paid for this entire time, which is why many employers do not allow their nonexempt employees to eat their lunches at their desks.

Rest periods may be unpaid if they are more than 20 minutes in length and the employee has the freedom to use this time as he chooses. In determining if an employee has the requisite degree of freedom during a rest break that is greater than 20 minutes in length in order to classify this break as unpaid time, the Division of Wage and Hour and the courts have generally held that the following requirements must be met:

- a) The employee must be free to leave the employer’s premises and go wherever he pleases,
- b) The break must be for the employee’s benefit and not the employer’s,

- c) The rest period must be long enough to allow the employee freedom of action and the opportunity to relax, and
- d) The employer's motive cannot be based upon an attempt to evade the requirements of the FLSA.

If the employer requires an employee to be "on call" during a bona fide lunch break, then the employee must be paid for this time. However, if an employee is not actually on call, but the mere possibility that this employee may have his meal period interrupted exists, the employee need not be paid for this time.

H. 6TH Circuit Holds That Automatic Meal Break Deductions Are Permissible

The 6th U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals rejected an employee's claim to compensation for working during her lunch break, in violation of the Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA), where the employee failed to use internal reporting procedures that prevented the employer from becoming aware of its obligation to compensate her.

In White v. Baptist Memorial Health Care Corp., 6th Cir., No. 11-5717 (Nov. 6, 2012), Margaret White, a nurse for Baptist Memorial Health Care Corp., treated patients who came to the emergency department. Due to the nature of White's job at the hospital, meal breaks occurred during her shift as work demands allowed. Baptist's employee handbook stated employees working shifts of six or more hours received an unpaid meal break that was automatically deducted from their paychecks. The handbook also provided that if an employee's meal break was missed or interrupted because of a work-related reason, the employee would be compensated for the time she worked during the meal break. Baptist employees were instructed to record all time spent performing work during meal breaks in an "exception log," whether the meal break was interrupted partially or entirely.

White alleged that there were occasions when she missed meal breaks entirely or partially and Baptist did not compensate her, although she did not remember or have records of when these occasions occurred. On at least one occasion when she reported missing a meal break, she was compensated for her time. From time to time, she told her supervisors that she was not getting a meal break, but never mentioned that she was not compensated for missing her meal breaks. Eventually, White stopped reporting her missed meal breaks in the exception log.

Additionally, White knew she could report a payroll mistake to a nurse manager. When White used this procedure, the errors were "handled immediately." However, White did not use this procedure to correct the interrupted meal break errors that she failed to report, because she felt it would be what she called "an uphill battle."

White contended Baptist violated the FLSA by failing to compensate her for working during her lunch breaks. The district court held that Baptist's policy for

compensating hourly employees for missed meal breaks was lawful under the FLSA and the 6th Circuit affirmed.

An automatic meal deduction system is lawful under the FLSA. “As long as the employee can pursue his or her mealtime adequately and comfortably, is not engaged in the performance of any substantial duties, and does not spend time predominantly for the employer’s benefit, the employee is relieved of duty and is not entitled to compensation under the FLSA.”

If an “employer knows or has reason to believe that a worker is continuing to work, then the time is working time,” the court said. When the employee fails to follow reasonable time reporting procedures, she prevents the employer from knowing its obligation to compensate the employee and thwarts the employer’s ability to comply with the FLSA.

The 6th Circuit noted that each time White followed Baptist’s procedures for being compensated for interrupted meal breaks or for payroll errors, she was compensated. Although White told her supervisors occasionally that she was not getting her meal breaks, she never told her supervisors that she was not being compensated for missing her meal breaks. Accordingly, the court concluded that there was no way Baptist should have known White was not being compensated for missing her meal breaks.

Moreover, the court emphasized that Baptist established a system to compensate its workers for time worked during meal breaks. Without evidence that Baptist discouraged employees from reporting time worked during meal breaks or that they were otherwise notified that their employees were failing to report time worked during meal breaks, the 6th Circuit asserted that White could not recover under the FLSA.

WHAT DOES THIS MEAN TO HUMAN RESOURCES?

When automatically deducting meal breaks per shift, an employer should ensure that employees are receiving the full meal break. A “de minimis rule” applies when the matter at issue concerns only a few seconds or minutes of work beyond the scheduled working hours.

I. Call-In or Call-Back Time

Although employers often have agreed to pay their employees for a minimum number of guaranteed hours whenever they are called in or called back to work, the only time that must actually be paid as working time under the FLSA are those hours actually worked by the employee.

For instance, if an employer agrees to pay its employees for a minimum of three hours every time they are called in or back to work, and an employee is called in to work for only one hour, under the FLSA, only this one hour of time actually

spent working must be counted as working time, even though the employer is contractually obligated to pay this employee for three hours of work. Still, only the one hour spent working by the employee need be counted toward overtime calculations.

J. On Call Time

In determining whether or not the time an employee spends “on call” for an employer is classified as working time depends on the amount of freedom the employee has while on call for his employer. If an employee is required to remain on the employer’s premises, or so close to it in proximity that this time is not really his own to use as he chooses, then the employer must classify this “on call” time as working time.

On the other hand, if the employee is on call but can come and go as he pleases so that this time really is to use as he chooses, then this time need not be counted as working time. This remains true even if the employee is required to leave a phone number where he can be reached, to carry a “beeper,” or to refrain from drinking alcohol while on call. It is also permissible to require employees who are on call to be at the employer’s place of business within 20 minutes of receiving a call to come into work.

K. Sleeping Time

Whether or not an employee must be paid for “sleeping time” depends on a few factors. First, if an employee is working a shift of less than 24 hours, then the FLSA classifies any time the employee spends sleeping as working time.

On the other hand, if an employee is working a shift that is longer than 24 hours in length, then the employer may exclude up to eight hours of the employee’s “sleeping time” from his wages if:

- a) The employer has an agreement with the employee allowing it to exclude sleep time from the employee’s working time,
- b) The employer supplies the employee with adequate sleeping facilities, and
- c) The employee can usually get at least five hours of uninterrupted sleep.

Although the employee may be occasionally interrupted while sleeping, if such interruptions become too frequent, then the employee must be paid for the entire time spent sleeping.

Also, the agreement between the employee and the employer may be either expressed or implied. Of course, an express agreement, such as in the form of a written policy, is always preferred. However, the agreement may also be implied, such as by the custom of the industry.

L. Testing and Examinations

Since “working time” includes any time an employee is “suffered or permitted” to perform services for the employer, any time an employee spends being photographed, drug tested or receiving medical attention **during normal work hours** on the employer’s premises must be counted as working time.

However, if the employer requires an employee who has been absent to undergo a medical examination **before** being allowed to return to work, this time need not be counted as working time.

On the other hand, employers need not count any time an employee spends securing medical attention outside his normal work hours, even if the employee goes to see the employer’s physician and even if the employee was injured during work hours if the employer did not require the employee to secure such treatment.

And finally, the time spent by job applicants taking pre-employment tests need not be counted as working time. (They are not employees yet.)

M. Training Time

In order for the time an employee spends in a training session, class, a meeting or a seminar to not be counted as working time, the following factors must all be present:

- a) The employee’s attendance must fall outside his normal work hours,
- b) The employee’s attendance must be truly voluntary, which means that the employer must not have led the employee to believe that failing to attend the session would harm his employment in any way,
- c) The employee must not perform any productive work for the employer while attending the session, and
- d) The session must not be **directly related** to the employee’s job.

If all of these factors are not met, then the employer must count the time the employee spends at such sessions as working time.

Of course, whether a training session is **directly related** to an employee’s job can be a source of confusion. The most common example given to clarify this issue is when CPR classes are offered. If a janitor attends these classes on his own time,

he need not be paid for the time spent in this class since knowing CPR is not part of his job, unless his employer requires that the janitor be certified in CPR.

However, whether a nurse must be paid for her time spent in a CPR class is not so clear. On one hand, it could easily be argued that knowing CPR is related to the nurse's job, so this nurse should be paid for the time spent in such classes. However, knowing CPR is only remotely related to her job. It is not a principal element of her duties. Therefore, a strong argument exists that the nurse need not be paid for this time spent in CPR class if the other factors of this test are met.

Of course, if an employee voluntarily enrolls in a trade school, college or certificate program outside his normal working time, the employer need not count the time this employee spends pursuing such an education as working time. Similarly, if an employer offers a course that is also offered by an independent institution, then this training will not be viewed as being directly related to the employee's position.

And finally, if the state requires employees to undergo certain training to maintain their licenses or certifications, such as in the case of paramedics and CPR training, then such training sessions will not be viewed as being job-related. The reasoning that is being used here is since it is the state that requires the employee to receive this additional training attending the session is to the employees' benefit in maintaining their licenses or certifications and not to the employer's benefit.

Still, the other three requirements of this test must be met as well.

If a training session is meant to prepare an employee for a future position or future duties, then such a session will not be considered as being related to the employee's position.

N. When Is Training Time Not Compensable?

In Chao v. Tradesmen Int'l, Inc., No. 99-02973 (6th Cir. 2002), Tradesmen International, Inc. was a skilled labor leasing company that provided a complete range of workers to construction contractors on an "as-needed" basis. Tradesmen leases its employees, who are all skilled tradesmen ("field employees"), to various kinds of construction contractors.

Tradesmen requires that all of its applicants complete the Occupational Safety and Health Administration 10-hour general construction safety course as a prerequisite for being hired as a field employee. Tradesmen does not have any input on the safety standards covered by the course and does not edit the course to address any particular work environment of the company's employees.

During the employment interview, Tradesmen informs all of its field employee applicants that they must complete OSHA's 10-hour course in order to work for

Tradesmen. Candidates who have not attended the OSHA course are told that Tradesmen requires they complete this course as a condition of hire. However, applicants are also told that they may be offered immediate employment if they commit to registering for the OSHA course within sixty days and completing the course within a reasonable time.

Candidates who choose this option may attend either an OSHA course sponsored by an instructional institution or the class offered by Tradesmen at its field offices. Once candidates agree to satisfy the company's prehire safety training criteria, Tradesmen extends offers of employment to them.

Tradesmen presents its OSHA course over four separate 2 1/2 hour sessions. These classes are held in the evening, outside of regular working hours. Employees perform no work in the class and are not compensated for the time spent in the class. The class instruction provides only knowledge of general construction safety standards; it has no effect upon the trade skills of any field employee.

In 1998, the Department of Labor brought suit alleging that Tradesmen had violated the overtime provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act by failing to provide overtime compensation for employees attending the course when attendance time combined with regular work hours exceeded forty hours of work time during a week.

Under the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938, the time employees spend attending employer-sponsored lectures, meetings, and training programs is generally considered compensable. However, the Department of Labor's Wage and Hour Division has promulgated interpretive regulations for defining when employee attendance at "lectures, meetings, and training programs" is **not** compensable hours worked.

Attendance at lectures, meetings, training programs and similar activities need **not** be counted as working time if the following four criteria are met:

1. Attendance is outside of the employee's regular working hours,
2. Attendance is in fact voluntary,
3. The course, lecture, or meeting is not directly related to the employee's job, and
4. The employee does not perform any productive work during such attendance.

The parties stipulated in the district court that Tradesmen's OSHA training course satisfied the first, third, and fourth elements of this test. Thus, the only criterion at issue was whether attendance at Tradesmen's OSHA course is **voluntary** and

therefore non-compensable under the FLSA. “Involuntary attendance” is defined in the regulations as follows:

Attendance is not voluntary, of course, if it is required by the employer. It is not voluntary in fact if the employee is given to understand or led to believe that his present working conditions or the continuance of his employment would be adversely affected by nonattendance.

The 6th Circuit ruled in favor of Tradesmen. The court reasoned that the employees’ understood they were to complete OSHA’s 10-hour course as a condition of employment. The employees accepted these positions based upon the agreement that they would complete OSHA’s 10-hour course ... either before or after hire. Therefore, the employees’ attendance at these sessions was voluntary.

The court therefore held that the employees’ attendance at safety training course was not compensable under the FLSA.

O. Travel Time

Under the FLSA, an employee is not viewed as having arrived at work until he has reached the location required by the employer, which may be the employer’s place of business or an alternative location. The employee’s travel time to work is therefore regarded as being a “**preliminary activity**,” which is not compensable as working time, unless such a rule is changed by practice, contract or by custom.

Even if the employer requires the employee to report to an alternative job site that requires the employee to leave home earlier than usual, the employee’s travel time to and from work is generally seen as being nonwork time as long as the employee is not required to travel such a substantial distance that the distance traveled can no longer be classified as being an ordinary home-to-work commute but rather as a business trip out of town. Where the distinction between the two begins and ends is vague, although requiring employees to drive an extra **30 or so miles** has been found to be reasonable.

Of course, if an employee is required to stop at some location before going on to his work site, such as to pick up mail, then that employee’s working time must begin at the time he reaches the post office to pick up the mail, since this is the first location the employer required the employee to report to that day.

Travel throughout the workday, on the other hand, is classified as working time. For instance, if an employee is required to drive to a work site at 3:00 p.m. and then leaves this outlying location at 7:00 p.m. to go home, the employee is to be paid for his travel time to the work site and until 7:00 p.m., which was when he ended his work for the day. The employee need not be paid for his travel time

home from the work site, unless again, the employee has to travel more than a “**reasonable**” commuting distance.

However, if the employee must return to the employer’s premises from this outlying work site before going home for the day, then the employee’s working time ends when he **leaves the employer’s premises to go home**. The employee would therefore be paid travel time from the outlying site back to the employer’s premises.

If an employee is called to report back into work and is required to travel a substantial distance (not ordinary home-to-work travel) to a customer’s location after having already gone home for the day, the employee must be paid for his travel time.

Next, if an employee is required to travel out of town on a trip that does **not** require an overnight stay and cannot be considered ordinary home-to-work travel, then the employee is to be paid for all of his travel time if he leaves from his home and goes directly to this appointment without first stopping at his employer’s place of business. Likewise, this employee is to be paid for all of his travel time on his return trip if he does not stop at the employer’s premises before returning home.

However, if the employee **does** stop at the employer’s place of business before traveling to or returning from this appointment, then the employer need only count the employee’s travel time to or from its premises.

Suppose an employee normally finishes his work at 5 p.m. but is instead sent to another job which he finishes at 8 p.m. Then suppose the employee is required to return to his employer’s premises after the job is finished and he arrives at his employer’s place of business at 12:30 am, all of this travel time counts as working time.

Travel that keeps an employee away from home overnight is clearly working time when it cuts across the employee’s normal workday. The employee’s hours he regularly works will be classified as “working time,” even when the employee travels on nonworking days, such as for holidays, Saturdays, Sundays, etc.

It is the Division of Wage and Hour’s policy ***not*** to consider the time that an employee spends traveling away from home outside of his regular working hours when he is a passenger on an airplane, train, boat, bus, or automobile.

Therefore, if the employee’s travel time extends beyond his normal work hours, then the employer need **not** count such time as working time. Of course, this is assuming that the employee is not performing any work while traveling. Time spent by an employee writing a report is work time, even if it happens to occur while the employee is riding on a bus (or airplane) to or from work.

If an employee is offered public transportation but chooses to drive his car instead, the employer may count the employee's working hours as being either the time he spends driving the car or the time the employee would have been paid if he has used the public transportation.

Still, operating a motor vehicle in order to attend a business meeting may be viewed as performing a service for the employer, as opposed to merely riding in an airplane as a passenger where the employee can sleep, read, and so on. As a result, the employer may be required to count any travel time that extends beyond the employee's normal working hours as working time if the nonexempt employee is driving a car, for instance. This is why many employers require an exempt person to do the driving, so the nonexempt employees can read, sleep, and so on.

For example, suppose an employee who works in CITY A with regular working hours from 9 a.m. to 5 p.m. is given a special assignment in New York City. The employee is told to drive from CITY A at 8 a.m. and the employee arrives in New York at 12 noon, ready for work. Suppose the employee completes the special assignment at 3 p.m. and he arrives back home 7 p.m. Since this travel cannot be regarded as ordinary home-to-work travel, the employee would be paid until 7:00 pm.

However, let's suppose the employee took a train to get to New York. Since he was traveling by common carrier, the employee does not have to be paid for all of this time spent traveling. The travel between his home and the railroad depot may be deducted from his "working hours" because it would be the same as "home-to-work" travel. The rest of the travel time would be paid.

P. Waiting Time

Employees are to be paid for the services they are "suffered or permitted" to provide to their employer. Therefore, if employees arrive to work early and simply wait to begin work, then the employer need not count this time spent waiting as working time.

On the other hand, if employees are required to report to work at a certain time and must then wait for their assigned work to become available, then this time spent waiting must be counted as working time. However, if an employee completes his work and is forced to wait for his next assignment, the employer need not count the time the employee spends waiting as working time if the employee is completely relieved of his duties and is free to leave the employer's premises for a definite, specified period of time that is long enough so that the employee can use the time as he chooses. (See previous discussion earlier in these materials regarding "Breaks.")

XXVI. JOINT EMPLOYERS

In January 2020, the DOL announced its final rule regarding joint employers under the FLSA. This final rule became effective on March 16, 2020.

Under this final rule, the DOL continues to recognize two potential scenarios where an employee may have one or more joint employers.

In the first scenario, an employee performs work for one employer that simultaneously benefits another individual or entity. In this situation, the DOL has adopted a four-factor balancing test to determine whether the potential joint employer is directly or indirectly controlling the employee. These four factors assess whether the potential joint employer:

- Can hire or fire the employee;
- Supervises and controls the employee's work schedule or conditions of employment to a substantial degree;
- Determines the employee's rate and method of payment; and
- Maintains the employee's employment records.

The term "employment records" in this case refers to records, such as payroll records, records pertaining to the hiring or firing, supervision and control of the work schedules or conditions of employment, or determining the rate and method of payment of the employee.

Whether the entity or person receiving the benefits of the employee's labor is a joint employer will depend on balancing all the facts in a particular case. How much weight each particular factor should be given in this analysis will vary depending on the circumstances of each situation.

The final rule notes that additional factors may also be relevant in determining whether another person or entity is a joint employer in this type of situation, but only when they show whether the potential joint employer is exercising significant control over the terms and conditions of the employee's work.

Accordingly, to determine joint employer status, **no factors should be used to assess economic dependence**. Examples of factors that are **not relevant** because they assess economic dependence include, but are not limited to:

1. Whether the employee is in a specialty job or a job that otherwise requires special skill, initiative, judgment, or foresight;

2. Whether the employee has the opportunity for profit or loss based on his or her managerial skill;
3. Whether the employee invests in equipment or materials required for work or the employment of helpers; and
4. The number of contractual relationships, other than with the employer, that the potential joint employer has entered into to receive similar services.

The final rule also identifies certain other factors that do not make joint employer status more or less likely under the Act, including:

- If the company is operating as a franchisor, entering into a brand and supply agreement, or using a similar business model;
- The employee's economic dependence on the potential joint employer;
- The presence of contractual agreements the potential joint employer has that would require it to meet legal obligations or standards to protect the health or safety of employees or the general public;
- Requiring, monitoring, and enforcing other businesses' compliance with quality-control standards to ensure the consistent quality of a work product, brand, or business reputation; and
- Practices of providing sample handbooks or other forms to the employer, allowing an employer to operate a facility on its premises, offering an association health or retirement plan to (or participating in such a plan with) the employer, or jointly participating with an employer in an apprenticeship program.

In the second scenario, one employer employs an employee for one set of hours in a workweek, and then another employer employs the same employee for a separate set of hours in the same workweek.

However, the final rule did not make any substantive changes to the standard for determining joint employer liability in this second scenario. If the employers are acting independently of each other and are disassociated with respect to the employment of the employee, each employer may disregard all work performed by the employee for the other employer in determining its liability under the FLSA.

However, if the employers are sufficiently associated with respect to the employment of the employee, they are joint employers and must aggregate the hours worked for each for purposes of determining if they are in compliance. The employers will generally be sufficiently associated if:

- There is an arrangement between them to share the employee's services,
- The employer is acting directly or indirectly in the interest of the other employer in relation to the employee, or
- They share control of the employee, directly or indirectly, by reason of the fact that one employer controls, is controlled by, or is under common control with the other employer.

Finally, the final rule provides several examples of how the DOL's joint employer guidance should be applied in various factual circumstances at 29 CFR 791.2.

XXVII. U.S. SUPREME COURT: NEW DEFINITION FOR BEGINNING AND END OF WORKDAY

In IBP Inc. v Alvarez, U.S., No. 03-1238 (2005) and Tum v. Barber Foods Inc., U.S., No. 04-66 (2005), the U.S. Supreme Court considered whether employees are entitled to be compensated for the time they spend:

- ❖ Waiting at stations where required safety equipment is distributed,
- ❖ The time spent putting on and taking off this required safety equipment and
- ❖ Walking from and to the locker rooms where this protective equipment is "donned" (put on) and "doffed" (removed) at the beginning and end of each workday.

At the IBP plant in Pasco, Washington, employees were paid for the actual time they spent cutting and bagging meat. Since 1998, IBP had also paid the employees for four minutes of "clothes-changing time" in which these employees would put on, or "don," their required protective gear at the beginning of the workday and another four minutes at the end of the day to "doff," or remove, their protective gear. Even though it took much longer for employees to "don" and "doff" their protective gear each day, employees were only paid for four additional minutes at the beginning of the shift and four minutes at the end of the shift.

Additionally, once the employees had "donned" their protective gear for the day, they were not paid for the time it took them to walk from the locker room to their daily job locations. Likewise, at the end of the workday, these employees would walk back to the locker room where they would remove, or "doff," their required protective gear. Again, the employees were paid only four minutes of working time to remove, or "doff," this protective gear, but they were not paid for the time it took them to walk back to the locker room at the end of the day to remove their equipment.

All production workers were required to wear outer garments, hard hats, hairnets, earplugs, gloves, sleeves, aprons, leggings and boots. Many employees, particularly those who use knives in their work, were also required to wear protective equipment for

their hands, arms, torsos and legs as well. This gear includes chain link metal aprons, vests, Plexiglas armguards and special gloves. The workers were required to store their equipment and tools in company locker rooms, where most donned their protective gear at the start of each workday.

IBP based its logic of not paying employees for this “walking time” on the Portal-to-Portal Act. In 1947, Congress passed the “Portal-to-Portal Act,” an amendment to the Fair Labor Standards Act. The Portal Act exempted from coverage any time spent by the employees “walking on the employer’s premises to and from the location of the employee’s principal activity or activities [for the day].” (§4(a)(1)) The Portal Act also excluded those activities that are “preliminary or postliminary” to the employees’ actual performance of their jobs. (§4(a)(2))

IBP employees filed a class action under the Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA) to recover compensation for “preproduction and postproduction work,” which included the entire time spent “donning and doffing” their required safety equipment, not just the four minutes of time allotted by the company, and walking between the locker rooms and the production floor before and after their shifts.

On appeal to the Supreme Court, IBP did not challenge the employees’ contention that the entire time spent “donning and doffing” the unique protective gear was compensable time since it was an integral part of the employees’ principal activities of their jobs. However, IBP **did** challenge the determination that the walking time from the locker room to the work location, and vice versa at the end of the day, was also compensable, arguing that it was excluded from the FLSA by the Portal-to-Portal Act.

The Supreme Court decision also involved a claim by workers at a Barber Foods poultry processing plant in Portland, Maine. They challenged determinations by the 1st U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals that held walking time from the changing room to and from the production floor was excluded from FLSA coverage and that the time waiting to don or doff protective gear was not compensable.

In a unanimous decision, the Court ruled that once an employee’s workday starts, it is **all one continuous and compensable workday**. As a result, the employees’ workday begins when they “don” their required protective gear at the beginning of their shift, so all of their time spent walking to their respective work areas from the “changing areas” is compensable work time. Likewise, at the end of their day, the employees are to be paid for the time it takes to walk back to the locker rooms and “doff” their protective gear at the end of the day. Compensable time also includes the time employees have to wait **before** doffing, or removing, the gear, but **not** the time spent waiting **before** donning it, or putting it on, the court held.

Compensable “Walking Time”

In making its ruling, the Supreme Court relied on its previous 1956 holding in Steiner v. Mitchell, 350 U.S. 247. In Steiner, the Court ruled that employers, notwithstanding the Portal Act, **did in fact have** to pay employees for time they spent “donning and doffing”

their required safety equipment ... activities the court found to be “**integral and indispensable**” to the principal activity of performing their jobs.

The employees in both Tum and IBP, Inc. believed that walking to their job sites after having “donned” their required safety gear and then having to wait to begin work “inextricably linked” to the donning and doffing process. As a result, walking to and from their work locations are also “principal activities” marking the beginning and the end of the workday. The employees argued that their “walking and waiting” therefore occurred within the workday and are therefore **outside** the scope of the Portal Act.

The U.S. Supreme Court agreed. Relying heavily on U.S. Department of Labor regulations, the Court determined that the locker rooms where the special safety gear is donned (put on) and doffed (taken off) are places of performance of principal job activities. Walking to the locker rooms **before** starting work is excluded from FLSA coverage, so this time is not compensable. However, the Court ruled that walking from the locker rooms to other areas within the plant **after** the workday has commenced, which is when this equipment is donned, is included as part of the employees’ workday and is therefore compensable.

The Court then noted that walking to the work location after donning this protective equipment “is more comparable to time spent walking between two different positions on an assembly line” than to walking to the job before the workday has started.”

The Court also held that the time employees spend waiting to doff this unique protective gear at the end of their shift also **is compensable** because it is integral and indispensable to principal work activities. However, **waiting to don** (put on) the gear at the beginning of the shift was not integral to the employees’ work.

On the other hand, waiting to don clothes is compensable if the employer “requires its workers to report to the changing area at a **specific time** only to find that no protective gear was available until after some time had elapsed,” the court cautioned.

WHAT DOES THIS MEAN TO EMPLOYERS?

Determine when your workday **REALLY** begins for your various positions. The time spent “donning” and “doffing” protective equipment begins and ends the workday respectfully. Other “services for the employer” might also indicate the beginning of the workday, such as stopping at the Post Office for the employer to pick up mail, dropping a package off to a client on the way it to work, etc. Once an employee has provided a service for the employer, **THAT** begins the workday. All time thereafter is most likely considered “compensable.”

XXVIII. DAMAGES UNDER THE FLSA

A. Willful v. Nonwillful Violations

When the FLSA was enacted in 1938, it did not include a statute of limitations for any violations committed under the Act. As a result, any civil actions that were brought against employers under the FLSA were governed by each individual state's laws according to their statute of limitations.

However, in 1947, Congress passed the Portal-to-Portal Act (29 U.S.C. § 216, et seq.) which imposed a two-year statute of limitations for FLSA violations. In 1966, Congress amended the FLSA again and extended its statute of limitations to three years for any violations deemed to be “willfully” committed by employers.

Today, if employers violate the FLSA, and their violation is found to be nonwillful, employers will be liable for any damages caused by this violation for only the last two years. However, if employers “willfully” violate the FLSA, then they will be liable for any damages resulting from this violation for the last three years.

An obvious problem arising from this provision is how to define the term “willful.” Throughout the various jurisdictions, a split of authority has arisen regarding what exactly is meant by this term.

One interpretation of this “willfulness” standard that was previously accepted in some jurisdictions was the “in the picture” standard. Under the “in the picture” standard, it was contended that once an issue under the FLSA had been decided by the U.S. Department of Labor, or was “in the picture,” then employers were responsible for being in compliance with the decided issue.

Otherwise, employers were deemed to have “willfully” violated the Act, regardless of whether these employers were ever even aware of the fact that the standard existed. Under the “in the picture” standard, mere ignorance, or negligence, could place employers in the position of having “willfully” violated the FLSA, thus making employers liable for any violations they committed for the last three years.

However, in McLaughlin v. Richland Shoe Company, 486 U.S. 128 (1988), the U.S. Supreme Court examined the “in the picture” standard. The Court looked to the Webster's Dictionary's definition of the term “willful,” and held that the term “willful” was synonymous with such terms as “voluntary,” “intentional,” or “deliberate.” The Court therefore held that a violation under the FLSA would be deemed “willful” only if “the employer either knew or showed reckless disregard” for the applicable FLSA regulation, thereby overturning the “in the picture” standard.

As a result, today employers' mere negligence of an FLSA standard will no longer create a "willful" violation.

B. Liquidated Damages

When the FLSA was enacted in 1938, it contained a provision stating that employers who were found to be in violation of the overtime or minimum wage provisions of the Act must not only be ordered to reimburse the offended employees for their unpaid wages, but employers would also be ordered to pay these employees an additional sum of money equal to their back wages as "liquidated damages." Therefore, whenever employers violate the overtime or minimum wage provisions of the Act, they may actually be liable for "double damages."

The purpose behind mandating "double damages" for employees was not to penalize employers, but instead to compensate employees for damages they have suffered related to lost wages that are too obscure or difficult to prove, such as lost interest, lost investment opportunities, and so on. However, since the awarding of interest charges was already part of the reasoning for awarding liquidated damages in the first place, plaintiffs may not recover both liquidated damages and prejudgment interest.

In 1947, Congress amended the FLSA to help ease the harshness of the mandatory liquidated damages rule. As a result of this 1947 amendment, employers may now avoid paying these double damage awards if they are able to show that they acted in good faith with a reasonable belief they were not violating the Act at the time of the offense. However, there is still a strong preference for awarding employees double damages. Consequently, awarding double or liquidated damages still tends to be the norm, while awarding only single damage awards remains the exception.

Even if employers can sustain their burden of proof and overcome this presumption of double damages, the court may still decide to award double damages to employees anyway. Consequently, the decision to award single damages is completely discretionary by the court, so even if employers meet their burden of proof and show that they acted in good faith and had reasonable grounds for believing they were not violating the Act, employers might still find themselves paying offended employees double or liquidated damages.

One of the most difficult aspects employers face in sustaining this burden of proof is understanding what is meant by the terms "good faith" and "reasonable belief." In short, an affirmative duty is placed on employers to prove that they made an honest attempt to ascertain the proper interpretation of the Act in relation to their situation *and* that their reliance on the information they obtained was reasonable.

In carrying this burden, many courts have held that once the U.S. Department of Labor has voiced its opinion on a particular FLSA overtime or minimum wage

issue, employers can no longer argue that they made a “good faith” effort to discover the law’s application to their particular situation, which is very similar to the “in the picture” standard of the U.S. Supreme Court overturned regarding the “willfulness” definition, or that their reliance on erroneous information was reasonable. Consequently, employers claim mere ignorance of an FLSA regulation and sustain their burden of proof regarding liquidated damages.

Generally, in order for employers to fulfill their duty of inquiry for the purpose of liquidated damages, several courts have interpreted the regulations as requiring employers to solicit instructions directly from the proper governmental officials in writing, as opposed to obtaining mere oral directives, regarding their specific situation before they act.

Seeking general advice regarding the FLSA will not satisfy the requirements of this test, nor will receiving an oral response to a specific situation. If employers hope to rely upon the U.S. Department of Labor’s advice in showing that they fulfilled their “good faith” duty of inquiry and that they had a “reasonable belief” they were not violating the Act, employers must receive a written response from the Department of Labor providing them with a clear answer regarding their specific inquiry into their particular situation before such a letter will satisfy this test.

Employers may also rely on a U.S. Department of Labor Policy Letter in order to establish a “good faith” and a “reasonable belief” in relation to liquidated damages. However, since employers bear the burden of proving that they acted “explicitly” in good faith, employers also have the burden of proving that the policy letter they are relying upon fits exactly with their specific situation and that the policy letter has not been overturned.

Some employers accused of noncompliance have tried to argue that they were uncertain as to whether or not a certain provision of the Act applied to them. The courts have held, however, that mere uncertainty as to whether a law applied to employers is not a “reasonable belief.” Conversely, arguing that employers had discovered no precise legal guidelines governing their acts after conducting a good faith inquiry has been found to satisfy this test.

C. Other Remedies

In addition to incurring liquidated damage awards dating back as far as three years, employers may be subject to monetary liability for violating the Act in other areas as well. Two of these additional areas of liability are attorneys’ fees and costs. Under the FLSA, the courts are required to award reasonable attorneys’ fees and costs to successful plaintiffs who sue for violations under the Act.

Employers who violate the FLSA may also be subject to both civil and criminal penalties. Civil penalties can amount to as much as \$1,000 per offense, or

\$10,000 for each child labor violation, while criminal penalties can run up to \$10,000 for each violation, as well six months of possible imprisonment for willful violations.

Additionally, anyone who fails to obey a court-ordered subpoena, such as by failing to testify or supplying documents, may be subject to fines of no less than \$1,000 and no more than \$5,000, as well as possible imprisonment of up to one year upon conviction.

And finally, anyone filing a false FLSA claim or issuing a false statement in a Wage and Hour investigation may be subject to up to \$5,000 in fines and liquidated damages for any harm caused by such false claims or false statements.

XXIX. 6TH CIRCUIT AWARDS EMPLOYER \$55,000 IN COSTS IN FLSA ACTION

In Frye v. Baptist Memorial Hospital, Inc., No. 12-5371 (6TH Cir. December 4, 2012) Baptist Memorial Hospital provided employees an unpaid 30-minute lunch break each workday. As is common in many industries, the hospital automatically deducts the unpaid meal break from employees' hours worked. In the event employees perform any work during their meal breaks, they are instructed to report such work through exception procedures made available by the hospital. These exception procedures vary from department to department and may consist of writing down meal-break work in a formal log, submitting a written note to a supervisor, or verbally informing a supervisor of the work performed.

The plaintiff-employee filed a collective action under the FLSA, arguing the hospital's automatic deduction policy resulted in employees not being paid for meal-break work. The plaintiff maintained that the automatic deduction policy unlawfully "shifts the burden" of ensuring employees are paid for all time worked from the employer to its employees. The plaintiff further argued that the hospital failed to train employees adequately on use of its exception procedures, resulting in unreported and unpaid meal-break work.

However, the Sixth Circuit Court of Appeals found for the employer and awarded the employee who filed the lawsuit to pay the employer \$55,000.00 in costs.

First, the court held that automatic pay deduction policies for unpaid meal breaks do not inherently violate the FLSA and a class representative in a collective action must formally opt in to his own case to "commence" the lawsuit and stop the statute of limitations from beginning to run or he will be barred from filing suit. After considering the employer's request for court costs, the 6th Circuit went for a trifecta and awarded the employer more than **\$55,000.00** in fees and costs for defending against the action.

In challenging the award, the employee, Frye, made four primary arguments.

First, he argued that the FLSA doesn't provide for an award of costs to a prevailing defendant, and such an award would have a chilling (or dissuasive) effect on future FLSA claims.

Second, he claimed that the employer wasn't a "prevailing party" relative to the opt-in plaintiffs of the decertified collective action whose claims were dismissed without prejudice (meaning they could be refiled in the future).

Third, he contended that the employer's costs in defending the action shouldn't be taxed against him because they weren't necessary to resolve his substantive claims.

Finally, he argued that because he earned only \$75,000 a year, he would be impoverished if he was required to pay the award.

In response to Frye's argument that the employer's costs weren't recoverable under the FLSA, the court found that nothing in the Act precludes an award of costs to a prevailing defendant. Although Section 216(b) of the FLSA specifically addresses costs to a prevailing plaintiff, the court held that the employer could use Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 54 to seek its costs.

The court dismissed Frye's "chilling effect" argument without even discussing it.

As for his argument that the employer wasn't really a "prevailing party," the court didn't buy that, either. It found that since the employer successfully obtained decertification of the collective action and dismissal of Frye's claims because of his failure to opt in, the company was the prevailing party for purposes of the lawsuit.

The 6th Circuit also held that the district court didn't abuse its discretion in ordering Frye to pay the employer's costs. Given his level of income and expenses, he failed to demonstrate that he was unable to pay the costs awarded.

WHAT DOES THIS MEAN TO HUMAN RESOURCES?

The 6th Circuit's decision confirms that prevailing employers that obtain judgment before their case goes before a jury may receive their costs for defending the case under Section 216 of the FLSA. While the statute allows an award of attorneys' fees to prevailing employees only, the court's decision is favorable for employers and may make employees steer clear of filing frivolous FLSA claims.

XXX. U.S. SUPREME COURT: ORAL COMPLAINTS UNDER THE FLSA COUNT

In Kasten v. Saint-Gobain Performance Plastics Corp. No. 09-834 (2011), Kevin Kasten claimed that while he worked for Saint-Gobain Performance Plastics Corporation, the company's time clocks were located between the place he and his fellow employees donned and doffed their job-related protective gear and the place where they performed their assigned duties. According to Kasten, the clocks' location kept the workers from being paid for the time they spent donning and doffing their work gear. (In a separate but

related lawsuit, a district court found that Saint- Gobain’s time-clock placement violated the FLSA.)

After Saint-Gobain terminated his employment, Kasten sued under the FLSA, asserting that he was fired in retaliation for orally complaining about his employer’s time-clock placement. The FLSA prohibits employers from retaliating against employees who have **“filed any complaint”** under the statute. Kasten claimed that he repeatedly raised the time-clock placement issue with Saint-Gobain, using its internal grievance resolution procedure. More specifically, he asserted that he talked to his shift supervisor, an HR employee, his lead operator, the HR manager, and the operations manager about the time-clock placement and that those actions led the company to fire him.

According to Saint-Gobain, Kasten didn’t make a “significant complaint” about the time-clock placement. The company claimed it fired him after he was repeatedly warned about his failure to properly clock in and out and didn’t adjust his actions. The district court and the Seventh Circuit ruled for the employer, holding that FLSA complaints must be made in writing because of the “filed” language (*i.e.*, an oral complaint can’t be “filed”).

Kasten appealed to the U.S. Supreme Court. The court held for Kasten.

The Supreme Court examined whether the FLSA’s anti-retaliation provision protects only written complaints or whether oral complaints are also protected. The Court started its analysis with the text of the FLSA and noted that the “word ‘filed’ has different relevant meanings in different contexts.” The Court looked at various dictionaries, court decisions, statutes, and regulations for help and determined that those resources referenced both oral and written filings.

The Court next looked at other places in the FLSA where the term “filed” is used. It found that some of the other provisions involve filed material that is almost always in writing, some specifically require a writing, and some don’t resolve the oral/written question at all.

The Court concluded that the text of the FLSA alone didn’t provide an answer regarding whether the term “filed any complaint” included oral complaints and next looked at several functional considerations. The Court reasoned that the U.S. Congress intended the FLSA’s anti-retaliation provision to cover oral complaints because allowing only written complaints would undermine the Act’s basic objectives. In particular, it questioned why Congress would want to hinder use of the FLSA’s complaint procedure by workers who were illiterate, less educated, or overworked (*i.e.*, workers who would have trouble putting their complaints in writing).

Additionally, the Court noted that restricting complaints to only written ones would take away government agencies’ flexibility when enforcing the FLSA (*e.g.*, they might not be able to use hot lines, interviews, or other oral methods of receiving complaints). The Court also observed that not allowing oral complaints would discourage employers from using “desirable informal workplace grievance procedures to secure compliance with the Act.”

Next, the Court looked at the federal agencies' views on what the term "filed any complaint" entails. It noted that the secretary of labor has consistently held that the term covers oral and written complaints and that the U.S. Department of Labor expressed that view in an enforcement action filed years ago. The Court also found that the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission takes a similar stance in its compliance manual.

The Court addressed how complaints must be fair to employers and must give them "fair notice that an employee is making a complaint that could subject the employer to a later claim of retaliation." Additionally, according to the Court, FLSA complaints must have some degree of formality: "To fall within the scope of the anti-retaliation provision, a complaint must be sufficiently clear and detailed for a reasonable employer to understand it, in light of both content and context, as an assertion of rights protected by the statute and a call for their protection." The Court asserted that this standard can be met by both written and oral complaints.

The Supreme Court didn't address Saint-Gobain's claim that Kasten didn't have a case because the FLSA's anti-retaliation provision applies only to complaints filed with the government and he complained to a private employer, not the government. The Court noted that the lower courts disagreed with that claim and that since Saint-Gobain didn't raise the legal question in its Supreme Court petition, it didn't address the claim. Justice Antonin Scalia, however, raised the issue in his dissent, claiming that the FLSA's anti-retaliation provision doesn't cover complaints to employers but instead covers only official complaints to courts or government agencies.

WHAT DOES THIS MEAN TO HUMAN RESOURCES?

Although the Court did not address the question of whether complaints to private employers are protected under the FLSA's anti-retaliation provision, you still need to proceed with caution under the assumption that they *are* covered. It's a good time to update your policies and make sure your supervisors are trained on how to properly handle any kind of complaint — oral or written. You must also make sure that you *always* carefully document any type of complaint. In fact, it's a good idea for your organization to have established documentation and investigation procedures for addressing employee complaints.

XXXI. U.S. SUPREME COURT HOLDS POSTWORK SECURITY SCREENINGS NOT COMPENSABLE

In Integrity Staffing Solutions, Inc. v. Busk, No. 13-433 (U.S. Supreme Ct. 2015), Integrity Staffing Solutions provided warehouse staffing to Amazon.com. Its hourly employees retrieved products from the warehouse shelves and packaged them for delivery to Amazon customers.

To prevent theft, Integrity required its employees to undergo security screening before leaving the warehouse each day. Two employees, on behalf of a class of employees, claimed that the time spent waiting for and undergoing those security screenings, which took about roughly **25 minutes each day**, is compensable as "working time" under

FLSA. They alleged that the screening time could have been reduced to a “de minimis” amount by adding more security screeners or by staggering the end of the shifts so that employees could flow through the checkpoint more quickly.

They also alleged that the screenings were conducted “**to prevent employee theft**” and thus occurred “**solely for the benefit of the employers and their customers.**”

The district court dismissed the complaint for failure to state a claim.

However, the Ninth Circuit reversed, finding that the security screenings were necessary to complete the principal work performed by the employees and it was done **for the benefit of the employer**. Therefore, these duties were **integral and indispensable** to the employee's principal activities, so they were compensable under the FLSA.

However, the U.S. Supreme Court reversed.

The Court focused on the Portal-to-Portal Act, which exempted employers from liability under FLSA for “**activities which are preliminary to or postliminary to [the] principal activity or activities**” that an employee is employed to perform. 29 U.S.C. § 254(a).

The Court then held that the phrase “**principal activity or activities**” means all activities that are an “**integral and indispensable part of**” the employee's principal activities. The Court further stated that an activity is “integral and indispensable” **only** if it is “**an intrinsic element of those activities and one with which the employee cannot dispense if he is to perform his principal activities.**”

The Court concluded that the security screenings at issue were not the “**principal activity or activities which the employee is employed to perform,**” since the employees were hired to retrieve products and package them for shipment to customers.

Further, the security screenings were not “**integral and indispensable**” to the employees' duties as warehouse workers because they could have been eliminated altogether without impairing the employees' ability to do their work.

Therefore, the time spent in security screenings fell within the Portal-to-Portal Act's exemption, and was **not compensable** under the FLSA. The Court said that the Ninth Circuit erred by focusing simply on whether the employer requires the activities at issue.

XXXII. EMPLOYEE’S TESTIMONY IN OVERTIME DISPUTE IS GIVEN GREATEST WEIGHT

In Moran v. Al Basit LLC., 14-2335 (6th Cir., 2015), Jeffrey Moran was employed as a mechanic at Al Basit auto repair shop from summer 2011 to spring 2013. He was paid \$300 a week plus an additional as a bonus occasionally, but he was never paid any overtime.

Moran claimed he worked **65 to 68 hours** a week. **His testimony wasn't based on any written records of his hours worked. Rather, it was based on his imprecise recollections of the number of hours he generally worked each week.**

Moran's former employer defended against the claim by pointing to **time sheets that were created by one of the owners, who watched security camera footage each day to determine employees' arrival and departure times.**

Although Moran worked a different schedule each week, the time sheets recorded by the owners almost always reflected **30 hours of work every week.**

Additionally, the manager who worked with Moran testified that he never worked more than 30 hours a week.

The court posed the question before it very succinctly:

When an employee has presented no other evidence, is his testimony alone sufficient to defeat his former employer's motion for summary judgment?

The court held that it is.

The court found that **Moran's testimony by itself was sufficient to create a genuine issue of material fact that must be resolved at trial by a jury. He didn't need to recall his hours worked with specificity, and his testimony was sufficient to contradict evidence offered by his former employer.**

WHAT DOES THIS MEAN FOR HUMAN RESOURCES?

This case is very disturbing. The court has basically held that any nonexempt employee who claims that he has worked more hours than his employer recorded only has to say that the employer's records are incorrect and that employee can avoid summary judgment. This means such cases will cost employers tens of thousands of dollars.

Of course, the way the employer recorded the employee's hours of the employees was very odd. This cases actually reinforces the critical importance of requiring all nonexempt employees to complete their own time sheets and certify that these time records are accurate. Such records can be certified by the employee in hard copy form or electronically. Such evidence will do much to overcome the lies employees might tell to recover damages.

XXXIII. FRONTLINE SUPERVISORS ACTIONS CREATE FLSA LIABILITY

In Garcia v. SAR Food of Ohio, Inc., 1:14-cv-01514 (N.D. Ohio, 2015), Jose Garcia and Raymond Sutton were employed in a variety of hourly positions by SAR Food of Ohio, Inc., which owns and operates several restaurants. The jobs they worked, including cook positions, weren't exempt from the overtime requirements of the FLSA and applicable state law.

Garcia and Sutton worked varying hours based on the work schedules SAR set for them, but they claim they were frequently required to **continue working beyond their scheduled shifts**, and the additional work usually amounted to several hours each week. SAR used its work schedules to keep track of the hours employees worked. **Employees were told to make changes to the schedules to reflect the hours they actually worked and to initial the schedules to confirm their accuracy before payroll was processed.**

Other SAR employees testified that when they made changes to their schedules to reflect their actual hours worked, they were paid appropriately. Garcia and Sutton **never made any changes to their schedules**, but they usually initialed them anyway. (They claimed that some schedules were initialed by their supervisors on their behalf.)

As a result, they were paid **only** for the hours they were **scheduled to work**. Pay stubs issued by SAR included the statement, “Any questions concerning your pay, please call . . . Sarku Japan Payroll Department.”

The employee handbook contained a policy **forbidding off-the-clock work**, encouraging employees to raise any concerns about their pay with their manager or the payroll department, and prohibiting retaliation against any employee who raised such a concern.

Neither Garcia nor Sutton ever complained to anyone at SAR about their pay. They claimed they never received copies of the employee handbook.

Garcia and Sutton filed a lawsuit in which they alleged that SAR failed to properly pay them overtime under the FLSA and Ohio law. They claimed the company often required them to work past the end of their shifts without recording the extra time or compensating them for it.

In reaching its decision, the court broke its analysis of their claims into three questions.

1. Was there sufficient evidence that Garcia and Sutton worked any hours that were uncompensated?

Under recent case law from the U.S. 6th Circuit Court of Appeals, an **employee’s own uncorroborated allegations of time worked off the clock are sufficient evidence to defeat summary judgment** (a request for dismissal without a trial) and create a genuine issue of fact that must be decided by a jury. The court therefore found that Garcia and Sutton’s allegations that they worked hours beyond their scheduled hours and were not compensated for the time were sufficient.

2. Did SAR know or should it have known about the uncompensated time?

An employer can **avoid** liability for unpaid wages if an employee failed to comply with its policies and procedures for reporting his hours worked, but only if the employer neither knew nor should have known that the employee wasn’t being compensated for all hours worked.

Because Garcia and Sutton’s supervisors:

- Knew that the restaurants were being kept open **beyond** their regularly scheduled hours,
- They approved timesheets that Garcia and Sutton claim **didn’t reflect their actual hours worked**, and
- They initialed at least some timesheets **on behalf of Garcia and Sutton**,

... the court found there was sufficient evidence to create a genuine issue of fact that must be decided by a jury.

3. Should the supervisors’ knowledge of Garcia and Sutton’s uncompensated time be imputed to SAR, making the employer liable for any violation of the FLSA?

Because Garcia and Sutton claim that their supervisors prevented them from accurately reporting their hours and encouraged them to underreport their time, the court again found that there was sufficient evidence to create a genuine issue of fact that must be decided by a jury.

The fact that Garcia and Sutton **never updated their schedules to reflect their actual hours worked, never complained about the uncompensated time, and never contacted the payroll department to report their supervisors’ behavior could be considered by a jury, but could not be used to deny Garcia and Sutton the opportunity for a trial.**

WHAT DOES THIS MEAN FOR HUMAN RESOURCES?

This case is a reminder that it’s often the actions of your frontline supervisors that are **EXTREMELY** critical when it comes to liability. Employers need to train and hold supervisors accountable for ensuring that policies are distributed to all employees and that they are being followed.

XXXIV. NEW DOL SELF-REPORTING PROGRAM

In March 2018, the U.S. Department of Labor (DOL) announced that it was launching a new program that allows employers a chance to self-audit their wage and hour practices and report any violations they find in exchange for limited protection from additional liabilities and claims. The new program is called the “**Payroll Audit Independent Determination**” or “**PAID**,” and it will start as a six-month pilot, after which the DOL will decide whether to offer it on a permanent basis.

The primary appeal of the program is that by voluntarily reporting their errors, employers will receive some protection against liquidated damages and civil monetary penalties, which are typically awarded in successful wage and hour lawsuits.

This is how the program works.

Step 1: Complete a Compliance Assistance Review (CAR)

According to the DOL, before conducting a self-audit, the first step for an employer that wants to take advantage of the PAID program is to complete a Compliance Assistance Review (CAR) on the DOL website at www.dol.gov/whd/paid/.

This is primarily a series of videos and other information about compliance with the Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA), but the DOL says you will have to provide a certificate of completion and submit it to the agency to participate in the program. Note that when an employer starts with the CAR, the employer will be asked to provide both the name of the person going through the CAR program and the name of the name of the employer to the DOL.

Step 2: Conduct a self-audit of wage and hour practices

After completing the CAR, the next step will be to conduct a comprehensive audit of your wage and hour practices with the intent of uncovering violations of the overtime and/or minimum wage requirements of the FLSA. Ideally, the audit should examine all aspects of the employer's wage and hour practices, including, but not limited to:

- Making sure employees are compensated for all hours worked. Some of the more common problem areas include failing to pay employees properly for travel time, job-related training, on-call time, working breaks, "donning and doffing" time, and other similar situations.
- Verifying that everyone the employer has classified as being exempt from the FLSA's minimum wage and overtime requirements are classified correctly. A very common mistake is to misclassify someone as being exempt based solely on the fact that the employee is paid on a salary basis without also ensuring the employee also performs the necessary exempt duties.
- Determining if for those employees who have been classified as exempt, if the employer made any improper deductions from exempt employees' salaries and
- Assessing whether the employer is calculating the overtime rate correctly. Some of the more common errors include under-calculating the overtime owed because the employer failed to include various "extra" types of compensation, such as shift differentials and certain types of bonuses, into the overtime rate.

Step 3: Interaction with the DOL

Once the employer has results from its audit, and if it discovers any violations, the next step is to report the employer's findings to the regional DOL office. The DOL asks that when employers call, they should be prepared to describe the violations they have discovered, which includes the time frame in these violations occurred. They should also

be prepared to identify any affected employees and the amount of back wages the employer believes is owed to each employee.

The DOL's Wage and Hour Division (WHD) then will likely:

1. Request additional information, such as payroll records, job descriptions, and other related information,
2. Make its own findings and provide the employer with a summary of the amount of unpaid wages owed to each affected employee and
3. Provide settlement documents for each employee, which employees may choose to sign if they want to receive payment. Employees who sign the form and accept payment will waive their right to sue for the violations uncovered through the PAID program.

Step 4: Pay all back wages owed

Of course, the employer will be required to pay all the back wages owed to the employees by the end of the next full pay period after receiving the DOL's summary of unpaid wages and then provide proof that the employer did in fact pay these back wages to the Wage and Hour Division of the DOL as soon as possible.

WHAT DOES THIS MEAN FOR HR?

Perhaps the biggest potential pitfall to the PAID program is that there is no guarantee of protection from lawsuits based on the wage and hour problems an employer might voluntarily report to the DOL. Employees are not required to accept this payment of back wages offered to them. They could choose not to sign a waiver and instead take a very official-looking document showing the amount of back wages the employer admittedly owes them to an attorney. If that happens, there is nothing to prevent the employee from suing the organization not only for the amount of back wages owed but also for liquidated damages and attorneys' fees. This type of situation could also bloom into a class action lawsuit depending on the nature and pervasiveness of the violations found.

If any organization is interested in participating in the PAID program, it is best to discuss this with your employment attorney.

Notice: Legal Advice Disclaimer

The purpose of these materials is not to act as legal advice but is intended to provide human resource professionals and their managers with a general overview of some of the more important employment and labor laws affecting their departments. The facts of each instance vary to the point that such a brief overview could not possibly be used in place of the advice of legal counsel.

Also, every situation tends to be factually different depending on the circumstances involved, which requires a specific application of the law.

Additionally, employment and labor laws are in a constant state of change by way of either court decisions or the legislature.

Therefore, whenever such issues arise, the advice of an attorney should be sought.

Scott Warrick, JD, MLHR, CEQC, SHRM-SCP
Scott Warrick Human Resource Consulting, Coaching & Training Services
Scott Warrick Employment Law Services
(614) 738-8317 ♣ scott@scottwarrick.com
www.scottwarrick.com & www.scottwarrickemploymentlaw.com

Scott Warrick, JD, MLHR, CEQC, SHRM-SCP (www.scottwarrick.com & www.scottwarrickemploymentlaw.com) is both a practicing Employment Law Attorney and Human Resource Professional with almost 40 years of hands-on experience. Scott uses his unique background to help organizations get where they want to go, which includes coaching and training managers and employees in his own unique, practical, entertaining and humorous style.

That is why Scott has been described as “The Comedian Trainer.”

[Scott Trains Managers & Employees ON-SITE in over 50 topics](#) ... all of which can be customized **FOR YOU!**

LET SCOTT DESIGN A PROGRAM FOR YOU!

Scott combines the areas of law and human resources to help organizations in “Solving Employee Problems **BEFORE** They Happen.” Scott’s goal is **NOT** to win lawsuits. Instead, Scott’s goal is to **PREVENT THEM** while improving **EMPLOYEE MORALE**.

Scott’s book, **[“Solve Employee Problems Before They Start: Resolving Conflict in the Real World”](#)** is #1 for New Releases on Amazon for Conflict Resolution books!

Scott’s **[“Employment Law Videos”](#)** on the ADA, FMLA, FLSA and Harassment, **[“The Human Resource Professional’s Complete Guide To Federal Employment And Labor Law”](#)** & Scott’s **[“Do It Yourself HR Department”](#)** are favorites for anyone wanting to learn Employment Law and run an HR Department.

Scott has been named one of Business First’s 20 People To Know In HR, CEO Magazine’s 2008 Human Resources “Superstar,” a Nationally Certified Emotional Intelligence Instructor and a SHRM National Diversity Conference Presenter in 2003, 2006, 2007, 2008 and 2012.

Scott has also received the Human Resource Association of Central Ohio’s Linda Kerns Award for Outstanding Creativity in the Field of HR Management and the Ohio State Human Resource Council’s David Prize for Creativity in HR Management.

Scott’s academic background and awards include Capital University College of Law (Class Valedictorian (1st out of 233) and Summa Cum Laude), Master of Labor & Human Resources and B.A. in Organizational Communication from The Ohio State University.

For more information on Scott, just go to www.scottwarrick.com & www.scottwarrickemploymentlaw.com.

