

Daily Journal

Classifieds/Jobs/Office Space : Experts/Services : MCLE : Search : Logout

MONDAY TUESDAY WEDNESDAY THURSDAY TODAY

TODAY'S COLUMNS LIBRARY

Questions and Comments

NEWS RULINGS VERDICTS

Search >>

Previous Next

Bookmark Reprints

This is the property of the Daily Journal Corporation and fully protected by copyright. It is made available only to Daily Journal subscribers for personal, collaborative purposes and may not be distributed, reproduced, modified, stored or transferred without written permission. Please click Request to begin presentation ready copies to distribute to clients or use in commercial marketing materials or for permission to post on a website.

Creating flexibility in California's workplaces

Michael S. Kalt is a partner at Wilson Turner Kosmo LLP in San Diego and is the government affairs director of the California Council for the Society for Human Resource Management (CalSHRM).



Michael Letizia is a principal of Letizia HR Solutions in Stockton and is the state director for CalSHRM.



"Workplace flexibility" is often described as a strategic business imperative. Amongst other things, flexibility allows employees greater work-life balance, assists employers with recruiting, and may reduce traffic congestion and commuting times. For these and other reasons, employers and employees already had ample incentive to discuss flexible work options.

However, San Francisco's Family Friendly Workplace Ordinance, which took effect Jan. 1, suggests discussing workplace flexibility may soon be a legal requirement, not simply a good business practice.

This ordinance codifies an employee's "right to request" flexibility and imposes formal response requirements upon employers. Specifically, it requires employers meet with employees within 21 days of a request for a "flexible working arrangement" or a "predictable working arrangement," and to respond in writing within 21 days of the meeting whether the request is approved or denied. If denied, the employer must explain the "bona fide reasons" for the denial and notify the employee of the right to request reconsideration which, if requested, re-triggers the employer's obligations to meet and provide a further written response.

But the ordinance falls short by not providing the actual ability to be more flexible under California's inflexible labor laws. The fact is, overcommitted employees are not simply seeking another meeting, and human resource managers are not seeking more deadlines for written responses; rather, both are seeking the ability to be flexible without breaking the law.

During this legislative session, some open questions are whether the state Legislature will attempt to implement San Francisco's ordinance state-wide and, if so, whether it will, to paraphrase Bonnie Raitt, "give them something to talk about" during these now-mandatory meetings? Unfortunately, the recent quashing along a party-line vote before an Assembly committee of the Workplace Flexibility Act of 2013 (Assembly Bill 907) suggests the Legislature remains more interested in discussion than provision of workplace flexibility. However, a new year brings new opportunities to actually provide flexibility.

Flexible Workweeks

Employees frequently request a schedule other than the standard five-day, 40-hour workweek. The obvious benefits include working fewer days, thus allowing more time for family and personal pursuits, as well as reduced commuting time and child-care costs. Another benefit is "predictability," since employees know in advance their days off and can schedule familial responsibilities or enroll in education courses to further career opportunities. Such scheduling is often impractical under the current "make up" law (Labor Code Section 513) requiring such time be requested and used in the same workweek.

SPECIAL REPORT

Top Verdicts



Friday, February 14, 2014

U.S. Court of Appeals for the 9th Circuit Concealed carry gun ordinance struck down by 9th Circuit panel

Teeing up the next major gun rights issue for the U.S. Supreme Court, a divided 9th U.S. Circuit Court of Appeals panel on Thursday struck down San Diego County's concealed carry permitting ordinance.

Education

Law schools expanding classes to teach students to pass the bar exam

A large number of law schools now offer students classes in passing the bar exam, some taught by faculty, many run by commercial providers.

Criminal

Holder's call for repeal of ex-convict voting laws hits home

To strip otherwise eligible California citizens of this fundamental right, when they are neither in state prison nor on parole, is unnecessary, unjust and counterproductive. By **Joanna Cuevas Ingram**

Litigation

Justice Department proposes plan to undo merger

In a complex plan, the U.S. government wants to erase all benefit Bazaarvoice Inc. achieved when it bought its largest competitor, even though the merger between the ratings and review companies was completed in 2012.

Discipline

Disciplinary Actions

Here are summaries of lawyer disciplinary actions taken recently by the state Supreme Court or the Bar Court, listing attorney by name, age, city of residence and date of the court's action.

Government

Indigent defenders get \$40 million funding boost

Restored funding will also return CJA panel rates to pre-sequestration levels.

Solo and Small Firms

Small Firm Charms

The four-partner firm Heffernan Seubert & French LLP are all alumni of DLA Piper's East Palo Alto office, where they first forged their close working relationships.

Labor/Employment

Appellate panel sides with county in suit over retiree health care

Retired Orange County employees lacked the evidence to show that a longtime health care

The biggest initial hurdle is California's requirement that overtime be paid daily for work beyond eight hours (Labor Code Section 510). Opponents cite this law as a fundamental worker protection, yet neither federal law nor 47 other states require daily overtime. Indeed, organized labor is often the most vocal opponent of flexible work legislation, including AB 907, while negotiating such flexible schedules for its members.

Opponents also claim flexible schedules are already available under Labor Code Section 511, authorizing so-called "alternative workweek schedules." But the procedural requirements for implementing such schedules are so stringent and the potential penalties so great for even unintentional errors that very few employers (less than 2 percent) enact such schedules.

AB 907 and San Francisco's ordinance pursue similar public policy goals and need not be mutually exclusive. AB 907 would have retained the eight-hour workday generally for nonexempt employees, while making it easier for employees to choose an individual alternative workweek schedule. Daily overtime would remain for all other employees, and even those opting for individualized schedules would receive overtime for work beyond 10 hours in a day or 40 hours in a week. In this regard, AB 907 and the ordinance share similar goals but different approaches: The ordinance mandates a discussion about flexibility, while AB 907 proposes both discussion and the ability for an employee to work an actual flexible schedule.

In this legislative session, hopefully a similar bill balancing daily overtime, but allowing greater flexibility for individualized schedules, will enjoy greater support. To the extent labor is concerned about "employer coercion," perhaps it might withdraw its opposition if such schedules could only be requested by the employee in writing, with such approved requests then being filed with the labor commissioner. This approach, which the other two states requiring daily overtime (Nevada and Alaska) use, would allow employees to obtain the same scheduling benefits as union employees, while ensuring these requests were employee-initiated and occurring within an agreed-upon framework and with some measure of agency oversight.

Compensatory Time Off

Employee's also request compensatory time off - that is, extra time off after working a long day instead of overtime pay. Many seek to build and access a compensatory time off bank instead of depleting vacation time or taking unpaid leave. Compensatory time off has been generally available to federal and public sector employees for decades. However, federal law limits compensatory time off to the public sector - which could create conflict if state law differs - and it is only nominally available in California to some private sector employees. Fortunately, Congress is presently considering the Workplace Families Flexibility Act of 2013, which would largely resolve the conflict between California and federal law. If enacted at the federal level, the state Legislature should analyze this bill to minimize unnecessary conflict.

Job Sharing

"Job sharing" is another frequent request, whereby two employees perform the full range of duties and responsibilities associated with a single position. This is an attractive option for employees who wish to work fewer hours, such as individuals with considerable family commitments or approaching retirement. One potential limitation, however, is that California does not explicitly recognize a part-time exemption to the salary-basis test for exemption purposes. This means that as of July 1, 2014, a private employer may feel it must pay two full-time equivalents for a single position. The Legislature should consider approving prorated salary-basis for the job-sharing context.

Inefficiencies created by job sharing may present another problem in a position requiring five-days, 40-hours a week. This might make job sharing a less attractive option for employers than a system requiring overtime after 40 hours of work in a week or after 10 hours in a day. A minor exemption from daily overtime, perhaps up to 10 hours, might encourage increased job sharing for nonexempt employees.

Location Flexibility

Employees often request various forms of location flexibility. Yet California does not have any statutes or regulations specifically addressing telecommuting for private employers. One frequently raised issue is how to comply with California's myriad laws requiring notices be posted in a conspicuous place. While these laws do not specifically state employers must post required items in a telecommuting employee's home, neither do they provide an exemption for such. An express exemption or language clarifying that employers need only provide telecommuters with a link to electronic versions of required workplace posters would eliminate risk of lawsuits.

The legal uncertainty concerning workers' compensation liability for telecommuting employees similarly makes it less attractive, especially given the employer's general lack of control of an employee's home environment. The Legislature should consider an

benefit qualified as an implied contract between workers and the county, a 9th Circuit panel ruled Thursday.

Law Practice

MoFo grabs Orrick technology specialist in Silicon Valley

Morrison & Foerster LLP has snagged the co-chair of Orrick, Herrington & Sutcliffe LLP's technology transactions and sourcing practice for its Palo Alto office.

Judges and Judiciary

Veteran San Francisco County judge to retire

Charlotte Walter Woolard, a longtime San Francisco County Superior Court judge, said Thursday she is retiring at the end of her term early next year.

Litigation

Lawyers seeking change in bar admission rules lose

A group of attorneys seeking to change the rules for admission to practice law in California were denied relief after a federal judge dismissed the lawsuit.

Mergers & Acquisitions

Dealmakers

A roundup of recent merger and acquisition and financing activity and the lawyers involved.

Alternative Dispute Resolution

Howard C. Hay

Howard Hay has gained a reputation as one of the state's go-to employment law neutrals, lawyers say, because of his intense preparation and extensive experience in the realm.

Law Practice

Winston poaches Bingham partner

Winston & Strawn LLP has grabbed structured finance specialist Daniel Passage from Bingham McCutchen LLP, Winston confirmed Tuesday.

Labor/Employment

Judge certifies HP worker class action

A San Jose federal judge on Thursday granted conditional certification to a class of Hewlett-Packard Co. technology workers who claim they were denied overtime pay.

Creating flexibility in California's workplaces

Will the state Legislature attempt to adopt a state-wide version of San Francisco's Family Friendly Workplace Ordinance this legislative session? By **Michael S. Kalt and Michael Letizia**

Technology & Science

Wake up call for mobile app developers

Mobile applications developers need to have a frank discussion about privacy with their users, and figure out what degree of user collection is tolerable. By **John F. Stephens**

Perspective

Meet the real leaders of the women's suffrage movement

For those accustomed to thinking about the leaders of the women's suffrage movement as prim society ladies, Myra MacPherson's "The Scarlet Sisters" will surely astonish. By **Elaine Elinson**

Managing your dismissive and bully peers

exemption for telecommuters generally, or a more limited exemption covering particular instances (e.g., the coffee shop office).

At its core, workplace flexibility is of mutual interest for employers and employees, and one that can be encouraged with some minor adjustments to California's labor laws. The proposals mentioned above will encourage flexibility while safeguarding employee protections, thus giving employees and employers something to talk about when employees request a meeting about flexibility.

Michael S. Kalt is a partner at Wilson Turner Kosmo LLP in San Diego and is the government affairs director of the California Council for the Society for Human Resource Management (CalSHRM).

Michael Letizia is a principal of Letizia HR Solutions in Stockton and is the state director for CalSHRM.

When it comes to your oppressive peers, there are certain things that you should not do. By **Paul Fisher and Juli Adelman**

Mergers & Acquisitions

**VIDEO: Can shareholders
unscramble common-control
mergers?**



The conclusion reached by an appellate court in a recent case undermines the basis for the enactment of appraisal statutes and ultimately raises more questions than it answers. By **Moshe Kupietzky and Natasha Johnson**

[Previous](#) [Next](#)

[HOME](#) : [MOBILE SITE](#) : [CLASSIFIEDS](#) : [EXPERTS/SERVICES](#) : [MCLE](#) : [DIRECTORIES](#) : [SEARCH](#) : [PRIVACY](#) : [LOGOUT](#)