

**WILSON TURNER KOSMO** LLP  
ATTORNEYS AT LAW

550 WEST "C" STREET, SUITE 1050  
SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA 92101-3532

TELEPHONE  
(619) 236-9600

www.wilsonturnerkosmo.com  
mkalt@wilsonturnerkosmo.com

FACSIMILE  
(619) 236-9669

**LEGISLATIVE SUMMARY**

July was a fairly inactive month as the Legislature enjoyed its summer vacation. However, the Legislature has reconvened and will soon address a number of employment bills, including bills that would:

- Expand California's Equal Pay Act to target race and ethnicity-related wage differentials (SB 1063);
- Require employers to provide double pay for work performed on Thanksgiving (AB 67);
- Expand the prohibitions regarding "immigration-related practices" (SB 1001);
- Prohibit hiring-related inquiries concerning juvenile convictions (AB 1843);
- Preclude salary history from justifying gender-based waged differentials (AB 1676);
- Expand California's heat illness regulations to include indoor employees (SB 1167); and
- Require employers to either provide or make available for inspection policies regarding sexual assault/domestic violence leave rights and an employer's Illness and Injury Prevention Program (AB 2337 and AB 2895).

Looking ahead, the deadline for bills to pass the second legislative chamber is August 31<sup>st</sup>, and Governor Brown will then have until September 30<sup>th</sup> to sign or veto any bills that make it to his desk.

Since the last update, California enacted laws amending the requirement to list "hours worked" on itemized wage statements for certain employees (AB 2535), and authorizing the DFEH to investigate human trafficking violations (AB 1684). The requirement to use only registered foreign labor contractors from a 2014 law (SB 477) also took effect on July 1, 2016. At the municipal level, as expected, the Mayor of San Diego signed the amendments regarding San Diego's Paid Sick Leave Ordinance.

Discussed below are the key employment bills of potential general application that have already been enacted or have taken effect in 2016, followed by the bills that remain pending.

## **NEW LAWS ALREADY ENACTED**

### **San Diego's Minimum Wage and Paid Sick Leave Ordinance is Now in Effect, and the Related Implementing Ordinance Will be Formally Effective September 2, 2016**

San Diego's [Proposition I](#)—formally the “Referendum of Ordinance Regarding Earned Sick Leave and Minimum Wage” (the Ordinance)—received over 63 percent of the votes on the ballot measure on June 7, 2016. To give some history, the City Council had previously approved the Ordinance on August 18, 2014, after which a referendum petition qualified the measure for the ballot, and the Council subsequently voted to place it on the ballot in 2016.

Since San Diego voters passed the measure, the City passed and the Mayor approved an updated [Implementing Ordinance](#) modifying substantive portions of the new rule, as discussed below. Based on the timing of the Mayor's approval, this Ordinance will be formally effective on September 2, 2016. However, the City Attorney's Office has stated that employers acting under the Implementing Ordinance early will not suffer negative consequences.

The original [Ordinance](#) definitions, as well as the use and eligibility sections within the sick leave portion of the law remain largely unchanged, as does the \$10.50 minimum wage increase and the mandatory forty (40) hours of paid sick leave for employees, both of which were effective as of July 11, 2016. What has changed are the ways in which employers may implement sick leave policies, the rate at which sick leave must be paid out, the posting and notice deadlines, as well as the way in which the City plans on enforcing these new rules, as discussed below.

#### Who is Affected?

The Ordinance defines employers and employees broadly.

Employers are defined as any “person or persons, including associations, organization, partnerships, business trusts, limited liability companies, or corporations, who exercise control over the wages, hours, or working conditions of any employee, engage an employee, or permit an employee to work.” Note, a narrow exception to this definition includes aged, blind, or disabled people who receive in-home supportive services.

Eligible employees are defined as “any person who, in one or more calendar weeks of the year, performs at least two hours of work within the geographic boundaries of the City for an employer, and who qualifies for the payment of minimum wage under the State of California minimum wage law.” To determine if an employer is within the geographic boundaries of the city, visit [here](#).

#### San Diego's New Minimum Wage

Proposition I increases the current minimum wage from \$10 per hour to \$10.50 per hour. Looking forward, starting January 1, 2017, the minimum wage will become \$11.50 in the

City of San Diego, and starting January 1, 2019, the minimum wage will increase “by an amount corresponding to the prior year’s increase, if any, in the cost of living, as defined by the Consumer Price Index.”

Unlike the California minimum wage, these wage rates will not affect the exemption salary tests in California. Rather, the minimum wage rate used to calculate this amount must be the state minimum wage and not municipal.

#### San Diego’s New Sick Leave Entitlement

California law currently requires employees who work in California for 30 or more days within a year from the beginning of employment to be entitled to use 3 days or 24 hours of sick leave per year, whichever is greater, with a possible cap and carry-over of that time at 48 hours.

San Diego’s Ordinance requires these same employees, working within the boundaries of the City of San Diego (as discussed above), must receive up to five days or 40 hours of sick leave per year.

Also in line with the California law, the San Diego Ordinance states that sick leave must begin to accrue when employment starts, but employers need not allow employees to use it until the employee’s 90th day of employment.

Leave under the new Ordinance may be used under the following circumstances:

- (1) if an employee is physically or mentally unable to work due to illness, injury, or a medical condition;
- (2) for “Safe Time” defined as time away from work necessary to handle certain matters related to domestic violence, sexual assault, or stalking;
- (3) for medical appointments;
- (4) to care for or assist “certain family members” with an illness, injury, or medical injury; and
- (5) a place of business is closed by order of a public official due to a Public Health Emergency, or an employee is providing care or assistance to a child, whose school or child care provider is closed by order of a public official due to a Public Health Emergency.

Please note, the ability to use Paid Sick Leave for school/child-care-related closures and emergencies differs from the California law.

Alternative Accrual Methods, Including “Frontloading,” and a PTO Exception are Now Appropriate

As with the California law, the default accrual rule under the San Diego Ordinance is that employees must receive one hour of paid sick leave for every thirty hours worked.

While the San Diego Ordinance initially did not recognize any alternative accrual methods, the Implementation Ordinance amends this and allows “lump sum” or “frontloading” method that is allowed for under the general California sick leave law.

Section 39.0105(b)-(c) of the Amended Ordinance now states:

- (b) Employers must provide an Employee with one hour of Earned Sick Leave for every 30 hours worked by the Employee within the geographic boundaries of the City, but Employers are not required to provide an Employee with Earned Sick Leave in less than one-hour increments for a fraction of an hour worked. Employers may cap an Employee’s total accrual of Earned Sick Leave at 80 hours.
- (c) An Employer may satisfy the accrual and carry-over provisions of this section if no less than 40 hours of Earned Sick Leave are awarded to an Employee at the beginning of each Benefit Year for use in accordance with this Division, regardless of the Employee’s status as full-time, part-time, or temporary.

Employers utilizing the lump sum or frontloading method may not differentiate between classes of employees (e.g., part-time, full-time, temporary, etc.) with regard to the amount they bank at the beginning of the benefit year, as defined within the Ordinance.

Unlike the California sick leave law, the San Diego Ordinance also initially did not make clear that employers providing so-called “personal time off” (PTO) plans would not be required to provide additional sick leave. Responding to concerns this omission would create conflict with the state law and discourage PTO plans, Section 39.0105(g) of the Amended Ordinance specifies:

- (g) An Employer who provides an Employee with an amount of paid leave, including paid time off, paid vacation, or paid personal days sufficient to meet the requirements of this section, and who allows this paid leave to be used for the same purposes and under the same conditions as the Earned Sick Leave required by this Division, is not required to provide additional Earned Sick Leave to the Employee.

As a reminder, the San Diego Ordinance allows sick leave to be used for slightly different purposes than the state law, so employers wishing to rely upon this PTO exception from the San Diego Ordinance should compare their plan to ensure it allows PTO to be used “for the same purposes and under the same conditions” as the San Diego Ordinance.

While the San Diego Ordinance initially did not allow employers to cap sick leave accrual, the amendments allow employers to cap accrual at 80 sick leave hours, the theory being that an employee may accrue enough to use the full amount in one year, and have enough ready to carry-over to the next year and begin using immediately. (As

reminder, under the California law, employees may accrue up to 48 hours, or double the 24 hours of usage allowed).

### Sick Leave Paid at Employee's Regular Rate of Pay

Similar to the California sick leave law, the rate of pay at which employers are charged with paying out sick leave is at the employee's regular rate of pay, as opposed to their base rate of pay. For employers with a non-exempt workforce who utilize different rates of pay, commissions, structured bonus plans, or any other wage that may require adjustment of their overtime rate, must be cognizant of this and revise their payment practices for sick leave or paid time off accordingly.

### Updated Posting and Notice Deadlines

Under the Implementing Ordinance, the City is responsible for providing bulletin and notices, which can now be found [here](#). These include a bulletin announcing the adjusted minimum wage for the upcoming year and a notice for employers to post in the workplace informing employees of the minimum wage and sick leave entitlement.

Employers are charged with disseminating this notice, which must include the employer's name, contact information, and information on how the employer satisfies the requirements under the Ordinance, to all employees by October 1, 2016. This differs slightly from the California sick leave law, which requires notice via the Wage Theft Prevention Act, and which is only required for non-exempt employees. There is nothing within the Ordinance which requires acknowledgment or signature of this notice. However, employers are urged to keep a record of this for purposes of potential audits by the City's Enforcement Office, as defined within the Ordinance.

### Recordkeeping Requirements and Enforcement

Employers are required to create contemporaneous records documenting their employees' wages paid and accrual and use of sick leave. Employers are already required to provide such a record on their employees' wage statements under the general California sick leave law. Under the City's Ordinance, employers must also "allow Enforcement Official[s] reasonable access to these records in furtherance of an investigation conducted" pursuant to the Ordinance.

The lengthiest and most detailed update to the Ordinance is within section 39.0113, which outlines the authority and duties of the City's newly developed Enforcement Office, including investigatory rights, access rights, the ability to promulgate regulations, and implementation of the complaint process.

### The Take Away

Employers are urged to review and update their sick leave and/or paid time off policies and practices to ensure they are compliant, raise the minimum wage of anyone working within the City of San Diego to at least \$10.50 per hour, watch for the notice and posting

requirements from the City, and maintain appropriate records as discussed within the Ordinance.

For more information on California's state-wide sick leave law, see Wilson Turner Kosmo's 2015 Special Alert here: [California Amends Recently-Enacted Paid Sick Leave Law, Effective Immediately](#). You may also review the City's [Frequently Asked Questions](#), as well as updates regarding the Minimum Wage and Sick Leave Ordinance, [here](#).

**Reminder: Phase I of Los Angeles' Paid Sick Leave Law and Minimum Wage Increase Took Effect July 1<sup>st</sup>**

Somewhat similar to the San Diego and California minimum wage increases, beginning July 1, 2016, the minimum wage for Los Angeles employers with more than 25 employees increased to \$10.50, and will continue to increase each July 1<sup>st</sup>, reaching \$15.00 on July 1, 2020. For employers with 25 or fewer employees the minimum wage will increase in a similar format, starting to \$10.50 on July 1, 2017 and reaching \$15.00 on July 1, 2021.

On July 1, 2016, the Los Angeles Paid Sick law took effect for employers with more than 25 employees, and the law will take effect for employers with 25 or fewer employees on July 1, 2017. While the Los Angeles version more closely tracks the California version than the San Diego version, there are several key differences, including that employees are entitled to use six days of paid sick leave and accrue up to 72 hours (compared to three days and 48 hours respectively), and there is no exemption for collective-bargaining level employees.

The City of Los Angeles has issued the required poster providing a general overview of the minimum wage increase and sick leave law at:

[http://wagesla.lacity.org/sites/g/files/wph471/f/MW%20Sck%20Time%20poster\\_0.pdf](http://wagesla.lacity.org/sites/g/files/wph471/f/MW%20Sck%20Time%20poster_0.pdf)

**California's Minimum Wage to Increase to \$15.00 by 2022 (SB 3)**

To preclude votes on two union-backed statewide initiatives regarding the minimum wage, Governor Jerry Brown and his Democratic caucus introduced, quickly passed and enacted this law increasing California's minimum wage to \$15.00 an hour by 2022. For employers with more than 25 employees, the minimum wage will increase according to the following schedule:

<b>Increase Date</b>	<b>New Rate</b>	<b>New Salary Threshold</b>
January 1, 2017	\$10.50	\$43,680
January 1, 2018	\$11.00	\$45,760
January 1, 2019	\$12.00	\$49,920
January 1, 2020	\$13.00	\$54,080
January 1, 2021	\$14.00	\$58,240
January 1, 2022	\$15.00	\$62,400

For employers with 25 or fewer employees, the minimum wage will increase on a slightly slower schedule, as follows:

<b>Increase Date</b>	<b>New Rate</b>	<b>New Salary Threshold</b>
January 1, 2018	\$10.50	\$43,680
January 1, 2019	\$11.00	\$45,760
January 1, 2020	\$12.00	\$49,920
January 1, 2021	\$13.00	\$54,080
January 1, 2022	\$14.00	\$58,240
January 1, 2023	\$15.00	\$62,400

This new law also contemplates annual subsequent increases after the final scheduled increase, generally tied to consumer inflation, which the Director of Finance will determine by August 1<sup>st</sup> of each year with the increase, rounded to the nearest ten cents, to become effective the following January 1<sup>st</sup>. Once this formula is applied, the minimum wage may increase or stay the same, but it will not decrease.

Beginning in July 2017, the Director of Finance will be required to determine whether economic conditions can support the next scheduled minimum wage increase and, if not, the Governor would have the authority through a proclamation to temporarily suspend the next increase. The Governor would not be permitted to temporarily suspend scheduled minimum wage increases more than two times, and if the Governor does temporarily suspend a scheduled minimum wage increase, all remaining scheduled increases shall be postponed by an additional year.

As noted above, these increases to the hourly minimum wage will also impact the salary level needed for exempt employee purposes, with the salary level ultimately increasing to \$62,400 when the \$15.00 level is reached in 2022.

Lastly, this new law amends Labor Code section 245.5 to remove the exemption from California's Paid Sick Leave requirements for in-home supportive service employees. Accordingly, beginning on July 1, 2018, in-home supportive service employee who work 30 or more days in California within a year from commencement of employment will be entitled to accrue and use paid sick leave, albeit on a slightly different schedule enumerated in new subsection (e) to Labor Code section 246.

### **“Foreign Labor Contractor” Requirement Update (SB 477)**

As a reminder, in 2014, California enacted SB 477 to strengthen its regulations regarding “foreign labor contractors” who recruit foreign workers to relocate to California. For purposes of SB 477, “foreign labor contracting activity” is defined as “recruiting or soliciting for compensation a foreign worker who resides outside of the United States in furtherance of that worker’s employment in California, including when that activity occurs wholly outside the United States.” However, foreign labor contracting for purposes of SB 477 does not include recruiting activities undertaken directly by the employer to locate workers for the employer’s own use, and is also limited to the

recruitment of non-agricultural employees (since farm labor contractors are subject to other regulations).

In light of SB 477's focus on unscrupulous traffickers, by July 1, 2016 all foreign labor contractors were required to register with the Labor Commissioner. By August 1, 2016, the Labor Commissioner was required to post on its website the names of all registered foreign labor contractors, as well as a list of the labor contractors who were denied renewal or registration.

Although this law focuses on foreign labor contractors rather than employers, it has several implications for employers. First, new Business and Professions Code section 9998.2(c) precludes employers from knowingly entering into an agreement for the services of an unregistered foreign labor contractor. While employers are not subject to these registration requirements for their direct recruitment efforts, and SB 477 specifically exempts from joint and several liability those employers who use a registered foreign labor contractor, this liability exemption for the contractor's tortious activities only applies if the employer works with a registered foreign labor contractor.

Second, new Business and Professions Code section 9998.2(a) requires by July 1, 2016, an employer using the services of a foreign labor contractor to disclose to the Labor Commissioner the contact information of the employer's designated person to work with the foreign labor contractor, and submit a declaration consenting to jurisdiction if the employer's contact person has left the jurisdiction or is unavailable.

Lastly, the employer must be mindful that Business and Professions Code section 9998.6 precludes any person from discriminating or retaliating against a foreign worker or their family members because they have exercised any rights under this new law.

### **PAGA Amendments**

As part of the 2016-2017 Fiscal Year Budget Change Proposal, the Governor passed several amendments to PAGA—purportedly intended to reduce litigation costs for employers and improve outcomes for employees. The LWDA states on its website that the following procedural changes to PAGA are in effect as of June 27, 2016.

- A \$75 filing fee is required with new PAGA claim notices and any employer responses to an initial claim (including any employer cure). This fee is waivable for those qualified as *in forma pauperis*.
- PAGA claim notices must now be filed online to the LWDA, with written notice (certified mail) to the employer. Similarly, employer cure notices and/ or employer responses to a PAGA claim must also be filed online, with a copy sent to the aggrieved employee by certified mail.
- The LWDA's timeframe to review notices extends to 60 days. (Formerly 30 days.)



- Alleged aggrieved employees filing in court must provide a file-stamped copy of their PAGA Complaint to the LWDA (for any case filed on or after July 1, 2016).
- Court approval is required for any settlement of a PAGA civil action, whether or not the settlement includes an award of PAGA penalties.
- Proposed PAGA settlements are to be submitted to the LWDA at the same time they are submitted to the court.
- A copy of any court judgment, and any other order that awards or denies PAGA penalties, must be provided to the LWDA.

These are essentially procedural changes and less-impactful than some of the broader, more substantive changes contained in the original proposal. For example, the original proposed amendments included an amnesty program for invalidated “commonplace industry practices” and a provision allowing the LWDA to object-to or comment-on proposed PAGA settlements. Nonetheless, the actual amendments may be a precursor to more sweeping reform, and the legislative environment surrounding PAGA actions deserves close attention.

### **Increased Paid Family Leave Benefits (AB 908)**

Under California’s family temporary disability insurance program, employees may receive up to 6 weeks of wage replacement benefits when taking time off work to care for specified persons (e.g., child, spouse, parent, etc.) or to bond with a minor child within one year of the birth or placement of the child in connection with foster care or adoption. Citing a concern that the relatively low wage replacement rate dissuaded employees from using this benefit, this newly-enacted law amends Insurance Code section 3301 to increase the wage replacement benefits. Specifically, it modifies the formula for calculating these benefits to ensure a minimum weekly benefit of \$50, and to increase the wage replacement rate from the current 55% to 70% for most low-wage workers, and to 60% for higher wage earners.

Beginning January 1, 2017, this bill also removes the 7-day waiting period for these family leave benefits.

**Status:** This bill has already been signed by Governor Brown and takes effect January 1, 2017.

### **New Workplace Smoking Prohibitions Take Effect June 9<sup>th</sup> (ABx2 6 and SBx2 6)**

Labor Code section 6404.5 prohibits smoking of tobacco products inside an enclosed space at a place of employment and enumerates fines for violations of these protections. ABx2 6 amends this section to use the new definition of “smoking” (contained in amended Business and Professions Code section 22950.5) that includes “the use of an electronic smoking device that creates an aerosol or vapor, in any manner or in any form,

or the use of any oral smoking device for the purpose of circumventing the prohibition of smoking.”

SBx2 6 also expands these prohibitions to include so-called “owner-operated businesses” (i.e., those with no employees and the owner-operator is the only employee). It eliminates most of the specified exemptions that permit smoking in certain work environments, such as hotel lobbies, bars and taverns, banquet rooms, warehouse facilities, and employee break rooms.

**Status:** Governor Jerry Brown has already signed these bills and because of their unique procedural history and subject matter, they took effect June 9, 2016, rather than January 1, 2017.

### **San Francisco Enacts Paid Parental Leave Ordinance**

San Francisco recently enacted its Paid Parental Leave Ordinance (Ordinance no. 160065), which will require beginning on January 1, 2017, employers with 50 or more employees to pay to an employee on “parental leave” (as defined) the difference (so-called “supplemental compensation”) between their gross weekly wage and the Paid Family Leave Benefits paid from the state of California under its Paid Family Leave program. (Employers with 35 or more employees would need to make such payments beginning July 1, 2017, and employers with 20 or more employees would need to make such payments beginning January 1, 2018).

Please note also, in contrast with the pending bill that would require employers to provide unpaid parental leave to employees who worked 1,250 hours in the preceding 12 months (SB 1166 [discussed below]), the San Francisco Ordinance applies to any employee who (1) began employment with the “Covered Employer” (as defined) at least 180 days prior to the leave period; (b) performs at least eight hours of work per week for the employer in San Francisco; (c) at least 40% of those total weekly hours worked for the employer are in San Francisco; and (d) who is eligible to receive paid family leave compensation under the California Paid Family Leave law for the purpose of bonding with a new child.

As noted, the Ordinance requires the “Covered Employer” to provide “supplemental compensation” to an employee on leave representing the difference between the amount paid from the California Paid Family Leave fund and the employee’s “gross weekly wage.” Where the employee has multiple Covered Employers, this supplemental compensation can be apportioned between or among the employers based on the percentage of the employee’s gross weekly wages received from each employer. However, in cases where an employee works for a Covered employer and a non-Covered Employer, the Covered Employer is responsible only for its percentage of the employee’s total gross weekly wages.

The Ordinance also notes that an employer’s Supplemental Compensation obligation may also be proportionately capped by reference to the State maximum weekly benefit amount, depending on income levels.

As with many recent statutes and ordinances, this Ordinance requires the employer to post a poster to be developed by the San Francisco Office of Labor Standards Enforcement, it requires the employer to retain “Supplemental Compensation” records for three years; it prohibits retaliation, and authorizes agency enforcement.

More information about the San Francisco Ordinance can be found on the San Francisco’s Office of Labor Standards Enforcement website ([sfgov.org/olse](http://sfgov.org/olse)) or at [sfgov.org/olse/paid-parental-leave-ordinance](http://sfgov.org/olse/paid-parental-leave-ordinance)).

### **No Duty to Track “Hours Worked” on Itemized Wage Statements for Exempt Employees (AB 2535)**

While Labor Code section 226 requires employers to provide written wage statements containing specifically-enumerated information, including identifying the total hours worked, it contains an exception from the reporting the total hours worked for employees who are paid solely on salary and are exempt from overtime. Responding to concerns that there are many employees who are exempt from overtime, in which case employers may not track hours worked, but whose compensation is not “solely based on a salary” (e.g., salespersons paid on commission, high-ranking executives partially compensated with stock options, etc.), this law amends section 226 to expand this exception.

Specifically, in addition to the current language exempting tracking hours for those compensated solely on salary, new subsection (j) eliminates the need to show hours worked for employees exempt from minimum wage and overtime under a specified exemption for: (a) executive, administrative, or professional employees; (b) the “outside sales” exception; (c) salaried computer professionals; (d) parents, spouses, children, or legally-adopted children of the employer provided in applicable orders of the IWC; (e) directors, staff, and participants of a live-in alternative to incarceration rehabilitation program for substance abuse; (f) crew members employed on commercial passenger fishing boats; and (g) participants in national service programs.

### **Increased Local Enforcement to Combat Wage Theft (SB 1342)**

Citing concerns about the continued prevalence of wage theft, especially for lower income workers, this law adds new Government Code section 53060.4 to authorize city or county legislative bodies to delegate subpoena-issuing authority for enforcing local laws or ordinances, including local wage laws, to officials or department heads.

### **New Temporary Pay Rules Regarding Security Guards (AB 1311)**

Labor Code section 201.3 sets forth specific rules regarding wages for temporary service employers, including generally requiring such employees be paid weekly and not later than the regular payday of the following “calendar” week. Responding to a recent court decision regarding security guards, this law enacts new subsection (b)(1)(B) and creates a new industry-specific rule for security guards employed by temporary service providers since that industry generally uses a different payday than other industries. Under this new rule, registered security guards working for temporary service employers must be

paid weekly, regardless of when the assignment ends, and must be paid no later than the regular payday of the following “workweek” (rather than “calendar week” for other industries). This law was enacted on an urgency basis and is immediately effective.

### **DFEH Authorized to Investigate and Prosecute Human Trafficking Complaints (AB 1684)**

Since 2005, Penal Code section 236.1 and Civil Code section 52.5 have authorized human trafficking victims to pursue civil and criminal claims against traffickers. However, citing a concern these remedies are rarely utilized, this law amends Government Code section 12930 to authorize the DFEH to receive, investigate, conciliate, mediate and prosecute human trafficking complaints on behalf of a human trafficking victim. The law further provides that any damages recovered will belong to the victim but costs and attorney’s fees awarded in such action will belong to the DFEH. This law unanimously passed the Legislature without opposition.

### **PENDING BILLS**

#### **Double Pay on Thanksgiving (AB 67)**

Entitled the Double Pay on the Holiday Act of 2016, this bill would add Labor Code section 511.5 to require certain large employers (with more than 500 employees) to pay non-exempt employees twice their regular rate of pay for working on Thanksgiving. Unlike last year’s version which would have applied to almost all employers, this law would only apply to employees working in “retail store” or “grocery store” establishments, and would not apply to “retail food facilities” as defined in Health and Safety Code section 113789. “Retail store establishments” would be defined as those having a physical store within the state with more than 50 percent of its revenue generated from merchandise subject to the state’s sales and use tax, but specifically would not include stores located in a hotel, amusement park, movie theater or motor vehicle dealers. “Grocery store establishments” would be defined as those having a physical store within the state that sells primarily household foodstuffs for offsite consumption.

This requirement would only apply to non-exempt employees, and would not apply to employees covered by a collective bargaining agreement that expressly provides for the wages, hours of work, and working conditions of employees, and expressly provides for holiday premium pay, premium wage rates for overtime pay, and a regular rate of pay of not less than 30 percent above the state minimum wage.

*Status:* This bill failed passage last year, but narrowly passed the Assembly despite bi-partisan opposition. It is passed the Senate’s Labor and Industrial Relations Committee and is pending in the Appropriations Committee.

#### **Equal Pay Regardless of Race or Ethnicity (SB 1063)**

Following up on last year's amendments to California's Equal Pay Act regarding gender-based wage differentials (SB 358), the Wage Equality Act of 2016 would enact nearly identical language to preclude wage differentials based on race or ethnicity. Specifically, it would amend Labor Code section 1197.5 to prohibit employers from paying an employee at wage rates less than the rates paid to employees of another race or ethnicity for substantially similar work when viewed as a composite of skill, effort, and responsibility and performed under similar working conditions.

As with gender, the employer would bear the burden to demonstrate that the wage differential is based upon one or more of the following factors: (a) a seniority system; (b) a merit system; (c) a system that measures earnings by quantity or quality of production; or (d) a bona fide factor other than race or ethnicity, such as education, training, or experience. As with the "bona fide factor" exception following SB 358's enactment, the employer would be required to demonstrate that the factor is not derived from a race or ethnicity-based differential, is job-related to the position in question, and is consistent with a business necessity (i.e., an overriding legitimate business purpose that cannot be achieved through an alternative business practice). The employer would be required to demonstrate that each factor relied upon is applied reasonably and the one or more factors relied upon account for the entire wage differential.

Lastly, because SB 1163 amends section 1197.5 generally, it would also prohibit employers from discriminating against employees who report or assist with concerns about race/ethnicity-based wage differentials, it would provide the same enforcement mechanisms, and it would incorporate its protections for employees to disclose, inquire, or discuss wages.

**Status:** This bill passed the Senate on a party-line vote, and has passed the Assembly's Labor and Employment Committee and is pending in the Appropriations Committee.

### **Equal Pay Certifications for Certain State Contractors (AB 1890)**

Entitled the Equal Pay for Equal Work Act of 2016, this bill would amend Government Code section 12990 which presently identifies criteria for employers who wish to become a contractor for public works, including agreeing to California's non-discrimination laws and submitting a non-discrimination program to the Department of Fair Employment and Housing (DFEH) for approval and certification. For instance, while California presently states the DFEH "may require" a non-discrimination plan to be submitted, this bill would require employers with more than 100 employees in the state and a contract amounting to more than \$50,000 to submit its non-discrimination program and to submit periodic reports, no more than annually on a schedule to be determined by the department, of its compliance with this program. Employers with less than 100 employees in the state or a contract that amounts to less than \$50,000 may also be required to submit a non-discrimination program and, if so required, to comply with the same requirements applicable to employers with more than 100 employees in the state.

A non-discrimination program would need to include policies and procedures designed to ensure equal employment opportunities for applicants and employees, a description of

employment selection procedures, and a workforce analysis. This workforce analysis would need to include: (a) the total number of workers within a specified job category identified by race or national origin, and sex; (b) the total wages required to be reported on a W-2 for all workers within that job category identified by race, ethnicity, and sex; and (c) the total hours worked on an annual basis for all workers in a specific job category identified by race, ethnicity, and sex. Exempt employees would be presumed to work 40 hours a week and part-time employees would be presumed to work 20 hours a week, unless the employers utilizes a different standard number of hours per week for exempt employees, in which case the employer shall report total hours worked on an annual basis by those employees based on that standard number.

These proposed reporting changes appear similar to the August 2014 federal Department of Labor OFCCP's Notice of Proposed Rulemaking to require covered federal contractors and subcontractors with more than 100 employees to submit an annual equal pay report on employee compensation. As a reminder, the federal Equal Employment and Opportunity Commissioner is presently considering proposed changes to its EEO-1 Report, which would apply to all employers with more than 100 employees (not just federal contractors) and would require the submission of payroll data broken down by race/ethnicity, not just gender.

**Status:** This bill passed the Assembly and has passed the Senate's Government Organization Committee and is pending in the Senate's Appropriations Committee. Governor Brown vetoed a very similar bill (AB 1354) in 2015.

### **“Immigration-Related Practices” Protections Expanded (SB 1001)**

California has made immigration-related abuses a legislative priority, including last year's bill enacting a new \$10,000 penalty for E-Verify violations (AB 622), the 2014 amendment to FEHA prohibiting discrimination against drivers licenses issued to undocumented workers (AB 1660), and the 2013 bills prohibiting retaliation for “immigration-related practices” (AB 263 and SB 666). This bill would add new Labor Code section 1019.1 to broaden the protections from “unfair immigration-related practices” beyond the retaliation context and extend them to any employee or applicant regardless of whether they have made a complaint.

This bill would adopt the definition of “unfair immigration-related practice” currently contained in Labor Code section 1019, which includes (a) requesting more or different documents than required under federal law to verify eligibility or refusing to accept reasonably genuine documents; (b) using the federal E-Verify system to check the employment authorization status of an employee or an applicant at a time or in a manner not authorized by federal law; (c) threatening to file or the filing of a false police or government agency report; or (d) threatening to contact or contacting immigration authorities.

New section 1019.1 would deem it unlawful to engage in, or to direct another to engage in, an “unfair immigration-related practice” against an employee or applicant. It would also deem it unlawful for an employer or their agent to reinvestigate or re-verify an

incumbent employee's authorization to work using an unfair immigration-related practice. In effect, while federal immigration laws already prohibit documentation abuses by employers, this bill would provide a state remedy intended to be less cumbersome.

Lastly, the bill's author has expressed concern that immigrant workers who have been provided temporary legal status and the ability to apply for work authorization under President Obama's Executive Orders, including the Deferred Action for Parents of Americans of United States Citizens (DAPA) and the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA), may be subject to abuse. Accordingly, this bill would deem it unlawful for an employer or their agent to discriminate against an applicant or an employee with authorization to work based upon the specific status, or term of status that accompanies the authorization to work.

This bill would also authorize an employee or applicant to bring a civil action for equitable relief and any applicable damages or penalties, plus reasonable attorneys' fees and costs (including expert witness costs) for any violations.

**Status:** This bill passed the Senate with some bi-partisan support and has passed the Assembly's Labor and Employment and Judiciary Committees. It is presently pending in the Assembly's Appropriations Committee and passage appears likely.

### **Prohibition on Inquiring About Juvenile Court Actions (AB 1843)**

Consistent with the "ban the box" trend advancing nationwide, Labor Code section 432.7 prohibits employers from requesting applicants to disclose, or from using as a factor in determining employment conditions, information concerning an arrest or detention that did not result in a conviction, or information concerning a referral to or participation in a pre- or post-trial diversion program. Since 2014 (SB 530), California employers have also generally been prohibited from inquiring about or using information related to a conviction that has been judicially dismissed or ordered sealed.

This bill would amend Labor Code section 432.7 to provide similar protection related to juvenile-related arrests as it currently provides for adult criminal histories. Specifically, new subsection (a)(2) would preclude employers from requiring applicants to disclose, verbally or in writing, or from utilizing as a condition of employment, information concerning an arrest, detention, processing, diversion, supervision, adjudication or court disposition that occurred while the person was subject to the process and jurisdiction of juvenile court law.

New subsection (a)(3) would further provide that "conviction," for both subsections (a)(1) dealing with adults and (a)(2) dealing with juvenile courts, shall not include any adjudication by a juvenile court or any other court or action taken with respect to a person who is under the process and jurisdiction of juvenile court law.

*Status:* This bill has passed the Assembly, and has passed the Senate’s Labor and Industrial Relations Committee, and is pending in the Senate’s Appropriations Committee. It does not appear meaningfully opposed.

**Salary History by Itself not a Bona Fide Factor Justifying Gender-Based Wage Differential (AB 1676)**

In 2015, California enacted SB 358, substantially revising its Equal Pay Act protections, including materially revising the standard when attempting to justify a gender-related wage differential. Citing a concern that salary history potentially institutionalizes prior discriminatory pay practices, this bill originally proposed to add new Labor Code section 432.3 to prohibit any employer from seeking salary history information about an applicant for employment.

However, facing substantial opposition and since Governor Brown had vetoed a very similar bill in 2015 (AB 1017), this bill has recently been materially amended. Specifically, rather than creating a new Labor Code provision prohibiting salary history discussions, this bill would instead amend California’s Equal Pay Act (Labor Code section 1197.5) to provide that “prior salary shall not, by itself justify any disparity in compensation.”

*Status:* This bill passed the Assembly on a party-line vote, but following amendment it passed the Senate Judiciary unanimously and is pending in the Appropriations Committee. If it passes Appropriations, it will return to the Assembly for concurrence in the Senate amendments, which looks increasingly likely.

**Employers to Provide New Hires with Written Information about Time-Off Related to Sexual Assault, Domestic Violence or Stalking (AB 2337)**

Labor Code section 230.1 prohibits employers with more than 25 employees from discriminating or retaliating against employees who are victims of domestic violence, sexual assault, or stalking from taking time off from work for specified purposes to address the domestic violence, sexual assault, or stalking. This bill would add new subsection (h) to require employers to provide written information regarding these rights under section 230.1 and rights under Labor Code section 230, subsections (c), (e) and (f) prohibiting retaliation and requiring employers to reasonably accommodate victims of domestic violence, sexual assault or stalking. Employers will be required to provide this written information to new employees upon hire and to other employees upon request.

The bill also requires the Labor Commissioner, by July 1, 2017, to develop a form employers could use and to post it on its website, and specifies that an employer need not comply with these notice requirements until the Labor Commissioner posts the form. Alternatively, employer’s may develop and use its own notice provided it is “substantially similar in content and clarity” to the Labor Commissioner’s form.



**Status:** This bill unanimously passed the Assembly, and has passed the Senate's Labor and Industrial Relations and Judiciary Committees, and is pending in the Senate Appropriations Committee. It does not appear meaningfully opposed.

### **Illness and Injury Prevention Program Disclosures (AB 2895)**

The California Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1973 establishes safety responsibilities for employers and employees and, amongst other things, requires every employer to establish and maintain an effective illness and injury prevention program (IIPP). This IIPP must be in writing, except in certain circumstances, and must contain certain statutorily-enumerated items such as identifying the person responsible for the program, a training program, and specification of compliance and reporting methods.

Responding to concerns that many employees, particularly non-English speaking employees, are unaware of an employer's IIPP, this bill would amend Labor Code section 6417 and, beginning July 1, 2017, impose new disclosure requirements regarding these IIPPs. For instance, new subsection (e)(1) would require employers to maintain an up-to-date copy of the written injury prevention program at each worksite where three or more employees worked. New subsection (e)(2) would require the employer, beginning July 1, 2017, to inform each employee and each new hire in a language understood by the employee of the availability of the IIPP at the worksite, and of the employee's right to inspect and receive a copy of it.

If an employer receives a written request for a copy of the IIPP from a current employee or their authorized representative, the employer would be required to provide a copy at no cost within five business days, unless it can demonstrate impossibility of performance unrelated to a violation of section 6417's recordkeeping requirements. As with other statutes allowing employees to submit written inspection requests, the employer would be able to designate to whom such requests shall be made.

These copies are to be provided in English unless a majority of the employees at the worksite do not speak English, in which case the employer must provide the copies in the language spoken by the majority of the employees at the worksite. If the records exceed 50 pages, the employer must provide a summary addressing those items required by section 6417 in English or the language spoken by the majority of the worksite's employees.

Employees would be entitled to recover injunctive relief from the employer for failure to comply with the employee's written demand for compliance, unless the DLSE has cited the employer for failing to comply before the employee attempts to obtain injunctive relief.

**Status:** This bill narrowly passed the Assembly, and has passed the Senate's Labor and Industrial Relations Committee and is pending in the Appropriations Committee.

### **Heat Illness Prevention Regulations for Indoor Employees (SB 1167)**

Since 2006, California's Division of Occupational Safety and Health (DOSH) has adopted and enforced regulations establishing a heat illness prevention standard for outdoor workers. This bill would require DOSH, by July 1, 2018, to propose for adoption a heat illness and injury prevention standard applicable to indoor workers that provides equal or greater protection than those for outdoor workers. The DOSH would have the authority to propose high heat provisions limited only to certain industry sectors.

As a reminder, the Division of Occupational Safety and Health has previously produced a flyer entitled "Cal/OSHA Heat Illness Prevention for Indoor Working Environments" which focuses on five key areas of prevention: a written IIPP; frequent drinking of water; rest breaks; acclimation and weather monitoring; and emergency preparedness.

**Status:** This bill passed the Senate along a party-line vote, and has passed the Assembly's Labor and Employment Committee and is pending in the Appropriations Committee. The Legislature has previously passed two similar bills (AB 838 [2009] and AB 1054 [2007]), but both were vetoed by then-Governor Schwarzenegger.

### **Expanded Labor Commissioner Powers (AB 2261)**

Labor Code section 98.7 authorizes the Labor Commissioner, in response to a complaint involving a violation of any law within the Labor Commissioner's jurisdiction, to investigate this complaint. This bill would amend section 98.7 to allow the Labor Commissioner to, with or without receiving a complaint of discrimination, to commence an investigation of an employer that it suspects has discharged or otherwise discriminated against an individual in violation of any law under the Labor Commissioner's jurisdiction.

It would also require the assigned investigator to prepare and submit an investigation report to the Labor Commissioners based on its findings. It would also require the DLSE in investigating employers under this provision to follow the existing processes and requirements for employee initiated cases of unlawful discharge or discrimination.

**Status:** This bill has passed the Assembly, and the Senate's Labor and Industrial Relations, Judiciary and Appropriations Committees but may have stalled on the Senate floor.

### **Modified PAGA Deadlines (AB 2898)**

Labor Code section 2699.3 of the Private Attorneys General Act (PAGA) allows a private employee to pursue penalties on behalf of the Labor and Workforce Development Agency (LWDA) for alleged Labor Code violations. This bill would amend section 2699.3 to allow employees 90 days (rather than the current 60 days) to amend their complaints to add additional causes of action.

**Status:** The current version of this bill reflects a "gut and amend" of a prior bill, and so its prospects are unclear. It was recently ordered to the inactive file.

### **Bond Requirements for Minimum Wage Violations (AB 2899)**

Labor Code section 1194 prohibits employers from paying employees a wage less than the minimum wage, and allows aggrieved employees to recover lost wages, civil penalties, and liquidated damages for violations. Labor Code section 1197.1 allows a party to contest a citation issued by the Labor Commissioner through the superior court.

This bill would amend section 1197.1 and require a person seeking a writ of mandate contesting the Labor Commissioner's ruling to post with the Labor Commissioner a bond equal to the unpaid wages, excluding penalties, in favor of the aggrieved employee. This section would also specify the procedures for an appellant to pay any judgment as result of that hearing or the withdrawal of the writ. It would also provide that if the employer fails to pay the amounts owed within 10 days after the proceedings are concluded, the portion of the bond need to cover the amount owed would be forfeited by the employer to the employee.

*Status:* This bill passed the Assembly along a party-line vote, and has passed the Senate's Labor and Industrial Relations Committee and is pending in the Appropriations Committee.

### **Overtime Provisions for Domestic Worker Employees (SB 1015)**

In 2013, California enacted the Domestic Worker Bill of Rights (AB 241) which added Labor Code section 1454 and amended Wage Order 15-2001 to entitle a domestic work employee working as a personal attendant (as defined) the right to daily overtime after nine hours worked and weekly overtime after 45 hours worked. Entitled the Domestic Worker Bill of Rights of 2016, SB 1015 would remove the current January 1, 2017 sunset provision for section 1454, thus making those overtime provisions permanent.

*Status:* This bill passed the Senate, and has passed the Assembly's Labor and Employment Committee and is pending in the Appropriations Committee.

### **Assembly Passes Expedited Release of Prevailing Wage Escrowed Amounts (AB 326)**

Labor Code section 1742.1 presently provides that in prevailing wage proceedings, a contractor or subcontractor may avoid certain penalties by depositing the full amount of an assessment or notice with the Department of Industrial Relations (DIR). Responding to concerns the DIR is not required to release these funds within any particular timeframe, this bill would amend section 1742.1 to specify the DIR must release the escrowed funds, plus any interest earned, to the person entitled to those funds "within 30 days" following either the conclusion of all administrative and judicial review, or upon receiving written notice from the Labor Commissioner of a settlement or a final disposition of an assessment issued, or from the authorized representative of the awarding body or a settlement or final disposition.

**Status:** This bill unanimously passed the Assembly, and has passed the Senate's Labor and Industrial Relations Committee and is pending in the Appropriations Committee.

### **Car Wash Disclosures (AB 2897)**

The California Labor Code enumerates a number of provisions specifically applicable to car washes given their history of violations. This bill would add Labor Code section 2066.5 to require an existing car wash business to provide a successor with written notice of these requirements prior to the sale or transfer of the business.

**Status:** This bill unanimously passed the Assembly, and has passed the Senate's Labor and Industrial Relations Committee.

### **Expanded Protections for Janitorial Service Workers (AB 1978)**

Known as the Property Service Workers Protection Act, this bill would enact numerous measures to protect janitorial industry employees from sexual assault and other Labor Code violations. Amongst other things, it would require the Department of Industrial Relations to develop by July 1, 2018 training materials, for both supervisors and workers, regarding sexual harassment and sexual violence, and to establish requirements for such training. It would also direct Cal-OSHA to require janitorial industry employers to include this training as part of its injury and illness prevention plans. Additionally, it would establish a system of janitorial contractor registration to encourage labor standards compliance and to establish prompt and effective sanctions for violating this part.

**Status:** This bill has passed the Assembly, and has passed the Senate's Labor and Industrial Relations Committee and is pending in the Appropriations Committee.

### **Whistleblower Protections for Legislative Employees (AB 1788)**

Entitled the Legislative Employee Whistleblower Protection Act, this bill would prohibit interference with the right of legislative employees to make protected disclosures of ethics violations and would prohibit retaliation against employees who have made such protected disclosures. It would also establish a procedure for legislative employees to report violations of these prohibitions to the Legislature, and would impose civil and criminal liability on an individual violating these protections.

**Status:** This bill unanimously passed the Assembly, and has passed the Senate's Judiciary Committee and is pending in the Senate's Appropriations Committee.

### **Elimination of Some Employment Verification Requirements (AB 2532)**

Unemployment Insurance Code sections 9601.5 and 9601.7 require any state or local government agency, and any private employer contracting with a state or local government agency, that provides specified employment services to verify an individual's legal status or authorization to work prior to providing services to that

individual in accordance with federal procedures. This bill would repeal both of these sections and the requirements contained in them.

**Status:** This bill passed the Assembly along a party-line vote, and has passed the Senate's Labor and Industrial Relations Committee, and is pending in the Senate's Appropriations Committee.

### **Non-California Venue Provisions in Employment Agreements (SB 1241)**

This bill would add new Labor Code section 925 prohibiting an employer from requiring an applicant or employee to agree to a provision that would require the employee to adjudicate outside California a dispute arising in California, or deprive the employee of the protection of California law with respect to a controversy arising in California. Any such choice of law or venue provision would be voidable at the employee's request if it required the employee to adjudicate outside California or deprive the employee of the protections of California law. If the court invalidated such a provision, the matter would be adjudicated in California and under California law, and the prevailing employee would be entitled to recover reasonable attorneys' fees incurred enforcing this provision. If enacted, this section would apply to any contract entered into, modified or extended on or after January 1, 2017.

This section would not apply to an employee who is individually represented by legal counsel in negotiating the terms of an agreement to designate either the choice of venue or law provisions.

**Status:** This bill passed the Assembly along a party-line vote and has passed the Senate's Judiciary and Appropriations Committee along similar party-line votes. Governor Brown vetoed a similar bill in 2011 (AB 267) citing a concern about not wanting to dissuade non-California companies from hiring California employees.