

ALASKA SHRM STATE COUNCIL



AK Wage and Hour Update: AK Supreme Court & Burden of Proof Developments for Exemptions

Presented by Gregory S. Fisher

Program Handouts:

http://alaska.shrm.org/slides

Bookmark our pageFollow us on Facebook

http://alaska.shrm.org http://www.facebook.com/AKSHRMStateCouncil

HR. POWER OF THE PAST FORCE OF THE FUTURE

ALASKA STATE HR CONFERENCE MAY 14-15, 2020 REGISTER NOW!

ASHRM WEBINAR DEVELOPMENTS IMPACTING THE ALASKA WAGE AND HOUR ACT

February 28, 2020

Alaska Supreme Court to review burden of proof for exemptions

Gregory S. Fisher





 Currently, in Alaska (and only in Alaska) the burden of proof to establish a wage and hour exemption is Beyond a Reasonable Doubt





 It's a train wreck—a job-stifling catastrophe that increases risk and liability for employers, discourages growth and investment, and results in employees losing jobs and opportunities



Beyond a Reasonable Doubt

- []
- This is the burden of proof used in criminal cases
- It is <u>never</u> used in civil cases

 Private businesses lack resources to meet this standard











- Increases risk and costs for employers
- Decreases job opportunities for employees
- Depresses business investment and growth
- Creates inconsistent legal standards between state and federal law



- All employees are either exempt or non-exempt
- Exempt employees are higher compensated professionals, executives, adminstrative employees, computer professionals, and other management or higher level employees
- Non-exempt employees are everyone else, and are entitled to Overtime (time and a half normal hourly rate) for work over 8 hours in a day or 40 hours in a week



- Employees on either extreme are easy to classify (CEO vs. new kid in the mailroom).
- However, things get "gray" as one approaches the vast middle ground.
- The regulatory definitions are dense, lengthy, and subject to varying interpretations.
- It is quite like the tax code—different people can interpret same facts differently.





- Key concepts such as "management" or "primary duty" or "customarily and regularly" or "discretion and independent judgment" are defined in opaque terms.
- There is an "Alice in Wonderland" like quality to the definitions and their application.



- Includes traditional concepts such as hiring, supervising, and disciplining employees
- BUT also includes duties that a filing clerk or receptionist could perform (determining supplies or equipment to be used, controlling distribution of materials)





- It is not easy to determine when and whether many employees are exempt or not
- In many instances, you can provide wage and hour lawyers or investigators the same set of facts, and get different conclusions





- Wage and hour is all about damages and attorneys' fees.
- Overtime claims get base damages and liquidated damages (the base damages are doubled up). So, an overtime claim alleging \$10,000 is worth \$20,000.
- Then, attorneys are eligible for full, actual fees (which typically run in 6 figures).



- Multiple reasons
- Increases claims and makes settlement difficult
- Businesses cannot meet the standard
- Results in conflicting and contradictory law
- Employees lose jobs and benefits as businesses seeking to minimize risk outsource jobs
- Employees lose opportunities for professional growth as businesses cut training/mentoring
- Discourages business investment and growth



- Increases wage and hour claims, <u>and</u> makes it more difficult to settle claims.
- No incentive for plaintiffs to act reasonably.
- Businesses facing claims are held hostage to a system that makes no sense.





- Private employers lack resources or means to collect evidence to establish anything BRD.
- Private businesses don't have search warrant powers, or the powers that the Government has in criminal procedure to compel and collect evidence.





 Federal wage and hour law applies the normal and customary preponderance of the evidence standard.



 State law is based on federal law and principles (has been since 2005). The same law <u>should</u> be governed by the same standards.



- Employers outsource labor to avoid potential OT problems because they know that they cannot surmount the BRD standard.
- Computer professionals (IT Departments) a good example.



Outsourced employees lose jobs and benefits.

Employers face inconsistent laws.

- The same law should be governed by the same standards.
- However, that is <u>not</u> happening now.
- Consequently, same facts and same claims can lead to different results depending upon the burden of proof.
- Increases legal risks and costs for business for no reason.





17

- Employees lose potential training and advancement opportunities.
- Negative impact on growth.



- Employers are reluctant to allow "gray area" mid-level managers the opportunity to work more hours to learn and get necessary mentoring because of OT risk.
- Bank tellers are a good example.



It chills business growth and development.



- Businesses looking to expand or develop in Alaska study the employment and labor laws.
- Investment discouraged.

Biggest Myth—but the BRD standard helps Employees, right?







- Federal law (remember—same law and same legal principles are used) works great with a preponderance of the evidence standard.
- The BRD standard is actually a job-stifling catastrophe. Employees lose jobs, benefits, and opportunities for advancement.

Another Myth—but the BRD standard is necessary to protect rights, correct?



WRONG

- <u>All</u> other employment-related defenses are governed by a preponderance of the evidence standard.
- This includes defenses in employment discrimination and civil rights cases (which are more important from a public policy perspective than wage and hour OT claims)

Okay, so why does Alaska have a BRD standard?



- Actually, there is no good reason. The Court imposed the BRD standard in 2004 based on dicta (no briefing, analysis, or even argument).
- Not bashing the Court—even Babe Ruth struck out now and then.



The BRD "rule" just "sort of happened"



See Gregory Fisher, Alaska Law Review article



So Mr. Smarty Pants . . .

Your solution?



Could be an Easy fix. AS 23.10.060 could be amended to add one subdivision: "(k) In an action to recover unpaid overtime compensation or unpaid minimum wages, the defendant shall have the burden of proof to establish the existence of any claimed exemptions by a preponderance of the evidence."





Legislative Gridlock



Update!



- U.S. District Court certified the burden of proof issue to the Alaska Supreme Court
- Case is Travis Buntin v. Schlumberger
- Alaska Supreme Court accepted case
- Briefing is now in final stages



- State Council, Alaska Society Human Resource Management filed a "friend of the court" (or amicus) brief, urging court to adopt preponderance of the evidence standard
- Uncertain if the Alaska Supreme Court will hold oral argument
- Hopefully we will have a decision by the end of this year (perhaps sooner)



- Because it's right.
- Because it promotes job growth.
- Because it protects employees and helps them achieve their potential.
- Because it protects employers from facing inconsistent legal standards.
- Because it protects employers from facing unfair and unreasonable legal costs and risks.
- Because it brings state law into line with federal law, which was the whole point of the 2005 amendments to the Wage and Hour Act.



- Questions?
- Gregory Fisher, Davis Wright Tremaine LLP, 188 West Northern Lights, Ste. 1100, Anchorage, Alaska 99501 (907) 257-5335 (direct) gregoryfisher@dwt.com





ALASKA SHRM STATE COUNCIL



AK Wage and Hour Update:

AK Supreme Court & Burden of Proof Developments for Exemptions

Presented by Gregory S. Fisher

Certificate for Professional Development Credits:

Program Handouts:

http://alaska.shrm.org/certificate

http://alaska.shrm.org/slides

Bookmark our page

http://alaska.shrm.org

Follow us on Facebook

http://www.facebook.com/AKSHRMStateCouncil

HR. POWER OF THE PAST

ALASKA STATE HR CONFERENCE MAY 14-15, 2020 REGISTER NOW!