



June 2017

DOL Announces Reversal of Employee/Independent Contractor Classification & Joint Employer Guidance

On June 7, 2017, the United States Department of Labor (DOL) reversed its previous guidance issued during the administration of President Barack Obama that broadened the circumstances in which employers could be held liable for misclassification of employees as independent contractors, and as a joint employer with a separate business. New Secretary of Labor Alex Acosta announced that the DOL was withdrawing two letters: (1) a 2015 letter that encouraged scrutiny of employer-independent contractor relationship pursuant to the "economic realities test;" and (2) a separate 2016 letter that interpreted joint employers exercised "indirect" control over the worker. Although the letters were never legally binding, they served as a blueprint for how the DOL enforced federal laws and represented persuasive authority to courts.

Employee/Independent-Contractor Classification Guidance

From July 2015 until June 2017, the DOL's default position was that "most" workers are employees under the FLSA. The DOL also publicly used the "economic realities test" to determine whether work performed for an employer was done by an independent contractor or an employee. The "economic realities test" employed the following six factors: (1) the extent to which the work performed is an integral part of the employer's business; (2) the worker's opportunity for profit or loss depending on his or her managerial skill; (3) the extent of the relative investments of the employer and the worker; (4) whether the work performed requires special skills and initiative; (5) the permanency of the relationship; and (6) the degree of control exercised or retained by the employer.

The net effect of the DOL's use of the "economic realities test" was to greatly diminish the circumstances in which a worker was properly classified as an independent contractor. It is generally believed that the Obama administration employed that standard as a way to combat economic inequality, as the classification of a worker as an employee triggers many benefits for the worker, including minimum wage/overtime compensation, unemployment insurance, and workers' compensation.

Joint Employer Guidance

Relatedly, between January 2016 and July 2017, the DOL adopted the National Labor Relations Board's (NLRB's) decision in <u>Browning-Ferris Industries of California, Inc. v. NLRB</u>, which held that two separate businesses could share legal responsibility over the same employee so long as each exercised "indirect" control over that employee. That is, a company could be treated as an employer even if they did not directly control the employee's terms and conditions of work. In <u>Browning-Ferris</u>, the owner of a waste-disposal site was held to be a joint employer with the company it contracted to provide all of the site's staffing needs.

The DOL's decision to expand joint employer liability proved worrisome for many businesses, especially franchisors and those that relied on staffing companies to provide workers at a particular location. Nevertheless, the decision in <u>Browning-Ferris</u> is separate and remains legally binding upon employers.

This *GT Alert* was prepared by **David Long-Daniels** and **Jonathan M. Young**. Questions about this information can be directed to:

- > David Long-Daniels | +1 678.553.4744 | long-danielsd@gtlaw.com
- > Jonathan M. Young | +1 678.553.2675 | youngjon@gtlaw.com
- > Or your Greenberg Traurig attorney

Amsterdam + 31 20 301 7300

Atlanta +1 678.553.2100

Austin +1 512.320.7200

Berlin-+49 (0) 30 700 171 100

Berlin-GT Restructuring +49 (0) 30 700 171 100

Boca Raton +1 561.955.7600

Boston +1 617.310.6000

Chicago +1 312.456.8400

Dallas +1 214.665.3600 **Denver** +1 303.572.6500

Fort Lauderdale +1 954.765.0500

Houston +1 713.374.3500

Las Vegas +1 702.792.3773

London* +44 (0)203 349 8700

Los Angeles +1 310.586.7700

Mexico City+ +52 55 5029.0000

Miami +1 305.579.0500

New Jersey +1 973.360.7900 **Northern Virginia** +1 703.749.1300

Orange County +1 949.732.6500

Orlando +1 407.420.1000

Philadelphia +1 215.988.7800

Phoenix +1 602.445.8000

Sacramento +1 916.442.1111

San Francisco +1 415.655.1300

Seoul∞ +82 (0) 2.369.1000

Shanghai +86 (0) 21.6391.6633 **Tallahassee** +1 850.222.6891

Tampa +1 813.318.5700

Tel Aviv^ +03.636.6000

Tokyo¤ +81 (0)3 4510 2200

Warsaw~ +48 22 690 6100

Washington, D.C. +1 202.331.3100

Westchester County +1 914.286.2900

West Palm Beach +1 561.650.7900

This Greenberg Traurig Alert is issued for informational purposes only and is not intended to be construed or used as general legal advice nor as a solicitation of any type. Please contact the author(s) or your Greenberg Traurig contact if you have questions regarding the currency of this information. The hiring of a lawyer is an important decision. Before you decide, ask for written information about the lawyer's legal qualifications and experience. Greenberg Traurig is a service mark and trade name of Greenberg Traurig, LLP and Greenberg Traurig, P.A. ¬Greenberg Traurig's Berlin office is operated by Greenberg Traurig Germany, an affiliate of Greenberg Traurig, P.A. and Greenberg Traurig, LLP. [−] Berlin - GT Restructuring is operated by Köhler-Ma Geiser Partnerschaft Rechtsanwälte, Insolvenzverwalter. *Operates as a separate UK registered legal entity. **Greenberg Traurig is not responsible for any legal or other services rendered by attorneys employed by the strategic alliance firms. +Greenberg Traurig, Mexico City office is operated by Greenberg Traurig, S.C., an affiliate of Greenberg Traurig's Tel Aviv office is a branch of Greenberg Traurig, P.A. and Greenberg Traurig, LLP. ~Greenberg Traurig's Warsaw office is operated by Greenberg Traurig Grzesiak sp.k., an affiliate of Greenberg Traurig, P.A. and Greenberg Traurig's Warsaw office is operated by Greenberg Traurig Grzesiak sp.k., an affiliate of Greenberg Traurig, P.A. and G