



Welcome to ESTA: New York City's 'Earned Sick Time Act' Comes into Effect, DCA Proposes New Rules

Nearly a year after it was first passed in June 2013, the New York City Earned Sick Time Act (ESTA), providing paid sick time to employees in New York City, took effect this month. The law has been a top priority for the Mayor of New York City (The Mayor), who championed the original act as Public Advocate, campaigned for Mayor on pledges to expand its protections, and spearheaded amendments to broaden ESTA almost immediately upon taking office earlier this year. The law is likely to receive energetic enforcement, and employers in the City need to be aware of their expanded obligations under ESTA.

Under ESTA, employees of businesses with five or more workers are entitled to five paid sick days a year. Employees accrue a minimum of one hour of sick time for every 30 hours worked, but employers are not obligated to provide more than 40 hours of paid sick time in a calendar year. Sick time provided pursuant to ESTA begins to accrue at the commencement of employment, and the employee will be entitled to begin using sick time on the 120th calendar day following the start of his or her employment, or 120 days following the law's effective date. Employees may use sick time as it accrues.

While unused paid sick time carries over to the following calendar year, employers will not be required to allow the use of more than 40 hours of paid sick time in a calendar year. Also of note, ESTA does not require financial or other reimbursement to an employee for unused accrued sick time upon the employee's termination, resignation, retirement or other employment separation.

The law provides a broader definition of "sick" leave than what is traditionally considered by employers under the federal Family and Medical Leave Act. In addition to the traditional reasons for taking "sick" leave, ESTA covers an employee's need for diagnostic or preventative care, and provides that sick leave may be taken in the event the employee's place of business is closed by order of a public health official due to a public health emergency, or to care for a child whose school or place of care has been closed by

order of a public health official. An employee may also use sick time to care for a family member who needs diagnosis, treatment or preventative medical care. ESTA defines “family members” broadly to include an employee’s child, spouse, domestic partner, parent, sibling (including half-siblings, step-siblings and adopted siblings), grandchild or grandparent, as well as a child or parent of the employee’s spouse or domestic partner.

Employers may require “reasonable notice” of sick time use of up to seven days for foreseeable needs or “as soon as practicable” for unforeseeable needs. Employers may also require reasonable documentation for absences exceeding three consecutive work days. However, employers may not require an employee to find, or even to look for, another employee to cover his or her shift as a condition of taking leave.

Employers with an existing paid leave policy, such as paid-time off (PTO), will not have to offer additional time off if they already provide sufficient leave to satisfy the ordinance’s annual accrual requirements, and if they allow employees to use the time for the same purposes and under the same conditions as paid sick time under the ordinance. Critically, the employer may set a “reasonable minimum increment” for use of sick time, not to exceed four hours per day. This allows employers to mirror the requirements of ESTA with any current PTO policy already in place, and the law will not have an impact on more generous paid leave policies. Employers with existing collective bargaining agreements need not implement the terms of the Act until the current CBA expires.

ESTA requires employers to provide written notice to current employees this month, and to new employees at commencement of employment, regarding an employee’s rights to sick time, the employer’s calendar year, and an employee’s right to be free from retaliation and to bring a complaint. The notice must be posted “conspicuously” and any willful violation will result in a civil fine of \$50 for every employee not provided appropriate notice. The New York City Department of Consumer Affairs (DCA) recently published a form [Mandatory Notice](#).

The Mayor will designate a city agency (most likely the DCA) to administer and enforce ESTA’s provisions. ESTA provides the commissioner with “the power to conduct investigations ... upon his or her own initiative.” ESTA requires employers to retain records documenting their compliance for a minimum of three years, and to allow the Department to access those records in furtherance of any investigation. An employee may file a complaint with the Department within two years from the date the employee “knew or should have known” of the alleged violation.

The DCA has already published proposed Rules implementing ESTA, and scheduled a public hearing for April 29, 2014. A copy of the proposed Rules, along with information on how to submit a comment can be found [here](#).

While some “grey areas” remain about how New York City will implement and enforce ESTA, this much is clear: ESTA is here, and it is here to stay. Employers operating in the City should review their PTO policies to ensure they are in compliance with ESTA’s provisions, and likewise ensure that they are meeting the Act’s notice and document retention requirements.

This *GT Alert* was prepared by **Michael J. Slocum**, **Terence P. McCourt**, **Jonathan L. Sulds**, **Robert H. Bernstein** and **Jerrold F. Goldberg**. Questions about this information can be directed to:

- > [Michael J. Slocum](#) | +1 973.360.7900 | slocumm@gtlaw.com
- > [Terence P. McCourt](#) | +1 617.310.6246 | mccourt@gtlaw.com

- > [Jonathan L. Sulds](#) | +1 212.801.6882 | suldsj@gtlaw.com
- > [Robert H. Bernstein](#) | +1 973.360.7946 | bernsteinrob@gtlaw.com
- > [Jerrold F. Goldberg](#) | +1 212.801.9209 | goldbergj@gtlaw.com
- > Or your [Greenberg Traurig](#) attorney

Albany 518.689.1400	Denver 303.572.6500	New York 212.801.9200	Silicon Valley 650.328.8500
Amsterdam + 31 20 301 7300	Fort Lauderdale 954.765.0500	Orange County 949.732.6500	Tallahassee 850.222.6891
Atlanta 678.553.2100	Houston 713.374.3500	Orlando 407.420.1000	Tampa 813.318.5700
Austin 512.320.7200	Las Vegas 702.792.3773	Philadelphia 215.988.7800	Tel Aviv[^] +03.636.6000
Boca Raton 561.955.7600	London* +44 (0)203 349 8700	Phoenix 602.445.8000	Tysons Corner 703.749.1300
Boston 617.310.6000	Los Angeles 310.586.7700	Sacramento 916.442.1111	Warsaw[~] +48 22 690 6100
Chicago 312.456.8400	Mexico City⁺ +52 55 5029.0000	San Francisco 415.655.1300	Washington, D.C. 202.331.3100
Dallas 214.665.3600	Miami 305.579.0500	Seoul[∞] 82-2-369-1000	West Palm Beach 561.650.7900
Delaware 302.661.7000	New Jersey 973.360.7900	Shanghai +86 21 6391 6633	White Plains 914.286.2900

*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. *Operates as Greenberg Traurig Maher LLP. **Greenberg Traurig is not responsible for any legal or other services rendered by attorneys employed by the strategic alliance firms. +Greenberg Traurig's Mexico City office is operated by Greenberg Traurig, S.C., an affiliate of Greenberg Traurig, P.A. and Greenberg Traurig, LLP. ∞Operates as Greenberg Traurig LLP Foreign Legal Consultant Office. ^Greenberg Traurig's Tel Aviv office is a branch of Greenberg Traurig, P.A., Florida, USA. ~Greenberg Traurig's Warsaw office is operated by Greenberg Traurig Grzesiak sp.k., an affiliate of Greenberg Traurig, P.A. and Greenberg Traurig, LLP. Certain partners in Greenberg Traurig Grzesiak sp.k. are also shareholders in Greenberg Traurig, P.A. Images in this advertisement do not depict Greenberg Traurig attorneys, clients, staff or facilities. No aspect of this advertisement has been approved by the Supreme Court of New Jersey. ©2014 Greenberg Traurig, LLP. All rights reserved.*