



nobody@a1289.g.akamai.net
05/21/2002 12:04:11 PM

Please respond to nobody@a1289.g.akamai.net

Record Type: Record

To: John Morrall@EOP

CC:

Subject: Suggestion for Regulatory Reform

Name:

laurie gronlund

Address:

po box 1253

Telephone No.

6057737429

E-mail address:

laurie.gronlund@ci.pierre.sd.us

Name of Guidance:

Regulating Agency:

DEPARTMENT OF LABOR

Subagency (if any):

WAGE AND HOUR DIVISION

Citation (Code of Federal Regulation):

29 C.F.R. Section 541

Authority (Statute/Regulation)

Fair Labor Standards Act

Description of Problem (Nature of Impact and on Whom):

I am writing to recommend that the Fair Labor Standards Act FLSA regulations governing exempt and non-exempt employees be revised. The regulations, 29 C.F.R. Section 541, are out of date and difficult to apply in the modern workplace. In addition, the regulations were developed prior to their application to the public sector. **The FLSA** did not apply to the public

sector

until the mid 1980s, the regulations were developed following passage of the

law in 1938.

Because they are out dated and not designed for the public sector, a great deal

of confusion has ensued. Under the regulations, certain employees will be exempt from the laws overtime and minimum wage requirements if they meet a salary basis and a duties test. The salary basis test interferes with the progressive disciplinary policies often required by public sector employers.

According to the regulations, suspensions of less than one workweek will defeat

exempt status. However, exemptions of more than one workweek are fine. An

employer could discipline an employee by skipping from a written warning to a

full week suspension, but a written warning followed by a one-day suspension

would violate the regulations. This is but one of myriad problems with the regulations.

The duties test defines certain exempt categories - executive, administrative, and

professional, computer professionals and outside salesmen. A 1999 General

Accounting Office report to Congress summed up the problem nicely:

Finally, employers complained that the parts of the regulatory duties tests that

call for independent judgment and discretion on the part of those classified as

administrators and professionals led to confusing and inconsistent results in

classifications of similarly situated employees. Our discussions with DOL

investigators and review of compliance cases indicated that this part of the

duties test involved difficult and sometimes subjective determinations, and that it

was a source of contention in **DOL** audits. GAO/HEHS-99-164, FLSA: White Collar Exemptions in the Modern Work Place, September 1999.

Employees must also be paid a certain minimum amount in order to be classified

as exempt. The highest base amount referred to in the regulations is 250 per

week - about 13,000 per year. This dollar figure is certainly not representative

of a professional or managerial employee in today's economy. The entire regulation needs to be brought up to date.

Proposed Solution:

I am writing to recommend that the Fair Labor Standards Act FLSA regulations governing exempt and non-exempt employees be revised. The regulations, 29 C.F.R. Section 541, are out of date and difficult to apply in the

modern workplace. In addition, the regulations were developed prior to their

application to the public sector. The FLSA did not apply to the public sector

until the mid 1980s, the regulations were developed following passage of the

law in 1938.

Because they are out dated and not designed for the public sector, a great deal

of confusion has ensued. Under the regulations, certain employees will be exempt from the laws overtime and minimum wage requirements if they meet a salary basis and a duties test. The salary basis test interferes with the progressive disciplinary policies often required by public sector employers.

According to the regulations, suspensions of less than one workweek will defeat

exempt status. However, exemptions of more than one workweek are fine. An

employer could discipline an employee by skipping from a written warning to a

full week suspension, but a written warning followed by a one-day suspension

would violate the regulations. This is but one of myriad problems with the regulations.

The duties test defines certain exempt categories - executive, administrative, and

professional, computer professionals and outside salesmen. A 1999 General

Accounting Office report to Congress summed up the problem nicely:

Finally, employers complained that the parts of the regulatory duties tests that

call for independent judgment and discretion on the part of those classified as

administrators and professionals led to confusing and inconsistent results in

classifications of similarly situated employees. Our discussions with DOL

investigators and review of compliance cases indicated that this part of the

duties test involved difficult and sometimes subjective determinations, and that it

was a source of contention in DOL audits. GAO/HEHS-99-164, FLSA: White Collar Exemptions in the Modern Work Place, September 1999.

Employees must also be paid a certain minimum amount in order to be classified

as exempt. The highest base amount referred to in the regulations is 250 per

week - about 13,000 per year. This dollar figure is certainly not representative

of a professional or managerial employee in today's economy. The entire regulation needs to be brought up to date.

Estimate of Economic Impacts (Quantified Benefits and Costs if possible / Qualified description as needed):

I am writing to recommend that the Fair Labor Standards Act FLSA regulations governing exempt and non-exempt employees be revised. The regulations, 29 C.F.R. Section 541, are out of date and difficult to apply in the

modern workplace. In addition, the regulations were developed prior to their

application to the public sector. The FLSA did not apply to the public sector

until the mid 1980s, the regulations were developed following passage of the

law in 1938.

Because they are out dated and not designed for the public sector, a great deal

of confusion has ensued. Under the regulations, certain employees will be exempt from the laws overtime and minimum wage requirements if they meet a salary basis and a duties test. The salary basis test interferes with the progressive disciplinary policies often required by public sector employers.

According to the regulations, suspensions of less than one workweek will defeat

exempt status. However, exemptions of more than one workweek are fine. An employer could discipline an employee by skipping from a written warning to a

full week suspension, but a written warning followed by a one-day suspension

would violate the regulations. This is but one of myriad problems with the regulations.

The duties test defines certain exempt categories - executive, administrative, and

professional, computer professionals and outside salesmen. A 1999 General

Accounting Office report to Congress summed up the problem nicely:

Finally, employers complained that the parts of the regulatory duties tests that

call for independent judgment and discretion on the part of those classified as

administrators and professionals led to confusing and inconsistent results in

classifications of similarly situated employees. Our discussions with DOL

investigators and review of compliance cases indicated that this part of the

duties test involved difficult and sometimes subjective determinations, and that it

was a source of contention in DOL audits. GAO/HEHS-99-164, FLSA: White Collar Exemptions in the Modern Work Place, September 1999.

Employees must also be paid a certain minimum amount in order to be classified

as exempt. The highest base amount referred to in the regulations is 250 per

week - about 13,000 per year. This dollar figure is certainly not representative

of a professional or managerial employee in today's economy. The entire regulation needs to be brought up to date.