Bill as Introduced

SB 410-FN-LOCAL – AS INTRODUCED

2000 SESSION

00-2625
10/01

SENATE BILL ***410-FN-LOCAL***

AN ACT relative to payment for overtime by salaried employees.

SPONSORS: Sen. Trombly, Dist 7

COMMITTEE: Internal Affairs

ANALYSIS

This bill requires the payment of salaried employees an additional hourly rate for work over 50 hours in a week.

Explanation: Matter added to current law appears in ***bold italics.***
Matter removed from current law appears [~~in brackets and struckthrough.~~]
Matter which is either (a) all new or (b) repealed and reenacted appears in regular type.

00-2625
10/01

STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

In the Year of Our Lord Two Thousand

AN ACT relative to payment for overtime by salaried employees.

Be it Enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives in General Court convened:

1 New Section; Payment of Overtime for Salaried Employees. Amend RSA 275 by inserting after section 43-b the following new section:

275:43-c Payment of Overtime for Salaried Employees. A salaried employee who works more than 50 hours in a week shall receive his or her full salary plus an additional hourly rate for every hour over 50 hours. The hourly rate shall be calculated using the salary employee's regular weekly salary divided by 40.

2 Effective Date. This act shall take effect 60 days after its passage.

LBAO
00-2625
12/17/99

SB 410-FN-LOCAL - FISCAL NOTE

AN ACT relative to payment for overtime by salaried employees.

FISCAL IMPACT:

The Office of Legislative Budget Assistant is unable to complete a fiscal note for this bill as it is awaiting information from an agency.

Committee Minutes

Date: January 20, 2000
Time: 3:25 PM
Room: 103-LOB

The Senate Committee on Internal Affairs held a hearing on the following:

SB 410-FN-L relative to payment for overtime by salaried employees.

Members of Committee present:

Senator D'Allesandro
Senator Klemm
Senator Francoeur
Senator Pignatelli
Senator Trombly

The Chair, Senator Lou D'Allesandro, opened the hearing.
Senator Lou D'Allesandro, D. 20: I'd like to open the hearing on SB 410-FN-L, an act relative to payment for overtime by salaried employees. And call upon the Sponsor Senator Trombly.

Senator Rick A. Trombly, D. 7: Thank you Mr. Chair and members of the committee. SB 410-FN local is a bill that I sponsored at the request of a resident of the state of New Hampshire not a constituent. So terms of moving the ball forward on the terms of this legislation I would hope that person would be here. I explained that I would introduce it as a courtesy and I was hoping that the person could be here. Unfortunately when Marlene in the office contacted him he couldn't get time off from work I believe, so he won't be here. And I won't be long on this bill.

All I want to say is that I recognize that there will be a great deal of opposition to it, and some concerns I might have about the legislation in and of itself. So I would ask perhaps that this committee might want to send this bill to study and here's why;

As I was driving into Concord this morning I thought about this legislation knowing that it would need a quick death. But as businesses change in the state I think we're seeing, I saw on the news which made me think about this, employees now are being asked to work 60 and some work 70 hours a

week. We have pagers, faxes, E-mails and people work at home with their computers. People are not getting away from their jobs, and the thought was that technology would allow people to work less hours. The news cast said that that indeed was not the case. Companies were downsizing and not hiring employees, simply shifting the cost and the burden on other employees causing them to work more and longer hours. This was resulting in less productive employees.

I wont belabor the point, I think you get the just of why I would like to look at the changing nature of the work force relative to non-hourly wage employees. We take care of them but this is like picking up mercury. We have people in our work force who essentially don't leave their jobs. And I read a letter from somewhere talking about obligations of the state to companies, I wondered where we lost along the way our obligation to the people who work for us. I speak to you as an employer with salaried employees, and we treat them like human beings we expect a good days work from them and in return we get their loyalty because we treat them right.

This might not be the way we compensate people who have to put in those long hours. I would say a good study though of what business interests and what interests of employees are in the state of New Hampshire, is something we need to look at as legislature because we represent the business interest of the state that hire the people. And I don't cast any aspersions on them whatsoever because if they didn't do business here in the state our constituents wouldn't have jobs. But I do think we have a responsibility to look at in light of the changing work force, in light of the change of technology what we expect our constituents to do and how to compensate them for that.

Senator Lou D'Allesandro, D. 20: Thank you very much Senator Trombly. Any questions for Senator Trombly? If not, thank you very much for your testimony.

Senator Gary R. Francoeur, D. 14: Senator Trombly, are you proposing to just study this instead?

Senator Rick A. Trombly, D. 7: Yeah I would...I did it on behalf of a resident of the state and it was obviously somebody who had a problem that they wanted to address by the legislature. It's a fairly serious issue I wouldn't put it in. But I do think it raises issues that I think we need to address in conjunction with the business community. Cause I don't want to point a finger at business people and say they're not good. They are good. They employ people, but technology is changing the work place. And people who might have been working 50 hours a week now work 60 and 70, and I think we should examine how that relates to our labor laws. OSHA now is

looking at whether or not OSHA guidelines apply to the safety requirements of people who are working at home.

Senator Lou D'Allesandro, D. 20: Thank you Senator. Senator Pignatelli?

Senator Rick A. Trombly, D. 7: Mr. Simard is here, the person for whom I spoke.

Senator Debora B. Pignatelli, D. 13: Thank you.

It occurs to me that this might be a way for me to get salary increase, a lot of times I work more than 50 hours throughout the year and I might get 40 cents, 4 cents more an hour for every hour over the 50.

Senator Rick A. Trombly, D. 7: I got my mileage checked the other day and I'm still making $2.96 a day coming over here. I wouldn't oppose an increase in legislature. I voted for an increase by the way for the commission, I voted for the commission last session to study an increase in pay but I think there were only two of us who did that.

If I could Mr. Chairman, Mr. Simard is here and I most certainly sponsored it on his behalf. If you would yield to him, I would like to yield to him because it is something I did for him.

Paul Simard, Former House Member: I'm on a little break from work right now so I'll be very brief. My name is Paul Simard, I'm a former member of the House, I served on the labor committee with Chairman Shirley Merrill back in 1973.

I had called Senator Trombly up on this bill basically because I see a trend starting in this state that I'm not sure if it's healthy or not. If you start to read the labor laws- especially RSA 275- you're going to see that there are numerous references to quality of life in New Hampshire . And I see that quality of life being eroded on a daily basis. If we look in Concord right now and we see a lot of National chains coming in, a lot of retail outlets, a lot of restaurants and so forth.

I work for one of the restaurants and I'm not a disgruntled employee. I love my job, I do it well and I get compensated quite well for it. What I think I object to is when I was first hired I was told that I would work a 50 to 55 hour week, which is perfectly acceptable. I came from owning my own restaurant where I put in 80 to 90 hours a week and I did it cheerfully. The way I'm paid is I get a modest salary and I get bonuses. These bonuses are based on how I work with my materials, how I conserve my resources, how I schedule

my labor and so forth. And I do it quite well so I'm rewarded quite handsomely. My director also works on the same bonus basis, so that in the store that I work in we're approved for 5 managers but we only have 3 managers on salary. She gets a wonderful bonus based on working 3 people where the standards call for 5 people.

When you go into larger retail stores and you see a lot of departments, each of these department heads are on salary. And the same thing happens to, their general manager gets compensated based on how much of their salary they can save. They do this by running the salaried people more hours than they should. I'm afraid that the quality of life in New Hampshire is going to be drastically reduced as we see more of these chains come in.

I think its imperative of the legislature to take a good long look at what's going on and to see if maybe we shouldn't enact this legislation. We'll probably hear from the Department of Labor that this state has no authority to act in labor matters where larger cooperations earn more than a million dollars. There is a separation between Federal and State guidelines and the state is basically unable to deal with any of these situations. So I want you to take a good hard look at what a person has to do to qualify as a salaried employee. There were federal guidelines and I think it was 80/20 where 80% of your time had to be spent doing things other than the people that you supervise. These guidelines have been clouded and deluded where now anybody can be called salaried employee, and if you want the job you're going to say , "Yeah sure here I am I want the job" and your going to be subject to the whims of whatever the employer needs.

I originally had talked to my Senator, Senator Ned Gordon, about sponsoring this bill. Basically his answer to me was if you don't like your job get another one, which is the thought of a lot of people. But I think we really owe it to the people of New Hampshire to take a look at what those guidelines are, what the regulations are and come out with something that will probably stem the tide of abuse of employees. I guess that is about it. Oh by the way I think last week France passed a law -the country France- 35-hour workweek. What direction are we going in? Thank you.

Senator Lou D'Allesandro, D. 20: Thank you very much for your testimony. Senator Francoeur?

Senator Gary R. Francoeur, D. 14: Thank you. Mr. Simard your company you said pays you very well for what you do in your benefits. Is part of that compensation make it worth you staying there instead of going somewhere else?

Paul Simard: I enjoy my work, I would probably stay there if I wasn't paid. Basically I'm well compensated the normal person would feel that that compensation makes it worthwhile to be there. I guess it would depend on your own focus in life. What is most important to you your family, your friends, your wife, recreational time, quality of life, things that New Hampshire is known for or are you driven by greed? You know greed is good, I think we all saw that movie at one time. It's up to the individual.

Senator Lou D'Allesandro, D. 20: Any questions?

Senator Gary R. Francoeur, D. 14: If you don't put in those amount of hours per week and you put in your 50 to 55 will that be held against you?

Paul Simard: I would no longer be employed there.

Senator Lou D'Allesandro, D. 20: Further question?

Senator Gary R. Francoeur, D. 14: Are there other opportunities in your field?

Paul Simard: Yeah there are quite a few other opportunities and you know I mean I'm not locked into it and I'm not saying my job is bad. I'm saying that this thing could get way out of hand, could get way out of hand. I realize that I get paid probably a lot more than you people do for coming here. I know it was $200 when I was here.

Senator Lou D'Allesandro, D. 20: It hasn't gone up.

Further questions? Well it's always nice to see a distinguished member of the class of 1974. Thank you very much.

Paul Simard: Thank you .

Senator Lou D'Allesandro, D. 20: The following people have signed in as opposed to the bill but do not wish to speak; Nancy Trask from the Greater Nashua Chamber of Commerce, Gary Abbott from the Associated General Contractors of New Hampshire, Leslie Melby of the New Hampshire Hospitality Association, Katherine Eneguess from the Business and Industry Association, Stuart Trachy from the New Hampshire Grocers Association, and one who does wish to speak is Curtis J. Barry of the Retail Merchants Association.

Nancy Trask wishes to speak. Nancy we await your eloquent speech.

Nancy Trask, Greater Nashua Chamber of Commerce: Thank you.

See attachment A

So that was one of the reasons I wanted to oppose. Thank you, any questions?

Senator Lou D'Allesandro, D. 20: Thank you very much for your testimony. Sorry I missed you I didn't see the yes.

Nancy Trask: Thank you.

Senator Lou D'Allesandro, D. 20: Curtis J. Barry from the Retail Merchants Association.

Curtis J. Barry, Retail Merchants Association: Good afternoon. Thank you Mr. Chairman, Senators. My name is Curtis Barry I come before you today representing the Retail Merchants Association, a trade association made up of over 800 retailers ranging from your downtown independent shops to some of the major national retailers. I am here today before you in opposition to SB 410.

A number of reasons and I'll be as brief as possible. Salaried employees by in large aren't required to punch a clock or keep track of their hours. This would place an additional burden on management of a particular store or company to keep track of the hours that these individuals work during the week. In retail as in many other industries salaried employees at management level or otherwise are required to work certain number of hours at certain times of the year to get the job done. You've seen them in the malls during the holiday times, managers and other employees work many overtime hours. Many other industries have similar situations. This would create a problem in those times as well. In many of those instances that the salaried employees are compensated for that overtime worked by the various measures, comp-time being one of them. If a salaried employee is required to work 50 or 60 hours in one week in another week during the year they work 20 or 30 hours. They still receive their full compensation that week. There is no balance within this bill to compensate for that. Inventory is another time of year for retailers where people put in a lot of extra hours.

Picture, there was testimony to the fact that some managers may be receiving bonuses for working employees less hours, and thereby saving money for the company. Picture the store manager who schedules the employees for that particular store, who decides to schedule himself for an extra 20 hours a week over a normal 40 hour week, that's 60 hours. So he

can pick up a little time an a half, to the detriment of those folks who are working for hourly wages who will not be scheduled for those 20 hours during the week - another reason why this effects not only the company but other employees within that company.

To sum up the bottom line for the Retail Merchants Association is salaried employees accept that position with the understanding that they'll work 50 or 60 hours one week and maybe 20 or 30 hours another week, and still receive their annual wage regardless. In addition many companies are also compensating their employees salaried or otherwise with some creative ways other than wages. Stock options is just one that comes to my mind but there are various ways, and this doesn't address that as well and could put those in jeopardy. There are many benefits that employees receive that we know of that don't directly relate to wages, that could put these in jeopardy or have them reduced. Those are some of reasons that I should state that and we'd be very happy to work with the committee, or sub-committee or study committee if the committee wishes to go that route.

Senator Lou D'Allesandro, D. 20: Thank you very much. Any questions? If not, thank you very much for your testimony. Is there anyone who wishes to speak for or against SB 410? If not, we will call the hearing closed.

There is also **Attachment B**, concerning SB 410-FN-L from Robert Paul the Director of Employee Relations and Business Conduct.

Hearing closed at 3:45

Respectfully Submitted
Jillian Nina Mason, Secretary

SB 410 Requiring the payment of salaried employees an additional hourly rate for work over 50 hours in a week.

My name is Nancy Trask from Misomex International and I am here today representing the Greater Nashua Chamber of Commerce. I am here in opposition of SB 410. This bill would be costly for businesses throughout the state, is contrary to the Federal Fair Labor Standards act (it would jeopardize the exempt status of employees) and its enactment will greatly erode the "NH Advantage" for employers.

The FLSA, which was created in 1938, was developed to establish a national minimum wage and a maximum workweek. Its regulations carefully defined the rate on which overtime is determined and what kind of pay methods and employer is permitted to use in compensating employees. Along with those regulations the Act contains exemptions for certain "white collar" and other employment categories.

To pass this proposed legislation would go against these regulations. The exempt category of employment requires the employee to be paid on a predetermined salary basis, meet a primary duty test and meet a certain applicable minimum earnings threshold. The definition of predetermined salary is that it does not vary when quality or quantity of work performed varies. Under the FLSA exemptions, employers are not able to deduct an hour or partial day of absence from an exempt employee's pay. Doing so would jeopardize the exempt status. This legislation has employers tracking specific hours, determining hourly pay and paying it to this classification of employees. (Administrating and treating these EE's as hourly, non exempt.)

THE FLSA states that with certain exceptions, the exempt employee receives full pay for any week in which work is performed **without regard to the number of days or hours worked.** **(FLSA 29 CFR 541.118 q. executives)** as referenced from State and Federal Wage-Hour Compliance Guide, Warren, Gorham & Lamont 1996,1997

The proposed legislation is problematic. Technically, if an exempt employee is not paid based upon the number of hours he works to determine his pay how could employers determine that he has worked over 50? If an employee takes a few hours off in a week in which he "works over 50 hours" how is over 50 hours determined? Are those hours deducted? Doing so (tracking employee hours in this manner and subtracting hours when not worked) would jeopardize the exempt status.

This legislation goes against the spirit of the exempt status of the FLSA. Most exempt employees are higher paid managers and executives (see definition of exempt) calculating an hourly wage and paying it could be staggering. Part of being exempt is not "counting" the hours and these employees often qualify for other compensation such as bonuses and stock options and extended work week pay that conforms with the exempt definition.

Attachment B, SB 410-FN-L

65 Spit Brook Road, P.O. Box 868, Nashua, NH 03061-0868
Telephone (603) 885-4321 TDD (603) 885-STDD (7833)

SANDERS
A Lockheed Martin Company

20 January 2000

The Hon. Rick A. Trombly
Senate Internal Affairs Committee
Room 103 Legislative Office Bldg.
Concord, NH 03301

Dear Senator Trombly:

On behalf of Sanders, a Lockheed Martin Company, I am writing to express concern over Senate Bill 410, which would require NH employers to pay their salaried employees an additional hourly rate for hours worked over 50 in any workweek.

NH law defines "salaried" to include both exempt and non-exempt employees. Consequently, this bill would require Sanders to pay its exempt employees working more than 50 hours a week an overtime premium. With 3,000 exempt employees, of which about 10% work over 50 hours per week, our annual cost increase would be $5.4 million. Moreover, this legislation would primarily impact higher compensated management and technical professionals, thereby requiring premium pay to a group of exempt employees who are already eligible for and receive other variable compensation such as bonus and stock options.

At a time when we are struggling to control our costs, this legislation would result in an unacceptable increase to our cost of operation, negatively impacting our productivity and thus our ability to compete. In addition to the cost impact, it should be noted the Federal Fair Labor Standards Act has defined and governed the minimum wage and overtime requirements in this country since 1936. Like other companies over the years, Sanders has adapted its compensation program and methods to reflect and conform with these definitions and requirements. This bill would have the effect of nullifying the Executive, Professional, and Administrative exemptions under the FLSA, and force companies like Sanders to review and possibly re-engineer its entire compensation program.

The primary challenge to high technology companies like Sanders is the recruitment and retention of qualified, capable talent. We are constantly competing for this talent with Massachusetts and other states, and we can ill afford requirements that put us at a disadvantage. It is critical that we preserve and nurture the business climate that has traditionally existed here in New Hampshire. This legislation runs counter to that tradition, and therefore, I urge you to vote against SB 410 and allow companies like Sanders to remain productive and competitive.

Sincerely,

Robert L. Paul
Director Employee Relations and Business Conduct

RLP:nj

FILE COPY

Date: January 20, 2000
Time: 3:25 PM
Room: 103-LOB

The Senate Committee on Internal Affairs held a hearing on the following:

SB 410-FN-L relative to payment for overtime by salaried employees.

Members of Committee present:

Senator D'Allesandro
Senator Klemm
Senator Francoeur
Senator Pignatelli
Senator Trombly

The Chair, Senator Lou D'Allesandro, opened the hearing.
Senator Lou D'Allesandro, D. 20: I'd like to open the hearing on SB 410-FN-L, an act relative to payment for overtime by salaried employees. And call upon the Sponsor Senator Trombly.

Senator Rick A. Trombly, D. 7: Thank you Mr. Chair and members of the committee. SB 410-FN local is a bill that I sponsored at the request of a resident of the state of New Hampshire not a constituent. So terms of moving the ball forward on the terms of this legislation I would hope that person would be here. I explained that I would introduce it as a courtesy and I was hoping that the person could be here. Unfortunately when Marlene in the office contacted him he couldn't get time off from work I believe, so he won't be here. And I won't be long on this bill.

All I want to say is that I recognize that there will be a great deal of opposition to it, and some concerns I might have about the legislation in and of itself. So I would ask perhaps that this committee might want to send this bill to study and here's why;

As I was driving into Concord this morning I thought about this legislation knowing that it would need a quick death. But as businesses change in the state I think we're seeing, I saw on the news which made me think about this, employees now are being asked to work 60 and some work 70 hours a

week. We have pagers, faxes, E-mails and people work at home with their computers. People are not getting away from their jobs, and the thought was that technology would allow people to work less hours. The news cast said that that indeed was not the case. Companies were downsizing and not hiring employees, simply shifting the cost and the burden on other employees causing them to work more and longer hours. This was resulting in less productive employees.

I wont belabor the point, I think you get the just of why I would like to look at the changing nature of the work force relative to non-hourly wage employees. We take care of them but this is like picking up mercury. We have people in our work force who essentially don't leave their jobs. And I read a letter from somewhere talking about obligations of the state to companies, I wondered where we lost along the way our obligation to the people who work for us. I speak to you as an employer with salaried employees, and we treat them like human beings we expect a good days work from them and in return we get their loyalty because we treat them right.

This might not be the way we compensate people who have to put in those long hours. I would say a good study though of what business interests and what interests of employees are in the state of New Hampshire, is something we need to look at as legislature because we represent the business interest of the state that hire the people. And I don't cast any aspersions on them whatsoever because if they didn't do business here in the state our constituents wouldn't have jobs. But I do think we have a responsibility to look at in light of the changing work force, in light of the change of technology what we expect our constituents to do and how to compensate them for that.

Senator Lou D'Allesandro, D. 20: Thank you very much Senator Trombly. Any questions for Senator Trombly? If not, thank you very much for your testimony.

Senator Gary R. Francoeur, D. 14: Senator Trombly, are you proposing to just study this instead?

Senator Rick A. Trombly, D. 7: Yeah I would...I did it on behalf of a resident of the state and it was obviously somebody who had a problem that they wanted to address by the legislature. It's a fairly serious issue I wouldn't put it in. But I do think it raises issues that I think we need to address in conjunction with the business community. Cause I don't want to point a finger at business people and say they're not good. They are good. They employ people, but technology is changing the work place. And people who might have been working 50 hours a week now work 60 and 70, and I think we should examine how that relates to our labor laws. OSHA now is

looking at whether or not OSHA guidelines apply to the safety requirements of people who are working at home.

Senator Lou D'Allesandro, D. 20: Thank you Senator. Senator Pignatelli?

Senator Rick A. Trombly, D. 7: Mr. Simard is here, the person for whom I spoke.

Senator Debora B. Pignatelli, D. 13: Thank you.

It occurs to me that this might be a way for me to get salary increase, a lot of times I work more than 50 hours throughout the year and I might get 40 cents, 4 cents more an hour for every hour over the 50.

Senator Rick A. Trombly, D. 7: I got my mileage checked the other day and I'm still making $2.96 a day coming over here. I wouldn't oppose an increase in legislature. I voted for an increase by the way for the commission, I voted for the commission last session to study an increase in pay but I think there were only two of us who did that.

If I could Mr. Chairman, Mr. Simard is here and I most certainly sponsored it on his behalf. If you would yield to him, I would like to yield to him because it is something I did for him.

Paul Simard, Former House Member: I'm on a little break from work right now so I'll be very brief. My name is Paul Simard, I'm a former member of the House, I served on the labor committee with Chairman Shirley Merrill back in 1973.

I had called Senator Trombly up on this bill basically because I see a trend starting in this state that I'm not sure if it's healthy or not. If you start to read the labor laws- especially RSA 275- you're going to see that there are numerous references to quality of life in New Hampshire . And I see that quality of life being eroded on a daily basis. If we look in Concord right now and we see a lot of National chains coming in, a lot of retail outlets, a lot of restaurants and so forth.

I work for one of the restaurants and I'm not a disgruntled employee. I love my job, I do it well and I get compensated quite well for it. What I think I object to is when I was first hired I was told that I would work a 50 to 55 hour week, which is perfectly acceptable. I came from owning my own restaurant where I put in 80 to 90 hours a week and I did it cheerfully. The way I'm paid is I get a modest salary and I get bonuses. These bonuses are based on how I work with my materials, how I conserve my resources, how I schedule

my labor and so forth. And I do it quite well so I'm rewarded quite handsomely. My director also works on the same bonus basis, so that in the store that I work in we're approved for 5 managers but we only have 3 managers on salary. She gets a wonderful bonus based on working 3 people where the standards call for 5 people.

When you go into larger retail stores and you see a lot of departments, each of these department heads are on salary. And the same thing happens to, their general manager gets compensated based on how much of their salary they can save. They do this by running the salaried people more hours than they should. I'm afraid that the quality of life in New Hampshire is going to be drastically reduced as we see more of these chains come in.

I think its imperative of the legislature to take a good long look at what's going on and to see if maybe we shouldn't enact this legislation. We'll probably hear from the Department of Labor that this state has no authority to act in labor matters where larger cooperations earn more than a million dollars. There is a separation between Federal and State guidelines and the state is basically unable to deal with any of these situations. So I want you to take a good hard look at what a person has to do to qualify as a salaried employee. There were federal guidelines and I think it was 80/20 where 80% of your time had to be spent doing things other than the people that you supervise. These guidelines have been clouded and deluded where now anybody can be called salaried employee, and if you want the job you're going to say , "Yeah sure here I am I want the job" and your going to be subject to the whims of whatever the employer needs.

I originally had talked to my Senator, Senator Ned Gordon, about sponsoring this bill. Basically his answer to me was if you don't like your job get another one, which is the thought of a lot of people. But I think we really owe it to the people of New Hampshire to take a look at what those guidelines are, what the regulations are and come out with something that will probably stem the tide of abuse of employees. I guess that is about it. Oh by the way I think last week France passed a law -the country France- 35-hour workweek. What direction are we going in? Thank you.

Senator Lou D'Allesandro, D. 20: Thank you very much for your testimony. Senator Francoeur?

Senator Gary R. Francoeur, D. 14: Thank you. Mr. Simard your company you said pays you very well for what you do in your benefits. Is part of that compensation make it worth you staying there instead of going somewhere else?

Paul Simard: I enjoy my work, I would probably stay there if I wasn't paid. Basically I'm well compensated the normal person would feel that that compensation makes it worthwhile to be there. I guess it would depend on your own focus in life. What is most important to you your family, your friends, your wife, recreational time, quality of life, things that New Hampshire is known for or are you driven by greed? You know greed is good, I think we all saw that movie at one time. It's up to the individual.

Senator Lou D'Allesandro, D. 20: Any questions?

Senator Gary R. Francoeur, D. 14: If you don't put in those amount of hours per week and you put in your 50 to 55 will that be held against you?

Paul Simard: I would no longer be employed there.

Senator Lou D'Allesandro, D. 20: Further question?

Senator Gary R. Francoeur, D. 14: Are there other opportunities in your field?

Paul Simard: Yeah there are quite a few other opportunities and you know I mean I'm not locked into it and I'm not saying my job is bad. I'm saying that this thing could get way out of hand, could get way out of hand. I realize that I get paid probably a lot more than you people do for coming here. I know it was $200 when I was here.

Senator Lou D'Allesandro, D. 20: It hasn't gone up.

Further questions? Well it's always nice to see a distinguished member of the class of 1974. Thank you very much.

Paul Simard: Thank you .

Senator Lou D'Allesandro, D. 20: The following people have signed in as opposed to the bill but do not wish to speak; Nancy Trask from the Greater Nashua Chamber of Commerce, Gary Abbott from the Associated General Contractors of New Hampshire, Leslie Melby of the New Hampshire Hospitality Association, Katherine Eneguess from the Business and Industry Association, Stuart Trachy from the New Hampshire Grocers Association, and one who does wish to speak is Curtis J. Barry of the Retail Merchants Association.

Nancy Trask wishes to speak. Nancy we await your eloquent speech.

Nancy Trask, Greater Nashua Chamber of Commerce: Thank you.

See attachment A

So that was one of the reasons I wanted to oppose. Thank you, any questions?

Senator Lou D'Allesandro, D. 20: Thank you very much for your testimony. Sorry I missed you I didn't see the yes.

Nancy Trask: Thank you.

Senator Lou D'Allesandro, D. 20: Curtis J. Barry from the Retail Merchants Association.

Curtis J. Barry, Retail Merchants Association: Good afternoon. Thank you Mr. Chairman, Senators. My name is Curtis Barry I come before you today representing the Retail Merchants Association, a trade association made up of over 800 retailers ranging from your downtown independent shops to some of the major national retailers. I am here today before you in opposition to SB 410.

A number of reasons and I'll be as brief as possible. Salaried employees by in large aren't required to punch a clock or keep track of their hours. This would place an additional burden on management of a particular store or company to keep track of the hours that these individuals work during the week. In retail as in many other industries salaried employees at management level or otherwise are required to work certain number of hours at certain times of the year to get the job done. You've seen them in the malls during the holiday times, managers and other employees work many overtime hours. Many other industries have similar situations. This would create a problem in those times as well. In many of those instances that the salaried employees are compensated for that overtime worked by the various measures, comp-time being one of them. If a salaried employee is required to work 50 or 60 hours in one week in another week during the year they work 20 or 30 hours. They still receive their full compensation that week. There is no balance within this bill to compensate for that. Inventory is another time of year for retailers where people put in a lot of extra hours.

Picture, there was testimony to the fact that some managers may be receiving bonuses for working employees less hours, and thereby saving money for the company. Picture the store manager who schedules the employees for that particular store, who decides to schedule himself for an extra 20 hours a week over a normal 40 hour week, that's 60 hours. So he

can pick up a little time an a half, to the detriment of those folks who are working for hourly wages who will not be scheduled for those 20 hours during the week - another reason why this effects not only the company but other employees within that company.

To sum up the bottom line for the Retail Merchants Association is salaried employees accept that position with the understanding that they'll work 50 or 60 hours one week and maybe 20 or 30 hours another week, and still receive their annual wage regardless. In addition many companies are also compensating their employees salaried or otherwise with some creative ways other than wages. Stock options is just one that comes to my mind but there are various ways, and this doesn't address that as well and could put those in jeopardy. There are many benefits that employees receive that we know of that don't directly relate to wages, that could put these in jeopardy or have them reduced. Those are some of reasons that I should state that and we'd be very happy to work with the committee, or sub-committee or study committee if the committee wishes to go that route.

Senator Lou D'Allesandro, D. 20: Thank you very much. Any questions? If not, thank you very much for your testimony. Is there anyone who wishes to speak for or against SB 410? If not, we will call the hearing closed.

There is also **Attachment B**, concerning SB 410-FN-L from Robert Paul the Director of Employee Relations and Business Conduct.

Hearing closed at 3:45

Respectfully Submitted
Jillian Nina Mason, Secretary

SB 410 Requiring the payment of salaried employees an additional hourly rate for work over 50 hours in a week.

My name is Nancy Trask from Misomex International and I am here today representing the Greater Nashua Chamber of Commerce. I am here in opposition of SB 410. This bill would be costly for businesses throughout the state, is contrary to the Federal Fair Labor Standards act (it would jeopardize the exempt status of employees) and its enactment will greatly erode the "NH Advantage" for employers.

The FLSA, which was created in 1938, was developed to establish a national minimum wage and a maximum workweek. Its regulations carefully defined the rate on which overtime is determined and what kind of pay methods and employer is permitted to use in compensating employees. Along with those regulations the Act contains exemptions for certain "white collar" and other employment categories.

To pass this proposed legislation would go against these regulations. The exempt category of employment requires the employee to be paid on a predetermined salary basis, meet a primary duty test and meet a certain applicable minimum earnings threshold. The definition of predetermined salary is that it does not vary when quality or quantity of work performed varies. Under the FLSA exemptions, employers are not able to deduct an hour or partial day of absence from an exempt employee's pay. Doing so would jeopardize the exempt status. This legislation has employers tracking specific hours, determining hourly pay and paying it to this classification of employees. (Administrating and treating these EE's as hourly, non exempt.)

THE FLSA states that with certain exceptions, the exempt employee receives full pay for any week in which work is performed **without regard to the number of days or hours worked.** **(FLSA 29 CFR 541.118 q. executives)** as referenced from State and Federal Wage-Hour Compliance Guide, Warren, Gorham & Lamont 1996,1997

The proposed legislation is problematic. Technically, if an exempt employee is not paid based upon the number of hours he works to determine his pay how could employers determine that he has worked over 50? If an employee takes a few hours off in a week in which he "works over 50 hours" how is over 50 hours determined? Are those hours deducted? Doing so (tracking employee hours in this manner and subtracting hours when not worked) would jeopardize the exempt status.

This legislation goes against the spirit of the exempt status of the FLSA. Most exempt employees are higher paid managers and executives (see definition of exempt) calculating an hourly wage and paying it could be staggering. Part of being exempt is not "counting" the hours and these employees often qualify for other compensation such as bonuses and stock options and extended work week pay that conforms with the exempt definition.

Attachment B, SB 410-FN-L

65 Spit Brook Road, P.O. Box 868, Nashua, NH 03061-0868
Telephone (603) 885-4321 TDD (603) 885-STDD (7833)

SANDERS
A Lockheed Martin Company

20 January 2000

The Hon. Rick A. Trombly
Senate Internal Affairs Committee
Room 103 Legislative Office Bldg.
Concord, NH 03301

Dear Senator Trombly:

On behalf of Sanders, a Lockheed Martin Company, I am writing to express concern over Senate Bill 410, which would require NH employers to pay their salaried employees an additional hourly rate for hours worked over 50 in any workweek.

NH law defines "salaried" to include both exempt and non-exempt employees. Consequently, this bill would require Sanders to pay its exempt employees working more than 50 hours a week an overtime premium. With 3,000 exempt employees, of which about 10% work over 50 hours per week, our annual cost increase would be $5.4 million. Moreover, this legislation would primarily impact higher compensated management and technical professionals, thereby requiring premium pay to a group of exempt employees who are already eligible for and receive other variable compensation such as bonus and stock options.

At a time when we are struggling to control our costs, this legislation would result in an unacceptable increase to our cost of operation, negatively impacting our productivity and thus our ability to compete. In addition to the cost impact, it should be noted the Federal Fair Labor Standards Act has defined and governed the minimum wage and overtime requirements in this country since 1936. Like other companies over the years, Sanders has adapted its compensation program and methods to reflect and conform with these definitions and requirements. This bill would have the effect of nullifying the Executive, Professional, and Administrative exemptions under the FLSA, and force companies like Sanders to review and possibly re-engineer its entire compensation program.

The primary challenge to high technology companies like Sanders is the recruitment and retention of qualified, capable talent. We are constantly competing for this talent with Massachusetts and other states, and we can ill afford requirements that put us at a disadvantage. It is critical that we preserve and nurture the business climate that has traditionally existed here in New Hampshire. This legislation runs counter to that tradition, and therefore, I urge you to vote against SB 410 and allow companies like Sanders to remain productive and competitive.

Sincerely,

Robert L. Paul
Director Employee Relations and Business Conduct

RLP:nj

Speakers

SB 410-FN-L Senate Internal Affairs Hearing Sign In

APPEARING: IN FAVOR	APPEARING: TO OPPOSE	DATE: JANUARY 20, 2000 TIME: 3:10 PM NAME / REPRESENTING	WISH TO SPEAK?
✓		Rudi Thomsen Sponsor	✓
	✓	Nancy Frasle & Greater Nashua Chamber of Commerce	✓ (yes)
	✓	Gary Abbott Associated General Contractors of NH	NO
	✓	Leslie Melby NH Hospital Association	NO
	✓	KATHARINE ENEGUESS BUSINESS + Industry Assoc.	NO
	✓	Stuart Trachy N.H. Grocers Assoc.	NO
	✓	CURTIS J BARRY RETAIL MERCHANTS ASSOC. OF NH	YES
✓		~~Christine Wiggin Rep.~~	

Testimony

file copy SB 410

65 Spit Brook Road, P.O. Box 868, Nashua, NH 03061-0868
Telephone (603) 885-4321 TDD (603) 885-STDD (7833)

SANDERS
A Lockheed Martin Company

20 January 2000

The Hon. Rick A. Trombly
Senate Internal Affairs Committee
Room 103 Legislative Office Bldg.
Concord, NH 03301

Dear Senator Trombly:

On behalf of Sanders, a Lockheed Martin Company, I am writing to express concern over Senate Bill 410, which would require NH employers to pay their salaried employees an additional hourly rate for hours worked over 50 in any workweek.

NH law defines "salaried" to include both exempt and non-exempt employees. Consequently, this bill would require Sanders to pay its exempt employees working more than 50 hours a week an overtime premium. With 3,000 exempt employees, of which about 10% work over 50 hours per week, our annual cost increase would be $5.4 million. Moreover, this legislation would primarily impact higher compensated management and technical professionals, thereby requiring premium pay to a group of exempt employees who are already eligible for and receive other variable compensation such as bonus and stock options.

At a time when we are struggling to control our costs, this legislation would result in an unacceptable increase to our cost of operation, negatively impacting our productivity and thus our ability to compete. In addition to the cost impact, it should be noted the Federal Fair Labor Standards Act has defined and governed the minimum wage and overtime requirements in this country since 1936. Like other companies over the years, Sanders has adapted its compensation program and methods to reflect and conform with these definitions and requirements. This bill would have the effect of nullifying the Executive, Professional, and Administrative exemptions under the FLSA, and force companies like Sanders to review and possibly re-engineer its entire compensation program.

The primary challenge to high technology companies like Sanders is the recruitment and retention of qualified, capable talent. We are constantly competing for this talent with Massachusetts and other states, and we can ill afford requirements that put us at a disadvantage. It is critical that we preserve and nurture the business climate that has traditionally existed here in New Hampshire. This legislation runs counter to that tradition, and therefore, I urge you to vote against SB 410 and allow companies like Sanders to remain productive and competitive.

Sincerely,

Robert L. Paul
Director Employee Relations and Business Conduct

RLP:nj

Voting Sheets

Senate Internal Affairs Committee

EXECUTIVE SESSION

SB 410-FN-L

Hearing date: 1-20-2K Room: LOB-103

Motion of: OTP

Made by Senator:			*Seconded by Senator:*		
	D'Allesandro	☐		D'Allesandro	☑
	Klemm	☐		Klemm	☐
	Below	☐		Below	☐
	Francoeur	☑		Francoeur	☐
	Fraser	☐		Fraser	☐
	Pignatelli	☐		Pignatelli	☐
	Trombly	☐		Trombly	☐

Committee Member	*Present*	*Vote*	*Reported out by*
Senator Lou D'Allesandro, Chairman	☑	Opposed	
Senator Arthur Klemm, Vice-Chair	☑		
Senator Clifton Below	☐		
Senator Gary Francoeur	☑	✓	
Senator Leo Fraser	☐		
Senator Debora Pignatelli	☑		
Senator Rick Trombly	☑	Opposed	

*Amendments:

NOTES: Vote — 3-2

Committee Report

file copy SB 410

STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

SENATE

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE

Date: **FEB. _____, 2000**

THE COMMITTEE ON **Internal Affairs**

to which was referred **Senate Bill 410-FN-L**

AN ACT ***relative to payment for overtime by salaried employees.***

VOTE: **3 / 2**

Having considered the same, report the same without amendment and recommend that the bill: **OUGHT TO PASS**.

Senator Gary R. Francoeur
For the Committee

SB410 Docket

Next|Previous|Results List|Bill Status

Bill Title: relative to payment for overtime by salaried employees.

Date	Body	Description
1/5/00	**S**	Introduced and Ref. to Internal Affairs; SJ Convening Day, Pg. 13
1/6/00	**S**	Hearing, Jan 20, 3:10 p.m., Room, 103, LOB; SC1, Pg.5
1/31/00	**S**	Committee Report, Inexpedient to Legislate , 2/3/2000 ; SC8, Pg.6
2/3/00	**S**	Inexpedient to Legislate, MA, VV ==KILLED== ; SJ 2, Pg.82

**Docket Abbreviation Explanations

Next|Previous|Results List|Bill Status

SB410 Docket

Next|Previous|Results List|Bill Status

Bill Title: relative to payment for overtime by salaried employees.

Date	Body	Description
1/5/00	**S**	Introduced and Ref. to Internal Affairs; SJ Convening Day, Pg. 13
1/6/00	**S**	Hearing, Jan 20, 3:10 p.m., Room, 103, LOB; SC1, Pg.5
1/31/00	**S**	Committee Report, Inexpedient to Legislate , 2/3/2000 ; SC8, Pg.6
2/3/00	**S**	Inexpedient to Legislate, MA, VV ==KILLED== ; SJ 2, Pg.82

**Docket Abbreviation Explanations

Next|Previous|Results List|Bill Status