



FIRE WATCH

News and developments in employment law and labor relations for California Fire Safety Management.

MAY 2017

INDEX

Workplace Injuries.....	1
Wage and Hour	1
FBOR	2
Discrimination	3
Settlements	5

LCW NEWS

LCW Webinars	6
LCW Seminar	7
Train the Trainer Refresher.....	8
LCW Labor Relations Certification Program.....	9
Firm Activities	10

Fire Watch is published monthly for the benefit of the clients of Liebert Cassidy Whitmore. The information in *Fire Watch* should not be acted on without professional advice.

Los Angeles | Tel: 310.981.2000
 San Francisco | Tel: 415.512.3000
 Fresno | Tel: 559.256.7800
 San Diego | Tel: 619.481.5900
 Sacramento | Tel: 916.584.7000

©2017 Liebert Cassidy Whitmore
 lcwlegal.com

WORKPLACE INJURIES

Public Employer Immunity under Government Code Section 850.4 Applies to Two Different Categories of Firefighter Injuries.

Rebecca Quigley was a U.S. Forest Service Firefighter. The Service called in a non-firefighting team for assistance with logistics. While fighting a large fire, Quigley had to sleep at a base camp with other firefighters. Firefighters were sleeping in tents and sleeping bags on the ground. Part of the sleeping areas were roped off and marked as sleeping areas, but others were not. A safety officer surveyed the areas and recorded that each was separated from parking, shaded, and had been labeled as a “sleeping area” despite the fact that some sleeping areas did not meet those criteria. Each time Quigley tried to find a place to sleep, the designated sleeping areas were full. Therefore, she slept in a field area in a sleeping bag with a few other firefighters. One night, while Quigley was sleeping, an employee drove his water truck onto the field towards the showers. After collecting used water, he drove through the field again, this time running over Quigley and severely injuring her.

Quigley sued Garden Valley Fire Protection District, Chester Fire Protection District, and three employees alleging she was injured as a result of their negligence, failure to warn, and dangerous conditions of public property. The Districts contended they were entitled to immunity under Government Code section 850.4 which immunizes public agencies and their employees against claims for injuries caused in fighting fires. The Court determined that section 850.4 should be construed to apply to two types of injuries: (1) injuries resulting from the condition of firefighting equipment or facilities; or (2) injuries caused in fighting fires. The Court determined that an injury need not be caused by both requirements.

Quigley v. Garden Valley Fire Protection District, et al. (2017) ___ Cal.App.4th ___ [2017 WL 1399720].

NOTE:

This case also notes that most firefighters who are injured on the job have the option to utilize workers’ compensation provisions.

WAGE AND HOUR

Court Drastically Reduces Police Officers’ Claim for Attorneys’ Fees After Years of FLSA Litigation.

Los Angeles office Partners **Brian Walter** and **Geoff Sheldon** and a team of associates secured a significant reduction in attorney’s fees sought by attorneys who represented thousands of Los Angeles Police Department (“LAPD”) officers.

Litigation that wound up lasting over a decade began when approximately 2,500 current or former LAPD officers at the rank of lieutenant or below alleged that the City failed to pay them for overtime that they worked pre-shift, post-shift, during unpaid meal periods or on regular days off. The officers alleged that the City “should have known” that they did not accurately report all their overtime because LAPD gave them more work than allegedly could be done during their regular duty hours, the LAPD’s overtime policy (which required the accurate reporting of all overtime worked) was allegedly not enforced and certain LAPD supervisors (Sergeants and Lieutenants – many of whom were plaintiffs themselves) allegedly dissuaded them from reporting all time worked under an “unwritten” practice or rule to not report overtime of less than one hour. The officers also sought to be paid overtime for the time they spent “donning” and “doffing” their police uniforms and related gear (Sam Browne belt and Kevlar vest) before and after their shifts.

Earlier in the case, the District Court granted the City’s motion for summary judgment on the officers’ “donning” and “doffing” claims. The Court then granted the City’s motion to decertify the officers’ various “off-the-clock” work claims on the grounds that the officers were not “similarly situated” to one another. The officers then attempted to file 28 smaller collective action lawsuits, but those attempts were thwarted by misjoinder motions, which resulted in the dismissal of all but the first-named officer in each lawsuit. The end result was that only 20 of the approximately 2,500 officers remained in the lawsuits, and only their “off-the-clock” claim remained viable for trial.

The City then settled with the 20 officers at mediation. Because the officers’ attorneys were unwilling to settle their claim for attorney’s fees and costs for an amount the City deemed reasonable, the parties agreed to submit the issue of fees and costs to a District Court judge for determination. Collectively, the officers’ attorneys sought more than \$8 million from the City. LCW opposed the fee motions on behalf of the City, and the District Court awarded the three law firms representing the officers less than \$500,000 for work performed over a decade of litigation.

Acevedo v. City of Los Angeles (USDC Central Distr. 2016.)

FBOR

Interrogation by Criminal Investigators from Another Police Department Did Not Trigger Statutory Protections.

A veteran officer of the Oxnard Police Department (OPD) began dating a woman who had been indicted for murder. The officer discovered that the woman was under investigation early in their relationship, but continued dating her and even brought her inside the police station and on ride-alongs on multiple occasions.

The officer’s relationship was contrary to an OPD policy providing, in relevant part, “Except as required in the performance of official duties or, in the case of immediate relatives, employees shall not develop or maintain personal or financial relationships with any individual they know or reasonably should know is under criminal investigation.”

When the OPD caught wind of the relationship, it contacted the Santa Monica Police Department (SMPD), which was the agency handling the murder investigation. At the time, the prevailing belief at OPD was that the officer was not aware of the woman’s status.

SMPD investigators then requested to interview the officer, so OPD had him come to the station but did not tell him why. During the interview with the SMPD investigators, the officer said he knew the woman was being investigated for murder and added that he had been to court with her on several occasions. An OPD commander sat in on the interview, but did not ask any questions.

Immediately after the interview, the OPD commander placed the officer on administrative leave and initiated a personnel investigation. The officer retired three days later.

Ultimately, the OPD’s investigation concluded that the officer violated multiple department policies, including the policy prohibiting a relationship with an individual under criminal investigation. Had the officer not retired, the OPD would have terminated him. Due to the officer’s policy violations, OPD issued a post-retirement written reprimand. It also denied the officer a retirement badge, concealed weapons (CCW) endorsement, and the ability to purchase his service weapon – items for which he otherwise may have qualified.

The officer asserted various causes of action, all of which the trial court and Court of Appeal rejected. Among other things, the officer claimed the OPD violated his First Amendment rights to freedom of association by penalizing him for his relationship with a woman who had not been convicted of a crime. In addition, he argued that he was denied his procedural rights under Government Code section 3303, and the opportunity for an administrative appeal under Government Code section 3304. Both of these

Government Code sections fall within the Public Safety Officers' Procedural Bill of Rights Act (POBR), the police equivalent to the FBOR.

The officer contended that his interview with the SMPD investigators was an "interrogation" entitling him to various procedural protections under Government Code section 3303 (equivalent to section 3253 of the FBOR). However, section 3303 expressly states that it only applies when an officer is "under investigation and subjected to interrogation by his commanding officer, or any other member of the employing public safety department, that could lead to punitive action."

Here, the Court found there was substantial evidence that section 3303 was inapplicable. It reasoned that it was the SMPD investigators, not members of the OPD, who conducted the interview. Further, the officer was not under administrative investigation, given that the prevailing belief at OPD was that he was unaware of the woman's status.

The officer also claimed that OPD failed to provide him an opportunity for an administrative appeal, in violation of Government Code section 3304 of the POBR (equivalent to section 3254 of the FBOR). Under the statute, officers are entitled to administratively appeal a "punitive action," defined as "any action that may lead to dismissal, demotion, suspension, reduction in salary, written reprimand, or transfer for purposes of punishment." The Court found that the only relevant "punitive action" in this case was OPD's written reprimand, but it held that the reprimand was not actionable because section 3304 did not apply to "persons such as appellant who have voluntarily retired while a disciplinary investigation was pending against them."

Finally, the Court addressed the officer's contention that the OPD violated his First Amendment right to associate freely with the woman. The Court found no error in the trial court's rejection of this claim, noting that "[i]t is well established that there is no constitutional impediment to police department rules prohibiting officers from maintaining close personal relationships with persons charged with felonies such as murder."

Chronister v. City of Oxnard (2017) 2017 WL 1056115 [unpublished].

NOTE:

Certain aspects of this case, particularly those relating to the POBR, would likely apply to firefighting agencies the same as to police departments. Also, although this case is unpublished, and therefore not citable, it signals how other courts may decide cases that address similar questions pertaining to interrogations, administrative appeals, and freedom of association.

DISCRIMINATION

Twice Terminated Employee Defeats Employer's Motion for Summary Judgment on Wrongful Termination.

Gilberto Santillan worked as a garbage truck driver for USA Waste in Manhattan Beach, California for 30 years. In January 2009, USA Waste assigned Steve Kobzoff to be Santillan's route manager. Kobzoff attempted to discipline Santillan six times between January 2009 and July 2010. In March 2011, USA Waste's contract with the City of Manhattan Beach was up for renewal. A number of Manhattan Beach residents supported the renewal of the contract and praised Santillan's services as their garbage collector.

On December 5, 2011, USA Waste fired Santillan. USA Waste alleged it terminated Santillan because he had four accidents within a 10-month period. Santillan disputed the accidents and alleged USA Waste failed to follow the relevant collective bargaining agreement procedures. After Santillan's termination, USA Waste replaced him with an employee who was 13 years younger. Santillan was one of multiple, older, Spanish-speaking employees who USA Waste fired or suspended.

On December 7, 2011, Santillan filed a formal grievance to challenge his termination. After Santillan filed the grievance, USA Waste received hundreds of letters from Manhattan Beach residents demanding USA Waste reinstate Santillan.

On May 17, 2012, USA Waste and Santillan signed a settlement agreement. Santillan agreed to dismiss the grievance, and USA Waste agreed to reinstate his employment if he passed a drug test, physical exam, and criminal background check, and provided proof of his right to work in the United States through "e-Verify."

Santillan completed the requirements as requested. Maria Diaz, a USA Waste human resources employee told Santillan he would start on July 16, 2012. Diaz also told Santillan that he would need to provide a completed I-9 form showing his eligibility to work in the United States. When Santillan reported to work, he produced his driver's license and social security card to complete the I-9 form. Diaz informed Santillan that he also needed to provide a work authorization number and its expiration date. Santillan twice provided the identification number, but did not provide an expiration date. Therefore, Diaz sent Santillan home and USA Waste terminated him a second time for failing to provide proof of his right to work.

Santillan sued USA Waste for wrongful termination in violation of California's public policies against: (1) age discrimination; and (2) retaliation for having an attorney represent him during the settlement agreement

negotiations. USA Waste filed a motion for summary judgment, which the district court granted. Santillan appealed.

The Court of Appeals applied the burden shifting framework under *McDonnell Douglas Corp v. Green* to the wrongful termination claims. Under the first prong of the framework, the employee must establish a *prima facie* case of discrimination or retaliation. Under the second prong, the employer can rebut the presumption by providing a legitimate, non-discriminatory reason for its adverse employment action. If the employer is able to present legitimate reasons for its decision, the employee must show that the reason the employer provided is pretext for discriminatory conduct.

The Court first addressed Santillan's claim for wrongful termination in violation of California's public policy against age discrimination. To state a *prima facie* case of age discrimination under the Fair Employment and Housing Act (FEHA), the employee must establish: (1) membership in a protected class; (2) competent work performance; (3) an adverse employment action; and (4) circumstances that suggest a discriminatory motive.

The Court determined that Santillan provided evidence of the first three elements of age discrimination. In analyzing whether Santillan provided evidence of discriminatory motive, the Court determined that two pieces of evidence were sufficient. First, Santillan testified that Kobzof fired or suspended multiple, older Spanish-speaking employees. Second, the Court identified the 13-year age gap between Santillan and his replacement. Not only was his replacement younger, but Santillan also had approximately 21 more years of experience. The Court also determined that USA Waste failed to provide a legitimate, non-discriminatory reason for firing Santillan. USA Waste argued that Santillan failed to provide proof he was eligible to work in the United States, but Santillan provided two appropriate documents to prove his right to work, as allowed by the Immigration Control and Reform Act.

The Court also found that Santillan established a *prima facie* case of retaliation. First, Santillan showed that having an attorney represent him during settlement negotiations was a protected activity under California law. California's Labor Code section 923 gives an employee the right to representation as to the terms and conditions of employment. Second, USA Waste could not rebut the presumption that it retaliated against Santillan because it fired him within two months after his attorney negotiated the settlement agreement.

Santillan v. USA Waste of California (9th Cir. 2017) ___ F.3d ___ [2017 WL 1289971].

NOTE:

Age discrimination claims can still be viable even if

the terminated employee and the replacement employee are over 40. Both employees were over 40 in this case, but Santillan was significantly older -- 13 years older -- than his replacement.

Rejection of Former Employee's Request to Rescind Voluntary Resignation Does Not Constitute an Adverse Employment Action.

Ruth Featherstone, at-will employee, worked for the Southern California Permanente Medical Group (SCPMG). During her employment, she had a temporary disability as a side effect of medication she was taking. Unbeknownst to SCPMG, the medication caused her to have an "altered mental state." During that altered mental state, Featherstone called her supervisor and resigned. Her supervisor asked her to confirm her resignation in writing, which she did. Featherstone later informed SCPMG that she had an altered mental state when she resigned and asked to rescind the resignation. SCPMG declined.

Featherstone sued SCPMG for discrimination, failure to prevent discrimination, failure to accommodate, failure to engage in the interactive process, and wrongful termination under the California Fair Employment and Housing Act ("FEHA"). FEHA prohibits employment discrimination against an employee on the basis of a physical disability or medical condition. An employee in a disability discrimination case must prove that: (1) she has a disability; (2) she was otherwise qualified to do her job; (3) an adverse employment action occurred; and (4) her employer had a discriminatory intent.

The Court acknowledged that FEHA is silent on whether refusing to allow a former employee to rescind a voluntary resignation is considered an adverse employment action.

Due to a lack of case law from California courts, the Court reviewed federal decisions. That case law overwhelmingly supported a finding that refusing to accept an employee's request to rescind a voluntary resignation is not an adverse employment action absent unusual circumstances, such as constructive termination, or an employer's coercion or misconduct. As a result, the Court decided that SCPMG did not have a duty to allow Featherstone to rescind her voluntary resignation. Since Featherstone could not show an adverse employment action, her discrimination claims under the FEHA failed.

On the failure to accommodate claim, the Court noted that an employer's duty to accommodate only applies to known disabilities. When Featherstone resigned and SCPMG accepted the resignation, SCPMG did not know Featherstone was temporarily disabled because of the adverse drug reaction. Therefore, Featherstone was unable to establish SCPMG's duty to accommodate or engage in the interactive process.

Finally, the Court addressed the wrongful termination claim. The Court rejected the claim because California law provides that a claim for wrongful termination in violation of public policy fails if an employer did not violate the FEHA. Since Featherstone did not establish a FEHA violation, her wrongful termination claim also could not proceed.

Featherstone v. Southern California Permanente Medical Group (2017) ___ Cal.App.4th ___ [2017 WL 1399709].

NOTE:

This case also discusses the importance of promptly accepting an employee's offer to resign. If there is no contradictory procedure in an employment contract or policy, a binding contract to resign occurs if the employer accepts the resignation before the employee rescinds her offer to resign. In this case, SCPMG had already accepted the resignation by the time Featherstone asked to rescind it. A written resignation, followed by a written acceptance, can provide valuable evidence that a binding contract to voluntarily resign occurred.

SETTLEMENTS

Below are a couple of recent settlements in the public safety arena. We are providing this information to give readers an understanding of what employment litigation can cost public safety employers.

- A federal court in Virginia approved a settlement between Henrico County and a group of fire captains to resolve a lawsuit alleging the captains were misclassified as exempt in violation of the Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA). In total, the County agreed to pay more than \$580,000, including attorney's fees. Earlier in the case, the district court granted summary judgment to the County, finding that the captains were exempt under the FLSA's executive exemption. In so holding, the trial court concluded that the firefighters were not covered by the FLSA's "first responder" regulation, which states that the white collar exemptions "do not apply to ... fire fighters ... regardless of rank or pay level, who perform work such as preventing, controlling or extinguishing fires of any type; rescuing fire, crime or accident victims ... or other similar work." On appeal, the U.S. Court of Appeal for the Fourth Circuit (which covers Virginia, among other states) directed the trial court to reconsider the case in light of *Morrison v. County of Fairfax, VA* (4th Cir. 2016) 826 F.3d 758. In *Morrison*, a case we reported on in July 2016, the court applied the first responder regulation to a group of Fairfax County, Virginia fire captains. That case ultimately also settled for \$7.85 million.
- The City of Glen Rock, New Jersey paid out \$750,000 to settle a lawsuit with a terminated police officer who claimed that other officers harassed him due to his sexual orientation by making derogatory comments and lewd gestures, resulting in a hostile work environment. As part of the settlement, the officer was also reinstated. Under the FEHA, California employees are similarly protected against harassment based on sexual orientation.

§



Fire Watch, is available via email. If you would like to be added to the email distribution list or If you know someone who would benefit from this publication, please visit www.lcwlegal.com/subscribe.aspx.

Please note: By adding your name to the e-mail distribution list, you will no longer receive a hard copy of **Fire Watch**. If you have any questions, call Jennifer Ye at 310.981.2000.

LCW WEBINAR: NEGOTIABLE ITEMS – WAGES, HOURS, AND WORKING CONDITIONS



Tuesday, June 6, 2017 | 10 AM - 11 AM

Presented by:



[Peter Brown](#)

The scope of bargaining is broad and not specifically defined by the law. There is both the obligation to negotiate over a decision to modify a term or condition of employment within the scope of bargaining and the obligation to negotiate over the impact of an agency decision even if the agency has the right to make the decision unilaterally. This is confusing and frustrating. Confusing because the scope of bargaining has generally expanded based on cases issued by the Public Employment Relations Board, and frustrating because it often unclear as to whether a decision or just the impact of a decision must be negotiated. Come listen to an hour where Peter Brown tries to makes this difficult topic easier to understand.

Who Should Attend? *HR and Labor Relations professionals, Managers and Directors.*

Workshop Fee: *Consortium Members: \$70, Non-Members: \$100*

LCW WEBINAR: HIRING CALPERS RETIREES: DOING IT RIGHT?



Wednesday, June 14, 2017 | 10 AM - 11 AM

Presented by:



[Frances Rogers](#)

Join us for a presentation that will focus on the restrictions and requirements governing post-retirement work for CalPERS retirees. This webinar will discuss common pitfalls, mistakes, and misinterpretations of the post-retirement work restrictions governing CalPERS retired annuitants. Specific issues will include:

- independent contractors and third party employers,
- appointments of limited duration, and
- the limitations on “extra help” and interim appointments.

We will also discuss liability for violations of the post-retirement work restriction.



[Michael Youril](#)

Who Should Attend? *Risk Managers, Human Resources, Supervisors and Managers*

Workshop Fee: *Consortium Members: \$70, Non-Members: \$100*

Register Today: www.lcwlegal.com/events-and-training


LCW LIEBERT CASSIDY WHITMORE

**LCW SEMINAR: HOW TO AVOID CLAIMS OF
DISABILITY DISCRIMINATION: THE ROAD
TO REASONABLE ACCOMMODATION (WITH
SPECIAL GUEST – ASSISTANT CHIEF COUNSEL
PAULA PEARLMAN FROM DFEH)**

LCW is pleased to offer this seminar presented by our attorney, Jennifer Rosner and Assistant Chief Counsel at DFEH, Paula Pearlman.

Agencies are faced with many challenges when presented with employees with disabilities in the workplace. Presented by a state-wide leading Liebert Cassidy Whitmore attorney in the areas of employee disability and discrimination and **Special Guest Assistant Chief Counsel from the Department of Fair Employment and Housing (DFEH)**, this seminar will help employers successfully navigate through the reasonable accommodation process and provide a framework to answer the difficult questions such as: What are an employer's responsibilities when it suspects a disability but the employee hasn't requested an accommodation? How far is an employer required to go to accommodate a disability, and what happens when that conflicts with other statutory schemes or possibly the rights of other employees? What are the employer's responsibilities when discipline and disability intersect?

This workshop will also provide key information on what you should do when the interactive process breaks down and whether you can separate an employee or must file for disability retirement.

Attendees will learn:

- Real case studies from litigation handled by the DFEH and LCW, including a discussion about what went right and what went wrong in those cases;
- Practical ways to avoid claims of disability discrimination, failure to accommodate, and failure to engage in the disability process;
- Tips to identify known and unknown disabilities;
- Triggers to know your duty to accommodate;
- Medical certifications you can require;
- Tactics to handle seemingly endless leaves; and
- Preventive strategies directly from DFEH.

We invite you to take this unique opportunity to get extensive insight and best practices from LCW and DFEH, and hope you'll join us!

Who Should Attend?

Human Resources professionals, Risk Managers, Supervisors

Details:

Tuesday, July 11, 2017 | 9:00AM - 12:00PM
Fullerton Community Center | 340 W Commonwealth Ave, Fullerton, CA 92832

Pricing:

\$250 per person for Consortium Members
\$300 per person for Non-Consortium Members

REGISTER TODAY: [WWW.LCWLEGAL.COM/EVENTS-AND-TRAINING/
WEBINARS-SEMINARS](http://WWW.LCWLEGAL.COM/EVENTS-AND-TRAINING/WEBINARS-SEMINARS)

TRAIN THE TRAINER REFRESHER SESSIONS

SAN FRANCISCO - JUNE 2, 2017

SAN DIEGO - JUNE 9, 2017

FRESNO - JUNE 14, 2017

LOS ANGELES - JUNE 16, 2017

Time: 9:00 a.m. - 12:00 p.m.
Location: Liebert Cassidy Whitmore Offices
Cost: \$1,000 each or \$900 each if ERC Member

Liebert Cassidy Whitmore is offering "Train the Trainer" refresher sessions to provide you with the necessary tools to continue conducting mandatory AB 1825 (Govt. Code Section 12950.1) training for your agency. As you know, a key component of AB 1825 compliance is the provision of preventing harassment training to all supervisory employees every two years and to new supervisors within 6 months of their assumption of a supervisory position.

If you have attended one of LCW's previous Train the Trainer sessions, you are eligible to attend the Refresher course.

ATTENDEES WILL RECEIVE:

- 3 hours of instruction to be completed in one day
- Guide, PowerPoint slides and case studies (on CD and hard copy) complete with detailed speakers' notes for use in their future presentations
- Participant Guide for distribution in their future presentations
- Legal updates, where warranted, through 2019, including updated slides and facilitator / participant guides
- Certificate of Attendance for "Train the Trainer session"

REGISTRATION:

Visit <https://www.lcwlegal.com/events-and-training/webinars-seminars> for more information and to register online. Please contact Anna Sanzone-Ortiz at ASanzone-Ortiz@lcwlegal.com or 310.981.2051 for more information on how to bring this training to your agency.



*Developing Positive Partnerships
and Leadership Excellence
for Labor Relations Professionals*



The Liebert Cassidy Whitmore Labor Relations Certification Program[®] is designed for labor relations and human resources professionals who work in public sector agencies. It is designed for both those new to the field as well as experienced practitioners seeking to hone their skills. These workshops combine educational training with experiential learning methods ensuring that knowledge and skill development are enhanced. Participants may take one or all of the Certification programs, in any order. Take all of the classes to earn your certificate!

Next Class:

June 21, 2017

Nuts and Bolts of Negotiations



Navigate the nuts and bolts of public sector negotiations by exploring the legal framework of collective bargaining, preparation tips for the process, and setting up your strategy!

Register Now! <https://www.lcwlegal.com/events-and-training/labor-relations-certification-program/nuts-and-bolts-of-negotiations>

LEARN MORE AT WWW.LCWLEGAL.COM/LRCP

MANAGEMENT TRAINING WORKSHOPS

Firm Activities

Consortium Training

- June 1 “Disciplinary and Harassment Investigations: Who, What, When and How”
Gateway Public ERC | Santa Fe Springs | Laura Kalty & Hengameh S. Safaei
- June 1 “The Future is Now - Embracing Generational Diversity and Succession Planning”
Los Angeles County Human Resources Consortium | Los Angeles | Mark Meyerhoff
- June 1 “Advanced Investigations of Workplace Complaints”
San Mateo County ERC | Burlingame | Erin Kunze
- June 7 “A Guide to Implementing Public Employee Discipline” & “Prevention and Control of Absenteeism and Abuse of Leave”
Monterey Bay ERC | Hollister | Kimberly A. Horiuchi
- June 8 “Maximizing Supervisory Skills for the First Line Supervisor”
Orange County Consortium | Buena Park | Kristi Recchia

Customized Trainings

- June 1,15 “Preventing Workplace Harassment, Discrimination and Retaliation”
City of Glendale | Danny Y. Yoo
- June 2 “Preventing Workplace Harassment, Discrimination and Retaliation”
City of Rocklin | Kristin D. Lindgren
- June 2 “Train the Trainer Refresher: Harassment Prevention”
Liebert Cassidy Whitmore | San Francisco | Heather R. Coffman
- June 6 “Competencies for Successful Supervisory Skills and Building the Best Management Skills Toolbox”
City of Ontario | Kristi Recchia
- June 7,8 “Preventing Workplace Harassment, Discrimination and Retaliation”
Merced County | Merced | Che I. Johnson
- June 9 “Freedom of Speech and Right to Privacy”
Labor Relation Information System - LRIS | Las Vegas | Mark Meyerhoff
- June 9 “Train the Trainer Refresher: Harassment Prevention”
Liebert Cassidy Whitmore | San Diego | Judith S. Islas
- June 13 “Preventing Workplace Harassment, Discrimination and Retaliation”
City of Hesperia | Lee T. Patajo
- June 13 “Preventing Workplace Harassment, Discrimination and Retaliation”
City of Stockton | Kristin D. Lindgren
- June 14,22,29 “Preventing Workplace Harassment, Discrimination and Retaliation”
City of Newport Beach | Christopher S. Frederick
- June 14 “Mandated Reporting”
East Bay Regional Park District | Oakland | Erin Kunze
- June 14 “Train the Trainer Refresher: Harassment Prevention”

Liebert Cassidy Whitmore | Fresno | Shelline Bennett

- June 15 “Public Service: Understanding the Roles and Responsibilities of Public Employees”
City of Ontario | Kristi Recchia
- June 15 “MOU’s, Leaves and Accommodations”
City of Santa Monica | Laura Kalty
- June 16 “Train the Trainer Refresher: Harassment Prevention”
Liebert Cassidy Whitmore | Los Angeles | T. Oliver Yee
- June 20 “Preventing Workplace Harassment, Discrimination and Retaliation”
City of Concord | Heather R. Coffman
- June 21 “Preventing Workplace Harassment, Discrimination and Retaliation”
City of La Habra | Lee T. Patajo
- June 22 “Maximizing Supervisory Skills for the First Line Supervisor”
City of Manhattan Beach | Kristi Recchia
- June 22 “Performance Management: Evaluation, Discipline and Documentation and Guide to Implementing
Public Employee Discipline”
Mariposa County | Mariposa | Kimberly A. Horiuchi
- June 28 “Preventing Workplace Harassment, Discrimination and Retaliation”
City of Modesto | Che I. Johnson

Speaking Engagements

- June 27 “The GM Toolbox: Doing Business Contracts Yourself with Confidence”
California Special Districts Association (CSDA) General Managers Summit | Newport Beach |
Heather DeBlanc

Seminars/ Webinars

Register Today: www.lcwlegal.com/events-and-training

- June 6 “Negotiable Items - Wages, Hours, and Working Conditions”
Liebert Cassidy Whitmore | Webinar | Peter J. Brown
- June 14 “Hiring CALPERS Retirees: Doing it Right?”
Liebert Cassidy Whitmore | Webinar | Frances Rogers & Michael Youril
- June 21 “LCW Labor Relations Certification Program: Nuts and Bolts of Negotiations”
Liebert Cassidy Whitmore | Fullerton | Laura Kalty & Kristi Recchia

LCW LIEBERT CASSIDY WHITMORE

6033 West Century Blvd., 5th Floor | Los Angeles, CA 90045

 CalPublicAgencyLaborEmploymentBlog.com |  @lcwlegal

Copyright © 2017 **LCW** LIEBERT CASSIDY WHITMORE

Requests for permission to reproduce all or part of this publication should be addressed to Cynthia Weldon, Director of Marketing and Training at 310.981.2000.

Fire Watch is published monthly for the benefit of the clients of Liebert Cassidy Whitmore. The information in *Fire Watch* should not be acted on without professional advice. To contact us, please call 310.981.2000, 415.512.3000, 559.256.7800, 619.481.5900 or 916.584.7000 or e-mail info@lcwlegal.com.