



BRIEFING ROOM

News and developments in employment law and labor relations for California Law Enforcement Management.

SEPTEMBER 2019

INDEX

Discrimination	3
Firm Victory	1
Labor Relations.....	2
Public Records	4

LCW NEWS

Firm Activities	7
LCW Conference 2020.....	5
New to the Firm	6
Supreme Court Case Win	6

Briefing Room is published monthly for the benefit of the clients of Liebert Cassidy Whitmore. The information in *Briefing Room* 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

©2019 Liebert Cassidy Whitmore
www.lcwlegal.com

FIRM VICTORY

California Supreme Court Allows Law Enforcement Agency To Disclose “Brady Alerts” To Prosecutors.

LCW Partner [Geoffrey Sheldon](#), Senior Counsel [David Urban](#), and Associate Attorney [Alex Wong](#) led the Los Angeles County’s Sheriff’s Department (“LASD”) to victory in a closely watched case before the California Supreme Court. The State’s Supreme Court overturned a lower appellate court’s decision and held that the LASD could give prosecutors the name(s) of potential deputy witness(es) in a particular case, who are on its “Brady list”, without a Pitchess motion and court order.

The case arose from a conflict in the law between criminal defense rights and California peace officers’ privacy rights. In *Brady v. Maryland*, 373 U.S. 83 (1963), the U.S. Supreme Court (“USSC”) concluded that under the due process clause of U.S. Constitution’s 14th Amendment, the prosecution in a criminal case must disclose to the defense all evidence the prosecutor has that would tend to show the criminal defendant was not guilty, including evidence that that would impeach prosecution witnesses such as peace officers.

Sometimes, this “exculpatory” evidence is found in the personnel file of a peace officer witness. For example, if the personnel file shows that the officer had been dishonest or committed other significant misconduct (e.g., racial profiling), the defense could use that information to impeach the officer’s credibility or motivations at the criminal trial. Conversely, California Penal Code sections 832.7 and 832.8 and Evidence Code section 1043, et seq., sometimes called “the Pitchess statutes, generally make peace officer personnel records confidential. The Pitchess statutes say that in order to access peace officer personnel information, the party seeking the information must first file a motion with the court. If the motion is granted, which can only occur if the moving party establishes “good cause,” the court privately reviews the officer’s personnel records and provides the asking party any information the court deems relevant. This is commonly known as the “Pitchess” procedure, and the motion the party files is commonly called a “Pitchess motion.”

To address this conflict between a criminal defendant’s constitutional rights and a peace officer’s privacy rights, the LASD compiled a so-called “Brady list,” consisting of names and employee identification numbers of deputies whose personnel files contained sustained allegations of misconduct that could be used to impeach the deputies at trial. This Brady list typically includes officers who had been found to be dishonest or guilty of other acts of moral turpitude.

The LASD planned to disclose its Brady list to the district attorney’s office and other prosecutorial agencies. The prosecution would then know to file a Pitchess motion to obtain the relevant information from the deputy’s personnel file, or to alert the defense so it could file its own Pitchess motion. Under the proposed policy, no information from the deputies’ personnel files would be disclosed without a formal Pitchess motion and accompanying court order.

The LASD notified the deputies of the proposed policy. The Association for Los Angeles County Deputy Sheriffs (“ALADS”), a union representing non-supervisory deputies, opposed the policy. ALADS filed a lawsuit seeking an injunction to, among other things, prohibit the LASD from creating its *Brady* list or disclosing it (or individual names off of it) to anyone outside of the LASD, absent full compliance with the *Pitchess* procedure. The case made its way up to the California Supreme Court.

In a unanimous decision in favor of the LASD, the Court first evaluated the extent to which California’s SB 1421, effective January 1, 2019, affected its analysis. That new law, which went into effect while this case was pending, opened for public inspection many types of peace officers personnel records that could cause an officer to be on a *Brady* list, such as: particular categories of sustained findings of officer dishonesty, perjury, false statements, filing false reports, or evidence destruction, falsification, or concealment. The Court found that although some of this SB 1421 information could place an officer on a *Brady* list, other types of misconduct and information might also do so.

To resolve the case, the Court held that the “confidentiality” requirement of the *Pitchess* statutes should be interpreted to allow law enforcement agencies to comply with their constitutional obligations under *Brady* by providing limited *Brady* alerts to prosecutors. A *Brady* alert is limited to informing prosecutors that a potential peace officer witness in a particular case is on the *Brady* list. The Court reasoned:

In common usage, confidentiality is not limited to complete anonymity or secrecy...[D]eeming information “confidential” creates insiders (with whom information may be shared) and outsiders (with whom sharing information might be an impermissible disclosure). The text of the *Pitchess* statutes does not clearly indicate that prosecutors are outsiders, forbidden from receiving confidential *Brady* alerts.

The Court concluded that “the Department may provide prosecutors with the *Brady* alerts at issue here without violating confidentiality.”

It is important to note that the Court did not hold that LASD could forward an entire *Brady* list to prosecutors. Rather, the Court held that *Brady* alerts were permissible on a case-by-case basis, that is only when there was a pending criminal case.

Association for Los Angeles Deputy Sheriffs v. Superior Court (Los Angeles County Sheriff’s Department), No. S243855 (August 26, 2019)

NOTE:

This decision will allow law enforcement and criminal prosecutorial agencies to more efficiently work together without compromising an officer’s privacy rights. LCW celebrates its attorneys and staff for serving the Sheriff’s Department so well throughout this case.

LABOR RELATIONS

County Violated MMBA By Unilaterally Amending Rules Regarding Promotional Opportunities.

The County of Orange revised its Merit Selection Rules (“MSR”) for employee promotions and renamed them its Recruitment Rules and Policies (“RRP”). The Association of Orange County Deputy Sheriffs (“Association”) later learned of the revisions. The Association sent the County a letter identifying several changes it considered to be subject to bargaining, and requested the County to return to the status quo by reinstating the former MSR. The County declined, and replied that none of the changes concerned mandatory subjects of bargaining. The Association then filed an Unfair Practice Charge (“UPC”) with PERB based on the following changes.

First, the RRP amended the MSR’s “Qualification of Applicants” section to state that applicants must not only meet “minimum qualifications” to be considered for a position, but depending on the needs of the County, applicants must also have “desirable qualifications.” Second, the RRP amended the MSR’s “Assessment Requirements” section to require “desirable or ideal qualifications” in some circumstances addition to minimum qualifications. Third, the RRP included new language limiting applicants for inter-jurisdictional transfers from other counties. Fourth, the RRP employed a new “absent rater formula” to recuse a panel member in case of a “close personal relationship” with a candidate.

The ALJ ruled that the County’s actions did not violate the Meyers-Milias-Brown Act (“MMBA”) because these changes fell outside the scope of representation, and thus did not require advance notice to the Association or an opportunity to meet and confer. Applying the three-part test regarding the scope of representation, the ALJ referenced *City of Alhambra* (2010) PERB Decision No. 2139-M (*Alhambra*), which held that some changes to procedures for promotional opportunities are outside the scope of representation. The ALJ then concluded that based on *Alhambra*, the changes to threshold qualification levels in the RRP were outside the scope of representation.

As for the “absent rater formula” and inter-jurisdictional transfers, the ALJ found that these changes both had an effect on public services and were a fundamental managerial or policy decision, and therefore fell outside the scope of representation. The Association excepted to the ALJ’s ruling, and the matter was heard before the PERB Board.

PERB reversed the ALJ’s decision. PERB found that the County violated the MMBA by implementing changes to the MSR/RRP without affording the Association advance notice and an opportunity to bargain. PERB held that because the revisions at issue were substantive changes to the County’s promotional procedures, they fell within the scope of representation.

PERB examined 35 years of precedent predating the *Alhambra* decision which supported that promotional opportunities usually fall within the scope of representation. PERB stated that promotional opportunities fall outside the scope of representation only under unusual circumstances, such as when an employer makes no substantive changes to a procedure, or revises a procedure to comply with changes in the law.

PERB found no such unusual circumstances in this case. PERB found that the County’s implementation of “desired” qualifications excluded candidates who met the minimum qualifications, and therefore implicated the promotional opportunities of those who did not. The County’s new rating formula also altered promotional opportunities. PERB decided that the County’s desire for a uniform recruitment policy covering all departments did not create an unusual circumstance that released the County from its duty to bargain. PERB found that promotional criteria were within the scope of representation and disavowed *Alhambra* on this issue.

PERB also found that the County violated the MMBA with regard to effects bargaining. PERB disagreed with the ALJ’s conclusion that the Association failed to state a claim for effects bargaining because it did not demand effects bargaining after it learned of the unilateral implementation. PERB ruled that if a union learns of an agency’s decision after its unilateral implementation, there can be no waiver its right to bargain effects for failure to make a demand because a union’s obligation to demand effects bargaining never even arises in the face of an employer’s unilateral implementation. PERB also found the effects identified by the Association, including job security and promotional opportunities were not speculative given the substance of the unilaterally imposed changes.

County of Orange, PERB Decision No. 2663-M (2019).

NOTE:

This PERB decision disparages a nine-year old PERB precedent and overturns the ALJ’s decision that was in the employer’s favor. LCW will continue to monitor PERB decisions and report on whether this decision is part of any trend.

DISCRIMINATION

Employee Must Show An Adverse Employment Action Would Not Have Occurred But For A Disability.

Dr. Michael Murray sued the Mayo Clinic (“Clinic”) and various individuals alleging disability discrimination in violation of the federal Americans With Disabilities Act (“ADA”) after the Clinic terminated his employment. During trial, Dr. Murray requested that the district court instruct the jury that he would prevail if he established that his disability “was a *motivating factor*” in the Clinic’s decision to terminate his employment. The district court denied Dr. Murray’s request and instead instructed the jury that Dr. Murray needed to establish that he “was discharged *because* of his disability.” This is known as the “but for” causation standard. The jury returned a verdict in favor of the defendants. Dr. Murray appealed.

On appeal, Dr. Murray argued that the district court was required to instruct the jury on the “motivating factor” standard rather than the “but for” standard based on the Ninth Circuit precedent stated in the case *Head v. Glacier Northwest, Inc.*, 413 F.3d 1053 (9th Cir. 2005.) However, a three-judge panel of Ninth Circuit disagreed.

The court noted that while the Ninth Circuit’s decision in *Head* had been consistent with the plain meaning of the ADA and the interpretation of other courts, the U.S. Supreme Court (“USSC”) had subsequently issued decisions to change the applicable causation standard. For example, the USSC held that an employee must “prove that age was the ‘but-for’ cause of the employer’s adverse action” in order to prevail on a claim under the federal Age Discrimination in Employment Act in *Gross v. FBL Financial Services Inc.*, 557 U.S. 167 (2009). The USSC declined to extend the “motivating factor” causation standard to Title VII retaliation claims in *University of Texas Southwestern Medical Center v. Nassar*, 570 U.S. 338 (2013). Accordingly, the court noted that the USSC has retreated from the “motivating factor” causation standard.

The court noted that while a three-judge panel generally cannot overrule a prior Ninth Circuit decision, it may overrule prior authority when an intervening USSC case undermines the existing precedent. The court concluded

that because the USSC's decisions in *Gross* and *Nassar* were clearly irreconcilable with the Ninth Circuit's decision in *Head, Head* was overruled. Thus, the court found that an employee bringing a discrimination claim under the ADA must show that the adverse employment action would not have occurred but for the disability.

Murray v. Mayo Clinic (2019) 2019 WL 3939627.

NOTE:

This case confirms that California courts should apply the "but for" causation standard when considering ADA discrimination cases. This standard is more generous towards employers than the "motivating factor" causation standard.

Employee Could Not Establish Disability Discrimination Without A Causal Relationship Between His Impairment And Termination.

Jose Valtierra began working for Medtronic, Inc. in 2004 as a facility maintenance technician. Between his hiring until his termination in 2014, Valtierra was severely overweight. In late 2013, Valtierra received time off for joint pain associated with his weight. Valtierra returned to work in December 2013 without medical restrictions; however, he was still morbidly obese.

In May 2014, Valtierra's supervisor noticed Valtierra seemed to be having difficulty walking. Concerned about Valtierra's ability to perform his job, the supervisor checked the computer system the company used to track assignments. Although Valtierra had left for vacation a day prior, the computer system indicated that he had completed numerous assignments that should have taken a more significant amount of time to complete. When Valtierra's supervisor confronted him about these discrepancies, Valtierra admitted he had not performed all of the work, but intended to complete the assignments when he returned from vacation. Medtronic then terminated Valtierra for falsifying records.

Subsequently, Valtierra sued Medtronic alleging that he had a disability within the meaning of the Americans with Disabilities Act ("ADA") and that his termination was unlawful discrimination. The trial court dismissed Valtierra's case, finding that obesity, no matter how great, could not constitute a disability under ADA regulations unless the obesity is caused by an underlying condition. The trial court concluded that Valtierra was not able to demonstrate that his obesity was caused by such a condition.

On appeal, the Ninth Circuit affirmed the trial court's decision to dismiss the case. However, the Ninth Circuit did not decide whether Valtierra's obesity was a disability under the ADA. Instead, the court found that even assuming that Valtierra was disabled, he could

not establish ADA disability discrimination because he could not prove a causal relationship between his obesity and his termination. The court reasoned that because Valtierra admitted he marked assignments as completed when he had not done the work, and because he had been severely overweight throughout his employment, there was no basis to conclude that the company terminated him for any reason other than falsifying records.

Valtierra v. Medtronic Inc. (2019) 2019 WL 3917531.

NOTE:

Agencies should also be aware that obesity may be a disability within the meaning of the California Fair Employment and Housing Act ("FEHA") if there is a physiological cause or if the employer perceives of or regards the condition as a disability. Accordingly, public agencies should be sure to carefully evaluate all disability discrimination complaints and requests for accommodation involving obesity.

PUBLIC RECORDS

County Lawfully Increased Its Fee For Copies Of Records.

In 2010, Alameda County adopted an ordinance increasing the fee for copies of records from \$1.50 per page to \$3.50 per page. The County adopted this ordinance in response to studies it conducted in 2009 and 2010. The 2009 fee study revealed it cost the County \$3.60 in direct and indirect costs to copy one page of a County record. The second fee study in 2010 revealed it cost \$4.08 to copy one page of a record. That study attributed the increased cost to an increase in salary and benefits in the intervening year. The County also evaluated the fees of neighboring counties and found their fees ranged from \$1.00 per page to \$7.00 per page.

In 2014, California Public Records Research, Inc. ("CPRR") challenged the County's ordinance increasing the fee to \$3.50 per page based on Government Code section 27366. Government Code section 27366 provides that the fee "shall be set . . . in an amount necessary to recover the direct and indirect costs of providing the product or service." CPRR argued that the County violated section 27366. After the trial court found that the County's fee of \$3.50 per page was "unlawful under [section] 27366 as arbitrary, capricious, or entirely lacking evidentiary support," the County appealed.

On appeal, the County contended that it "did not abuse its discretion by enacting a fee schedule encompassing indirect costs authorized by Government Code section

27366.” The California Court of Appeal agreed. The court noted that the case hinged on what the Legislature meant by “indirect costs” in section 27366. The court relied on the statute’s legislative history and determined that the Legislature intended to give county boards of supervisors the flexibility and discretion to consider a wide range of indirect costs. Therefore, the court concluded that CPRR could not establish that the County had violated section 27366.

Further, the Court of Appeal determined that the County’s fee schedule was not “arbitrary, capricious, or entirely lacking evidentiary support” as the trial court had found. CPRR alleged that the \$52.50 cost for a typical 15-page deed of trust demonstrated the “excessiveness” of the County’s \$3.50 per page fee. However, the court reasoned that CPRR provided no evidence about the average length of copy requests, or the reasonableness of charging fees based on a flat rate per page. The court also noted that even though the County’s 2010 fee study found it cost \$4.08 per page to make copies of official records, it still adopted a fee of \$3.50 per page. Therefore, the court concluded that it must defer to the County’s decision to charge \$3.50 per page for copies of official records.

California Public Records Research, Inc. v. County of Alameda, 27 Cal.App.5th 800 (2019).

NOTE:

This case demonstrates that California counties have broad discretion to set fees for copying records. LCW attorneys can help public agencies ensure that any proposed fee increases are appropriate.

§

REGISTRATION IS NOW OPEN FOR THE

LCW

2020

Public Sector Employment Law Annual Conference

Hyatt Regency San Francisco
January 22-24, 2020

For More Information:
lcwlegal.com/lcw-conference

Earn up to 5 hours of POST-Credit!

40 years
 1980 - 2020



Congratulations to **Geoffrey Sheldon**, **Alex Wong**
and **David Urban** on their victory in a California
Supreme Court case!



“The importance of a fair trial to a criminal defendant is paramount to our justice system, and this reinforces that.”

- **Geoffrey Sheldon**



California Supreme Court decided unanimously that the Los Angeles County Sheriff’s Department and other law enforcement agencies may alert prosecutors that a deputy who is slated to testify in a criminal case has a history of misconduct. News of this decision made numerous publications in California and around the country – and Geoffrey Sheldon was interviewed to provide his input!

Quoted in the following publications:

- Fresno Bee
- Associated Press
- The Sacramento Bee
- Los Angeles Times
- Miami Herald
- Merced Sun Star
- Santa Maria Times
- KRCA
- Idaho Statesman
- SMDaily Journal
- Washington Times
- The San Francisco Chronicle
- Bakersfield.com
- San Diego Union Tribune
- OC Register
- Daily Journal
- NH Register
- CEB (Continuing Education of the Bar)
- NBC Bay Area
- Houston Chronicle
- Kansas City News
- Napa Valley Register

NEW TO THE FIRM



Amy Brandt is an Associate in our San Francisco office where she works closely with school district management and leaders on various issues such as employee investigations, employee discipline, civil rights issues, student discipline, contract interpretation, contract drafting, and community partnerships.

She can be reached at 415.512.3045 or abrandt@lcwlegal.com.



Monica Espejo joins our Sacramento office where she provides representation and counsel to clients in matters pertaining to labor & employment law as well as business, construction, and facilities. She represents both public and private sector clients.

She can be reached at 916.584.7083 or mespejo@lcwlegal.com.

MANAGEMENT TRAINING WORKSHOPS

Firm Activities

Consortium Training

- Sept. 11** **“Nuts & Bolts: Navigating Common Legal Risks for the Front Line Supervisor”**
Humboldt County ERC | Fortuna | Jack Hughes
- Sept. 11** **“Difficult Conversations” & “The Future is Now - Embracing Generational Diversity and Succession Planning”**
San Gabriel Valley ERC | Alhambra | Christopher S. Frederick
- Sept. 11** **“The Meaning of At-Will, Probationary, Seasonal, Part-time and Contract Employment”**
Ventura/Santa Barbara ERC | Webinar | Ronnie Arenas
- Sept. 12** **“Managing the Marginal Employee” & “Finding the Facts: Employee Misconduct & Disciplinary Investigations (formerly Conducting Disciplinary Investigations: Who, What, When and How)”**
Central Valley ERC | Fresno | Shelline Bennett
- Sept. 12** **“Maximizing Supervisory Skills for the First Line Supervisor”**
Gold Country ERC | Citrus Heights | Kristin D. Lindgren
- Sept. 12** **“Exercising Your Management Rights”**
Humboldt County ERC | Fortuna | Jack Hughes
- Sept. 12** **“Labor Code 101 for Public Agencies”**
Monterey Bay ERC | Webinar | Michael Youril
- Sept. 12** **“Public Service: Understanding the Roles and Responsibilities of Public Employees” & “Workplace Bullying: A Growing Concern”**
San Diego ERC | La Mesa | Stephanie J. Lowe
- Sept. 17** **“Privacy Issues in the Workplace” & “Labor Code 101 for Public Agencies”**
North San Diego County ERC | Vista | Kevin J. Chicas
- Sept. 18** **“Preventing Workplace Harassment, Discrimination and Retaliation”**
NorCal ERC | San Ramon | Morin I. Jacob
- Sept. 19** **“MOU Auditing and The Book of Long Term Debt” & “Labor Code 101 for Public Agencies”**
Coachella Valley ERC | La Quinta | Melanie L. Chaney
- Sept. 19** **“Privacy Issues in the Workplace” & “Navigating the Crossroads of Discipline and Disability Accommodation”**
Napa/Solano/Yolo ERC | Fairfield | Gage C. Dungy
- Sept. 19** **“Difficult Conversations” & “The Art of Writing the Performance Evaluation”**
Orange County Consortium | Tustin | Kristi Recchia
- Sept. 19** **“Legal Issues Regarding Hiring” & “Workplace Bullying: A Growing Concern”**
West Inland Empire ERC | Chino Hills | Danny Y. Yoo
- Sept. 25** **“Nuts & Bolts: Navigating Common Legal Risks for the Front Line Supervisor” & “Managing the Marginal Employee”**
Central Coast ERC | Paso Robles | Che I. Johnson

Sept. 26	“Maximizing Supervisory Skills for the First Line Supervisor Part 1” LA County Human Resources Consortium Los Angeles Elizabeth T. Arce
Oct. 2	“Leaves, Leaves and More Leaves” North State ERC Webinar Lisa S. Charbonneau
Oct. 3	“Maximizing Supervisory Skills for the First Line Supervisor” Central Valley ERC Lindsay Tony G. Carvalho & Che I. Johnson
Oct. 3	“The Future is Now - Embracing Generational Diversity and Succession Planning” Gateway Public ERC South Gate Kristi Recchia
Oct. 3	“Prevention and Control of Absenteeism and Abuse of Leave” & “Managing the Marginal Employee” Imperial Valley ERC El Centro Frances Rogers
Oct. 3	“The Future is Now - Embracing Generational Diversity and Succession Planning” & “Managing the Marginal Employee” San Joaquin Valley ERC Ripon Michael Youril
Oct. 3	“Preventing Workplace Harassment, Discrimination and Retaliation” South Bay ERC Redondo Beach Ronnie Arenas
Oct. 10	“Technology & Employee Privacy” Bay Area ERC Webinar Che I. Johnson
Oct. 10	“Maximizing Supervisory Skills for the First Line Supervisor” East Inland Empire ERC Fontana Kristi Recchia
Oct. 10	“Technology & Employee Privacy” San Mateo County ERC Webinar Che I. Johnson
Oct. 10	“The Future is Now - Embracing Generational Diversity and Succession Planning” & “Iron Fists or Kid Gloves: Retaliation in the Workplace” Ventura/Santa Barbara ERC Camarillo Christopher S. Frederick
Oct. 16	“Labor Negotiations from Beginning to End” & “Leaves, Leaves and More Leaves” San Gabriel Valley ERC Alhambra T. Oliver Yee
Oct. 17	“Preventing Workplace Harassment, Discrimination and Retaliation” & “Case Study for Managing Illnesses or Injuries” Coachella Valley ERC Palm Desert Ronnie Arenas
Oct. 17	“Preventing Workplace Harassment, Discrimination & Retaliation” Orange County Consortium Buena Park Laura Drottz Kalty
Oct. 23	“Leaves, Leaves and More Leaves” & “Nuts & Bolts: Navigating Common Legal Risks for the Front Line Supervisor” NorCal ERC Danville Richard Bolanos
Oct. 24	“Maximizing Supervisory Skills for the First Line Supervisor Part 2” LA County Human Resources Consortium Los Angeles Elizabeth T. Arce
Oct. 24	“Exercising Your Management Rights” & “An Agency’s Guide to Employee Retirement” Mendocino County ERC Ukiah Erin Kunze

- Oct. 30 **“Difficult Conversations” & “Maximizing Performance Through Evaluation, Documentation and Corrective Action”**
Gold Country ERC | Roseville | Gage C. Dungy & Brian J. Hoffman
- Oct. 30 **“A Guide to Implementing Public Employee Discipline” & “Nuts & Bolts: Navigating Common Legal Risks for the Front Line Supervisor”**
Monterey Bay ERC | Watsonville | Casey Williams

Customized Training

Our customized training programs can help improve workplace performance and reduce exposure to liability and costly litigation. For more information, please visit www.lcwlegal.com/events-and-training/training.

- Sept. 10,18,24 **“Preventing Workplace Harassment, Discrimination and Retaliation”**
City of Sunnyvale | Lisa S. Charbonneau
- Sept. 10 **“Harassment and Ethics”**
City of Long Beach Water Department | Long Beach | Laura Drottz Kalty
- Sept. 10 **“Key Legal Principles for Public Safety Managers - POST Management Course”**
Peace Officer Standards and Training - POST | San Diego | Stefanie K. Vaudreuil
- Sept. 11 **“Preventing Workplace Harassment, Discrimination and Retaliation and Mandated Reporting”**
East Bay Regional Park District | Castro Valley | Casey Williams
- Sept. 12 **“Preventing Workplace Harassment, Discrimination and Retaliation”**
City of Brea | Laura Drottz Kalty
- Sept. 12 **“Preventing Workplace Harassment, Discrimination and Retaliation”**
Rancho Simi Recreation and Park District | Simi Valley | Joung H. Yim
- Sept. 12 **“Preventing Workplace Harassment, Discrimination and Retaliation”**
Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County | Whittier | Christopher S. Frederick
- Sept. 13 **“Inclusive Leadership”**
San Diego County Water Authority | San Diego | Kristi Recchia
- Sept. 16 **“Supervisor/Management Development Training”**
City of Manhattan Beach | Kristi Recchia
- Sept. 16,20 **“Preventing Workplace Harassment, Discrimination and Retaliation”**
City of Sausalito | Lisa S. Charbonneau
- Sept. 17,18,19 **“Preventing Workplace Harassment, Discrimination and Retaliation”**
Irvine Ranch Water District | Irvine | Christopher S. Frederick
- Sept. 18 **“Preventing Workplace Harassment, Discrimination and Retaliation”**
City of San Bruno | Kelsey Cropper
- Sept. 19 **“MOU’s, Leaves and Accommodations”**
City of Santa Monica | Laura Drottz Kalty
- Sept. 24 **“Preventing Workplace Harassment, Discrimination and Retaliation”**
City of Monterey Park | Laura Drottz Kalty

Sept. 24 **“Preventing Workplace Harassment, Discrimination and Retaliation”**
City of National City | Kevin J. Chicas

Sept. 24 **“Maximizing Supervisory Skills for the First Line Supervisor”**
Mono County | Lee Vining | Gage C. Dungy

Sept. 25 **“Maximizing Supervisory Skills for the First Line Supervisor”**
City of Glendale | Stacey H. Sullivan

Sept. 25 **“Preventing Workplace Harassment, Discrimination and Retaliation”**
City of Pittsburg | Kelsey Cropper

Speaking Engagements

Sept. 17 **“Police Officers Bill of Rights (POBR)”**
Golden West Academy POST Supervisory Leadership Institute | Huntington Beach | J. Scott Tiedemann

Sept. 25 **“Harassment Training”**
Public Employer Labor Relations Association of California (PELRAC) 2019 Annual Conference | Cathedral City | Laura Drottz Kalty

Sept. 27 **“Tactical Considerations When Conducting Internal Affairs Investigations”**
Association of Workplace Investigators (AWI) Annual Conference | Marina del Rey | Laura Drottz Kalty

Sept. 27 **“Tackling Challenges in Accommodating Mental Disabilities in the Workplace”**
Public Agency Risk Managers Association (PARMA) Central Valley Chapter Fall Training | Clovis | Michael Youril

Sept. 27 **“Legal Update”**
Public Employer Labor Relations Association of California (PELRAC) Annual Conference | Cathedral City | Peter J. Brown

Sept. 27 **“Advanced Negotiations”**
Public Employer Labor Relations Association of California (PELRAC) Annual Conference | Cathedral City | Peter J. Brown

Sept. 27 **“Public Safety Legal Update”**
Solano County Law Enforcement Executive Administrators Workshop | Bodega Bay | Morin I. Jacob

Oct. 4 **“Hot Topics in Labor and Employment Law”**
NORCAL-HR Fall Conference | Lodi | Gage C. Dungy

Oct. 9 **“Public Safety Legal Update”**
San Bernardino & Riverside County Police Chiefs Conference | Indian Wells | Geoffrey S. Sheldon & James E. Oldendorph

Oct. 16 **“Re-Imagining Modern Policing in California”**
League of California Cities 2019 Annual Conference | Long Beach | J. Scott Tiedemann & Neil Okazaki & David E. Mastagni & Jorge Cisneros

Oct. 17 **“#MeToo2.0: A Guide to Help Navigate New Workplace Harassment Laws”**
League of California Cities | Long Beach | J. Scott Tiedemann

Oct. 18 **“Walking the Tightrope: Recognizing, Addressing and Accommodating Mental Illnesses & Disabilities”**
League of California Cities 2019 Annual Conference | Long Beach | Jennifer Rosner

- Oct. 18 **“Labor and Employment Litigation Update”**
League of California Cities 2019 Annual Conference City Attorneys’ Track | Long Beach | Suzanne Solomon
- Oct. 18 **“AB 1661 Sexual Harassment Prevention”**
League of California Cities Annual Conference | Long Beach | Christopher S. Frederick
- Oct. 23 **“FLSA - Police & Fire Issues”**
National Public Employer Labor Relations Association (NPELRA) | Webinar | Lisa S. Charbonneau

Seminars/Webinar

For more information and to register, please visit www.lcwlegal.com/events-and-training/webinars-seminars.

- Sept. 12 **“Nuts & Bolts of Negotiations”**
Liebert Cassidy Whitmore | Alhambra | Melanie L. Chaney & Kristi Recchia
- Sept. 17 **“Is it Pensionable? Hybrids, Lump Sums, & Other Pensionable Compensation Challenges”**
Liebert Cassidy Whitmore | Webinar | Laura Drottz Kalty
- Oct. 1 **“Last, Best & Final Offers & the Impasse Process”**
Liebert Cassidy Whitmore | Webinar | Jack Hughes
- Oct. 8 **“10 Problems You may have with CalPERS, and How to Fix Them”**
Liebert Cassidy Whitmore | Webinar | Michael Youril
- Oct. 8 **“2-Day FLSA Academy (Day 1)”**
Liebert Cassidy Whitmore | Citrus Heights | Richard Bolanos & Lisa Charbonneau
- Oct. 9 **“2-Day FLSA Academy (Day 2)”**
Liebert Cassidy Whitmore | Citrus Heights | Richard Bolanos & Lisa Charbonneau
- Oct. 17 **“Bargaining Over Benefits”**
Liebert Cassidy Whitmore | Suisun City | Steven M. Berliner & Kristi Recchia
- Oct. 23 **“Best Practices for Conducting Legally Compliant Internal Affairs Investigations (Day 1)”**
Liebert Cassidy Whitmore | Irvine | J. Scott Tiedemann and Geoffrey S. Sheldon
- Oct. 24 **“Best Practices for Conducting Legally Compliant Internal Affairs Investigations (Day 2)”**
Liebert Cassidy Whitmore | Irvine | J. Scott Tiedemann & Geoffrey S. Sheldon



FIRM PUBLICATIONS

To view these articles and the most recent attorney-authored articles, please visit: www.lcwlegal.com/news.

Managing **Partner J. Scott Tiedemann** authored California Public Employee Relations (CPER)’s “Pocket Guide to the Firefighters Procedural Bill of Rights Act – 5th Edition” and provided updates for the “Pocket Guide to the Public Safety Officers Procedural Bill of Rights Act.”



The **Briefing Room** 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/news. **Please note:** By adding your name to the e-mail distribution list, you will no longer receive a hard copy of the **Briefing Room**. If you have any questions, contact Jaja Hsu at 310.981.2091 or at jhsu@lcwlegal.com.

LCW LIEBERT CASSIDY WHITMORE

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

 CalPublicAgencyLaborEmploymentBlog.com |  @lcwlegal

Copyright © 2019 **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.

Briefing Room is published monthly for the benefit of the clients of Liebert Cassidy Whitmore. The information in *Briefing Room* 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.