



BRIEFING ROOM

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

MAY 2021

INDEX

Brown Act.....	4
Firm Victories.....	1
Personnel Records.....	2

LCW NEWS

Firm Activities.....	7
Labor Relations Certificate Program ..	6
New to the Firm	5
Upcoming Webinar	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.

FIRM VICTORIES

LCW Obtains Dismissal Of Police Officer's Whistleblower Retaliation Lawsuit.

LCW Partners **Jesse Maddox** and **Michael Youril** obtained summary judgment for a city against a former police officer's claim of whistleblower retaliation.

In February 2016, the city hired the officer subject to a one-year probationary period. The officer immediately joined the police officers' association. In December 2016, the officer attended an association meeting. At that meeting, the association discussed a loan it had made to a corporal, who was then-president of the association. The officer learned the loan was for the purchase of a personal vehicle.

During the meeting, the association's treasurer confirmed that the loan was proper under the association's bylaws and had been repaid. In response, the officer stated that the association was not in the business of making loans, and therefore the association's money should not be used to benefit one individual. The officer was one of many who expressed an opinion during the meeting that the loan was improper or illegal. The association's members agreed that the association would speak with an attorney to determine whether to remove the loan portion of the bylaws.

In January 2017, the chief of police terminated the officer's employment for falsely reporting his time worked, and then refusing to correct his time sheet when questioned about it by a superior officer. The officer then sued the city, alleging whistleblower retaliation in violation of Labor Code Section 1102.5. The officer alleged the chief terminated him in retaliation for speaking out about potential illegal association conduct. The officer alleged that the association's treasurer influenced the chief because of the officer's comments during the association meeting.

The city moved for summary judgment on the ground that the officer could not establish essential elements of a whistleblower retaliation claim. First, the officer could not show he made a protected disclosure of information to a government, a law enforcement agency, or a person with authority over the employee. Second, the city alleged the officer could not show a nexus between any alleged protected disclosure and his termination. Lastly, the city had a legitimate, non-retaliatory reason for terminating the officer (i.e., for failing to accurately report his time worked).

The trial court granted summary judgment for the city. The officer appealed, and the Court of Appeal affirmed.

The Court of Appeal held the officer did not make a protected disclosure of information because: 1) his comments were made to the association and its members; and 2) he did not disclose new information during the meeting, but merely opined that the loan was illegal based on the facts he learned from the association. As a result, the Court affirmed summary judgment for the city. Since

the Court of Appeal determined that the officer could not establish the essential elements of his whistleblower retaliation claim, it did not address the city's argument that it had a legitimate, non-retaliatory reason for terminating the officer's employment.

NOTE:

A summary judgment motion is a powerful tool that can save public agencies money by getting lawsuits dismissed before trial. LCW attorneys can help public agencies determine whether a case is appropriate for summary judgment.

City Defeats Police Grievance Seeking MOU Overtime For Uniform Donning And Doffing.

LCW Partners **Brian Walter** and **Geoffrey Sheldon** and Associate Attorneys **Danny Yoo** and **Emanuela Tala** defeated a "class action" grievance arbitration on behalf of a city. The stakes were high as the grievance sought overtime pay going back four years prior to the filing of the grievance in November 2006 and continuing until the grievance was resolved plus interest, civil penalties, and attorney fees.

The grievance arbitration concerned the interpretation of an overtime provision in the memorandum of understanding between the city and the police union (MOU). The MOU provision stated, "All hours or portions thereof worked in excess of [regularly scheduled] work hours ... shall be overtime including hours worked by an employee when on a regular day off, hours in lieu of a holiday or vacation pay."

The union claimed that the provision obligated the city to pay MOU (as opposed to Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA)) overtime for time peace officers spent "donning" and "doffing" their uniforms and related safety gear. The union claimed its grievance was consistent with the city's past practice and its intent during the negotiations of the terms of the MOU.

The city claimed that the MOU overtime provision did not cover donning and doffing. To support its position, the city presented evidence that the city and union considered adding a provision to the MOU in 2009 to compensate officers for donning and doffing their uniforms, but the city ultimately rejected the provision. Also, the MOU provided for a cash payment for "the cost of uniform replacement, maintenance and other professional expenses," but was silent on the issue of donning and doffing uniforms.

The union argued that there was an established past practice to pay for donning and doffing. The arbitrator disagreed, noting that the city and union had been litigating this issue for years prior to his ruling on the union's grievance. That litigation proved the absence of any mutual agreement.

The union also argued that the city's previous rejection of a MOU provision that would compensate officers for donning and doffing did not undermine the parties' intent that officers be compensated for donning and doffing. The arbitrator disagreed and found that if the city intended to include compensation for donning and doffing as part of the MOU, it would have indicated as much in the MOU's various provisions concerning overtime and payments for uniforms. The arbitrator further noted that the union's view of the city's undisclosed intent during MOU negotiations did not determine the mutual intent of the parties.

Lastly, the union argued that even if the parties had no affirmative intent to compensate officers for donning and doffing, an intent should be inferred in order to maintain compliance with the definition of "hours worked" under California law. The arbitrator held that he was precluded from addressing that argument because the union's grievance did not address the applicability of State law. The arbitrator declined to expand the grievance to consider external law.

For these reasons, the arbitrator found that the MOU's overtime provisions did not obligate the city to pay overtime for time officers spent donning and doffing their uniforms and related safety gear.

NOTE:

Wage and hour issues are often raised on behalf of a large category or class of employees and can subject public agencies to substantial liability. LCW attorneys regularly defend public agencies against allegations of unpaid overtime and can assist agencies to limit or eliminate liability.

PERSONNEL RECORDS

Police Department Was Not Required To Disclose Confidential Records To The Subject Officer Prior To Further Interrogation.

In December 2017, a citizen filed a complaint against officers from the Oakland Police Department (Department), alleging that the officers violated the citizen's rights while conducting a mental health welfare check. The Department's internal affairs investigation included an interrogation of each of the accused officers. The Department's investigation cleared the officers.

Following the Department's investigation, the Oakland Community Police Review Association (OCPRA), a civilian oversight agency with independent authority to investigate claims of police misconduct, conducted its own investigation into the citizen complaint. Before

the OCPRA's interrogations of the officers, counsel for the officers demanded copies of all "reports and complaints" prepared or compiled by the Department's investigators pursuant to Government Code Section 3303(g), a provision within the Public Safety Officers Procedural Bill of Rights Act (POBR). Section 3303(g) provides that a public safety officer shall have access to a tape recording of his or her interrogation "if any further proceedings are contemplated or prior to any further interrogation at a subsequent time. The public safety officer shall be entitled to a transcribed copy of any notes made by a stenographer or to any reports or complaints made by investigators or other persons, except those which are deemed by the investigating agency to be confidential."

The OCPRA agreed to provide the officers with recordings and transcribed notes from their prior interrogations during the Department's investigation, but refused to produce any other materials. After interrogating each officer, the OCPRA completed its investigation and determined that the officers knowingly violated the complainant's civil rights.

The officers and their union filed a petition for writ of mandate, alleging that the City of Oakland (City) violated their procedural rights by refusing to disclose the requested reports and complaints prior to the officers' subsequent interrogations.

The trial court noted that the Fourth District of the California Court of Appeal examined a similar issue in *Santa Ana Police Officers' Association v. City of Santa Ana (Santa Ana)*, and held that the POBR requires agencies to disclose complaints and reports to officers after an initial interrogation and "prior to any further interrogation." Relying on *Santa Ana*, the trial court granted the petition and ordered the City to disregard the officers' interrogation testimony in any current or future disciplinary proceedings. The City appealed, and the First District of the California Court of Appeal reversed and remanded the matter to the trial court for further proceedings.

The Court of Appeal held that the plain language of Section 3303(g) only requires disclosure of tape recordings of an officer's interrogation prior to any subsequent interrogation of the officer. The statute does not specify when an officer's entitlement to the reports and complaints arises, but does grant an agency the ability to withhold these materials on confidentiality grounds under certain circumstances, including if disclosure would otherwise interfere with an ongoing investigation. Accordingly, the Court of Appeal held that stenographer's notes, reports, and complaints should be disclosed upon request, including prior to a subsequent interrogation, unless the investigating agency designates the material as confidential. The

court noted that the agency can also de-designate a record previously deemed confidential when the basis for confidentiality no longer exists, such as the end of the investigation.

The Court of Appeal also concluded that mandatory disclosure of complaints and reports prior to any subsequent interrogation of an officer suspected of misconduct undermines a core objective of the POBR – maintaining the public's confidence in the effectiveness and integrity of law enforcement agencies by ensuring that internal investigations into officer misconduct are conducted promptly and fairly.

The Court of Appeal disagreed with the *Santa Ana* decision, reversed, and remanded the matter to the trial court to determine whether the City had a basis for withholding the requested reports and complaints due to their confidential nature.

Oakland Police Officers' Association v. City of Oakland, 2021 WL 1608876 (Cal. Ct. App., Apr. 26, 2021).

NOTE:

This decision creates a split of authority between the First and Fourth Districts of the California Court of Appeal regarding an agency's duty to disclose investigation materials before a subsequent interrogation of the subject officer. LCW attorneys can help agencies navigate conflicting case law decided under the POBR, including disclosure requirements during an ongoing personnel investigation.

A Pitchess Motion Is Required Before An Agency Can Disclose Its Own Peace Officer's Personnel Records.

In 1997, the County of Ventura's (County) Office of the District Attorney (VCDA) hired Tracy Towner to serve as an investigator. In 2014, Towner was promoted to investigative commander. In 2017, Towner testified in an action regarding another VCDA investigator before the County's Civil Service Commission (Commission). The Commission found his testimony credible. Thereafter, the VCDA opened an independent investigation into Towner's testimony at the Commission hearing, which determined that Towner had testified falsely at the hearing. As a result, the VCDA terminated Towner. Towner appealed his termination and requested a hearing before the Commission.

The County filed a petition for writ of mandate, requesting that the court enjoin the Commission from hearing Towner's appeal due to a conflict of interest since the Commission previously found the testimony underlying his termination credible. The exhibits to the petition the County filed in court included an excerpt of the independent investigator's report and the notices of disciplinary action relating to Towner's termination.

The Commission ultimately heard Towner's appeal and ordered him reinstated with full back pay and benefits.

Towner then sued the County, in relevant part, for negligence per se and violations of the Public Safety Officers Procedural Bill of Rights Act (POBR). As to the negligence per se claim, Towner alleged the County violated Penal Code Section 832.7 by publicly disclosing his confidential personnel records without appropriate judicial review (i.e., without bringing a *Pitchess* motion). As to the POBR claim, Towner alleged the County intentionally publicly disclosed his confidential personnel records in violation of multiple provisions of the Government Code.

The County moved to strike Towner's POBR and negligence per se claims under California's anti-SLAPP statute, which allows for the early dismissal of a case that thwarts constitutionally-protected speech. A court examines an anti-SLAPP motion in two parts: 1) whether a defendant has shown the challenged cause of action arises from protected activity; and 2) whether the plaintiff has demonstrated a probability of prevailing on the claim.

The trial court granted the County's motion to strike, finding the County's writ petition and exhibits fell within the scope of the anti-SLAPP statute as a written statement submitted in a judicial proceeding. The trial court also found that Towner failed to show a probability of success on the merits because: 1) the County's conduct was protected by the litigation privilege; and 2) neither the POBR nor Penal Code Section 832.7 provided a private right of action based on disclosure of confidential personnel records. Towner appealed, and the California Court of Appeal reversed.

On appeal, Towner argued that the anti-SLAPP statute did not apply because the County's disclosure of his confidential personnel records was illegal as a matter of law. The Court of Appeal agreed, noting that Penal Code Section 832.7 states that confidential peace officer records may only be disclosed following to a *Pitchess* motion. The Court of Appeal also noted that Government Code Section 1222 makes a public officer's "willful omission to perform any duty enjoined by law" a misdemeanor. The Court of Appeal held that the County willfully failed to treat Towner's personnel documents as confidential by intentionally filing them as exhibits in the writ proceeding. Since the County's actions violated both Penal Code Section 832.7 and Government Code Section 1222, Towner adequately showed that the County's conduct was illegal as a matter of law and therefore was not protected activity under the anti-SLAPP statute.

Based on the foregoing, the Court of Appeal reversed and remanded the matter to the trial court with directions to enter an order denying the County's motion.

Towner v. County of Ventura, et al., 2021 WL 1660616 (Cal. Ct. App. Apr. 28, 2021).

NOTE:

Prior to this decision, there was a lack of clarity on whether an agency must file a Pitchess motion to use and disclose its own peace officer personnel records in litigation or administrative hearings. This decision clarifies that an agency not only must do so, but that disclosing confidential peace officer personnel records without a Pitchess motion could be a crime if willfully done. LCW attorneys can assist agencies with protecting the confidentiality of peace officer records in accordance with this decision.

BROWN ACT

Association's Brown Act Claims Dismissed Due To Unreasonable Litigation Delay.

Prior to 2018, the Julian Volunteer Fire Company Association (Volunteer Association) provided fire prevention and emergency services through a local fire district, the Julian-Cuyamaca Fire Protection District (District), to the Julian and Cuyamaca rural communities. In April 2018, the District's board of supervisors approved a resolution to dissolve the District and to be replaced by the County of San Diego (County) fire authority.

Two weeks later, the Volunteer Association sued the District, alleging the District's approval of the resolution violated the Brown Act. The Volunteer Association alleged that the District's board members secretly communicated through email and private meetings to discuss the dissolution prior to the formal negotiations. The Volunteer Association sought a writ of mandate ordering the District to vacate the resolution. The trial court scheduled a hearing in November 2018 to rule on the merits of the Brown Act claims. However, the Volunteer Association took the hearing off calendar in October 2018.

While the Volunteer Association's lawsuit was pending, the County and the San Diego Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO) conducted a mandatory review of the dissolution request, which included holding public hearings and a special election for residents affected by the request. In March 2019, the County announced the special election had resulted in a majority vote favoring the District's dissolution.

Following the election, the Volunteer Association filed an emergency motion asking the court to immediately enter judgment in favor of its Brown Act claims, without notifying LAFCO or the County of this request. The court entered judgment for Volunteer Association and issued a writ ordering the District to revoke its original dissolution resolution. The District then relied on this judgment to preclude LAFCO from certifying the special election results.

The County and LAFCO then intervened in the Volunteer Association's lawsuit and successfully moved to vacate the judgment and the writ. The County and LAFCO moved for judgment on the pleadings against the Volunteer Association. They argued that the lawsuit was untimely and that the Brown Act claims were barred by the laches doctrine, which applies if a plaintiff unreasonably delays in prosecuting its claims to the prejudice of the defendant. The trial court granted the motion solely on the grounds that the lawsuit was untimely and entered judgment against the Volunteer Association. The Volunteer Association appealed, and the California Court of Appeal affirmed on different grounds.

The Court of Appeal found that the Volunteer Association improperly waited to reschedule the hearing on its Brown Act claims until after the special election results were announced. In doing so, the Court of Appeal held that Volunteer Association unreasonably delayed since the alleged Brown Act violations occurred months before the special election. The Court noted the Volunteer Association presented no justification for the delay, such as the need to conduct discovery. The Court also found that the delay prejudiced LAFCO, the City and the general public, given the substantial costs and burdens of the completed special election. Based on this ruling, the Court affirmed the judgment against the Volunteer Association.

Julian Volunteer Fire Company Association v. Julian-Cuyamaca Fire Protection District, 62 Cal.App.5th 583 (2021).

NOTE:

While litigation is often a lengthy process, this decision shows that some delays are improper if they prejudice the party being sued.

§

NEW TO THE FIRM

Richard Daniel Seitz is an Associate in the Los Angeles office of LCW, where he advises clients on all aspects of labor and employment law, retirement and labor relations issues. He is experienced in law and motion and appellate practice and works with the firm's public sector clients on discipline issues, retirement and labor relations matters, and compliance with state and federal COVID-19 laws and regulations.

He can be reached at 310.981.2316 or dseitz@lcwlegal.com.

Brian R. Dierzé is an Associate in the Los Angeles office of LCW where he advises clients on all aspects of labor and employment law. Brian is skilled in contract review, in-depth research into legal and legislative issues and provides guidance to LCW public sector clients.

He can be reached at 310.981.2731 or bdierze@lcwlegal.com.

Joel Guerra is an Associate in LCW's Sacramento office, where he advises clients on all manner of employment-related matters. He is experienced in defending harassment, discrimination, retaliation, and wrongful termination claims; appearing before administrative tribunals and state court writ departments to resolve disability retirement claims; and settling wage and hour class, collective, and representative actions.

He can be reached at 209.617.5549 or jguerra@lcwlegal.com.



LABOR RELATIONS CERTIFICATION PROGRAM



The LCW 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.

Participants may take one or all of the classes, in any order. Take all of the classes to earn your certificate and receive 6 hours of HRCI credit per course!

Join our other upcoming HRCI Certified - Labor Relations Certification Program Workshops:

1. May 12 & 19, 2021 - Communication Counts!
2. June 17 & 24, 2021 - The Rules of Engagement: Issues, Impacts & Impasse
3. July 21 & 28, 2021 - Nuts & Bolts of Negotiations

The use of this official seal confirms that this Activity has met HR Certification Institute's® (HRCI®) criteria for recertification credit pre-approval.



[Learn more about this program here.](#)

Upcoming Webinar Hiring CalPERS Retirees: Do's and Don'ts

June 9, 2021 | 10:00 - 11:00am
Register online [here!](#)



FIRM PUBLICATIONS

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

Partner [Brian P. Walter](#) was quoted in the April 6 issue of *WorldatWork's Workspan Daily* section in a piece highlighting potential increases in lawsuits involving employees who spend “off the clock” time taking part in health screening and/or other tasks designed to help ensure a safe workplace.

In a recent KFI News segment with reporter Corbin Carson, Partner [Mark Meyerhoff](#) discussed whether police officers have First Amendment rights that allow them to make comments on social media. While police officers do indeed have personal free speech rights, Mark shared that there is a significant difference between personal free speech and speech of public concern. He indicated that statements about the public should not cause a level of disruption that impacts the officer’s department (i.e. offensive comments or those that advocate violence), and that new laws call for more diversity/bias training and expanded background checks to avoid hiring officers that engage in behavior that may negatively impact their departments.

Managing Partner [Scott Tiedemann](#) recently discussed details of the high-profile Kelly Thomas case with KFI News reporter Corbin Carson. As attorney for the City of Fullerton, which prevailed, Scott said it has taken nine years of lawsuits and appeals to uphold terminations of police officers involved in the use of force against Thomas. “It’s really hard in the moment when there are protests—hundreds ... thousands of people protesting saying ‘The officers need to be fired,’” said Scott. “If you cave into that pressure and you don’t do things right on the front end, you can find yourself years later having your decisions overturned.” Scott explained that procedural mistakes can cost millions in back pay and rob the public of the justice they are demanding in this type of case, and he shared that the last two police officers involved in this case recently abandoned their lawsuits in which they unsuccessfully tried to be reinstated to their positions in law enforcement.

Partner [Mark Meyerhoff](#) recently took part in a KNX 1070 Newsradio segment with reporter Craig Fiegener in which Mark discussed a new law that will require public safety applicants for employment in California to be screened for implicit or explicit biases. This law will go into effect in January 2022 and puts pressure on public safety departments to determine how best to conduct such screening. Mark also discussed the issue of public safety departments limiting the private speech of police personnel that is so prevalent amidst high-profile social and political issues.

MANAGEMENT TRAINING WORKSHOPS

Firm Activities

Consortium Trainings

- | | |
|---------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| May 5 | “Finding the Facts: Employee Misconduct & Disciplinary Investigations”
Bay Area ERC Webinar Shelline Bennett |
| May 5 | “Finding the Facts: Employee Misconduct & Disciplinary Investigations”
Central Valley ERC Webinar Shelline Bennett |
| May 5 | “Workplace Bullying: A Growing Concern”
Humboldt County ERC Webinar Erin Kunze |
| May 5 | “Workplace Bullying: A Growing Concern”
Monterey Bay ERC Webinar Erin Kunze |
| May 6 | “Leaves, Leaves and More Leaves”
Gateway Public ERC Webinar T. Oliver Yee |
| May 6 | “The Disability Interactive Process”
NorCal ERC Webinar Danny Y. Yoo |
| May 6 | “Difficult Conversations”
North San Diego County ERC Webinar Stacey H. Sullivan |
| May 6 | “Leaves, Leaves and More Leaves”
San Mateo County ERC Webinar T. Oliver Yee |
| May 12 | “Addressing Workplace Violence”
Coachella Valley ERC Webinar Erin Kunze and Arti Bhimani |

- May 12** **“Iron Fists or Kid Gloves: Retaliation in the Workplace”**
North State ERC | Webinar | Michael Youril and Yesenia Carrillo
- May 12** **“Difficult Conversations”**
Orange County ERC | Webinar | Stacey H. Sullivan
- May 13** **“Nuts and Bolts: Navigating Common Legal Risks for the First Line Supervisor”**
East Inland Empire ERC | Webinar | Heather Coffman
- May 13** **“The Art of Writing the Performance Evaluation”**
LA County HR Consortium | Webinar | I. Emanuela Tala
- May 13** **“Leaves, Leaves and More Leaves”**
San Diego ERC | Webinar | T. Oliver Yee
- May 19** **“Leaves, Leaves and More Leaves”**
Central Valley ERC | Webinar | Che I. Johnson
- May 19** **“Leaves, Leaves and More Leaves”**
Gold Country ERC | Webinar | Che I. Johnson
- May 20** **“The Future is Now - Embracing Generational Diversity & Succession Planning”**
Mendocino County ERC | Webinar | Kristi Recchia
- May 20** **“The Future is Now - Embracing Generational Diversity & Succession Planning”**
Sonoma/Marin ERC | Webinar | Kristi Recchia
- May 20** **“The Future is Now - Embracing Generational Diversity & Succession Planning”**
West Inland Empire ERC | Webinar | Kristi Recchia
- Jun. 2** **“The Art of Writing the Performance Evaluation”**
Humboldt County ERC | Webinar | I. Emanuela Tala
- Jun. 2** **“Maximizing Supervisory Skills for the First Line Supervisor - Part 1”**
Monterey Bay ERC | Webinar | Kristi Recchia
- Jun. 2** **“Managing the Marginal Employee”**
NorCal ERC | Webinar | Erin Kunze
- Jun. 2** **“The Art of Writing the Performance Evaluation”**
North State ERC | Webinar | I. Emanuela Tala
- Jun. 2** **“Maximizing Supervisory Skills for the First Line Supervisor - Part 1”**
Orange County ERC | Webinar | Kristi Recchia
- Jun. 2** **“The Art of Writing the Performance Evaluation”**
San Gabriel Valley ERC | Webinar | I. Emanuela Tala
- Jun. 3** **“The Art of Writing the Performance Evaluation”**
North San Diego County ERC | Webinar | Stephanie J. Lowe
- Jun. 3** **“The Art of Writing the Performance Evaluation”**
San Mateo County ERC | Webinar | Stephanie J. Lowe
- Jun. 3** **“Legal Issues Regarding Hiring”**
West Inland Empire ERC | Webinar | Melanie L. Chaney

- Jun. 10** **“A Guide to Implementing Public Employee Discipline”**
Bay Area ERC | Webinar | Kevin J. Chicas
- Jun. 10** **“A Guide to Implementing Public Employee Discipline”**
Imperial Valley ERC | Webinar | Kevin J. Chicas
- Jun. 10** **“Advanced FLSA”**
San Diego ERC | Webinar | Elizabeth Tom Arce
- Jun. 16** **“The Art of Writing the Performance Evaluation”**
Gold Country ERC | Webinar | I. Emanuela Tala
- Jun. 16** **“Maximizing Supervisory Skills for the First Line Supervisor - Part 2”**
Monterey Bay ERC | Webinar | Kristi Recchia
- Jun. 16** **“Maximizing Supervisory Skills for the First Line Supervisor - Part 2”**
Orange County | Webinar | Kristi Recchia
- Jun. 16** **“Introduction to the FLSA”**
Sonoma/Marin ERC | Webinar | Lisa S. Charbonneau
- Jun. 16** **“The Art of Writing the Performance Evaluation”**
South Bay ERC | Webinar | I. Emanuela Tala

Customized Trainings

- May 5** **“Performance Management/Evaluation and Coaching”**
City of Ontario | Webinar | Kristi Recchia
- May 5** **“Preventing Workplace Harassment, Discrimination and Retaliation”**
ERMA | Reedley | Michael Youril
- May 6** **“Ethics in Public Service and Preventing Workplace Harassment, Discrimination and Retaliation”**
City of Delano | Delano | Michael Youril
- May 6** **“Supervisor’s Guide to Understanding Employee Rights Regarding Labor, Leaves and Accommodations”**
ERMA | Webinar | Lisa S. Charbonneau
- May 10** **“Maximizing Supervisory Skills for the First Line Supervisor”**
City of Stockton | Webinar | Che I. Johnson
- May 11** **“Preventing Workplace Harassment, Discrimination and Retaliation”**
County of San Luis Obispo | Webinar | Stephanie J. Lowe
- May 17** **“Preventing Workplace Harassment, Discrimination and Retaliation”**
City of Palo Alto | Palo Alto | Jack Hughes
- May 18** **“Maximizing Performance Through Evaluation, Documentation, and Corrective Action”**
City of Stockton | Webinar | Che I. Johnson
- May 19** **“Preventing Workplace Harassment, Discrimination and Retaliation”**
City of Fremont | Webinar | Jack Hughes
- May 19** **“Progressive Discipline and Discipline Appeals, Including Skelly”**
City of Ontario | Webinar | Leighton Henderson

- May 19** **“Ethics in Public Service”**
County of Placer | Webinar | T. Oliver Yee
- May 19** **“Ethics in Public Service”**
County of San Luis Obispo | Webinar | Stephanie J. Lowe
- May 24** **“Preventing Workplace Harassment, Discrimination and Retaliation”**
City of Stockton | Webinar | Shelline Bennett
- May 26** **“Social Media Training”**
City of Burbank | Webinar | Danny Y. Yoo
- May 26** **“Brown Act” and “Social Media”**
City of National City | Webinar | Stacey H. Sullivan
- May 28** **“Preventing Workplace Harassment, Discrimination and Retaliation”**
City of Stockton | Webinar | Shelline Bennett
- Jun. 2** **“PBOR & FBOR”**
City of Ontario | Webinar | Laura Drottz Kalty
- Jun. 7 & 11** **“Preventing Workplace Harassment, Discrimination and Retaliation”**
City of Stockton | Webinar | Shelline Bennett
- Jun. 8** **“Key Legal Principles for Public Safety Managers - POST Management Course”**
Peace Officer Standards and Training - POST | San Diego | Stefanie K. Vaudreuil or English R. Bryant
- Jun. 11** **“Freedom of Speech and Right to Privacy”**
Labor Relation Information System - LRIS | Las Vegas | Mark Meyerhoff
- Jun. 15** **“Key Legal Principles for Public Safety Managers - POST Management Course”**
Peace Officer Standards and Training - POST | San Diego | Mark Meyerhoff
- Jun. 16** **“Preventing Workplace Harassment, Discrimination and Retaliation”**
City of Hesperia | Hesperia | Christopher S. Frederick
- Jun. 16** **“Hiring and Personnel Issues”**
City of Ontario | Webinar | Leighton Henderson
- Jun. 22** **“Key Legal Principles for Public Safety Managers - POST Management Course”**
Peace Officer Standards and Training - POST | San Diego | Stefanie K. Vaudreuil
- Jun. 29** **“Labor and Meet and Confer”**
City of Ontario | Webinar | Kristi Recchia

Seminars/Webinars

- May 11** **“Are Your Exempt Employees Really Exempt?”**
Liebert Cassidy Whitmore | Webinar | T. Oliver Yee
- May 12** **“Labor Relations Academy: Communication Counts!: Part 1”**
Liebert Cassidy Whitmore | Webinar | Kristi Recchia & Jack Hughes
- May 19** **“Labor Relations Academy: Communication Counts!: Part 2”**
Liebert Cassidy Whitmore | Webinar | Kristi Recchia & Jack Hughes

Jun. 17 **“Labor Relations Academy: The Rules of Engagement: Issues, Impacts & Impasse: Part 1”**
Liebert Cassidy Whitmore | Webinar | Kristi Recchia & Peter J. Brown

Jun. 24 **“Labor Relations Academy: The Rules of Engagement: Issues, Impacts & Impasse: Part 2”**
Liebert Cassidy Whitmore | Webinar | Kristi Recchia & Peter J. Brown

Speaking Engagements

May 14 **“Labor Relations and Negotiations”**
California State Association of Counties (CSAC) Faculty Meeting | Webinar | Richard S. Whitmore & Richard Bolanos

May 14 **“Gender Identity Bias in the Workplace”**
County Counsels’ Association of California (CCAC) Spring Civil Law & Litigation Speaking Engagement | Webinar | Morin I. Jacob

May 19 **“Executive Briefing: What Police Chiefs Need to Know about Labor Relations and Personnel Issues”**
California Police Chiefs Association (CPCA) Becoming a Police Chief: Developing a Mindset for Success and Service | Long Beach | J. Scott Tiedemann

Jun. 9 **“Personnel Issues and Records”**
CPCA Partnering for Your Department’s Success: A Course for Law Enforcement Executive Assistants | San Diego | Mark Meyerhoff

Jun. 17 **“Disability Accommodations in the Post COVID World”**
Southern California Public Agency Risk Management Association (PARMA) Chapter Meeting | Anaheim | Jennifer Rosner

Copyright © 2021 **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.