On Your Radar

Draw on Our Expertise

October, 2017

This monthly publication provides a snapshot of what you need to know about developments relating to employee absence management, workplace accommodations, and benefits. Watch for an issue to arrive in your inbox each month!

State Legislative Updates

New York State | First Wave of Paid Family Leave Forms Released

The New York Workers' Compensation Board has released three forms for employers' use in the administration of the New York Paid Family Leave law that becomes effective on January 1, 2018. Read more.

Rhode Island | Joins the Paid Sick and Safe Leave Bandwagon

The Governor of Rhode Island has signed the "Healthy and Safe Families Workplace Act. Effective July 1, 2018. Read more.

Federal & State Agencies

EEOC | A Fiscal Year-End Blitz of ADA Lawsuits

The EEOC filed dozens of lawsuits in the month of September. Over 20 of them accuse the employer of disability discrimination and violations of the ADA. Here's just a sample of those cases. Read more.

DOL | Proposed Delay in the Effective Date for ERISA Disability Claims Handling Rules

The DOL proposes a delay to the effective date of the ERISA disability claims handling rules by days as it seeks to "solicit additional public input and examine regulatory alternatives". What does this mean? Read more.

Court Opinions

"How long of a leave of absence do I have to grant as an accommodation under the Americans with Disabilities Act?"

Seems like a pretty simple question. The answer is anything but! Read more.

Draw on Our Expertise

GET TO KNOW

Marti Cardi, Esq.
Vice President, Matrix Absence Management

Gail Cohen, Esq.
Director, Employment law and Compliance, Matrix Absence Management, Inc.

READ OUR BLOG
Learn about our insights in absence management and workplace accommodations, and how they affect you and your business.

RELIANCE STANDARD
A MEMBER OF THE TOKIO MARINE GROUP

MATRIX ABSENCE MANAGEMENT
A MEMBER OF THE TOKIO MARINE GROUP

On Your Radar

Draw on Our Expertise

State Legislative Updates

New York

New York - Releases the First Wave of Paid Family Leave Forms

In something of a stealth move, the New York Workers' Compensation Board has released three forms for employers' use in administering and complying with the Paid Family Leave Law that provides benefits starting January 1, 2018. Those of us who check the NY PFL website daily and are signed up for news feeds received no word, but had to learn of the new forms through back channels. The released forms include the following:

Employee Paid Family Leave Opt-Out and Waiver of Benefits (PFL-Waiver, 9-17)

> If an employee does not expect to work long enough to qualify for Paid Family Leave (a seasonal worker, for example), the employee may opt out of Paid Family Leave by completing the Waiver of Benefits Form. Eligibility requires 26 weeks of 20 or more hours per week, or 175 days of work averaging fewer than 20 hours per week, with a covered employer.

This form contains some interesting news. The employee's waiver can be revoked by the employee or automatically because the employee has or will work more than the time needed for eligibility. Per the regulations, the employee then has the obligation to catch up on contributions that would have been made during the eligibility period but for the waiver, but the regulations do not specify how the employer can recoup these amounts. The form appears to authorize additional deductions from the employee's pay to catch up for missed contributions:

> *I also understand if this waiver is revoked (either by me or by a change in my work schedule), my employer may take retroactive deductions for the period of time I was covered by this waiver, and this period of time counts towards my eligibility for paid family leave. [Emphasis added.]*

Employer's Application for Voluntary Coverage (No Employee Contribution) (PFL-135, 9-17)

> Employers exempt from providing mandatory Paid Family Leave may provide voluntary Paid Family Leave by completing PFL-135 (if no employee contribution is required).

Employer's Application for Voluntary Coverage (Employee Contribution Required) (PFL-136, 9-17)

> Employers exempt from providing mandatory Paid Family Leave may provide voluntary Paid Family Leave by completing PFL-136 (if they will be requiring an employee contribution).

The NY PFL regulations also calls for forms for employee use to request NY PFL, and certifications to support leave taken to care for a family member with a serious health condition, for military

exigencies, and to bond with a new child due to birth or placement for adoption or foster care. Employers and insurance carriers still working to get ready for the January 1, 2018, effective date have been begging the WCB for these other forms, which will be critical in getting the information the employer is entitled to for consideration of leave requests. Employers and carriers are permitted to use their own forms, but clearly it is safest and easiest to use NY-sanctioned forms, especially at the beginning of this uncharted leave law.

The new forms, and additional forms as they are released, can be found at this link: https://www.ny.gov/new-york-state-paid-family-leave/paid-family-leave-employer-and-employee-forms-0

For more information about New York Paid Family Leave, check out our previous blog posts: August 2017, July 2017, May 2017, March 2017, and April 2016.

Rhode Island

Rhode Island – Joins the Paid Sick and Safe Leave Bandwagon

Rhode Island has joined the plethora of states that have passed paid sick and safe leave legislation for the state's workers. The Rhode Island "Healthy and Safe Families Workplace Act" (H5413/S290) was signed into law by the Governor on September 28, 2017.

The basics. Effective July 1, 2018, Rhode Island employees of an employer with 18 or more employees in Rhode Island will earn one hour of paid leave time for every 35 hours worked, up to a maximum of 24 hours of accrued paid sick and safe leave in 2018, 32 hours in 2019, and 40 hours in 2020 and thereafter. Employees can carryover any unused, accrued paid time; however, the use of such time is still subject to the maximums (i.e. 24 hours in 2018, etc.). Accrued but unused sick and safe time is not payable to the employee upon termination.

Employees begin to accrue leave as of July 1, 2018, or their date of hire, whichever is later. While employees can begin to earn and accrue leave, employers can impose a waiting period of up to 90 days for new hires before they can take any accrued time. Temporary employees must wait up to 180 days to use any accrued leave (unless the employer agrees otherwise).

Leave reasons. Employees may use sick and safe leave for any of the following reasons:

- The employee's own mental or physical illness, injury, or health condition; need for preventive care, diagnosis, care; or treatment of a mental or physical illness, injury, or health condition.
- Care of a family member for the same reasons as the employee's own needs.
- When an employer's business or the employee's child's childcare care facility or school is closed due to a public health emergency.
- When the employee or his or her family member is a victim of domestic violence, sexual

assault or stalking.

Covered relationships. "Family member" is broadly defined under the Act to include: child (biological, adopted, or foster son or daughter, a stepson or stepdaughter, a legal ward, a son or daughter of a domestic partner, or a son or daughter of an employee who stands in loco parentis to that child), parent, spouse or domestic partner, parent-in-law, grandparent, grandchild, sibling, care recipient, or member of the employee's household. A "care recipient" is a person for whom the employee is responsible for providing or arranging health or safety related care.

Employee notice and documentation. Employees are required to provide notice (in the means designated by the employer in its policy) where the need for leave is foreseeable. Employer may also require documentation (again, as long as the employer has a policy that says so) for leaves of 3 or more consecutive work days. The documentation requirement is quite limited and only allows for documentation that the leave is for a permissible purpose. The employer may not require documentation regarding the nature of the illness or details of the domestic violence, sexual assault or stalking.

Permitted employee discipline. This Act also incorporates a few safeguards for employers:

- An employer may discipline, up to and including termination of employment, an employee who is committing fraud or abuse by engaging in an activity that is not consistent with an allowable purpose for paid sick and safe leave;
- An employer may also discipline an employee (again up to termination) an employee who exhibits a clear pattern of taking leave just before or after a weekend, vacation, or holiday if the employee is unable to provide reasonable documentation that the leave has been taken for a permissible purpose.

Pings for employers with Rhode Island workers:

- Ensure that your pay practices are in order and ready to provide for the necessary accruals and usage accounting starting July 1, 2018.
- Draft a clear policy governing Rhode Island paid sick and safe leave. At a minimum, be sure to specify the means by which employees must give notice of the need for Rhode Island paid sick and safe leave (e.g., by email, other written request, verbal to supervisor, a call-in line, etc.) and your documentation requirements within the parameters of the law. Be sure your employees know about these policies by special notice, new hire notice, including in your employee handbook, and/or posting in areas in which workers congregate like lunch or break rooms.

On Your Radar

Draw on Our Expertise

Federal and State Agencies

EEOC – A Fiscal Year End Blitz of ADA Lawsuits by the EEOC

The EEOC has been on a tear and filed dozens of lawsuits in the month of September, over 20 of which accuse the employer of disability discrimination and violations of the ADA. The lawsuits cover a wide range of ADA violations, including failure to accommodate, requesting unnecessary medical information, terminations for exceeding the employer's "maximum leave policy, and more.

We asked one of our contacts at the EEOC about this recent surge of litigation. We learned that although there is a pattern of filing more cases at the end of the EEOC's fiscal year (September 30) there isn't a particular reason for that. The Office of General Counsel builds its cases as they come up so there isn't a reason why OGC should file more cases in one quarter than another. Nonetheless, September 2017 was a banner month.

The EEOC files lawsuits after confidential attempts at conciliation to settle the claims. Once a lawsuit is filed all bets are off and the EEOC publicizes its filings on the EEOC Newsroom website. Remember that these are *allegations only,* and many of the employers sued may have very good defenses. However, a look at the kinds of practices that the EEOC is focusing on – and deciding to litigate – can be very instructive to employers.

Here is a sample of the ADA cases filed by the EEOC just in September 2017:

9/6/17

EEOC announces it has filed a lawsuit against the Blood Bank of Hawaii, accusing the Bank of having an **inflexible leave policy** and failing to provide additional leave beyond the 12 weeks of FMLA or engage in the interactive process under the ADA. https://www.eeoc.gov/eeoc/newsroom/release/9-6-17.cfm

9/14/17

Wynn Las Vegas sued by the EEOC on behalf of an employee who, it alleges, requested leave for surgery and treatment for a recurrence of ovarian cancer and **fired her on the basis of her disability.** https://www.eeoc.gov//eeoc/newsroom/release/9-14-17.cfm

9/19/17

All-Star Priority Staffing, a Phoenix-based temporary agency, was sued by the EEOC for **requiring applicants to complete a detailed medical questionnaire** (including medications and prior work-related injuries) and, the EEOC alleges, used this information to deny employment opportunities to

those applicants. https://www.eeoc.gov//eeoc/newsroom/release/9-19-17.cfm

9/21/17

The EEOC sued Gulf Logistics, an oil and gas vessel company in Louisiana, alleging it **required an employee** who sought assistance from the Company's EAP **to take a leave of absence because they regarded him as disabled.** https://www.eeoc.gov/eeoc/newsroom/release/9-21-17.cfm

That same day, the EEOC sued Rivers Casino on behalf of an employee who they claim requested a few extra weeks of **leave to have surgery and chemotherapy and was denied leave and fired** on the basis of the request and his disability. https://www.eeoc.gov/eeoc/newsroom/release/9-21-17e.cfm

9/22/17

Lowe's was sued by the EEOC on behalf of an employee who it alleged had a spinal cord injury which limited the use of his right arm but after being promoted, delegate the task of using power equipment (which requires use of both hands) to subordinates. The EEOC claims that Lowe's informed the employee it **could no longer accommodate him and demoted him to a non-supervisory role.** https://www.eeoc.gov//eeoc/newsroom/release/9-22-17.cfm

That same day, the EEOC sued Hertz, accusing it of **declining to hire an applicant because he used a cane.** In its press release, the EEOC alleges that the manager who interviewed the applicant expressed concerns about his mobility because of his cane and that Hertz hired a less qualified applicant. https://www.eeoc.gov//eeoc/newsroom/release/9-22-17b.cfm

9/25/17

Just days later, the EEOC filed suit against Otto's Candies, a Louisiana-based marine transport services company. The lawsuit alleges that Otto's violated the ADA when it **fired a long-time employee for his recurrent pancreatitis,** and **ignored medical information from his doctor and the Coast Guard that he could perform the essential functions of his job and that he had done so for 10 years.** https://www.eeoc.gov//eeoc/newsroom/release/9-25-17e.cfm

9/26/17

The following day, the EEOC announced it had filed suit against Blue Cross/Blue Shield of Texas on behalf of a deaf applicant who, it alleges, was **unable to complete the online application because it had an audio portion and was denied reasonable accommodations.**
https://www.eeoc.gov//eeoc/newsroom/release/9-26-17.cfm

The EEOC filed suit against Wal-Mart in Wisconsin, alleging that a deaf and visually impaired employee who had previously been granted accommodations was **required to submit to unnecessary additional medical inquiry and placed on a leave** until it was received rendered "a

return to work impossible." https://www.eeoc.gov//eeoc/newsroom/release/9-26-17c.cfm

Still on the same day, the EEOC announced it had sued St. Vincent's Hospital for declining to reassign an employee to a vacant position for which she was qualified "despite knowing her restrictions were indefinite" and **"required her to take leave at reduced pay even though she wanted to continue to work."** https://www.eeoc.gov//eeoc/newsroom/release/9-26-17d.cfm

9/27/17

The following day, the EEOC filed suit against a Kansas City property management company, accusing it of violating the ADA when it declined to provide a 1-week extension to an employee for recovery from surgery because it had a **maximum 30-day medical leave policy.** https://www.eeoc.gov//eeoc/newsroom/release/9-27-17g.cfm

Continuing its roll, the EEOC filed a suit against Norfolk Southern Railroad, accusing it of a pattern and practice of **denying employment opportunities on the basis of perceived or actual disabilities disclosed during the application or return to work process.** The enumerated disabilities included cancer, diabetes, drug addiction or past drug treatment, arthritis, and PTSD. https://www.eeoc.gov//eeoc/newsroom/release/9-27-17i.cfm

And yet again on that day, the EEOC sued Inside Up, a San Diego-based company. In this lawsuit, the EEOC accused the company of **denying accommodations to an employee with COPD and asthma and firing him** because of those conditions and his request for accommodations. https://www.eeoc.gov//eeoc/newsroom/release/9-27-17k.cfm

And also on 9/27, the EEOC sued MidSouth Extrusion, a plastic manufacturer in Louisiana, accusing the company of **firing an employee** who disclosed decreased lung capacity due to childhood tuberculosis though he **did not ask for or need accommodation and was able to perform his essential job functions.** https://www.eeoc.gov//eeoc/newsroom/release/9-27-17l.cfm

And again 9/27, the EEOC brought a lawsuit against a logistics company in Maryland, accusing it of abruptly **firing an employee just 1 week before he was scheduled to have treatment for a benign brain tumor**. https://www.eeoc.gov//eeoc/newsroom/release/9-27-17o.cfm

9/28/17

Whew! A new day. Whole Foods was sued by the EEOC and accused of disability discrimination when it **fired an employee in a North Carolina store for absenteeism.** The lawsuit alleges that Whole Foods was aware that the **employee would need time off for her kidney impairment** and that the Company knew this because she had previously had a kidney transplant. https://www.eeoc.gov//eeoc/newsroom/release/9-28-17d.cfm

On Your Radar

Draw on Our Expertise

9/29/17

The EEOC sued a real estate company for firing a female employee with breast cancer, who was purportedly told she was **being fired because it was "taking too long for her to get better."** https://www.eeoc.gov//eeoc/newsroom/release/9-29-17e.cfm

That same day, the EEOC sued Volvo, accusing it of discriminating against an applicant who disclosed in his pre-employment physical that he **was taking suboxone to treat his heroin addiction from which he had recovered.** https://www.eeoc.gov//eeoc/newsroom/release/9-29-17a.cfm

The EEOC also filed suit against G4S in Michigan, accusing it of violating the ADA when it fired a security guard who had a seated position, but was placed in a position that required her to patrol on foot and **denying her reasonable accommodations for her medical conditions that she contends required seated work.** https://www.eeoc.gov//eeoc/newsroom/release/9-29-17c.cfm

Continuing its momentum, the EEOC also sued Crain Automotive, an auto supplier in Arkansas, accusing it of violating the ADA after **firing and declining to discuss accommodations within days of an employee disclosing** an array of mental health conditions to her supervisors. https://www.eeoc.gov//eeoc/newsroom/release/9-29-17d.cfm

Prestige Care, Inc., and its affiliates, which provide skilled nursing and assisted living facilities, were included in the month-end flurry of filings. The EEOC alleges the company **denied light duty and leave as an accommodation** to employees with disabilities. The company also would not allow employees to return to work after a medical leave unless they did so **without medical restrictions ("100% healed")** and discharged employees for **exceeding the companies' restrictive leave policy.** https://www.eeoc.gov/eeoc/newsroom/release/9-29-17b.cfm

And finally, to wrap up September . . . the EEOC filed suit in North Carolina on behalf of a certified nursing assistant with arthritis **who sought a light duty position** while a new medication was being tried and was allegedly **fired for exceeding the company's 2-week maximum leave policy.** https://www.eeoc.gov//eeoc/newsroom/release/9-29-17f.cfm

Matrix Can Help with Your ADA Challenges!

Matrix's industry-leading ADA Advantage™ offers meaningful assistance to employers, whether dealing with accommodations for employee disabilities or with accommodations requested due to pregnancy and related conditions. We help you all the way, from intake to medical assessment to assisting with the interactive process, and of course follow-up, recordkeeping, and reporting – but you get the say in which accommodations to provide or deny. Our experienced ADA Specialists are supported by the Matrix Clinical and Compliance teams.

Find out more from your Account Manager or local Reliance Standard sales representative, or contact us at ping@matrixcos.com.

On Your Radar

Draw on Our Expertise

DOL – Proposes to Delay the Effective Date of ERISA Disability Claims Handling Rules and Seeks More Public Comment

It's a moving target, but we're watching! The amended ERISA disability claims handling rules (the "Final Rule") are set to go into effect for claims filed on or after January 1, 2018. But, as we previously reported, the US Department of Labor announced in July that it is **"reviewing these amendments for questions of law and policy."** Today the DOL issued a Proposed Rule that will be published in the Federal Register on October 12, 2017. You can read an advance copy of the Proposed Rule here.

The DOL proposes to delay the effective date of the ERISA disability claims handling rules by 90 days, to April 1, 2018 (some irony there). The reason for the delay is to allow the DOL time to "solicit additional public input and examine regulatory alternatives" to the Final Rule. Here are some important dates:

- Comments on the proposal to extend the applicability date for 90 days must be submitted to the Department on or before October 27, 2017 (15 days after publication of the Proposed Rule in the Federal Register)
- Comments providing data and otherwise germane to the examination of the merits of rescinding, modifying, or retaining the rule must be submitted to the Department on or before December 11, 2017 (60 days after publication of the Proposed Rule in the Federal Register)

We will provide immediate updates of any new developments on our blog, http://matrix-radar.com/ – please sign up!

For a refresher on the requirements of the changes to ERISA disability claims handling requirements, as set forth in the Final Rule, review our prior blog post http://matrix-radar.com/2017/01/a-game-changer-dol-releases-new-erisa-disability-claims-rules/.

What is Matrix Doing? At Matrix we have been working diligently to prepare for the new rules. Regardless of the outcome of the DOL review, Matrix will be ready to administer our clients' disability plans in compliance with the new regulations by January 1, 2018, or other new effective date. To this end, we have assembled a task force of experts in disability plans, claims handling procedures, ERISA, and customer service. Our practice leaders and account managers will be in touch with clients during the lead-up to the effective date – whatever it is! – to discuss changes to plan notifications, procedures, and more. If you have questions in the meantime, contact your account manager or sales representative, or send us an email at ping@matrixcos.com.

On Your Radar

Draw on Our Expertise

Court Opinions

"How long of a leave of absence do I have to grant as an accommodation under the Americans with Disabilities Act?"

I get this question frequently. I have long advised that employers must consider a new or extended leave of absence as a possible accommodation. In assessing an employee's ADA leave request, employers need to look at what the employee will be doing during that leave: Rehabilitative therapy? Trying new medications? Learning to work with an assistive device or a support animal? Maybe recovery from surgery or an injury?

The Equal Employment Opportunity Commission agrees with me – or rather, I have come to agree with the EEOC. EEOC Commissioner Chai Feldblum is often quoted as calling the ADA an "inadvertent leave law." And indeed it is – the ADA was not designed to be job-protected medical leave of absence. Rather, the basic goal is to enable the disabled employee to work – with a reasonable workplace accommodation if needed. But for years, the Commission's guidance has been that leave is a reasonable accommodation as long as it is of a (somewhat) definite duration and will enable the employee to perform his essential functions upon return to work.

The 7th Circuit Court of Appeals begs to differ. In a recent case, the court ruled that an employer did not fail to provide a reasonable accommodation when it denied an employee's request for a 2-3 month continued leave of absence after exhaustion of FMLA.

The Facts. Raymond Severson worked for Heartland Woodcraft, Inc., a fabricator of retail display fixtures from 2006 to 2013. His position was physically demanding, often requiring him to lift 50 pounds or more. Raymond had a back problem that first manifested itself in 2005. During flare-ups, the condition made it difficult or impossible for Raymond to walk, bend, lift, sit, stand, move, and work.

Raymond had generally performed well and received promotions over the years but was having difficulty in his latest position. He met with management on June 5, 2013, and accepted a demotion to second-shift lead, but never commenced work in that position. Earlier the same day, Raymond wrenched his back at home exacerbating his back condition and was in obvious pain as a result. He left work after the meeting with managers and then requested continuous FMLA leave due to his back.

During his FMLA leave Raymond stayed in touch with Heartland's HR representatives. He received periodic extensions of his leave based on medical reports that showed he had multiple herniated and

bulging discs in his spine. In mid-August, after steroid treatments yielded little improvement, Raymond informed HR that he was going to have back surgery on August 27 – the last day of his FMLA entitlement – and would need 2-3 more months of leave as an ADA accommodation. Heartland denied this request but told Raymond he was welcome to reapply when he was able to return to work.

Raymond never reapplied for work. Instead, he chose to sue Heartland for failure to accommodate. Oh, Raymond! You should have taken a different path!

"The ADA is an antidiscrimination statute, not a medical-leave entitlement." So says the 7th Circuit. After analyzing the relevant sections of the ADA, the court stated:

> A "reasonable accommodation" is one that allows the disabled employee to "perform the essential functions of the employment position." If the proposed accommodation does not make it possible for the employee to perform his job, then the employee is not a "qualified individual" as that term is defined in the ADA.
>
> Simply put, an extended leave of absence does not give a disabled individual the means to work; it excuses his not working. [Citations omitted.]

And this:

> A multi-month leave of absence is beyond the scope of a reasonable accommodation under the ADA.

The court acknowledged the possibility that a brief period of leave to deal with a medical condition could be a reasonable accommodation in some circumstances, such as occasional flare-ups of arthritis or lupus.

> Intermittent time off or a short leave of absence—say, a couple of days or even a couple of weeks—may, in appropriate circumstances, be analogous to a part-time or modified work schedule, two of the examples listed in [the ADA]. But a medical leave spanning multiple months does not permit the employee to perform the essential functions of his job. [Citations omitted.]

Of interest and some degree of persuasion, the court compared the FMLA and the ADA as "leave of absence" statutes:

> If, as the EEOC argues, employees are entitled to extended time off as a reasonable accommodation, the ADA is transformed into a medical-leave statute—in effect, an open-

> ended extension of the FMLA. That's an untenable interpretation of the term "reasonable accommodation."

So there we have it. According to the 7th Circuit, a leave of absence as an ADA accommodation is not reasonable if it is expected to last more than "a couple of weeks," or if it will "span[ ] multiple months."

Employers also have some comfort from the case *Hwang v. Kansas State University* (10th Cir. 2014). In that case, the court ruled that a 6-month leave was not a reasonable accommodation:

> It's difficult to conceive how an employee's absence for six months — an absence in which she could not work from home, part-time, or in any way in any place — could be consistent with discharging the essential functions of most any job in the national economy today. Even if it were, it is difficult to conceive when requiring so much latitude from an employer might qualify as a reasonable accommodation.

As the court said, ADA accommodations are "all about enabling employees to work, not to not work." You can read a great summary of the *Hwang* case on Jeff Nowak's FMLA Insights blog here.

Other than these two decisions, we are not aware of any other federal appellate court that has addressed how long of a leave is a reasonable accommodation under the Amendments Act (ADAAA). [The 7th Circuit includes the states of Illinois, Indiana, and Wisconsin within in its jurisdiction; the 10th Circuit includes Colorado, Kansas, New Mexico, Oklahoma, Utah, and Wyoming.]

Employers, continue to tread softly and act wisely. Don't throw caution to the wind just because one or two courts have issued a reasonable opinion. See our Pings below for recommendations on how to assess requests for leave under the ADA since the Amendments Act.

Severson v. Heartland Woodcraft, Inc. (7th Cir. Sept. 20, 2017)

Pings for Employers

- ***Don't ignore the possibility of leave as a reasonable accommodation.*** Nothing in the 7th Circuit's ruling changes the employer's obligation to consider more leave of absence as a reasonable accommodation following the exhaustion of other job-protected leaves such as FMLA or a company policy of allowing a set amount of medical leave. Any inflexible leave policy could still be an ADA violation. Read more on this topic at our blog post regarding an EEOC/Lowe's $8.6 million consent decree.

On Your Radar

Draw on Our Expertise

- **Don't forget the interactive process**. Although the ADA does not require an employer to engage in the interactive process (check out footnote 1 in the Severson opinion), that is still the best way to ensure that you are fulfilling your ADA obligations to consider a reasonable accommodation upon request by a disabled employee.

- **Review the EEOC's resource document on leave as an ADA accommodation.** It is always a good idea to understand the EEOC's thinking on a tough issue, and they have shared with us in their resource document, Employer-Provided Leave and the Americans with Disabilities Act, issued May 9, 2016.

- **If you are thinking of denying an ADA request for leave as an accommodation, consult with your employment counsel**. Even in the 7th and 10th Circuits, this is still a tricky issue. And, the EEOC will likely reject this case in its own proceedings.

MATRIX CAN HELP! Matrix's start-to-finish ADA Advantage management services can help you wrangle with tough issues like accommodation decisions, including leave assessment of leave of absence requests. You always retain the final decision whether and how to accommodate, but we manage the intake, medical assessment, interactive process, recordkeeping, follow-up, and more. Our expert team of ADA Specialist is at the ready with practical advice and expert guidance. To learn more, contact us at ping@matrixcos.com.

MATRIX CAN HELP! Questions about how legislative changes or court opinions could impact your business? Want to learn more about our benefits and absence management solutions? Matrix provides leave, disability, and accommodation management services to employers seeking a comprehensive and compliant solution to these complex employer obligations. We monitor the many leave laws being passed around the country, watch the courts and governmental agencies, and specialize in understanding how they work together.

For leave management and accommodation assistance, contact your Account Manager or local Reliance Standard Sales Representative or contact us at ping@matrixcos.com.