

ALERT

VOLUME 38, NUMBER 10 • MARCH 30, 2012



CalChamber Identifies 'Job Creator' Legislation

Bills Support Goals of Renew California Plan



The California Chamber of Commerce this week released its 2012 list of

"job creator" legislation, identifying 31 bills that will help improve California's job climate and our state's economy.

"Lack of certainty and common sense regulation are among the key barriers to an improved job climate in California," said Allan Zaremberg, CalChamber

president and CEO. "It behooves lawmakers to zero in on those bills that will provide solutions employers need to begin investing in our economy and hiring people again."

Renew California

The list of identified job creator bills supports CalChamber's Renew California plan, first released in 2010 and updated in 2011 to provide policymakers with a framework for restoring California's competitiveness and giving job creators

See 'Job Creator': Page 4

New Leave Mandate Passes Assembly Committee



OPPOSE

A California Chamber of Commerce-**opposed** bill that burdens employers with a mandated benefit different from federal law passed the Assembly Labor and Employment Committee on March 28.

AB 2039 (Swanson; D-Alameda) significantly expands the type of individuals or circumstances under which employees can take a 12-week, protected leave of absence under California's Family Rights Act (CFRA), as well as creates an even further disconnect with the federal Family and Medical Leave Act (FMLA).

In testimony to the committee, the CalChamber emphasized the need to consider AB 2039 in light of the cumulative impact of all leaves required in California. No other state provides protected leave for all the categories offered in California, CalChamber Policy Advocate Jennifer Barrera commented.

Expands California Law

Currently, CFRA requires an employer with 50 or more employees to allow an employee who has worked at least 1,250 hours to take up to 12 weeks of leave in a 12-month period for his/her own serious medical condition, for the birth or

See New: Page 5

Pilot Program to Boost 'Work for Warriors'



Photo by Megan Wood

CalChamber Vice President of Government Relations Marc Burgat (right) joins Assembly Speaker John A. Pérez (at podium) and Major General David S. Baldwin, California National Guard, at a March 29 news conference announcing the Assembly's \$500,000 contribution to help establish a National Guard pilot employment project, 'Work for Warriors,' to help connect unemployed/underemployed Guard members with employers. Story on Page 7.

Inside

New State Energy Tax
Illegal: Page 3

Labor Law Corner

Property Owners/Employers May Restrict Smoking to Designated Areas



Sunny Lee
HR Adviser

Employees are complaining about other employees smoking on break and are fearful of possible exposure to secondary smoke. Can I prohibit employees from smoking?

No, you may not prohibit employees from smoking outside of your office on their own time. You may, however, restrict employees from smoking in the

office and limit smoking to designated outdoor smoking areas.

In addition, you may implement a smoking policy to make employees aware of fellow employees' concerns about secondary smoke and other hygiene issues.

Public Laws

By state law, smoking is prohibited in any enclosed workspace, including restrooms and stairways.

When that law went into effect in 1995, employers sought to accommodate smokers by designating areas outside the building where smokers could smoke on breaks and meal periods. If smoking areas were not designated, often employees smoked outside the front door, which resulted in customer complaints.

Complaints from members of the public about being exposed to secondary smoke have caused a number of cities to adopt local ordinances that restrict smoking around entrances to public buildings (i.e., 20 feet), on city streets and sidewalks, beaches, parks and outdoor areas, in public transit stations, shopping centers, outdoor restaurants, etc.

Employers should be aware of restrictions that have been adopted in the cities where they do business.

Employer Property

An employer that owns its property can designate whether smoking is permitted on the property, including in the parking lot and on sidewalks.

Employers that choose to permit smoking outdoors often designate an outdoor break area. If the area is shared by non-smokers and smokers, non-smokers may be exposed to secondary smoke even though the area is outdoors and well ventilated.

Employees have a legitimate complaint about secondary smoke as it is a recognized health hazard. Therefore, if an employer has established an outdoor break area, separate break areas should be designated for smokers and non-smokers.

Personal Hygiene

In addressing an employee's concerns about being exposed to secondary smoke when he/she smells smoke on a smoker's breath, the employee should be assured that there is no risk of exposure since

there is no smoke that is airborne.

Often, however, an employee's hygiene can be of concern to other employees who have to work in close proximity to the smoker.

That issue can be addressed directly with the smoker by bringing it to his/her attention and asking the employee to use a mouthwash, breath spray or breath mint and wash his/her hands after a smoke break before returning to work.

The issue of other employees objecting to a strong smoke smell on the employee's clothing and hair is more difficult to address if the employee smokes in his/her home. The employer may ask employees to be mindful of the smell and not come to work if they have a strong smoke odor on their clothing or hair.

Lastly, you might consider moving employees who are very sensitive to these issues or moving the smoker to another location. Because smoking is a lawful activity protected under Labor Code Section 96(k), you may not discipline an employee or terminate him/her for smoking off your premises.

The Labor Law Helpline is a service to California Chamber of Commerce preferred and executive members. For expert explanations of labor laws and Cal/OSHA regulations, not legal counsel for specific situations, call (800) 348-2262, or submit your question at www.hrcalifornia.com.

California Chamber Officers

Timothy S. Dubois
Chair

Frederick E. Hitchcock
First Vice Chair

Anne Buettner
Second Vice Chair

Joseph M. Otting
Third Vice Chair

S. Shariq Yosufzai
Immediate Past Chair

Allan Zarembeg
President and Chief Executive Officer

Alert (ISSN 0882-0929) is published weekly during legislative session with exceptions by California Chamber of Commerce, 1215 K Street, Suite 1400, Sacramento, CA 95814-3918. Subscription price is \$50 paid through membership dues. Periodicals Postage Paid at Sacramento, CA.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to Alert, 1215 K Street, Suite 1400, Sacramento, CA 95814-3918. Publisher: Allan Zarembeg. Executive Editor: Ann Amioka. Associate Editor: Sara Espinosa. Art Director: Marcy Wacker. Capitol Correspondent: Christine Haddon. Photographer: Megan Wood.

Permission granted to reprint articles if credit is given to the California Chamber of Commerce Alert, and reprint is mailed to Alert at address above.

*E-mail: alert@calchamber.com.
Home page: www.calchamber.com.*

CalChamber Calendar

Host Reception/Host Breakfast:
May 21–22, Sacramento

Labor law answers
online HRCalifornia.com



New State Energy Tax is Illegal, Unwise



Loren Kaye

Billions of dollars in new taxes may soon flow into California state government to be spent on new programs.

The taxes are harmful to the economy, they're probably illegal, and they're not

even needed for the program's success.

And don't even imagine that they're getting legislative or voter approval.

I'm not talking about new income taxes or sales taxes for education. Not new taxes to balance the state's budget. Not new taxes to sew up the tattered safety net or rescue California's once-vaunted higher education system.

Beginning later this year, billions in new revenues will be used for...well, we don't exactly know yet.

Energy Tax

The taxes will be levied by the "cap and trade auction," a scheme developed by the Air Resources Board (ARB) to regulate the emission of greenhouse gases under 2006 legislation. According to the administration, the auction will raise between \$12 billion and \$60 billion through 2020.

And perhaps craziest of all—these new taxes are utterly unnecessary to achieve the greenhouse gas reduction goals set forth by the Legislature in the first place. Doubly crazy when you consider that these new billions in taxes would be collected as gasoline prices are climbing to new record highs and as electricity prices are ticking ever upward.

Legal Questions

The auction is probably illegal on its face. The legislation in question, AB 32, passed in 2006, authorized "market-based compliance mechanisms" to reduce greenhouse gas emissions. As such, the ARB adopted a conventional cap-and-trade program (like the successful Clean Air Act Acid Rain Program) that distributes allowances to greenhouse gas emitters and permits the allowances to be traded in a securities market to efficiently

allocate the required greenhouse gas reductions.

But in a surprise twist, the ARB held back one-in-ten of these allowances, and decided to instead auction them into the market—in effect charging a 10% tax on the distribution of greenhouse gas allowances.

Nowhere in the legislation was such an auction or tax authorized. And for good reason—any new tax would require a two-thirds vote of the Legislature, which wasn't in the cards for such a controversial bill. Indeed, the authors of AB 32 recognized this: then-Assembly Speaker Fabian Núñez (D-Los Angeles)

Guest Commentary by Loren Kaye

wrote an official letter clarifying that the fee authority in the bill was limited to "direct costs" of administration; Senator Fran Pavley (D-Agoura Hills) sought (and failed) to give the ARB specific authority to run an auction.

The administration and some legislators have lately taken to calling the auction a "fee," which would obviate the need for supermajority legislative approval. But the change in name doesn't change the underlying illegal maneuver, since a fee cannot be levied if its primary purpose is to raise revenues for new programs, which is the basic purpose of the auction.

Incoming Revenues

Notwithstanding the serious legal and policy clouds, the ARB has scheduled auctions as early as August of this year, even though neither the administration nor the Legislature has yet determined how to spend the proceeds, estimated at between \$660 million and \$3 billion for 2012–13 alone.

By any measure, these are extraordinarily large revenues to appear in state coffers with so far little public attention and only modest legislative oversight. The revenues aren't even programmed yet in the state budget.

The administration proposes merely to provide the Legislature with an expen-

diture plan at some future date, some 30 days before it begins to allocate revenues.

The administration estimates that, of the estimated \$1 billion in new revenues from the auction for the next fiscal year, some \$500 million would be spent to offset existing General Fund costs of greenhouse gas mitigation activities. The remaining \$500 million would be "invested" in:

- clean and efficient energy;
- low-carbon transportation;
- natural resource protection; and
- sustainable infrastructure

development.

Last month, the Legislative Analyst released a report that raised concerns over the schedule, budgeting and oversight of the new auction, as well as urging prudence given the legal cloud shadowing the program. Indeed, the analyst has not been able to identify more than \$100 million in current General Fund costs for the first \$500 million, and where the remaining \$500 million would be spent is anybody's guess.

But wait, there's more. The Public Utilities Commission is responsible for ordering the redistribution of between \$650 million and \$2.6 billion of auction revenues generated from the state's electric utilities. The commission has opened a proceeding to determine how and on what the money should be spent, although they have committed to see the funds used "to benefit electricity consumers."

California is struggling with real deterioration of basic public services, caused by years of fiscal mismanagement and a devastating economic recession. A legitimate public debate is unfolding whether to raise income and sales taxes to shore up education, public safety and safety net programs. It is revealing and disturbing that billions in new taxes to support as-yet-unidentified energy subsidies is moving along with little public deliberation and even less respect for the law.

Loren Kaye is president of the California Foundation for Commerce and Education, a nonprofit think tank affiliated with the California Chamber of Commerce.

‘Job Creator’ Legislation Supports Goals of Renew California Plan

From Page 1

the certainty and stability to make investment and hiring decisions. Renew California is based on five pillars for economic recovery:

- Reducing regulatory and litigation costs of hiring new employees and keeping them on the job;
- Ensuring certainty and stability of private investments in plants, equipment and technology;
- Enacting a fair and predictable tax structure;
- Investing in public and private works that provide the backbone for economic growth; and
- Providing a world-class education to prepare high school students for work or college, and supporting public colleges and universities to prepare students and innovate technologies.

Legislation included on the job creator list released on March 27 will change throughout the year as bills are amended or new language is introduced.

The 2012 CalChamber job creator list can be viewed at www.calchamber.com/jobcreators and includes the following proposed bills.

Environmental Regulation

● **AB 890 (Olsen; R-Modesto) Reduces Regulatory Burdens** — Improves safety and roadway conditions that expedite goods and people movement by exempting roadway projects from the California Environmental Quality Act process.

● **AB 1073 (Fuentes; D-Sylmar) Project Streamlining** — Promotes the use of cost-efficient energy by allowing a solar facility to convert from solar thermal technology to photovoltaic technology without having to file a new application.

● **AB 1095 (B. Berryhill; R-Ceres) Reduces Regulatory Burdens** — Ensures transparency and avoids costly litigation for business by creating a hearing board to resolve disagreements between businesses and the California Air Resources Board.

● **AB 1755 (Perea; D-Fresno) Reduces Energy Costs** — Fairly allocates and reduces energy costs for business by authorizing a fixed per-customer charge among all rate payers.

● **AB 1771 (Valadao; R-Hanford) Reduces Energy Costs** — Reduces



energy costs and promotes renewable energy by including hydroelectric generation in the definition of a renewable energy resource.

● **AB 2577 (Galgiani; D-Livingston) Alleviates Unnecessary Delays** — Reduces project delays by ensuring timely public comments in the California Environmental Quality Act process.

● **SB 971 (Cannella; R-Ceres) Reduces Energy Costs** — Reduces energy costs and promotes renewable energy by eliminating the penalty on utilities that use clean, renewable hydroelectric as part of their energy generation mix.

● **SB 1139 (Rubio; D-East Bakersfield) Creates Regulatory Certainty** — Advances the state’s environmental policies and promotes job creation by reducing the regulatory burdens for the permitting process of carbon capturing and storage projects.

Education

● **SB 1402 (Lieu; D-Torrance) Better Workforce Development** — Helps improve alignment of the state’s workforce needs and education resources by reauthorizing the Economic and Workforce Development program within the California Community College system.

Economic Development

● **AB 1804 (Valadao; R-Hanford) Project Labor Agreements** — Promotes job and economic growth by freeing up local funds through elimination of penalties on local government that prohibit project labor agreements.

● **AB 2485 (Hueso; D-San Diego) Provides Development Opportunities** — Promotes private-public partnerships by allowing the Department of Transportation to contract with private companies for the operation of rest areas in conjunction with the development of a

retail establishment.

● **SB 1161 (Padilla; D-Pacoima) Internet-Based Services** — Provides certainty and creates a level playing field for California business by assuring that Voice over Internet Protocol- and Internet Protocol-enabled services will not be regulated at the state level but rather at the federal level.

Labor and Employment

● **AB 2176 (Logue; R-Linda) Reduction of Frivolous Meal Period Litigation** — Reduces costly litigation regarding meal periods for commercial drivers who transport hazardous materials.

● **SB 1114 (Dutton; R-Rancho Cucamonga) Reduces Wage-and-Hour Competitive Disadvantage for California Employers** — Lowers costly daily overtime requirement for California employers by requiring payment of overtime only after 10 hours in a workday.

● **SB 1115 (Dutton; R-Rancho Cucamonga) Workplace Flexibility for Small Employers** — Alleviates the burden of unnecessary regulations by allowing an employer with 10 or fewer employees to implement an alternative workweek schedule at the request of the employees.

● **SB 1362 (LaMalfa; R-Richvale) Reduction of Frivolous Meal Period Litigation** — Reduces costly litigation regarding meal periods for commercial drivers who are regulated by federal law.

Legal Reform

● **AB 2043 (Wagner; R-Irvine) Increases Class Action Fairness** — Helps prevent meritless class actions by allowing defendants an equal right to appeal a court order granting certification of a class.

● **SB 1374 (Harman; R-Huntington Beach) Reliance on State Agencies’ Written Advice** — Protects employers from inappropriate litigation by affirming they can rely upon the state government to provide them with information regarding how to comply with the law.

Regulatory Reform

● **AB 1612 (Lara; D-Los Angeles) Administrative Practices** — Promotes

See ‘Job Creator’: Next Page

‘Job Creator’ Legislation Supports Goals of Renew California Plan

From Previous Page

government accountability and a transparent process by requiring proposed new residential building standards to include the cost of compliance, potential benefits of the proposed standard and the underlying model used to achieve those estimates.

● **AB 1982 (Wagner; R-Irvine) Provides Accountability for Expensive Regulation** — Provides certainty and flexibility for businesses by extending the time frame when they are required to comply with new regulations.

● **AB 2091 (B. Berryhill; R-Ceres) Increases Regulatory Certainty** — Provides certainty and the ability for businesses to meet government mandates by requiring that new technology required to implement a new regulation is available and affordable.

● **SB 1099 (Wright; D-Inglewood) Creates Regulatory Certainty** — Provides certainty for business by creating a predictable and easy-to-track implementation schedule for new regulations.

Taxation

● **AB 1510 (Garrick; R-Carlsbad) Health Care Expenses Tax Deductions**

— Encourages job growth through freeing small businesses to invest in business growth instead of spending limited resources on health care expenses, by entitling individuals, including the self-employed, to a state tax deduction for contributions to a Health Savings Account (HSA) in conformity with federal tax law.

● **AB 1605 (Garrick; R-Carlsbad) Tax Break for Small Businesses** — Reduces upfront costs for small businesses by eliminating the minimum franchise tax for the first year the business is in operation.

● **AB 1911 (Donnelly; R-Twin Peaks) More Manufacturing Jobs** — Encourages employers to maintain and expand their manufacturing operations in California by providing a permanent, partial sales-and-use-tax exemption for purchases of manufacturing equipment.

● **AB 1972 (Huber; D-El Dorado Hills) More Manufacturing/R&D Jobs** — Encourages employers to maintain and expand their manufacturing operations in California by providing a full sales-and-use-tax exemption for purchases of manufacturing and research and development equipment made through December 31, 2018.

● **AB 2026 (Fuentes; D-Sylmar) Film Credit Extension** — Protects jobs in the film industry by extending the film tax credit for five years, until July 1, 2020.

● **SB 1167 (R. Calderon; D-Montebello) Film Credit Extension** — Protects jobs in the film industry by extending the film tax credit for five years, until July 1, 2020.

Tourism

● **AB 2113 (Hueso; D-San Diego) Enhanced Driver License** — Encourages international trade and tourism by authorizing the Department of Motor Vehicles to issue enhanced driver licenses to U.S. citizens to expedite legal traffic at the border.

● **AB 2245 (Smyth; R-Santa Clarita) Reduces Regulatory Burdens** — Maximizes state funding and promotes tourism by exempting bikeways from the California Environmental Quality Act process.

● **SB 973 (Vargas; D-San Diego) Reduces Regulatory Burdens** — Supports tourism by exempting events with a park use or special events permit from the California Environmental Quality Act process.

New Leave Mandate Passes Assembly Committee

From Page 1

placement of a child, or to care for the serious medical condition of a child (under 18 years of age or adult dependent), spouse, or parent.

The current definition of “parent” includes step-parents as well as individuals who stand in place of a parent, “in loco parentis,” to the child.

AB 2039 seeks to expand CFRA by allowing an employee a protected leave to care for adult children, parents-in-law, grandparents and siblings. The initial intent of CFRA was to provide a balance between an individual’s work life and personal life. This proposed change, however, would disrupt that balance and have a negative impact on California employers.

Substantial Burden

Expanding the types of individuals or circumstances under which an employee can take a leave of absence under CFRA,

through AB 2039, would only further increase the cost of doing business for employers in California.

Given that the individuals proposed by AB 2039 are not covered by the FMLA, an employee could use his/her 12 weeks of CFRA to care for the serious medical condition of a parent-in-law, then take another 12-week leave under FMLA to care for the medical condition for his/her spouse, child or parent.

This significant expansion of leave for employees would create such a substantial burden on employers that it would discourage employers from growing to more than 50 employees in order to avoid triggering CFRA/FMLA or from locating to this state. California cannot afford to impede growth and overburden employers with such a requirement.

Leave Already Protected

The new burden that AB 2039 creates

is unnecessary. The proposed category of individuals that AB 2039 seeks to include under the protections of CFRA are generally already protected. A grandparent or step-parent who stands in loco parentis to a child, can already take a protected leave of absence under CFRA to care for that child, and vice versa. There is no need to create another exception for the parent-in-law, daughter-in-law, or son-in law to also be able to take leave.

Key Vote

AB 2039 passed Assembly Labor and Employment on a vote of 5-1.

Ayes: Swanson (D-Alameda), Alejo (D-Watsonville), Allen (D-Santa Rosa), Furutani (D-South Los Angeles County), Yamada (D-Davis).

Noes: Morrell (R-Rancho Cucamonga).

Staff Contact: Jennifer Barrera

Independent Contractors Vital, Growing Source of California Economic Strength

Independent contractors are a vital and growing source of strength in California's economy, according to a new report co-sponsored by the California Foundation for Commerce and Education (CFCE).

Attempts to rein in independent contractors through onerous regulations would have a harmful effect on California's economic productivity and employment, the study concluded.

Independent contracting is a business arrangement in which a client firm (or government) will contract with, usually, a small business or individual to perform work that might otherwise be performed in-house by staff employees.

Labor unions in California and elsewhere have criticized these arrangements and attempted to apply onerous regulations on record-keeping and taxation that would reduce the incentive to employ or become an independent contractor.

The study, prepared by Philip J. Romero, Ph.D., professor of finance at the University of Oregon and former chief economist for Governor Pete Wilson, found that independent contractors are an important source of economic strength in California, and that arguments aimed at undermining independent contracting are based on myth, not credible data.

Key Findings

Key findings in the report include:

- California's economic growth in particular depends heavily on small businesses and independent contractors. In 2009 (the most recent year available), roughly 1.5 million Californians worked primarily for their own businesses—more than one of every 11 workers in the state. Self-employment is about one-third more common in California than in the nation.



This is not surprising since California has long had a reputation as an incubator for new businesses. According to Romero, “arguably, the state’s high rate of new business formation is one of its few remaining competitive advantages.”

- Romero provides convincing evidence that “the rate at which new firms are created may be the single most important contributor to economic growth.” Since California is among the leading states in formation of small and new businesses—which in turn are the key generators of job growth and long-term prosperity—“its economy would suffer disproportionately if independent contracting was curbed.”

- Romero refutes the myths (masquerading as arguments) that have arisen in the debate on independent contracting. Independent contractors do not gain a competitive advantage in evasion of labor and tax laws—indeed, tax compliance is the same or higher for contractors than for employees. Contracting work is not a “fallback occupation” for those who have lost

jobs—in fact, self-employment fell during the recent recession and has grown during boom years. Finally, contracting is a symptom, not a cause, of increasing global competition.

- Restricting independent contracting will slow economic growth and add to the state’s unemployment rate. Using several national measures of regulation, Romero calculated that adding restrictions on labor arrangements, including independent contracting, “will suppress state [gross domestic product] GDP growth by between 0.3% and 0.6% ... and add between 0.25% and 0.5% to the state’s unemployment rate.”

- State policies that encourage self-employment facilitate productivity growth and thereby make the state’s economy more competitive. These policies assist workers who may be entrepreneurially inclined to pursue higher income, autonomy and greater job satisfaction.

Romero concludes that the greater cost of restrictions on independent contracting is not the short-run impact; it is “the suppression of innovation and productivity improvements that are at the heart of all economic progress.”

The Economic Benefits of Preserving Independent Contracting was co-sponsored by CFCE, California Business Roundtable, California Hispanic Chambers of Commerce, California Asian Pacific Chamber of Commerce, and National Federation of Independent Business, California. The full report is available at www.calchamber.com/cfce.

Next Alert:
April 13

Visit www.calchamber.com for products and services to help you do business in California.

CalChamber, Employer Coalition Seek Workers' Comp 'Fix That Sticks'

A broad-based coalition of employers and other groups, including the California Chamber of Commerce, gathered in Sacramento this week to focus on cost-saving reforms to California's workers' compensation system.

After the passage of CalChamber-supported reforms in 2003–2004, the costs of the California workers' compensation system significantly declined. Since 2006, this trend has reversed and costs have risen to pre-reform levels.

The erosion of medical treatment reforms, increase in litigation over disability ratings and emergence of profiteering abuses have increased costs and pose a serious threat to the system and the state's economy.

Compared to other states, the California workers' compensation system costs too much for what it delivers. The system is the fifth most expensive in the nation with costs at 131% of the national median.

The California workers' compensation system remains too expensive to administer and too adversarial in how employers, injured workers and service providers interact. It also provides too many financial incentives for third



Photo by Megan Wood

Jeremy Merz, CalChamber policy advocate on workers' compensation issues, welcomes attendees to a March 26–27 event to focus on cost-saving workers' compensation reforms.

parties to exploit loopholes and engage in gamesmanship at the expense of employers and injured workers.

Benchmarks with other comparable states show that California's benefit delivery expense is 70% greater than

average. More than one-third of the system's costs are spent on administration and expenses, and California's litigation rate is 10% higher than comparable states.

Since 2005, costs per claim have increased more than 40% due to greater costs for medical treatment, cash benefits and expenses. For injured workers, claims are more complicated and take longer to resolve.

The number of disputed cases filed with the Workers' Compensation Appeals Board also has increased. In addition, there was a 46% increase in the number of filed liens between 2009 and 2010.

CalChamber Position

Workers' compensation costs must decrease to ensure that California remains economically competitive. Any discussion of increasing benefits must be met with offsets in other parts of the workers' compensation system that reduce overall system costs.

The ultimate goal is preserving a balanced system that provides equitable benefits to injured workers at a sustainable cost to employers.

Staff Contact: Jeremy Merz

'Work for Warriors' Pilot Program to Link National Guard Members, Jobs

Assembly Speaker John A. Pérez (D-Los Angeles) and Major General David S. Baldwin, adjutant general for the California National Guard, announced on March 29 the Assembly's \$500,000 contribution to help establish the new National Guard employment pilot program called "Work for Warriors."

The program will match up the skills of unemployed and underemployed National Guard members with the hiring needs of employers, with the goal of reducing unemployment and underemployment among California Guard members by 25% within a year and a longer-term goal of lowering unemployment under 5%.

The employers who have already committed to supporting the Work for Warriors program are the California Chamber of Commerce, Comcast, Granite Construction, Dollar General, Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory,

JP Morgan Chase, Solar City and the California Conservation Corps.

"As an Air Force veteran, I believe it is very important that we create opportunities for those who serve our country to work in the private sector," said CalChamber President and CEO Allan Zaremberg.

"CalChamber is pleased to be involved with this opportunity to bring together those serving in the California National Guard and California businesses. It is an honor to support a program that matches those who serve our country with employers in need of highly skilled workers," said CalChamber Vice President of Government Relations Marc Burtat.

California is home to the largest and most frequently deployed National Guard force in the country, deploying more than 37,000 times to countries worldwide since September 11, 2001.

Seminars/Trade Shows

More information and events at www.calchamber.com/events.

Labor Law

HR 101: Intro to HR Administration Seminar. CalChamber. April 11, Sacramento. (800) 331-8877.

Hiring, Onboarding and Recordkeeping 101. CalChamber. April 12, Sacramento. (800) 331-8877.

Performance Evaluations, Discipline and Termination. CalChamber. April 12, Sacramento. (800) 331-8877.

Paying and Scheduling Non-Exempt Employees Webinar. CalChamber. April 19. (800) 331-8877.

International Trade

Basics of Exporting - Webinars. U.S. Department of Commerce. April 4—How to Find HS Codes, Duties and Taxes; April 18—Understanding Export Controls; May 2—Duty Drawbacks. (800) 872-8723.

Grow Your Business, Export to Mexico. Mexican Consulate. April 4, Fresno. (559) 233-3065.



Quick Reference for Managers or Anyone New to HR

CalChamber's *2012 HR Handbook for California Employers* is an easy-to-understand guide for complying with complex California and federal employment laws. Make confident HR decisions about hiring, policies, benefits, compensation, workplace safety, termination and more.



Step-by-step guide to managing HR issues and complying with labor laws: **\$39.99**

The 2012 version includes important legal updates such as:

- New notice of pay details
- New restrictions for performing credit checks
- New law requiring employees continue to receive health benefits during Pregnancy Disability Leave
- Overtime for out-of-state employees

With this comprehensive guide you also get online access to download nearly 200 required and recommended forms.

Get a \$5 Starbucks Card when you buy a 2012 HR Handbook for California Employers by 4/4/12.

Use priority code HRST2A.

Preferred and Executive members receive their 20% discount in addition to this offer.

ORDER online now at calchamber.com/hrhandbook or call (800) 331-8877.

ADDRESS SERVICE REQUESTED

Helping California Business Do BusinessSM

www.calchamber.com

P.O. BOX 1736 SACRAMENTO, CA 95812-1736
(916) 444-6670 FACSIMILE (916) 444-6685

CALIFORNIA CHAMBER OF COMMERCE



Periodicals
Postage
PAID
Sacramento, CA