

Congress of the United States
Washington, D.C. 20515

April 12, 2021

The Honorable Marty J. Walsh
Secretary of Labor
U.S. Department of Labor
200 Constitution Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20210

RE: Comments on the Notice of Proposed Rulemaking, RIN 1235-AA34, Independent Contractor Status Under the *Fair Labor Standards Act*; Withdrawal

Dear Secretary Walsh:

We write in strong support of the Department of Labor’s (Department or DOL) proposal to withdraw the January 2021 final interpretive rule “Independent Contractor Status under the Fair Labor Standards Act” (Independent Contractor Rule or Rule).¹

The *Fair Labor Standards Act* (FLSA)² has a broad employment standard that ensures its protections are extended to a wide range of workers. The Independent Contractor Rule conflicts with the FLSA’s text and congressional intent by narrowing the Department’s interpretation of who is considered an employee under the Act. This Rule would lead to misclassification, subjecting vulnerable workers to wage theft, placing law-abiding businesses at a competitive disadvantage, and depriving state and federal governments of much-needed tax revenue. We strongly urge the Department to withdraw this harmful Rule.

The Independent Contractor Rule narrows the Department’s interpretation of employee status, in direct conflict with the FLSA’s text and congressional intent.

The FLSA is the cornerstone of wage and hour protections, ensuring employees earn a minimum wage, receive premium pay for overtime work, and are protected from child labor. The FLSA defines an “employee” as “any individual employed by an employer”,³ and the term “employ” includes “to suffer or permit to work.”⁴ The courts have said that an “entity ‘suffers or permits’ an individual to work if, as a matter of economic reality, the individual is dependent on the entity.”⁵ As the Department points out,⁶ for decades, the courts and the Department have applied a multi-factor “economic realities” test “to determine whether the worker is economically

¹ Independent Contractor Status Under the Fair Labor Standards Act, 86 Fed. Reg. 1168 (Jan. 7, 2021).

² 29 U.S.C. §§201 et seq.

³ 29 U.S.C. § 203(e)(1).

⁴ 29 U.S.C. § 203(g).

⁵ *Antenor v. D & S Farms*, 88 F.3d 925, 929 (11th Cir. 1996).

⁶ Independent Contractor Status Under the Fair Labor Standards Act, 86 Fed. Reg. 14027, 14028 (proposed Mar. 12, 2021).

dependent on the employer (and thus its employee) or is really in business for him or herself (and thus its independent contractor).”⁷

While the articulation of specific factors and the number of factors used varies slightly by court, the following six factors are almost uniformly used in federal courts of appeal as indicators of economic dependence: (1) the extent to which the work performed is an integral part of the employer’s business; (2) the worker’s opportunity for profit or loss depending on his or her managerial skill; (3) the extent of the relative investments of the employer and the worker; (4) whether the work performed requires special skills and initiative; (5) the permanency of the relationship; and (6) the degree of control exercised or retained by the employer.⁸ Courts look at the totality of circumstances, and no single factor should be given undue weight, especially the control factor.⁹ Giving undue weight to the control factor would render this test the common-law control test.

The Independent Contractor Rule narrows the Department’s interpretation of employee status under the FLSA by creating a new five-factor test.¹⁰ Two factors, the nature and degree of the control over the work and the worker’s opportunity for profit or loss, are deemed core factors and given undue weight.¹¹ Under the Rule, where the two core factors point toward the same classification, the analysis is virtually complete; an individual who is determining status “may approach the remaining factors and circumstances with skepticism.”¹² While the preamble to the proposed rule colors this test as a “variation” of the economic realities test,¹³ in truth, the test effectively rejects the inquiry into economic dependence and instead makes employee status a question of control of specific elements of a job—whether to take a job, and the ability to work for others—by the worker.

Giving the control factor outsized weight under the Rule’s test is in direct conflict with congressional intent. When establishing the broad “to suffer or permit to work” standard under the FLSA, Congress consciously rejected the narrower common law standard of employment, which turns on the degree to which the employer has control over an employee. Congress instead chose an employment definition “whose striking breadth . . . stretches the meaning of ‘employee’”¹⁴ and requires the Act’s “application to many persons and working relationships

⁷ Wage and Hour Div., U.S. Dep’t of Labor, Adm’r Interp. No. 2015-1, The Application of the Fair Labor Standards Act’s “Suffer or Permit” Standard in the Identification of Employees Who Are Misclassified as Independent Contractors 2.

⁸ *Id.* at 4.

⁹ *Brock v. Superior Care, Inc.*, 840 F.2d 1054, 1059 (2d Cir. 1988).

¹⁰ Independent Contractor Final Rule, 86 Fed. Reg. 1168, 1168.

¹¹ *Id.*

¹² *Id.* at 1197. The remaining factors are the amount of skill required for the work, the degree of permanence of the working relationship between the worker and the potential employer, and whether the work is part of an integrated unit of production.

¹³ Independent Contractor Status Under the Fair Labor Standards Act, 85 Fed. Reg. 60600, 60612 (proposed Sept. 25, 2020).

¹⁴ *Nationwide Mut. Ins. Co. v. Darden*, 503 U.S. 318, 326 (1992).

The Hon. Marty J. Walsh
April, 12, 2021
Page 3

which, prior to this Act, were not deemed to fall within an employer-employee category.”¹⁵ As the Supreme Court has noted, employment under the FLSA has the “broadest definition that has ever been included in any one act.”¹⁶

Moreover, in passing the FLSA, Congress intended “to eliminate, as rapidly as practicable, substandard labor conditions throughout the nation.”¹⁷ Such a purpose cannot be met with the Department’s narrow control test, which could leave out significant portions of the workforce.

The Department has no statutory authority to narrow coverage under the FLSA or undermine its purpose in this way. Congress has not delegated rulemaking authority to the Department with respect to the scope of the employment relationship under the FLSA. The Department only has interpretive rule, or guidance, authority on this issue, but such interpretations cannot conflict with the text or intent behind the FLSA, as this Rule does.¹⁸

The Independent Contractor Rule would cost workers billions of dollars in lost wages each year, but the Rule failed to quantify or consider these costs.

The misclassification of employees is a pervasive issue that undermines the economic security of workers and their families. A 2000 DOL-commissioned study found that 10 to 30 percent of firms audited in nine states misclassified at least one of their workers.¹⁹ According to the Internal Revenue’s Service’s 1984 estimate (the most recent comprehensive misclassification estimate), 15 percent of employers misclassified their employees.²⁰ Misclassification is most prevalent in industries where employers have a greater financial incentive and leverage to shift costs onto workers or where work is performed in settings where unlawful employment practices are easier to conceal.²¹ This includes trucking, construction, janitorial services, home health care, and industries that employ large numbers of undocumented workers.

The Independent Contractor Rule would lead to increases in misclassification. Employers using the Rule’s narrow control test might seek to improperly change their workers’ classification from “employee” to “independent contractor” or hire workers as independent contractors where they

¹⁵ *Walling v. Portland Terminal Co.*, 330 U.S. 148, 150-51 (1947).

¹⁶ *United States v. Rosenwasser*, 323 U.S. 360, 363 n. 3 (1945) (quoting 81 Cong. Rec. 7,657 (1938) (remarks of Sen. Hugo Black)).

¹⁷ *Powell v. United States Cartridge Co.*, 339 U.S. 497, 510 (1949).

¹⁸ The Department concedes it has no authority to adopt a test based on control: “Accordingly, the Department believes it is legally constrained from adopting the common law control test absent Congressional legislation to amend the FLSA.” Independent Contractor Proposed Rule, 85 Fed. Reg. 60600, 60635.

¹⁹ Lalith De Silva, et al., *Independent Contractors: Prevalence and Implications for Unemployment Insurance Programs*, Planmatics, Inc., Prepared for the U.S. Department of Labor Employment and Training Administration iii (2000), <http://wdr.doleta.gov/owsdrr/00-5/00-5.pdf>.

²⁰ Government Accountability Office, *Employee Misclassification: Improved Coordination, Outreach, and Targeting Could Better Ensure Detection and Prevention* 10 (Aug. 2009), <http://www.gao.gov/assets/300/293679.pdf>.

²¹ Françoise Carré, *(In)dependent Contractor Misclassification*, Economic Policy Institute 6 (2015), <http://www.epi.org/publication/independent-contractor-misclassification/>.

The Hon. Marty J. Walsh
April, 12, 2021
Page 4

would otherwise be classified as employees, misclassifying these workers. The preamble to the Rule offers no estimate of the number of workers who would be at risk of misclassification because of the Rule.

Employees misclassified under the Independent Contractor Rule would be at increased risk of wage theft because, as the Rule’s preamble notes, “the minimum wage and overtime pay requirements of the FLSA would no longer apply to workers who shift from employee status to independent contractor status.”²² This could lead to significant income losses for workers. For example, in 2012 the Wage and Hour Division (WHD) recovered roughly \$250,000 in unpaid overtime and minimum wages for 75 workers who were misclassified by a cleaning company²³—the equivalent of nearly three months of earnings. The Rule even signals to employers that it is designed to be a “get out of jail free” card for wage theft, stating that reliance on the interpretations in the Rule that have not been invalidated by the courts provide employers with a defense against minimum wage and overtime protections.²⁴

Astonishingly, the preamble to the Rule failed to quantify how much workers stand to lose in wages, as legally required.²⁵ In comments to the proposed rule, the Economic Policy Institute submitted estimates that a final rule could result in at least \$3.3 billion in transfers from workers to employers each year.²⁶ In addition, workers could incur at least \$400 million for necessary paperwork associated with being newly misclassified as independent contractors.²⁷ This means the estimated cost to workers could be at least \$3.7 billion annually.²⁵

While the Independent Contractor Rule would impact the Department's interpretation of employee status under the FLSA, the Department concludes that employers may use the same “classification decisions for purposes of benefits and legal requirements under other federal and state laws.”²⁸ As such, the preamble concedes the Rule could leave workers with fewer benefits that are tied to the employment relationship, such as health insurance and retirement contributions.²⁹ The preamble fails to quantify the loss of these benefits.

The Rule would also undermine child labor standards in the FLSA that keep our nation’s

²² Independent Contractor Final Rule, 86 Fed. Reg. 1168, 1218.

²³ *Skokie Cleaning Business Must Pay \$500K In Unpaid Wages, Damages To Workers*, CHICAGO.CBSLOCAL.COM (May 5, 2012), <https://chicago.cbslocal.com/2012/05/05/skokie-cleaning-business-must-pay-500k-in-unpaid-wages-damages-to-workers/>.

²⁴ Independent Contractor Final Rule, 86 Fed. Reg. 1168, 1246; 29 U.S.C. 259.

²⁵ Independent Contractor Final Rule, 86 Fed. Reg. 1168, 1210. Executive Order 13563 requires agencies to “quantify anticipated present and future benefits and costs as accurately as possible.” Exec. Order No. 13563, Improving Regulation and Regulatory Review, 3 C.F.R. § 13563 (2011).

²⁶ The Economic Policy Institute’s estimates are based on the assumption that there will be a 5 percent increase in the number of workers who are independent contractors in their main job as a result of this rule, coupled with other conservative estimates regarding the number of independent contractors in their main job main and workers’ pay levels. Economic Policy Institute, Comment Letter on Proposed Rule on Independent Contractor Status Under the Fair Labor Standards Act (Oct. 26, 2020).

²⁷ *Id.*

²⁸ Independent Contractor Final Rule, 86 Fed. Reg. 1168, 1216 n. 110.

²⁹ *Id.* at 1216.

children safe and healthy. The preamble to the Rule also fails to acknowledge or quantify the potential impact on other protections that rely on the FLSA's definition of employment, including equal pay claims under the *Equal Pay Act of 1963*³⁰ and family and medical leave protections under the *Family and Medical Leave Act*.³¹

The Independent Contractor Rule could cost our economy billions when businesses and states are already struggling to make it through a public health crisis and economic downturn.

The Independent Contractor Rule would provide low-road employers with a free pass to continue or adopt a misclassification model. Employers who misclassify their workers can achieve significant labor cost savings—nearly 30 percent³²—by avoiding compliance with minimum wage and overtime obligations as well as payment of employment taxes and workers' compensation premiums.³³ This creates a competitive disadvantage for law-abiding businesses that properly classify their workers as employees and comply with FLSA requirements. The preamble offers no estimate of how the Rule would cost law-abiding businesses who will have to compete with misclassifying employers. In passing the FLSA, Congress sought “to eliminate the competitive advantage enjoyed by goods produced under substandard conditions.”³⁴ The Independent Contractor Rule would undermine that goal.

This proposal could also impose a significant financial burden for federal, state, and local governments due to billions in lost tax revenues. According to a 2009 GAO report, the Internal Revenue Service (IRS) estimated that, in 1984, roughly 15 percent of employers misclassified 3.4 million workers, costing the federal government \$1.6 billion in lost revenue³⁵ (\$3.72 billion in 2019 dollars). Nearly 60 percent of this lost revenue was attributable to misclassified workers failing to pay income taxes.³⁶ If employers relied on this Rule to misclassify their workers, state and local governments could see reduced revenues.

Misclassification also negatively impacts key labor insurance programs, such as unemployment insurance, workers' compensation, and disability insurance systems. For example, a 2000 DOL-commissioned study found nearly \$200 million in lost unemployment insurance tax revenue per year through the 1990s due to misclassification.³⁷ During that time period, annually, an

³⁰ 29 U.S.C. § 206(d).

³¹ 29 U.S.C. § 2601 et seq.

³² National Employment Law Project, *Independent Contractor Misclassification Imposes Huge Costs on Workers and Federal and State Treasuries* (Sept. 2017), <https://www.nelp.org/publication/independent-contractor-misclassification-imposes-huge-costs-on-workers-and-federal-and-state-treasuries/>.

³³ Carré, *supra* at 4.

³⁴ The FLSA states “labor conditions detrimental to the maintenance of the minimum standard of living necessary for health, efficiency, and general well-being of workers . . . constitutes an unfair method of competition in commerce”. 29 U.S.C. § 202(a).

³⁵ U.S. General Accounting Office, *Employee Misclassification: Improved Coordination, Outreach, and Targeting Could Better Ensure Detection and Prevention* 10 (August 2009), <http://www.gao.gov/products/GAO-09-717>.

³⁶ *Id.*

³⁷ de Silva, *supra* note 18, at 69.

The Hon. Marty J. Walsh
April, 12, 2021
Page 6

estimated 80,000 workers entitled to UI benefits were not receiving them.³⁸ The preamble fails to quantify or include any analysis on these potential impacts. The Economic Policy Institute estimates at least \$750 million in transfers from social insurance funds to employers each year as a result of the Rule.³⁹

During the current pandemic, millions of small businesses across the country are struggling to stay afloat. State and local governments are struggling to meet budget demands with lowered revenues and increased demand for public services and social insurance programs. This Rule would only exacerbate these conditions.

For these reasons, we strongly support the Department's proposal to withdraw the harmful Independent Contractor Rule.


Sincerely,



ROBERT C. "BOBBY" SCOTT
Chairman
Committee on Education and Labor



ALMA S. ADAMS PH.D.
Chair
Subcommittee on Workforce Protections
Committee on Education and Labor



DANNY K. DAVIS
Member of Congress

/S/


JACKIE SPEIER
Member of Congress




FREDERICA S. WILSON
Member of Congress



MARCY KAPTUR
Member of Congress



ANDY LEVIN
Member of Congress



JAN SCHAKOWSKY
Member of Congress

³⁸ *Id.*


³⁹ Economic Policy Institute, Comment Letter on Proposed Rule on Independent Contractor Status Under the Fair Labor Standards Act (Oct. 26, 2020).



JAMES P. MCGOVERN
Member of Congress

/S/

ANDRÉ CARSON
Member of Congress



SANFORD D. BISHOP
Member of Congress



ILHAN OMAR
Member of Congress



ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON
Member of Congress

/S/

NANETTE DIAZ BARRAGÁN
Member of Congress



GRACE F. NAPOLITANO
Member of Congress



MONDAIRE JONES
Member of Congress



MARK DESAULNIER
Member of Congress



SUZANNE BONAMICI
Member of Congress

/S/

BONNIE WATSON COLEMAN
Member of Congress



PETER WELCH
Member of Congress




THOMAS R. SUOZZI
Member of Congress

/S/


JUAN VARGAS
Member of Congress

/S/


JULIA BROWNLEY
Member of Congress




JOE COURTNEY
Member of Congress



VAL DEMINGS
Member of Congress




FRANK J. MRVAN
Member of Congress




BOBBY L. RUSH
Member of Congress

/S/

ALAN LOWENTHAL
Member of Congress



BARBARA LEE
Member of Congress



JESÚS G. "CHUY" GARCÍA
Member of Congress




JAHANA HAYES
Member of Congress

/S/

BETTY MCCOLLUM
Member of Congress



JAMIE RASKIN
Member of Congress



ADRIANO ESPAILLAT
Member of Congress




DEBBIE DINGELL
Member of Congress



JOSEPH D. MORELLE
Member of Congress



SUSAN WILD
Member of Congress



PRAMILA JAYAPAL
Member of Congress



MARK POCAN
Member of Congress

/S/

ERIC SWALWELL
Member of Congress

/S/

C.A. DUTCH RUPPERSBERGER
Member of Congress



MARK TAKANO
Member of Congress



EMANUEL CLEAVER, II
Member of Congress



DEBBIE WASSERMAN SCHULTZ
Member of Congress

/S/

ANTHONY G. BROWN
Member of Congress



CAROLYN B. MALONEY
Member of Congress

/S/

BENNIE THOMPSON
Member of Congress



TIM RYAN
Member of Congress

/S./


DINA TITUS
Member of Congress



JOAQUIN CASTRO
Member of Congress

/S./

MARIE NEWMAN
Member of Congress



LUCILLE ROYBAL-ALLARD
Member of Congress

/S./

STEVE COHEN
Member of Congress



ROSA L. DELAURO
Member of Congress

/S./

JOHN YARMUTH
Member of Congress



RASIDA TLAIB
Member of Congress



DONALD NORCROSS
Member of Congress



RAUL GRIJALVA
Member of Congress

/S./

CORI BUSH
Member of Congress

/S./

JOHN GARAMENDI
Member of Congress




KAREN BASS
Member of Congress




FRANK PALLONE, JR.
Member of Congress

/S/

GERALD E. CONNOLLY
Member of Congress




STEPHEN F. LYNCH
Member of Congress




JOHN B. LARSON
Member of Congress



**GREGORIO KILILI CAMACHO
SABLAN**
Member of Congress



KATHERINE M. CLARK
Member of Congress




JUDY CHU
Member of Congress

/S/

JARED HUFFMAN
Member of Congress



VERONICA ESCOBAR
Member of Congress



BRENDA L. LAWRENCE
Member of Congress

/S/


JOHN P. SARBANES
Member of Congress



MIKIE SHERRILL
Member of Congress

/S/

LINDA T. SÁNCHEZ
Member of Congress



BRENDAN F. BOYLE
Member of Congress



BILL PASCRELL, JR.
Member of Congress

The Hon. Marty J. Walsh
April, 12, 2021
Page 12



ANGIE CRAIG
Member of Congress

/S/

ALBIO SIRE
Member of Congress