STATE OF CALIFORNIA
DEPARTMENT OF FAIR EMPLOYMENT AND HOUSING
COUNCIL MEETING
ablic Hearing on the Proposed Employment
ations Regarding Criminal History, the California
Rights Act, and the New Parent Leave Act
Transcript of Proceedings
State Capitol, Room 113
1315 10th Street
Sacramento, California
Wednesday, October 23, 2019
10:17 a.m.
any Flores, CSR 13460

1	APPEARANCES		1	PROCEEDINGS:
2	COUNCIL MEMBERS:		2	October 23, 2019
3	Chaya Mandelbaum, Chairman			
4				CHAIRMAN MANDELBAUM: Great. Well, we are
5	Tim Iglesias		5	at our public hearing. So we're going to go on the
6	Joseph Ortiz		6	record and start our public hearing.
7	Dara Schur		7	So we are now on the record, and it is Wednesday,
8			8	October 23rd, and we're here at the State Capitol in
9	Staff:		9	Sacramento. My name is Chaya Mandelbaum, chairperson of
10	Brian Sperber, regulatory/legi	slative counsel	10	the Fair Employment and Housing Council, and joining me
11			11	today are members of the council, Council Member Dale
12			12	Brodsky, Dara Schur, Tim Iglesias, and Joseph Ortiz.
13			13	Even though we've had an informal introduction
14			14	off the record, let me again welcome you to this hearing
15			15	portion of the meeting. The purpose of this hearing is
16			16	to receive public comment regarding issuance of
17			17	amendments to the FEHA's employment regulations that
18			18	relate to new legal provisions regarding criminal
19			19	history and employment and parental leave. This
20			20	rulemaking clarifies, makes specific, and supplements
21			21	any state regulations interpreting the FEHA that are set
22			22	forth in Government Code 13900, et seq.
23			23	The proposed regulations are slated to appear in
24			24	the California Code of Regulations Title 2, sections
25			25	11017.1 and 11087 through 96. Copies of the proposed
		Page 2		Page 4
1			1	amendments to the regulations are available at the front
1	INDEX	Dago	2	of the room and are reflected in Attachment D to today's
2	1. Introduction	Page 4	3	materials and the notice and initial statement of
3	2. Opening Comments	4	4	reasons are reflected in Attachment B and C,
4	3. Public Comment	7	5	respectively. The text of the Council's regulations is
5	8. Adjournment	13	6	also available on the Council's web page.
6	9. Reporter's Certificate	14	7	We're holding this meeting as part of our formal
7			8	rulemaking process, and it was noticed in the California
8			9	regulatory notice register to the public on September 6,
9			10	2019 and also via email sent to more than 7,500
10			11	individuals and stakeholders and through the Council's
11			12	web page. Pursuant to the notice, we're taking
12			13	testimony today on the proposed amendments and will also
13			14	accept written testimony or written comments rather
14			15	on the regulations until 5:00 o'clock today, October
15			16	23rd. So if you haven't already submitted, you can
16			17	submit your written comments to the Council at
17			18	FEHCouncil@DFEH.CA.GOV. Or you can mail them instead to
18 19			19	the Council in the DFEH's Los Angeles office located at
20			20	320 West 4th Street, 10th floor in LA 90013. You can
20			21	also give your written comments, if you brought them, to
21			22	Brian. And if you didn't bring a written comment to
23			23	provide to Brian today, make sure you get it in by 5:00
24			24	this afternoon.
25			25	Anyone who testifies here today will or
		Page 3	25	Anyone who testifies here today will or Page 5

2 (Pages 2 to 5)

1		
-	submits any written comments will receive a copy of any	¹ years and have been emersed in this in the statutes
2	changes or amendments the Council makes to the proposed	² that we're addressing here for more for all of that
3	regulations and will also have an opportunity to submit	³ time most of that time.
4	comments if during a 15-day period if the Council	⁴ So I do have a couple comments. I think that
5	makes substantive or substantial change to the proposed	⁵ the, the regulation's really good. I just I just
6	amendments after receiving public comment and also	⁶ want to focus on two things. The first is a minor one
7	anyone who requests a copy, an opportunity to have that	⁷ with respect to the regulations on criminal history.
8	as well.	8 When I looked at the definitions and, and read I
9	So we'll consider all the commence made here	⁹ mean, I think that there should be a definition of
10	today as well as all comments received in writing, and	¹⁰ "conditional offer of employment" in 110 in 11017.1
11	we'll respond to those comments in our final statement	¹¹ B-4. There are a bunch of definitions, and I'm going to
12	of reasons, which will be part of the rulemaking record.	¹² submit something in writing in which I have a simple
13	So as you can tell, this hearing's being	¹³ proposal for how to define that. It's because
14	transcribed by a court reporter, and the transcript of	¹⁴ "conditional offer of employment" is so important in
15	the hearing, as well as all written comments received,	¹⁵ these regulations in terms of when an employer can
16	will also be part of the official rulemaking record.	¹⁶ request information and when they can't. And I thought
17	Because this hearing is being transcribed, as you'll	¹⁷ it would be very helpful to have a definition on that.
18	notice, I am speaking a little bit slower than I would	¹⁸ Do you want me to read my suggestion, or do you
19	in the everyday course of conversation, and we would	19 want to just take it by written
20	appreciate it if you would do the same so that our court	²⁰ CHAIRMAN MANDELBAUM: Well, if it's going
21	reporter is able to take down testimony.	²¹ to if you're going to have it in writing, we'll see
22	You won't be sworn in when you testify, but we do	²² it in there
23	ask that you come to the front of the room and speak	²³ MS. BRODSKY: Okay.
24	into the microphone so that the court reporter can take	²⁴ CHAIRMAN MANDELBAUM: but whatever you
25	down your remarks. Please start by stating and spelling	²⁵ prefer.
		D
	Page 6	Page 8
1		
1 2	your name and any affiliation that you are offering your	1 MS. BRODSKY: Okay. Then the, the second
3	remarks on behalf of. Also, if you're commenting on a	 and only other suggestion I have has to do with request to the family the Family Rights Act and, and this is
4	specific regulation, it's helpful if you can identify	
5	the section and subsection of the regulations so that we	specifically about 1100, D 1, at page sevent the
	can refer to it as you're providing your comments. So	
h		b Council to consider changing this definition to undate
6	we'll hear testimony until all those wishing to testify	6 Council to consider changing this definition to update
7	today have had an opportunity to do so.	 it to make it consistent with the definition in of
7 8	today have had an opportunity to do so. Any initial questions?	 it to make it consistent with the definition in of "employer" in 1108 sorry. 11008 subsection D.
7 8 9	today have had an opportunity to do so. Any initial questions? Seeing and hearing none, we're ready to begin.	 it to make it consistent with the definition in of "employer" in 1108 sorry. 11008 subsection D. The as it's written now, the definition that's
7 8 9 10	today have had an opportunity to do so. Any initial questions? Seeing and hearing none, we're ready to begin. So if anyone would like to provide public comment on	 it to make it consistent with the definition in of "employer" in 1108 sorry. 11008 subsection D. The as it's written now, the definition that's provided under these under the proposed regulations
7 8 9 10 11	today have had an opportunity to do so.Any initial questions?Seeing and hearing none, we're ready to begin.So if anyone would like to provide public comment onAttachment D, the proposed regulations, now would be a	 it to make it consistent with the definition in of "employer" in 1108 sorry. 11008 subsection D. The as it's written now, the definition that's provided under these under the proposed regulations is, "directly employed means the employer maintains an
7 8 9 10 11 12	today have had an opportunity to do so.Any initial questions?Seeing and hearing none, we're ready to begin.So if anyone would like to provide public comment onAttachment D, the proposed regulations, now would be a good time to come to the front.	 it to make it consistent with the definition in of "employer" in 1108 sorry. 11008 subsection D. The as it's written now, the definition that's provided under these under the proposed regulations is, "directly employed means the employer maintains an aggregate of at least 20," and in parens, "NPLA, or 50,"
7 8 9 10 11 12 13	 today have had an opportunity to do so. Any initial questions? Seeing and hearing none, we're ready to begin. So if anyone would like to provide public comment on Attachment D, the proposed regulations, now would be a good time to come to the front. Brian, any email comments? 	 it to make it consistent with the definition in of "employer" in 1108 sorry. 11008 subsection D. The as it's written now, the definition that's provided under these under the proposed regulations is, "directly employed means the employer maintains an aggregate of at least 20," and in parens, "NPLA, or 50," in parens, "CFRA, part- or full-time employees on its
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	today have had an opportunity to do so. Any initial questions? Seeing and hearing none, we're ready to begin. So if anyone would like to provide public comment on Attachment D, the proposed regulations, now would be a good time to come to the front. Brian, any email comments? MR. SPERBER: Internet's down.	 it to make it consistent with the definition in of "employer" in 1108 sorry. 11008 subsection D. The as it's written now, the definition that's provided under these under the proposed regulations is, "directly employed means the employer maintains an aggregate of at least 20," and in parens, "NPLA, or 50," in parens, "CFRA, part- or full-time employees on its payroll," in parens, "S, for each working day during
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	today have had an opportunity to do so. Any initial questions? Seeing and hearing none, we're ready to begin. So if anyone would like to provide public comment on Attachment D, the proposed regulations, now would be a good time to come to the front. Brian, any email comments? MR. SPERBER: Internet's down. CHAIRMAN MANDELBAUM: Oh, okay.	 it to make it consistent with the definition in of "employer" in 1108 sorry. 11008 subsection D. The as it's written now, the definition that's provided under these under the proposed regulations is, "directly employed means the employer maintains an aggregate of at least 20," and in parens, "NPLA, or 50," in parens, "CFRA, part- or full-time employees on its payroll," in parens, "S, for each working day during each of 20 or more calendar workweeks in the current or
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	today have had an opportunity to do so. Any initial questions? Seeing and hearing none, we're ready to begin. So if anyone would like to provide public comment on Attachment D, the proposed regulations, now would be a good time to come to the front. Brian, any email comments? MR. SPERBER: Internet's down. CHAIRMAN MANDELBAUM: Oh, okay. Well, why dope you why don't you	 it to make it consistent with the definition in of "employer" in 1108 sorry. 11008 subsection D. The as it's written now, the definition that's provided under these under the proposed regulations is, "directly employed means the employer maintains an aggregate of at least 20," and in parens, "NPLA, or 50," in parens, "CFRA, part- or full-time employees on its payroll," in parens, "S, for each working day during each of 20 or more calendar workweeks in the current or preceding calendar year." I want to focus on that
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	today have had an opportunity to do so. Any initial questions? Seeing and hearing none, we're ready to begin. So if anyone would like to provide public comment on Attachment D, the proposed regulations, now would be a good time to come to the front. Brian, any email comments? MR. SPERBER: Internet's down. CHAIRMAN MANDELBAUM: Oh, okay. Well, why dope you why don't you COUNCIL MEMBER BRODSKY: All right.	 it to make it consistent with the definition in of "employer" in 1108 sorry. 11008 subsection D. The as it's written now, the definition that's provided under these under the proposed regulations is, "directly employed means the employer maintains an aggregate of at least 20," and in parens, "NPLA, or 50," in parens, "CFRA, part- or full-time employees on its payroll," in parens, "S, for each working day during each of 20 or more calendar workweeks in the current or preceding calendar year." I want to focus on that language. It's, it's I in, in looking at
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	today have had an opportunity to do so. Any initial questions? Seeing and hearing none, we're ready to begin. So if anyone would like to provide public comment on Attachment D, the proposed regulations, now would be a good time to come to the front. Brian, any email comments? MR. SPERBER: Internet's down. CHAIRMAN MANDELBAUM: Oh, okay. Well, why dope you why don't you COUNCIL MEMBER BRODSKY: All right. CHAIRMAN MANDELBAUM: kick this off.	 it to make it consistent with the definition in of "employer" in 1108 sorry. 11008 subsection D. The as it's written now, the definition that's provided under these under the proposed regulations is, "directly employed means the employer maintains an aggregate of at least 20," and in parens, "NPLA, or 50," in parens, "CFRA, part- or full-time employees on its payroll," in parens, "S, for each working day during each of 20 or more calendar workweeks in the current or preceding calendar year." I want to focus on that language. It's, it's I in, in looking at it, I reviewed the legislative history from CFRA, which
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	today have had an opportunity to do so. Any initial questions? Seeing and hearing none, we're ready to begin. So if anyone would like to provide public comment on Attachment D, the proposed regulations, now would be a good time to come to the front. Brian, any email comments? MR. SPERBER: Internet's down. CHAIRMAN MANDELBAUM: Oh, okay. Well, why dope you why don't you COUNCIL MEMBER BRODSKY: All right. CHAIRMAN MANDELBAUM: kick this off. MS. BRODSKY: All right. I have some	 it to make it consistent with the definition in of "employer" in 1108 sorry. 11008 subsection D. The as it's written now, the definition that's provided under these under the proposed regulations is, "directly employed means the employer maintains an aggregate of at least 20," and in parens, "NPLA, or 50," in parens, "CFRA, part- or full-time employees on its payroll," in parens, "S, for each working day during each of 20 or more calendar workweeks in the current or preceding calendar year." I want to focus on that language. It's, it's, it's I in, in looking at it, I reviewed the legislative history from CFRA, which I have given Brian a copy of from when it was first
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	today have had an opportunity to do so. Any initial questions? Seeing and hearing none, we're ready to begin. So if anyone would like to provide public comment on Attachment D, the proposed regulations, now would be a good time to come to the front. Brian, any email comments? MR. SPERBER: Internet's down. CHAIRMAN MANDELBAUM: Oh, okay. Well, why dope you why don't you COUNCIL MEMBER BRODSKY: All right. CHAIRMAN MANDELBAUM: kick this off. MS. BRODSKY: All right. I have some comments.	 it to make it consistent with the definition in of "employer" in 1108 sorry. 11008 subsection D. The as it's written now, the definition that's provided under these under the proposed regulations is, "directly employed means the employer maintains an aggregate of at least 20," and in parens, "NPLA, or 50," in parens, "CFRA, part- or full-time employees on its payroll," in parens, "S, for each working day during each of 20 or more calendar workweeks in the current or preceding calendar year." I want to focus on that it, I reviewed the legislative history from CFRA, which I have given Brian a copy of from when it was first enacted in 1991. I wanted to see whether there was any
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	today have had an opportunity to do so. Any initial questions? Seeing and hearing none, we're ready to begin. So if anyone would like to provide public comment on Attachment D, the proposed regulations, now would be a good time to come to the front. Brian, any email comments? MR. SPERBER: Internet's down. CHAIRMAN MANDELBAUM: Oh, okay. Well, why dope you why don't you COUNCIL MEMBER BRODSKY: All right. CHAIRMAN MANDELBAUM: kick this off. MS. BRODSKY: All right. I have some comments. I'm Dale Brodsky as you know. I am a member of	 it to make it consistent with the definition in of "employer" in 1108 sorry. 11008 subsection D. The as it's written now, the definition that's provided under these under the proposed regulations is, "directly employed means the employer maintains an aggregate of at least 20," and in parens, "NPLA, or 50," in parens, "CFRA, part- or full-time employees on its payroll," in parens, "S, for each working day during each of 20 or more calendar workweeks in the current or preceding calendar year." I want to focus on that it, I reviewed the legislative history from CFRA, which I have given Brian a copy of from when it was first enacted in 1991. I wanted to see whether there was any definition or any reason why that language had to be
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	today have had an opportunity to do so. Any initial questions? Seeing and hearing none, we're ready to begin. So if anyone would like to provide public comment on Attachment D, the proposed regulations, now would be a good time to come to the front. Brian, any email comments? MR. SPERBER: Internet's down. CHAIRMAN MANDELBAUM: Oh, okay. Well, why dope you why don't you COUNCIL MEMBER BRODSKY: All right. CHAIRMAN MANDELBAUM: kick this off. MS. BRODSKY: All right. I have some comments. I'm Dale Brodsky as you know. I am a member of the council, but I'm making these comments not wearing	 it to make it consistent with the definition in of "employer" in 1108 sorry. 11008 subsection D. The as it's written now, the definition that's provided under these under the proposed regulations is, "directly employed means the employer maintains an aggregate of at least 20," and in parens, "NPLA, or 50," in parens, "CFRA, part- or full-time employees on its payroll," in parens, "S, for each working day during each of 20 or more calendar workweeks in the current or preceding calendar year." I want to focus on that it, I reviewed the legislative history from CFRA, which I have given Brian a copy of from when it was first enacted in 1991. I wanted to see whether there was any definition or any reason why that language had to be there. There's not. I looked at all caselaw that I
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	today have had an opportunity to do so. Any initial questions? Seeing and hearing none, we're ready to begin. So if anyone would like to provide public comment on Attachment D, the proposed regulations, now would be a good time to come to the front. Brian, any email comments? MR. SPERBER: Internet's down. CHAIRMAN MANDELBAUM: Oh, okay. Well, why dope you why don't you COUNCIL MEMBER BRODSKY: All right. CHAIRMAN MANDELBAUM: kick this off. MS. BRODSKY: All right. I have some comments. I'm Dale Brodsky as you know. I am a member of the council, but I'm making these comments as a member of the	 it to make it consistent with the definition in of "employer" in 1108 sorry. 11008 subsection D. The as it's written now, the definition that's provided under these under the proposed regulations is, "directly employed means the employer maintains an aggregate of at least 20," and in parens, "NPLA, or 50," in parens, "CFRA, part- or full-time employees on its payroll," in parens, "S, for each working day during each of 20 or more calendar workweeks in the current or preceding calendar year." I want to focus on that it, I reviewed the legislative history from CFRA, which I have given Brian a copy of from when it was first enacted in 1991. I wanted to see whether there was any definition or any reason why that language had to be there. There's not. I looked at all caselaw that I could find on the subject, and I could not find any
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	today have had an opportunity to do so. Any initial questions? Seeing and hearing none, we're ready to begin. So if anyone would like to provide public comment on Attachment D, the proposed regulations, now would be a good time to come to the front. Brian, any email comments? MR. SPERBER: Internet's down. CHAIRMAN MANDELBAUM: Oh, okay. Well, why dope you why don't you COUNCIL MEMBER BRODSKY: All right. CHAIRMAN MANDELBAUM: kick this off. MS. BRODSKY: All right. I have some comments. I'm Dale Brodsky as you know. I am a member of the council, but I'm making these comments as a member of the public. I'm an attorney in practice. I have been	 it to make it consistent with the definition in of "employer" in 1108 sorry. 11008 subsection D. The as it's written now, the definition that's provided under these under the proposed regulations is, "directly employed means the employer maintains an aggregate of at least 20," and in parens, "NPLA, or 50," in parens, "CFRA, part- or full-time employees on its payroll," in parens, "S, for each working day during each of 20 or more calendar workweeks in the current or preceding calendar year." I want to focus on that In parens, it's, it's I in, in looking at it, I reviewed the legislative history from CFRA, which I have given Brian a copy of from when it was first enacted in 1991. I wanted to see whether there was any definition or any reason why that language had to be there. There's not. I looked at all caselaw that I could find on the subject, and I could not find any caselaw that justified having that definition.
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	today have had an opportunity to do so. Any initial questions? Seeing and hearing none, we're ready to begin. So if anyone would like to provide public comment on Attachment D, the proposed regulations, now would be a good time to come to the front. Brian, any email comments? MR. SPERBER: Internet's down. CHAIRMAN MANDELBAUM: Oh, okay. Well, why dope you why don't you COUNCIL MEMBER BRODSKY: All right. CHAIRMAN MANDELBAUM: kick this off. MS. BRODSKY: All right. I have some comments. I'm Dale Brodsky as you know. I am a member of the council, but I'm making these comments as a member of the	 it to make it consistent with the definition in of "employer" in 1108 sorry. 11008 subsection D. The as it's written now, the definition that's provided under these under the proposed regulations is, "directly employed means the employer maintains an aggregate of at least 20," and in parens, "NPLA, or 50," in parens, "CFRA, part- or full-time employees on its payroll," in parens, "S, for each working day during each of 20 or more calendar workweeks in the current or preceding calendar year." I want to focus on that it, I reviewed the legislative history from CFRA, which I have given Brian a copy of from when it was first enacted in 1991. I wanted to see whether there was any definition or any reason why that language had to be there. There's not. I looked at all caselaw that I could find on the subject, and I could not find any
7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	today have had an opportunity to do so. Any initial questions? Seeing and hearing none, we're ready to begin. So if anyone would like to provide public comment on Attachment D, the proposed regulations, now would be a good time to come to the front. Brian, any email comments? MR. SPERBER: Internet's down. CHAIRMAN MANDELBAUM: Oh, okay. Well, why dope you why don't you COUNCIL MEMBER BRODSKY: All right. CHAIRMAN MANDELBAUM: kick this off. MS. BRODSKY: All right. I have some comments. I'm Dale Brodsky as you know. I am a member of the council, but I'm making these comments as a member of the public. I'm an attorney in practice. I have been	 it to make it consistent with the definition in of "employer" in 1108 sorry. 11008 subsection D. The as it's written now, the definition that's provided under these under the proposed regulations is, "directly employed means the employer maintains an aggregate of at least 20," and in parens, "NPLA, or 50," in parens, "CFRA, part- or full-time employees on its payroll," in parens, "S, for each working day during each of 20 or more calendar workweeks in the current or preceding calendar year." I want to focus on that In parens, it's, it's I in, in looking at it, I reviewed the legislative history from CFRA, which I have given Brian a copy of from when it was first enacted in 1991. I wanted to see whether there was any definition or any reason why that language had to be there. There's not. I looked at all caselaw that I could find on the subject, and I could not find any caselaw that justified having that definition.

3 (Pages 6 to 9)

1	think there are four reasons why that language should be	¹ So for all those reasons, I really urge us to
2	changed and made consistent with 11008 D-1, which is the	² change that, and I have proposed a very simple fix in my
3	definitional in our general FEHA employment regulations.	³ written letter. And, and so the and then there's one
4	We've defined what regular what it means to be an	⁴ other suggestion that I had that I think that the
5	employer. And in that context, we changed we took	⁵ existing language has it says that "people on the
6	out language that was the language that's still in this	6 payroll." I'm suggesting that we omit "payroll,"
7	one that would have conditioned employers and would	⁷ because what the statute says is there have to be
8	said that employees had to be employed during 20 weeks	⁸ employees who receive a wages of salary. That's much
9	during the previous calendar or during the calendar	⁹ more explicit than being on a payroll, because somebody
10	year. And we took that out and replaced it with a	¹⁰ could be an employee and not be on the payroll or
11	different manner of counting. That was why the original	¹¹ someone who's not an employee could be on the payroll.
12	language, it was what the original language in our	¹² So you want to and that's in my letter, I, I have
13	Family Rights Act regulations, that I worked on a long	¹³ a citation to some dicta in a Supreme Court decision in
14	time ago, mirrored that. The language that had	¹⁴ which Justice Leah made a in a different slightly
15	previously existed as the definition of the "employer,"	¹⁵ different context but observed that as well.
16	we changed that back in January. At our January 28th,	¹⁶ So I would suggest just going back and using the
17	2019 meeting, we voted unanimously to approve amendments	¹⁷ same wording wages and/or salary and that's also
18	to the employment regulations, which changed that	¹⁸ incorporated in my written comment. So thank you.
19	language, took that out, and provided a different	¹⁹ CHAIRMAN MANDELBAUM: Thank you, Mrs.
20	definition of "regular employee."	²⁰ Brodsky.
21	Nevertheless, as it's currently drafted, these	²¹ MS. BRODSKY: Hmm?
22	CFRA regulations still use that old wording. So really,	22 CHAIRMAN MANDELBAUM: Not "Council Member
23	the I think we need to change it, first, because the	²³ Brodsky."
24	counting mechanism that is still there, the 50 having	Any other no? Okay. So we don't have any
25	to relying on 20 working weeks during the calendar	²⁵ email comments.
	Page 10	Dage 12
	Page 10	Page 12
1	year is not based on any California statute. It's	¹ Anyone else want to provide public comment on the
2		
	similar to it is the same as FMI A in Title 7, but	
3	similar to it is the same as FMLA in Title 7, but it's not in any California statute.	² proposed regulations regarding criminal history of the
	it's not in any California statute.	 proposed regulations regarding criminal history of the California Family Rights Act as the New Parent Leave
3	it's not in any California statute. Secondly, now I mean before the two	 proposed regulations regarding criminal history of the California Family Rights Act as the New Parent Leave Act?
3 4	it's not in any California statute. Secondly, now I mean before the two definitions were mutually they were consistent; the	 proposed regulations regarding criminal history of the California Family Rights Act as the New Parent Leave Act? COUNCIL MEMBER IGLESIAS: I forget; is it
3 4 5	it's not in any California statute. Secondly, now I mean before the two definitions were mutually they were consistent; the definition of the employer, directly employing and	 proposed regulations regarding criminal history of the California Family Rights Act as the New Parent Leave Act? COUNCIL MEMBER IGLESIAS: I forget; is it appropriate for council members in this hearing to make
3 4 5 6	it's not in any California statute. Secondly, now I mean before the two definitions were mutually they were consistent; the definition of the employer, directly employing and regular employment for FEHA for were totally	 proposed regulations regarding criminal history of the California Family Rights Act as the New Parent Leave Act? COUNCIL MEMBER IGLESIAS: I forget; is it appropriate for council members in this hearing to make
3 4 5 6 7	it's not in any California statute. Secondly, now I mean before the two definitions were mutually they were consistent; the definition of the employer, directly employing and regular employment for FEHA for were totally consistent. Now there's no regulatory source for the	 proposed regulations regarding criminal history of the California Family Rights Act as the New Parent Leave Act? COUNCIL MEMBER IGLESIAS: I forget; is it appropriate for council members in this hearing to make comments or no? CHAIRMAN MANDELBAUM: I think it would be
3 4 5 6 7 8	it's not in any California statute. Secondly, now I mean before the two definitions were mutually they were consistent; the definition of the employer, directly employing and regular employment for FEHA for were totally consistent. Now there's no regulatory source for the current the way that it's still written.	 proposed regulations regarding criminal history of the California Family Rights Act as the New Parent Leave Act? COUNCIL MEMBER IGLESIAS: I forget; is it appropriate for council members in this hearing to make comments or no? CHAIRMAN MANDELBAUM: I think it would be the next one. So this is the draft we already voted on,
3 4 5 6 7 8 9	it's not in any California statute. Secondly, now I mean before the two definitions were mutually they were consistent; the definition of the employer, directly employing and regular employment for FEHA for were totally consistent. Now there's no regulatory source for the current the way that it's still written. Third reason is that, in and of itself, 11008 D-2	 proposed regulations regarding criminal history of the California Family Rights Act as the New Parent Leave Act? COUNCIL MEMBER IGLESIAS: I forget; is it appropriate for council members in this hearing to make comments or no? CHAIRMAN MANDELBAUM: I think it would be the next one. So this is the draft we already voted on, and then we'll amend it once we process the written
3 4 5 7 8 9 10	it's not in any California statute. Secondly, now I mean before the two definitions were mutually they were consistent; the definition of the employer, directly employing and regular employment for FEHA for were totally consistent. Now there's no regulatory source for the current the way that it's still written. Third reason is that, in and of itself, 11008 D-2 expressly states that for the purposes of CFRA and NPLA,	 proposed regulations regarding criminal history of the California Family Rights Act as the New Parent Leave Act? COUNCIL MEMBER IGLESIAS: I forget; is it appropriate for council members in this hearing to make comments or no? CHAIRMAN MANDELBAUM: I think it would be the next one. So this is the draft we already voted on, and then we'll amend it once we process the written public comments and Mrs. Brodsky's oral public comment
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	it's not in any California statute. Secondly, now I mean before the two definitions were mutually they were consistent; the definition of the employer, directly employing and regular employment for FEHA for were totally consistent. Now there's no regulatory source for the current the way that it's still written. Third reason is that, in and of itself, 11008 D-2 expressly states that for the purposes of CFRA and NPLA, employees must be counted in the same way as they're	 proposed regulations regarding criminal history of the California Family Rights Act as the New Parent Leave Act? COUNCIL MEMBER IGLESIAS: I forget; is it appropriate for council members in this hearing to make comments or no? CHAIRMAN MANDELBAUM: I think it would be the next one. So this is the draft we already voted on, and then we'll amend it once we process the written public comments and Mrs. Brodsky's oral public comment and written comment.
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	it's not in any California statute. Secondly, now I mean before the two definitions were mutually they were consistent; the definition of the employer, directly employing and regular employment for FEHA for were totally consistent. Now there's no regulatory source for the current the way that it's still written. Third reason is that, in and of itself, 11008 D-2 expressly states that for the purposes of CFRA and NPLA,	 proposed regulations regarding criminal history of the California Family Rights Act as the New Parent Leave Act? COUNCIL MEMBER IGLESIAS: I forget; is it appropriate for council members in this hearing to make comments or no? CHAIRMAN MANDELBAUM: I think it would be the next one. So this is the draft we already voted on, and then we'll amend it once we process the written public comments and Mrs. Brodsky's oral public comment and written comment. So seeing no other people who are wishing to
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	it's not in any California statute. Secondly, now I mean before the two definitions were mutually they were consistent; the definition of the employer, directly employing and regular employment for FEHA for were totally consistent. Now there's no regulatory source for the current the way that it's still written. Third reason is that, in and of itself, 11008 D-2 expressly states that for the purposes of CFRA and NPLA, employees must be counted in the same way as they're described in 11008 D-1. So we've actually said that ourselves; that that definition applies. So you	 proposed regulations regarding criminal history of the California Family Rights Act as the New Parent Leave Act? COUNCIL MEMBER IGLESIAS: I forget; is it appropriate for council members in this hearing to make comments or no? CHAIRMAN MANDELBAUM: I think it would be the next one. So this is the draft we already voted on, and then we'll amend it once we process the written public comments and Mrs. Brodsky's oral public comment So seeing no other people who are wishing to provide public comment, we will conclude with our public
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	it's not in any California statute. Secondly, now I mean before the two definitions were mutually they were consistent; the definition of the employer, directly employing and regular employment for FEHA for were totally consistent. Now there's no regulatory source for the current the way that it's still written. Third reason is that, in and of itself, 11008 D-2 expressly states that for the purposes of CFRA and NPLA, employees must be counted in the same way as they're described in 11008 D-1. So we've actually said that ourselves; that that definition applies. So you can't I mean, it doesn't make sense to have another	 proposed regulations regarding criminal history of the California Family Rights Act as the New Parent Leave Act? COUNCIL MEMBER IGLESIAS: I forget; is it appropriate for council members in this hearing to make comments or no? CHAIRMAN MANDELBAUM: I think it would be the next one. So this is the draft we already voted on, and then we'll amend it once we process the written public comments and Mrs. Brodsky's oral public comment So seeing no other people who are wishing to provide public comment, we will conclude with our public hearing portion of the meeting. So thanks to those who
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	it's not in any California statute. Secondly, now I mean before the two definitions were mutually they were consistent; the definition of the employer, directly employing and regular employment for FEHA for were totally consistent. Now there's no regulatory source for the current the way that it's still written. Third reason is that, in and of itself, 11008 D-2 expressly states that for the purposes of CFRA and NPLA, employees must be counted in the same way as they're described in 11008 D-1. So we've actually said that ourselves; that that definition applies. So you can't I mean, it doesn't make sense to have another regulation that's inconsistent with that.	 proposed regulations regarding criminal history of the California Family Rights Act as the New Parent Leave Act? COUNCIL MEMBER IGLESIAS: I forget; is it appropriate for council members in this hearing to make comments or no? CHAIRMAN MANDELBAUM: I think it would be the next one. So this is the draft we already voted on, and then we'll amend it once we process the written public comments. So seeing no other people who are wishing to provide public comment, we will conclude with our public hearing portion of the meeting. So thanks to those who plan to submit written comments. We look forward to
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	it's not in any California statute. Secondly, now I mean before the two definitions were mutually they were consistent; the definition of the employer, directly employing and regular employment for FEHA for were totally consistent. Now there's no regulatory source for the current the way that it's still written. Third reason is that, in and of itself, 11008 D-2 expressly states that for the purposes of CFRA and NPLA, employees must be counted in the same way as they're described in 11008 D-1. So we've actually said that ourselves; that that definition applies. So you can't I mean, it doesn't make sense to have another regulation that's inconsistent with that. And fourth, the definition of employer for	 proposed regulations regarding criminal history of the California Family Rights Act as the New Parent Leave Act? COUNCIL MEMBER IGLESIAS: I forget; is it appropriate for council members in this hearing to make comments or no? CHAIRMAN MANDELBAUM: I think it would be the next one. So this is the draft we already voted on, and then we'll amend it once we process the written public comments and Mrs. Brodsky's oral public comment So seeing no other people who are wishing to provide public comment, we will conclude with our public hearing portion of the meeting. So thanks to those who plan to submit written comments. We look forward to reading it. Please remember to get it in by 5:00
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	it's not in any California statute. Secondly, now I mean before the two definitions were mutually they were consistent; the definition of the employer, directly employing and regular employment for FEHA for were totally consistent. Now there's no regulatory source for the current the way that it's still written. Third reason is that, in and of itself, 11008 D-2 expressly states that for the purposes of CFRA and NPLA, employees must be counted in the same way as they're described in 11008 D-1. So we've actually said that ourselves; that that definition applies. So you can't I mean, it doesn't make sense to have another regulation that's inconsistent with that. And fourth, the definition of employer for Pregnancy Disability Leave Act does not require an	 proposed regulations regarding criminal history of the California Family Rights Act as the New Parent Leave Act? COUNCIL MEMBER IGLESIAS: I forget; is it appropriate for council members in this hearing to make comments or no? CHAIRMAN MANDELBAUM: I think it would be the next one. So this is the draft we already voted on, and then we'll amend it once we process the written public comments and Mrs. Brodsky's oral public comment So seeing no other people who are wishing to provide public comment, we will conclude with our public hearing portion of the meeting. So thanks to those who plan to submit written comments. We look forward to reading it. Please remember to get it in by 5:00 o'clock today.
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	it's not in any California statute. Secondly, now I mean before the two definitions were mutually they were consistent; the definition of the employer, directly employing and regular employment for FEHA for were totally consistent. Now there's no regulatory source for the current the way that it's still written. Third reason is that, in and of itself, 11008 D-2 expressly states that for the purposes of CFRA and NPLA, employees must be counted in the same way as they're described in 11008 D-1. So we've actually said that ourselves; that that definition applies. So you can't I mean, it doesn't make sense to have another regulation that's inconsistent with that. And fourth, the definition of employer for Pregnancy Disability Leave Act does not require an employee to have worked, you know to have you	 proposed regulations regarding criminal history of the California Family Rights Act as the New Parent Leave Act? COUNCIL MEMBER IGLESIAS: I forget; is it appropriate for council members in this hearing to make comments or no? CHAIRMAN MANDELBAUM: I think it would be the next one. So this is the draft we already voted on, and then we'll amend it once we process the written public comments and Mrs. Brodsky's oral public comment So seeing no other people who are wishing to provide public comment, we will conclude with our public hearing portion of the meeting. So thanks to those who plan to submit written comments. We look forward to reading it. Please remember to get it in by 5:00 o'clock today. So with that, the hearing portion of this meeting
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	it's not in any California statute. Secondly, now I mean before the two definitions were mutually they were consistent; the definition of the employer, directly employing and regular employment for FEHA for were totally consistent. Now there's no regulatory source for the current the way that it's still written. Third reason is that, in and of itself, 11008 D-2 expressly states that for the purposes of CFRA and NPLA, employees must be counted in the same way as they're described in 11008 D-1. So we've actually said that ourselves; that that definition applies. So you can't I mean, it doesn't make sense to have another regulation that's inconsistent with that. And fourth, the definition of employer for Pregnancy Disability Leave Act does not require an employee to have worked, you know to have you don't have to have had 20 or 50 employees on the on	 proposed regulations regarding criminal history of the California Family Rights Act as the New Parent Leave Act? COUNCIL MEMBER IGLESIAS: I forget; is it appropriate for council members in this hearing to make comments or no? CHAIRMAN MANDELBAUM: I think it would be the next one. So this is the draft we already voted on, and then we'll amend it once we process the written public comments and Mrs. Brodsky's oral public comment So seeing no other people who are wishing to provide public comment, we will conclude with our public hearing portion of the meeting. So thanks to those who plan to submit written comments. We look forward to reading it. Please remember to get it in by 5:00 o'clock today. So with that, the hearing portion of this meeting
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	it's not in any California statute. Secondly, now I mean before the two definitions were mutually they were consistent; the definition of the employer, directly employing and regular employment for FEHA for were totally consistent. Now there's no regulatory source for the current the way that it's still written. Third reason is that, in and of itself, 11008 D-2 expressly states that for the purposes of CFRA and NPLA, employees must be counted in the same way as they're described in 11008 D-1. So we've actually said that ourselves; that that definition applies. So you can't I mean, it doesn't make sense to have another regulation that's inconsistent with that. And fourth, the definition of employer for Pregnancy Disability Leave Act does not require an employee to have worked, you know to have you don't have to have had 20 or 50 employees on the on the books for 20 weeks. So now you've got PDL,	 proposed regulations regarding criminal history of the California Family Rights Act as the New Parent Leave Act? COUNCIL MEMBER IGLESIAS: I forget; is it appropriate for council members in this hearing to make comments or no? CHAIRMAN MANDELBAUM: I think it would be the next one. So this is the draft we already voted on, and then we'll amend it once we process the written public comments and Mrs. Brodsky's oral public comment So seeing no other people who are wishing to provide public comment, we will conclude with our public hearing portion of the meeting. So thanks to those who plan to submit written comments. We look forward to reading it. Please remember to get it in by 5:00 o'clock today. So with that, the hearing portion of this meeting is adjourned.
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	it's not in any California statute. Secondly, now I mean before the two definitions were mutually they were consistent; the definition of the employer, directly employing and regular employment for FEHA for were totally consistent. Now there's no regulatory source for the current the way that it's still written. Third reason is that, in and of itself, 11008 D-2 expressly states that for the purposes of CFRA and NPLA, employees must be counted in the same way as they're described in 11008 D-1. So we've actually said that ourselves; that that definition applies. So you can't I mean, it doesn't make sense to have another regulation that's inconsistent with that. And fourth, the definition of employer for Pregnancy Disability Leave Act does not require an employee to have worked, you know to have you don't have to have had 20 or 50 employees on the on the books for 20 weeks. So now you've got PDL, Pregnancy Disability Leave, which often runs	 proposed regulations regarding criminal history of the California Family Rights Act as the New Parent Leave Act? COUNCIL MEMBER IGLESIAS: I forget; is it appropriate for council members in this hearing to make comments or no? CHAIRMAN MANDELBAUM: I think it would be the next one. So this is the draft we already voted on, and then we'll amend it once we process the written public comments and Mrs. Brodsky's oral public comment So seeing no other people who are wishing to provide public comment, we will conclude with our public hearing portion of the meeting. So thanks to those who plan to submit written comments. We look forward to reading it. Please remember to get it in by 5:00 o'clock today. So with that, the hearing portion of this meeting is adjourned.
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	it's not in any California statute. Secondly, now I mean before the two definitions were mutually they were consistent; the definition of the employer, directly employing and regular employment for FEHA for were totally consistent. Now there's no regulatory source for the current the way that it's still written. Third reason is that, in and of itself, 11008 D-2 expressly states that for the purposes of CFRA and NPLA, employees must be counted in the same way as they're described in 11008 D-1. So we've actually said that ourselves; that that definition applies. So you can't I mean, it doesn't make sense to have another regulation that's inconsistent with that. And fourth, the definition of employer for Pregnancy Disability Leave Act does not require an employee to have worked, you know to have you don't have to have had 20 or 50 employees on the on the books for 20 weeks. So now you've got PDL, Pregnancy Disability Leave, which often runs sequentially or, you know, with CFRA, which, as it's	 proposed regulations regarding criminal history of the California Family Rights Act as the New Parent Leave Act? COUNCIL MEMBER IGLESIAS: I forget; is it appropriate for council members in this hearing to make comments or no? CHAIRMAN MANDELBAUM: I think it would be the next one. So this is the draft we already voted on, and then we'll amend it once we process the written public comments and Mrs. Brodsky's oral public comment and written comment. So seeing no other people who are wishing to provide public comment, we will conclude with our public hearing portion of the meeting. So thanks to those who plan to submit written comments. We look forward to reading it. Please remember to get it in by 5:00 o'clock today. So with that, the hearing portion of this meeting is adjourned.
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	it's not in any California statute. Secondly, now I mean before the two definitions were mutually they were consistent; the definition of the employer, directly employing and regular employment for FEHA for were totally consistent. Now there's no regulatory source for the current the way that it's still written. Third reason is that, in and of itself, 11008 D-2 expressly states that for the purposes of CFRA and NPLA, employees must be counted in the same way as they're described in 11008 D-1. So we've actually said that ourselves; that that definition applies. So you can't I mean, it doesn't make sense to have another regulation that's inconsistent with that. And fourth, the definition of employer for Pregnancy Disability Leave Act does not require an employee to have worked, you know to have you don't have to have had 20 or 50 employees on the on the books for 20 weeks. So now you've got PDL, Pregnancy Disability Leave, which often runs sequentially or, you know, with CFRA, which, as it's written now, would be subject to two different counting	 proposed regulations regarding criminal history of the California Family Rights Act as the New Parent Leave Act? COUNCIL MEMBER IGLESIAS: I forget; is it appropriate for council members in this hearing to make comments or no? CHAIRMAN MANDELBAUM: I think it would be the next one. So this is the draft we already voted on, and then we'll amend it once we process the written public comments and Mrs. Brodsky's oral public comment and written comment. So seeing no other people who are wishing to provide public comment, we will conclude with our public hearing portion of the meeting. So thanks to those who plan to submit written comments. We look forward to reading it. Please remember to get it in by 5:00 o'clock today. So with that, the hearing portion of this meeting is adjourned.
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	it's not in any California statute. Secondly, now I mean before the two definitions were mutually they were consistent; the definition of the employer, directly employing and regular employment for FEHA for were totally consistent. Now there's no regulatory source for the current the way that it's still written. Third reason is that, in and of itself, 11008 D-2 expressly states that for the purposes of CFRA and NPLA, employees must be counted in the same way as they're described in 11008 D-1. So we've actually said that ourselves; that that definition applies. So you can't I mean, it doesn't make sense to have another regulation that's inconsistent with that. And fourth, the definition of employer for Pregnancy Disability Leave Act does not require an employee to have worked, you know to have you don't have to have had 20 or 50 employees on the on the books for 20 weeks. So now you've got PDL, Pregnancy Disability Leave, which often runs sequentially or, you know, with CFRA, which, as it's	 proposed regulations regarding criminal history of the California Family Rights Act as the New Parent Leave Act? COUNCIL MEMBER IGLESIAS: I forget; is it appropriate for council members in this hearing to make comments or no? CHAIRMAN MANDELBAUM: I think it would be the next one. So this is the draft we already voted on, and then we'll amend it once we process the written public comments and Mrs. Brodsky's oral public comment and written comment. So seeing no other people who are wishing to provide public comment, we will conclude with our public hearing portion of the meeting. So thanks to those who plan to submit written comments. We look forward to reading it. Please remember to get it in by 5:00 o'clock today. So with that, the hearing portion of this meeting is adjourned.
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	it's not in any California statute. Secondly, now I mean before the two definitions were mutually they were consistent; the definition of the employer, directly employing and regular employment for FEHA for were totally consistent. Now there's no regulatory source for the current the way that it's still written. Third reason is that, in and of itself, 11008 D-2 expressly states that for the purposes of CFRA and NPLA, employees must be counted in the same way as they're described in 11008 D-1. So we've actually said that ourselves; that that definition applies. So you can't I mean, it doesn't make sense to have another regulation that's inconsistent with that. And fourth, the definition of employer for Pregnancy Disability Leave Act does not require an employee to have worked, you know to have you don't have to have had 20 or 50 employees on the on the books for 20 weeks. So now you've got PDL, Pregnancy Disability Leave, which often runs sequentially or, you know, with CFRA, which, as it's written now, would be subject to two different counting	 proposed regulations regarding criminal history of the California Family Rights Act as the New Parent Leave Act? COUNCIL MEMBER IGLESIAS: I forget; is it appropriate for council members in this hearing to make comments or no? CHAIRMAN MANDELBAUM: I think it would be the next one. So this is the draft we already voted on, and then we'll amend it once we process the written public comments and Mrs. Brodsky's oral public comment and written comment. So seeing no other people who are wishing to provide public comment, we will conclude with our public hearing portion of the meeting. So thanks to those who plan to submit written comments. We look forward to reading it. Please remember to get it in by 5:00 o'clock today. So with that, the hearing portion of this meeting is adjourned.

4 (Pages 10 to 13)

1	I, Brittany Flores, a Certified Shorthand Reporter of	
2	the State of California, duly authorized to administer	
3	oaths, do hereby certify:	
4	That the foregoing proceedings were taken before me	
5	at the time and place herein set forth; that a record of	
6	the proceedings was made by me using machine shorthand	
7	which was thereafter transcribed under my direction;	
8	that the foregoing transcript is a true record of the	
9	testimony given.	
10	I further certify I am neither financially interested	
11	in the action nor a relative or employee of any attorney	
12	of party to this action.	
13	IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have this date subscribed my	
14	name.	
15		
16	Dated: 11/6/2019	
17		
18		
19	Brittany Flores CSR 13460	
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
	Page 14	

Page 1 chairperson 4:9 different 10:11,19 11:24 going 4:5 8:11,20,21 Α м change 6:5 10:23 12:2 12:14,15 12:16 **a.m** 1:17 13:22 machine 14:6 changed 10:2,5,16,18 good 7:12 8:5 direction 14:7 mail 5:18 able 6.21 changes 6:2 directly 9:5,11 11:6 Government 4:22 maintains 9:11 accept 5:14 **Disability** 11:18,22 changing 9:6 Great 4:4 Act 1:8.8 9:3 10:13 11:18 making 7:22.23 Chava 2:3 4:9 dope 7:16 13:3,4 Mandelbaum 2:3 4:4,9 citation 12:13 draft 13:9 Н action 14:11.12 7:15,18 8:20,24 12:19 clarifies 4:20 drafted 10:21 hat 7:23 addressing 8:2 12:22 13:8 Code 4:22.24 duly 14:2 hear 7:6 adjourned 13:20 manner 10:11 come 6:23 7:12 hearing 1:6 4:5,6,14,15 Adjournment 3:5 materials 5:3 commence 6:9 Ε 6:15,17 7:9 13:6,15,19 administer 14:2 mean 8:9 11:4,15 comment 3:4 4:16 5:22 email 5:10 7:13 12:25 hearing's 6:13 affiliation 7:1 means 9:11 10:4 6:6 7:10 12:18 13:1,11 afternoon 5:24 emersed 8:1 helpful 7:3 8:17 mechanism 10:24 13:12.14 history 1:7 4:19 8:7 9:18 employed 9:5,11 10:8 mechanisms 11:25 aggregate 9:12 commenting 7:2 employee 10:20 11:19 ago 10:14 13:2 meeting 1:3 4:15 5:7 comments 3:3 5:14,17 12:10,11 14:11 Hmm 12:21 amend 13:10 10:17 13:15,19 5:21 6:1,4,10,11,15 employees 9:13 10:8 holding 5:7 amendments 4:17 5:1 member 4:11 7:17,21,23 7:5,13,20,22,23 8:4 Housing 1:2 4:10 11:12,20 12:8 5:13 6:2.6 10:17 12:22 13:5 12:25 13:7.11.16 employer 8:15 9:8,11 and/or 12:17 members 2:2 4:11 13:6 conclude 13:14 10:5,15 11:6,17 Angeles 5:19 microphone 6:24 concluded 13:22 employers 10:7 appear 4:23 minor 8:6 identify 7:3 conditional 8.10 14 employing 11:6 **APPEARANCES** 2:1 mirrored 10:14 Iglesias 2:5 4:12 13:5 conditioned 10:7 employment 1:2,6 4:10 applies 11:14 mutually 11:5 important 8:14 consider 6:9 9:6 4:17,19 7:25 8:10,14 appreciate 6:20 inconsistent 11:16 consistent 9:7 10:2 11:5 10.3 18 11.7 appropriate 13:6 incorporated 12:18 Ν 11:8 enacted 9:20 approve 10:17 **INDEX** 3:1 name 4:9 7:1 14:14 context 10:5 12:15 et 4:22 Attachment 5:2,4 7:11 individuals 5:11 need 10:23 conversation 6:19 everyday 6:19 attorney 7:24 14:11 informal 4:13 neither 14:10 **Copies** 4:25 existed 10:15 authorized 14.2 information 8:16 Nevertheless 10:21 copy 6:1,7 9:19 existing 12:5 available 5:1,6 initial 5:3 7:8 **new** 1:8 4:18 13:3 council 1:3 2:2 4:10,11 explicit 12:9 interested 14:10 notice 5:3,9,12 6:18 4:11 5:17.19 6:2.4 expressly 11:11 В Internet's 7:14 noticed 5.8 7:17,22 9:6 12:22 13:5 interpreting 4:21 **B** 5:4 NPLA 9:12 11:11 13.6 F introduction 3:2 4:13 **B-4** 8:11 Council's 5:5,6,11 Fair 1:2 4:10 issuance 4:16 back 10:16 12:16 0 counsel 2:10 background 9:25 family 1:8 9:3,3 10:13 counted 11:12 o'clock 5:15 13:18 based 11:1 13:3 J **o0o** 13:24 counting 10:11,24 11:24 FEHA 4:21 10:3 11:7 behalf 7:2 January 10:16,16 couple 8:4 oaths 14:3 FEHA's 4:17 bit 6:18 course 6:19 joining 4:10 observed 12:15 FEHCouncil@DFEH.C... books 11:21 court 6:14,20,24 12:13 **Joseph** 2:6 4:12 October 1:16 4:2,8 5:15 Brian 2:10 5:22,23 7:13 5.18Justice 12:14 criminal 1:7 4:18 8:7 offer 8:10,14 field 7:25 9.19 offering 7:1 justified 9:24 13.2final 6:11 bring 5:22 office 5:19 CSR 1:25 14:19 Brittany 1:25 14:1,19 financially 14:10 κ official 6:16 current 9:15 11:9 find 9:23,23 Brodsky 2:4 4:12 7:17 **Oh** 7:15 currently 10:21 kick 7:18 first 8:6 9:19 10:23 7:19,21 8:23 9:1 12:20 okay 7:15 8:23 9:1 12:24 know 7:21 11:19,23 fix 12:2 12:21,23 D old 10:22 floor 5:20 Brodsky's 13:11 omit 12:6 **D** 5:2 7:11 9:8 Flores 1:25 14:1,19 brought 5:21 once 13:10 **D-1** 9:4 10:2 11:13 FMLA 11:2 LA 5:20 bunch 8:11 Opening 3:3 **D-2** 11:10 focus 8:6 9:16 language 9:17,21 10:1,6 opportunity 6:3,7 7:7 Dale 2:4 4:11 7:21 10:6,12,12,14,19 12:5 foregoing 14:4,8 С oral 13.11 Dara 2:7 4:12 law 7:25 forget 13:5 **C** 5:4 original 10:11,12 date 14:13 Leah 12:14 formal 5:7 calendar 9:15,16 10:9,9 Ortiz 2:6 4:12 Dated 14:16 leave 1:8 4:19 11:18,22 forth 4:22 14:5 10.25day 9:14 13:3 forward 13.16 California 1:1,7,14 4:24 Ρ decision 12:13 legal 4:18 four 10:1 5:8 11:1,3 13:3 14:2 page 3:1 5:6.12 9:4 define 8:13 fourth 11:17 legislative 9:18 Capitol 1:12 4:8 defined 10:4 parens 9:12,13,14 letter 12:3,12 front 5:1 6:23 7:12 caselaw 9:22,24 definition 8:9,17 9:5,6,7 little 6:18 Parent 1:8 13:3 full-time 9:13 Certificate 3:6 9:9,21,24 10:15,20 parental 4:19 located 5:19 further 14:10 Certified 14:1 part 5:7 6:12,16 11:6,14,17 long 10:13 certify 14:3,10 definitional 10:3 part- 9:13 look 13:16 G **CFRA** 9:13,18 10:22 definitions 8:8,11 11:5 party 14:12 looked 8:8 9:22 general 10:3 11:11.23 payroll 9:14 12:6,6,9,10 **DEPARTMENT** 1:2 looking 9:17 give 5:21 Chairman 2:3 4:4 7:15 described 11:13 12:11 Los 5:19 given 9:19 14:9 7:18 8:20,24 12:19,22 **PDL** 11:21 DFEH's 5:19 13:8 go 4:5 dicta 12:13 people 12:5 13:13

> Council Meeting October 23, 2019

reporter 6:14,21,24 14:1

Reporter's 3:6

requests 6:7

respect 8:7

require 11:18

respond 6:11

reviewed 9:18

right 7:17,19

6:12,16

runs 11:22

S 9:14

13:3

request 8:16 9:2

respectively 5:5

Rights 1:8 9:3 10:13

room 1:12 5:2 6:23

rulemaking 4:20 5:8

S

Sacramento 1:14 4:9

salary 12:8,17

Schur 2:7 4:12

Secondly 11:4

sections 4:24

see 8:21 9:20

seeing 7:9 13:13

sense 11:15,25

September 5:9

set 4:21 14:5

similar 11:2

slated 4:23

slightly 12:14

somebody 12:9

slower 6:18

source 11:8

speak 6:23

speaking 6:18

specific 4:20 7:3

Sperber 2:10 7:14

stakeholders 5:11

statement 5:3 6:11

statute 11:1,3 12:7

subject 9:23 11:24

submit 5:17 6:3 8:12

state 1:1,12 4:8,21 14:2

specifically 9:4

spelling 6:25

start 4:6 6:25

states 11:11

stating 6:25

statutes 8:1

13.16

submits 6:1

submitted 5:16

subscribed 14:13

subsection 7:4 9:8

Street 1:13 5:20

Staff 2:9

sorry 9:8

sequentially 11:23

shorthand 14:1,6

simple 8:12 12:2

says 12:5,7

second 9:1

section 7:4

sent 5:10

seq 4:22

seven 9.4

period 6:4

place 14:5

plan 13:16

practice 7:24

preceding 9:16 prefer 8:25

previous 10:9

14:4.6

previously 10:15

proceeding 13:22

process 5:8 13:10

proposal 8:13

12:2 13:2

providing 7:5

purpose 4:15

purposes 11:11

Pursuant 5:12

questions 7:8

read 8:8,18

ready 7.9

12.1

reading 13:17

really 8:5 10:22 12:1

reasons 5:4 6:12 10:1

receive 4.16 6.1 12.8

record 4:6,7,14 6:12,16

regarding 1:7 4:16,18

regular 10:4,20 11:7

regulation 7:3 11:16

regulations 1:7 4:17,21

7:4,11 8:7,15 9:10

10:3,13,18,22 13:2

regulatory 5:9 11:8

regulatory/legislative

4:23,24 5:1,5,15 6:3

regulation's 8:5

received 6:10,15

receiving 6:6

14:5,8

reflected 5:2,4

refer 7:5

13.2

2:10

relate 4:18

relative 14:11

relying 10:25

remarks 6:25 7:2

remember 13.17

replaced 10:10

register 5:9

reason 9:21 11:10

provisions 4:18

13.14

proceedings 1:10 4:1

proposed 1:6 4:23,25

provide 5:23 7:10 13:1

public 1:6 3:4 4:5,6,16

13:11,11,14,14

5:9 6:6 7:10,24 13:1

0

R

provided 9:10 10:19

5:13 6:2,5 7:11 9:10

Please 6:25 13:17

portion 4:15 13:15,19

. Pregnancy 11:18,22

substantial 6:5 **WHEREOF** 14:13 6 substantive 6:5 wishing 7:6 13:13 6 5:9 suggest 12:16 WITNESS 14:13 suggesting 12:6 wording 10:22 12:17 suggestion 8:18 9:2 worked 10:13 11:19 7 3:4 11:2 12:4 working 7:25 9:14 10:25 7.500 5:10 supplements 4:20 workweeks 9:15 **Supreme** 12:13 writing 6:10 8:12,21 8 sure 5:23 written 5:14.14.17.21.22 8 3:5 sworn 6:22 6:1,15 8:19 9:9 11:9 11:24 12:3,18 13:10 Т 13:12.16 9 take 6:21,24 8:19 **9** 3:6 Х 90013 5:20 taken 14:4 96 4:25 tell 6:13 terms 8:15 Υ testifies 5:25 year 9:16 10:10 11:1 testify 6:22 7:6 years 8:1 testimony 5:13,14 6:21 7:6 14:9 Ζ text 5:5 thank 12:18.19 0 thanks 13:15 things 8:6 think 8:4,9 10:1,23 12:4 1 13:8 1 3:2 Third 11:10 10:17 1:17 thought 8:16 10:32 13:22 Tim 2:5 4:12 10th 1:13 5:20 time 7:12 8:3,3 10:14 11/6/2019 14:16 14:5 **110** 8:10 Title 4:24 11:2 **11008** 9:8 10:2 11:10,13 today 4:11 5:13,15,23,25 11017.1 4:25 8:10 6:10 7:7 13:18 1108 9:8 today's 5:2 11087 4:25 9:4 totally 11:7 **113** 1:12 transcribed 6:14.17 14:7 **13** 3:5 transcript 1:10 6:14 14:8 1315 1:13 true 14:8 13460 1:25 14:19 two 8:6 11:4,24 **13900** 4:22 14 3:6 U 15-day 6:4 **1991** 9:20 unanimously 10:17 update 9:6 urge 12:1 2 use 10:22 **2** 3:3 4:24 20 9:12,15 10:8,25 11:20 v 11:21 2019 1:16 4:2 5:10 10:17 voted 10:17 13:9 **23** 1:16 4:2 23rd 4:8 5:16 W 28th 10:16 wages 12:8,17 want 8:6.18.19 9:16

3 **3** 3:4 **320** 5:20 4 4 3:2,3 40 7:25 4th 5:20 5 5:00 5:15,23 13:17

50 9:12 10:24 11:20

Page 2

Council Meeting October 23, 2019

12:12 13:1

we'll 6:9,11 7:6 8:21

we're 4:5,8 5:7,12 7:9

we've 4:13 10:4 11:13

Wednesday 1:16 4:7

weeks 10:8,25 11:21

wanted 9:20

way 11:9,12

wearing 7:22

welcome 4:14

West 5:20

web 5:6,12

13:10

8:2