

JULY/AUGUST 2016

VOL. 16-7

PRATT'S

ENERGY LAW

REPORT



EDITOR'S NOTE: REDUCTIONS IN FORCE

Steven A. Meyerowitz

EFFECTIVELY MANAGING WORKFORCE CONTRACTION IN TURBULENT TIMES

Robert G. Lian Jr. and Brian Glenn Patterson

ENERGY MERGERS AND ACQUISITIONS: A YEAR IN REVIEW - PART II

William S. Lamb, Michael Didriksen,
Elaine M. Walsh, Hillary H. Holmes, and
Thomas E. Holmberg

**THE JONES ACT AND EXPORT OF CRUDE
OIL AND LNG FROM THE U.S.** Christopher
R. Hart and Lisa Houssiere

U.S. SUPREME COURT INVALIDATES MARYLAND PROGRAM THAT SUPPLEMENTS FERC-APPROVED CAPACITY PAYMENTS

Adam Wenner and A. Cory
Lankford

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION PROPOSES RULE EXPANDING SAFETY REQUIREMENTS FOR NATURAL GAS PIPELINES

Scott Janoe, Gregory S. Wagner,
Jerrod Harrison, and Gina Sagar

CFTC ENERGY AND ENVIRONMENTAL MARKETS ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING

Athena Yvonne Eastwood, Paul J. Pantano, Jr.,
Neal E. Kumar, and Michael Selig

Pratt's Energy Law Report

VOLUME 16

NUMBER 7

JULY/AUGUST 2016

Editor's Note: Reductions in Force	
Steven A. Meyerowitz	247
Effectively Managing Workforce Contraction in Turbulent Times	
Robert G. Lian Jr. and Brian Glenn Patterson	249
Energy Mergers and Acquisitions: A Year in Review—Part II	
William S. Lamb, Michael Didriksen, Elaine M. Walsh, Hillary H. Holmes, and Thomas E. Holmberg	256
The Jones Act and Export of Crude Oil and LNG from the U.S.	
Christopher R. Hart and Lisa Houssiere	278
U.S. Supreme Court Invalidates Maryland Program That Supplements FERC-Approved Capacity Payments	
Adam Wenner and A. Cory Lankford	281
Department of Transportation Proposes Rule Expanding Safety Requirements for Natural Gas Pipelines	
Scott Janoe, Gregory S. Wagner, Jerrod Harrison, and Gina Sagar	284
CFTC Energy and Environmental Markets Advisory Committee Meeting	
Athena Yvonne Eastwood, Paul J. Pantano, Jr., Neal E. Kumar, and Michael Selig	289

QUESTIONS ABOUT THIS PUBLICATION?

For questions about the **Editorial Content** appearing in these volumes or reprint permission, please email:

Jacqueline M. Morris at (908) 673-1528

Email: jacqueline.m.morris@lexisnexis.com

For assistance with replacement pages, shipments, billing or other customer service matters, please call:

Customer Services Department at (800) 833-9844

Outside the United States and Canada, please call (518) 487-3000

Fax Number (518) 487-3584

Customer Service Web site <http://www.lexisnexis.com/custserv/>

For information on other Matthew Bender publications, please call

Your account manager or (800) 223-1940

Outside the United States and Canada, please call (518) 487-3000

ISBN: 978-1-6328-0836-3 (print)

ISBN: 978-1-6328-0837-0 (ebook)

ISSN: 2374-3395 (print)

ISSN: 2374-3409 (online)

Cite this publication as:

[author name], [*article title*], [vol. no.] PRATT'S ENERGY LAW REPORT [page number]

(LexisNexis A.S. Pratt);

Ian Coles, *Rare Earth Elements: Deep Sea Mining and the Law of the Sea*, 14 PRATT'S ENERGY LAW REPORT 4 (LexisNexis A.S. Pratt)

This publication is sold with the understanding that the publisher is not engaged in rendering legal, accounting, or other professional services. If legal advice or other expert assistance is required, the services of a competent professional should be sought.

LexisNexis and the Knowledge Burst logo are registered trademarks of Reed Elsevier Properties Inc., used under license. A.S. Pratt is a registered trademark of Reed Elsevier Properties SA, used under license.

Copyright © 2016 Reed Elsevier Properties SA, used under license by Matthew Bender & Company, Inc. All Rights Reserved.

No copyright is claimed by LexisNexis, Matthew Bender & Company, Inc., or Reed Elsevier Properties SA, in the text of statutes, regulations, and excerpts from court opinions quoted within this work. Permission to copy material may be licensed for a fee from the Copyright Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Drive, Danvers, Mass. 01923, telephone (978) 750-8400.

An A.S. Pratt® Publication

Editorial Office
230 Park Ave., 7th Floor, New York, NY 10169 (800) 543-6862
www.lexisnexis.com

MATTHEW  BENDER

Editor-in-Chief, Editor & Board of Editors

EDITOR-IN-CHIEF

STEVEN A. MEYEROWITZ

President, Meyerowitz Communications Inc.

EDITOR

VICTORIA PRUSSEN SPEARS

Senior Vice President, Meyerowitz Communications Inc.

BOARD OF EDITORS

SAMUEL B. BOXERMAN

Partner, Sidley Austin LLP

ANDREW CALDER

Partner, Kirkland & Ellis LLP

M. SETH GINTHER

Partner, Hirschler Fleischer, P.C.

R. TODD JOHNSON

Partner, Jones Day

BARCLAY NICHOLSON

Partner, Norton Rose Fulbright

BRADLEY A. WALKER

Counsel, Buchanan Ingersoll & Rooney PC

ELAINE M. WALSH

Partner, Baker Botts L.L.P.

SEAN T. WHEELER

Partner, Latham & Watkins LLP

WANDA B. WHIGHAM

Senior Counsel, Holland & Knight LLP

Hydraulic Fracturing Developments

ERIC ROTHENBERG

Partner, O'Melveny & Myers LLP

Pratt's Energy Law Report is published 10 times a year by Matthew Bender & Company, Inc. Periodicals Postage Paid at Washington, D.C., and at additional mailing offices. Copyright 2016 Reed Elsevier Properties SA, used under license by Matthew Bender & Company, Inc. No part of this journal may be reproduced in any form—by microfilm, xerography, or otherwise—or incorporated into any information retrieval system without the written permission of the copyright owner. For customer support, please contact LexisNexis Matthew Bender, 1275 Broadway, Albany, NY 12204 or e-mail Customer.Support@lexisnexis.com. Direct any editorial inquires and send any material for publication to Steven A. Meyerowitz, Editor-in-Chief, Meyerowitz Communications Inc., 26910 Grand Central Parkway Suite 18R, Floral Park, New York 11005, smeyerowitz@meyerowitzcommunications.com, 347.235.0882. Material for publication is welcomed—articles, decisions, or other items of interest to lawyers and law firms, in-house energy counsel, government lawyers, senior business executives, and anyone interested in energy-related environmental preservation, the laws governing cutting-edge alternative energy technologies, and legal developments affecting traditional and new energy providers. This publication is designed to be accurate and authoritative, but neither the publisher nor the authors are rendering legal, accounting, or other professional services in this publication. If legal or other expert advice is desired, retain the services of an appropriate professional. The articles and columns reflect only the present considerations and views of the authors and do not necessarily reflect those of the firms or organizations with which they are affiliated, any of the former or present clients of the authors or their firms or organizations, or the editors or publisher.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to Pratt's Energy Law Report, LexisNexis Matthew Bender, 121 Chanlon Road, North Building, New Providence, NJ 07974.

Effectively Managing Workforce Contraction in Turbulent Times

*By Robert G. Lian Jr. and Brian Glenn Patterson**

Many energy-related companies are considering operational cost-savings measures, including employee reductions. The authors of this article provide an outline of the key considerations when dealing with workforce reduction issues.

The ongoing instability in the price of oil is forcing many energy-related companies to reevaluate their operations and consider steps to trim their costs, including workforce reorganizations and reductions. In making plans for adjustments to company staffing levels, employers must tread cautiously. There are numerous federal and state employment law issues that employers should consider before implementing a reduction in force (“RIF”) or terminating individual employees. Failure to comply with the applicable statutes, which may require as much as two to three months’ advance notice of any covered layoffs, can negate some of the anticipated savings and lead to litigation. Although employers can limit exposure to lawsuits through the use of releases obtained in exchange for benefits or severance packages, strict requirements must be met for such releases to be valid.

Focusing on RIFs, this article provides an outline of the key considerations when dealing with workforce reduction issues. It is intended to provide a general overview of the issues to aid in a basic understanding of the range of challenges and potential options. It is not intended to substitute for consultation with qualified counsel.

BEFORE IMPLEMENTING A REDUCTION IN FORCE

Laying off employees is a delicate matter fraught with legal and emotional implications. However, advance planning can help minimize a company’s legal exposure for RIFs. Such planning should include the following steps:

Select a Restructuring Team

The first step in implementing a RIF involves establishing a restructuring team to determine whether layoffs are needed or whether other cost-cutting

* Robert G. Lian Jr. is a partner at Akin Gump Strauss Hauer & Feld LLP focusing his practice on labor and employment litigation and providing strategic advice to clients in a range of industries. Brian Glenn Patterson is counsel at the firm representing employers in the areas of employment discrimination, wrongful discharge, and the Fair Labor Standards Act. The authors may be reached at blian@akingump.com and bpatterson@akingump.com, respectively.

measures will suffice. A restructuring team should include a senior member of the human resources department, other high-level managers, operational representatives and counsel. Ideally, the team also should consist of personnel who have experience with layoffs.

Consider the Alternatives to a RIF

Before proceeding with a RIF, the team should consider alternatives. While a RIF can help a company quickly trim expenses, it can result in the loss of talent needed for when demand resumes. Companies should consider alternatives to forced layoffs, including early retirements, voluntary RIFs, schedule or wage reductions, furloughs, in-sourcing of functions and related measures to reduce the company's cost structure without putting its talent pool at risk or otherwise having to face the difficulties associated with employee job loss.

Establish the Business Objectives and Rationale for the RIF

Ideally, the next step in a RIF should involve identifying and documenting the employer's business objectives for the RIF. Once it determines that layoffs are necessary, the employer should work with counsel to document the linkage between the proposed layoffs and the stated business objectives.

Thereafter the employer must determine which employees to lay-off—whether the RIF will focus on certain job titles or functions, entire locations, facilities, or departments. The answers should be consistent with the stated goals of the RIF and can help focus and shape the layoff plan. The employer also should consider whether there will be a single round of layoffs or multiple ones. Various factors might influence that decision, including the predictability of the business climate, product demand, employee morale, the ability to retain essential employees, and operational requirements.

Develop Selection Criteria

Next, the employer should develop the criteria it will use to select employees for the layoff. Objective reasons are often easier to defend than subjective ones if they are later called into question in litigation.

Most layoff selections, however, will involve a subjective component, such as employee performance or assessment of future capabilities. Nevertheless, the employer should consider ways to maximize the objective components of the decision. For example, rather than relying solely on a supervisor's evaluation, the employer might give some weight to employee seniority. In situations where the employer will use employees' performance as a selection criterion, the employer may need to rely on prior performance evaluations, a ranking system developed specifically for the layoff or some combination of the two. If rankings prepared as part of the layoff process are inconsistent with prior evaluations, the

employer must be prepared to explain the discrepancy.

Company counsel can aid the employer in developing the appropriate documentation of the criteria the employer will use, the reasons for such criteria and its link to the rationale for the layoff. Clearly documenting the criteria to be used also will defuse potential arguments that the employer manipulated the criteria to target certain employees for layoff.

Select the Decision-Makers

After the employer decides which criteria to use, it should focus on selecting the appropriate decision-makers. In general, senior management and human resources personnel may be in the best position to make the general overarching decisions, such as those concerning the scope of the layoff, the locations or facilities to close, the product lines to discontinue and the services to outsource.

Decisions concerning which employees to retain may be best left to managers who have personal knowledge of the employees' performance, unless the selections are based on purely objective criteria. Leaving all decision making to a single individual carries potential risks: that individual may be a poor witness, may later be terminated or laid off, or may harbor or be perceived as harboring personal animus toward certain employees.

Identify Any Contractual Requirements

While workers are "at will," meaning they can be laid off or otherwise terminated at any time, with or without cause or notice, subject only to statutory restrictions, many employees have employment contracts, offer letters or other arrangements that place limits on how the employer may end their employment. The team should consider all such agreements and arrangements in evaluating job reductions. Contractual restrictions on layoffs may also be found in other sources, such as employee handbooks, options or equity agreements, general employee policies or, in rare cases, verbal promises by management.

In unionized workforces, contractual restrictions in collective bargaining agreements or those established through past practice are also likely to place limits on an employer's ability to reduce its workforce or implement other cost-containment measures. In the case of a RIF, these restrictions may impose certain criteria, obligations or procedures on the RIF. In addition, the decision to implement the RIF, along with its effects on the employer's workforce, may be subject to mandatory bargaining.

Analyze for Discriminatory Treatment or Effect

RIF selection criteria can sometimes lead to unexpected or unintended effects on individuals in statutorily protected classifications. To ensure a fuller

understanding of a proposed RIF's impact, under guidance of counsel, employers should conduct a review of any RIF plan to identify possible issues of disparate treatment or impact potentially caused by the plan.

“Disparate treatment” occurs when an employer intentionally selects certain employees for layoff based on a protected characteristic, such as race, color, national origin, sex and pregnancy, age, disability, or religion. Unlawful disparate treatment also can occur under Section 510 of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act (“ERISA”), if the employer selects employees for layoff to avoid or reduce the costs associated with providing ERISA-covered benefits or to prevent employees from attaining any ERISA-covered benefit, such as pensions. Employers must also consider other protected characteristics under state and local laws.

“Disparate impact” occurs when the selection criteria unintentionally cause the layoff to fall most heavily on a protected group. For example, disparate impact against older workers may occur if an employer uses employee salaries as a criterion. Because older workers tend to earn higher salaries, a layoff may disproportionately impact older workers. Where disparate impact exists and cannot be eliminated, employment counsel should be consulted to evaluate whether the company has a defensible business justification for its selection criteria.

Employers may use outside experts or consultants to assist in conducting disparate treatment and disparate impact statistical analyses. Such outside analyses can be particularly helpful in understanding issues of disparate treatment or impact and in defending against a claim if litigation does result.

Consider Other Potential Legal Issues

After the employer has identified the employees selected for layoff, it should consider the status of each one to ensure that there are no potential claims lurking. For example, employees who are on protected maternity, family, medical or military leave may have certain reinstatement rights under the Family and Medical Leave Act (“FMLA”) or the Uniformed Services Employment and Reemployment Rights Act (“USERRA”). Unless the employer can invoke certain defenses, discharging such employees while they are on leave can expose an employer to liability.

Terminating employees on these or other types of protected leaves of absence, such as disability or workers' compensation leave, may also create the appearance of retaliation. Similarly, terminating an employee who is considered a protected “whistleblower” under federal, state or local law or an employee who is known to have engaged in protected, concerted union activity could subject an employer to retaliation claims. Individuals who participated in internal

investigations or as witnesses for other employees may also have a basis for a retaliation claim.

Review Restrictive Covenant Obligations

Another relevant consideration is whether the employees are under any restrictive covenant obligations that the employer may wish to enforce after implementing a RIF. Such obligations include not soliciting clients or employees and not joining a competitor. State law may impact the employer's ability to enforce such obligations, because some courts may be reluctant to enforce restrictive covenants when an employee is terminated through no fault of their own.

Document Carefully

It is imperative that the employer carefully document the reasons for the RIF, the criteria used and the reasons that the employer selected or did not select each employee in the affected area(s). Such documentation assists in refuting any claim that the employer manipulated the layoff criteria for unlawful reasons or had any illicit motive for the layoffs. In that comprehensive documentation, the employer should use consistent explanations as to why it selected certain employees for layoff or retention. It also may be appropriate to maintain notes and minutes from any RIF committee meetings.

Identify When Notice Should Be Given

Failure to provide adequate notice is a significant potential pitfall for employers implementing RIFs. Thus, employers should carefully review applicable federal, state and local law pertaining to this question before proceeding.

The federal Worker Adjustment and Retraining Notification ("WARN") Act and various state equivalents known as "mini-WARN" Acts require that covered employers give up to 60 to 90 days' advance notice before implementing a "plant closing" or "mass layoff." These statutes compel back pay and benefits, civil penalties and attorneys' fees in litigation where the employer did not give proper notice to affected employees or their union representatives, and/or certain government officials. Such penalties are designed to inflict a steep price and can significantly reduce any savings produced by a RIF.

The federal WARN Act is technical and complex. In general, it applies to private employers with a total of 100 or more full-time employees and mandates 60 days' advance notice of any plant closings or mass layoffs. A "plant closing" occurs if (1) 50 or more employees suffer an "employment loss" within a 30-day period or (2) an employer temporarily or permanently closes down an entire site or certain facilities or operating units within a "single employment site." A "mass layoff" is any other RIF where either (1) 500 or more employees at a

single site suffer an employment loss within a 30-day period or (2) one-third or more of an employment site's active employees (but at least 50 or more employees) suffer an employment loss within a 30-day period. An "employment loss" is considered to be (1) an employment termination, other than a discharge for cause, voluntary departure, or retirement; (2) a layoff exceeding six months; or (3) a reduction in an employee's hours of work of more than 50 percent in each month of any six-month period.

In determining whether the employer satisfies these threshold requirements, it is important to check applicable state and local laws. Many jurisdictions have enacted mini-WARNs that dramatically lower the initial threshold numbers and increase the amount of advance notice that employers must give. For example, New York's mini-WARN Act requires employers with 50 or more employees to give at least 90 days' advance notice of any mass layoffs, plant closings or "relocation" of operations.

There may be exceptions that excuse the employer from providing the full amount of notice required under applicable law. For example, under the federal WARN Act, the "faltering company exception" may excuse notice in situations where the employer is closing an entire employment site. The "unforeseeable business circumstances exception," which generally applies to unexpected events beyond the employer's control, may also relieve some or all of the employer's obligation to give notice. However, it is unlikely that the recent drop in the price of oil, on its own, qualifies for this exception.

IMPLEMENTING THE RIF

Once the employer has completed the steps outlined above and compiled its final list of employees selected for layoff, it should make final preparations for implementing the RIF. These preparations include:

- 1) identifying the corporate representatives who will advise the employees individually of the decisions, coaching them in advance on the employer's consistent explanation for the RIF, preparing a "script" to be followed with prepared responses to anticipated questions and familiarizing them with information on benefits and any outplacement services for terminated employees;
- 2) ensuring that the employer pays all accrued but unpaid wages, bonuses, vacation, prenegotiated severance, and other compensation in a timely manner, with appropriate withholdings and in accordance with state and local law;
- 3) compiling information packets for terminated employees regarding final compensation payments, outplacement assistance, insurance continuation, and procedures for reapplying for other positions within

the company; and

- 4) preparing a handout outlining answers to frequently asked questions about the RIF for distribution to all employees, regardless of whether or not they were included in the RIF; this will help control the spread of rumors and gossip and ensure dissemination of consistent explanations for the RIF.

Finally, employers should consider offering additional benefits or severance packages to selected employees in exchange for a release of all potential claims against the employer. There are several strict legal requirements that employers must follow to obtain a valid release, particularly with workers age 40 or older. However, obtaining a valid release is the best method of limiting potential liability against the employer.

A release also provides an opportunity for the employer to require binding arbitration to resolve any disputes that may arise between the employer and the discharged employees and to bind the employees to covenants of confidentiality, cooperation in future proceedings and the like. Employment counsel can advise employers on how to craft releases that will best withstand legal challenges and keep them abreast of any potential changes in the law.