

CHAPTER 8**LAYOFFS****Authority**

N.J.S.A. 11A:2-6(d), 11A:2-11(h), 11A:2-28, 11A:6-28, and 11A:8-1 through 11A:8-4.

Source and Effective Date

R.2009 d.41, effective December 23, 2008.
See: 40 N.J.R. 4381(a), 41 N.J.R. 399(b).

Chapter Expiration Date

In accordance with N.J.S.A. 52:14B-5.1.d, the expiration date of Chapter 8, Layoffs, was extended by gubernatorial directive from June 20, 2016, to June 20, 2017. See: 48 N.J.R. 1445(a).

Chapter Historical Note

Chapter 8, Layoffs, was adopted as R.1990 d.49, effective January 16, 1990. See: 21 N.J.R. 3340(a), 22 N.J.R. 169(a).

Pursuant to Executive Order No. 66(1978), Chapter 8, Layoffs, was readopted as R.1995 d.55, effective December 30, 1994. See: 26 N.J.R. 3518(a), 27 N.J.R. 482(a).

Pursuant to Executive Order No. 66(1978), Chapter 8, Layoffs, was readopted as R.1995 d.251, effective April 21, 1995. See: 27 N.J.R. 612(a), 27 N.J.R. 1967(b).

Pursuant to Executive Order No. 66(1978), Chapter 8, Layoffs, was readopted as R.2000 d.12, effective December 9, 1999. See: 31 N.J.R. 2827(a), 32 N.J.R. 39(a).

Chapter 8, Layoffs, was readopted as R.2003 d.304, effective June 30, 2003. See 35 N.J.R. 345(a), 35 N.J.R. 3551(b).

Chapter 8, Layoffs, was readopted as R.2009 d.41, effective December 23, 2008. See: Source and Effective Date. See, also, section annotations.

In accordance with N.J.S.A. 52:14B-5.1b, Chapter 8, Layoffs, was scheduled to expire on December 23, 2015. See: 43 N.J.R. 1203(a).

In accordance with N.J.S.A. 52:14B-5.1.c(2), Chapter 8, Layoffs, was scheduled to expire on June 20, 2016. See: 48 N.J.R. 12(a).

Cross References

Applicability of this chapter to SES members and positions, see N.J.A.C. 4A:3-2.3 and N.J.A.C. 4A:3-2.9.

CHAPTER TABLE OF CONTENTS**SUBCHAPTER 1. PROCEDURES**

- 4A:8-1.1 General
- 4A:8-1.1A (Reserved)
- 4A:8-1.2 Alternatives to layoff
- 4A:8-1.3 Pre-layoff actions
- 4A:8-1.4 Review by Department of Personnel
- 4A:8-1.5 Layoff units and job locations
- 4A:8-1.6 Layoff notice

SUBCHAPTER 2. EMPLOYEE LAYOFF RIGHTS

- 4A:8-2.1 Types of layoff rights
- 4A:8-2.2 Exercise of lateral and demotional rights
- 4A:8-2.3 Exercise of special reemployment rights
- 4A:8-2.4 Seniority
- 4A:8-2.5 Reassignments
- 4A:8-2.6 Appeals

SUBCHAPTER 1. PROCEDURES**4A:8-1.1 General**

(a) An appointing authority may institute layoff actions for economy, efficiency, or other related reasons.

1. Demotions for economy, efficiency, or other related reasons shall be considered layoff actions and shall be subject to the requirements of this chapter.

(b) In the case of those titles approved for inclusion in job bands (see N.J.A.C. 4A:3-3.2A), all layoff rights, including lateral, demotional, and special reemployment rights, shall be based on the job band, not the title level within the band.

1. All references to titles in this chapter shall mean the job band in the case of those titles approved for inclusion in job bands.

2. All references to class codes in this chapter shall mean the class code of the lowest title level in the band in the case of those titles approved for inclusion in a job band.

(c) The Chairperson of the Civil Service Commission or designee shall determine seniority (see N.J.A.C. 4A:8-2.4), and shall designate lateral, demotional, and special reemployment rights for all career service titles prior to the effective date of the layoff and have such information provided to affected parties.

(d) At no time shall any employee be subject to any layoff action if the employee is on a military leave of absence for active service in the Armed Forces of the United States in time of war or emergency.

Amended by R.1995 d.251, effective May 15, 1995.

See: 27 N.J.R. 612(a), 27 N.J.R. 1967(b).

Amended by R.2000 d.12, effective January 3, 2000.

See: 31 N.J.R. 2827(a), 32 N.J.R. 39(a).

In (b), substituted "and merit points (see N.J.A.C. 4A:8-2.4), and shall" for "and" following "seniority"; and added (c).

Amended by R.2003 d.304, effective August 4, 2003.

See: 35 N.J.R. 345(a), 35 N.J.R. 3551(b).

In (b), deleted "and merit points" following "shall determine seniority"; deleted (c).

Emergency amendment, R.2009 d.133, effective March 25, 2009 (to expire May 24, 2009).

See: 41 N.J.R. 1535(a).

In (b), substituted "Chairperson" for "Commissioner" and "Civil Service Commission" for "Department of Personnel"; and added (c).

Adopted concurrent amendment, R.2009 d.206, effective May 24, 2009.

See: 41 N.J.R. 1535(a), 41 N.J.R. 2459(a).

Provisions of R.2009 d.133 adopted without change.

Amended by R.2014 d.099, effective June 2, 2014.

See: 45 N.J.R. 500(a), 46 N.J.R. 1331(c).

In the introductory paragraph of (a) and of (a)1, inserted a comma following "efficiency"; added new (b); recodified former (b) through (c) as (c) through (d); and in (c), deleted "or authorized representative" following "Chairperson", and inserted "or designee", and a comma following "demotional".

Case Notes

Negotiations with union concerning Department of Environmental Protection's reduction of employees' workweek were preempted by statute and regulations that created comprehensive demotional layoff scheme. *State v. Communications Workers of America, AFL-CIO*, 285 N.J.Super. 541, 667 A.2d 1070 (A.D.1995), certification denied.

Reduction in plumbing subcode official's work hours and compensation was motivated only by budgetary concerns and was done in good faith and did not violate Uniform Construction Code Act. *Voges v. Borough of Tinton Falls*, 268 N.J.Super. 279, 633 A.2d 566 (A.D.1993), certification denied 135 N.J. 466, 640 A.2d 848.

Statute which permitted lay off of permanent public employee superseded statute providing that an injured public employee receiving workers' compensation benefits was to continue on the payroll. *Novak v. Camden County Health Services Center Bd. of Managers*, 255 N.J.Super. 93, 604 A.2d 649 (A.D.1992).

Authority to regulate causes of removal and suspension. *State v. Local 195, IFPTE*, 179 N.J.Super. 146, 430 A.2d 966 (App.Div.1981), certification denied, 89 N.J. 433, 446 A.2d 158.

Employee improperly removed after suspension for same infraction. *Newark v. Copeland*, 171 N.J.Super. 571, 410 A.2d 274 (App.Div. 1980).

Employees of a housing authority who were laid off from their positions and certified on common special reemployment lists were entitled to replace city employees in comparable positions who had not been permanently appointed in the classified service. *Department of Civil Service v. Newark*, 131 N.J. Super. 275, 329 A.2d 572, 1974 N.J. Super. LEXIS 468 (App.Div. 1974).

Dismissal of veterans protected by Veteran's Tenure Act in non-civil service county. *Cooper v. Imbriani*, 122 N.J.Super. 469, 300 A.2d 863 (App.Div.1973), affirmed, 63 N.J. 535, 310 A.2d 457 (1973).

Filing, by an employee who had appealed her layoff as a systems analyst by a county department of administration, of an application to PERS to retire with a service pension constituted a resignation that mooted her layoff appeal and justified an order affirming the departmental action and dismissing the layoff appeal. *In re Batra, Morris Cty. Dep't of Admin.*, OAL DKT. NO. CSV 00532-15 (Slip Opinion), Initial Decision (May 13, 2015).

Fire department officials who were laid off by a township following a change in administration did not carry their burden per N.J.A.C. 4A:2-1.4(c) to show that the layoff was actuated by a bad faith motivation within the meaning of N.J.A.C. 4A:8-2.6(c) because while the proper layoff proceedings were not initially followed, those errors were corrected. Moreover, neither of the officials adduced any bona fide evidence of bad faith, and the fact that one of the officials indicated that the township's business administrator was rude to him, that fact alone was insufficient to constitute bad faith on the part of the township. To the contrary, the preponderance of credible evidence demonstrates that the township laid off the officials for purposes of efficiency and economy per N.J.A.C. 4A:8-1.1(a) based on changes in administration and the form of government. *In re Hendrickson, Jr., et al, Vernon Twp., Dep't of Public Safety*, OAL DKT. NO. CSV 4683-13, OAL DKT. NO. CSV 4684-13 (Consolidated), 2014 N.J. AGEN LEXIS 474, Initial Decision (August 5, 2014).

An Administrative Law Judge concluded that a worker who had been laid off from her position as Senior Clerk Typist for a township did not prove that her layoff was effectuated for an improper motive such as ill will or other improper reason. Specifically, though the worker claimed that she was targeted for layoff because an interim township manager had animus towards her, the township showed that that manager was not even in the management position when the layoff plan was conceived and approved. Nor did the worker establish that there was any nexus between grievances that she had filed a year earlier and the layoff. Moreover, the township adduced ample evidence that the layoffs were necessary due to reasons of economy within the meaning of N.J.A.C.

4A:8-1.1(a) and N.J.A.C. 4A:1-1.3 including that the township had experienced a decrease of \$ 725,000 in tax revenues and its surplus had dropped to below \$ 1 million. *Twp. of Sparta, Layoffs 2010 (Lehman)*, v. Twp. of Sparta, Dep't of Pub. Works, OAL Dkt. No. CSV 00239-11, AGENCY Dkt. No. 2009-529, 2014 N.J. AGEN LEXIS 170, Initial Decision (April 8, 2014).

Appeals of permanent employees who were laid off by the City of Newark pursuant to N.J.A.C. 4A:8-1.1 were dismissed. A preponderance of the evidence did not exist that Newark intended to replace permanent custodians or aides with per diem custodians or aides on a permanent basis, and Newark did contend that its layoff was part of a plan to reduce payroll costs. *In re Elijah Arce, Sandra Currias, Wilma Austin, Thomasina Anderson, Corey Adams, June George, Ruthie Bray, Newark Public Schools 2012 Layoffs*, OAL DKT. No. CSV 14873-12, CSV 14876-12, CSV 16647-12, CSV 16648-12 1, CSV 16649-12, and CSV 16655-12 (Consolidated), 2014 N.J. AGEN LEXIS 142, Initial Decision (March 31, 2014).

Layoffs of Skilled Trades Association, Inc. (STA) members were done for reasons of economy and efficiency pursuant to N.J.S.A. 11A:8-1a and N.J.A.C. 4A:8-1.1(a). STA members were considered for layoff because they were not producing sufficient revenues from referrals to cover their costs, there was less maintenance work mainly due to changes in the Newark Housing Authority's housing stock, and the STA had not had any prior layoffs. Moreover, the STA's contentions that they were laid off due to anti-union animus were unpersuasive. *In re Newark Housing Authority Layoff—2010*, OAL DKT. Nos. CSV 09080-10 and PRC 012872-11, 2014 N.J. AGEN Lexis 31, Initial Decision (February 25, 2014).

City employee did not establish a right to compensation on her claim that her layoff from her position of director and coordinator of the city's Office of Aging, which layoff occurred as part of a general layoff undertaken for fiscal purposes. Because N.J.A.C. 4A:8-1.1(a) authorized a civil service municipality to lay off employees for "economy, efficiency or other related reasons," an employee who is challenging a layoff cannot satisfy the onerous burden in a good-faith appeal per N.J.A.C. 4A:8-2.6(a) by offering evidence that the challenged layoff was partially motivated by an unlawful motive where, as here, there was evidence that the layoff was also designed to effect economies. *In re City of Trenton Layoffs, Dep't of Admin. & Fin.*, OAL Dkt. No. CSV 876-11, AGENCY Dkt. Nos. 2011-2141 et al., 2014 N.J. AGEN LEXIS 70, Initial Decision (February 10, 2014).

City Code enforcement officers did not carry their burden of proof per N.J.A.C. 4A:8-2.6(c) to show by a preponderance of evidence that their employer's action in laying them off was taken in bad faith in that it was made for reasons other than economy or efficiency or other like reasons. While the officers showed that the city had made other hires and had increased the salaries of other employees since the date of the layoff, this in and of itself did not support a showing of bad faith as the record clearly reflected that the city was facing a significant deficit, a decrease in revenue and an increase in appropriations in the pre-layoff period. The city's efforts to address its fiscal situation involved a comprehensive plan including layoffs in positions that the city thought were non-essential, furloughs, payroll lags, and alternative healthcare coverage. Moreover, some of the hiring related to positions addressing critical operational needs and were funded at least in part by grants. Also relevant was the fact that the majority of the hires were both provisional and seasonal, which have a lighter financial impact for the city's taxpayers. That being so, the layoff action was properly found to have been instituted for reasons of economy and/or efficiency within the meaning of N.J.A.C. 4A:8-1.1(a) and that the officers were not entitled to relief from that action. *In re Murray, et al., City of Jersey City Layoffs*, CSC DKT. NO. 2011-4941, 2011-4945, 2011-4981 (Consolidated), OAL DKT. NO. CSV 7877-11 REMAND, 2013 N.J. CSC LEXIS 1203, Final Administrative Action (December 4, 2013).

Action of Jersey City to lay off certain employees was sustained on remand pursuant to N.J.S.A. 11A:8-1 and N.J.A.C. 4A:8-1.1(a). While there were hires and salary increases since the subject layoff, this in and of itself did not support a showing of bad faith, as the record soundly reflects that Jersey City was facing a significant deficit, decrease in

revenue and increase in appropriations, like pension costs, leading into the layoff. *Jersey City's* effort to address its fiscal situation involved a comprehensive plan that included not only layoffs for positions *Jersey City* felt were non-essential, but furloughs, payroll lags, and alternative healthcare coverage. It also could not be overlooked that hires were solely for critical operational needs and were partially grant-funded. In *re Charles Murray, Kirkland Williams, and Kamei Harris, Jersey City Layoffs*, OAL DKT. Nos. CSV 4958-13, CSV 4959-13, and CSV 4960-13, 2013 N.J. AGEN LEXIS 296, Initial Decision (Oct. 25, 2013).

School district employee who did not assert a good faith challenge to the June 2010 termination of his provisional appointment as Supervisor, Building Service and the simultaneous layoff from his prior permanent position of Recreation Maintenance Worker, both of which layoffs were justified on the grounds of economy and efficiency, when he challenged the application of his layoff rights could not bring a good faith challenge as part of his appeal from a decision that the layoff was proper because such a claim had to be brought within 20 days of his receipt of the final notice of layoff or demotion per N.J.A.C. 4A:8-2.6, which deadline was jurisdictional and could not be relaxed. Moreover, there was a presumption of good faith on the part of the appointing authority; the question is not whether the action actually achieved its purpose of saving money but whether the authority's motive in adopting the action was to accomplish economies or instead to remove a public employee without following N.J.A.C. 4A:8-1.1 et seq. In *re Albert Franchetta, Vineland Sch. Distr.*, CSC Docket No. 2012-2696, 2013 N.J. CSC LEXIS 266, Final Agency Action (April 17, 2013).

An Administrative Law Judge concluded that an employee who had been laid off from her position as code enforcement/zoning officer for a borough failed to show that her layoff was not motivated by true considerations of economy and/or efficiency or was a result of bad faith within the meaning of N.J.A.C. 4A:8-1.1(a), N.J.A.C. 4A:2-1.4(c) and N.J.A.C. 4A:8-2.6(c). The uncontroverted and overwhelming evidence was that the borough did institute a layoff plan at a time when it was increasingly evident that measures had to be taken to confront rising costs and that, as a result of instituting the layoff, it did actually effectuate significant and massive economic benefit to the borough as well as efficiency as a result of the creation of a new interlocal agreement with a neighboring community. An essential consequence thereof was that the types of functions previously performed the employee and/or her assistant were largely re-assigned to others, thereby significantly reducing the borough's direct costs. In *re Cathcart, Borough of Beach Haven*, OAL Dkt. No. CSV 06387-07, AGENCY Dkt. 2007-4151-I, 2010 N.J. AGEN LEXIS 1027, Initial Decision (February 24, 2010).

Employee with permanent title of Children's Supervisor who accepted a position as a Human Services Specialist I with the county appointing authority when the county privatized its Children's Shelter was never laid off; the county rescinded its planned layoff, as all affected employees had accepted alternate employment within the county, and thus the employee's new position was a provisional appointment within current continuous service, pending promotional examination procedures. Therefore, when his provisional appointment was terminated for unsatisfactory performance, the employee was entitled to be returned to his permanent title; if the permanent title was no longer utilized, the county was required to implement layoff procedures, including giving 45 days' notice to the employee. In *re Garcia*, OAL Dkt. No. CSV 11932-07, 2008 N.J. AGEN LEXIS 595, Merit System Board Decision (May 7, 2008).

Initial Decision (2007 N.J. AGEN LEXIS 711) adopted, in which a housing authority manager who was laid off was found to have failed to prove that his layoff was in bad faith. The layoffs were HUD mandated due to a funding reduction and the manager had been given bumping rights that he had not exercised. In *re Cotton*, OAL Dkt. No. CSV 10458-06, 2007 N.J. AGEN LEXIS 1034, Final Decision (December 19, 2007).

Politically motivated layoffs reversed, while layoff due to reasons of economy upheld. In *re City of Orange Layoffs Appeal*, 97 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 639.

Layoff of clerk typist due to economy affirmed. *DiMarco v. Borough of Highlands, Department of Building and Grounds*, 97 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 599.

Demotion in good faith if position not necessary for agency's operation. *Henry, Kennedy and Wise v. Cape May County*, 97 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 147.

Municipality's decision to lay off and replace public employees with private contractors was done in good faith where private contract's savings were rationally related to legitimate governmental purpose. *Conklin and Ollearo v. Township of Milford*, 96 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 755.

Decision to lay off and demote Division of Developmental Disabilities employees was made in good faith for reasons of economy. *Orsati, et al. v. Department of Human Services*, 96 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 743.

Department of Human Services acted in good faith when it imposed department-wide layoffs and demotions of its employees. *Cable, et al. v. Department of Human Services, Central Office*, 96 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 713.

Layoffs and demotions of Division of Family Development employees was done in good faith for reasons of economy. *Ambrass, et al. v. Department of Human Services*, 96 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 696.

Employee layoff determinations which were made in good faith for economic and efficiency reasons were upheld. In the Matter of the Layoffs of *Guzman, et al.*, 96 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 625.

Department of Human Services 1992 layoffs were not motivated by bad faith. In the Matter of *Donna Marrinan, et al.*, 96 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 557.

Department of Human Services acted in good faith when laying off employees due to reduction in its salary account for fiscal 1993. *Cully, et al. v. Department of Human Services*, 96 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 547.

Department of Human Services 1992 layoffs were not motivated by bad faith. *Barker, et al. v. Department of Human Services*, 96 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 539.

City's bona fide reduction of budget deficit supported large-scale layoffs. In the Matter of the City of Newark Layoffs, 96 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 361.

Good-faith layoff action supported by cut in federal salary funding and diminished need for position. *Billings v. City of Perth Amboy*, 96 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 314.

City's otherwise well-motivated layoff decision was not undermined by particularized ill will. *Peters v. City of Orange*, 96 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 227.

Government employer demonstrated good faith in lay-off action by showing necessity for reasons of economy. *Stagliano v. Camden County*, 96 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 215.

Administrative analyst's layoff in good faith when taken pursuant to departmental reorganization plan. *Bowring v. State Department of the Public Advocate*, 96 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 44.

Failure to show bad faith or discrimination defeats state agency personnel specialist's challenge to removal pursuant to reduction in force. *Bhanja v. Department of Personnel*, 96 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 41.

Evidence failed to establish bad faith cause of action in connection with layoffs and demotions in question. *Chepiga v. Mental Health and Hospitals*, 95 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 630.

Demotion of personnel assistants pursuant to reorganization of district under newly formed state operated school system was not in bad faith. *Dowling v. State Operated School District*, 95 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 603.

Demotions for reasons of economy were not arbitrary even though employees performed same tasks in lower positions. *Sowa v. Commerce and Economic Development*, 95 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 589.

Termination of handicapped offset machine operator was not discriminatory, but was in good faith for reasons of economy and efficiency. *Hansell v. Department of Human Services*, 95 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 575.

Layoff of messenger by county clerk's office was in good faith when messenger's functions were performed by a fax machine and other employees. *Barnes v. Camden County*, 95 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 471.

Proof was lacking that reassignment of public defender office investigator was made in bad faith. *Jacobson v. New Jersey Public Defender*, 95 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 342.

Elimination of five water repairer positions to enable two electronic repairmen positions was in good faith for reasons of economy and efficiency. *Caggiano v. Township of Sparta*, 95 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 211.

Animosity towards public employee by others did not preclude layoff for economic reasons when those others had no role in layoff. *Matter of State Department of Corrections 1992 Layoffs*, 95 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 63.

Layoffs and demotions made in good faith. In the *Matter of State Dept. Of Corrections 1992 Employee Layoffs*, 95 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 63.

Employees failed to prove that layoffs and demotions were made in bad faith. In the *Matter of the State Dept. Of Health 1993 F.Y. Layoffs*, 95 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 45.

Reasonable, logical, and good faith efforts to accommodate budgetary reductions meant that layoffs were made in good faith for economic reasons. *Matter of State Department of Health 1993 Layoffs*, 95 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 45.

Layoffs of public employees were not motivated by bad faith, but by economic considerations and were justified. *Edwards v. Department of Community Affairs*, 95 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 29.

Act of councilmen in eliminating public employee's position was not for reasons of animosity, but was for reasons of economy and was justified. *De Prima v. Department of Administration and Finance*, 95 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 20.

Layoff of Director of Planning was in good faith in effort to achieve government economy. *DePrima v. Department of Administration and Finance*, 95 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 20.

Layoffs of pharmacists were made in good faith. *Gordon v. Department of Military and Veterans' Affairs*, 95 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 6.

Layoffs of the pharmacists pursuant to decision of departments to use contractors for pharmaceutical substances rather than in-house pharmacists were justified for economic reasons. *Gordon v. Department of Military and Veterans Affairs*, 95 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 6.

Layoff of employee was proper. *Adewusi v. Atlantic County Department of Administration*, 95 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 5.

Layoff of landscape artist from county land office for reasons of efficiency and economy was not unjustified. *Adewusi v. Atlantic County*, 95 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 3.

Bad faith in eliminating jobs; proof. *Privitera v. Treasury Department*, 94 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 693.

Proof that layoff was instituted for reason other than economy, efficiency or other related reason. *Meybohm v. Treasury Department*, 94 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 665.

No bad faith was established; jobs abolished. In the *Matter of the Essex County Layoffs*, 94 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 601.

Township acted for reasons of efficiency and economy when it laid off employees. *Aiello v. Township of Brick*, 93 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 719.

Layoff of long-time employee was not in bad faith. *Accitelli v. Department of Environmental Protection and Energy*, 93 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 716.

Employees failed to prove that township acted in bad faith in laying them off. *Winslow Township Police Department Communications Operators v. Winslow Township*, 93 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 713.

County department acted for reasons of economy and efficiency in layoff. *LaMorte v. Ocean County Department of Consumer Protection*, 93 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 669.

Good faith elimination of position. *Vida v. Jersey City State College*, 93 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 594.

Elimination of former job title; not bad faith. *Barcheski v. Perth Amboy Department of Public Works*, 93 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 565.

City acted in good faith. In the *Matter of Atlantic City Layoffs*, 93 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 533.

Demotion in lieu of layoff; good faith. *Murphy v. Lacey Township Police Department*, 93 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 487.

Layoff was for economic reasons. *Wright v. Department of Human Services*, 93 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 374.

Department-wide temporary layoffs done in good faith. *Department of Personnel Employees v. Department of Personnel*, 93 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 328.

Excessive absenteeism and lateness warranted removal. *Thomas v. Bergen Pines County Hospital*, 93 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 316.

City utility department eliminated position in good faith. *Rudolph v. Egg Harbor City Utility Department*, 93 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 313.

Good faith lay off. *Dobiles v. Union County*, 93 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 274.

Elimination of code enforcement officer position was in bad faith. *Sholty v. Bloomfield Township Department of Community Development and Inspections*, 93 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 221.

Layoff of borough engineering aid was in "good faith". *Wudecki v. Fair Lawn Department of Engineering*, 93 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 164.

Division of Motor Vehicles acted in "good faith". *Field Monitors v. Division of Motor Vehicles*, 93 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 103.

Layoff was result of compliance with environmental protection laws; laid off workers lacked necessary skills. *Towns v. Carteret Borough Sewage Disposal Plant*, 93 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 99.

Layoff of city employee was in good faith. *Chadwick v. Township of Lakewood*, 93 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 61.

Layoff was for reasons of economy. *Cope v. Township of Parsippany-Troy Hills*, 93 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 6.

Layoff; good-faith necessity to achieve economy. In the *Matter of Bergen County Layoffs*, 92 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 761.

Layoff was in good faith. *Jones v. New Jersey Board of Regulatory Commissioners*, 92 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 743.

Layoff of employees done in good faith. *Boker v. City of Long Branch*, 92 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 661.

Layoff was for political reason. *Johnston v. Camden County*, 92 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 617.

Layoff of director of occupational therapy was in good faith for reasons of economy. *Gaines et al. v. Vineland Developmental Center*, 92 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 516.

Layoff of administrative analyst was in good faith for reasons of economy. *Exter v. Dept. of Commerce & Economic Development*, 92 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 514.

Department of Human Services employee failed to establish that Department's decision to eliminate position was taken in bad faith. *Frizino v. Department of Human Services*, 92 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 428.

Laying off of parking enforcement officer was based in good faith. *Moore v. Township of Middletown*, 92 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 420.

School employee's layoff was for reasons of economy, efficiency, or other related reasons. *Sparany v. Brick Township School District*, 92 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 396.

Layoff of former assistant violations clerk of borough's department of revenue and finance was not taken in good faith for reason of economy, efficiency. *Glab v. Borough of Belmar*, 92 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 377.

City acted in good faith when data processing manager was laid off. *Baldwin v. Department of Financial Management, Ocean City*, 92 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 367.

Layoff; good faith. *Dimaria v. Department of Human Services*, 92 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 238.

"Good faith" layoff. *Davis v. Department of Central Services, Camden County*, 92 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 190.

Layoff; purposes of economy and efficiency. *Wooten v. Hillside Police Dept.*, 92 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 176.

There was no bad faith on the part of the appointing authority with respect to layoff rights. *Loughrey v. McCorkle Training School*, 92 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 13.

Layoff was in good faith. N.J.S.A. 11A:8-1, 11A:8-4. *Freeman v. City of East Orange*, 91 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 7.

Municipal layoff of permanent employees improper; proper procedures not followed; burden of proof lies with employee (citing former N.J.A.C. 4:1-16.3 and 16.6). *Clark v. City of Paterson*, 6 N.J.A.R. 25 (1980).

Layoff in bad faith; employees may be laid off for purposes of economy; however, CETA employees may not replace permanent employees (citing former N.J.A.C. 4:1-16.1); emergency, temporary, provisional and probationary employees must be laid off prior to permanent employees (citing former N.J.A.C. 4:1-16.2); lay off for economic purposes not to be in bad faith (citing former N.J.A.C. 4:1-16.3). *Tyler et al. v. City of Paterson*, 2 N.J.A.R. 272 (1979).

4A:8-1.1A (Reserved)

Emergency New Rule, R.2009 d.133, effective March 25, 2009 (to expire May 24, 2009).

See: 41 N.J.R. 1535(a).

Adopted concurrent new rule, R.2009 d.206, effective May 24, 2009, with changes effective June 15, 2009.

See: 41 N.J.R. 1535(a), 41 N.J.R. 2459(a).

In (b), substituted "safety and welfare," for "and safety" and "protection, law enforcement, fire safety" for "welfare, law enforcement"; and in (e), substituted "Leave an employee takes under the State Family Leave Act (see N.J.S.A. 34:11B-1 et seq.) or the Federal Family and Medical Leave Act (see 42 U.S.C. §§12101 et seq.)" for "A Federal Family and Medical Leave Act leave or other leave for medical or family reasons".

Repealed by R.2009 d.382, effective December 21, 2009.

See: 41 N.J.R. 3139(a), 41 N.J.R. 4701(a).

Section was "Temporary layoffs".

4A:8-1.2 Alternatives to layoff

(a) In State service, appointing authorities shall lessen the possibility of layoffs by offering and implementing, as appropriate, voluntary alternatives.

(b) In local service, appointing authorities should lessen the possibility of layoffs by considering voluntary alternatives.

(c) Alternatives to layoff may include, but are not limited to:

1. Granting of leaves of absence without pay to permanent employees, without loss of seniority for purposes of this Title, subject to the approval of the Department of Personnel;

2. Granting voluntary furloughs to employees (see N.J.A.C. 4A:6-1.23);

3. Allowing voluntary reduction of work hours by employees, which may include job sharing arrangements;

4. Providing employees with optional temporary demotional title changes; and

5. Other appropriate actions to avoid a layoff.

(d) Employee participation in alternatives is voluntary. Should a layoff occur despite alternative measures, employee layoff rights shall not be diminished by their participation in any such alternative measure; that is, the employee will be considered to have been serving in the original title and earning seniority in that title.

(e) Appointing authorities should consult with affected negotiations representatives prior to offering alternatives to layoff.

(f) Appointing authorities shall submit a plan for alternatives to layoff and obtain approval from the Department of Personnel prior to implementation. The plan shall include time periods for all alternatives, a statement of the employees' right to be restored to prior status should a layoff occur during such time periods, and summaries of employee status and salary at the conclusion of time periods.

Amended by R.1995 d.251, effective May 15, 1995.

See: 27 N.J.R. 612(a), 27 N.J.R. 1967(b).

Petition for Rulemaking.

See: 41 N.J.R. 3850(b).

Petition for Rulemaking.

See: 42 N.J.R. 1911(a).

Case Notes

Despite evidence of the mayor's animus toward a recycling coordinator, the decision to close the municipal recycling bureau was not a bad-faith pretext for removing the coordinator from his position; the fact that everyone in the bureau was relocated except for the coordinator did not require a finding of bad faith because the individuals who received transfers to other departments included laborers and drivers that the City needed in other areas, and the one other supervisor who was reassigned was simply given the position he held before joining the bureau (rejecting 2006 N.J. AGEN LEXIS 359). In re Mack, OAL Dkt. No.

CSV 562-05, 2006 N.J. AGEN LEXIS 1118, Final Decision (December 6, 2006), *aff'd per curiam*, No. A-2606-06T2, 2008 N.J. Super. Unpub. LEXIS 2302 (App.Div. March 20, 2008).

Demotions of fire department personnel due to reasons of economy affirmed. Layoffs, City of East Orange Fire Department, 97 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 666.

Termination of security officer due to reasons of economy and efficiency affirmed. *Alexander v. Town of Boonton Housing Authority*, 97 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 579.

Reduction in hours of county's Cultural and Heritage Commission employees was done in good faith for reasons of economy and efficiency. *Bogutz, et al. v. Camden County*, 96 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 574.

Labor relations specialist failed to prove that demotion in lieu of lay-off was motivated by bad faith. *Crooms v. Newark School District*, 94 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 73.

Salary reductions; good faith. *Moynihan v. Borough of Belmar*, 92 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 172.

4A:8-1.3 Pre-layoff actions

(a) Appointing authorities shall lessen the possibility, extent or impact of layoffs by implementing, as appropriate, pre-layoff actions which may include, but are not limited to:

1. Initiating a temporary hiring and/or promotion freeze;
2. Separating non-permanent employees;
3. Returning provisional employees to their permanent titles;
4. Reassigning employees; and
5. Assisting potentially affected employees in securing transfers or other employment.

(b) The appointing authority shall to the extent possible lessen the impact of any layoff action on permanent employees by first placing employees without permanent status, and then those with the least seniority, in positions being vacated, reclassified or abolished.

(c) Appointing authorities shall consult with affected negotiations representatives prior to initiating measures under this section.

(d) Upon request by an appointing authority, assistance may be provided by the Department of Personnel in implementing pre-layoff measures.

Amended by R.2000 d.12, effective January 3, 2000.
See: 31 N.J.R. 2827(a), 32 N.J.R. 39(a).

Rewrote (d).

Amended by R.2003 d.304, effective August 4, 2003.
See: 35 N.J.R. 345(a), 35 N.J.R. 3551(b).

Rewrote (b) through (d).

Petition for Rulemaking.

See: 41 N.J.R. 3850(b).

Petition for Rulemaking.

See: 42 N.J.R. 1911(a).

Case Notes

Township conducted appropriate pre-layoff actions prior to submitting a layoff plan including by assisting potentially affected employees in securing transfers or other employment and consulting with the representatives of groups affected by the layoffs prior to

initiating them. Moreover, because the evidence supported a finding that the layoff plan was instituted for the purpose of accomplishing economy and efficiency, the employees failed to establish that the township had proceeded in bad faith. In re Bertoldi, Twp. of West Orange, Police Dep't., OAL DKT. NO. CSV 04882-11, 2014 N.J. CSC LEXIS 370, Final Administrative Determination (April 9, 2014).

Although police officers asserted that they were chosen for layoffs in bad faith, an administrative law judge concluded that the township initiated the layoff of permanent employees for economy and efficiency and it conducted the layoff in accordance with Civil Service Guidelines pursuant to N.J.A.C. 4A:8-1.3. Layoffs and demotions occurred in numerous departments, not just the police department. The township proposed concessions that would have prevented layoffs and demotion. Though the concessions would have had a serious financial impact upon personnel, the size of the impact was not determined by an invidious motive, but rather calculated to offset the projected budget deficit, which certainly was in the public interest of the citizens. Further the members and officers of the police department who were demoted or laid off were not chosen based upon their union activities, political affiliation, race, gender or age. In re Barbella, et al., Twp. of West Orange 2011 Layoffs Police Dep't., OAL DKT. No. 2011-4260, 2014 N.J. AGEN LEXIS 32, Initial Decision (February 26, 2014).

Division of Classification and Personnel Management did not err in determining an employee's layoff rights pursuant to N.J.A.C. 4A:8-1.3. As a result of her layoff from her permanent position based on the closing of her layoff unit, the Cumberland Manor, there were no lateral or demotional displacement rights that could be afforded to the employee. She did not have any rights to a position beyond the Cumberland Manor in another layoff unit. The fact that a different appointing authority offered another employee with less seniority a vacant position did not evidence a misapplication of her title rights under N.J.A.C. 4A:8-1.6(f)1. In re Rosemary Coleman, Cumberland Cnty., CSC Dkt. No. 2013-1937, 2013 N.J. CSC LEXIS 830, Final Decision (September 19, 2013).

There was no bad faith in displacement of employee. *Snyder v. Department of Human Services*, 92 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 709.

4A:8-1.4 Review by Department of Personnel

(a) At least 30 days prior to issuance of layoff notices, or such other period as permitted by the Department of Personnel, the following information shall be submitted by an appointing authority to the Department of Personnel:

1. The reason for the layoff;
2. The projected effective date of layoff;
3. Sample copies of the layoff notice and the projected date for issuance;
4. The number of positions (including position numbers in State service) by title to be vacated, reclassified, or abolished and the names, status, layoff units, locations and, as of the effective date of the layoff, permanent titles of employees initially affected, including employees on leave;
5. The vacant positions in the layoff unit (including position numbers in State service) that the appointing authority is willing to fill as of the effective date of the layoff;
6. A detailed explanation of all alternative and pre-layoff actions that have been taken, or have been considered and determined inapplicable;

7. A summary of consultations with affected negotiations representatives; and

8. A list of affected negotiations representatives, including addresses and the units they represent.

(b) In local jurisdictions having a performance evaluation program approved by the Department of Personnel, the appointing authority shall also submit the names of permanent employees who have received a rating below Commendable or equivalent in their permanent title within the 12-month period preceding the effective date of the layoff.

(c) Following submission of the information required in (a) above, all vacant positions identified in (a) 5 above shall be filled, except under exceptional circumstances with the approval of the Commissioner, and may only be filled through layoff procedures.

(d) Upon review of the information required to be submitted in (a) and (b) above, or in the absence of timely submission of such information, the Commissioner may take appropriate remedial action, including:

1. Requiring submission of additional or corrected information;
2. Providing needed assistance to the appointing authority;
3. Directing implementation of appropriate alternative or pre-layoff measures; or
4. Directing necessary changes in the layoff notice, which may include the effective date of the layoff.

(e) Upon approval of the layoff plan, the Department of Personnel shall provide affected negotiations representatives with a copy of the plan as it affects their represented employees.

Amended by R.1995 d.251, effective May 15, 1995.

See: 27 N.J.R. 612(a), 27 N.J.R. 1967(b).

Amended by R.2000 d.12, effective January 3, 2000.

See: 31 N.J.R. 2827(a), 32 N.J.R. 39(a).

In (a), deleted a former 4, and recodified former 5 through 9 as 4 through 8; in (b), substituted "below Commendable" for "of Marginally Below Standards or Significantly Below Standards" following "rating"; and in (c), made an internal reference change.

Petition for Rulemaking.

See: 41 N.J.R. 3850(b).

Petition for Rulemaking.

See: 42 N.J.R. 1911(a).

Case Notes

Municipal ordinance allocating to mayor authority to lay off subordinates of municipal clerk did not violate doctrine of separation of powers. City Council, City of Orange Tp. v. Brown, 249 N.J.Super. 185, 592 A.2d 260 (A.D.1991).

Appointing authority failed to follow established layoff procedures when it did not submit to the Civil Service Commission for prior approval prior a layoff plan, which delineated the reason for the layoff, the projected date of the layoff, the number of positions affected, the names of employees to be affected, and the explanation of all alternative and pre-layoff actions that had been taken and considered. Thus, the

Commission ordered it to submit a layoff plan to the Division of Classification and Personnel Management as well as submitting the information required in N.J.A.C. 4A:8-1.4(a). Because certain employees did not receive written notice of their layoffs pursuant to N.J.A.C. 4A:8-1.6(a), they were entitled to 45 days' mitigated back pay. In re William Hendrickson and Thomas Van Gorder, Vernon Twp., CSC Dkt. Nos. 2012-1772 and 2012-1773, 2013 N.J. CSC LEXIS 139 Civil Service Comm'n Decision (January 24, 2013).

4A:8-1.5 Layoff units and job locations

(a) In State service, the layoff unit shall be a department or autonomous agency and include all programs administered by that department or agency. An autonomous agency is one which is in, but not under the supervision of, a principal department.

(b) In the Judiciary, the layoff unit shall be a vicinage or the Central Office and include all programs administered by that vicinage or Central Office.

(c) In local service, the layoff unit shall be a department in a county or municipality, an entire autonomous agency (see N.J.A.C. 4A:8-2.1(c)1i), or an entire school district. However, prior to the time set by N.J.A.C. 4A:8-1.4 for submission of information to the Civil Service Commission, a different layoff unit consisting of one or more departments may be approved by the Chair/CEO of the Civil Service Commission under the following procedures:

1. A request may be submitted by an appointing authority to the Chair/CEO or the matter may be initiated by the Chair/CEO.

2. Notice of the request shall be provided by the appointing authority to affected negotiations representatives upon submission to the Chair/CEO.

3. After receipt of the request, the Chair/CEO shall specify a period of time, which in no event shall be less than 20 days, during which affected employees and negotiations representatives may submit written comment and recommendations.

4. Thereafter, the Chair/CEO shall issue a determination approving, modifying or rejecting the proposed layoff unit, after considering:

- i. The need for a unit larger than a department;
- ii. The functional and organizational structure of the local jurisdiction;
- iii. The number of employees, funding source and job titles in the proposed unit;
- iv. The effect upon employee layoff rights; and
- v. The impact upon service to departmental clientele and the public.

(d) In State service, the Chair/CEO shall determine job locations within each department or autonomous agency.

1. Each job location shall consist of a county.

2. The Chair/CEO shall assign a job location to every facility and office within a department or autonomous agency.

3. In the Judiciary, each vicinage, and the Central Office, shall be considered a separate job location.

4. See N.J.A.C. 4A:8-2.2 for exercise of lateral and demotional rights within job locations. See N.J.A.C. 4A:8-2.3 for exercise of special reemployment rights within job locations.

(e) In local service, the entire political subdivision is the job location and includes any facility operated by the political subdivision outside its geographic borders.

Amended by R.1995 d.251, effective May 15, 1995.

See: 27 N.J.R. 612(a), 27 N.J.R. 1967(b).

Amended by R.2000 d.12, effective January 3, 2000.

See: 31 N.J.R. 2827(a), 32 N.J.R. 39(a).

Rewrote (a).

Amended by R.2003 d.304, effective August 4, 2003.

See: 35 N.J.R. 345(a), 35 N.J.R. 3551(b).

Rewrote (a).

Petition for Rulemaking.

See: 41 N.J.R. 4833(b).

Petition for Rulemaking.

See: 42 N.J.R. 1085(a).

Amended by R.2010 d.221, effective October 18, 2010.

See: 42 N.J.R. 1278(a), 42 N.J.R. 2406(a).

Added new (b); recodified former (b) through (d) as (d) through (e); in the introductory paragraph of (c), substituted "Civil Service Commission" for "Department of Personnel" and "Chair/CEO of the Civil Service Commission" for "Commissioner"; in (c)1 through (c)4, substituted "Chair/CEO" for "Commissioner" throughout; in the introductory paragraph of (d) and in (d)2, substituted "Chair/CEO" for "Commissioner of Personnel"; added new (d)3; and recodified former (d)3 as (d)4.

Case Notes

Commissioner of Personnel's failure to consider factors other than the effect on those adversely impacted at the Board of Public Utilities by the potential expansion of the Department of Environmental Protection layoff unit to include the Board of Public Utilities required remand for reconsideration by the Commissioner of her decision denying the Department of Environmental Protection rate analysts' petition to expand layoff unit to include the Board of Public Utilities. In re Donohue, 329 N.J.Super. 488, 748 A.2d 598 (N.J.Super.A.D. 2000).

The Division of Classification and Personnel Management correctly determined that an employee who was a former building service worker in a county nursing home that was closing did not have any displacement rights. First, her permanent title had no demotional rights. Although the title had lateral rights per N.J.A.C. 4A:8-2.1, there were no employees in her layoff unit, which was determined per N.J.A.C. 4A:8-1.5(c) to be the county department of human services, for her to displace. Nor were there any employees active in the employee's prior held title, so there were no displacement opportunities under N.J.A.C. 4A:8-2.2(f). In re Doty et al., Sussex Cnty., CSC Docket Nos. 2013-932, 2013-1049 (Consolidated), 2013 N.J. CSC LEXIS 1156, Final Administrative Determination (December 4, 2013).

Employee's layoff from the title of Road Inspector was affirmed. Contrary to his argument that prior-held demotional title rights extended beyond the layoff unit, N.J.S.A. 11A:8-1(f) and N.J.A.C. 4A:8-2.2(c) clearly mandated that prior-held demotional title rights were within the layoff unit. Because the layoff had already occurred and it was determined that the employee did not have prior held title rights outside of his layoff unit, no basis existed under N.J.A.C. 4A:8-1.5(c)1 to consider a request to expand the layoff unit. In re Grady Butts, Salem Cnty., CSC Dkt. No. 2013-238, 2013 N.J. CSC LEXIS 573, Final Decision (June 28, 2013).

4A:8-1.6 Layoff notice

(a) No permanent employee or employee serving in a working test period shall be separated or demoted as a result of a layoff action without having been served by the appointing authority, at least 45 days prior to the action, with a written notice personally, unless the employee is on a leave of absence or otherwise unavailable, in which case by certified mail. If service is by certified mail, the 45 days shall be counted from the first date of notice by the United States Postal Service to addressee. A notice shall also be conspicuously posted in all affected facilities of the layoff unit. A copy of the notice serviced on employees shall be provided to the Department of Personnel and affected negotiations representatives.

1. In State service, the Commissioner may order a greater period of time for written notice to employees.

(b) The notice shall contain the following:

1. The effective date of the layoff action; and
2. The reason for the layoff.

(c) The appointing authority shall be responsible for keeping records of those employees receiving the layoff notice.

(d) A layoff shall not take place more than 120 days after service of the notice unless an extension of time is granted by the Commissioner for good cause. If a layoff has not taken place within 120 days of service of the notice, and no extension has been granted, new notices must be served at least 45 days prior to the effective date of the layoff.

(e) Layoff rights and related seniority determinations (see N.J.A.C. 4A:8-2) shall be based upon the scheduled effective date of a layoff. These determinations shall remain applicable even if the effective date of the layoff is extended. However, when the scheduled effective date is extended, the appointing authority shall notify the Department of Personnel of employees who successfully complete their working test periods prior to displacement. The Department of Personnel shall then redetermine only the special reemployment rights to reflect the newly attained permanent status.

(f) Following determination of layoff rights by the Department of Personnel, permanent and probationary employees affected by a layoff action shall be served with a final written notice of their status, including a statement of appeal rights.

1. Employees notified of their separation from service due to layoff shall be informed of vacancies in other State departments or agencies, to which an employee, if qualified and if rated Commendable or above in the most recent final PAR rating (or equivalent), shall have a right to accept an appointment in lieu of separation. Should an employee accept an appointment to such a vacancy in lieu of separation, the employee shall forfeit any special reemployment rights that he or she would have had.

Amended by R.1995 d.251, effective May 15, 1995.

See: 27 N.J.R. 612(a), 27 N.J.R. 1967(b).

Amended by R.2000 d.12, effective January 3, 2000.

See: 31 N.J.R. 2827(a), 32 N.J.R. 39(a).

In (e), inserted a reference to merit points determinations in the first sentence; and in (f), added 1.

Amended by R.2003 d.304, effective August 4, 2003.

See: 35 N.J.R. 345(a), 35 N.J.R. 3551(b).

In (e), deleted "and merit points" following "seniority".

Amended by R.2009 d.41, effective January 20, 2009.

See: 40 N.J.R. 4381(a), 41 N.J.R. 399(b).

In (f)1, inserted "(or equivalent)".

Case Notes

Insufficient notification of charges. Dept. of Law and Public Safety v. Miller, 115 N.J.Super. 122, 278 A.2d 495 (App.Div.1971).

School district employee who was laid off from a school district under the district's lay off plan did not provide sufficient evidence to refute the presumption that she received a 45-day notice of the layoff as required by N.J.A.C. 4A:8-1.6(a) because the appointing authority asserted that it mailed the notice via certified and regular mail, there was no evidence that the regular mail notice was returned or that the employee had changed her address, and there was no other evidence to support a finding that the employee did not receive the notice via regular mail. In re Barnes-Williams, Newark Sch. Dist., CSC Dkt. No. 2013-1072, 2013 N.J. CSC LEXIS 1198, Final Admin. Determination (November 21, 2013).

Layoff rights of several employees who had various positions with a city school district were properly determined on findings that the workers were properly notified of their layoff by notice of layoff letters that were sent at least 45 days prior to the date on which the layoff was effective and that the school district, as required, had met with representatives of the union that represented the workers. In re Concepcion, et al., Newark Sch. Dist., CSC Docket No. 2013-693, 2013 N.J. CSC LEXIS 1167, Final Administrative Decision (November 21, 2013).

Layoff rights of several employees who were custodial workers with a city school district were properly determined on findings that the workers were properly notified of their layoff by notice of layoff letters that were sent at least 45 days prior to the date on which the layoff was effective, that the school district, as required, had met with representatives of the union that represented the workers and that the workers were the least senior employees in the title and therefore had no bumping rights. In re Beaton, et al., Newark Sch. Dist., CSC Docket No. 2013-691, 2013 N.J. CSC LEXIS 1163, Final Administrative Decision (November 21, 2013).

Division of Classification and Personnel Management did not err in determining an employee's layoff rights pursuant to N.J.A.C. 4A:8-1.3. As a result of her layoff from her permanent position based on the closing of her layoff unit, the Cumberland Manor, there were no lateral or demotional displacement rights that could be afforded to the employee. She did not have any rights to a position beyond the Cumberland Manor in another layoff unit. The fact that a different appointing authority offered another employee with less seniority a vacant position did not evidence a misapplication of her title rights under N.J.A.C. 4A:8-1.6(f)1. In re Rosemary Coleman, Cumberland Cnty., CSC Dkt. No. 2013-1937, 2013 N.J. CSC LEXIS 830, Final Decision (September 19, 2013).

Appointing authority failed to follow established layoff procedures when it did not submit to the Civil Service Commission for prior approval prior a layoff plan, which delineated the reason for the layoff, the projected date of the layoff, the number of positions affected, the names of employees to be affected, and the explanation of all alternative and pre-layoff actions that had been taken and considered. Thus, the Commission ordered it to submit a layoff plan to the Division of Classification and Personnel Management as well as submitting the information required in N.J.A.C. 4A:8-1.4(a). Because certain employees did not receive written notice of their layoffs pursuant to N.J.A.C.

4A:8-1.6(a), they were entitled to 45 days' mitigated back pay. In re William Hendrickson and Thomas Van Gorder, Vernon Twp., CSC Dkt. Nos. 2012-1772 and 2012-1773, 2013 N.J. CSC LEXIS 139 Civil Service Comm'n Decision (January 24, 2013).

Even though a laid-off employee failed to carry his burden to show that his layoff was not in good faith, such a finding did not impair the employee's right, per N.J.A.C. 4A:8-1.6, to receive 45 days' written notice of the layoff. In re Newark Housing Auth. 2006, OAL DKT. NO. CSV12563-07, AGENCY DKT. 2007-894, 2008 N.J. AGEN LEXIS 1517, Initial Decision (May 1, 2008).

In an appeal of a layoff decision from a housing authority, an administrative law judge concluded that the laid off employee had been appropriately compensated for back pay. Although the employee did not receive 45 days' notice of the layoff as required under New Jersey law, the employee received his salary for a period from September 1, 2006 until December 18, 2006, the effective day of the layoff and was thus compensated for the notice period. In re Newark Hous. Auth. 2006 OAL Dkt. No. CSV12563-07, 2008 N.J. AGEN LEXIS 1517, Initial Decision (May 1, 2008).

Appointing authority was not required to reinstate a worker upon the Board's modification and reduction of his disciplinary penalty because the appointing authority had implemented a reduction in work force, which would have resulted in the worker's layoff; because the worker's back pay encompassed the period in which he would have received the required 45-day notice of layoff if he had not been terminated, there was no need for an additional 45-day notice. In re Rogers, OAL Dkt. No. CSV 6535-06, 2007 N.J. AGEN LEXIS 1149, Merit System Board Decision (July 25, 2007).

Employer's lay off procedure triggers additional salary award to laid-off employees for failure to comply with state's notice requirements. Baylor, et al. v. Phillipsburg Municipal Utilities Authority, 97 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 78.

SUBCHAPTER 2. EMPLOYEE LAYOFF RIGHTS

4A:8-2.1 Types of layoff rights

(a) A lateral title right means the right of a permanent employee to exercise displacement rights as set forth in N.J.A.C. 4A:8-2.2 against an employee in the layoff unit holding a title determined to be the same or comparable to the affected title of the employee. For a probationary employee, a lateral title right means the right to fill a vacant position or displace a provisional or probationary employee in the same title. Title comparability shall be determined by the Department of Personnel based on the following criteria:

1. The title(s) shall have substantially similar duties and responsibilities and the same class code;
2. The education and experience requirements for the title(s) are the same or similar and the mandatory requirements shall not exceed those of the affected title;
3. There shall be no special skills, licenses, certification or registration requirements which are not also mandatory for the affected title; and
4. Any employee in the affected title with minimal training and orientation could perform the duties of the designated title by virtue of having qualified for the affected title.

(b) A demotional title right means the right of a permanent employee to exercise displacement rights as set forth in N.J.A.C. 4A:8-2.2 against an employee in the layoff unit holding a title determined to be lower than but related to the affected title of the employee. Demotional title rights shall be determined by the Department of Personnel based on the following criteria:

1. The title(s) shall have lower but substantially similar duties and responsibilities and, where applicable, a lower class code;
2. The education and experience requirements for the title(s) shall be similar and the mandatory requirements shall not exceed those of the affected title;
3. Special skills, licenses, certification or registration requirements shall be similar and not exceed those which are mandatory for the affected title; and
4. Any employee in the affected title with minimal training and orientation could perform the duties of the designated title by virtue of having qualified for the affected title.

(c) A special reemployment right means the right of a permanent employee, based on his or her permanent title at the time of the layoff action, to be certified for reappointment after the layoff action to the same, lateral and lower related titles. Special reemployment rights shall be determined by the Department of Personnel in the same manner as lateral and demotional rights.

1. A special reemployment list from one governmental jurisdiction shall not be certified to another jurisdiction.
 - i. In local service, for purposes of this chapter, an autonomous agency shall be considered a separate jurisdiction. An autonomous agency is one which, by statute, is a body corporate and has the powers of an appointing authority.
 - ii. In State service, the entire State government constitutes a single jurisdiction.

(d) Employees serving in a specialized credential variant title shall have title rights based upon the special credentialing, provided that the employees are serving in a specialized credential variant title on or before submission of the layoff plan, see N.J.A.C. 4A:8-1.4. Specialized credentialing shall be based upon at least one of the following, upon approval by the Department of Personnel:

1. Licensure or certification;
2. Specialized education;
3. Specialized client-based or program experience; or
4. Service as a trainee in a specialized area of operation leading to advancement to a primary title with specialized credentialing.

(e) Affected negotiations representatives shall be given reasonable notice and permitted to be present at any meeting with individual employees where layoff rights are discussed.

(f) See N.J.A.C. 4A:8-2.2 for the exercise of lateral and demotional title rights, and see N.J.A.C. 4A:8-2.3 for the exercise of special reemployment rights.

Amended by R.1994 d.441, effective September 6, 1994.

See: 26 N.J.R. 2182(a), 26 N.J.R. 3705(b).

Amended by R.1995 d.251, effective May 15, 1995.

See: 27 N.J.R. 612(a), 27 N.J.R. 1967(b).

Amended by R.2009 d.41, effective January 20, 2009.

See: 40 N.J.R. 4381(a), 41 N.J.R. 399(b).

In (a)1, deleted “, in State service,” following “responsibilities and”; and in (b)1, deleted “in State service,” following “responsibilities and.”

Case Notes

County prosecutor's office and other offices of county governmental structure were “one governmental jurisdiction”, and eligible persons on county-wide special reemployment list were entitled to fill positions in county prosecutor's office and to displace provisional appointees. Matter of Chief Clerk, 282 N.J.Super. 530, 660 A.2d 1217 (A.D.1995).

Employee's appeal of the determination of her layoff rights was untimely pursuant to N.J.A.C. 4A:2-1.1(b). She was aware of the determination when she received notification of her separation from employment, but she did not file an appeal requesting to be placed on the Special Reemployment List (SRL) until over a year after the layoff. Even if the merits of the matter were considered, she failed to show that the Division of State and Local Operations did not properly apply the uniform regulatory criteria found in N.J.A.C. 4A:8-2.1 et seq. She was not permanent in the title Social Worker 2 at the time of her displacement and, therefore, could not be placed on an SRL for that title. In re Tysen Graham, Dep't. of Human Serv., CSC DKT. No. 2014-658, 2013 N.J. CSC LEXIS 1089, Final Decision (December 6, 2013).

The Division of Classification and Personnel Management correctly determined that an employee who was a former building service worker in a county nursing home that was closing did not have any displacement rights. First, her permanent title had no demotional rights. Although the title had lateral rights per N.J.A.C. 4A:8-2.1, there were no employees in her layoff unit, which was determined per N.J.A.C. 4A:8-1.5(c) to be the county department of human services, for her to displace. Nor were there any employees active in the employee's prior held title, so there were no displacement opportunities under N.J.A.C. 4A:8-2.2(f). In re Doty et al., Sussex Cnty., CSC Docket Nos. 2013-932, 2013-1049 (Consolidated), 2013 N.J. CSC LEXIS 1156, Final Administrative Determination (December 4, 2013).

The Civil Service Commission found, based upon a review of the record, that a school district properly determined and applied the employee's layoff rights, as required by N.J.A.C. 4A:8-2.1, and N.J.A.C. 4A:8-2.6(a)2, because there were no lateral or demotional positions in the layoff unit available for bumping rights under the employee's permanent title of Community Aide/Teacher's Aide. The employee's argument that her seniority and displacement rights were violated was without merit because the employee had not established that she had title rights to any positions encumbered by any other employees in the school district. In re Barnes-Williams, Newark Sch. Dist., CSC Dkt. No. 2013-1072, 2013 N.J. CSC LEXIS 1198, Final Admin. Determination (November 21, 2013).

Layoff rights of several employees who had various positions with a city school district were properly determined on findings that the workers were properly notified of their layoff by notice of layoff letters that were sent at least 45 days prior to the date on which the layoff was effective and that the school district, as required, had met with representatives of the union that represented the workers. In re Concepcion, et al., Newark Sch. Dist., CSC Docket No. 2013-693, 2013 N.J. CSC LEXIS 1167, Final Administrative Decision (November 21, 2013).

Layoff rights of several employees who were custodial workers with a city school district were properly determined on findings that the workers were properly notified of their layoff by notice of layoff letters that were sent at least 45 days prior to the date on which the layoff was effective, that the school district, as required, had met with representatives of the union that represented the workers and that the workers were the least senior employees in the title and therefore had no bumping rights. In re Beaton, et al., Newark Sch. Dist., CSC Docket No. 2013-691, 2013 N.J. CSC LEXIS 1163, Final Administrative Decision (November 21, 2013).

Two employees were properly determined by the Division of Classification and Personnel Management pursuant to N.J.A.C. 4A:8-2.1(a) and (b) based on their permanent titles of Laboratory Technician. They did not have layoff rights to the title of Medical Record Clerk since they never held that title permanently. Although one employee held the title of Medical Record Clerk provisionally, she had no vested right to that title since she was not permanent in that title. Contrary to the employees' arguments that they held the title of Medical Record Clerk since 2002, they did not take an examination administered by the Civil Service Commission for the title of Medical Record Clerk. There were no lateral or demotional positions in the layoff unit for the employees to exercise any bumping rights. In re Michelle Gatling and Kim Sharpe, Newark Sch. Dist., CSC Dkt. Nos. 2013-741, 2013-697, 2013 N.J. CSC LEXIS 903, Final Order (October 3, 2013).

County was not entitled to an order cancelling a certification for Computer Service Technician (C0562M), Middlesex County, that was issued in connection with a provisional appointment made to the subject title by the county's board of social services. Though the board of social services was an autonomous agency within the meaning of N.J.A.C. 4A:4-3.7(e), N.J.A.C. 4A:8-2.1(c)1i and N.J.A.C. 4A:1-1.3, an eligible list that was formulated in connection with a position within the board of social services applied to all positions in the county. The only exception to this rule involved special reemployment lists which were treated differently. Because the list at issue here was not a special reemployment list, the county was required to utilize the eligible list that was issued in connection with the board of social services. In re Computer Serv. Technician (C0562M), Middlesex Cnty., CSC Docket No. 2013-2299, 2013 N.J. CSC LEXIS 854, Final Administrative Action (August 16, 2013).

Title rights of a former Tree Maintenance worker were correctly determined by the Division of State and Local Operations pursuant to N.J.A.C. 4A:8-2.1 et seq. The worker provided no substantive evidence that his layoff rights were improperly calculated, and while he alleged that two other individuals were currently employed and working, he provided no evidence in support of these allegations. In re William Owens, City of Trenton, CSC Dkt. No. 2012-573, 2013 N.J. CSC LEXIS 574, Final Decision (June 26, 2013).

The issue of title comparability that is the subject of N.J.A.C. 4A:4-7.1A(c)2 is significant in the context of the intergovernmental transfer program given the substantial rights afforded to a participant in the program. For example, N.J.A.C. 4A:8-2.4(a) provides that an employee's continuous service accumulated prior to an intergovernmental transfer shall be considered as continuous permanent service in the jurisdiction for layoff purposes. Thus, if two different titles involved in an intergovernmental transfer are determined to be substantially similar, for layoff purposes, seniority for determining lateral, demotional and special reemployment rights would include all time in the previous jurisdiction. Therefore, to permit an intergovernmental transfer involving two titles that are not substantially similar could have the effect of inappropriately expanding the transferee's lateral and demotional title rights in the new jurisdiction. Indeed, the determination of lateral and demotional title rights under N.J.A.C. 4A:8-2.1 utilizes the exact same criteria listed in N.J.A.C. 4A:4-7.1A(c). Accordingly, the rules governing the determination whether titles involved in an intergovernmental transfer are substantially similar are strictly construed. In re Diane M. Cannatella, Dep't of Human Servs., CSC Dkt. No. 2013-2834, 2013 N.J. CSC LEXIS 623, Final Decision (May 16, 2013).

Employee whose name was placed on a special reemployment list for various positions including Mechanic Helper and Laborer 1 due to the

circumstances of his layoff had no right to be appointed to the position of Mechanic because it was classified as a higher level title than either Mechanic Helper or Laborer 1. Because N.J.A.C. 4A:8-2.1 provides that only lateral or demotional displacement rights may be exercised to titles with substantially similar duties and responsibilities, such rights did not exist as to the Mechanic title, which was classified at a higher level than either Mechanic Helper or Laborer 1. In re Harold Nugent, Brick Twp., CSC Docket No. 2013-251, 2013 N.J. CSC LEXIS 197, Final Agency Action (April 17, 2013).

A senior security guard with a city's recreation and natural resource department prevailed on his claim that while the Division of State and Local Operations (SLO) correctly determined the guard's layoff rights at the time of that layoff, which was as of September 16, 2011, based on the information it had at the time, the city's retention of "temporary" personnel who were performing the same duties of the title from which the guard was laid off was improper and the guard was entitled, per N.J.A.C. 4A:8-2.1(a) and N.J.A.C. 4A:8-2.2, to displace the temporary employee, who was required to be removed from the position. In re Morris, City of Trenton, CSC Docket No. 2012-1733, 2013 N.J. CSC LEXIS 944, Final Action (April 3, 2013).

N.J.A.C. 4A:8-2.2(f) did not provide a basis for a county employee who had been laid off from her position as Community Service Aide to displace other employees of the county health department because the rule, as applied by the Division of State and Local Operations (SLO), only provided for the exercise of demotional title rights to prior-held permanent titles and there were no employees serving in the lateral titles of Clean Neighborhood Program Aide, Community Relations Aide, Program Development Aide Community Service, and Planning Aide in the Department of Health. SLO also correctly determined that the employee did not have any displacement rights to her former titles because, under these facts, movement to the previous permanent titles would be considered either a promotion or a lateral title change, neither of which was authorized under applicable rules including N.J.A.C. 4A:8-2.1(b), which established demotional, not promotional, title rights. In re Margaret Mullen, Bergen County, CSC Dkt. No. 2013-40, 2013 N.J. CSC LEXIS 120 (February 21, 2013).

4A:8-2.2 Exercise of lateral and demotional rights

(a) Employees shall be ranked, for purposes of exercise of layoff rights, in order of seniority.

(b) In State service, a permanent employee in a position affected by a layoff action shall be provided applicable lateral and demotional title rights first at the employee's option within the municipality in which the facility or office is located, and then to the job locations selected by the employee within the department or autonomous agency. The employee shall select individual job locations in preferential order from the list of all job locations within the department or autonomous agency and indicate:

1. Job locations at which he or she will accept lateral title rights; and
2. Job locations at which he or she will accept demotional title rights, including any restrictions based on salary range or class code.

(c) In local service, a permanent employee in a position affected by a layoff action shall be provided title rights within the layoff unit.

(d) Following the employee's selection of job location preferences, lateral and demotional title rights shall be provided in the following order:

1. A vacant position that the appointing authority has previously indicated it is willing to fill;

2. A position held by a provisional employee who does not have permanent status in another title. Where there are multiple provisional employees at a job location, the specific position shall be determined by the appointing authority;

3. A position held by a provisional employee who has permanent status in another title. Where there are multiple provisionals at a job location, the specific position shall be based on the level of the permanent title held and seniority;

4. The position held by the employee serving in a working test period with the least seniority;

5. In State service, and in local jurisdictions having a performance evaluation program approved by the Chairperson of the Civil Service Commission or designee, the position held by the permanent employee whose most recent (within the last 12 months) performance rating in his or her permanent title was Unsatisfactory or equivalent rating;

6. The position held by the permanent employee with the least seniority (see N.J.A.C. 4A:8-2.4).

(e) Employees serving in their working test periods shall be provided rights to their probationary titles in the same order as (d)1 through 4 above.

(f) Demotional rights may extend beyond the employee's demotional title rights to include any title previously held on a permanent basis within current continuous service. Displacement may be made only on the basis of greater permanent continuous service except when a provisional or probationary employee is serving in the previously held title. In such cases, the provisional or probationary employee shall be subject to displacement.

1. Such extended rights shall not be granted when the employee has either lateral title rights options, or demotional title rights options to a title with a higher class code than the previously held title, within the selected job locations.

(g) Employees who are placed in trainee titles shall serve a complete training period if the trainee title is outside of either the specialized or generalized title series or job band from which they were laid off.

(h) When employees are granted demotional title rights, the employees shall be entitled to exercise these rights regardless of whether they have greater or less seniority than the employees against whom they are exercising such rights.

Amended by R.1990 d.555, effective November 19, 1990.

See: 22 N.J.R. 2629(b), 22 N.J.R. 3482(c).

Reference to "State service" deleted; rule applies to both local and State service.

Amended by R.1995 d.251, effective May 15, 1995.

See: 27 N.J.R. 612(a), 27 N.J.R. 1967(b).

Administrative change.

See: 27 N.J.R. 2384(b).

Administrative correction.

See: 27 N.J.R. 3156(a).

Amended by R.1996 d.259, effective June 3, 1996.

See: 28 N.J.R. 1334(a), 28 N.J.R. 2839(a).

In (c)4 substituted "seniority" for "probationary time" and in (d) substituted "rights to their probationary titles" for "lateral title rights".

Amended by R.2000 d.12, effective January 3, 2000.

See: 31 N.J.R. 2827(a), 32 N.J.R. 39(a).

Rewrote the section.

Amended by R.2003 d.304, effective August 4, 2003.

See: 35 N.J.R. 345(a), 35 N.J.R. 3551(b).

Rewrote the section.

Amended by R.2014 d.099, effective June 2, 2014.

See: 45 N.J.R. 500(a), 46 N.J.R. 1331(c).

In (d)5, substituted "Chairperson of the Civil Service Commission or designee" for "Department of Personnel"; and in (g), inserted "or job band".

Case Notes

The Division of Classification and Personnel Management correctly determined that an employee who was a former building service worker in a county nursing home that was closing did not have any displacement rights. First, her permanent title had no demotional rights. Although the title had lateral rights per N.J.A.C. 4A:8-2.1, there were no employees in her layoff unit, which was determined per N.J.A.C. 4A:8-1.5(c) to be the county department of human services, for her to displace. Nor were there any employees active in the employee's prior held title, so there were no displacement opportunities under N.J.A.C. 4A:8-2.2(f). In re Doty et al., Sussex Cnty., CSC Docket Nos. 2013-932, 2013-1049 (Consolidated), 2013 N.J. CSC LEXIS 1156, Final Administrative Determination (December 4, 2013).

Employee's layoff from the title of Road Inspector was affirmed. Contrary to his argument that prior-held demotional title rights extended beyond the layoff unit, N.J.S.A. 11A:8-1(f) and N.J.A.C. 4A:8-2.2(c) clearly mandated that prior-held demotional title rights were within the layoff unit. Because the layoff had already occurred and it was determined that the employee did not have prior held title rights outside of his layoff unit, no basis existed under N.J.A.C. 4A:8-1.5(c)1 to consider a request to expand the layoff unit. In re Grady Butts, Salem Cnty., CSC Dkt. No. 2013-238, 2013-N.J. CSC LEXIS 573, Final Decision (June 28, 2013).

Though a laid-off employee whose name was on a special reemployment list for various positions including Mechanic Helper and Laborer 1 was entitled to appointment to a Laborer 1 position that became available thereafter ahead of employees whose names were not on that list, he was not entitled to precedence over other employees whose seniority entitled them to certification ahead of him because, per N.J.A.C. 4A:8-2.2(a) and N.J.A.C. 4A:8-2.3(c)3, appointments from a special employment list were required to be made in the order certified. In re Harold Nugent, Brick Twp., CSC Docket No. 2013-251, 2013 N.J. CSC LEXIS 197, Final Agency Action (April 17, 2013).

A senior security guard with a city's recreation and natural resource department prevailed on his claim that while the Division of State and Local Operations (SLO) correctly determined the guard's layoff rights at the time of that layoff, which was as of September 16, 2011, based on the information it had at the time, the city's retention of "temporary" personnel who were performing the same duties of the title from which the guard was laid off was improper and the guard was entitled, per N.J.A.C. 4A:8-2.1(a) and N.J.A.C. 4A:8-2.2, to displace the temporary employee, who was required to be removed from the position. In re Morris, City of Trenton, CSC Docket No. 2012-1733, 2013 N.J. CSC LEXIS 944, Final Action (April 3, 2013).

N.J.A.C. 4A:8-2.2(f) did not provide a basis for a county employee who had been laid off from her position as Community Service Aide to displace other employees of the county health department because the rule, as applied by the Division of State and Local Operations (SLO), only provided for the exercise of demotional title rights to prior-held

permanent titles and there were no employees serving in the lateral titles of Clean Neighborhood Program Aide, Community Relations Aide, Program Development Aide Community Service, and Planning Aide in the Department of Health. SLO also correctly determined that the employee did not have any displacement rights to her former titles because, under these facts, movement to the previous permanent titles would be considered either a promotion or a lateral title change, neither of which was authorized under applicable rules including N.J.A.C. 4A:8-2:1(b), which established demotional, not promotional, title rights. In re Margaret Mullen, Bergen County, CSC Dkt. No. 2013-40, 2013 N.J. CSC LEXIS 120 (February 21, 2013).

Displaced employee was properly separated from her provisional position of Technical Assistant 3 and returned to her permanent title Human Services Technician. Although she argued that she had more seniority than an employee who retained her provisional position while she was displaced in the layoff proceedings, the displaced employee was appropriately targeted under N.J.A.C. 4A:8-2.2(d) because the retained employee's title was higher than that of the displaced employee. In re Dekontee Lincoln, Dep't. of Human Services, CSC Dkt. No. 2013-4, 2013 N.J. CSC LEXIS 7, Final Decision (January 25, 2013).

Layoff of township employees for reasons of economy was upheld where no bad faith was shown. Taylor v. Township of Irvington, 96 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 441.

State agency's demotion of contract administrator taken in good faith when part of state-wide reduction in force and contract administrator failed to demonstrate bad faith. Foster v. New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection and Energy, 96 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 80.

4A:8-2.3 Exercise of special reemployment rights

(a) A permanent employee shall be granted special reemployment rights based on the permanent title from which or he she has been laid off, demoted or displaced by job location. In addition, the employee shall be entitled to special reemployment rights to his or her previously held lateral or demotional title (see N.J.A.C. 4A:8-2.2(f)). These rights are subject to the following limitations:

1. In State service, an employee who is displaced from the municipality in which his or her facility or office was located shall, at the employee's option, be granted special reemployment rights to that municipality in addition to job locations selected by the employee.

2. An employee who is displaced by job location in a layoff action, but remains in his or her permanent title, or is reappointed to his or her permanent title from a special reemployment list, shall have special reemployment rights only to his or her original job location at the time of layoff. In cases where no facility or office remains in the original job location, the employee shall be provided the choice of another job location. As permitted by the Department of Personnel for other good cause, and upon written request by the employee with notice to the appointing authority, the employee may substitute another job location for the original job location.

3. An employee who exercises a lateral title right or who is reappointed to a lateral title from a special reemployment list shall retain special reemployment rights only to his or her original permanent title and job location at the time of the layoff. In cases where no facility or office remains in the original job location, the employee shall be

provided the choice of another job location. As permitted by the Department of Personnel for other good cause, and upon written request by the employee with notice to the appointing authority, the employee may substitute another job location for the original job location.

(b) Priority of special reemployment lists shall be determined as follows:

1. Special reemployment lists shall take priority over all other reemployment lists, open competitive lists and lateral title changes pending examination (see N.J.A.C. 4A:4-7.6(c)), except those resulting from position reclassifications, for the entire jurisdiction (see N.J.A.C. 4A:8-2.1(c) 1). Special reemployment lists shall also take priority over promotional lists for the State department, autonomous agency or local department where the layoff occurred.

2. Special reemployment lists shall also take priority over noncompetitive appointments, transfers except appointments pursuant to N.J.A.C. 4A:8-1.6(f)1, and all lateral title changes except those resulting from position reclassification within a layoff unit.

(c) Employees shall be placed on a special reemployment list for an unlimited duration.

1. Ranking on the list shall be based on the employee's permanent title and seniority at the time of layoff, based on the method for calculating seniority in effect at the time of certification of the list.

2. An employee who accepts an appointment to a position in another department or agency in lieu of separation at the time of layoff shall not be placed on a special reemployment list. See N.J.A.C. 4A:8-1.6(f)1.

3. Appointments from the list shall be made in the order certified. Removal of names from a special reemployment list may be made in accordance with applicable rules (see N.J.A.C. 4A:4-4.7 and 4A:4-6). Following appointment from a special reemployment list, an employee's name shall be removed from the special reemployment list for any title with the same or lower class code, except that the employee shall retain rights to his or her permanent job title and job location at the time of layoff.

(d) Employees who resign or retire in lieu of lateral displacement, demotion or layoff, or who subsequently resign or retire, will not be placed or remain on a special reemployment list (see N.J.A.C. 4A:4-3.1(a)3).

(e) In State service, employees who decline reemployment to a job location will be removed from future certifications to that location for that title and all previously held lateral or lower titles. Employees who decline reemployment to their original or substituted job location (other than the original municipality) will be certified only to the original municipality for that title and all lateral or lower titles. Employees who decline reemployment to their original municipality shall

be removed from the special reemployment list for that title and all lateral or lower titles.

1. However, employees who are unavailable for work when offered reemployment due to temporary disability or other good cause shall remain on the special reemployment list. Employees who decline reemployment because the position is in a different shift from the position from which they were displaced, or because the position is full time when the position from which displaced was part-time (or vice versa) shall remain on the special reemployment list.

(f) The name of an employee shall be removed from all applicable special reemployment lists where the employee receives an intergovernmental transfer in accordance with N.J.A.C. 4A:4-7.1A within one year of the effective date of a layoff resulting in the employee's separation from service.

(g) In local service, the name of an employee laid off from the title of Police Assistant and placed on a special reemployment list shall be removed from the list if the employee is over the age of 35. See N.J.A.C. 4A:4-2.3(b)2i.

Amended by R.1995 d.251, effective May 15, 1995.

See: 27 N.J.R. 612(a), 27 N.J.R. 1967(b).

Amended by R.2000 d.12, effective January 3, 2000.

See: 31 N.J.R. 2827(a), 32 N.J.R. 39(a).

In (a), changed N.J.A.C. reference in the introductory paragraph; in (b), inserted an exception in 2; rewrote (c); and in (e), inserted "previously held" following "and all" in the first sentence of the introductory paragraph.

Amended by R.2001 d.420, effective November 19, 2001.

See: 33 N.J.R. 2567(a), 33 N.J.R. 3895(b).

Added (f).

Amended by R.2003 d.304, effective August 4, 2003.

See: 35 N.J.R. 345(a), 35 N.J.R. 3551(b).

In (a), amended the N.J.A.C. reference in the introductory paragraph; in (b)2, inserted "noncompetitive appointments," preceding "transfers"; rewrote (c).

Amended by R.2006 d.104, effective March 20, 2006.

See: 37 N.J.R. 4351(a), 38 N.J.R. 1425(a).

Added (g).

Amended by R.2009 d.41, effective January 20, 2009.

See: 40 N.J.R. 4381(a), 41 N.J.R. 399(b).

In (c)3, deleted "(State service) or lower level (local service)" following "lower class code".

Administrative correction.

See: 44 N.J.R. 2057(a).

Case Notes

Authority to establish lists of permanent civil service employees eligible for special reemployment; generally, special reemployment list has highest priority. *Matter of Chief Clerk*, 282 N.J.Super. 530, 660 A.2d 1217 (A.D.1995).

Validity of preference rights in re-promotion based on veterans status (citing former N.J.A.C. 4:1-16.3). *Scarillo v. Dep't of Civil Service*, 146 N.J.Super. 127, 369 A.2d 26 (App.Div.1977).

Veteran's preference in regard to reemployment. *Scarillo v. Department of Civil Service*, 146 N.J.Super. 127, 369 A.2d 26 (App.Div.1977).

Employee was not entitled to reconsideration of a decision finding that he was properly not appointed from a special reemployment list or from an open competitive list to the positions of Mechanic, Mechanic Helper, or Laborer 1. The Civil Service Commission did not err in considering his seniority under N.J.A.C. 4A:8-2.3(c) and N.J.A.C. 4A:8-2.4(a). Ranking on special reemployment lists was not based solely on

seniority in title. The appointing authority appointed the two more senior eligibles from the special reemployment list for Laborer 1. These two eligibles were hired in 2003 and the employee was hired in 2004. Further, the employee's name was not certified on the special employment list for Mechanic Helper because he had less jurisdictional seniority than the individual who was appointed. In re Harold Nugent, Brick Twp., CSC Dkt. No. 2013-3171, 2014 N.J. CSC LEXIS 4, Final Decision (April 10, 2014).

Good cause was shown to relax N.J.A.C. 4A:8-2.3(b)2 and approve an employee's regular appointment in the non-competitive title of Maintenance Repairer even though a special reemployment list existed for that title as a result of a hospital layoff. The certification was delayed, the employee had been serving continuously in the provisional title for over 12 months, and the title was now non-competitive. In re Burlington Cnty., CSC Dkt. No. 2013-1777, 2013 N.J. CSC LEXIS 479, Final Decision (June 28, 2013).

Though a laid-off employee whose name was on a special reemployment list for various positions including Mechanic Helper and Laborer 1 was entitled to appointment to a Laborer 1 position that became available thereafter ahead of employees whose names were not on that list, he was not entitled to precedence over other employees whose seniority entitled them to certification ahead of him because, per N.J.A.C. 4A:8-2.2(a) and N.J.A.C. 4A:8-2.3(c)3, appointments from a special employment list were required to be made in the order certified. In re Harold Nugent, Brick Twp., CSC Docket No. 2013-251, 2013 N.J. CSC LEXIS 197, Final Agency Action (April 17, 2013).

Removal of the names of certain employees from a special reemployment list upon acceptance of an intergovernmental transfer was proper under N.J.A.C. 4A:8-2.3(f) and N.J.A.C. 4A:4-7.1A where, as here, that transfer occurred within one year of the effective date of a layoff resulting in the employee's separation from service. Nor were the employees entitled to be specifically advised of such removal by the transferee authority. In re Cincilla et al, Police Officer (Special), Trenton, CSC Docket Nos. 2013-1238, 2013-1239 and 2013- 1240 (Consolidated), 2013 N.J. CSC LEXIS 349, Final Decision (April 3, 2013).

Evidence of abuse of patients at developmental center by human services assistant was insufficient to warrant termination. *Gibbons v. Department of Human Services*, 95 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 10.

4A:8-2.4 Seniority

(a) Seniority for purposes of this chapter, except for police and fire titles as set forth in (b) below, is the amount of continuous permanent service in the jurisdiction, regardless of title. An employee's continuous permanent service accumulated prior to an intergovernmental transfer effected in accordance with N.J.A.C. 4A:4-7.1A shall be considered as continuous permanent service in the jurisdiction. Seniority shall be based on total calendar years, months, and days in continuous permanent service regardless of work week, work year, or part-time status.

1. A resignation/new appointment pursuant to N.J.A.C. 4A:4-7.9 shall not be considered a break in continuous service.

(b) For police and fire titles in State and local service, seniority for purposes of this chapter is the amount of continuous permanent service in an employee's current permanent title and other titles that have (or would have had) lateral or demotional rights to the current permanent title. A police officer's continuous permanent service accumulated prior to an intergovernmental transfer effected in accordance

with N.J.A.C. 4A:4-7.1A, shall be considered as continuous permanent service in the jurisdiction unless the police officer waives all accumulated sick leave and seniority rights in effecting the transfer. Seniority shall be based on total calendar years, months, and days in title regardless of work week, work year, or part-time status.

1. A police title is any law enforcement rank or title where entry level employees are required by N.J.S.A. 52:17B-66 et seq. (Police Training Act) to complete a police training course.

2. A fire title is any uniform fire department rank or title.

3. If two or more employees in a police or fire title have equal seniority, the tie shall be broken in the order of priority set forth in (h) below, except that the fifth tie-breaking factor shall give priority to the employee with greater continuous permanent service, regardless of title.

4. A county or municipal appointing authority may elect to provide, through adoption of an ordinance or resolution, as appropriate, that employees in police and fire titles may exercise previously held demotional rights, pursuant to N.J.A.C. 4A:8-2.2(f) against employees in any layoff unit in the jurisdiction. Such ordinance or resolution shall not be given effect during a layoff unless adopted at least 90 days prior to submission of the layoff plan (see N.J.A.C. 4A:8-1.4).

(c) Preferred status, which means a higher ranking for layoff rights purposes than anyone currently serving in a demotional title, shall be provided as follows:

1. Employees with permanent status who exercise their demotional rights in a layoff action, other than to a previously held title pursuant to N.J.A.C. 4A:8-2.2(f), will have preferred status.

2. Employees reappointed from a special reemployment list to a lower title in the same layoff unit from which they were laid off or demoted will have preferred status. Records of preferred status shall be maintained by the appointing authority in a manner acceptable to the Chairperson of the Civil Service Commission or designee.

3. If more than one employee has preferred status, priority will be determined on the basis of the class code of the permanent title from which each employee was laid off or demoted and the seniority held in the higher title.

(d) The following shall not be deducted from seniority calculations:

1. Voluntary furloughs;

2. All leaves with pay including sick leave injury (SLI);

3. Leaves without pay for the following purposes: military, educational, gubernatorial appointment, unclassi-

fied appointment, personal sick, disability, family, furlough extension, and voluntary alternative to layoff;

4. In State service, employment in the Senior Executive Service (SES), provided the employee had permanent service prior to the SES appointment; and

5. In local service, leave to fill elective public office.

(e) Suspensions, other leaves of absence without pay, and any period an employee is laid off shall be deducted in calculating seniority. In State service, deductions will be made only for such suspensions, leaves of absence, and periods of layoff that began on or after March 1, 1987. In local service, deductions will be made only for such suspensions, leaves of absence, and periods of layoff that began on or after July 1, 1988.

(f) Employees reappointed from a special reemployment list shall be considered as having continuous service for seniority purposes; however, the elapsed time between the layoff and reappointment shall be deducted from the employee's seniority.

(g) Employees serving in their working test period shall be granted seniority based on the length of service following regular appointment. Permanent employees serving in a working test period in another title shall also continue to accrue seniority in their permanent titles. Permanent employees serving in a provisional, temporary, or interim appointment shall continue to accrue seniority in their permanent titles.

(h) Tie-breakers based on service shall include service accumulated prior to an intergovernmental transfer effected in accordance with N.J.A.C. 4A:4-7.1A, except for all firefighters, and except where a law enforcement officer, including a sheriff's officer and a county correction officer, waives all accumulated seniority rights in the intergovernmental transfer. If two or more employees have equal seniority, the tie shall be broken in the following order of priority:

1. A disabled veteran shall have priority over a veteran. A veteran shall have priority over a non-veteran (see N.J.A.C. 4A:5-1);

2. The employee with the higher performance rating shall have priority over an employee with a lower rating, provided that all tied employees were rated by the same supervisor and were subject to the same PAR rating scale. In local service, the performance rating system must have been approved by the Chairperson of the Civil Service Commission or designee;

3. The employee with the greater amount of continuous permanent service in the employee's current permanent title and other titles that have (or would have had) lateral or demotional rights to the current permanent title, shall have priority. An employee appointed to a previously held title pursuant to N.J.A.C. 4A:8-2.2(f) shall have all permanent

continuous service in that title aggregated for seniority purposes;

4. The employee with the greater seniority in the title before a break in service shall have priority;

5. The employee with greater non-continuous permanent service, regardless of title, shall have priority;

6. The employee who ranked higher on the same eligible list for the title shall have priority;

7. The employee with greater continuous service as a provisional, temporary, or interim appointee in the subject title shall have priority;

8. The employee with greater total service, regardless of title or status, shall have priority;

9. The employee with the higher performance rating during the 12-month period prior to the effective date of the layoff shall have priority over an employee with a lower rating, provided that all tied employees were rated by the same supervisor and were subject to the same PAR rating scale. In local service, the performance rating system must have been approved by the Chairperson or designee;

10. The employee with the higher performance rating during the period between 24 months and 12 months prior to the effective date of the layoff shall have priority over an employee with a lower rating, provided that all tied employees were rated by the same supervisor and were subject to the same PAR rating scale. In local service, the performance rating system must have been approved by the Chairperson or designee;

11. Other factors as may be determined by the Chairperson or designee.

Amended by R.1990 d.387, effective August 6, 1990.

See: 22 N.J.R. 1300(b), 22 N.J.R. 2263(a).

In (c): added "family" to list of leaves with pay.

Amended by R.1994 d.620, effective December 19, 1994.

See: 26 N.J.R. 3511(a), 26 N.J.R. 5002(b).

Amended by R.1995 d.12, effective January 3, 1995.

See: 26 N.J.R. 4126(a), 27 N.J.R. 145(a).

Amended by R.1995 d.251, effective May 15, 1995.

See: 27 N.J.R. 612(a), 27 N.J.R. 1967(b).

Administrative correction.

See: 27 N.J.R. 3156(a).

Petitions for Rulemaking: Layoffs, Seniority.

See: 27 N.J.R. 4916(a).

Amended by R.1996 d.259, effective June 3, 1996.

See: 28 N.J.R. 1334(a), 28 N.J.R. 2839(a).

In (d) added provision relating to local service.

Amended by R.1996 d.260, effective June 3, 1996.

See: 28 N.J.R. 1441(a), 28 N.J.R. 2841(a).

In (a) excepted police and fire titles, added (b) and recodified former (b)-(g) as (c)-(h).

Amended by R.2000 d.12, effective January 3, 2000.

See: 31 N.J.R. 2827(a), 32 N.J.R. 39(a).

In (b)4, changed N.J.A.C. reference; rewrote (c); and added (i) and (j).

Amended by R.2001 d.420, effective November 19, 2001.

See: 33 N.J.R. 2567(a), 33 N.J.R. 3895(b).

In (a) and (b), added second sentences in the introductory paragraphs; in (h) rewrote the introductory paragraph.

Amended by R.2003 d.304, effective August 4, 2003.

See: 35 N.J.R. 345(a), 35 N.J.R. 3551(b).

Amended N.J.A.C. references throughout; rewrote (c)3; deleted (i) and (j).

Administrative correction.

See: 38 N.J.R. 2686(a).

Amended by R.2007 d.358, effective November 19, 2007.

See: 39 N.J.R. 2680(a), 39 N.J.R. 4923(b).

In the introductory paragraph of (b), inserted the second sentence; in (b)4 and (h)3, updated the N.J.A.C. references; and rewrote the introductory paragraph of (h).

Amended by R.2009 d.41, effective January 20, 2009.

See: 40 N.J.R. 4381(a), 41 N.J.R. 399(b).

In (c)1, updated the N.J.A.C. reference; and in (c)3, deleted "in State service, or the class level in local service," following "class code".

Amended by R.2014 d.045, effective March 17, 2014.

See: 45 N.J.R. 525(a), 46 N.J.R. 497(a).

In the introductory paragraph of (a) and of (b), inserted a comma following "months" and following "year"; in (c)2, substituted "Chairperson of the Civil Service Commission or designee" for "Department of Personnel"; in (d)3, inserted a comma following "extension"; in (d)4, inserted "(SES)"; in (e), inserted a comma following "pay" and following "absence" twice, and substituted "that" for "which" twice; in (g) and (h)7, inserted a comma following "temporary"; and rewrote (h)2 and (h)9 through (h)11.

Case Notes

Statute which permitted layoff of permanent public employee superseded statute providing that an injured public employee receiving workers' compensation benefits was to continue on the payroll. *Novak v. Camden County Health Services Center Bd. of Managers*, 255 N.J.Super. 93, 604 A.2d 649 (A.D.1992).

Negotiability of seniority. *State v. State Supervisory Employees Association*, 78 N.J. 54, 393 A.2d 233 (1978).

Laid-off employees of a city police department were not entitled to relief on their claim that the method used by the former Division of State and Local Operations to determine which officers would be laid off and/or demoted was unconstitutional because their layoff rights were properly determined based on service in their permanent titles at the time of the layoff and because there was no constitutional or legislative mandate that layoffs or demotions in lieu thereof proceed in the order posited by the employees. In re *Romary, et al.*, Paterson, CSC Docket No. 2013-201, 2014 N.J. CSC LEXIS 343, Final Administrative Determination (April 23, 2014).

Employee was not entitled to reconsideration of a decision finding that he was properly not appointed from a special reemployment list or from an open competitive list to the positions of Mechanic, Mechanic Helper, or Laborer 1. The Civil Service Commission did not err in considering his seniority under N.J.A.C. 4A:8-2.3(c) and N.J.A.C. 4A:8-2.4(a). Ranking on special reemployment lists was not based solely on seniority in title. The appointing authority appointed the two more senior eligibles from the special reemployment list for Laborer 1. These two eligibles were hired in 2003 and the employee was hired in 2004. Further, the employee's name was not certified on the special employment list for Mechanic Helper because he had less jurisdictional seniority than the individual who was appointed. In re *Harold Nugent, Brick Twp.*, CSC Dkt. No. 2013-3171, 2014 N.J. CSC LEXIS 4, Final Decision (April 10, 2014).

Employee's layoff was rescinded and she was returned with seniority and benefits to the position of Keyboarding Clerk 1. In the department in which she was working at the time of the layoff, there were two Keyboarding Clerks 1 with less seniority than the employee, and one was on leave of absence to serve as an unclassified Confidential Assistant. The employee had the right to displace an employee who was a Keyboarding Clerk 1 with less seniority than her under N.J.A.C. 4A:8-2.4(a). In re *Rose Mattera, Supervising Clerk Transcriber, Wildwood City*, CSC Dkt. No. 2012-81, 2013 N.J. CSC LEXIS 801, Final Decision (October 17, 2013).

The issue of title comparability that is the subject of N.J.A.C. 4A:4-7.1A(c)2 is significant in the context of the intergovernmental transfer

program given the substantial rights afforded to a participant in the program. For example, N.J.A.C. 4A:8-2.4(a) provides that an employee's continuous service accumulated prior to an intergovernmental transfer shall be considered as continuous permanent service in the jurisdiction for layoff purposes. Thus, if two different titles involved in an intergovernmental transfer are determined to be substantially similar, for layoff purposes, seniority for determining lateral, demotional and special reemployment rights would include all time in the previous jurisdiction. Therefore, to permit an intergovernmental transfer involving two titles that are not substantially similar could have the effect of inappropriately expanding the transferee's lateral and demotional title rights in the new jurisdiction. Indeed, the determination of lateral and demotional title rights under N.J.A.C. 4A:8-2.1 utilizes the exact same criteria listed in N.J.A.C. 4A:4-7.1A(c). Accordingly, the rules governing the determination whether titles involved in an intergovernmental transfer are substantially similar are strictly construed. In re Diane M. Cannatella, Dep't of Human Servs., CSC Dkt. No. 2013-2834, 2013 N.J. CSC LEXIS 623, Final Decision (May 16, 2013).

4A:8-2.5 Reassignments

(a) For a period of 12 months after the service of the layoff notice required by N.J.A.C. 4A:8-1.6(a), no permanent or probationary employee in the layoff unit in a title actually affected by layoff procedures shall be subject to the following types of involuntary reassignments, except as permitted by the Commissioner for good cause:

1. Reassignment to a different shift, unless the reassignment is based on a seniority program;
2. In State service, if employed in the original municipality, reassignment to a different municipality; and
3. In State service, if not employed in the original municipality, reassignment to a different job location.

(b) Specific justification for such involuntary reassignments must be shown by the appointing authority.

(c) During the period described in (a) above, notice of the types of voluntary reassignments listed in (a) above shall be provided to affected negotiations representatives, and appointing authorities should consult with such representatives upon request. Appointing authorities shall conspicuously post notices of opportunities for voluntary reassignment for a period of 10 working days at all work locations.

Amended by R.1995 d.251, effective May 15, 1995.
See: 27 N.J.R. 612(a), 27 N.J.R. 1967(b).
Administrative correction.
See: 27 N.J.R. 3156(a).

4A:8-2.6 Appeals

(a) Permanent employees and employees in their working test period may file the following types of appeals:

1. Good faith appeals, based on a claim that the appointing authority laid off or demoted the employee in lieu of layoff for reasons other than economy, efficiency or other related reasons. Such appeals shall be subject to hearing and final administrative determination by the Merit System Board (see N.J.A.C. 4A:2-2.9 et seq.); and/or
2. Determination of rights appeals, based on a claim that an employee's layoff rights or seniority were deter-

mined and/or applied incorrectly. Such appeals shall be subject to a review of the written record by the Department of Personnel, with a right to further appeal to the Commissioner (see N.J.A.C. 4A:2-1.1(d)).

(b) Good faith and determination of rights appeals shall be filed within 20 days of receipt of the final notice of status required by N.J.A.C. 4A:8-1.6(f). Appeals must specify what determination is being appealed, the reason(s) for the appeal, and the relief requested.

(c) The burden of proof is on the appellant.

Case Notes

Standards of review to be applied by Commission in appeals de novo. *Henry v. Rahway State Prison*, 81 N.J. 571, 410 A.2d 686 (1980).

Filing, by an employee who had appealed her layoff as a systems analyst by a county department of administration, of an application to PERS to retire with a service pension constituted a resignation that mooted her layoff appeal and justified an order affirming the departmental action and dismissing the layoff appeal. In re Batra, Morris Cty. Dep't of Admin., OAL DKT. NO. CSV 00532-15 (Slip Opinion), Initial Decision (May 13, 2015).

City's layoff of civilian Emergency Medical Technicians (EMTs) and transfer of the EMTs' duties to city firefighters was not motivated by bad faith but rather by reasons of economy and efficiency. While the EMTs argued that what the city characterized as a "fiscal crisis" in 2010-2011 was a mere pretext for the city to undertake a long-planned elimination of civilian EMT positions, the record supported the city's position that the layoff was consistent with various recommendations for reduction of costs including that a Department of Community Affairs report that reduction and consolidation of personnel might improve efficiency. Given the presumption that the city acted in good faith, the EMTs failed to rebut that presumption and the record supported a finding that the city had acted in good faith in the matter. In re Alicea-Lopez, et al., v. Paterson, OAL DKT. NO. CSV 9882-11, 2015 N.J. AGEN LEXIS 283, Initial Decision (April 14, 2015).

Township conducted appropriate pre-layoff actions prior to submitting a layoff plan including by assisting potentially affected employees in securing transfers or other employment and consulting with the representatives of groups affected by the layoffs prior to initiating them. Moreover, because the evidence supported a finding that the layoff plan was instituted for the purpose of accomplishing economy and efficiency, the employees failed to establish that the township had proceeded in bad faith. In re Bertoldi, Twp. of West Orange, Police Dep't., OAL DKT. NO. CSV 04882-11, 2014 N.J. CSC LEXIS 370, Final Administrative Determination (April 9, 2014).

Former Deputy Director, Human Services, did not have standing to appeal her layoff under N.J.S.A. 11A:8-4 and N.J.A.C. 4A:8-2.6(a)1. Her title change to Keyboarding Clerk 1 was not the result of her exercising any lateral or demotional rights as a result of a layoff. Rather, she was merely returned to her permanent title of Keyboarding Clerk 1 and she was not laid-off in the 2010 layoff. Thus, she could not challenge the good faith of that layoff. In re Dep't of Admin. And Fin., Trenton, Layoffs (Tywana L. Smith and DuEwa Edwards-Dickson), OAL Docket No. CSV 876-11, 2014 N.J. CSC LEXIS 337, Final Decision (April 9, 2014).

Fire department officials who were laid off by a township following a change in administration did not carry their burden per N.J.A.C. 4A:2-1.4(c) to show that the layoff was actuated by a bad faith motivation within the meaning of N.J.A.C. 4A:8-2.6(c) because while the proper layoff proceedings were not initially followed, those errors were corrected. Moreover, neither of the officials adduced any bona fide evidence of bad faith, and the fact that one of the officials indicated that the township's business administrator was rude to him, that fact alone was insufficient to constitute bad faith on the part of the township. To

the contrary, the preponderance of credible evidence demonstrates that the township laid off the officials for purposes of efficiency and economy per N.J.A.C. 4A:8-1.1(a) based on changes in administration and the form of government. In re Hendrickson, Jr., et al, Vernon Twp., Dep't of Public Safety, OAL DKT. NO. CSV 4683-13, OAL DKT. NO. CSV 4684-13 (Consolidated), 2014 N.J. AGEN LEXIS 474, Initial Decision (August 5, 2014).

Because a city employee who was serving as the provisional deputy director of human services did not hold that title in a permanent capacity within the meaning of N.J.A.C. 4A:2-2.1(a), she lacked standing under N.J.A.C. 4A:8-2.6 to appeal her demotion from that position as part of a general layoff of city employees necessitated by fiscal constraints. In re City of Trenton Layoffs, Dep't of Admin. & Fin., OAL Dkt. No. CSV 876-11, AGENCY Dkt. Nos. 2011-2141 et al., 2014 N.J. AGEN LEXIS 70, Initial Decision (February 10, 2014).

City employee did not establish a right to compensation on her claim that her layoff from her position of director and coordinator of the city's Office of Aging, which layoff occurred as part of a general layoff undertaken for fiscal purposes. Because N.J.A.C. 4A:8-1.1(a) authorized a civil service municipality to lay off employees for "economy, efficiency or other related reasons," an employee who is challenging a layoff cannot satisfy the onerous burden in a good-faith appeal per N.J.A.C. 4A:8-2.6(a) by offering evidence that the challenged layoff was partially motivated by an unlawful motive where, as here, there was evidence that the layoff was also designed to effect economies. In re City of Trenton Layoffs, Dep't of Admin. & Fin., OAL Dkt. No. CSV 876-11, AGENCY Dkt. Nos. 2011-2141 et al., 2014 N.J. AGEN LEXIS 70, Initial Decision (February 10, 2014).

City Code enforcement officers did not carry their burden of proof per N.J.A.C. 4A:8-2.6(c) to show by a preponderance of evidence that their employer's action in laying them off was taken in bad faith in that it was made for reasons other than economy or efficiency or other like reasons. While the officers showed that the city had made other hires and had increased the salaries of other employees since the date of the layoff, this in and of itself did not support a showing of bad faith as the record clearly reflected that the city was facing a significant deficit, a decrease in revenue and an increase in appropriations in the pre-layoff period. The city's efforts to address its fiscal situation involved a comprehensive plan including layoffs in positions that the city thought were non-essential, furloughs, payroll lags, and alternative healthcare coverage. Moreover, some of the hiring related to positions addressing critical operational needs and were funded at least in part by grants. Also relevant was the fact that the majority of the hires were both provisional and seasonal, which have a lighter financial impact for the city's taxpayers. That being so, the layoff action was properly found to have been instituted for reasons of economy and/or efficiency within the meaning of N.J.A.C. 4A:8-1.1(a) and that the officers were not entitled to relief from that action. In re Murray, et al., City of Jersey City Layoffs, CSC DKT. NO. 2011-4941, 2011-4945, 2011-4981 (Consolidated), OAL DKT. NO. CSV 7877-11 REMAND, 2013 N.J. CSC LEXIS 1203, Final Administrative Action (December 4, 2013).

The Civil Service Commission found, based upon a review of the record, that a school district properly determined and applied the employee's layoff rights, as required by N.J.A.C. 4A:8-2.1, and N.J.A.C. 4A:8-2.6(a)2, because there were no lateral or demotional positions in the layoff unit available for bumping rights under the employee's permanent title of Community Aide/Teacher's Aide. The employee's argument that her seniority and displacement rights were violated was without merit because the employee had not established that she had title rights to any positions encumbered by any other employees in the school district. In re Barnes-Williams, Newark Sch. Dist., CSC Dkt. No. 2013-1072, 2013 N.J. CSC LEXIS 1198, Final Admin. Determination (November 21, 2013).

As part of a targeted lay off in a school district, the title of a former employee in the school district had been properly determined to be Community Aide Schools/Teacher's Aide, pursuant to N.J.A.C. 4A:8-2.1, because the employee's claimed title of Parent Liaison did not exist as a Civil Service title, and further, the employee could be titled as a Community Aide/Teacher's Aide even without an examination because

the position was non-competitive and did not require an exam. In re Barnes-Williams, Newark Sch. Dist., CSC Dkt. No. 2013-1072, 2013 N.J. CSC LEXIS 1198, Final Admin. Determination (November 21, 2013).

Layoff rights of several employees who had various positions with a city school district were properly determined on findings that the workers were properly notified of their layoff by notice of layoff letters that were sent at least 45 days prior to the date on which the layoff was effective and that the school district, as required, had met with representatives of the union that represented the workers. In re Concepcion, et al., Newark Sch. Dist., CSC Docket No. 2013-693, 2013 N.J. CSC LEXIS 1167, Final Administrative Decision (November 21, 2013).

Layoff rights of several employees who were custodial workers with a city school district were properly determined on findings that the workers were properly notified of their layoff by notice of layoff letters that were sent at least 45 days prior to the date on which the layoff was effective, that the school district, as required, had met with representatives of the union that represented the workers and that the workers were the least senior employees in the title and therefore had no bumping rights. In re Beaton, et al., Newark Sch. Dist., CSC Docket No. 2013-691, 2013 N.J. CSC LEXIS 1163, Final Administrative Decision (November 21, 2013).

Civil Service Commission found that an appointing authority's action in demoting an employee serving in the position of Assistant Youth Opportunity Coordinator to the title of Community Service Aide was justified pursuant to N.J.S.A. 11A:8-4 and N.J.A.C. 4A:8-2.6(a)1. There was absolutely no evidence in the record that the mayor authored a "hit list" to target political opponents for layoff, and while there was sufficient evidence to support the administrative law judge's credibility determination regarding the mayor, the employee did not demonstrate that his layoff was not taken for purposes of economy. In re Umar Salahuddin et al., Atlantic City, OAL Dkt. No. CSV 6737-10, 2013 N.J. CSC LEXIS 800, Final Decision (October 2, 2013).

Action of appointing authority (City) in laying off employees for reasons of economy and efficiency under N.J.S.A. 11A:8-1(a) and N.J.A.C. 4:8-1.1(a) was justified. The employees conceded that the layoff/demotion plan was intended to save money and was motivated (at least in part) by the undisputed budgetary crisis the City was facing at the time such layoffs/demotions were implemented; and therefore, as a matter of law, the layoffs were implemented "for reasons of economy..." under N.J.A.C. 4A:8-2.6(a). Even if completely true, the employees' main assertions that there were less severe alternatives to the layoffs that were rejected by the City and that the layoffs were partially motivated by a desire to force certain concessions from the union at the bargaining table were insufficient as a matter of law to overcome the presumption of "good faith" that attached to layoff decisions in civil service municipalities, because the employees conceded that the layoffs/demotions were motivated by a desire to save money. In re Robert MacReady, Curtis Williams, Joyce Mollineaux, Owen C. Ingenito, and Neil Anderson, et al v. City of Atlantic City, OAL Dkt. Nos. CSV 10773, CSV 13536-10, CSV 13546-10, CSV 810-11 (Consolidated), 2013 N.J. CSC LEXIS 804, Final Decision (September 18, 2013).

County welfare agency investigator failed to show that the former Division of State and Local Operations improperly determined her layoff rights under N.J.A.C. 4A:8-2.6(a)2. There were no lateral or demotional positions in the layoff unit for the investigator to exercise any bumping rights, and her argument that another employee with less seniority was afforded displacement rights was misplaced. In re Sharon DelValle, Union County, CSC Dkt. No. 2012-3689, 2013 N.J. CSC LEXIS 279, Final Decision (May 2, 2013).

Employee met his substantial burden of showing bad faith under N.J.A.C. 4A:8-2.6(a) in his demotion from the position of Assistant Youth Opportunity Coordinator to Community Service Aide. No true savings were achieved because the original position was filled by a supporter of the mayor at a net salary increase. The administrative law judge concluded that the mayor saw an opportunity to utilize a general layoff to punish a political opponent and that such conduct amounted to

bad faith under the law. *Atlantic City Layoffs 2010 – (Supervisors) v. City of Atlantic City*, OAL Dkt. No. CSV 6737-10, 2013 N.J. AGEN LEXIS 104, Initial Decision (April 30, 2013).

Appeals of a city action engaging in the layoff or demotion of various employees were dismissed because the employees failed to meet their substantial burden in overcoming the good faith that attached to the layoff plans. They conceded that the plans were intended to save money and were motivated, at least in part, by the undisputed budgetary crisis of the city; therefore, as a matter of law, the layoffs were implemented for reasons of economy under N.J.A.C. 4A:8-2.6(a). Even if it were true that there were less severe alternatives to the layoffs and were partially motivated by a desire to force certain concessions from the union, those assertions were not sufficient to overcome the presumption of good faith when the employees conceded that the layoffs were motivated by a desire to save money. In *re Atlantic City Layoffs 2010*, Robert Macready, and In *re Atlantic City Layoffs 2010*, Dep't. of Licensing and Inspections, Joyce Mollineaux, and In *re Atlantic City Layoffs*, Dep't. of Public Safety, and In *re Atlantic City Layoffs*, Dep't. of Public Safety, Owen C. Ingenito, OAL Dkt. Nos. CSV 10773-10, CSV 13536-10, CSV 13546-10, and CSV 810-11 (Consolidated), 2013 N.J. AGEN LEXIS 98, Initial Decision (April 30, 2013).

When a library associate was laid off as the result of the bumping rights of another employee, an administrative law judge found that the Library's layoff plan was not set in motion or constructed in order to target the associate to lose her job under N.J.A.C. 4A:8-2.6(a)(1). Her union activity was marginal at best and did not create enough ill-will with the management and the library director, in particular, in order to make the associate a target for the layoff. Based on the director's detailed testimony that covered the financial distress and painstaking analysis made in order to reach a maximum cost savings with a minimum impact on the employees, there could be little doubt that the Library's goal in the layoff was economy and/or efficiency. In *re Bloomfield Public Library Layoff – 2011 Barinderjit K. Bal*, OAL Dkt. No. CSV 02142-12, 2013 N.J. AGEN LEXIS 103, Initial Decision (April 19, 2013).

School district employee who did not assert a good faith challenge to the June 2010 termination of his provisional appointment as Supervisor, Building Service and the simultaneous layoff from his prior permanent position of Recreation Maintenance Worker, both of which layoffs were justified on the grounds of economy and efficiency, when he challenged the application of his layoff rights could not bring a good faith challenge as part of his appeal from a decision that the layoff was proper because such a claim had to be brought within 20 days of his receipt of the final notice of layoff or demotion per N.J.A.C. 4A:8-2.6, which deadline was jurisdictional and could not be relaxed. Moreover, there was a presumption of good faith on the part of the appointing authority; the question is not whether the action actually achieved its purpose of saving money but whether the authority's motive in adopting the action was to accomplish economies or instead to remove a public employee without following N.J.A.C. 4A:8-1 et seq. In *re Albert Franchetta, Vineland Sch. Distr.*, CSC Docket No. 2012-2696, 2013 N.J. CSC LEXIS 266, Final Agency Action (April 17, 2013).

Police officer failed to establish under N.J.A.C. 4A:8-2.6(c) that the Town of Harrison acted in bad faith when it chose him as one of the employees being laid off. The authorized layoff was for economy and efficiency in order to reduce the shortfall in the Town's budget. Even if the officer proved that invidious motivation was partially responsible for him being one of the persons chosen in the layoff, and he did not, such motivation was insufficient to counter the Town's need to reduce a budget shortfall. In *Re Harrison Police Dep't*, OAL Dkt. No. CSV 05047-10, 2013 N.J. AGEN LEXIS 71, Initial Decision (April 5, 2013).

Sheriff's employees failed to demonstrate that their layoffs were for reasons other than economy or efficiency; the mere rescission of some of the layoffs did not demonstrate that the sheriff's office was financially secure. In *re Passaic County Civilian Employees 2008 Layoffs*, OAL Dkt. No. CSV 1151-09, 2011 N.J. CSC LEXIS 1098, Final Decision (September 7, 2011).

Two sheriff's employees failed to present credible or convincing evidence that they were specifically targeted for layoff for discriminatory or invidious reasons arising out of their union activities and the fact that one of their spouses had previously filed a lawsuit against the county. The county was experiencing a budgetary crisis and the use of machinery rendered at least one of the positions obsolete. In *re Passaic County Civilian Employees 2008 Layoffs*, OAL Dkt. No. CSV 1151-09, 2011 N.J. CSC LEXIS 1098, Final Decision (September 7, 2011).

Issues of position classification are not reviewable in the context of a layoff appeal; a layoff rights appeal is subject to a review of the written record and is treated as a separate appeal from the good faith layoff appeal. In *re Passaic County Civilian Employees 2008 Layoffs*, OAL Dkt. No. CSV 1151-09, 2011 N.J. CSC LEXIS 1098, Final Decision (September 7, 2011).

Though an Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) had jurisdiction to consider and in fact properly concluded that layoffs that were challenged by a group of municipal workers were good faith layoffs because there was a logical or reasonable connection between the layoff decision and the personnel action challenged by the employees, the ALJ should not have considered the workers' cognate challenge to the city's failure to reappoint them to other positions. Such an issue must be raised in a title rights appeal under N.J.A.C. 4A:8-2.6(a)2 and was to be heard on the record. In *re Water & Wastewater Util. Employee Layoff, Perth Amboy*, OAL Docket No. CSV 1164-09, CSC Docket No. 2010-424, 2011 N.J. AGEN LEXIS 943, Final Administrative Action (June 2, 2011).

An Administrative Law Judge concluded that an employee who had been laid off from her position as code enforcement/zoning officer for a borough failed to show that her layoff was not motivated by true considerations of economy and/or efficiency or was a result of bad faith within the meaning of N.J.A.C. 4A:8-1.1(a), N.J.A.C. 4A:2-1.4(c) and N.J.A.C. 4A:8-2.6(c). The uncontroverted and overwhelming evidence was that the borough did institute a layoff plan at a time when it was increasingly evident that measures had to be taken to confront rising costs and that, as a result of instituting the layoff, it did actually effectuate significant and massive economic benefit to the borough as well as efficiency as a result of the creation of a new interlocal agreement with a neighboring community. An essential consequence thereof was that the types of functions previously performed the employee and/or her assistant were largely re-assigned to others, thereby significantly reducing the borough's direct costs. In *re Cathcart, Borough of Beach Haven*, OAL Dkt. No. CSV 06387-07, AGENCY Dkt. 2007-4151-I, 2010 N.J. AGEN LEXIS 1027, Initial Decision (February 24, 2010).

Former senior juvenile detention officers who were demoted in lieu of layoff failed to provide any evidence that the layoffs were retaliatory for the filing of an unfair practice charge; the record indicated that the appointing authority recognized the potential for a layoff as early as 2005 and that the demotions in lieu of layoff were in good faith and based on economy or efficiency. In *re Bremmer*, OAL Dkt. No. CSV 4790-07, 2009 N.J. AGEN LEXIS 909, Final Decision (February 11, 2009).

Initial Decision (2008 N.J. AGEN LEXIS 54) adopted, which found, on conflicting evidence, that a plumbing official's layoff was for economic reasons and not in retaliation for the plumber's "whistle blowing" to the Department of Community Affairs concerning the employer's management practice of understaffing and usurping his authority. In *re Zaccaria*, OAL Dkt. No. CSV 4929-07, 2008 N.J. AGEN LEXIS 561, Final Decision (March 12, 2008).

Principal planner's appeal from the decision to lay him off was dismissed after he failed to prove that the decision was made in bad faith or based on race; the appointing authority's justification of economy for the layoff was amply supported by its prior actions of issuing hiring and spending freezes, terminating provisional employees, eliminating vacant positions, and reducing capital expenditures (adopting 2007 N.J. AGEN LEXIS 201). In *re Brooks*, OAL Dkt. No. CSV 9670-03, 2007 N.J. AGEN LEXIS 1181, Final Decision (May 23, 2007).

Clerk failed to demonstrate that her layoff was in retaliation for maternity leave or a health insurance buy-out; the evidence showed that

the layoff was the result of the appointing authority's cost-cutting measures and the clerk failed to set forth sufficient evidence that the layoff was instituted for a reason other than economic efficiency. In re Torsiello, OAL Dkt. No. CSV 3976-05, 2007 N.J. AGEN LEXIS 221, Initial Decision (April 24, 2007), adopted (Merit System Board June 6, 2007).

Despite evidence of the mayor's animus toward a recycling coordinator, the decision to close the municipal recycling bureau was not a bad-faith pretext for removing the coordinator from his position; even if ill will was a factor in the City's decision, the record nevertheless fully supported the conclusion that the City was primarily motivated by a desire to remove itself from the recycling business for reasons of economy and efficiency (rejecting 2006 N.J. AGEN LEXIS 359). In re Mack, OAL Dkt. No. CSV 562-05, 2006 N.J. AGEN LEXIS 1118, Final Decision (December 6, 2006), *aff'd per curiam*, No. A-2606-06T2, 2008 N.J. Super. Unpub. LEXIS 2302 (App.Div. March 20, 2008).

Where municipal housing authority had been taken over by HUD due to financial problems and questions involving reimbursement, layoffs of certain employees during a privatization effort were found not to have been in bad faith. In re Blackston, OAL Dkt. No. CSV 10161-05 (CSV 10515-98 and CSV 805-99 On Remand), 2006 N.J. AGEN LEXIS 406, Initial Decision (July 18, 2006), adopted (Merit System Board Aug. 23, 2006), *aff'd*, Nos. A-1162-06T2, A-4513-06T2, 2008 N.J. Super. Unpub. LEXIS 300 (App.Div. Aug. 12, 2008).

Department of Personnel approval of a layoff plan is not relevant to a determination of good faith of the layoff plan; the Department merely reviews the plan to make sure that it adheres to the procedural requirements needed for a layoff. In re Blackston, OAL Dkt. No. CSV 10515-98 and CSV 805-99 (Consolidated), 2005 N.J. AGEN LEXIS 1043, Merit System Board Decision (November 22, 2005).

Summary decision was properly granted in former water employees' appeal from their layoffs because there was no genuine issue of material fact that the layoffs were the result of economic hardship and the need for efficiency; the question was not whether the layoffs achieved the purpose of saving money, but whether the motive in adopting the layoffs was to accomplish economies or instead to remove a public employee without following merit system law and rules (adopting 2005 N.J. AGEN LEXIS 428). In re Antonello, OAL Dkt. No. CSV 5695-03, 2005 N.J. AGEN LEXIS 1202, Final Decision (October 19, 2005), *aff'd per curiam*, No. A-1994-05T3, 2007 N.J. Super. Unpub. LEXIS 2931 (App.Div. June 14, 2007).

Building and grounds worker may not appeal alleged bad faith layoff when city did not lay him off. *Granger, et al. v. Department of Buildings and Grounds*, 96 N.J.A.R.2d (CSV) 90.

Determination as to whether layoffs for purposes of economy were made in good faith. *Tyler, et al. v. City of Paterson*, 2 N.J.A.R. 272 (1979). *DiGerolamo v. Borough of Roselle*, 1 N.J.A.R. 1 (1979).