

## SS-8 Determination—Determination for Public Inspection

Occupation

04FSC.22 Overseer

Determination:

☒ Employee

☐ Contractor

UILC

Third Party Communication:

☒ None

☐ Yes

### Facts of Case

The firm is in the business of operating an event catering center. The worker was engaged as the bar manager, a ranch hand, an event manager as well as provided maintenance services. He received a 2014 Form 1099-MISC for his services; he also provided services in 2013 and received a Form 1099-MISC. There was no written agreement.

In this case, the worker provided most of the information. The firm, through its owners, provided instructions for the worker on mowing, running equipment, and setting-up for events. The firm gave the worker his task assignments, determined the methods by which the assignments were performed and would be contacted if any problems or issues arose. The worker only submitted verbal reports. His hours varied but were usually forty hours or more each week. A list of work requirements was provided each day indicating what needed to be done. All the work was performed at the firm's premises. There were staff meetings. The worker was required to provide the services personally. He hired substitutes or helpers with the firm's approval. The firm paid any additional workers.

The firm provided everything such as the property, equipment, tools, and supplies. The worker supplied his truck and some tools. He was paid an hourly rate and had no other economic risk. The customer paid the firm. The firm established the level of payment for services.

There were no benefits. Either party could terminate the relationship without incurring a liability. The worker did not perform similar services for others. The relationship ended when the worker quit.

---

## Analysis

---

In determining whether an individual is an employee or an independent contractor under the common law, all evidence of both control and lack of control or independence must be considered. The relationship of the worker and the business must be examined. Facts that show a right to direct or control how the worker performs the specific tasks for which he or she is hired, who controls the financial aspects of the worker's activities, and how the parties perceive their relationship should be considered. As is the case in almost all worker classification cases, some facts point to an employment relationship while other facts indicate independent contractor status. The determination of the worker's status, then, rests on the weight given to the factors, keeping in mind that no one factor rules. The degree of importance of each factor varies depending on the occupation and the circumstances.

Factors that illustrate whether there is a right to control how a worker performs a task include training and instructions. In this case, the firm retained the right to change the worker's methods and to direct the worker to the extent necessary to protect its financial investment. The firm provided the worker with instructions and his assigned daily duties. He performed a variety of services and did so according to the firm's directions. He worked scheduled hours and days at the firm's location. A worker who is required to comply with another person's instructions about when, where, and how he or she is to work is ordinarily an employee. This control factor is present if the person or persons for whom the services are performed have the right to require compliance with instructions. Some employees may work without receiving instructions because they are highly proficient and conscientious workers or because the duties are so simple or familiar to them. Furthermore, the instructions, that show how to reach the desired results, may have been oral and given only once at the beginning of the relationship. During the time period involved, the worker provided his services on a continuous basis. A continuing relationship between the worker and the person or persons for whom the services are performed indicates that an employer-employee relationship exists. A continuing relationship may exist where work is performed in frequently recurring although irregular intervals.

Factors that illustrate whether there is a right to direct and control the financial aspects of the worker's activities include significant investment, unreimbursed expenses, the methods of payment, and the opportunity for profit or loss. In this case, the worker did not invest capital or assume business risks, and therefore, did not have the opportunity to realize a profit or incur a loss as a result of the services provided. The firm had the investment in the business operations. The worker simply received an hourly rate of pay and had no other economic risk. Payment by the hour, week, or month generally points to an employer-employee relationship, provided that this method of payment is not just a convenient way of paying a lump sum agreed upon as the cost of a job.

Factors that illustrate how the parties perceive their relationship include the intent of the parties as expressed in written contracts; the provision of, or lack of employee benefits; the right of the parties to terminate the relationship; the permanency of the relationship; and whether the services performed are part of the service recipient's regular business activities. There were no benefits and there was no written agreement. The worker provided his labor at the firm's premises. He was not engaged in an independent enterprise, but rather the services performed by the worker were part of the necessary activities of the firm's operations. Integration of the worker's services into the business operations generally shows that the worker is subject to direction and control. When the success or continuation of a business depends to an appreciable degree upon the performance of certain services, the workers who perform those services must necessarily be subject to a certain amount of control by the owner of the business.

Based on the above analysis, we conclude that the firm had the right to exercise direction and control over the worker to the degree necessary to establish that the worker was a common law employee and not an independent contractor operating a trade or business.