

## Wage and Hour Division, Labor

## § 780.312

quarter of the current calendar year. Such employees are exempt under the basic provisions of section 13(a)(6)(A).

### § 780.307 Exemption for employer's immediate family.

Section 13(a)(6)(B) of the Fair Labor Standards Amendments of 1966 provides a minimum wage and overtime exemption in the case of "any employee engaged in agriculture \* \* \* if such employee is the parent, spouse, child, or other member of the employer's immediate family." The requirements of this exemption, evident from the statutory language, are that the employee be employed in agriculture and that he be a close blood relative, spouse or member of the employer's immediate family. Reference is made to subpart B of this part as to what constitutes employment in agriculture. The section 13(a)(6)(B) exemption applies to such an individual even though he is employed by an employer who otherwise used more than 500 man-days of agricultural labor in a calendar quarter of the preceding calendar year, as discussed in § 780.305.

### § 780.308 Definition of immediate family.

The Act does not define the scope of "immediate family." Whether an individual other than a parent, spouse or child will be considered as a member of the employer's immediate family, for purposes of sections 3(e)(1) and 13(a)(6)(b), does not depend on the fact that he is related by blood or marriage. Other than a parent, spouse or child, only the following persons will be considered to qualify as part of the employer's immediate family: Step-children, foster children, step-parents and foster parents. Other relatives, even when living permanently in the same household as the employer, will not be considered to be part of the "immediate family."

[38 FR 17726, July 3, 1973]

### § 780.309 Man-day exclusion.

Section 3(e)(1) specifically excludes from the employer's man-day total (as defined in section 3(u)) employees who qualify for exemption under section 13(a)(6)(B). See § 780.301. This man-day count is a basic factor in the applica-

tion of the section 13(a)(6)(A) exemption. See § 780.302 *et seq.*

### § 780.310 Exemption for local hand harvest laborers.

Section 13(a)(6)(C) was added to the Act by the Fair Labor Standards Amendments of 1966. The legislative history of the exemption indicates that it was intended to apply to the local worker who goes out on a temporary basis during the harvest season to harvest crops. The exemption was not intended to apply to a full-time farmworker, that is, one who earns a livelihood at farming. For instance, migrant laborers who travel from farm to farm were not intended to be within the scope of this exemption.

### § 780.311 Basic conditions of section 13(a)(6)(C).

(a) Section 13(a)(6)(C) of the Act applies to an employee who:

- (1) Is employed in agriculture.
- (2) Is employed as a hand harvest laborer.
- (3) Is paid on a piece-rate basis.
- (4) Is paid piece-rates in an operation which has been, and is customarily and generally recognized as having been, paid on a piece-rate basis in the region of employment.
- (5) Commutes daily from his permanent residence to the farm on which he is so employed.
- (6) Has been employed in agriculture less than 13 weeks during the preceding calendar year.

(b) In order for the exemption to apply to an employee, all of the requirements must be met. Since a hand harvest laborer is normally an agricultural worker, while so engaged, such an employee would meet the basic requirements that he be employed in agriculture. Subpart B of this part contains a more detailed discussion of what constitutes employment in agriculture. The meaning and application of the remaining requirements are discussed in the following sections.

### § 780.312 "Hand harvest laborer" defined.

(a) The term hand harvest laborer for purposes of this exemption refers to farm workers engaged in harvesting by hand, or with hand tools, soil grown

### § 780.313

crops such as cotton, tobacco, grains, fruits, and vegetables. The term would not include harvesting operations performed by an employee with an electrically powered mechanical device, such as a "blueberry picking tool." "Hand-harvesting" refers only to soil-grown crops and does not include any operation involving animals, such as shearing or lambing of sheep and catching chickens. Hand-harvesting is defined as manually gathering or severing the crop from the soil, stems, or roots at its growing position in the fields. Included are integral related operations, closely related geographically and in point of time, which are performed before the transportation to concentration points on the farm.

For example:

(1) Employees who take tobacco leaves from the pickers and string them on poles by hand qualify as "hand harvest laborers" because the stringing operation is performed in the field almost simultaneously with the picking and before transportation to the concentration point on the farm (drying shed).

(2) The picking up of tomatoes by hand after hand pulling from the vines is "hand-harvesting," as it is performed where the crop is severed and prior to its transportation to the packing shed.

(b) The definition is limited to harvesting, and the performance by the hand harvester of any nonharvesting operation in the same workweek would cause the loss of the section 13(a)(6)(C) exemption.

For example:

(1) Employees who wrap tomatoes in a packing shed would not qualify, as the wrapping is a nonharvesting operation. (*Schultz v. Durrence* (S.D. Ga.) 63 CCH. Lab. Cas. 32,387; 19 W.H. Cases 747.)

(2) Employees who hand pick small undesirable fruit prior to harvesting in order to insure a better crop would not qualify for the exemption. This is a preharvest culling operation performed as a part of the cultivation and growing operations not harvesting.

(3) Employees who chop cotton, since this is a nonharvesting operation.

### § 780.313 Piece rate basis.

The exemption provides that the employee must be paid on a piece-rate basis. To be exempt the employee must be compensated solely on piece rates during the workweek. The exemption does not apply in any workweek in which the employee is compensated on

### 29 CFR Ch. V (7-1-06 Edition)

any other basis. For example, if an employee is compensated on an hourly rate for part of the week and on a piece rate for part of the week, the exemption would not be available. Also, if any pieceworker who is otherwise subject to the minimum wage provisions of the Act does not meet all the requirements set forth in this section he must be paid at least the minimum wage for each hour worked in a particular workweek, regardless of the fact he is paid on piece rate unless he is exempted by some other provision of the Act.

### § 780.314 Operations customarily \* \* \* paid on a piece rate basis \* \* \*.

A significant test of the exemption is that the hand harvest operation "has been, and is customarily and generally recognized as having been, paid on a piece rate basis in the region of employment." The legislative history is silent on who must customarily and generally recognize the hand harvest operation as having been paid on a piece rate basis. However, considering the context in which the term is used, such recognition must be on the part of agricultural employers and employees and other individuals in the region of employment who are familiar with farming operations and practices in the region and the method of compensation utilized in such operations and practices.

### § 780.315 Local hand harvest laborers.

(a) A requirement of the exemption is that an employee must commute each day from his permanent residence to the farm where he is employed. Thus, the exemption does not apply to a migrant worker who travels to different areas of the country during the harvesting seasons. This would be true even though the worker may remain in the area for a considerable period of time. On the other hand, if a migrant worker actually changes his place of residence and thereafter commutes daily from his permanent residence, the exemption applies from the date of the change of residence if the other tests are met.

(b) The fact that a worker may live on the farm where the operations are performed would not be a reason for