EMPLOYMENT LAWSCENE ALERT: UNION ORGANIZATION IS ON THE RISE

Recently, it seems like the stars have aligned in favor of unions. When President Biden was elected in 2020, a part of his workplace initiatives included the promotion of collective bargaining and the protection of employees' rights to join and form unions. Then, a global pandemic struck, which made many employees reconsider and question their relationships with their workplaces and employers. In February 2022, the White House Task Force on Worker Organization and Empowerment released a report promoting the Biden Administration's support for worker organization and collective bargaining by recommending, among other things, that the federal government use its "authority to support worker empowerment by providing information, improving transparency, and making sure existing pro-worker services are delivered in a timely and helpful manner." Earlier this month, the National Labor Relations Board (NLRB) announced that union representation petitions filed with the Board between October 1, 2021 and March 31, 2022, had increased 57% over the prior six-month period. Additionally, unions have made major headlines recently with successful union elections at an Amazon fulfillment center on Long Island and multiple Starbucks locations.

And more changes are likely on the horizon. For example, on April 7, the NLRB General Counsel issued a memo challenging employers' well-established free speech rights, which are protected pursuant to Section 8(c) of the National Labor Relations Act (NLRA). The General Counsel's memo announced that she will ask the Board to find that mandatory employee meetings, held by employers to express their opinions on union organizing, violate employees' Section 7 rights under the NLRA. If the Board takes this position, it would be a huge blow to employers' ability to effectively and freely communicate with their employees and would also be contrary to U.S. Supreme Court precedent recognizing employers' free speech rights in the workplace.

So, what's an employer to do? Employers cannot threaten employees, cannot interrogate them about their support of a union, cannot promise things to influence the union vote, and cannot surveil employees. However, to lawfully counter a union's organizational activities, employers can help ensure that employees are accurately informed about the effects of unionization to allow employees to make free and clear decisions without coercion about their rights under Section 7. To do so, employers should make sure that their supervisors are properly trained on how to recognize the signs of union organizing activities and how to lawfully respond to employees' questions and concerns about unionization.

As always, the labor and employment law team at O'Neil Cannon is here for employers to answer questions and address labor and employment law concerns. We encourage you to

reach out with any questions, concerns, or legal issues you may have.

EMPLOYMENT LAWSCENE ALERT: BIDEN ADMINISTRATION WILL PROMOTE A SIGNIFICANT SHIFT IN RECENT FEDERAL LABOR LAW

In our series discussing the new workplace initiatives under the Biden Administration, we will next address the Biden Administration's desire to make significant changes in National Labor Relation Board ("NLRB"' or "Board") policy and to roll back the labor law precedent of the Trump Administration's NLRB. The Biden Administration's labor policy through the NLRB will focus on two primary goals: (1) the promotion of collective bargaining and (2) the protection of employees' rights to join and form unions. In pursuing this focused labor policy, the Biden Administration is keeping the promise it made during the Presidential campaign that it will pursue policies and the development of labor law that serves the interests of unions. All employers will need to pay attention for the next four years to the NLRB's development and application of the Biden Administration's labor policies.

Through the former NLRB's General Counsel, Peter Robb, the Trump Administration made significant pro-management policy changes and shepherded pro-management developments in labor law under the National Labor Relations Act (the "NLRA" or the "Act"). Under the Obama Administration, the Democratically–led Board took an expansive view on how the Act should be interpreted and enforced, including a very broad reading of Section 7 of the Act, which provides that employees have the right to "engage in other concerted activities for the purpose of collective bargaining or other mutual aid or protection." The Trump-era Board then narrowed this expanded reach of Section 7.

During the Trump Administration, many of the Obama-era Board policies and decisions were overturned by the Board or by the federal courts, including: (i) overturning of the Board's *Specialty Healthcare* decision that allowed unions to define their own bargaining units, including the recognition of micro-units; (ii) allowing employers, in the Board's decision of *Johnson Controls*, to withdraw union recognition at the expiration of a collective bargaining agreement if the employer can prove that the union does not continue to have majority support amongst bargaining unit employees; (iii) the U.S. Supreme Court's decision in *Epic Systems* overturning the Board's *Murphy Oil* decision where the Supreme Court held that an employer's requirement that employees agree to class- and collective-action waivers in mandatory arbitration agreements does not violate the NLRA; (iv) the Board's *MV*

Transportation decision that applied a "contract coverage" analysis instead of a "clear and unmistakable waiver" standard in determining whether an employer with a collective bargaining agreement has the duty to bargain over, or has the right to implement, work or safety rules without bargaining that are within the scope and compass of the parties' existing collective bargaining agreement; (v) overturning, in *Caesars Entertainment*, the Board's 2014 controversial *Purple Communications* decision, which had held that employees have the right to use their employers' email systems for non-business purposes, including communicating about union organizing; and (vi) overturning, in *Apogee Retail*, the Board's decision in *Banner Estrella Medical Center* where the Board ruled that employees have a Section 7 right to discuss discipline and ongoing investigations involving themselves and other co-workers despite an employer's confidentiality policy that prohibits such communications during a workplace investigation.

To follow through on his pledge made during his campaign to be "the most pro-union president," President Biden, as part of his first executive actions, took the unprecedented step to fire Mr. Robb as the NLRB's General Counsel. President Biden broke 85 years of tradition by being the first U.S. President to remove an incumbent NLRB general counsel before the end of his term. Mr. Robb's term was set to end in mid-November. President Biden's termination of Mr. Robb signals a shift in NLRB policy objectives under the Biden Administration and sets the stage for a roll back of the Trump-era NLRB policies and precedent.

President Biden quickly replaced Mr. Robb with Peter Ohr as NLRB's acting General Counsel. Mr. Ohr comes from the NLRB's Chicago Regional Office where he was its Regional Director. Mr. Ohr did not waste any time as the NLRB's acting General Counsel when, in a two-day span, he rescinded 10 Trump-era NLRB General Counsel Memoranda and two NLRB Operations-Management Memoranda issued by his predecessor. Mr. Ohr cited that the rescinded memoranda guidances were either not necessary or in conflict with the NLRB's policy objective of encouraging collective bargaining. Those guidances rescinded by Mr. Ohr, among others, included: (i) holding that employers may violate the Act when they enter "neutrality agreements" with unions to assist unions in their organizing efforts; (ii) on handbook rules developed following the Board's decision in *Boeing*; (iii) on a union's duty to properly notify employees subject to a union security clause of their *Beck* rights not to pay dues unrelated to collective bargaining and to provide further notice of the reduced amount of dues and fees for dues objectors in the initial *Beck* notice; (iv) on deferral of NLRB Charges under *Dubo Manufacturing Company* that instructed NLRB Regions to defer under *Dubo* or consider deferral of all Section 8(a)(1), (3), (5) and 8(b)(1)(A), and (3) cases in which a grievance was filed; and (v) on instructing NLRB Regions and Board agents on how to proceed during investigations in connections with securing the testimony of former supervisors and former agents and how audio recordings should be dealt with during investigations.

In the meantime, President Biden has nominated Jennifer Abruzzo to become the next NLRB General Counsel. Ms. Abruzzo was the second-ranking NLRB official under the Obama Administration as the agency's Deputy General Counsel. Most recently, Ms. Abruzzo was special counsel for the Communications Workers of America. The White House referred to Ms. Abruzzo as "[a] tested and experienced leader, [who] will work to enforce U.S. labor laws that safeguard the rights of workers to join together to improve their wages and working conditions and protect against unfair labor practices." Richard Trumpka, president of the American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations (AFL-CIO) supported Ms. Abruzzo's nomination by stating that "the days of the NLRB actively blocking workers from organizing a union are over." Ms. Abruzzo's nomination will have to be confirmed by consent of the Senate, which is currently evenly divided between Democrats and Republicans. Ms. Abruzzo's road to confirmation could be bumpy given the strong criticism by some Republican Senators of President Biden's unprecedented decision to fire Ms. Abruzzo's predecessor, Mr. Robb, before the end of his term.

Biden Administration Will Push Pro-Union Legislation, Including the PRO Act

Besides the change in the NLRB's General Counsel and the effects that change will have on the development of federal labor policy, the Biden Administration, together with the Democratically controlled Congress, is also planning sweeping legislative changes to the Act with the objective to make union organizing easier for employees. The proposed legislation that employers should pay most attention to is the Protecting the Right to Organize (PRO) Act (H.R.2474 and S.1306).

Specifically, pro-union allies of the Biden Administration are pushing the administration to pass the PRO Act, which would be an overhaul of federal labor law under the NLRA. The PRO Act, which the U.S. House of Representatives passed in February 2020, includes in its current form several controversial and seismic shifts in established federal labor law, including:

- Permitting the NLRB to assess civil penalties against employers, ranging from $50,000 to $100,000, for each unfair labor practice violation, which also includes personal liability for managers of alleged violations;
- Providing employees with a private cause of action against an employer for unfair labor practice violations;
- Permitting secondary strikes by a labor organization to encourage participation of union members in strikes initiated by employees represented by a different labor organization;
- Terminating the right of employers to bring claims against unions that conduct such secondary strikes;
- Superseding state's right-to-work laws, by requiring employees represented by a union to contribute fees to the labor organization for the cost of such representation;
- Expanding unfair labor practices to include prohibitions against replacement of, or discrimination against, workers who participate in strikes;
- Making it an unfair labor practice to require or coerce employees to attend employer

meetings designed to discourage union membership;
- Prohibiting employers from entering into agreements with employees under which employees waive the right to pursue or join collective or class-action litigation;
- Requiring the NLRB to promulgate rules requiring employers to post notices of employees' labor rights and protections and establishing penalties for failing to comply with such requirement;
- Prohibiting employers from participating in any NLRB representation proceedings;
- Requiring employers to provide a list of voters to the labor organization seeking to represent the bargaining unit in an NLRB-directed election;
- In initial contract negotiations for a first contract, compelling employers and unions to mediation with the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service in the event the parties do not reach an agreement within 90 days after commencing negotiations;
- Compelling employers to bargain with a labor organization that has received a majority of valid votes for representation in an NLRB-directed election; and
- Providing statutory authority for the requirement that the NLRB must set preelection hearings to begin not later than 8 days after notifying the labor organization of such a petition and set postelection hearings to begin not later than 14 days after an objection to a decision has been filed.

President Biden promised during his campaign to sign the PRO Act. This legislation, however, is currently stalled in the U.S. Senate and may face an uphill battle given the Senate's current cloture rule to end a filibuster—which requires 60 votes to cut off debate on most matters. Consequently, to the extent that the PRO Act is subject to a filibuster in the Senate, it is unlikely that the PRO Act will become law in its current form. Nonetheless, all employers should pay careful attention to the PRO Act and its movement through the U.S. Congress.

What Employers Should and Can Do

Given the Biden Administration's priority of encouraging employees to unionize, and with the pro-labor individuals that President Biden has placed in top leadership positions in the U.S. Department of Labor, including the nomination of Marty Walsh, the former two-term mayor of Boston and former union leader, to become the next Secretary of Labor, union organizing activity is likely to increase. To lawfully counter those activities, employers can help ensure that employees are accurately informed about unionization to allow employees to make free and clear decisions without coercion about their rights under Section 7. To do so, employers should make sure that their supervisors are properly trained on how to recognize the signs of union organizing activities and how to lawfully respond to employees' questions about unionization.

As always, the labor and employment law team at O'Neil Cannon is here for employers to answer your questions and address your concerns about the changes to federal labor policy and law under the Biden Administration. We encourage you to reach out with any questions, concerns, or legal issues you may have.

SEVENTH CIRCUIT UPHOLDS WISCONSIN RIGHT-TO-WORK

In March 2015, Wisconsin Governor Scott Walker signed Right-to-Work legislation into law, which allowed workers covered by union representation to not pay union dues if they do not wish to. Since its passage, the law has been under legal fire, including a failed bid for preliminary injunction to halt the law and a state circuit court ruling that found the law unconstitutional. However, in 2015, the federal district court sitting in the Eastern District of Wisconsin upheld the Right-to-Work law as constitutional, relying heavily on the Seventh Circuit's 2014 decision, *Sweeney v. Pence*, which upheld Indiana's right-to-work statute.

On Wednesday, the Seventh Circuit doubled down on its holding in *Sweeny* and upheld Wisconsin's Right-to-Work law as constitutional. The Court found that the plaintiff unions had failed to provide "any compelling reason" to overturn the *Sweeny* decision. The ruling stated that there have been no intervening developments in statutory, Supreme Court, or even intermediate appellate court law that would cause them to reevaluate their decision in *Sweeney* and that the strong dissent in *Sweeney* and a close vote to rehear the case en banc were not compelling reasons that would justify overturning a three-year old decision. The Court also rejected the unions' takings clause argument, whereby they claimed that members of the union who did not pay dues but benefitted from the unions' bargaining and political activities would be taking the unions' property without compensation. The Court found that, in the event that a taking occurred, state courts could "provide an adequate route for seeking just compensation." Although the union has stated that it is considering its next steps, it appears that Wisconsin's Right-to-Work law will continue to pass judicial scrutiny and be enforceable and constitutional.

YOUR LEASED EMPLOYEES MAY NOW JOIN A UNION WITH YOUR REGULAR EMPLOYEES – AND THEY DON'T NEED TO ASK YOUR PERMISSION

Today, in *Miller and Anderson, Inc. v. Tradesmen International and Sheet Metal Works International Association, Local Union No. 19, AFL-CIO*, the NLRB decided that, pursuant to the NLRA, temporary or leased employees who work for an employer as joint employees under an agreement with a staffing agency or similar entity do not have to have the

employer's consent to join the union that covers that employer's regular employees. The full opinion can be found here. This decision overturns a 2004 NRLB decision, *Oakwood Care Center*, which held that employees who were jointly employed by an employer and a staffing agency could not be in the same bargaining unit without the employer's consent. Today's decision revives a 2000 NLRB decision, *M.B. Sturgis*, which held that both temporary and regular workers could be represented by the same union without the joint consent of the employer and the staffing agency. Under *M.B. Sturgis*, temporary staffing employees could be included in a single bargaining unit with regular employees when: (1) the staffing agency and the employer were determined to be joint employers and (2) the temporary staffing employees shared a "community of interest" with the regular employees. The *M.B. Sturgis* decision by a Clinton-appointed Board upended a 1973 NLRB decision that found that a single bargaining unit of regular employees and leased employees to be inappropriate without the consent of both employers.

The political-weighted pendulum of the Obama-appointed Board continues to swing in favor of the unions by continuing to expand the scope of the NLRA to cover additional employees and additional actions, particularly in the area of joint-employers. This inclusion of leased employees in an employer's bargaining unit is just another step down that road. Employers must be aware of this decision in any situation where they have leased employees in the same or similar positions as regular employees who are represented by a union or wish to be represented by a union.

EMPLOYMENT LAWSCENE ALERT: DANE COUNTY JUDGE FINDS RIGHT-TO-WORK LAW UNCONSTITUTIONAL

On March 9, 2015, Governor Scott Walker signed Act 1 (Wisconsin's Right-to-Work legislation) into law, which allows workers covered by a collective bargaining agreement to not pay union dues if they choose not to do so (our previous blog on the law can be found here). Opponents of the law immediately went to work trying to defeat the new law. In late March, the Dane County Circuit Court denied the Wisconsin State AFL-CIO and two labor unions' bid for a preliminary injunction that would have halted implementation of the law. However, this past Friday, the same Court ruled that Wisconsin's Right-to-Work law is unconstitutional (full opinion here).

The unions argued that Act 1 effects an unconstitutional taking of their property without just compensation in violation of Article I, § 13 of the Wisconsin Constitution by "prohibiting the

unions from charging nonmembers who refuse to pay for representative service which unions continue to be obligated to provide" by law. Article I, § 13 of the Wisconsin Constitution provides "[t]he property of no person shall be taken for public use without just compensation therefor." The unions successfully argued that their service of providing collective bargaining representation to all employees constitutes "property" subject to a protectable interest under Wisconsin's Constitution. The unions then successfully convinced the circuit court that Act 1 effectuates a taking of their property by requiring the unions to provide services to non-paying nonmembers, because the exclusivity principle of Section 9 of the National Labor Relations Act requires that a union elected by a majority of workers in a bargaining unit must represent all employees, whether or not such employees support the union. The circuit court then opined that Act 1 creates a "free-rider" problem whereby non-union members could refuse to pay for services that the unions are required, by law, to provide to them under the duty of fair representation.

Right-to-Work laws have been enacted in twenty-four other states, and none have been struck down. The Seventh Circuit, which Wisconsin is a part of, in *Sweeney v. Pence*, 767 F.3d 654 (7th Cir. 2014), rejected similar arguments brought by unions challenging Indiana's recently enacted right-to-work law. The circuit court, however, was not persuaded by the decisions in other jurisdictions and expressly held that it was not obligated to reconcile its decision with the Seventh Circuit's decision in *Sweeney*. In justifying its decision, the circuit court found that one important difference between the Indiana and Wisconsin laws is what qualifies as "just compensation." Applying Indiana law, the Seventh Circuit ruled that the ability to exclusively bargain on behalf of employees was a special privilege that qualified as "just compensation;" whereas, under Wisconsin law, the circuit court rejected such a theory and found that Wisconsin has a long history of equating "just compensation" with the payment of money.

Wisconsin's Attorney General and the Department of Justice have already stated that the State will appeal the ruling, which is likely to be overturned on appeal. In the meantime, the Department of Justice is likely to file a motion to stay the ruling until a higher court can decide the issue. We will keep you posted as matters develop.

EMPLOYMENT LAWSCENE ALERT: GOVERNOR WALKER SIGNS RIGHT-TO-WORK BILL

Wisconsin Governor Scott Walker has officially signed Right-to-Work legislation, which, as discussed in last Friday's blog, will allow workers covered by union representation to not pay union dues if they do not wish to. Although the union will still have the right to collectively

bargain on behalf of all private-sector employees in a bargaining unit, employees can elect not to pay the union dues or fees. This law affects new collective bargaining agreements, as well as the renewal, modification, or extension of a current collective bargaining agreement. However, employees who are currently under a collective bargaining agreement will have to continue paying union dues until that agreement expires or is renewed, modified, or extended. The full text of the bill can be found here.

EMPLOYMENT LAWSCENE ALERT: WISCONSIN ASSEMBLY PASSES RIGHT-TO-WORK BILL — GOVERNOR WALKER EXPECTED TO SIGN BILL ON MONDAY

Today, Friday, March 6, 2015, the Wisconsin State Assembly after a marathon session passed right-to-work legislation by a vote of 62 to 35. The State Senate had previously approved the right-to-work legislation by a vote of 17 to 15 the previous week. The votes were cast according to party lines. The fast-tracked bill will be sent to Governor Scott Walker for signature, which could occur as early as Monday. The bill is aimed at making Wisconsin more attractive to businesses by prohibiting as a condition of employment membership in a labor organization, and, accordingly, provides employees the freedom to choose as to whether they want to pay union dues. Union supporters strongly opposed the bill arguing that the bill harms unions and slows job growth. However, Republican Assembly Speaker Robin Vos said that in Indiana, which passed a similar bill in 2012, unions have not shrunk and jobs have grown.

Once Governor Walker signs the bill, Wisconsin will become the 25th right-to-work state in the country following recent right-to-work legislation passed in Indiana and Michigan. The right-to-work legislation will affect only private-sector workers. The Wisconsin bill would make it a crime punishable by up to nine months in jail to require a worker who is not in a union to pay dues.

Right-to-work is an often misinterpreted concept, as it does not guarantee any right to employment. Under federal labor law, a union that is elected to represent a bargaining unit must represent all workers, even those who have voted against the union. In states that do not have right-to-work laws, all employees in the bargaining unit are required to pay their fair share of union dues for that representation, even if they voted against the union and do not wish to pay union dues. In right-to-work states, however, which Wisconsin will soon be, employees cannot be compelled to pay any union dues or fees in a workplace where an union

represents employees through a collective bargaining agreement even though such employees will be covered by the collective bargaining agreement. Wisconsin's right-to-work legislation also makes it unlawful to require any individual to become or remain a member of an union.

Once Governor Walker signs the bill, the new right-to-work law will apply upon the renewal, modification, or extension of any private sector collective bargaining agreement. This means that for collective bargaining agreements currently in place as of the time of enactment of the law, employees would still be required to pay their fair share of union dues and remain members of the union for the remaining term of the agreement. However, for any collective bargaining agreement entered into, renewed or modified after enactment of the legislation, any union security clause requiring employees to be members of the union or any requirement for employees to pay union dues would no longer be enforceable.

EMPLOYMENT LAWSCENE ALERT: NLRB ISSUES NEW RULES FOR UNION ELECTIONS

On Monday, December 15, 2014, the National Labor Relations Board (NLRB) issued rules that will speed up the union election process. Although the rules do not take effect until April 14, 2015, employers should be aware of them and start preparing for the changes now.

Under the current rules, representation petitions are filed seeking to have the NLRB conduct an election to determine if employees wish to be represented by a union for the purposes of collective bargaining with their employer. The Board then investigates these petitions to determine if an election should be conducted and will direct the election, if appropriate. There is currently a 25-day minimum period of time between the filing of a petition and the date of an election. Parties must agree prior to the election on the voting unit and other issues. If the parties do not agree, the 25-day minimum can be extended in order to hold a pre-election hearing and, if necessary, a post-election hearing. Currently, that date as to when the pre- and post-election hearings are held can vary by Region. Also, under current rules, parties are not required to identify all specific issues in dispute, and litigation on voter eligibility and inclusion can occur prior to the determination of whether an election should be held.

Under the new NLRB rules, the road to a representation election will be substantially different and quicker. There will no longer be a minimum time frame between the date of the petition and the date of the election. This means that since representation elections will happen more quickly and with a shortened time frame to an election; and employers will be severely limited in their ability to properly and effectively communicate with their employees about the pros and cons of union representation. While the NLRB did not specify any date certain as to

when an election must be conducted, under the new expedited election rules, it is anticipated that an election will now occur between 10 and 21 days after the filing of a petition as compared with the current 38 to 45 day time frame.

Now petitions can be filed and transmitted between the parties electronically. With the filing of a representation petition, the petitioning union must also file a letter of position and evidence that employees support the petition (the "showing of interest"). Upon receipt, an employer must post and distribute to employees an NLRB notice about the petition and the potential for an election to follow.

The regional director will now set a pre-election hearing eight (8) days after a petition is filed. The purpose of the pre-election hearing is limited in scope and is designed to determine whether there is a "question of representation." Employers will be required to file a letter of position prior to the pre-election hearing identifying all issues that the employer wishes to litigate before the election. In addition, employers must also provide a list of the names, shifts, work locations, and job classifications of the employees in the petitioned-for unit, and any other employees that it seeks to add to the unit based upon a community of interests. Based upon the evidence presented at the hearing, the regional director will decide whether an election should be held and which, if any, voter eligibility questions should be litigated prior to the election.

If an election is directed, the regional director will ordinarily transmit the notice of election at the same time as the direction of election and will specify in the direction of election the election details, such as the date, time, place and type of election and the payroll period for eligibility. An election date will be set for the earliest date practicable. Now there is a new *Excelsior* list requirement as an employer, within two (2) days after a direction of election is issued (as opposed to seven (7) days under the previous rules), must provide a list of employees eligible to vote that now must include employees' personal phone numbers and email addresses, if available.

The NLRB regional office will then conduct the election and, if necessary, hold a post-election hearing to resolve any challenges to voters' eligibility and objections to the conduct of the election or conduct affecting the results of the election. While objections to voter eligibility had been a pre-election issue, it will now be held off until after the election in the event that the objection becomes moot. However, any issues not raised in the employer's position statement will most likely be considered waived by the NLRB. The post-election hearing will be scheduled 14 days after the filings of objections.

Although there is already a pending legal challenge to the new NLRB rule, a suit filed by the U.S. Chamber of Commerce and several trade associations, and there are likely to be others, employers should prepare for these rules to be enforced as the NLRB's new rules are game changers for employers. Employers will have less time to effectively communicate with their employees and employees will have less time formulate their true desires as to whether

union representation serves their best interests.

Importantly, employers should not wait until an election petition is filed to address workplace issues that may lead to a representation petition being filed. Employers will need to be proactive in informing their employees about their stance on union-related issues and making sure that employees feel that their concerns are being heard and addressed by the employer. Employers should also train supervisors to be aware of issues that could lead to employees' desire to unionize. If an employer anticipates or suspects that any type of union organizing activities is occurring within its workplace, delaying a response is no longer a viable option. Now, employers will be required to immediately begin the process of drafting communications to employees upon any indication of organizing activities and devise a sound and lawful strategy as to how it will confront any attempt to organize well before a petition is filed. Waiting to act until a petition is filed may be too late!

EMPLOYMENT LAWSCENE ALERT: NLRB DECIDES THAT WORKERS CAN USE THEIR EMPLOYERS EMAIL — EVEN FOR UNION ORGANIZING

On December 11, 2014, in *Purple Communications, Inc.*, the NLRB overturned its 2007 *Register Guard* decision and held that employees have the right to use their employers' email systems for nonbusiness purposes, including communicating about union organizing. The NLRB emphasized the importance of email as a critical means of communication for employees, especially in today's workplace culture, and noted that some personal use of an employer email system is common and often accepted by employers. Because communication among employees is a foundation for the exercise of Section 7 rights, the NLRB held that employers who have chosen to give employees access to their email systems must now permit those employees to use those systems for statutorily protected communications on nonworking time. Employers are permitted to monitor employees' email use to ensure that it is being used properly. Employers will not be engaged in unlawful surveillance of Section 7 activity unless they do something "out of the ordinary," such as increasing monitoring during an organizational campaign or focusing monitoring effects on protected conduct or union activists.

In an attempt to balance the employees' Section 7 rights to communication with the legitimate interests of employers, this decision only applies to workers who have already been given access to their employers' email systems; employers are not required to provide

access to employees. Businesses may also be able to justify a complete ban on non-work use of email if they can point to special circumstances that make such a prohibition necessary to maintain production or discipline. It will be the employer's burden to show what the interest at issue is and demonstrate how that interest supports any email use restrictions the company has implemented. The decision did not address email access by non-employees or any other type of electronic communication systems.

Employers should review their computer use and e-mail policies in light of this decision. Employers should determine which employees should or need to have access to their computer and e-mail systems and whether there is any business justification to impose a complete ban on non-work use of email.

EMPLOYMENT LAWSCENE ALERT: 2014 COULD STILL DELIVER IMPORTANT DECISIONS FROM THE NLRB

Although we previously posted an article outlining that the mid-term elections could improve the landscape for employers regarding administrative agency enforcement, including the National Labor Relations Board ("NLRB"), employers may still see a significant pro-union push from the NLRB before the end of 2014.

Democratic-appointee Nancy Schiffer's term on the NLRB ends December 16, 2014. The Obama Administration has nominated Senate Health Education and Pensions Committee chief labor counsel Lauren McFerran to take Schiffer's place on the five-member board. However, the now Republican-controlled Senate must approve all NLRB nominations. If the Senate does not confirm McFerran, or any other proposed nominee, the NLRB could be locked in a 2-2 partisan stalemate. Therefore, many believe that the currently Democratic NLRB will try to get major changes pushed through while they are still in the majority. This could include changes to union election procedures and changes to the definition of joint-employer status.

The NLRB has proposed rule changes that would significantly change the union election process. If issued, they would shorten the period between filing of an election petition and the election itself to only seven days. If this happens, employers will have less time to inform workers of the pros and cons of unionizing. Among other changes, the new rules would also require employers to submit a "statement of position" on the election petition by the time the pre-election hearing is held and waive any issues not raised in the statement.

Also, the NLRB could expand the standard for determining joint employer status in the Browning-Ferris case. A decision from the Board on this important topic is expected soon. For the past thirty years, the NLRB has analyzed whether two or more companies are joint employers under a "degree of control" test. The Board, in its expected decision in Browning-Ferris, could change that standard to a "totality of the circumstances" standard. A broader standard from the Board in finding joint employer liability would be expected given the NLRB's General Counsel recent decision to permit 43 unfair labor practice charges against McDonald's, USA, LLC to move forward under a "joint employer" theory finding that McDonald's should be held liable, along with its independently-owned franchisees, based upon allegations that the franchisees violated workers' rights in responding to workplace protests. If the NLRB expands the definition of "joint employer," as expected, more companies that do not use direct employees could potentially face unfair labor practice charges for the conduct of other companies or could even be required to recognize and bargain with unions.

Employers should monitor the NLRB's decisions and actions through the end of the year and look for rulings that could impact them and their employees.