



Lozano Smith
ATTORNEYS AT LAW

Janus v. AFSCME and Related California Legislation

PUBLIC EMPLOYER/EMPLOYEE RELATIONS TOOLKIT

Prepared By

Lozano Smith's
Labor & Employment and
Community College
Practice Groups

Updated 7/11/2018



Bakersfield
Fresno
Los Angeles
Mission Viejo
Monterey
Sacramento
San Diego
Walnut Creek

LozanoSmith.com

TOOLKIT INDEX



JANUS V. AFSCME

Overview & Next Steps

Senate Bill 866 Overview

Frequently Asked Questions

Implementation Checklist

Legislative Update – Pending Bills Relating to *Janus*

Sample Letter to Board Members

OVERVIEW & NEXT STEPS



FIRM OVERVIEW

Practice Areas

Charter Schools
Community Colleges
Facilities & Business
Labor & Employment
Litigation
Local Government/
Special Districts
Public Finance
Public Safety
Special Education
Students
Technology & Innovation

Statewide

Bakersfield
Fresno
Los Angeles
Mission Viejo
Monterey
Sacramento
San Diego
Walnut Creek

Practice Group Leaders



Stephanie White
swhite@lozanosmith.com



Steve Ngo
sngo@lozanosmith.com

Overturing a longstanding precedent, the United States Supreme Court has held in *Janus v. AFSCME* that public employees may not be compelled to pay mandatory agency fees, or “fair share” fees, to public-sector unions, because such fees violate the First Amendment.

The *Janus* decision will have a sweeping, nationwide impact on public sector labor unions. The Court’s 5-4 decision immediately affects laws in at least 22 states, including California, that currently allow public sector unions to charge and collect agency or fair share fees.

BACKGROUND

Mark Janus is an Illinois public sector employee who sued the American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees (AFSCME), arguing that a state law allowing the union to charge and collect fees from non-members violated his and other workers’ First Amendment rights.

The Supreme Court previously decided this issue in 1977 in the case of *Abood v. Detroit Board of Education*, then holding it was constitutional for public sector unions to collect agency fees from nonunion members to defray the cost of collective bargaining and other activities, provided nonunion members were not required to pay for a union’s political or ideological activities. The Court now holds in *Janus* that states and public-sector unions may no longer collect agency fees from nonconsenting employees.

The Court held that compelling employees to subsidize the speech of private speakers, including public-sector unions, violates the First Amendment, noting that “[c]ompelling individuals to mouth support for views they find objectionable violates that cardinal constitutional command, and in most contexts, any such effort would be universally condemned.”

Critically, “Neither an agency fee nor any other payment to the union may be deducted from a nonmember’s wages, nor may any other attempt be made to collect such a payment, unless the employee affirmatively consents to pay.” In anticipation of the ruling, California’s newly adopted Senate Bill (SB) 866, signed into law by the Governor on June 27, makes several changes regarding public employers’ deduction of union dues and fees. Among these is a requirement for public employers to rely on the representations of the union regarding an employee’s deduction authorizations. The new California requirement creates a potential conflict with the Supreme Court’s express statement that an employee must “affirmatively consent to pay,” because under SB 866 the employer is not entitled to see the authorization before making a deduction unless there is a dispute.

Additional notable statements made by the Court in *Janus* include:

- > Unions can be effective even without agency fees, without which designation of a public-sector union as the exclusive representative still confers many benefits.
- > Representation of nonmembers, even without agency fees, furthers the union's interest in keeping control of the administration of the collective bargaining agreement, since the resolution of one employee's grievance can affect others.
- > Going forward, it would likely be unconstitutional for a public sector employer to adopt a collective bargaining agreement that discriminates against nonmember employees.
- > Individual employees who are not members of a union may potentially be required to pay for certain services of a union, such as representation at disciplinary proceedings.

NEXT STEPS AND CONSIDERATIONS FOR EMPLOYERS

1. Stop agency fee deductions

The Court's decision in *Janus* is effective immediately, meaning employees who are non-members cannot be charged agency fees. Accordingly, employers must stop deducting agency fees from the paychecks of public employees. Going forward, an employer may not deduct fees unless an employee clearly and affirmatively consents to the deduction before it is implemented.

SB 866 creates a layer of potential complication because it modifies the law to require public employers to rely on the representations of the union regarding an employee's deduction authorizations. This likely leaves public agency employers with at least three potential options: (1) stop agency fee deductions immediately without communication with union leadership; (2) stop the agency fee deductions after providing a notice to union leadership as to the employees who the public agency believes to be agency fee payers and whose deductions will be halted with the July paycheck; or (3) stop the fee deductions after the union and public employer agree to the list of employees whose fee deductions will be halted, and rely on the new provisions of SB 866 requiring the union to defend and indemnify the employer in the event a fee payer brings suit to recover fees deducted subsequent to the issuance of the *Janus* decision.

Public agencies may wish to have their human resources and payroll departments work collaboratively with union leadership to confirm and identify employees who are agency fee payers and develop a strategy to ensure prompt compliance with *Janus*.

2. Implement a communication plan

Public agency employers who have agency fee provisions in their union agreements should develop a communication plan to address the likely questions that will come from employees and unions in the days and weeks following this decision. Specifically, taking steps to identify a single point person to respond to questions regarding the impacts of the *Janus* decision will ensure cohesive and clear messaging and avoid the potential for managers and supervisors to inadvertently run afoul of laws prohibiting discouraging or deterring union membership. In developing these communication strategies regarding whether, and how, to communicate the *Janus* decision to employees, employers should remain neutral and mindful of applicable law, including SB 285, which prohibits employers from deterring or discouraging public employees from becoming or remaining members of a union, and SB 866, which restricts a public employer's ability to end employees mass communications about joining or not joining a union.

Specifically, under SB 866, any “mass communication” sent to employees or applicants concerning their rights to join or support or refrain from joining or supporting their union requires a meet and confer process with the applicable union. Any mass communication concerning the *Janus* decision may fall within this provision and require the parties to attempt to craft a mutually agreeable content, or follow the alternate process of distributing two sets of mass communication: one from the employer and one from the union. Public employers wanting to communicate with employees about the *Janus* decision and related issues must be mindful in drafting the content of any such communication, as it may fall within the scope of the “mass communication” requirements of SB 866.

Public agency employers are further encouraged to provide an update on the case to their unrepresented managers and supervisors, along with governing board members, and to provide talking points in the event they are faced with questions about the *Janus* decision. If managers or supervisors are represented, the public agency should work with counsel to ensure that communication with these represented groups is consistent with SB 866.

To assist our clients, we are developing a communication template. If you are interested in receiving this, please contact one of our offices.

3. Examine Collective Bargaining Agreements

After these immediate next steps are in place, in consultation with legal counsel, public agency employers should review their collective bargaining agreements to determine how the Court’s decision impacts current contract language, assess what articles are impacted by *Janus*, and determine whether any immediate action or negotiation is required.

While the Court’s decision may not immediately impact current dues-paying union members, some members could choose to opt out of union membership in the future as a result of the Court’s decision, in accordance with applicable collective bargaining agreements and membership agreement. To the extent membership in a union and attendant dues deductions are premised on an opt-out article or practice, wherein the employee is automatically in the union and automatically charged union dues unless he or she opts out, such provisions will need to be negotiated with the union to comply with *Janus* so that an employee clearly and affirmatively consents to union membership.

RELATED BILLS

In addition to SB 866, please be aware that there are other bills pending in the California Legislature that address union dues and labor relations. Lozano Smith is tracking all of these pending bills and will provide updates if any are adopted by the Legislature and signed by the Governor.

SB 866 OVERVIEW



FIRM OVERVIEW

Practice Areas

Charter Schools
Community Colleges
Facilities & Business
Labor & Employment
Litigation
Local Government/
Special Districts
Public Finance
Public Safety
Special Education
Students
Technology & Innovation

Statewide

Bakersfield
Fresno
Los Angeles
Mission Viejo
Monterey
Sacramento
San Diego
Walnut Creek

California lawmakers have approved a budget trailer bill that imposes new obligations on public sector employers related to deducting union dues and fees from workers' paychecks. Governor Jerry Brown signed Senate Bill (SB) 866 on the same day the United States Supreme Court barred the collection of mandatory agency fees that cover unions' cost of providing services, which the Court deemed a violation of workers' First Amendment free speech rights.

The Governor signed the bill, which combines the language of several other pieces of pending legislation intended to protect public agency unions, on June 27, 2018. Like all budget bills, the provisions in SB 866 became effectively immediately.

DUES PROCESSING

SB 866 standardizes dues processing requirements across public agency unions and expands the requirements to include employees of the Judicial Council, and also public transit district employees who are not already covered by a specific collective bargaining law. The bill also covers municipal employees and both certificated and classified employees who work for public school and community college district employers.

SB 866 imposes explicit requirements on public agency employers and generally makes unions responsible for portions of the dues collection process. Specifically, the bill:

- > Authorizes employee organizations, bona fide associations and both current and re-tired public agency employees to request payroll deductions and requires employers to honor such requests.
- > Specifies that revocation of an authorization must be determined by the terms of the authorization and requires public employers to direct employee requests to cancel or change deductions to the employee organization.
- > Clarifies the period in which payroll deductions commence after the employee organization notifies the public employer that it has written authorization for the deductions.
- > Bars a public employer from requiring an employee organization to submit a copy of a written authorization before commencing payroll deductions, unless a dispute arises about the existence or terms of the authorization.
- > Requires unions to indemnify public employers against claims regarding dues deductions made in reliance on information provided by the union.
- > For academic employees only, permits public agencies to recover, from the dues and fees transmitted to the union, the actual reasonable cost of making the deductions.

NEW EMPLOYEE ORIENTATION

Additionally, the bill makes the date, time and location of new employee orientation sessions confidential. Under SB 866, only invited employees, union representatives and vendors contracted to provide services for the sessions may be given date, time and location information for orientation sessions. These new provisions are in furtherance of AB 119, which mandated union access to new employee orientation sessions and became effective on January 1.

EMPLOYER COMMUNICATION

The bill restates existing law that took effect January 1 that bars public employers from discouraging or deterring public employees or applicants from becoming or remaining union members and additionally prohibits public employers from discouraging or deterring employees or applicants from authorizing union representation or the deduction of union dues or fees.

SB 866 also subjects to the meet and confer process any mass communication regarding public employees' right to support or join, or to refrain from supporting or joining, a union. If an agreement about the content of the communication is not reached, public employers must include a communication of "reasonable length" from the union representative with any communication they send regarding this right.

The Public Employment Relations Board (PERB) is granted jurisdiction for enforcing the bill's provisions.

FREQUENTLY ASKED QUESTIONS



Q. WHAT IS JANUS?

A. *Janus v. AFSCME* is a lawsuit filed by Mark Janus, an Illinois state employee, contesting the lawfulness of mandatory or involuntary agency fees he was assessed by AFSCME, the union his position was part of but that he opted out of joining. Like California, Illinois has an agency fee system in place, requiring public employees who choose not to be part of the union to pay an “agency fee” or “fair share fee” to the union for the benefit of the union’s representation of the position. This case made its way to the U.S. Supreme Court in 2017. A similar lawsuit, *Friedrichs v. California Teachers Association*, was argued before the Court in 2016 and resulted in a 4-4 split decision due to Justice Scalia’s death, leaving intact the propriety of agency fees.

Prior to *Janus*, the case that controlled agency fees was *Abood v. Detroit Board of Education*, a 1977 U.S. Supreme Court decision holding that agency fees were constitutional. This has been binding law until now as *Janus* overrules *Abood*. The Court in *Janus* held that mandatory or involuntary agency fees violate employees’ First Amendment free speech rights.

Because involuntary agency fees are now unconstitutional, as of the date of the Court’s decision in *Janus*, agency fee payers can no longer be charged such fees with their express consent.

Q. WHAT ARE AGENCY FEE PAYERS?

A. Agency fee payers are employees who work in bargaining unit positions who have opted out of the union. While agency fee payers cannot be compelled to pay for the political activities of the union, these employees are required to pay the costs associated with collective bargaining, grievance processing, and contract administration, among other things. The amount paid as an “agency fee” is lower than the amount paid to become a union member. At least 22 states, including California, have laws that provide for agency fees. Under *Janus*, these involuntary agency fee statutes are no longer constitutional.

Q. WHAT ARE DUES PAYERS?

A. Dues payers are employees who choose to join the union and pay dues to the union to cover activities, including the political and ideological activities of the union. *Janus* does not impact the lawfulness of union dues, but does require nonunion members to consent to any sort of fees to the union prior to such deduction being made. To the extent your collective bargaining agreement provides that employees are automatically union members and dues payers unless they opt out of the union, such provision will need to be renegotiated with the union to comply with *Janus*, to demonstrate employees in the union have affirmatively consented to union membership.

Q. WHAT SHOULD I DO NOW?

A. The most immediate concern is ensuring that agency fee deductions for 12 month employees, and those who are paid over 12 months, are immediately stopped for employees designated as agency fee payers as of the decision’s date. This will likely require working with the union to identify all agency fee payers and working with payroll to stop any agency fee deductions. Employers will then take the same steps for 10 and 11 month employees. It is also possible that current dues payers may no longer wish to be part of the union, which will require a more nuanced response given the recent passage of SB 866 limiting how an employer

is able to respond to requests to change dues deductions. Specifically, for any employee who wishes to change their deduction authorization (i.e., become a union member or no longer be in the union) such requests are required to be processed by the union and the employer must implement any changes in deductions based on the representation of the union as to the employee's deduction authorization. Unless there is a dispute about the employee's deduction authorization, the union is not required to supply the employer with the employee's written authorization. It is important to recognize that the union may rely on SB 866 and refuse to provide employers with any tangible evidence of employee consent to union membership and fees deduction—like an authorization form. It is too early to determine whether the Legislature will pass cleanup legislation addressing this apparent conflict between SB 866's requirement that employers rely on a union's representation as to an employee's deduction authorization and *Janus*' requirement that non-members affirmatively consent to any fee paid to a union or consent to union membership.

Also, employees may have questions for administrators and management regarding the *Janus* decision, which will require careful navigation to ensure compliance with labor laws including recent amendments to the Education Code and Government Code under SB 866. We have outlined these issues in our Implementation Checklist.

Q. WHAT IF I CANNOT IMMEDIATELY STOP AGENCY FEE DEDUCTIONS?

A. Depending on payroll processing, from a logistical standpoint it may not be possible to immediately stop agency fee deductions particularly for the month of June as most payrolls locked prior to the *Janus* decision being issued. In this situation, we recommend stopping any agency fee deduction as soon as possible for only those employees designated as agency fee payers as of the decision's date. For any agency fee deductions made after the *Janus* decision, it is the obligation of the union to reimburse employees for any fees improperly withheld. Many collective bargaining agreements contain language that the union will defend and indemnify the employer for any claims related to an organizational security provision, including agency fee deductions. Therefore, administrators should direct employees to contact the appropriate union for any reimbursement.

Q. WE HAVE A CLOSED CONTRACT (COLLECTIVE BARGAINING AGREEMENT), DO I NEED TO ASK THE UNION IF WE CAN RE-OPEN THE CONTRACT TO MAKE CHANGES TO ALIGN WITH THE JANUS RULING?

A. Probably not. Many collective bargaining agreements contain a severability clause stating that if any provision of the agreement is held invalid by operation of law or by a court, the remaining provisions shall remain in full force and effect. If your agreement does not have this language, you may need to meet and negotiate the agreement to align with *Janus*. Also, as discussed above, given the affirmative consent requirement under *Janus*, a contract article that provides for an opt-out system, wherein employees are automatically in the union and dues payers unless they opt out, will need to be renegotiated.

Q. HOW DO I COMMUNICATE WITH EMPLOYEES ABOUT JANUS?

A. To begin with, there is no requirement that an employer communicate with employees about the *Janus* decision. Any communication with employees about *Janus* will need to be carefully crafted in order to comply with new and existing labor laws. While employers do possess free speech rights, they are not unlimited and have recently been further limited by SB 866. Under SB 866, a public employer is required to meet and confer with the union on the content of any mass communication concerning public employees' rights to join or support a union or to refrain from doing so. If the parties are unable to agree upon content of the mass communication, the employer may disseminate the communication but must, at the same time, distribute the union's own mass communication.

Q. DOES JANUS IMPACT COLLECTION OF UNION DUES?

A. Not in most cases. Aside from holding that involuntary agency fees are unlawful, the Court in *Janus* also made clear that membership in a union (and associated deduction of union dues) will not be implied and must be affirmatively consented to. Therefore, so long as the employee has expressly consented to join a union or to pay union dues, employers are required to deduct union dues. Most unions use a dues deduction authorization form that, depending on the language on the form, may already satisfy this requirement. If an employer is unsure as to whether union members have given this affirmative consent, we recommend the employer continue deducting dues but contact the union and ask for verification. If an employee challenges the decision, the union is required to indemnify the public agency for defending such challenges. If the union provides verbal verification that employees have given required written authorization we recommend that you confirm that verification in writing to the union. While a public employer must rely on representations by the union, it is best to confirm the representation in writing. We cannot require the union to provide a copy of the written authorization under SB 866 absent a dispute. Although an employer could theoretically halt dues deductions until it received evidence of affirmative consent to be in the union, this is risky and may result in a legal challenge from the union without any required indemnification by the union in such legal action.

Q. HOW DOES JANUS IMPACT NEW EMPLOYEES WHO DESIRE TO JOIN THE UNION OR NOT?

A. In *Janus*, the Court made no distinction between new employees and existing employees as it pertains to dues deductions, agency fees, and related affirmative consent. Again, if the employee chooses to join the union, the employer must honor that decision and commence dues deduction. Similarly, if an employee does not want to be in the union, the employer must honor that decision. For both, the employer is required, under SB 866, to rely on the representation of the union as to the employee's status as union member or nonmember. The sooner the employer obtains verification from the union, the sooner it can start deducting dues for new employees who have chosen to be in the union. It is possible that if an employer waits an unreasonable amount of time to begin deducting dues after the union has represented that the employee is in the union, the union may challenge such action and claim back dues are owed from the date verification of consent was provided. However, prior to verification by the union the status of employees as union members cannot be presumed. With this in mind, an employer might consider reaching out to the union and asking that notification verifying an employee's choice to be in the union or not be given to the employer as soon as possible or within a certain time prior to the date payroll is processed after the union obtains verification from the employee.

Q. CAN A UNION REQUIRE A UNION MEMBER TO REMAIN IN THE UNION FOR A SPECIFIC PERIOD OF TIME?

A. The *Janus* decision does not address this issue. However, it appears that an employee could consent to a commitment to remain in the union; however, a firm requirement that the employee commit to a specified lengthy period of time may raise First Amendment questions as to whether the consent given is sufficient. As a practical matter, this is an issue between the member and the union, as the employer must honor the representations made by the union as to an employee's deduction authorization status under SB 866.

Q. ONE OF OUR UNIONS JUST TOLD ME THAT THEY ARE GOING TO MAKE EMPLOYEES SIGN CONTRACTS AGREEING TO PAY DUES FOR ONE OR MORE YEARS. IS THIS LEGAL UNDER JANUS?

A. The terms of any membership agreement is between the union and the employee. In the event an employee joins a union, signs a commitment for some designated period of time and then seeks to terminate membership early, the employee may tell the employer to stop deducting dues. At that time, under *Janus*, there is an argument that the employer is supposed to stop the deduction. However, under the recently signed

SB 866, the employer is supposed to rely on the union's representation as to the employee's membership status. So the employer could be faced with a situation where the employee demands that dues deductions stop and the union demands they continue for the duration of the membership agreement. In such circumstances, employers will have to make the decision of stopping deductions at the employee's request or continuing the deductions at the union's request. Because this is an evolving area of the law, we recommend that employers work with their legal counsel to understand risks and benefits of each option before deciding which option to exercise.

Q. MY COMMUNITY COLLEGE DISTRICT RECENTLY RECEIVED A CALIFORNIA PUBLIC RECORDS ACT ("CPRA") REQUEST FOR A LIST OF UNION MEMBERS INCLUDING THEIR CONTACT INFORMATION. HOW SHOULD I RESPOND?

- A. This request appears to have been issued state-wide by an entity that may be seeking to encourage union members to cease paying their dues in accordance with the recent U.S. Supreme Court case *Janus v. AFSCME* (No. 16-1466, Decided June 27, 2018).

This request should be approached thoughtfully due to the variety of laws and obligations implicated. On one hand, the college is obligated under the CPRA (Gov. Code, § 6250 et seq.) to provide all responsive, non-exempt, "public records." On the other hand, some community college districts may have also received requests from their bargaining units generally requesting:

- a) That the college provide the bargaining unit with notice if a CPRA request, such as this one, is received by the college prior to responding to the requesting party; and
- b) That the college refuse to provide contact information.

In some situations where a CPRA request is made for personnel information that the college intends to disclose, some colleges have notified the affected employees. If this is past practice that the college is considering, please keep in mind Senate Bill (SB) 285, which prohibits employers from deterring or discouraging public employees from becoming or remaining members of a union, and SB 866, which restricts a public employer's ability to send employees mass communications about joining or not joining a union. Depending on how such notice is phrased, a bargaining unit may challenge the college on one of the aforementioned laws.

There are several options available for responding to such a request including providing all of the information requested, providing some of the information requested, or refusing to provide any of the information requested. Because the option taken in responding could impact your relationship with your labor partners and/or lead to litigation for failing to comply with the CPRA or violating employee privacy rights, we recommend you carefully weigh each option, in conjunction with legal counsel, before deciding how you will respond.

Q. ANYTHING ELSE I SHOULD KNOW?

- A. In anticipation of the *Janus* decision, labor unions throughout California lobbied legislators to obtain more protective and union friendly laws on the books in order to acquire and retain more dues payers. AB 119, requiring public employers to give unions access to new employee orientations and onboarding, is an example of these lobbying efforts that have translated into new law. In addition, SB 285, signed into law in October 2017, makes it unlawful for a public employer to "deter or discourage public employees from becoming or remaining members of an employee organization."

As mentioned earlier, SB 866 will have a significant impact on public employers in California. Under SB 866, public employers are not able to obtain an employee's written authorization for payroll deductions to a union unless a dispute arises about such deductions. This could significantly hamper the ability to properly process payroll if the employer does not have up-to-date payroll records of who is an agency fee payer. The bill does

provide for indemnification by the union for any disputes related to deductions but does not require the union to also defend the college in those disputes. This means that the college will need to defend any such claim and only after doing so would be entitled to indemnification by the union.

This bill also modifies AB 119, by providing that the time, place, and location of new employee orientations are confidential and can only be shared with the employee(s), union, and any vendor contracted to provide services for purposes of the orientation.

Finally, as discussed above, SB 866 provides that before a public employer distributes to employees any mass communication concerning their rights to join or support a union, or to refrain from doing so, it must confer with the union. This is significant and alters public agency operation above and beyond *Janus*.

There are likely to be a number of questions that arise. At each of our eight offices, we are here to help you navigate the complexities of the post-*Janus* world.

IMPLEMENTATION CHECKLIST



BACKGROUND

On June 27, the United States Supreme Court decided the *Janus v. AFSCME* case. As a result, public employees may not be compelled to pay mandatory agency fees, or “fair share” fees, to public-sector unions, because such involuntary fees violate the First Amendment of the United States Constitution. The *Janus* decision immediately affects laws impacting public agencies that currently allow public sector unions to charge and collect agency, or “fair share” fees, and provides that neither an agency fee nor any other form of payment to a public-sector union by a non-member may be deducted from the employee unless the employee clearly and affirmatively consents before any money is taken from them. It follows that for an employee to waive his/her First Amendment rights by becoming a union member, an employee must consent to joining the union as waiver of such rights cannot be presumed under *Janus*.

In light of this monumental decision, the following checklist is designed to provide public agencies with a first set of considerations for implementing the *Janus* decision.

Phase One: Stop Agency Fee Deductions and Execute Your Communication Plan

AGENCY FEE DEDUCTION AND IMPACT

Timing

The Court’s decision in *Janus* is effective immediately, meaning employees who are non-union members cannot be charged agency fees. Accordingly, employers must stop deducting agency fees from the paychecks of employees. Please see below for three practical options to do so.

Identification

Employers should have their human resources and payroll teams work collaboratively with the union leadership to identify employees who are agency fee payers and develop a cohesive strategy to ensure immediate compliance with *Janus*.

Impact of SB 866

California’s newly adopted Senate Bill (“SB”) 866 creates an added layer of potential complication in implementing the *Janus* decision, because it modifies the law to require public employers to rely on the representations of the union regarding an employee’s deduction authorizations. This likely leaves public agency employers with three options: (1) stop agency fee deductions immediately without communication with union leadership; (2) stop the agency fee deductions after providing a minimal amount of notice to union leadership as to the employees who the college believes to be agency fee payers and whose deductions will be halted with the July paycheck; or (3) stop the fee deductions after the union and college agree to the list of employees whose fees will be deducted and have the union defend and indemnify the college if fees are deducted prior to reaching agreement.

COMMUNICATION

Plan

Implement a communication plan to address the likely questions that will come from employees and unions in the days and weeks following this decision.

Central Contact

Consider identifying a single point person that can respond to questions regarding the impacts of the *Janus* decision.

Tone

In developing these communication strategies regarding whether, and how, to communicate the *Janus* decision to employees, employers are encouraged to remain neutral and mindful of applicable law, including Senate Bill 285, prohibiting employers from deterring or discouraging public employees from becoming or remaining members of a union. If the agency wants to transmit a mass communication to employees concerning *Janus*, depending on the content, it may be obligated to meet and confer with labor partners over such communication under SB 866.

Internal Updates

Provide ongoing updates regarding the case and corresponding impacts to college administrators managers and supervisors, as well as governing board members.

Talking Points

Disseminate key messages to approved spokesperson(s) in the event they are faced with questions about the *Janus* decision.

Phase Two: Bargaining Options Post-*Janus*

The following list outlines immediate and representative areas of considerations and questions that your agency will need to contemplate. Given the uniqueness of collective bargaining agreements, SB 866 and the *Janus* decision will have varying and individual impacts for public agencies. The following common clauses in CBAs now merit review:

Recognition

How does my CBA apply to union members and non-union members? Does it need to be clarified?

Union Rights

How does this decision impact access to employees and prospective employees?

Severability/Savings

Do I have a severability clause in my CBA that renders any provisions contrary to *Janus* and/or SB 866 severable from the remaining valid provisions of the CBA?

Opt-Out Provisions

Do they comply with this ruling?

Religious Objection Clauses

Are these still relevant?

Hiring Forms

How will I need to modify the form? Do we have employees fill out the form? Am I required to bargain any modifications?

* These guidelines provide a quick desk reference for local educational agencies to use in response to the *Janus* decision. Public agencies should review their own policies and adopt practices in accordance with those terms. This is not an exhaustive summary of applicable law and should not be construed as legal advice.

LEGISLATIVE UPDATE

PENDING BILLS RELATING TO JANUS



BILL NUMBER/DESCRIPTION (June 27, 2018)

AB 2017. Public employers: employee organizations.

Public employers are prohibited under existing law from deterring or discouraging public employees from becoming or remaining members of an employee organization. This bill broadens the definition of “public employer.” This bill would also prohibit public employers from deterring or discouraging *prospective* public employees from becoming or remaining members of an employee organization.

AB 2154. Public Employment: Labor Relations: Release Time.

This bill specifies requirements for paid release time for union representatives for certain specified activities. The bill would require the exclusive representative to provide reasonable notice requesting such an absence.

AB 2577. Personal income taxes: deductions: labor organization dues.

This bill, for a specified period of time, would authorize as a deduction from gross income the amount paid or incurred during the taxable year for member dues to a labor organization paid by a taxpayer.

AB 3121. Evidentiary privileges: union agent-represented worker privilege.

This bill provides that, in general, a union agent and a represented employee or represented former employee would have a privilege to refuse to disclose confidential communications between the employee or former employee and the union agent which were made when the union agent was acting in his or her representative capacity. The bill provides that a represented employee or represented former employee would generally also have a privilege to prevent someone else from disclosing such a privileged communication. This bill describes additional waiver provisions and also states that this privilege would *not* apply in criminal proceedings.

SB 1085. Public employees: leaves of absence: exclusive bargaining representative service.

This bill would require, when requested by the exclusive representative of an employee, that a public employer grant leaves of absence, without loss of compensation or other benefits, to allow employees to serve as stewards or officers of the exclusive representative, or of any statewide or national employee organization with which the exclusive representative is affiliated.

Further, as provided in this bill, the steward or representative would have reinstatement rights at the end of this leave. Specifically, they would have a right of reinstatement to the same position and work location held before the leave, or if this is not feasible, a substantially similar position without loss of seniority, rank, or classification.

The bill would require the exclusive representation or employee organization to reimburse the public employer for all compensation paid to the employee on this type of leave, unless otherwise agreed to. The bill would also provide that a public employer is not liable for acts, omissions, or injuries by employees that occur during this type of leave.

Assembly Concurrent Resolution (ACR) 185. Unions.

This measure would declare that the Legislature recognizes unions and their efforts to represent workers. Among other declarations, the measure would declare that the Legislature supports the organizing of workers who continue to fight for union rights.

SAMPLE LETTER TO BOARD MEMBERS

The United States Supreme Court recently decided the highly-anticipated *Janus v. AFSCME* case in a 5 - 4 decision that alters the landscape of public sector employment relations and collective bargaining. Overturning longstanding precedent, the Court held that public employees may not be compelled to pay mandatory agency fees, or “fair share” fees, to public-sector unions, because such involuntary fees violate the First Amendment of the United States Constitution.

Janus v. AFSCME challenged the constitutionality of requiring public employees who are not union members to pay compulsory agency fees to an exclusive representative. Mark Janus is an Illinois public sector employee who sued the American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees (“AFSCME”), arguing a state law allowing the union to charge and collect fees from non-members, including Janus, violated his and other workers’ First Amendment rights.

Agency fee payers are employees who work under an agency fee system who have opted out of the union. Through agency fees, these employees are required to pay the costs associated with collective bargaining, grievance processing, and contract administration, among other things. Agency fee payers cannot be compelled to pay for the political and ideological activities of the union. At least 22 states, including California, have laws that provide for agency fees. Under *Janus*, these agency fee statutes are no longer constitutional. Dues payers, on the other hand, are employees who are members of the union and pay dues to the union for both the matters that agency fee payers pay for, and also for the political and ideological activities of the union. *Janus* does not immediately impact dues payers because these employees have chosen to be part of the union. However, the *Janus* decision held that employees who choose not to be in the union must affirmatively consent to any payment made by that nonmember to the union. Similarly, *Janus* requires employees to affirmatively consent to be in the union, which could impact public agencies that have a union contract providing for an opt-out system wherein the employee is automatically in the union and a dues payer unless he/she opts out of union membership.

The Supreme Court previously decided this issue in 1977 in *Abood v. Detroit Board of Education*, then holding it constitutional for public sector unions to collect fees from nonunion members, to defray the cost of collective bargaining and other activities, provided nonunion members are not required to pay for a union’s political activities. This has been the law for over forty years, until now.

In anticipation of the *Janus* decision, labor unions throughout California lobbied legislators to obtain more protective and union friendly laws on the books in order to acquire and retain more dues payers. Assembly Bill (“AB”) 119, requiring public employers to give unions access to new employee orientations and onboarding, is an example of these lobbying efforts that have translated into new law. In addition, Senate Bill (“SB”) 285, signed into law in October 2017,

makes it unlawful for a public employer to “deter or discourage public employees from becoming or remaining members of an employee organization.” SB 866—signed by the Governor on June 27, 2018—was immediately effective and contains several provisions, one of which will impact certain community college district communications. This bill provides that any mass communication made by a public employer concerning public employees’ rights to join or support a union, or to refrain from doing so, is subject to the meet and confer process with the union(s). In the event the parties are unable to reach agreement on the content of the communication, the community college district is able to distribute the communication, but also must simultaneously distribute the union’s own mass communication. “Mass communication,” is defined as “a written document, or script for an oral or recorded presentation or message, that is intended for delivery to multiple public employees.” At least one employee organization appears to interpret mass communication as a communication to more than one employee. There are several other active bills that, if passed, would further expand union rights in California.

Given the above, it is critically important that Board Members, as representatives of the community college district, are aware of these limitations on communications regarding union participation and tailor any comments or responses to questions accordingly. If an employee asks you questions about the *Janus* case, the recent legislation, or whether to join or stay in the union, we strongly recommend that you refer them to their labor organization for answers to those questions. We also recommend that you be mindful of any comments that you may make that could be construed as deterring or discouraging union participation as we expect this limitation will be broadly construed. If you have any questions, or if you need to direct our employees to a community college district contact, please reach out to _____ [likely Vice Chancellor].



Lozano Smith
ATTORNEYS AT LAW

LozanoSmith.com

Disclaimer:

As the information contained herein is necessarily general, its application to a particular set of facts and circumstances may vary. For this reason, this document does not constitute legal advice. We recommend that you consult with your counsel prior to acting on the information contained herein.

Copyright © 2018 Lozano Smith

All rights reserved. No portion of this work may be copied, distributed, sold or used for any commercial advantage or private gain, nor any derivative work prepared therefrom, nor shall any sub-license be granted, without the express prior written permission of Lozano Smith through its Managing Partner. The Managing Partner of Lozano Smith hereby grants permission to any client of Lozano Smith to whom Lozano Smith provides a copy to use such copy intact and solely for the internal purposes of such client. By accepting this product, recipient agrees it shall not use the work except consistent with the terms of this limited license.