

Representing Management Exclusively in Workplace Law and Related Litigation

jackson | lewis
Attorneys at Law

Jackson Lewis LLP
58 South Service Road
Suite 410
Melville, NY 11747
Tel. 631-247-0404
Fax. 631-247-0417
www.jacksonlewis.com

ALBANY, NY	DETROIT, MI	MINNEAPOLIS, MN	PORTSMOUTH, NH
ALBUQUERQUE, NM	GREENVILLE, SC	MORRISTOWN, NJ	PROVIDENCE, RI
ATLANTA, GA	HARTFORD, CT	NEW ORLEANS, LA	RALEIGH-DURHAM, NC
BIRMINGHAM, AL	HOUSTON, TX	NEW YORK, NY	RICHMOND, VA
BOSTON, MA	JACKSONVILLE, FL	OMAHA, NE	SACRAMENTO, CA
CHICAGO, IL	LAS VEGAS, NV	ORANGE COUNTY, CA	SAN DIEGO, CA
CINCINNATI, OH	LONG ISLAND, NY	ORLANDO, FL	SAN FRANCISCO, CA
CLEVELAND, OH	LOS ANGELES, CA	PHILADELPHIA, PA	SEATTLE, WA
DALLAS, TX	MEMPHIS, TN	PHOENIX, AZ	STAMFORD, CT
DENVER, CO	MIAMI, FL	PITTSBURGH, PA	WASHINGTON DC REGION
		PORTLAND, OR	WHITE PLAINS, NY

MY DIRECT DIAL IS: 631-247-4609
MY EMAIL ADDRESS IS: BRITONR@JACKSONLEWIS.COM

**REMARKS ON BEHALF OF AIRLINE SERVICES COUNCIL OF NATIONAL AIR
TRANSPORTATION ASSOCIATION**

RE: DOCKET NO. C-6964

Good morning, Chairman Dougherty, Member Hoglander, Member Puchala, and staff of the NMB. My name is Roger Briton. I am a member of the firm of Jackson Lewis LLP and am appearing today on behalf of the Airline Services Council of the National Air Transportation Association (“ASC”). ASC counts among its members many airline service companies that are a critical component of the air transportation system. On an outsource basis, ASC members perform many functions traditionally and historically performed by airline employees, among them a variety of ground and passenger handling services. In prior determinations of the Board, several ASC members have been held to be “derivative” carriers subject to the Railway Labor Act. As such, this segment of the aviation industry has a significant interest in the rule change now being contemplated by the Board as well as in maintaining stability in the representation and negotiation arenas in which they operate.

We welcome this opportunity to express some of our views in this forum. We anticipate expanding on this presentation and filing comments pursuant to the Board's Notice of Proposed Rulemaking. We also appreciate the opportunity to hear the views of the various constituencies in the industries covered by the RLA and are hopeful that the Board will carefully evaluate all views before taking any actions to disturb longstanding practices and procedures under the Act.

OVERVIEW

By way of brief overview, we note that the RLA has been a remarkably resilient and effective tool in promoting the Act's fundamental purposes. In that connection, we note that the first among the general purposes identified in Section 1a of the Act is "to avoid any interruption to commerce or to the operation of any carrier engaged therein." As the Board has repeatedly recognized, its consistent policies in administering and implementing the requirements of the Act have proven very effective in supporting this primary statutory purpose. On behalf of ASC, however, we are concerned that the Board's proposed change to the balloting and vote counting rules potentially fosters precisely the instability that the Act abhors. We also are concerned that what appears to be a "rush to judgment" will not address many issues which we believe are critical to maintaining stability in these industries. In that connection, we view it as essential that all segments of all covered industries clearly understand fully all the ground rules which will apply in future representation disputes.

The Board's election rules are long established and have not changed, except incrementally, for many years. The "sea change" proposed in the NPRM calls into question the continued vitality of other board rules and procedures, as well. The full scope of these changes

should be identified at one time and opened for comment among all segments of all covered industries. Changes should not be made without the full participation of all constituencies and only in an orderly, carefully considered process. We are concerned that the proposal to change the form of ballot and method of ballot counting is but the beginning of a cascade of changes, all of which we submit are unnecessary and ill-conceived. In any event, a piecemeal approach to change at best will cause uncertainty, and at worst may lead to instability.

CONCERNS OVER THE PROPOSED RULE CHANGE

The Board has consistently held that its procedures should not be changed unless “mandated by law,” or required by “essential ... administrative necessity.” There has been no showing whatever of this type of necessity. Moreover, the means by which this has been undertaken—at the very least giving the appearance of pre-judgment—calls into question the integrity of the process.

Procedure aside, we are concerned that the proposed change will lead to certification of minority representatives. This will foster instability in contract negotiations and, very likely in carrier operations themselves, resulting in an increase in interruptions to commerce. Under the proposed rule, a small number of voters may determine the result of an election. With low “ballot box turnout,” an organization lacking the affirmative support of a majority of the craft or class may be charged with negotiating a collective bargaining agreement on behalf of numerous individuals who do not support its representative status. Experience in recent years has reflected the difficulty in getting collective bargaining agreements ratified, even where airline employee representatives are certified under traditional majority rules. Those

difficulties can only be exacerbated where representatives are supported only by a minority. The potential for more disruption is obvious.

There are other flaws. For instance, the Board has not addressed how the rule change will affect multi-union elections. Consider the following scenario: An incumbent union (A) is being challenged by another organization (B). Of the 100 employees casting ballots, 20 vote for union A, 45 vote for union B, and 35 vote for no union. Under the Board's existing rules, if the 65 votes for union representation constitute a majority of eligible voters, union B would be certified. Under the proposed rule, however, union B does not have a majority of votes cast. What then? In this situation, the NLRB would conduct a rerun election with the two highest vote-getters (here, union B and no union), but it is entirely unclear how this Board would deal with it. One thing is clear: where only the ballots cast by actual voters count, there would be no reason to aggregate the votes gathered by the unions A and B. At the very least, this issue should be addressed during any rulemaking on the proposed change.

The proposed rule change also creates uncertainty with regard to remedies in the event of election interference. The ballot form and vote counting methodology under consideration by the Board appears to be the same as the ballot form and procedure long known as the "Laker ballot," which has been used, for many years, as a remedy in cases of carrier election interference. If the "Laker ballot" now becomes the "new norm," then the Board must carefully consider the range of potential remedies available in the event of election interference. Will the "Key ballot," now used only in egregious cases, become S.O.P. for interference cases? Under what circumstances will bargaining orders be available in interference cases? Once the door opens to certification of a minority representative, the possibility of election interference by

unions increases. The Board needs to consider rules governing union election conduct and remedies in the event of union interference if it goes down this path.

The foregoing are only some of the issues spawned by the NPRM. There are many others. The Board should carefully and deliberately identify, evaluate and respond to these original issues, before changing an election procedure so fundamental.

OTHER ISSUES TO BE CONSIDERED

If the Board is committed to undertaking an overhaul of long-standing rules, procedures and practices, its failure to do so on a global basis can only serve to heighten uncertainty for all of the Board's constituencies. We note, for instance, that the NPRM does not address an IBT proposal for the provision of lists of eligible voters' names and addresses ("Excelsior" lists). Is this proposal still "on the table?" If so, shouldn't it be subject to comment by all constituencies? The same applies to the proposal by the Chamber of Commerce to establish a clear and simple decertification process. These are significant issues which the Board should not simply leave in limbo

If the Board is seriously considering overhauling its rules, one cannot ignore the impact it will have on critical standards that the Board has consistently and historically applied. For instance, the Board has long recognized the propriety of system-wide crafts or classes. This no doubt facilitates stability and the avoidance of interruptions to commerce. As part of this proceeding, the Board should confirm the continued vitality of system-wide representation. Similarly, the Board should confirm that the current showing of interest requirements are not subject to change. If alternative procedures for certification, such as "card checks," are even being given thought, the Board owes it to all constituencies to air the issue thoroughly and

carefully before moving in this direction. At present, card check as a basis for certification has been applied only in the most egregious employer election interference cases. If there is any consideration being given to expanding this process, that change deserves rigorous review and analysis.

These are just some of the issues raising concerns over instability. If other changes are contemplated by the Board or any of the Board's constituencies, they should be laid on the table and vetted as a whole, not piecemeal or seriatum. Speaking on behalf of ASC, no change is needed and any overhaul is unnecessary and ill considered. That having been said, what is most critical is that all constituencies understand all of the rules going forward.

CONCLUSION

We appreciate the opportunity to present these views and to hear the views of others. We strongly believe that the Board's system of administering the representation features of the Act have been consistently, carefully and properly applied for the last 75 years. While we recognize that review with a fresh eye is worthwhile, from time to time, a comprehensive review requires that all relevant issues be open to comment and that the views of all industry segments be encouraged and carefully considered. Ultimately, if any changes are made, they should enhance—not destabilize—the fundamental purposes of the RLA.

Thank you.



Roger. H. Briton