

Unwrapping Late Year NLRB Decisions – Next Steps For Your Organization to Consider

By Jonathan J. Spitz, Philip B. Rosen, Chad P. Richter, Richard I. Greenberg, Suellen Oswald and Laura A. Pierson-Scheinberg

December 16, 2017

Two weeks after newly appointed National Labor Relations Board General Counsel Peter Robb signaled his intent to ask the Board to consider overruling many union-friendly precedents of the Obama-era Board, the Board has beaten him to the punch. Over the course of two days (December 14 and 15), the Board repudiated three of the Obama Board's most vexing decisions – on joint employer status (*Browning-Ferris industries / HY-Brand Industrial Contractors*), micro-bargaining units (*Specialty Healthcare / PCC Structurals*), and employer workplace rules and policies (*Lutheran Heritage-Livonia / The Boeing Company*). The Board's spate of employer-friendly decisions provides a number of opportunities for the proactive employer.

In *Hy-Brand Industrial Contractors*, the Board overruled *Browning-Ferris Industries*, 362 NLRB No. 186 (2015), which held two entities are joint employers under the National Labor Relations Act where the second employer exercises indirect control over another entity's employees, or where the second employer has reserved rights of control, even if unexercised. In *Hy-Brand*, the reconstituted Board reversed course, returning to prior precedent finding joint employer status only where the second entity has *actually* exercised control over the other entity's employees and has done so "directly and immediately."

In *PCC Structurals*, 365 NLRB No. 160 (Dec. 15, 2017), the Board overruled *Specialty Healthcare*, 357 NLRB 934 (2011), which made it easier for unions to organize "micro-units." Instead, the Board returned to its prior analysis for assessing "whether a proposed bargaining unit constitutes an appropriate unit for collective bargaining when the employer contends that the smallest appropriate unit must include additional employees." Under *PCC*, the Board no longer will shift the burden to employers to establish excluded employees share such an "overwhelming community of interest" with petitioned-for employees that there is "no legitimate basis upon which to exclude [them] from" the petitioned-for unit because the traditional community-of-interest factors "overlap almost completely." Instead, the Board will not carve out a "micro-unit" unless it finds petitioned-for employees "share a community of interest sufficiently distinct from the interests of employees excluded from the petitioned-for group to warrant a finding that the proposed group constitutes a separate appropriate unit." The revised standard will make it more difficult for unions to carve out smaller, artificial groups in an effort to disenfranchise employees who are inclined to vote against union representation.

Finally, in *The Boeing Corporation*, 365 NLRB No. 164 (Dec. 15, 2017), the Board revised its standard for assessing whether workplace rules and policies interfere with employee rights under Section 7 of the NLRA. *Boeing* overruled *Lutheran Heritage-Livonia*, 343 NLRB 646 (2004), in which the Board broadly held unlawful rules which employees could "reasonably construe" to prohibit Section 7 activity. *Boeing* replaces this assessment with a two-part analysis evaluating (1) the nature and extent of the potential impact of the rule on NLRA rights, and (2) legitimate justifications associated with the rule. The new test requires scrutinizing rules on several levels: (1) to determine whether, when reasonably interpreted, they would have no tendency to interfere with Section 7 rights; (2) whether any rules that have a reasonable tendency to interfere with Section 7 rights have been deemed by the Board to be lawful because the risk of such interference is outweighed by the justifications associated with the rules; and (3) to determine the justification for certain rules that have a potential adverse impact on NLRA activity and whether the justification outweighs the potential adverse impact on Section 7 rights.

What Employers Should Do Now

The Board's holiday-time decisions provide the opportunity for employers to reclaim rights lost to activist decisions of the Obama Board. Consider the following steps:

1. To the extent your organization has avoided certain ventures or business relationships due to

Meet the Authors



[Jonathan J. Spitz](#)

Principal
Atlanta
404-586-1835
Email



[Philip B. Rosen](#)

Principal
New York Metro
New York City
212-545-4001
Email



[Chad P. Richter](#)

Office Managing Principal
Omaha
402-827-4233
Email

potential joint employer liability, **reassess whether joint employer fears remain significant** and your risk/reward assessment. Likewise, reassess situations in which your organization has avoided engaging with third party labor. While the threat of joint employer status and potential liability remains, employers may have more leeway to run their business without being deemed to be a joint employer.

2. Conduct a **bargaining unit analysis** to determine whether there are opportunities to reinforce facts and practices which will buttress your organization's arguments in support of more favorable bargaining unit configurations. For example, conventional wisdom is that "wall-to-wall" bargaining units are much more difficult for unions to organize than smaller, discrete units which may harbor pockets of discontent.
3. **Consider a full review of policies and procedures.** Some rules found unlawful under the Obama Board's expansive reading of Section 7 are once again lawful and may be reinserted in employer policies. Of particular focus are rules addressing "respectful conduct," prohibiting "insubordination," and prohibiting use of cameras and recording devices. *Boeing* greatly increases the right of employers to implement justified, facially neutral rules which can be read to interfere with Section 7 rights only through a tortured reading.
4. **Continue to train managers and supervisors.** While the Trump Board has scaled back some of the excesses of its predecessor, the new focus on protected concerted activity in non-union workplaces cannot be put back into the proverbial bottle. Training for management employees on Section 7 rights and positive employee relations remains essential.

These recommendations, while simple, require deep thought and analysis. Jackson Lewis attorneys stand ready to provide input and guidance. For assistance please contact the authors listed here or the Jackson Lewis attorney with whom you regularly work.

©2017 Jackson Lewis P.C. This material is provided for informational purposes only. It is not intended to constitute legal advice nor does it create a client-lawyer relationship between Jackson Lewis and any recipient. Recipients should consult with counsel before taking any actions based on the information contained within this material. This material may be considered attorney advertising in some jurisdictions. Prior results do not guarantee a similar outcome.

Focused on labor and employment law since 1958, Jackson Lewis P.C.'s 950+ attorneys located in major cities nationwide consistently identify and respond to new ways workplace law intersects business. We help employers develop proactive strategies, strong policies and business-oriented solutions to cultivate high-functioning workforces that are engaged, stable and diverse, and share our clients' goals to emphasize inclusivity and respect for the contribution of every employee. For more information, visit <https://www.jacksonlewis.com>.



Richard I. Greenberg

Principal
New York Metro
New York City
212-545-4080
Email



Suellen Oswald

Principal
Cleveland
216-750-4339
Email



Laura A. Pierson-Scheinberg

Principal
San Francisco
415-796-5408
Email

Practices

Labor Relations

Industries

Chemicals
Construction
Energy and Utilities
Financial Services
Government Contractors
Healthcare
Higher Education
Hospitality
Insurance
Life Sciences
Manufacturing
Media
Professional Services
Real Estate
Retail
Technology
Transportation