

STATE OF ALABAMA OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL

LUTHER STRANGE ATTORNEY GENERAL

February 4, 2016

501 WASHINGTON AVENUE P.O. BOX 300152 MONTGOMERY, AL 36130-0152 (334) 242-7300 WWW.AGO.ALABAMA.GOV

VIA FEDERAL EXPRESS & E-MAIL

The Honorable Howard Shelanski
Administrator, Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs
Office of Management and Budget
725 17th Street, NW
Washington, DC 20503
OIRA submission@omb.eop.gov

Re: The Proposed Persuader Advice Exemption Rule (RIN: 1245-AA03)

As the chief legal officers of our states, we are writing to express our concerns about the proposed final rule referenced above and currently under consideration. As proposed, we believe this new rule would undermine long-standing protections for confidential attorney-client communications and would place undue burdens on small businesses within our states.

For more than 50 years, the Labor Management Reporting and Disclosure Act ("LMRDA") has preserved the confidentiality of attorney-client communications by exempting attorney advice relating to labor relations issues from disclosure generally, and specifically, by exempting confidential attorney-client interactions. This new rule, however, would undermine these protections by requiring the reporting of advice related to persuasion of employees, regardless of whether the lawyers who provide the advice communicate with anyone other than their clients. These new reporting requirements would put lawyers in our states in an ethical dilemma: An attorney must either risk professional disciplinary action by disclosing employer confidences or risk liability under the LMRDA by refusing to disclose employer confidences.

The new rule will cause particular harm to small businesses in our states. The reporting requirement applies specifically to outside consultants. Because many large corporations employ in-house counsels, they will have access to legal advice on labor matters, free of the disclosure concerns raised by the new rule. Small businesses, by their very nature, are less likely to employ an in-house counsel. The burden of this new rule will fall chiefly on them, with heavy penalties if they fail to comply.

Ultimately, this proposed rule will have a chilling effect on attorney-client confidentiality and employers' fundamental right to counsel. The rule may well discourage employers from seeking legal representation, a consequence contrary to the overall intent of the Act. It will also dissuade attorneys from taking labor cases in order to avoid the ethical dilemma the new rule creates. For these reasons, the Bar Associations of many of our states, as well as the American Bar Association, also have expressed their concern with the dramatic, negative impact the rule would have on the practice of law and the right to associate with counsel.

The Department of Labor claims that the new rule is "firmly rooted in the plain meaning of the statutory text." But the rule contradicts more than five decades of practice founded on the Department's interpretation following enactment of the LMRDA. The Department points to no change in the statute to justify its reinterpretation, and the new rule is without foundation in the law.

On behalf of the undersigned states, we urge the OMB office to reject the proposed rule as drafted and reaffirm the longstanding interpretation of the advice exemption to the reporting requirements of the LMRDA.

Luther Strange

Alabama Attorney General

Luther Strange

Mark Brnovich

Mark 13

Arizona Attorney General

Leslie Rutledge

Arkansas Attorney General

25. Olens

< Gilt

Sam Olens

Georgia Attorney General

Lawrence G. Wasden Idaho Attorney General

Derek Schmidt

Kansas Attorney General

Jeff Landry

Louisiana Attorney General

Bill Tchueth

Bill Schuette

Michigan Attorney General

Adam Paul Laxalt Nevada Attorney General

Scott Pruitt

Oklahoma Attorney General

Alan Wilson

South Carolina Attorney General

Dan Wilson

Marty Jackley

South Dakota Attorney General

PATRICK Momse

Patrick Morrisey

West Virginia Attorney General

Example of the continuum from "probably unrelated" to "could be related" to "persuader activity": Confusion, Over-Reporting, Under-Reporting and Potential Criminal Exposure Created for Small, Non-Union Employers and their Providers

9. Traditional Persuader Activity delivered directly to	\rightarrow	Rarely provided by	attorneys, by	most	consultants	or by trade	associations;	usually from	niche
8. Active campaign consulting	\rightarrow	Drafting, coaching, and	teaching	effective and	lawful	behaviors	(not directly	to voters)	
7. Pre-Campaign Training in Do's and Don'ts	\rightarrow	Usually in the context of	some level of	union activity	reported to	the employer	by employees	or a union	itself
6. "How to Remain Union-Free" Program or Related Preventive	\rightarrow	Explicit connection to	a Union-Free	objective but	the content is	mostly	Positive	Employee	Relations plus
5. "Positive Employee Relations" Training	\rightarrow	Blending soft skills and	total rewards	issues to	strengthen	the	relationship	with	employees.
4. Employee Opinion or Engagement Surveys	\rightarrow	Can be a regular	temperature	check, can	have mixed	objectives or	could be a	key part of	campaign
3. "Total Rewards Strategies" and Consulting	\rightarrow	Compensation and Benefit	planning may	be unrelated,	have mixed	objectives or be	a key part of	campaign	prevention
2. Reviewing or Drafting Employee Handbooks	\rightarrow	Usually unrelated to	campaign	context; Will	always	involve	"protected	concerted	activity"
1. General Soft Skills Training or Coaching for Supervisors and Managers	\rightarrow	Usually unrelated to	Sec. 7	Context;	might have a	dual	objective;	could be in	the midst of

providers

Do's and

Can be part of a Union-

prevention

issues per

a campaign

objective.

			= "	
			-	
				20