



June 18, 2024

The Honorable Lola Smallwood-Cuevas  
Chair, Senate Committee on Labor, Public  
Employment and Retirement  
1021 O St. Ste. 6740  
Sacramento, CA 95814

**RE: AB 2421 (Low) Employer-Employee Relations: Confidential Communications.**  
**OPPOSE** (As Amended 06/17/24)

Dear Senator Smallwood-Cuevas,

The League of California Cities (Cal Cities), California State Association of Counties (CSAC), California Special Districts Association (CSDA), Rural County Representatives of California (RCRC), Urban Counties of California (UCC), the Association of California Healthcare Districts (ACHD), Public Risk Innovation, Solutions, and Management (PRISM), California Association of Joint Powers Authorities (CAJPA), Community College League of California, the California Association of Recreation and Park Districts (CARPD), the Association of California School Administrators (ACSA), and the California School Boards Association (CSBA), write to inform you of our respectful opposition to Assembly Bill (AB) 2421 (Low). This bill would restrict an employer's ability to conduct internal investigations to the detriment of employees' and the public's safety and well-being.

Recent amendments to the bill removed prior language stating the **intent** to create an employee-union representative privilege in the context of California public employment, and now express an intention not to create an evidentiary privilege.

However, **the substantive provisions of the bill**, which were previously intended to create a privilege, remain largely unchanged.

### **Previous Legislation and Previous Veto**

Our concerns with AB 2421 are consistent with the issues raised in response to similar legislation (AB 418 (Kalra, 2019)) and reflected in the veto message to AB 729 (Hernandez, 2013)). *"I don't believe it is appropriate to put communications with a union agent on equal footing with communications with one's spouse, priest, physician or attorney. Moreover, this bill could compromise the ability of employers to conduct investigations into workplace safety, harassment and other allegations."* – Governor Jerry Brown

### **Limits the Ability for Local Agencies to Conduct Thorough Internal Investigations**

In order to conduct proper investigations that uphold the public's trust and ensure the safety and well-being of both public employees and the public, it is critical that a public employer has the ability to interview all potential parties and witnesses to ascertain the facts and understand the matter fully. AB 2421 interferes with the ability to interview witnesses because it would prohibit public agencies from questioning any employee or employee representative regarding communications made between an employee and an "employee representative." In doing so, this bill would permit the silencing of employees who wish to voluntarily report an incident or testify in front of necessary employer investigations into misconduct. It would also limit the ability of employers to conduct investigations into workplace safety, harassment, and other allegations.

Under this bill, the employee or the "employee representative" could at will decide to shield virtually any work-related communication. This could be problematic regarding workplace investigations for alleged harassment or other misconduct; as the employee representative could potentially prevent an employer from completing a comprehensive investigation. This is especially problematic because a union representative does not only represent one worker, but the bargaining unit as a whole. AB 2421 lacks guardrails to prevent potential conflicts of interest that could arise during employee conflicts.

### **Expansion of New One-Sided Standard**

As noted above, while the prior intent language referencing a privilege has been removed, the substance of the bill remains largely the same. The attorney-client relationship is carefully defined by state law. Privilege is by design narrow in scope to protect the confidentiality and integrity of relationships, both professional and familiar in nature, where highly sensitive and deeply personal information is exchanged. AB 2421 fails to recognize this well-established threshold and instead would create a new, broad shield for public employees, which was previously intended to be a privilege, without meaningful limitation on how it will function.

Additionally, the provisions of AB 2421 would apply to any employee, and anyone designated as the "employee representative," a term that is not defined in the bill. This means that AB 2421 could be interpreted to not only apply to a union representative

but also to a coworker, friend, or family member in certain workplace investigations, administrative proceedings, and civil litigation.

Unlike privileges, which apply to both sides of the litigation or proceedings such as the attorney-client privilege, AB 2421 does not equally protect the management-employee communication, or communications between members of management regarding labor union disputes or grievance issues. Consequently, in labor related proceedings such as California Public Employment Relations Board hearings, an employer would be forced to disclose all related communications, while the employee representative or employee could pick and choose which communications they wanted to disclose which may result in unjust rulings or decisions made against the public agency regarding labor related proceedings.

Additionally, the bill would impede a public employer's ability to defend itself in litigation and conduct fact-finding in other adversarial processes. It would create a significant advantage to employees in the context of disciplinary and grievance proceedings, significantly limiting an employer from investigating, prosecuting, or defending against such actions.

### **Workplace Safety and Government Operations**

AB 2421 would interfere with the public employer's responsibility to provide a safe workplace, free from unlawful discrimination, harassment, or retaliation, by impeding a public employer's ability to communicate with employees to learn about, investigate and respond to such concerns. AB 2421 could also decrease workplace safety if public employers are limited in their ability to investigate threats of violence within the workforce. Employers are legally required to promptly investigate complaints of unlawful discrimination, harassment, retaliation, and other types of unlawful workplace conduct. If the employer is limited in its communications with employees, it will make it much more difficult to comply with these legal obligations, which were imposed by the legislature to create safer workplaces, free from unlawful discrimination and harassment.

In the context of the recent pandemic, the bill could have also compromised the ability of public employers to investigate outbreaks and implement public health orders or regulations.

Given the overly broad nature of the bill, it could be read to prohibit employers from communicating with employees about anything from day-to-day activities to matters that are important for government operations. Employers may not even know they are violating the bill by communicating with staff, because only the employee or their representative would know or could decide when a communication was made "in confidence." Lastly, the bill could even decrease public agency transparency and accountability due to the potential increased difficulty in investigating accusations of public corruption, or misuse of public funds.

For the aforementioned reasons, our concerns with AB 2421 have not been meaningfully addressed, and the organizations listed below respectfully remain

opposed to the bill. If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact our organizations' representatives directly.

Sincerely,

 <p>Johnnie Piña Legislative Affairs, Lobbyist League of California Cities <a href="mailto:jpiña@calcities.org">jpiña@calcities.org</a></p>	 <p>Kalyn Dean Legislative Advocate California State Association of Counties <a href="mailto:kdean@counties.org">kdean@counties.org</a></p>
 <p>Jean Hurst Legislative Representative Urban Counties of California <a href="mailto:jkh@hbeadvocacy.com">jkh@hbeadvocacy.com</a></p>	 <p>Sarah Dukett Policy Advocate Rural County Representatives of California <a href="mailto:sdukett@rcrcnet.org">sdukett@rcrcnet.org</a></p>
 <p>Aaron Avery Director of State Legislative Affairs California Special Districts Association <a href="mailto:aarona@cdda.net">aarona@cdda.net</a></p>	 <p>Faith Borges Legislative Representative California Association of Joint Powers Authorities <a href="mailto:FBorges@Actumllc.com">FBorges@Actumllc.com</a></p>
 <p>Sarah Bridge Association of California Healthcare Districts <a href="mailto:sarah@deveauburrgroup.com">sarah@deveauburrgroup.com</a></p>	 <p>Dorothy Johnson Legislative Advocate Association of California School Administrators <a href="mailto:djohnson@acsa.org">djohnson@acsa.org</a></p>

 <p>Jason Schmelzer Public Risk Innovation, Solutions, and Management (PRISM) <a href="mailto:jason@SYASLpartners.com">jason@SYASLpartners.com</a></p>	 <p>Andrew Martinez Senior Director of Government Relations Community College League of California <a href="mailto:amartinez@cclleague.org">amartinez@cclleague.org</a></p>
 <p>Chris Reeve Legislative Director California School Boards Association <a href="mailto:creefe@csba.org">creefe@csba.org</a></p>	 <p>Alyssa Silhi Legislative Advocate California Association of Park and Recreation Districts <a href="mailto:asilhi@publicpolicygroup.com">asilhi@publicpolicygroup.com</a></p>

CC:

The Honorable Evan Low  
Honorable Members, Senate Committee on Labor,  
Public Employment and Retirement  
Glenn Miles, Consultant, Senate Committee on Labor, Public  
Employment and Retirement  
Corry Botts, Policy Consultant, Senate Republican Caucus  
Mary Hernandez, Chief Deputy Legislative Secretary,  
Office of Governor Gavin Newsom