August 28, 2018

Roxanne Rothschild
Deputy Executive Secretary
National Labor Relations Board
1015 Half Street SE
Washington, DC 20570-0001

Re: McDonald’s USA, LLC, A Joint Employer, et al. and Fast Food Workers Committee and Service Employees International Union, CTW, CLC, et al., Cases 02-CA-093893, et al.; 04-CA-125567, et. al.

Dear Ms. Rothschild:

This amicus letter is being submitted in the above referenced case on behalf of the following trade groups: Coalition for a Democratic Workplace; American Hotel & Lodging Association; Associated Builders and Contractors; Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America; HR Policy Association; Independent Electrical Contractors, Inc.; International Foodservice Distributors Association; International Franchise Association; the National Association of Manufacturers; National Association of Wholesaler-Distributors; National Federation of Independent Business; National Retail Federation; Restaurant Law Center; Retail Industry Leaders Association and the Society for Human Resource Management (the “Trade Groups”). The Trade Groups respectfully request that this amicus letter be filed and circulated to the Board members sitting on this case. We certify that a copy of this letter has been sent to all persons and entities shown as being copied below.

The Trade Groups each have an abiding interest not only in the proper development of the law under the National Labor Relations Act, but also in the efficient operation of the National Labor Relations Board, unhindered by unfounded and legally unsupported attempts to prevent the Board from making decisions in cases of national importance.

The Trade Groups wholly endorse the arguments made by McDonald’s USA, LLC (“McDonald’s USA”), in its opposition to the Motion to Recuse Chairman Ring and Member Emanuel filed by the Service Employees International Union (“SEIU” or “Union”). McDonald’s
USA’s arguments are well-founded and ineluctably lead to the conclusion that there is no basis whatsoever for either Chairman Ring or Member Emanuel to recuse themselves in this case, or in any case where any of the Board members are similarly situated as to the parties and law firms involved here.

McDonald’s USA correctly interprets the two relevant ethics provisions regarding recusal and the specific limits they seek to impose. Both Executive Order 13770 and 5 C.F.R. § 2635.502 apply only to matters involving a party that a Member personally represented, or matters in which the Member’s former employer actively represented the party before the Board.¹ Neither Chairman Ring nor Member Emanuel personally represented any of the parties in this matter during the two years prior to their appointments to the Board. Neither of their former law firms served as counsel of record, or had any communications with the Board, on behalf of any parties in this matter. The plain text of these policies and the policy justifications behind them do not require—or even suggest—recusal would be an appropriate course for either Member.²

The Union ignores these reasonable limitations on the scope of the recusal obligation. It advocates for a standard that would drastically and unjustifiably expand the scope of the rules. Here, the Union contends that where a Member’s former law firm represented a party in a different but related capacity, that Member cannot decide a matter involving that party without the appearance of bias. This standard is irreconcilable with the text of the Executive Order and federal regulations, and unmanageable as a practical matter.

¹ See, e.g., 82 Fed. Reg. 9333 (appointees should abstain from “any particular matter involving specific parties that is directly and substantially related to [a] former employer or former clients”). Matters are “directly and substantially related” if they are “matters in which the appointee’s former employer or former client is a party or represents a party.” Id. at 9334. A “former client” is “any person for whom the appointee served personally as . . . attorney.” Id. (emphasis added).

² McDonald’s USA is also correct that the Union has waived any right it may have had to seek Member Emmanuel’s recusal. The Board has held that parties cannot wait until after a Board Member has participated in a case to seek that member’s recusal if it was aware of the purported grounds for recusal prior to the Member’s participation. See, e.g., Somerset Valley, Case No. 22-RC-131139, Order at *3 (NLRB Nov. 16, 2011). Member Emmanuel has already issued rulings in the instant proceeding and the Union surely knew where he worked long before he joined the Board.
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The specific time limits and definitions included in the rules are there to prevent the uncertainty that inevitably would follow subjective attempts to determine the types of prior client relationships that might call into question a Board Member’s impartiality. Given the number of law firms retained at any given time by large employers, adopting the Union’s position on recusal would incentivize frivolous recusal arguments in any matter involving a large employer. This would not only pervert the purpose of the recusal rules, but could also prevent the Board from efficiently deciding many of the matters it confronts.

Taken to its logical conclusion, the standard urged by the Union could create a plausible basis for the recusal of virtually any Board Member if their former employer had any dealings with a party at some point, on some arguably similar legal issue. Such a standard would in effect preclude Board Members drawn from private practice—and organized labor, for that matter—from participating in a wide range of issues that come before the Board. The effect would be to fundamentally alter the functioning of the Board and impede its ability to decide important questions of law. This is untenable.

Adopting the Union’s proffered interpretation would also further confuse the already muddled state of affairs on this issue generally, given NLRB Inspector General David Berry’s unprecedented—and legally unsupported—recent opinion that Member Emmanuel should have recused himself from the Board’s decision in *Hy-Brand Industrial Contractors, Ltd.*, 365 NLRB No. 156 (Dec. 14, 2017), because his former firm represented a party in the *Browning-Ferris* matter. See National Labor Relations Board Office of Inspector General Memorandum, February 9, 2018. As many have noted since the issuance of his opinion, General Berry’s reasoning is inherently flawed. See, e.g., Thomas Jipping, “National Labor Relations Board Inspector General and Ethics Officer Employ Erroneous Ethics Standard,” The Heritage Foundation (August 7, 2018). Entertaining the Union’s effort to distort the ethics rules even further, for obvious political and tactical reasons, would stretch the rules far beyond their intended purpose. The Board should strongly reject its attempt to capitalize on the confusion created by General Berry’s report.

---

3 As McDonald’s USA notes, Craig Becker, the SEIU’s former Assistant General Counsel and current General Counsel for the AFL-CIO, decided a matter involving the SEIU almost immediately after his appointment to the Board, and rejected calls that he recuse himself from that matter. See SEIU, *Nurses Alliance, Local 121 RN*, 355 NLRB 234, 242 (2010)(stating that a “‘reasonable person’ appearing before the Board will distinguish between the roles I played as an advocate and a scholar in the past and the position I now hold as a member of the NLRB”). The potential for genuine concern regarding impartiality was far greater in the case of former Member Becker than it is here.
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The Board should deny the Union’s motion for recusal because it is legally dubious and would set an unnecessary and unworkable precedent. McDonald’s USA’s opposition is based on historic Board practice, which provided fair and consistent outcomes to past recusal disputes. While there is no doubt that impartial and disinterested Board members are vital to the legitimacy of the Board’s decisions, motions like the one filed by the Union in this matter attempt to manipulate that legitimate aim to gain a political advantage in a single matter. Surely, if granted, the SEIU may benefit in the short term, but it would also open the door for the same type of petty maneuvering in future cases. That is not why the ethics rules exist.

Finally, we urge the Board to issue a decision that will not only govern in this case, but will be broadly drafted to strongly discourage parties in other and future cases from filing similarly unfounded motions to recuse.

Very truly yours,

[Signature]
Kurt G. Larkin, Esq.
Hunton Andrews Kurth, LLP
951 East Byrd Street
Richmond, VA 23219
(804) 788-8776 – phone

Ronald E. Meisburg, Esq.
Hunton Andrews Kurth, LLP
2200 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20037
(202) 955-1539 – phone

Counsel to the Trade Groups

The Coalition for a Democratic Workplace
c/o Associated Builders and Contractors
440 1st Street, NW, Suite 200
Washington, DC 20001
(202) 595-1505 – phone

American Hotel & Lodging Association
1250 I Street, NW, Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005
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(202) 289-3100 – phone
(202) 289-3199 – fax

Associated Builders and Contractors
440 1st Street, NW, Suite 200
Washington, DC 20001
(202) 595-1505 – phone

Chamber of Commerce of the United States of America
1615 H Street, NW
Washington, DC 20062
(202) 659-6000 – phone

HR Policy Association
1100 Thirteenth Street, NW, Suite 850
Washington, DC 20005
(202) 789-8670 – phone

Independent Electrical Contractors, Inc.
4401 Ford Avenue, Suite 1100
Alexandria, VA 22302
(703) 650-0054 – phone

International Foodservice Distributors Association
1410 Spring Hill Road, Suite 210
McLean, VA 22102
(703) 532-9400 – phone

International Franchise Association
1900 K Street, NW, Suite 700
Washington, DC 20006
(202) 628-8000 – phone
(202) 628-0812 – fax

The National Association of Manufacturers
733 10th Street NW, Suite 700
Washington, DC 20001
(202) 637-3000 – phone
(202) 637-3182 – fax
National Association of Wholesaler-Distributors
1325 G Street, NW, Suite 1000
Washington, DC 20005
(202) 872-0885 – phone
(202) 785-0586 – fax

National Federation of Independent Business
1201 F St, NW #200
Washington, DC 20004
(202) 554-9000

National Retail Federation
1101 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 1200
Washington, DC 20005
(202) 783-7971 – phone
(202) 737-2849 – fax

Restaurant Law Center
2055 L Street, NW, Suite 700
Washington, DC 20036
(202) 331-5900 – phone

Retail Industry Leaders Association
1700 N. Moore Street, Suite 2250
Arlington, VA 22209
(703) 841-2300 – phone
(703) 841-1184 – fax

Society for Human Resource Management
1800 Duke Street
Alexandria, VA 22314
(800) 283-7476 – phone

cc:  See Attached List
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Gwynne Wilcox, Esq.
Micah Wissing, Esq.
David Slutsky, Esq.
Alexander Rabb, Esq.
Levy Ratner, P.C.
80 Eighth Ave., Eighth Floor
New York, NY 10011-7175
gwilcox@levyratner.com
mwissing@levyratner.com
dslutsky@levyratner.com
arabb@levyratner.com

Zachary Herlands, Esq.
Alejandro Ortiz, Esq.
Nicholas Rowe, Esq.
Jamie Rucker, Esq.
Jacob Frisch, Esq.
Nicole Lancia, Esq.
National Labor Relations Board, Region 2
26 Federal Plaza, Room 3614
New York, NY 10278
zachary.herlands@nlrb.gov
alejandro.ortiz@nlrb.gov
nicholas.rowe@nlrb.gov
jamie.rucker@nlrb.gov
jacob.frisch@nlrb.gov
nicole.lancia@nlrb.gov

Robert Brody, Esq.
Kate Bogard, Esq.
Alexander Friedman, Esq.
Brody and Associates, LLC
120 Post Road West, Suite 101
Westport, Connecticut 06880
Rbrody@Brodyandassociates.com
Kbogard@Brodyandassociates.com
Afriedman@Brodyandassociates.com

David P. Dean, Esq.
Kathy L. Krieger, Esq.
Ryan E. Griffin, Esq.
James & Hoffman, PC
1130 Connecticut Ave, NW, Suite 950
Washington, DC 20036
dpdean@jamhoff.com
kkrieger@jamhoff.com
regriffin@jamhoff.com

Judith A. Scott
Service Employees International Union
1800 Massachusetts Avenue, NW
Washington, DC 20036-1806
judy.scott@seiu.org

Mary Joyce Carlson
1100 New York Avenue, Suite 500 West, NW
Washington, DC 20005
carlsonmji@yahoo.com

Michael J. Healy
Healey & Hornack, P.C.
247 Fort Pitt Blvd., 4th Floor
Pittsburgh, PA 15222
mike@unionlawyers.net

Deena Kobell, Esq.
National Labor Relations Board, Region 04
615 Chestnut Street, 7th floor
Philadelphia, PA 19106-4404
deena.kobell@nlrb.gov

Joseph A. Hirsch
Hirsch & Hirsch
One Belmont Avenue
8th Floor, Suite 8001
Bala Cynwyd, PA 19004
jahirsch@hirschfirm.com
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Edward Castillo, Esq.
Christina Hill, Esq.
Kevin McCormick, Esq.
Sylvia Taylor, Esq.
National Labor Relations Board, Region 13
209 South La Salle Street, Suite 900
Chicago, IL 60604-1443
edward.castillo@nlrb.gov
christina.hill@nlrb.gov

Barry M. Bennett
George A. Luscombe, III
Dowd, Bloch, Bennett & Cervone
8 S. Michigan Ave, Fl 19
Chicago, IL 60603-3315
bbennett@dbb-law.com
gluscombe@dbb-law.com

Steve A. Miller
James M. Hux, Jr.
Fisher & Phillips LLP
10 S Wacker Dr., Ste 3450
Chicago, IL 60606-7592
smiller@laborlawyers.com
jhux@laborlawyers.com

Fredric Roberson, Esq.
National Labor Relations Board, Region 25
575 N. Pennsylvania St. Suite, 238
Indianapolis, IN 46205-1520
fredric.roberston@nlrb.gov

Jeffrey A. Macey
Robert A. Hicks
Macey Swanson and Allman
445 N Pennsylvania St., Ste 401
Indianapolis, IN 46204-1893
jmacey@maceylaw.com
rhicks@maceylaw.com

Sean Graham
Weinberg Roger & Rosenfeld
800 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 1320
Los Angeles, CA 90017-2623
sgraham@unioncounsel.net

Richard McPalmer, Esq.
National Labor Relations Board, Region 20
901 Market Street, Suite 400
San Francisco, CA 94103
richard.mcpalmer@nlrb.gov

Ashley Ratliff
Best, Best & Krieger
500 Capitol Mall
Suite 1700
Sacramento, CA 95814
Ashley.Ratliff@bbklaw.com

Roger Crawford
Best, Best & Krieger
2855 E. Guasti Road, Suite 400
Ontario CA, 91761
Roger.Crawford@bbklaw.com

Jonathan Cohen
Eli Naduris-Weissman
Rothner, Segall & Greenstone
510 South Marengo Avenue
Pasadena, CA 91101-3115
jcohen@rsglomer.com
enaduris-weissman@rsglomer.com

Brian Gee, Esq.
Rudy Fong-Sandoval, Esq.
John Rubin, Esq.
Anne White, Esq.
National Labor Relations Board, Region 31
11500 W. Olympic Boulevard, Suite 600
Los Angeles, CA 90064
Brian.Gee@nlrb.gov
rudy.fong-sandoval@nlrb.gov
john.rubin@nlrb.gov
Anne.White@nlrb.gov

Louis P. DiLorenzo, Esq.
Tyler T. Hendry, Esq.
Patrick V. Melfi, Esq.
Bond, Schoeneck & King, PLLC
600 Third Avenue
New York, New York 10016
ldilorenzo@bsk.com
thendry@bsk.com
pmelfi@bsk.com

Thomas M. O'Connell
Best, Best & Krieger
3390 University Avenue
5th Floor
Riverside, CA 92501
Thomas.OConnell@bbklaw.com

Willis J. Goldsmith
Ilana R. Yoffe
Justin D. Martin
JONES DAY
250 Vesey Street
New York, New York 10281
Tel: 212.326.3939
Fax: 212.755.7306
wgoldsmith@jonessday.com
iyoffe@jonessday.com
jmartin@jonessday.com

Michael S. Ferrell
Jonathan M. Linas
E. Michael Rossman
JONES DAY
77 West Wacker Drive
Chicago, Illinois 60601
Tel: 312.269.4245
Fax: 312.782.8585
mferrell@jonessday.com
jlinas@jonessday.com
emrossman@jonessday.com