

**Testimony of Jean-Andre Sassine, UAW Parking Production Staff Organizing Campaign
Before the NYC Council Committee on Civil Service and Labor Re: Res. No. 1180
February 28, 2008**

My name is Jean-Andre Sassine. I am a parking coordinator in the film & television production industry. We have been organizing a union with the UAW for almost two years. We have signed up a super-majority of workers. If the Employee Free Choice Act were law we would have a union contract today. The only reason why we don't is because the bosses of the film and TV industry – the same people who failed to break the WGA – refuse to recognize our union and want to tie us up at the pro-business, anti-worker National Labor Relations Board.

The parking production staff are the people who clear the streets for film shoots on New York locations. We go out 12-24-36 hours in advance of a shoot and put out the orange cones. We post the "No Parking" signs in the neighborhoods where shooting will take place. We are the first ones the public see, we tell them what's going on in their neighborhood, and we tell them they can't park. You can imagine the abuse this opens us up to. We do this job in every weather imaginable- sleet, snow, sub zero temperatures and horizontal rain.

For the privilege of representing some of the most famous names in media we are paid an average of \$10 / hour. Out of this \$10/hr we have to provide our meals, buy gas @ \$3.29/gal to heat our shelters (our cars) and find bathrooms through the night as none are provided to us. We cannot afford to get sick on the job as most of us don't have health care. When the production does come in and we are finished parking the trucks, we are not allowed to eat at the same catering truck we just spent the night clearing space for. We have to wait for the other workers who are all unionized and just arrived on the set to eat first.

As we are a workforce that is predominantly minority (African American, Caribbean descent, Latino / Hispanic pacific islander) this reminds us all of segregation and separate water fountains and seats at the back of the bus!

And why you may ask do they treat us this way? Because they can. Because the industry experiences no repercussions for firing us for complaining. Because they are not accountable to anyone. Because the current laws is stacked against us and denies us our union and a voice at work. Our sole recourse is to quit, receive unemployment while looking for another job in this economy. I will not give up a job I enjoy, a position I and many others have a gift for and become a burden to my fellow taxpayers so a multi-billion dollar industry can sweep this shame under a rug of glitz and awards! No, we have decided to unionize and fight for our rights!

Our treatment is a clear example of the need for EFCA. We would not be subject to this degradation with a union contract. No one else on the set is forced to accept ever lesser wages with the threat of replacement except for us. A union contract would provide a standard that is livable. Recognition of our UAW union would place us on an equal playing field, on par with our other union/guild colleagues and free us to be better parents and citizens. Instead of chasing the ever shrinking dollar we can go to parent/teacher conferences. With a union contract we might be able make sure our families had the health care they deserved and we might even be able to dream of retiring one day and enjoying our grandchildren, as none of us currently have any retirement benefits.

In a city with 51% unemployment for African Americans alone and an industry that is constantly maligned for not being sensitive to diversity, recognizing our union would be a huge step in the right direction. .

But the producers and studios have not accepted our invitation to dialogue. People willing to work and contribute must have a say in the work place. "No taxation without representation" was the mantra I was taught in history class. "No production without representation" is the American way. We want our voice. Recognize the UAW Production Parking Staff by card check today!

American Federation of Labor and Congress of Industrial Organizations



815 Sixteenth Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006
(202) 637-5000
www.aflcio.org

EXECUTIVE COUNCIL

JOHN J. SWEENEY
PRESIDENT

RICHARD L. TRUMKA
SECRETARY-TREASURER

LINDA CHAVEZ-THOMPSON
EXECUTIVE VICE PRESIDENT

Gerald W. McEntee
Patricia Friend
Robert A. Scardelletti
Michael J. Sullivan
Cheryl Johnson, R.N.
William Burrus
James Williams
William H. Young
Andrea E. Brooks
Laura Rico
Paul C. Thompson

Gene Upshaw
Michael Goodwin
John M. Bowers
Harold Schatberger
Clyde Rivers
Leo W. Gerard
John J. Flynn
Nat LaCour
Larry Cohen
Thomas C. Short
James C. Little

Michael Sacco
William Lucy
R. Thomas Buffenbarger
Edwin D. Hill
Cecil Roberts
Edward J. McElroy Jr.
Baxter M. Atkinson
Vincent Giblin
Warren George
Robbie Sparks
Alan Rosenberg

Frank Hurt
Leon Lynch
Elizabeth Bunn
Joseph J. Hunt
Edward C. Sullivan
Ron Gettelfinger
John Gage
William Hite
Gregory J. Junemann
Nancy Wohlforth
Capt. John Prater

“The Employee Free Choice Act”

Testimony to NYC Council Committee on Civil Service and Labor

Susan Borenstein, Senior Field Representative, AFL-CIO

February 28, 2008

Good afternoon. Thank you Chair Addabbo and other members on the Committee for the opportunity to testify today on Resolution 1180, calling upon the United States Congress to pass the "Employee Free Choice Act." My name is Susan Borenstein, Senior Field Representative with the national AFL-CIO.

Workers have had the legal right to organize since it was established by the National Labor Relations Act (NLRA) of 1935. This right was institutionalized internationally in the United Nations Universal Declaration of Human Rights in 1948, but today this right is more honored in its breach. This is the only human right left in the United States that workers exercise in fear.

Our nation's labor law system is broken. Rather than protect worker's rights, it has done the very opposite. Under the current system, workers who try to form a union are often fired, intimidated, and harassed by employers. In addition, employers view the cost of high priced union busting law firms as the price of doing business. When employers are found in violation of the law, the penalties are so small they do not act as a deterrent. Even after workers successfully form a union, the democratic process is thwarted because

one-third of the time they are not able to get a contract due to interminable legal maneuvers, and just plain employer stall tactics.

In the NLRB election process, the employer maintains overwhelming power to influence the outcome of the vote. Employers have the ability to force workers to attend anti-union meetings and can legally fire workers if they refuse to attend. Employers can campaign against the union at the workplace, but union organizers cannot. The U.S. constitution stops at the door.

Among private-sector employers whose workers try to form unions, 92% force employees to attend mandatory anti-union meetings and 25% illegally fire at least one worker for union activity. This is supposed to be a free and fair election but the employer, who controls the voters' paycheck, has unlimited access to speak against the union in the workplace while restricting pro-union speech.

If any of your election campaigns were run like NLRB elections, you would not have access to a list of registered voters and their home addresses until shortly before the election. Your opposition on the other hand would have complete access from the get go. Only your opposition could campaign all day long during work hours. You would be restricted to campaigning from the boundaries of the district. Additionally, your opposition could compel voters to listen to their campaign speeches anytime during the day. You could never do this. Even if you win the election against these odds, your opposition can contest the outcome for years. Clearly, no one could call this a robust democracy.

The Employee Free Choice Act would level the playing field for employees and employers in three ways. First, it establishes a majority sign-up, meaning that if a majority of the employees sign union authorization cards, a company must recognize the union. Secondly, it strengthens penalties for companies that illegally coerce or intimidate employees in an effort to prevent them from forming a union. And lastly, it brings in a

neutral third party to settle a contract when a company and a newly certified union cannot agree on a contract after three months.

Majority sign-up is not a new approach. For public sector workers in New York State, majority sign-up has been in use since the 1960's and it has worked well. In the private sector, responsible employers such as Cingular Wireless have also agreed to majority sign-up. Where majority sign up is the rule, both public and private sector employers have found it to be an effective way to allow workers the freedom to make their own decision. The result is less hostility and polarization in the workplace than the failed NLRB process.

Unions are good for America, and they're good for New York. Our data shows that in areas where union density, the percentage of the unionized workforce, is high, poverty rates are lower and civic participation is higher. Moreover, union workers are more likely to have health care, retirement benefits, and higher wages than non-union workers. The facts are 78% of union workers compared to 49% of non-union workers have health care. Eighty-one percent of union workers versus 47% of non-union workers have some kind of retirement security in addition to social security. And finally, union workers wages are 30% higher than non-union workers, and this difference is even greater for union women and African-American, Latino, and Asian workers.

Collective bargaining remains the best opportunity working men and women have to fight for better wages, benefits, and working conditions, and to be lifted into the middle class. That is why we have found more than half of U.S. workers – 60 million – say they would join a union right now if they could without fear of reprisal. The Employee Free Choice Act would restore the purpose of the NLRA, and protect a workers right to organize. For all these reasons, I urge you to pass this resolution today. Thank you.


**Testimony of Joanna Holzman, GSOC/UAW Local 2110 before the NYC Council
Committee on Civil Service and Labor Re: Res. No 1180 February 28, 2008**

Hello. Thank you for having me here today. My name is Joanna Holzman. I'm a member of the graduate employee union at New York University – GSOC/UAW Local 2110 – which is the union for some 2,000 teaching and research assistants at NYU. I'm here asking you to support the Employee Free Choice Act as someone who knows what it's like to be at workplace where our very basic right to choose to be represented by our union has been trampled upon. Our country's labor law is meant to equal the playing field just a bit to protect our rights to choose collective bargaining – to protect our rights to have some say in our workplace - but it isn't working. Workers need our labor laws to be fixed, here in New York City and across the country.

Let me tell you a little a bit about the situation of graduate employees at New York University. In classrooms and research labs, we do the work that makes the university function. In 2002, as a union, we negotiated a contract with NYU which not only secured desperately needed pay raises, but among other things for the first time also gave us healthcare benefits, teaching training, and a fair and impartial procedure for resolving workplace grievances. By the time our contract expired in 2005, George Bush's National Labor Relations Board reversed an earlier stance and took away our protection under national labor law. The decision also destroyed ballots from union representation elections at Columbia and other private universities where workers had been inspired by what we achieved at NYU. Ignoring the clearly expressed will of the vast majority of graduate employees, NYU hid behind that labor board decision and refused to negotiate a second contract. When we went out on strike in wake of that refusal, NYU threatened to blacklist us for years to come. They coerced, threatened, and bullied us for standing up for our right to form a union. And, of course, they began to rollback the gains we had made under our union contract. Our health benefits have been rolled back every year since then. Some graduate employees are being asked to work two jobs – in an office and in the classroom – for one paycheck. I hear complaints it seems every time I turn around from grads in crisis because we have no guaranteed provisions for sick

leave or family leave; because we have no protection from ever increasing workloads in which we're being told we're paid for twenty hours a week, but then given job responsibilities that take thirty to forty hours a week; because women who are pregnant have been told in so many words that they ought not be having children while pursuing their degrees. Not surprisingly, then, despite a history of intimidation from NYU, more graduate employees than ever have signed union cards in the past year.

You would expect better conduct from anyone doing business in New York City, especially from one of its leading universities. And that's why I know that workers across the city need better. We need our country's broken labor laws to be fixed, and your support for the Employee Free Choice Act, along with its ultimate passage into federal law, will go a long way towards fixing a broken system. That said, the Employee Free Choice Act would not entirely solve our problem at NYU. As long as employers can rely on conservative judges to gut our labor laws, we'll need something more – your support. We appreciate all that this body has done to support workers' rights in this great city, but the struggle is never over. We need you to continue to do what you do now – to use your leadership to tell employers that New York is a great city because we respect people's rights. And if you want to do business here, respecting workers' rights to organize unions is part of the bargain. Thank you for your support.



Broken Promises

Verizon neglects its commitment to provide good jobs and quality service

By Erin Johansson
American Rights at Work
September 2007

About American Rights at Work

American Rights at Work is a national, nonprofit labor policy and advocacy organization. We envision a nation where the freedom of workers to organize unions and bargain collectively with employers is guaranteed and promoted.

Through coalition-building, research, public relations, policy analysis, and advocacy, American Rights at Work:

- > Investigates and exposes workers' rights abuses and the inadequacy of U.S. labor law.
- > Stimulates debate about the state of workers' rights among journalists, policymakers, advocacy groups, companies, and the public.
- > Promotes public policy that protects workers from hostile employers and weak laws that impede their rights to form unions and bargain collectively.
- > Publicizes success stories of profitable companies and public agencies that respect workers' rights and build innovative partnerships with unions.

Broken Promises: Verizon neglects its commitment to provide good jobs and quality service

© September 2007 American Rights at Work

By Erin Johansson, Research Associate, American Rights at Work

All Rights Reserved

For additional copies of this report, please visit our website, www.americanrightsatwork.org, or contact info@americanrightsatwork.org.

Broken Promises

Verizon neglects its commitment to provide good jobs and quality service

Telecommunications companies provide services that are as essential to the public as our national highway system, and they have long recognized their role as public utilities rather than simply private businesses. The industry has also maintained its infrastructure in communities across the country in rural, suburban, and urban areas to ensure the quality of communication necessary for public safety and economic development. Investing in employees is key to providing these services. For decades, the telecommunications industry has provided technicians, customer service agents, operators, and others with job security, opportunities to advance and gain new skills, and sustainable wages and benefits. Yet since Verizon was formed in 2000, it has shirked its responsibilities as a public utility, pursuing a race-to-the-bottom, low-road business model that is detrimental to both employees and customers.


This report will detail how Verizon has maintained non-union divisions by interfering with its employees' freedom of association, including Verizon Business technicians whose recent request for union recognition has been denied by the company. The report will also reveal how Verizon is downsizing its traditional landline operation, risking this source of good jobs, and further degrading the quality of service and access to high speed technology for residential and business customers. Finally, using AT&T's productive relationship with its employees and unions as an example, this report shows that Verizon could choose a high-road model of investing in its employees and still compete in a rapidly changing industry.

Good jobs that our communities need at risk

The traditional telecommunications industry (wired telecom, as opposed to wireless telecom and cable) has historically been a source of good jobs for workers without a college education. This sector has also been an important source of employment for women and workers of color, who earn considerably higher wages than average.¹ This is largely the result of collective bargaining, which began nationally in the Bell system in 1974 before it was broken up, and lifted industry wages well above the national average.²

The percentage of workers represented by unions in the wired telecom industry is very high at 62 percent.³ Union workers in the sector earn considerably more than non-union workers, demonstrating the strength of collective bargaining.⁴ Unions have also encouraged a high-road model of labor relations with benefits for employers and customers. Compared to non-union establishments, union employers spend 83 percent more on training for technicians, and 90 percent more for training for customer service representatives.⁵ Employers earn back their investment; excluding workers leaving for retirement, turnover among service representatives one-third less and for technicians it is reduced by 45 percent.⁶ Cornell University professor Rose Batt found that when telecom call centers emphasized greater training, higher compensation, and job security through union contracts, not only was turnover reduced, but sales growth improved.⁷ Conversely, Batt found that higher turnover both increased employer costs of recruitment and negatively impacted sales.⁸


As the telecommunications industry has undergone rapid changes, spurred by new technologies and government deregulation, employment is shifting away from wired telecom and into the cable and wireless sectors. Workers without unions in these new growth sectors receive lower compensation, less funding for job training,



less job security, and also suffer from higher turnover.⁹ Cable giant Comcast has a pattern of suppressing its employees' right to form unions and ability to raise standards in the industry.¹⁰ Verizon straddles both new and old sectors, operating as a former Bell company in wired telecom, while branching out into the new growth sector with Verizon Wireless and fiber optics television services.¹¹ Yet to the detriment of workers, customers, and communities, Verizon appears to be embracing the low-road employment model of these new sectors by denying its employees' right to form unions.

Dubious corporate structure suppresses union representation

When David Rogol drives his van imprinted with the Verizon logo to repair phone lines, one would assume that he was part of the company's longtime union workforce. Yet despite working side-by-side with Verizon's union technicians, David is a non-union technician working under the company's Verizon Business division. That's because Verizon Communications Inc. is split into three divisions: Verizon Telecom, Verizon Business, and Verizon Wireless. Verizon Telecom provides wired services for domestic residential and small business customers, including both traditional copper and newer fiber landlines; Verizon Business provides wired services for large domestic and international customers; and Verizon Wireless provides wireless services.¹²



Verizon's corporate structure appears to be a textbook example of 'double breasting,' a tactic where an owner operates a non-union business separate from its union business in order to avoid having all of its employees enjoy the benefits of a union contract. When the company was formed in 2000 out of the merger of Bell Atlantic Corp. and GTE Corp., it inherited a decades-long collective bargaining relationship with the Communication Workers of America (CWA) and the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers (IBEW). By double breasting, Verizon created a wall between the approximately 97,000 union employees in Verizon Telecom and the 35,000 employees at Verizon Business and Verizon Wireless.¹³ Thus in order for employees at Verizon Wireless and Verizon Business to have rights on the job and the benefits a union contract, they must organize in the face of fierce company resistance. At Verizon Business, employees are still without their union despite a strong majority demanding recognition in New York and New England, while workers at only one location at Verizon Wireless have successfully formed a union.

Fighting for fairness at Verizon Business

In 2006, Verizon acquired MCI and created the Verizon Business division for the former MCI employees. These beleaguered employees came to Verizon after surviving one of the greatest corporate scandals of our time. In 2005, former MCI/WorldCom CEO Bernard Ebbers was sentenced to 25 years in prison for perpetrating an accounting fraud that led to the 2002 collapse of the company, and the loss of 20,000 jobs and \$180 billion in investments.¹⁴ MCI/WorldCom employees lost tens of thousands of dollars in their 401(k) retirement funds when the company's stock plummeted. In 2003, MCI/WorldCom emerged from bankruptcy under the name MCI. Many of these former MCI employees hoped

	Verizon Communications Inc.		
	Verizon Business	Verizon Telecom	Verizon Wireless
<i>Employees eligible for union representation</i>	5,000	98,000	30,000
<i>Employees currently in unions</i>	300	97,000	50

for a better future when they were purchased by Verizon, assuming that they would have a union to protect them from corporate greed. But Verizon had other plans.

The Verizon Business division, which houses approximately 2,500 technicians, is a non-union, lower-tiered operation. Though Verizon Business techs perform virtually the same work as their union counterparts at Verizon Telecom, according to the techs interviewed for this report, they are denied the higher wages, fully-paid health benefits, and pension plan offered by the union contract.¹⁵ Verizon Business techs are also lacking job security, as Phil St. John, a tech from New Hampshire, lamented: "If you're willing to give up your nights at home and your family time to do the things they need you to do, you want them to be there for you when you're older, when you can't work all the time."¹⁶ And unlike their Telecom coworkers, Verizon Business techs work without regular and fair raises and clear paths to promotion provided by the union contract. According to one tech from New York, "The way they dish out promotions or raises, it's definitely geared to who they want to give it to versus who deserves them... We have techs who have been here for less time than myself and are making as much as I'm making."¹⁷

Former Verizon manager fights for union recognition

Many might find Thomas Fraine, a Verizon Business technician in Massachusetts, an unlikely supporter of the current union effort. Fraine spent 18 years working as a manager for Verizon Telecom, and after retiring, he joined a small Boston firm that was bought out by MCI/WorldCom, and later, by Verizon. Even as a manager, Fraine says, "I still appreciated what a union could do for the workforce. I saw how it's a family and you protect one another—how you're not just at the whim of some manager." His relationship with his employees and their union was never hostile, though they had problems to work out from time-to-time. Fraine hopes to replicate that kind of productive relationship with his own managers through union representation at Verizon Business.

Techs endure management intimidation

In order to raise their job standards to the level of their peers at Telecom, Verizon Business techs sought to form a union in early 2007. Before they went public with their campaign to join CWA and IBEW in New York and New England in February 2007, the company prepared itself for any potential organizing activity. In November 2006, it warned its supervisors: "If picketing or handbilling occurs, report that activity to your Emergency Operations Center contacts. If any activity is job affecting or disruptive, report those incidents to your local Labor Relations and EOC contacts."¹⁸ In the months that followed, Verizon Business proceeded to use intimidation and misinformation, interfering with the techs' fundamental right to freedom of association.

Verizon Business management is targeting union supporters, making an example of them before their peers. A senior manager who visited the Monsey, NY, site singled out Christopher Bloncourt, who was openly involved in the union effort. Bloncourt had been previously given a warning by his manager after he posted a pro-union ad that ran in *The New York Times* on a coworker's cubicle. After his coworkers witnessed the senior manager pull Bloncourt in for a one-on-one meeting about the union, Bloncourt recounted, "people couldn't even look me in the face."¹⁹ To make matters worse, Bloncourt's manager began working in the cubicle behind him, despite having his own corner office on the other side of the worksite. He endured this for several months: "I remember sitting in the parking lot—horrified—my stomach turning upside down because I had to go in there, my manager is sitting right behind me. I gotta worry if I hit the wrong key stroke. It was a horrible, horrible experience."

In August 2007, the National Labor Relations Board (NLRB) issued a complaint charging Verizon Business with violating the law in its efforts to suppress union activity at the Monsey, NY, site where Bloncourt works.²⁰ The federal agency alleges that the manager illegally spied on employees to obtain information about their union activities. It also alleges that the company illegally discriminated against union supporters when it gave verbal warnings to Bloncourt and his coworker for posting the union ad. On the same day, the NLRB issued another complaint alleging that Verizon Business violated its employees' rights at the Pittsburgh site.²¹ The company was charged with threatening to lay off employees for supporting the union, giving a warning to a union supporter for his effort to get his coworkers to sign union authorization cards, soliciting employees to inform managers if they wanted to get their authorization cards back, and other illegal conduct.

David Rogol, a tech from Massachusetts, recounted the intimidation by management that he experienced. He was visited by a senior manager shortly before the union effort went public—a man whom he had only met twice in his seven years at the job.²² Rogol recounted how the manager cited details of his seven year work history, indicating that he had closely read his personnel file. The manager then proceeded to question Rogol about the union organizing activities that Verizon Business had apparently discovered. Rogol later resigned from his position as team leader in order to gain the protection of the National Labor Relations Act, which excludes supervisors, during his effort to form a union.

Verizon disseminates misinformation

In response to employees' organizing, Verizon Business has launched a multi-media assault of anti-union communications. Senator Hillary Clinton expressed concern over "the intimidation, the threats, and the false statements" contained in the company's propaganda,²³ which has included flyers, emails, and even a website. The "Union Awareness" website advises employees to visit the anti-union Center for Union Facts website,²⁴ run by notorious industry lobbyist Richard Berman described by *USA Today* as a "a third party hired by companies to be their public face when they take on unpopular battles."²⁵ To further disseminate its message, Verizon Business has dispatched senior managers to its worksites to hold captive audience meetings, numbering as many as one to two per week, according to techs interviewed for this report. Thomas Fraine, a tech from Massachusetts, witnessed Verizon Business representatives intimidating employees with warnings that they could lose their benefits because bargaining would start from "ground zero."²⁶

Despite this interference, 65 percent of eligible Verizon Business techs in New York and 75 percent of techs in New England have signed union authorization cards, which were verified by community leaders and elected officials, including five members of Congress who checked the signed authorization cards against the employee roster.³⁰ Yet Verizon refuses to recognize the techs' union and insists that an election is the only fair method of determining majority support.³¹ Knowing that the NLRB election process will likely subject them to long delays and managerial coercion,³² the techs have mounted a campaign to get the company to honor their choice. Phil St. John echoes the frustration felt by many of the techs: "In my eyes, a union isn't against the company—we just want to protect ourselves from greed. If we can make our company profitable, that's great. But let's see the profits trickle down."³³

Verizon violates the rights of its wireless workers

Verizon's interference with its Verizon Business techs' efforts to win a voice at work is not an isolated instance, but is part of a pattern of anti-union conduct by the company. According to charges filed by the NLRB, Verizon Wireless managers threatened Woburn, MA, employees that it would close the call center if they organized.³⁴ The company settled the

Verizon hires anti-union consultant to wage PR war during bargaining

Verizon was clearly not aiming for productive 2003 negotiations with CWA and IBEW when it hired George Washington University professor Jarol Manheim to craft media-friendly anti-union messages to "reframe the company's actions and the union's motives" in a report titled "Verizon and CWA: A Cautionary Tale."²⁷ Manheim wrote that CWA's "unreasonable demands... threaten to damage the single most dependable pillar remaining in the industry... Verizon."²⁸ Far from a promoter of reasoned labor-management relations, Manheim wrote a briefing book for the U.S. Chamber of Commerce that warned employers of the supposed "fundamentally extortionate quality" of union organizing tactics.²⁹

charges, which included supervisory threats and interrogation, by agreeing to post a notice promising not to break the law.³⁵ Yet in a stunning illustration of how labor law fails to truly protect workers, the notice had to be mailed to employees' homes, as the company shut down the call center and moved the work to South Carolina before the employees could form a union.

In 2003, Verizon Wireless responded employees organizing in Orangeburg, NY, by illegally threatening a union activist with termination if he spoke to his coworkers about the union.³⁶ The division was also found guilty of prohibiting employees from discussing the union during their rest breaks, and discriminatorily enforcing a no-solicitation rule against union activity while allowing other forms of solicitation at work.³⁷ In 2004, Verizon Wireless shut down its Orangeburg and Morristown, NJ, call centers and moved the work to South Carolina, North Carolina, and Arizona—all states with 'right-

to-work' laws that weaken unions. The only current Verizon Wireless location where workers have a union is in New York City, which was organized in 1995 when the employees were employed by Nynex (a predecessor company).

There is also evidence that Verizon is interfering with its Telecom employees' efforts to form a union in Long Beach, CA. On the eve and day of the election, a senior manager who flew in from New Jersey went from cubicle to cubicle, talking to employees. Verizon claimed he was merely "talking about what the employee wanted to talk about."³⁸ However, CWA charges the manager was coercively campaigning against the union in violation of the neutrality agreement, where both the union and company refrain from disparaging each other or intimidating employees during organizing, that covers Telecom employees in that region.³⁹ Not surprisingly, the workers ended up narrowly voting against union representation, despite a majority demonstrating support before the manager arrived.⁴⁰ Eight employees recently testified of coercive tactics at arbitration hearings which remain ongoing.⁴¹

Letting the information superhighway crumble

Verizon has divisively carved out non-union divisions with Verizon Business and Verizon Wireless, preventing these employees from raising their job standards to the level of the union Verizon Telecom workers. Yet even Verizon's union employees are at risk of losing not only their family-supporting compensation, but their jobs as well. Verizon is downsizing its older and less profitable landline operations—the core infrastructure that residential and business customers rely on for phone and high speed internet—which has detrimental ramifications for employees as well as customers.

Between 2001 and 2002, Verizon eliminated over 20,000 union Telecom employees in the Northeast.⁴³ Shortly after, Verizon was forced to pay \$15 million in customer rebates for excessively long outages in New York.⁴⁴ A 2003 report by the New York Public Service Commission expressed concerns over Verizon's serious decline in service given its further layoff plans and lack of capital spending.⁴⁵ In 2007, New York State Attorney General Andrew Cuomo called on the agency to tighten standards to improve Verizon's "chronically poor" service, noting that the company appeared to be neglecting its landlines in favor of investing in fiber optics.⁴⁶ The company's poor record was also at issue during a recent hearing by the Maryland Public Service Commission, which was prompted by a 50 percent increase in customer complaints in 2007.⁴⁷

Verizon is also attempting to divest its more rural landline operations in many states. In 2004, after protests by Verizon employees, customers, and elected officials over the company's proposal to sell its upstate New York landlines, the company dropped its plans.⁴⁸ Now the company is seeking approval from the public utilities commissions to sell its landlines in Maine, New Hampshire, and Vermont to tiny FairPoint Communications in Charlotte, NC, for \$2.7 billion.⁴⁹ Because of FairPoint's small size, the sale would qualify Verizon for a tax incentive worth \$700 million.⁵⁰ Yet a recent Morgan Stanley report exposed FairPoint's financial vulnerabilities, giving credence to concerns raised by workers, consumer advocates, and elected officials that the new company would be unable to adequately invest in the landline workforce and infrastructure.⁵¹

Both FairPoint and Verizon suffer poor and declining service records in New England,⁵² and without an influx of resources into these operations, the situation will likely worsen. New England businesses could be at a competitive disadvantage if FairPoint cannot maintain current infrastructure and invest in high speed technologies. Landline outages could become more frequent, potentially compromising communication during emergencies. The deal could also deprive the region of a vital source of family-supporting jobs if FairPoint cannot invest in training or maintain the current level of

Verizon fights against rights for all workers

Verizon does not seem satisfied to focus its efforts on suppressing the freedom of association for its own workforce, and instead is targeting the efforts of all U.S. workers to improve their protections under federal labor law. The Employee Free Choice Act is a bill that would grant workers union representation after a majority present signed authorization cards to demonstrate their choice to belong to a union. This right to a "majority sign-up" would have forced Verizon Business to recognize the techs' union when they presented their union authorization cards. In a memo to employees opposing the bill, Verizon Business falsely stated that "current law provides more than adequate means for unions to sign up employees."⁴²

compensation, and if it continues to outsource as it has with other operations.⁵³ These concerns could spread as Verizon is seeking a buyer for its landlines in Indiana, Illinois, Ohio, and Michigan.⁵⁴

AT&T: Taking a higher-road approach

Verizon's model destroying family-supporting jobs in the name of competition is not inevitable in the rapidly changing telecommunications industry, even given the lower job standards of wireless and cable companies. AT&T's experiences prove that it's possible for a telecommunications company to maintain a productive and more balanced relationship with its employees' unions and still remain competitive and profitable.

In 2006, AT&T, Bell South, and Cingular Wireless merged to create one of the largest union workforces in the telecommunications industry, employing nearly 180,000 union-represented employees throughout the company, including its wireless, wireline, and broadband divisions. In stark contrast to Verizon, AT&T respects its employees' freedom to form unions. Prior to AT&T's merger, Cingular Wireless and the CWA negotiated a strong neutrality agreement, which has proved to be a win-win strategy, allowing both management and employees to focus their energy and resources on the growth of the business rather than on hostile conflict during organizing drives. Given a free and fair chance to make an informed decision, 85 percent of the non-management wireless workforce has chosen union representation.⁵⁸

AT&T has also demonstrated a commitment to expanding its good jobs throughout communities in the United States, working with CWA to return previously outsourced help desk support positions to in-house positions. New call centers will soon open in seven cities, including New Orleans, Indianapolis, and Las Vegas, creating over 5,000 new jobs.⁵⁹ An active labor-management alliance at AT&T works to enhance employee growth and development, providing employees with classes and workshops on topics as diverse as technology training to career transitioning. According to Mark Royse, Executive Vice President of Labor Relations, "AT&T and its customers benefit from the skills and professionalism of union-represented employees in our business units. Our company has long taken pride in our cooperative and respectful relationship with the unions that represent our employees."⁶⁰

Make Verizon work for everyone

Under Verizon's current business model, tens of thousands of secure, well-paying jobs are at risk of disappearing. By operating non-union divisions where workers' efforts to form a union are met with intimidation, Verizon has been able to prevent the benefits of collective bargaining from spreading beyond its union landline operation. And by downsizing its landline operations, thousands of good union jobs are at risk. The consequences of Verizon's actions go beyond its workforce, as communities lose good jobs, and customers suffer poor service while missing out on the benefits of high speed broadband. Yet in the face of these problems, Verizon's executives have handsomely compensated themselves. In 2006, Verizon's top five executives earned a combined \$68 million.⁶¹

With all of this at stake, customers, workers, communities, and elected leaders must call on Verizon to adopt a positive, productive labor relations model. This change in course involves a commitment by Verizon to maintain and expand good jobs in the communities where it operates. Research has demonstrated that investing in employees—through training, fair compensation, and job security—reaps rewards for employees, companies, and consumers. In the near term, Verizon should adopt a neutral stance when its employees decide to form unions. It should also agree to recognize the majority

Managers aren't spared Verizon's attack on good job standards

Verizon's union employees are not the only targets of the company's low-road employment model. In 2005, Verizon announced it was freezing contributions to the defined benefit pension plan for 50,000 managers, and discontinuing the benefit for new managers.⁵⁵ It also planned to discontinue its contribution toward the retiree healthcare premium for managers with less than 15 years of service.⁵⁶ While financially-troubled airlines and steel companies have been dropping pension plans in recent years, Verizon was the first profitable company with a healthy pension plan to end these benefits in the name of competition.⁵⁷ A number of other profitable companies, including Hewlett Packard and IBM, quickly followed suit. Without a union contract to protect them, the managers were powerless to protest the company's plan.

support by Verizon Business techs for union representation. In the long term, however, Verizon should remove the superficial divisions of the company that segregate union workers from non-union workers and extend the collective bargaining agreement to all of its employees. A two-tiered system of employment standards is fundamentally unfair.

Verizon has obligations as a public utility to provide reliable services to the communities it serves. While Verizon's investment in fiber optics technology holds promise for the company's success and for customers, the company must not be allowed neglect its landline operations. In the interest of public safety, Verizon must ensure that citizens have access to landlines, especially during emergencies. The company also has a duty to ensure that individuals and businesses—whether urban, suburban, or rural—have access to the technologies necessary to compete in the current economy.

How can we motivate Verizon to change course? For one, regulators and elected officials have some power to regulate Verizon as a public utility and to require the company to meet its obligations to consumers, employees, and communities. Secondly, consumers have the power to put pressure on Verizon. Verizon Wireless customers can communicate to the company that they will switch to AT&T when their contracts expire if the company doesn't respect its workers. Likewise, Verizon Business customers, including colleges, universities, and municipal and state governments, can bring the weight of their institutions to call for the company to improve its relationship with its employees. Thirdly, Verizon shareholders can impact the company's course, as they demonstrated this year by passing a resolution giving themselves an advisory vote on executive compensation. Lastly, community leaders must stand with all Verizon employees in their efforts to save one of the most important sources of good jobs in our country.

Endnotes

- 1 Vicky Lovell, Heidi Hartmann, and Jessica Koski. "Making the Right Call: Jobs and Diversity in the Communications and Media Sector," Institute for Women's Policy Research, 2006.
- 2 Prior to 1984, AT&T, or the "Bell System," had a monopoly on telephone service. An antitrust suit filed by the federal government led to the 1984 divestiture of AT&T, which was split into seven independent regional companies. For more information, see "Breakup of the Bell System," *Communication News*, Sept. 1984. Source on collective bargaining figures: Julie Martinez Ortega, "No Bargain: Comcast and the Future of Workers' Rights in Telecommunications," American Rights at Work, June 2004.
- 3 Bureau of Labor Statistics, May 2006 National Industry-Specific Occupational Employment and Wage Estimates, reports that there are 485,830 employees in the Wired Telecom sector. The Securities and Exchange Commission 10K forms filed by AT&T, Verizon and Qwest, which represent the vast majority of union Verizon Telecom employees, report employing approximately 300,000 union represented employees.
- 4 Lovell.
- 5 Jeffrey A. Keefe, "Racing to the Bottom: How Antiquated Public Policy Is Destroying the Best Jobs in Telecommunications," Economic Policy Institute, 2005.
- 6 Ibid.
- 7 Rosemary Batt, "Managing Customer Services: Human Resources Practices, Quit Rates, and Sales Growth," *Academy of Management Journal*, 45:3 (2002).
- 8 Ibid.
- 9 Keefe.
- 10 Martinez Ortega.
- 11 Verizon Communications Inc., website accessed 20 Aug 2007 <<http://investor.verizon.com/business/index.aspx>>.
- 12 Ibid.
- 13 Communication Workers of America, website accessed 20 Aug 2007 <<http://www.cwa-union.org/news/cwa-news/page.jsp?itemID=28514724>>.
- 14 "Worldcom's Ebberts enters prison," BBC News online, 26 Sept. 2006 <<http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/business/5380458.stm>>.
- 15 Communication Workers of America, website accessed 20 Aug 2007 <<http://www.freechoiceatverizon.com/why/>>.
- 16 Phil St. John, Verizon Business technician, personal interview by Erin Johansson, 18 July 2007.
- 17 Anonymous Verizon Business technician, personal interview by Erin Johansson, 23 July 2007.
- 18 Email sent by Verizon Message Center to Verizon Telecom Management, 14 Nov. 2006, on file with American Rights at Work.
- 19 Christopher Bloncourt, Verizon Business technician, personal interview by Erin Johansson, 24 July 2007.
- 20 *Verizon Business*, National Labor Relations Board Complaint and Notice of Hearing, 2-CA-38216, 30 Aug 2007.
- 21 *Verizon Business*, National Labor Relations Board Complaint and Notice of Hearing, 6-CA-35571, 6-CA-35613, 30 Aug 2007.
- 22 David Rogol, Verizon Business technician, personal interview by Erin Johansson, 19 July 2007.
- 23 Communication Workers of America and International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers. "Unity @ Verizon: Report to shareholders," 3 May 2007.
- 24 Verizon Business, Union Awareness website, accessed 7 June 2007 <<http://myeweb.verizon.com/eweb/myportal/vzb/AboutYou/UnionAwareness/FAQ>>.
- 25 Jayne O'Donnell, "Got a nasty fight? Here's your man; Lobbyist takes on MADD, safety advocates," *USA Today*, 31 July 2006.
- 26 Thomas Fraine, Verizon Business technician, personal interview by Erin Johansson, 27 July 2007.
- 27 Jarol B. Manheim, "Verizon Positioning Narrative," commissioned by Verizon, 28 July 2002. On file with American Rights at Work.
- 28 Ibid.
- 29 Jarol B. Manheim, "Trends in Union Corporate Campaigns: A Briefing Book," U.S. Chamber of Commerce, 2005.
- 30 CWA and IBEW, "Unity @ Verizon: Report to shareholders." Video of the card check available at: http://www.unionvoice.org/cwa_unity_verizon/notice-description.tcl?newsletter_id=5452040
- 31 "Verizon Business supports the right of our employees to make the personal decision on whether or not to be represented by a union. This is an individual decision which needs to be made after understanding all the facts and in the privacy of a secret ballot." Verizon Business, Union Awareness website, accessed 7 June 2007 <<http://myeweb.verizon.com/eweb/myportal/vzb/AboutYou/UnionAwareness/FAQ>>. According to John Elia, when he asked CEO Ivan Seidenberg to recognize the Verizon Business techs' union at the 2007 Verizon shareholders meeting, Seidenberg refused and insisted the techs vote in an election. John Elia, Verizon Business technician, personal interview by Erin Johansson, 29 Aug. 2007
- 32 Chirag Mehta and Nik Theodore, "Undermining the Right to Organize," Center for Urban Economic Development, University of Illinois at Chicago, report for American Rights at Work, Dec. 2005.
- 33 Phil St. John, personal interview.
- 34 *Verizon Wireless*, NLRB Region 1 Order Consolidating Cases, Consolidated Complaint and Notice of Hearing, Cases 1-CA-38318, 1-CA-38553, 9 Jan 2001.
- 35 *Verizon Wireless*, National Labor Relations Board Settlement Agreement, 1-CA-38318, 1-CA-38553, May 2001.
- 36 *Cellco Partnership d/b/a Verizon Wireless*, 349 NLRB 061 (2007).
- 37 Ibid.
- 38 Email from Paul Gwaltney, Director of Verizon Labor Relations, to Mark Bixler, Area Director of the Communication Workers of America, District 9, sent 20 Apr 2007. Copy on file with American Rights at Work.

- 39 Letter from Mark Bixler, Area Director of the Communication Workers of America, District 9, to Paul Gwaltney, Director of Verizon Labor Relations and Louis Zigman, counsel, notice given of objections to union representation election, sent 25 Apr 2007. Copy on file with American Rights at Work.
- 40 Ed Sabol, Director of Organizing at the Communication Workers of America, personal interview by Erin Johansson, 22 Aug 2007.
- 41 Communication Workers of America website, "Long Beach Techs Testify about Verizon's Illegal Tactics," 16 Aug 2007 <<http://www.cwa-union.org/news/page.jsp?itemID=28822658>>.
- 42 "Verizon Business supports the right of our employees to make the personal decision on whether or not to be represented by a union. This is an individual decision which needs to be made after understanding all the facts and in the privacy of a secret ballot." Verizon Business, Union Awareness website, accessed 7 June 2007 <<http://myeweb.verizon.com/eweb/myportal/vzb/AboutYou/UnionAwareness/FAQ>>.
- 43 Communication Workers of America. "Fighting for Verizon's Future: Hometown Jobs & Quality Service," Power Point presentation prepared for negotiations with Verizon, 2003. On file with American Rights at Work.
- 44 "State Telecom Activities," *Communications Daily*, 27 May 2003.
- 45 Ibid.
- 46 Office of New York Attorney General Andrew Cuomo, "Cuomo Releases Report Showing Verizon Fails to Make Timely Repairs 30% of the Time," press release, 17 Apr 2007.
- 47 Meredith Cohn, "Verizon says it missed over 20% of service calls," *The Baltimore Sun*, 9 Aug. 2007.
- 48 Communication Workers of America, "New York Regulators, Lawmakers Should Block Verizon Sale of Upstate Landlines—and Also Correct the Root Problem," 20 Feb 2004, available at <<http://www.cwa-union.org/news/page.jsp?itemID=27353274>>; "Verizon Drops Move to Sell Upstate Lines," 4 Oct 2004, available at <<http://www.cwa-union.org/news/page.jsp?itemID=27354432>>.
- 49 Dan McLean, "Report doubtful of FairPoint finances," *The Burlington Free Press*, 13 June 2007.
- 50 New Hampshire Public Utilities Commission, Direct Testimony of Randy Barber on behalf of the Communication Workers of America and International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, Docket No. DT 07-011, 1 Aug 2007.
- 51 McLean.
- 52 Maine Public Utilities Commission, Docket No. 2005-155, "Examiner's Report (Revenue Requirement and Service Quality Issues)," 9 May 2007; State of Vermont Public Service Board, Testimony of Kenneth R. Peres on behalf of the Communication Workers of America and the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, Docket No. 7270, 24 May 2007.
- 53 State of Vermont Public Service Board, Testimony of Kenneth R. Peres on behalf of the Communication Workers of America and the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, Docket No. 7270, 24 May 2007.
- 54 Spencer Ante, "Verizon's Spin-off Offensive," *Business Week Online*, 18 Jan. 2007.
- 55 Jerry Geisel, "Verizon retools managers' pensions; Defined benefit freeze part of \$3 billion, 10-year cost cutting plan," *Business Insurance*, 12 Dec 2005.
- 56 Geisel.
- 57 Geoffrey Colvin, "The End of a Dream : As competitive pressure mounts, even healthy firms are killing off pension plans," *Fortune*, 26 June 2006.
- 58 American Rights at Work. "The Labor Day List: Partnerships that Work," Sept. 2007.
- 59 Ibid.
- 60 Ibid.
- 61 AFL-CIO Office of Investment, Association of BellTel Retirees, Communication Workers of America. "Just Say 'No' to Pay for Failure at Verizon Communications," Apr. 2007.



American Rights at Work
1100 17th Street NW, Suite 950
Washington, DC 20036

p: 202-822-2127
f: 202-822-2168

info@americanrightsatwork.org
www.americanrightsatwork.org

