

and order itself provides that the Union shall process the objections “...for all employees who *with reasonable promptness* after receiving the notices... elect to file *Breaux* objections...” (33 ALRB No. 2 at page 8, item 2(d), emphasis added.) The Board finds that the discrepancy between the language contained in item 2(d) on page 8 of its decision and order and the language in the last item of the Notice to Agricultural Employees attached to the decision and order was an oversight, and will therefore modify the language in the Notice to be consistent with that of its order. ¹

PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that the Notice to Agricultural Employees issued with Board decision 33 ALRB No. 2 is modified to read as follows:

“WE WILL reimburse for all unit employees who have, or will with reasonable promptness after notice, file *Breaux* objections with us, for

//

//

¹ The Board notes that the Charging parties in their response to the Respondent’s motion for clarification request the Board designate a set time period after receiving the corrected *Breaux* notice in which employees may perfect their retroactive *Breaux* objections, and requests that this period not be fewer than 60 days. The Respondent has informed the Board that it does not oppose the Charging parties’ suggestion of setting a time period of 60 days. The Board finds that it need not designate a response period for the employees’ renewed opportunity to object in its revised Notice to Agricultural Employees as controlling case law vests the Union with the responsibility for setting forth the particulars of the objections procedure in the *Breaux* notice itself.

any dues and fees exacted for nonrepresentational purposes, with interest, for each accounting period since September 23, 2003.”

By Direction of the Board.

Dated: June 1, 2007

J. ANTONIO BARBOSA
Executive Secretary, ALRB