STATE OF CALIFORNIA AGRICULTURAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD
In the Matter of: )
PUBLIC HEARING TO RECEIVE )
COMMENT ON WORKSITE ACCESS )
DOUBLE TREE BY HILTON
FRESNO CONVENTION CENTER
2233 VENTURA STREET
SALON C
FRESNO, CALIFORNIA
WEDNESDAY, SEPTEMBER 9, 2015
Reported By:
Jacqueline Denlinger

#### APPEARANCES

### BOARD MEMBERS

William B. Gould, Chairman

Genevieve Shiroma

Cathryn Rivera-Hernandez

#### STAFF

Karen Snell, Counsel to the Agricultural Labor Relations Board

Eduardo Blanco, Senior Legal Advisor

#### PERSONS PRESENTING ORAL COMMENT

Rick Mines, Researcher

Barry Bedwell, California Fresh Fruit Association

Carmen Garza

Maureen Keffer, CRLA, Director of Indigenous Worker Project

Fausto Santos, CRLA, Outreach Worker

Harold McClarty, Farmer, HMC Farms

Ron Barsamian, Esq., Barsamian & Moody

Leoncio Vasquez, Director, Indigenous Community Group

Anthony Raimondo, Esq., Raimondo & Associates

Howard Sagaser, Esq.

Tal Cloud, Small Business Owner

Laura Brown, California Citrus Mutual

Irma Luna, ALRB Field Examiner

# APPEARANCES (CONT.)

# PANEL MEMBERS: FARMWORKERS AND GERAWAN PETITIONER

Silvia Lopez, Gerawan Petitioner

Carlos Uribe

Rolando Padilla

Angel Lopez

Lucero Lopez

Eduardo Luna Torres

Angel Rincon

PANEL MEMBERS: UFW

Rafael Marquez Amaro

Agustin Rodriguez

Ana Rosa Romero

Jared Romero (phonetic)

Esperanza Ruiz

Ofelia Reyes

	4
<u>INDEX</u>	
	PAGE
<u>Oral Comment</u>	
Richard Mines	10
Barry Bedwell	44
Carmen Garza	45
Maureen Keffer	65
Fausto Santos	92
Harold McClarty	103
Ron Barsamian	112
Leoncio Vasquez	130
Anthony Raimondo	139
Panel: Farmworkers and Gerawan Petitioner	147
Howard Sagaser	159
Panel: UFW	168
Tal Cloud	174
Laura Brown	180
Irma Luna	186

## PROCEEDINGS

1:09 p.m.

CHAIRMAN GOULD: All right. Good morning -- good afternoon, and I'm the Chairman of the Agricultural Labor Relations Board. And with me here are my colleagues, Board Members Genevieve Shiroma and Cathryn Rivera-Hernandez, and they have been with the Board prior to my appointment.

And I want to thank, in particular, my Senior

Legal Advisor Eduardo Blanco and my Counsel Karen Snell who have worked so hard to put together this series of hearings on this important matter involving access for the Agricultural Labor Relations Board to advise farmer workers, and perhaps supervisors, of the rights guaranteed under the 1975 Agricultural Labor Relations Act and procedures to be employed in that connection.

As usually, I'm grateful to Executive Secretary Antonio Barbosa who is sitting at the back, really the, as I say in my formal statement here, the heart, soul and brains of the agency for three-and-a-half decades. And he's coordinated these hearings -- he's just put his hands up, he agrees with my assessment -- and that with his normal extraordinary skill and dedication.

Now these hearings commencing here in Fresno, continuing Salinas, Santa Maria, and we may schedule one next month in Oxnard, as well, are designed to obtain full

public input on -- into this process, a process which, as some of us already know, began with my newly created -- the Board's newly created Ad HOC Labor Management Committee in Sacramento on August 3 of this year. And I want to thank the members of the Ad Hoc Committee for not only participating on August 3, but getting the word out, helping us getting the word out about these hearings, and for appearing before the Board and presenting public comment on this important subject.

These hearings focus upon the worker -- worker education and access to promote such exclusively. And I know that there are many -- and many of you here know that there are many matter pending before the Board and the courts relating to the ALRA. But these hearings are not concerned with other matters. And any commentary about them are and will be held to be out of order as not germane to the proceedings.

However, on other matters that don't relate to access and to worker education, they can always be raised directly to our attention at any of our regularly noticed public meetings held in Sacramento at any time.

To ensure that farm workers are able to fully participate in this process we have made arrangements to have Spanish, Mixtec, Triqui, and Hmong interpreters on hand who are available to provide language assistance,

either in presentation or public comment to the Board, or listening to the conduct of this hearing itself. The -- the interpreters will be, and one of them is right now, in the back of the room and will offer simultaneous interpreting as needed.

As I said on August 3 when we had our Ad Hoc Committee meeting, and also in earlier testimony to the legislature this year, this exercise flows directly from the invitation extended by the Court of Appeal for the 4th District in the important San Diego Nursery Company case to the Board to engage in rulemaking regulation worker education and access to private property. In San Diego Nursery the focus was upon the program devised by the Board in the '70s relating to the election machinery.

And these hearings -- through these hearings we're trying revise -- revive consideration of the general approach taken by our predecessors in San Diego Nursery. But much has changed, obviously, from 1979 through 2015. The focus of the Board at that time was on election machinery. That's not our focus here.

Although there are some decertification petitions pending before the Board, there are no representation petitions polling for certification. None have been filed since I became Chairman a year-and-a-half ago. Most of our docket is unfair labor practice cases consisting of

protests by unorganized workers who are not calling for union representation, but rather calling for changes in their employment conditions. They have nothing whatsoever to do with union representation. That in and of itself is a big change from '79.

Now on this question of understanding of the law, I'd be remiss if I didn't note, and the New York Times has picked this up just a few days ago, the fact that the public thinks of our statute and the National Labor Relations Act as a -- as a labor management statute. And the fact is that the bedrock of the statute is the right of workers as workers to engage in concerted activities for a number of objectives, including the right of workers to protest and to seek reforms when they believe that they have -- their wages are too low, or they believe that they have inferior or unsatisfactory employment conditions.

I found that not only are workers in the private sector covered by the National Labor Relations Act are unaware of their right to protest, seek changes in conditions of employment that are unsatisfactory, without regard to union representation at all but that 80 years of the distribution of manuals and literature by the government and private parties, as well as remedial notices for violations, don't seek to have answered the change, this basic reality.

I and my colleagues welcome all input and advice from all interested parties, laypeople, lawyers, farm workers, growers, unions, and any others. And we appreciate your willingness to participate in this important process.

Witnesses will be called by Mr. Blanco and Ms.

Snell. If you haven't given your name to us, please do so now. The Board Members may ask and I may ask questions of witnesses. Those of you who wish to make a statement will be allowed to do so. And we are -- we are -- I have advised the Executive Secretary that we will release to the public, as we have already released to the Ad Hoc Committee, the -- a list of all people who have registered as witnesses and those who will make statement -- who will list themselves subsequently.

We request that you keep your comments brief so that we can hear from everyone who would like to speak. If you have additional comments, you're welcome to submit them to our Executive Secretary Antonio Barbosa in writing any time before October 15 -- any time before October 15.

After the Board completes this fact-finding process we will hold a public meeting where proposed regulations may be voted upon, and you'll have another chance to express your views at that time. And if the process goes forward, in writing, and perhaps in another

```
10
1
   hearing subsequently.
2
              So now let us begin. And I'll turn to Ms. Snell
3
   to please call the first witness.
4
             MS. SNELL:
                          Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
5
             For the first witness I'd call Richard Mines.
6
              DR. MINES: Good afternoon.
7
             MS. SNELL: Good afternoon, Mr. Mines.
8
              Do you have a Ph.D. In Agricultural Economics
9
   from U.C. Berkeley?
10
              DR. MINES:
                          I do.
11
             MS. SNELL: Is a copy of your curriculum vitae
12
   behind Tab 1 in the binder that has been provided to the
13
   Board?
14
              DR. MINES: I believe so.
15
             MS. SNELL: And that's a true and accurate copy
16
   of your -- your curriculum vitae?
17
              DR. MINES:
                          Yes, ma'am.
18
             MS. SNELL:
                         For the past 35 years have you --
19
              DR. MINES: For the past 35 years?
20
             MS. SNELL: Are you -- are you okay, Madame
21
   Reporter?
22
              For the past 35 years have you conducted survey
23
   research among Mexican Farm Worker and other immigrants to
24
   California?
25
              DR. MINES: Yes, I have.
```

1 MS. SNELL: And the rest of the United States? 2 DR. MINES: And the rest of the United States. 3 MS. SNELL: Did you work for the U.S. Department 4 of Labor in the Policy Department between 1988 and 1999? 5 DR. MINES: Yeah. I think -- I think I might 6 have gone there in late '87, but until -- until July '99. 7 MS. SNELL: During that time did you design, 8 implement, and manage the Department of Labor's National 9 Agricultural Workers Survey? 10 I did. I did from --DR. MINES: 11 MS. SNELL: And is that known as NAWS? 12 DR. MINES: Yeah, NAWS. I got it off the ground 13 in October '88 and it's still going on today. MS. SNELL: And do policymakers continue to rely 14 15 on NAWS in formulating policies pertaining to farm workers? 16 They do. For example, they use it to DR. MINES: 17 divide up the money, to allocate the money in many farm 18 workers programs and national programs like, you know, Head 19 Start and stuff like that. 20 MS. SNELL: Is each NAWS survey based on 21 interviews with an average of 2,500 agricultural workers 22 across the United States? 23 DR. MINES: Yes. You can see the 24 numbers on the NAWS website by year. And it varied between 25 1,500 and about 3,000 over the years, depending on budget.

MS. SNELL: All right. And has -- has NAWS data been used to prepare reports about California farm workers in particular?

DR. MINES: Yes, there's been a couple of reports. There's a couple of reports during my time. I'm not sure. I left for other endeavors in '99, but there's always been reports since then on Southern California. But there were two during my tenure there.

MS. SNELL: Based on recent data, recent NAWS data, are approximately 63 percent of California farm workers undocumented?

DR. MINES: Right. I haven't -- you know, I didn't run those numbers. But Susan Gabbard, the director of the survey for the company that does the survey, has estimated that it's pretty stable for -- in recent years. It hasn't changed much in recent years, but --

MS. SNELL: Please describe how farm workers surveyed for NAWS are selected?

DR. MINES: Well, it's a complicated process, proportional to size. First, you divide a country into 12, you know, areas. Then within those areas you choose counties -- you choose counties randomly, but with the ones with more agriculture being -- being chosen. And then you choose -- you make a list of farmers in the area and contractors and you choose them randomly. And then you

go -- you make -- you make an arrangement with the -- with the grower, the contractor, and you go to the field where the people shape up. And you choose randomly from the people that are -- that shape up in the field.

That's -- you know, you can read the, you know, the methodology on the NAWS website, the details.

MS. SNELL: And does NAWS obtain access to the work site to carry out the survey work?

DR. MINES: That's the -- we -- when we went to design the survey we talked to a lot of statisticians, and that's the only way we can reach all farm workers. To get all the farm workers in the country on a universal list, that's the only way to do it.

MS. SNELL: Is that the job site?

DR. MINES: At the job site. That's the only way to get everybody. You know, you can do it by household, you can do it by network, there's various ideas. But that's the only way to get the full, you know, population, the full universe, you know, assembled to sample.

MS. SNELL: Do most agricultural employers voluntarily allow access?

DR. MINES: Yes, most -- most do. There's -- depending on the year there's a good minority that don't.

But it's, as I said, it's a minority. Most allow it. The grower see it's in their interest, as well, to find out who

1 farm workers are out there, how many women, how many men, 2 you know, when they came to the country, how much they 3 earn. Everybody wants to know this data. So in general, 4 yeah, growers collaborate. 5 MS. SNELL: And have you run into problems 6 with -- with that access impeding productivity or any other 7 problems for employers? 8 DR. MINES: Well, the -- it -- there's -- if 9 you -- if growers down cooperate, then there's a danger 10 that might advise -- might enter into the data. But enough 11 have cooperated so that we have very good -- once we get 12 the cooperation of growers, then the workers, 95 percent --13 there's a very high rate of response rate among workers. 14 The -- the interviewers are -- some have been there since 15 the beginning of the survey, you know, 25 years ago, 28 16 It's a very skilled, high-paid professional years ago. 17 interviewer. It's not like interviewers (inaudible). 18 These guys are pros. And they get -- once they get access 19 to workers they get the interview. 20 MS. SNELL: All right. And are they able to do 21 that without disrupting the -- the farm process? 22 DR. MINES: No, they don't -- there's -- there's 23 no disruption of the farm process. 24 MS. SNELL: Now would you say that it's essential

to the -- to NAWS work to get access to the work site?

25

DR. MINES: Well, it's impossible to take a sample of the universal farm workers without access to the work site. That's -- that's the way the methodology was designed in 1988 and that's the way it's been going in the 28 or whatever number of years since then.

MS. SNELL: Could you do the work by mail?

DR. MINES: By mail? No. There's -- there's -- a very large minority of farm workers are semi-literate or illiterate. And most of the rest of them don't -- would not respond to a survey. In fact, people in general don't respond to most surveys, but certainly not farm workers.

MS. SNELL: You mentioned an issue of literacy. Can you tell us more about what you found in that regard?

DR. MINES: Well, there's -- traditionally farm workers come from rural Mexico, and they've gone to an average of about six years of school in rural Mexico.

Many -- a large portion have gone to no school or very few years of school. And the schools in rural Mexico are not that -- necessarily that great. In 1977 I put my son in a village school in Zacatecas and they were just copying letters off the board, and he was the best. Even though he didn't know Spanish he was the best in the class because he could copy letters off the board.

So the educational level is not very high among -- among farm workers. And they're not a very --

1 they're not inclined to use written materials very much. 2 In your experience do most farm MS. SNELL: 3 workers have access to a computer? 4 DR. MINES: No, they -- very few have access to 5 computers. A lot of them have access to cell phones, but 6 not smart phones. So they don't -- they don't -- they 7 don't use it. 8 Is that right, Fausto, they don't really use 9 computers that much? 10 MS. SNELL: All right. And do -- well, strike 11 that. 12 Now, in -- in the 2000s, the late 2000s, did you 13 coauthor a study of California's Indigenous Farm Workers 14 that was published in 2010? 15 DR. MINES: Right. We did a survey which 16 occupied me probably full-time from 2006 to 2009 in which 17 we interviewed, in various stages, over 400 farm workers 18 in, you know, an hour-and-a-half long survey, all of whom 19 were indigenous speaking farm workers. 20 21 MS. SNELL: And why did you focus on that 22 population? 23 I was approached by the -- by the DR. MINES: 24 CRLA. And they wanted to know who these farm workers were 25 because there were so many, essentially a lot of the

portion of the population that they didn't have any -- they had just started a program of -- of indigenous speaking outreach workers and they wanted to know who they -- what -- who was the population and where were they and what crops are they working, where do they common, what do they earn?

And -- and so they -- since I had been doing surveys since 1977, they approached me and I agreed to do it. And we raised the money and -- from California down that way, and we did it.

MS. SNELL: I'm going to show you what's behind Tab 3 in binders I prepared for the Board. Is this a copy of the report that you prepared?

DR. MINES: Right. It's also online at Indigenous farmerworkers.org if anybody wants to look at it.

MS. SNELL: Okay. And in 2010 did you estimate there were approximately 700,000 Mexican farm workers in California, and approximately 165,000 were indigenous farm workers from southern Mexico?

DR. MINES: Well, there's an estimate, kind of an ongoing estimate of 700,000 farm workers in California.

That includes all farm workers and about 95 percent of the Mexicans. I estimate there's about 112,000 indigenous farm workers and 40,000 family.

MS. SNELL: Okay.

DR. MINES: And you can see that in the demographic section on the -- on the website.

MS. SNELL: Okay. And at the time of that survey did you estimate that approximately 16 percent of California's farm labor force was indigenous farm workers?

DR. MINES: Right. That's the best estimate we could make. It's definitely -- it was definitely a conservative estimate, you know, a minimum -- a minimum. It may have been higher than that, but we estimated that at least -- at least 16 percent, 120,000, were indigenous farm workers, Mexican farm workers.

MS. SNELL: How did you define an indigenous farm worker, Mexican farm worker?

DR. MINES: Well, whether somebody is indigenous or not is up to them, you know, it's a self-identification thing. But for the -- for the sake of the survey we only did surveys in -- in nine villages. You know, our methodology led us to nine villages which use the uso y constumbres. That's -- indigenous villages have -- they require their -- their inhabitants to take on certain duties, work and catigos (phonetic) and jobs for the community. If don't do it they can lose their home, they can lose their -- their fields. And so all those villages have that system and they all spoke it. It's the dominant language in all the villages was an indigenous language.

So that's -- that's how we knew they're indigenous, for that reason.

But, you know, I can't -- I can't say that person is indigenous, that other person is not indigenous. That person has to tell you. It's, you know, self-identification.

MS. SNELL: Now you mentioned the different native languages, and we'll have more testimony about that later.

DR. MINES: Right.

MS. SNELL: But did you find that approximately 88 percent of the indigenous farm workers in California speak either Mixteco, Xacoteco (phonetic) or Triqui?

DR. MINES: Right. There's -- it's about -- at the time -- at the time we did the survey it was about 52 or 3 percent Mixteco, about 25 percent Xacoteco, and 10 percent Triqui. And then there's Shatino (phonetic) and various other languages that -- you know, Cerupicha (phonetic), you know, various other languages. So -- but they're small groups. The majority are Mixteco speaking.

MS. SNELL: Do indigenous languages have a written form?

DR. MINES: Yes, they do. There's poetry and so forth. But the farm worker -- the indigenous farm workers -- the overwhelming majority of indigenous farm

workers can't read their native language. Most of them can read a little bit of Spanish, but they don't read in their native language. They can speak it and understand it, but they don't -- you know, there's a few scholars that study, you know, the native language. But it's not -- the written language is not an everyday occurrence. You can't send out brochures in a native language and expect anybody to read it, their version, nobody could read it, except for these scholars that are not farm workers.

MS. SNELL: And did you find that if indigenous farm workers speak Spanish they speak it as a second language?

DR. MINES: Right. They all -- they all -- they all speak it as a second language. There are quite a few that speak Spanish well, but there are many of them that don't speak it very well at all. So there's a spectrum of people. In many of these remote villages, not very much Spanish is spoken.

MS. SNELL: And would you say that those who speak Spanish, not all of them can read or write Spanish?

DR. MINES: Right. There's -- Spanish literacy or even Spanish speaking is -- not all farm workers -- all indigenous farm workers can speak Spanish. And, you know, most of them don't read well.

MS. SNELL: Now I just want to point out for the

Board that you have summarized your findings about the educational level of indigenous farm workers on Page 36 of your report.

So let me ask you more generally, what is your understanding of the average number of years of education of California's farm workers?

DR. MINES: California's farm workers are, you know, predominantly Mexican, 95 percent. There's some Salvadorians and Hondurans and others. Traditionally they have an average education of about between five and six years. And it's getting a little bit -- a little bit higher in recent years, which gives us that Mexico is improving. So as people come across the border they've been to school more in Mexico. And -- but it's still probably between six and seven right now, I would think. And one has to remember that though the education system in Mexico has approved, people that tend to go into farm work tend to be from the remote, less -- remote areas where they have -- they have less educational opportunities, both in the number of years they go to school and in the quality of the schools.

MS. SNELL: Now, in order to conduct the interviews for the Indigenous Farm Workers Study, did you hire interviewers who spoke indigenous languages?

DR. MINES: Yeah. We had a bunch of -- you know,

at one point we had 40 indigenous speakers in the early stages of the survey when we -- when we were picking a sample. All the interviewers -- I went along on many, many interviews and heard a lot of Triqui and Mixtec and Xacoteco and so forth, but I didn't understand anything during interviews. The bilingual people explained to me in Spanish afterwards what had, you know, transpired. All the interviews were done in native languages.

MS. SNELL: And do you think you could have communicated to the level necessary to conduct the survey without having indigenous speakers do the interviews?

DR. MINES: I don't -- I don't think so, even those that speak Spanish pretty well feel more -- if you want to get information that's -- that's confidential and reliable.

I just spent a year in Mexico a couple of years ago that I spent interviewing Nawa (phonetic) speaking cane cutters in Jalisco. And when I would be interviewing the person, the Nawa speaker in broken Spanish, you don't really -- he's not really relaxed. He doesn't really tell you very much. Then you bring an Nawa speaker over and they start talking and elaborating. It's not the same.

If you want -- if you want to get good information from -- from indigenous speaking Mexican farm workers, you've got to speak to them in their native

1 language. 2 And would you say the inverse in MS. SNELL: 3 terms of conveying more detailed information, is it 4 important to have a native speaker communicate with an 5 individual? 6 DR. MINES: Right. If -- if you go to like --7 after we did the survey we went out to the community and 8 gave results to the community and have people talk in 9 Spanish. And then I'd, you know, invite somebody else to 10 explain it in Mixtec and Triqui. And the people just, you 11 know, they -- instead of listening, you know, a little, but 12 they start listening, they start laughing, they start, you 13 know, asking questions. It's -- you know, it's their --14 it's their language, you know? 15 Now, I'd like --MS. SNELL: 16 DR. MINES: And --17 MS. SNELL: Sorry. Were you done? 18 DR. MINES: I'm done. 19 MS. SNELL: Okay. I'd like to ask a few 20 questions about your findings. 21 First of all, did you reach any conclusions about 22 how indigenous farm workers fared compared to other farm 23 workers? 24 MS. SNELL: Yeah. Well, they're -- they're the 25 most recently arrived, and it's not surprising, and they're a little bit -- and they're younger than -- than the average farm workers, so it's not surprising that they earn less. About two-thirds earn the minimum wage or less.

They are more prone to suffer -- when we do measures of labor conditions they -- they actually suffer from -- from poor labor conditions. For example, they pay for rides more and they pay for equipment more. They pay for housing more and -- and the like. They have -- they have inferior housing. They have -- they own housing less. They have fewer cars. On any measure you want to ask me about, they're in a situation of relative poverty compared to the Mestiso (phonetic) Mexican farm workers.

MS. SNELL: And as a result of, in part, their undocumented status, is it hard to make contact with indigenous farm workers?

DR. MINES: Yes. Well, the undocumented status is not just indigenous, of course. There's probably a majority of non-indigenous that are also undocumented. But the indigenous people are very hard to approach. In order to do the survey we had to go through, you know, a long process of getting to know them. That's why we did it, we focused on nine communities. We wanted to get the confidence of those nine communities. And interviewers — an interviewer or interviewers were assigned to one community to get to know them.

The indigenous people in Mexico have been discriminated against for 500 years. They don't trust non-indigenous people and are very unlikely to -- to share information or feel at ease with non-indigenous people. Their experience is that whenever they have dealt with them they've been cheated or tripped by non-indigenous people in Mexico and the United States.

And so it's very important to consider that when you consider how to approach them if you want to get their confidence if you want to inform them about labor law.

And, of course, these are the people that know least about labor law and about their collective bargaining rights.

And you're going to have to consider very carefully how to do it, because these people do not trust outsiders.

MS. SNELL: All right. Now, speaking of knowledge of legal rights, in the Indigenous Farm Workers Study did you ask indigenous farm workers whether they had heard about legal services that were available to them?

DR. MINES: Right. We asked them if they've heard of legal services for them, and the majority hadn't. I don't know the number right off, it's in the report, but the majority hadn't heard. But we did ask them that question.

MS. SNELL: And -- and, yes, my next question, based on your research is it your conclusion that most

indigenous farm workers are unaware of their legal rights?

DR. MINES: Certainly. They -- where they -- where they come from in Mexico, the remote areas they come from in Mexico, and this would be true of farm workers in general, not just indigenous, they -- farm workers who have come here recently, most of them have come here in the last ten years. And -- and where they came from there wasn't any -- there wasn't any -- there weren't any unions. There wasn't an organization going on, labor organization going on where they came from.

And here they haven't been exposed to any organization. There hasn't been going -- anything going on in recent years, you know, since they've come, and so they haven't really had a chance to be exposed to a labor union organization. And they -- and they -- and nobody has told them about -- about their collective bargaining rights or their -- for example, most of them in the NAWS don't even know about, you know, a lot of them, it depends on the year, but let's say half or more don't know about their Workers' Comp rights, which is -- which is something which they seek because they see people in their community hurt all the time. They don't even know about that, that they have a right to that.

So -- so it's certainly the -- the more difficult thing about, you know -- you know, the labor standards, the

Federal Standards Act, minimum wage, overtime, and collective bargaining rights, they don't -- most of them are not going to be aware of that.

MS. SNELL: All right. And did you ask questions about their knowledge of farm worker unions in particular or --

DR. MINES: The NAWS -- the NAWS has. I didn't ask that in the indigenous survey, but the NAWS has a question about that. And most, like I just said, most have not been exposed to union, so they don't know about it. There's -- there's no unions out there, you know, organizing most farm workers, it's just a small minority. I'd have you look at the -- at the NAWS reports, but certainly less than -- less than 15 percent answered the question, yes, they know about it. And, in fact, if -- when you ask them if they've heard of Cesar Chavez they say, "You mean Julio Cesar Chavez, the boxer?" They haven't heard of the -- haven't heard of the labor leader but they've heard of the boxer.

MS. SNELL: Now, are you familiar with the Agricultural Labor Relations Act?

DR. MINES: To some extent, not like you are,

23 but --

MS. SNELL: Okay. As someone who has surveyed many farm workers, do you believe farm workers know their

rights and responsibilities under the ALRA?

DR. MINES: I doubt that they've ever heard of it. That -- I doubt the vast majority have ever heard of it. I haven't -- but I haven't asked that question on, you know, on a survey.

But, you know, in light of what I had just said over the last two or three minutes, that they haven't heard of Cesar Chavez. They haven't heard of the unions. Unions had not been active and they haven't seen them. Where they come from there's no unions. There's very little labor law enforcement in the areas where they come from. I mean, the Department of Labor in Mexico doesn't enforce labor law in Mexico where they come from. So they just plain haven't had a chance to learn about it.

MS. SNELL: As -- as you know from conversations we've had, the ALRB is considering promulgating a rule that would permit ALRB staff to visit agricultural work sites for the purpose of educating farm workers and field supervisors or foremen about the rights and responsibilities provided by the ALRB, the act. Would you support such a rule?

DR. MINES: Yeah, I would support it. I think it's probably the only way to get access. Because as you can see by the way I designed the Indigenous Farm Workers Survey and by the way the NAWS is designed, if you -- if

you do household surveys to get access to farmers you have to go through a very expensive process of finding out who is in neighborhood. Because when you come to a door and the person comes to the door, he's not going to identify all the people that he's got, you know, living in a house in violation of -- of housing, you know, standards, and the people are going to be jumping over the back fences, you know? And that's why the current population survey, the consensus -- the U.S. Census doesn't find the bottom 20 percent of farm workers. They just don't show up in the surveys.

And so, yes, I would say that I you want to get access to -- to indigenous farm workers and farm workers at the bottom that know the least about labor law, if you want to get access to those people, then the workplace is the only -- only option for you to -- to get access to those people, to get -- to get access to the full universe of those people, and especially those that are most in need of it.

MS. SNELL: All right. Thank you.

And just -- I want to point out for the Board, behind Tab 2 of the binder I've included a California Labor Board study done -- published in 2005 based on data from 2001-2002. And this is the most recent comprehensive NAWS study I was able to find.

Since some big changes have happened after -- DR. MINES: Right.

MS. SNELL: -- that was published, in particular with the economic downturn, that -- that has rendered these statistics somewhat questionable in some areas?

DR. MINES: Well, I don't think it renders them as questionable, but I know they need to be updated. And certainly the population is much more stable than it was before the -- both the borders was slammed shut by the -- by the -- by the border patrol and the -- and Marcos threatening farm workers coming, you know, coming across the border. And so it's getting -- it's much more difficult to cross the border. Many, many tens of thousands of people still do it, but a lot fewer than before.

So the population, for example, ten years ago, maybe a third of a population was going back and forth from Mexico every year of the California farm worker force. Now it's probably ten percent, mostly the legals. And it's, you know, very expensive and difficult and dangerous to go back and forth.

MS. SNELL: And is -- the first 18 pages behind Tab 2, I included some figures that you had directed me to that were pulled together from more recent NAWS data by someone that you -- that you have (inaudible)?

```
1
             DR. MINES: The director of the survey, Susan
2
   Gabbard, yeah.
3
             MS. SNELL:
                        And if the Board has questions about
4
   that information, are you prepared to address them?
5
             DR. MINES:
                         Right.
                                  I mean, I, you know, I or
6
   somebody else can analyze the public use tape of the NAWS
7
   which has data up to 2012. So you can -- you can update
8
   any -- you can cross tab that data any -- any which way for
9
   whatever you want to know.
10
             MS. SNELL: All right. I don't have any further
11
   questions. Does the Board?
12
             CHAIRMAN GOULD: Great. We'll turn to Member
13
   Rivera-Hernandez first.
14
             BOARD MEMBER RIVERA-HERNANDEZ: Dr. Mike -- I
15
   don't -- is it on? Okay. Sorry.
16
             Thank you for coming. I have some practical
17
   questions --
18
             DR. MINES: Sure.
19
             BOARD MEMBER RIVERA-HERNANDEZ: -- about the
20
   survey. And that was, when are the surveys done --
21
             DR. MINES: In -- in ours?
22
             BOARD MEMBER RIVERA-HERNANDEZ: -- practically,
23
   the -- when you go and actually speak to the workers?
24
             DR. MINES:
                        Okay.
                                The -- the National
25
   Agricultural Workers Survey, the NAWS, which started in '88
```

and is going on still today, I haven't been there since '99, so --

BOARD MEMBER RIVERA-HERNANDEZ: Yeah. I understand. Thanks.

DR. MINES: -- but I -- my successor has been the same person the whole time.

Anyway, there's -- there's three surveys a year to catch the seasonality. And so you do surveys three times a year, and so there's about 800, 600, 700, 800 people surveyed each cycle. There's been like 80-something cycles since the beginning. And so you -- I think it's probably pretty confusing, how do you -- how do you actually get access to these people who are undocumented, you know, in reports? But actually, you know, it's not that hard to -- if you know the right jokes and the right -- and the right expressions it's not hard to -- once you get -- meet them and talk to them, they -- they -- it's not that hard to -- to speak to them.

The hardest part is getting through the employer, to get the employer's permission. And that's, like I say, it's about -- I think it's about 75 or 80 percent of employers collaborate. And then they'll tell you, those -- those employers that collaborate, and the NAWS goes out and goes to the associations, you know, the Strawberry Commission and the -- and the, you know, Farm Bureau and

other -- and other local farm organizations and tries -- tries to push the survey to get people to collaborate.

Once you go out to the field they're going to say, where do the people shape up? You know, they go — they get lunch here and in the morning they're here, and you go out there. You see there's 20 people out there and you know you have to do 5 surveys. You question them and see — you know, you choose — you choose the five people that you have to survey and you go say, can I talk to you, either now or at your home or, you know, at church, or wherever you want to meet. And that's — that's really how NAWS — NAWS does it. It seems difficult, but having done it many, many times I didn't find it that difficult to do.

BOARD MEMBER RIVERA-HERNANDEZ: Okay. And so you essentially -- you go out and you schedule a time, and then you'd actually do the survey at --

DR. MINES: Yeah. The survey can take between 45 minutes and an hour depending -- an hour-and-a-half depending on how big the family is --

BOARD MEMBER RIVERA-HERNANDEZ: Right.

DR. MINES: -- how long -- we do a one-year labor history, you know, how many jobs a person has had. And, you know, and also there's -- depending on the individual there's health modules, there's educational modules. The NAWS is paid for, not just by the Department of Labor, but

by -- when I was there I spent most of my time raising money for, you know, for migrant Head Start, you know? The FDA, the EPA, a lot of people want to have their questions in NAWS. They want to know, you know -- you know, how it effects their department.

BOARD MEMBER RIVERA-HERNANDEZ: And I was wondering, to that -- to that point, because you're asking, essentially, about employer compliance with pesticides, Workers' Comp, the injuries.

DR. MINES: Right.

BOARD MEMBER RIVERA-HERNANDEZ: And when you have the discussions with these employers, they are still willing to let you come in --

DR. MINES: The employers are still willing to -BOARD MEMBER RIVERA-HERNANDEZ: -- to raise
these --

DR. MINES: The information -- what we tell them and what we do is that information is actually secure. You know, the individual grower, you could not find that -- his name in the data. You know, even by county in the public use tape it's not -- it's not identifiable by county. And most certainly, depending on the type of the data, the data is very carefully -- you know, a panel of the Department of Labor and other agencies of the federal government made sure that the public use tape does -- does not allow

1 identification of anybody. 2 BOARD MEMBER RIVERA-HERNANDEZ: So in order to 3 access -- in order to gain the data, essentially, if an 4 employer isn't complying, nothing is done with the 5 information; correct? 6 DR. MINES: No. There's no -- no other -- no 7 other agency, including the Department of Labor, has access 8 to that data. 9 BOARD MEMBER RIVERA-HERNANDEZ: Okay. 10 DR. MINES: It's -- yeah, it's difficult. 11 mean, it's -- not only in those other -- other things that 12 are even more disturbing as one sees out there than -- than 13 labor abuse. 14 BOARD MEMBER RIVERA-HERNANDEZ: Yeah. Yeah. 15 Thank you. 16 Just a follow-up. Do you do the MS. SNELL: 17 interviews at a particular time of day or a particular part 18 of the workday? 19 DR. MINES: Most -- most surveys are done at 20 night and on weekends, especially Sundays. 21 MS. SNELL: I'm talking specifically about when 22 you go. 23 DR. MINES: Oh, no, no. You go wherever the 24 employer allows you access. And so it's normally --25 MS. SNELL: And how about --

DR. MINES: -- normally in the morning or the -the shape up in the morning where, you know, people -- the cars come into the field and the -- and the workers are milling around you before they work, that's normally when -- when it happens. But it could happen -- you know, I don't know whether Susan has ever taken statistics on that, but that's just my impression. MS. SNELL: So it's before work begins? DR. MINES: Correct. MS. SNELL: Okay. DR. MINES: When most -- most of the -- the selection would occur for the National Agricultural Workers Survey. That's not true of the other surveys that, you know -- you know, I've done about 20 or 25 surveys over my lifetime and each -- each survey is different. CHAIRMAN GOULD: Did you want --BOARD MEMBER SHIROMA: Yes. Oops. Thank you. Thank you. Buenos dias, everyone. Thank you for spending

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Buenos dias, everyone. Thank you for spending time with us. Thank you to the Chair for providing the -- this forum for a very -- a very meaningful discussion.

Mr. Mines, thank you. I am an admirer of your work and of the NAWS work. And I think it's tremendous that we have data going back to 1998, again to see the trends to help policymakers --

DR. MINES: Right.

BOARD MEMBER SHIROMA: -- make a well-informed decision.

My question is: Do you have an approximate percentage of how many -- you said most interviews end up being done at night or on the weekends after prearranging at the work site to talk with somebody. So -- so that means very few or a smaller percentage of interviews are actually done at the work site or rather the logistic --

DR. MINES: Yeah. A minority -- a minority are done at the work site because it's -- it's, you know, lunch hour or it's after work at the -- you know, but the -- but the NAWS does not interfere with the, you know, flow of work.

BOARD MEMBER SHIROMA: Sure.

DR. MINES: So if the -- you know, the foreman is also there. You know, so if they've got to go to work, they've got to go to work. Then, you know, you have to meet the person later. Like I said, Sunday is -- Sunday is a favorite time, you know, because that's when they're washing their clothes.

BOARD MEMBER SHIROMA: Can multi-task, do the interview and do the washing of clothes.

Yeah, we were on a tour recently where we were talking with a farm worker and he very, very politely told

us, you know, I really would like to answer your questions, however, the employer is providing a bonus if I finish, you know, X number of bags, etcetera. So we said --

DR. MINES: Right.

BOARD MEMBER SHIROMA: -- sorry. We don't want to interfere with somebody being able to --

DR. MINES: Right.

BOARD MEMBER SHIROMA: -- earn their money.

And with the indigenous farm workers, in terms of garnering an interview, do they ever say, gee, I've got to check with my community leader first before I agree to an interview or --

DR. MINES: You mean from their own community?

BOARD MEMBER SHIROMA: Yeah. Yeah.

DR. MINES: We came across that mostly in the -in the Jamaican and -- excuse me, the Haitian community.

There was a lot of (inaudible) in the Haitian community in
Florida. We came across getting -- having to get
permission from them.

But I think you raise -- in terms of what the objective of this -- of this rule is, I think you would be -- it would behoove you to -- to pay attention to that question. Because I think it's -- the -- the people -- the indigenous people and Mexican farm workers in general, but in particular the indigenous people, have a very closed

society. And we actually, for the -- for the indigenous farm workers, I and two or three other people, including Fausto sitting there, went -- went to -- to Oaxaca and Guerrero and Michoacán and asked for permission of the community leaders, you know, from the village if we could do the survey.

I think that going to the work site is to identify the networks that you have to get confidence with them in order to spread the word about the -- about their rights. And then you might have to go somewhere else to -- to have, you know, somebody speak, hopefully in their own language, explain their rights to them.

But you have to identify -- the first thing we did with the indigenous farm workers survey is we -- we went out and identified 350 networks of people, village networks. That's the first -- that was the first step so we could get access. And that might be something that you -- you could consider doing this, is figuring out, not only for indigenous but in general, farm workers, where do they come? What's their village?

We want to get the confidence that -- you know, one of the ways -- you say, how do get the confidence for an interview? I say, "You're from, you know, oh, you're from Michoacán, you know, (inaudible)." So you -- you get them to think you really know where they come from and you

understand, you know, what their life is like. 1 2 BOARD MEMBER SHIROMA: Thank you. 3 CHAIRMAN GOULD: If I could just follow up on 4 part of what Ms. Shiroma asked. She pointed out that we 5 ran into this farm worker who said, you know, I'd like to 6 talk to you but I've get to get -- their paying me a 7 bonus --8 DR. MINES: Yeah, right. 9 CHAIRMAN GOULD: -- and I got to get the work 10 done. 11 DR. MINES: Make some money, yeah. 12 CHAIRMAN GOULD: So we wondered whether you 13 encountered -- I mean, to some extent that overlaps with 14 this other point about having the confidence of the person. 15 But -- but as a practical matter, do you run up 16 against the problem of -- of finding this non-working time, 17 you know, given the fact that people are being paid in many 18 instances --19 DR. MINES: Right. 20 CHAIRMAN GOULD: -- by the piece, so to speak? 21 DR. MINES: Right. They're being paid by the 22 And peak season when they work -- when they're piece. 23 working ten hours a day, and sometimes seven days a week, 24 it is hard to find the time, that's true. So in certain

situations you might want to, you know, know what the

25

1 peak -- the peak of the season is and you want to -- you 2 want to, you know, get to talk to those workers a little 3 bit before the peak or a little bit after the peak just, 4 you know, as they're coming to the work site as their 5 leaving, you know, the work areas. So --6 CHAIRMAN GOULD: But did you encounter this 7 problem in --8 DR. MINES: Yes, I did. 9 CHAIRMAN GOULD: -- your research? 10 DR. MINES: Yeah. I have encountered the 11 problem. But I tried to -- to be sensitive to -- to that. 12 And I would -- I would never stop anybody from -- from 13 trying to make some money. 14 CHAIRMAN GOULD: For sure. 15 Yeah. In fact, in one of the studies DR. MINES: 16 I did in 1980 I picked along with the workers. 17 lemons along with them. I said, "If I fill up half your 18 bin will you sit down with me for half-an-hour." And then 19 that's how got access to them the next day. I was a 20 little -- a little bit younger then. 21 CHAIRMAN GOULD: Now, you earlier spoke about the 22 extent to which workers are knowledgeable about the 23 Agricultural Labor Relations Act. 24 I mean, putting aside the whole question of 25 unions and organizing, did you -- do you have any knowledge

1 about the extent to which they know that if they protest 2 about a low wage or what they think are inferior working 3 conditions and the employer retaliates against them that 4 they're -- that that's against the law, that that's 5 protected activity? Do you -- do you come across any 6 knowledge of farm workers about that basic concept that's 7 contained in the Agricultural Labor Relations Act? 8 DR. MINES: Not -- there are -- there are, you 9 know, lines across which the foreman can't walk before 10 people lose their temper and, you know, want a better wage, 11 but I don't think it's based on their knowledge of ALRA. 12 It think it's just based on their -- on their anger point 13 and what they need to tell their wives that they're making, 14 you know? 15 So, you know, I don't think there's really -- I don't think there's a lot of information out there about 16 17 the ALRA. 18 CHAIRMAN GOULD: Thank you. 19 Well, Mr. Mines, we want to thank you very much. 20 BOARD MEMBER RIVERA-HERNANDEZ: I'm sorry --21 CHAIRMAN GOULD: Oh. 22 BOARD MEMBER RIVERA-HERNANDEZ: -- could I ask 23 one -- just one last question? 24 Given -- and again, thank you for making the trip 25 out here, and your vast experience.

Given what you know we're trying to accomplish with this -- this reg, and is there any piece of advice and/or caution that you haven't shared already that you think would be beneficial for us to know?

DR. MINES: I'll just -- I'll just repeat myself. Here you have -- in California you have a Mexican industry that has a very thin veneer or angle on, you know, management on top. But the -- 90 percent of the people involved in the industry are first-language Spanish or indigenous languages. These are -- these are people that identify with their network more than collective -- you know, a collective idea of, you know, unions or anything other type of -- they -- they're in a mutual reciprocal -- the way they survive is within their network, exchange favors within the network.

So what you want to do is you want to identify those networks, the farm workers, there's not that many, you know, just a couple thousand of those networks out there, you want to identify those networks and get within those networks to try to get the people together network by network and -- and present the material to them about their -- their rights. And you'll have a lot more success than any other way.

BOARD MEMBER RIVERA-HERNANDEZ: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN GOULD: Thank you very much, Mr. Mines.

The -- next we'll turn to Mr. Barry Bedwell with the California Fresh Fruit Association. And I believe Mr. Bedwell has advised the Board that he's going to share some of this time with Ms. Carmen Garza.

MR. BEDWELL: Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN GOULD: Thank you.

MR. BEDWELL: With the Board's permission I'd like to introduce Carmen Garza who has been a good friend for over a decade. She has a fantastic history of working in the agricultural industry as a farm worker in numerous capacities. And she drove up today from Delano. And I'd like to yield at least a portion of my time to give you some very valid points.

14 CHAIRMAN GOULD: And I think I met Ms. Garza, did
15 I not --

MS. GARZA: Yes, we've met.

17 CHAIRMAN GOULD: -- in Sacramento. Thank you.

MS. GARZA: Yes, we did.

19 CHAIRMAN GOULD: Thank you.

MS. GARZA: Yes, we did meet. After all this information that this gentleman gave just before me, I feel like where have I been all this time? My goodness. But I'll tell you, I started working in the California fields in 1960. I was 13 years old at the time. It was not against the law for underage people to work at that time.

But I don't remember hearing anything about farm workers' rights or issues, other than those we discussed among ourselves in the fields.

At that time we didn't have cell phones, internet or social media. There was limited Spanish radio and television that provided one hour of Spanish radio per day and one hour of Spanish television for a week. That was back in my time. All they did was play a couple of mariachi and a few commercials and the hour was gone, so there was no time for anything else.

Later I learned that organizations and church groups were holding meetings to figure out how to get information to farm -- field workers. But because of the communication challenges, different groups decided to get help from college students who in those days were interested in what they call social justice. We just knew them as hippies at that time. That was a different time.

Life is much different now in 2015. There are many ways people learn of opportunities and rights today. There are more than ten Spanish radio stations in my area, and there are five, or I don't know how many, free public television stations that broadcast in our area and are all -- and all of them provide educational programs and public service messages.

Today most workers have cell phones and computers

and communicate through texting and social media. Even I can use a computer. And I have a smart phone, and I use the internet for news. I use Facebook to communicate with family and friends, and even send my messages through -- through text.

Farm workers go to work to work. Having the ALRB or any other state or federal agencies would disrupt the work. That's the way I feel.

Two good examples of how information is so accessible to field workers in Spanish is the recent Heat Illness Prevention Regulation issued by Cal/OSHA and the Affordable Care Act. Both of these laws have a critical impact to the lives of farm workers.

Cal/OSHA's Heat Illness Regulations were implemented and communicated throughout the state without Cal/OSHA needing to visit the fields to educate workers and supervisors.

Thousands of field workers learned about and got insurance for the first time last year under the Affordable Care Act. Information was provided on television, radio, and the internet. It was all achieved throughout the entire country without any agency needing to go to the fields to educate workers about the rights under the act.

Why doesn't the ALRB take a lesson from those examples and use the same methods to get the message out to

the workers? It might even be more beneficial to the workers.

Your proposal to visit agricultural workers doesn't make sense since farm workers have the same opportunities to receive information as everyone else. The thing to remember is that we're not back in the old age anymore. I know we're farm workers. But even -- even in Mexico in the little towns that the gentleman was talking about, even there they have telephones and television and radio. So it's something to consider. Thank you.

MR. BARBOSA: Well, I want to follow up with Carmen's comments and really get to the focus on the issue. I think as we talked at the Ad Hoc Committee in Sacramento earlier in the month I think we all heard that there really wasn't any kind of opposition or overly considered about education. I think we all agree that the farm workers have a right to understand the Agricultural Labor Relations Act and the concerted rights that are protected under that act.

I think where we're -- we're finding conflict, quite frankly, is the focus as it shifts to how to best educate. And, of course, as soon as we get into the issue of access we're going to have contentiousness in many, many ways. Let me just point out some of the concerns that I've heard.

First of all, and you're probably going to hear

later today from some legal experts. I'm not going to pretend I'm a lawyer. But you're -- I'm giving you a heads up, you're going to hear about statutory authority and can this be done. I'm not -- that's not my concern right now. My concern is how to help accomplish the goal of education, at the same time really accomplish the goal of preventing disruption in the workplace, and at the bottom line not following the wishes of the employees. So you're going to hear legal arguments.

The other thing that you just heard is that things have changed so much. I have been amazed at the use of social media within the farm worker community. There are communication networks out there. And I think the gentleman, Dr. Mines before us, talked about networking. I think that should be a clue to us to how to better communicate and educate.

about on access issues that have been just recently demonstrated is over the issue of nonproductive time. And certainly under an hourly rate, if you come in and you're talking to people there's going to have to be compensation for the workers. If people are under piece rate we find that the current law says that there's going to have to be compensation for nonproductive time. So that is a cost, and absolute cost that is going to have to be borne by

employers under access grantance.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

The other things that we hear is that many times workers, as we all see with our own jobs, you like to get to the job, you focus on getting it done, you want to get out, and you want to go home and see your family. These issues, really at times, may or may not belong in the workplace, and that might not be the best place to educate individuals.

And then the big issue, that I think we have to be honest with ourselves and address. There's a concern out there, first over access and the potential for bias in the message. And we are at a particular point in time in the history of the Agricultural Labor Act where, unfortunately, there seems to be evidence of bias, not by the Board, I will point out, but by ALRB staff in the presentation of information and data. We can't ignore that. And I have to tell you that there's a perception that's prevalent within the community, not just employers but employees, as well, that they aren't getting the straight scoop from Board representatives. We have to understand that. So to, at this point, move out to access and use the Board as the educational instrument I think would cause massive concern. We have to understand that.

And then also I think we -- we have to look at the other examples that Carmen mentioned. Today, you know,

we've worked in conjunction with Cal/OSHA very hard, since 2005 when California became the first state to institute the Heat Illness Prevention Regulations. We stood up with the governor and said, yes, we need to do something. We need to better educate. We set seminars in motion. We helped put together information such as this, which I want to leave with you. I'm sure you have copies. But, for instance, here are videos in six different languages, six different languages, Spanish, English, information that can be passed out, posters.

This is the kind of approach that I think demands that we look at first, in terms of education. To jump simply to the access issue, I believe we're going to lose focus on our true intent, and that's education. Because the issue itself of the access will become so contentious.

So when I'm up here to I think I want to keep an open mind in terms of how we can work together on education. But the message has to be clear that at this point in time the access, I believe, will be counterproductive as trying to push forth as a solution for education.

So I think if we move forward and talk about education and that focus you can have willing collaborators. I think if we focus on access there's going to be tenacious opposition.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN GOULD: You know, if I can just ask, while I appreciate both what you and Ms. Garza have had to say, and I want to say how much I enjoyed meeting Ms. Garza in Sacramento awhile back, and it's good -- it's good to see you again, I -- you know, some of the things you say you're -- you remind me, Barry, of a program that I was involved in for a large multi-national company that was -- had decided to educate -- attempt to educate its workers about the rights -- rights under the National Labor Relations Act.

And one of the things they did, you mentioned videos, was that videos were put together by -- actually by myself because I was appointed by this company as an independent monitor. And every employee was required to, as part of the training program, was required to -- and safety program, was required to listen to and observe and listen to these -- these videos. I don't know that there was an opportunity for follow-up questions at the time.

Would you advocate something like that?

MR. BEDWELL: I think we have to keep an open mind. The key to any of these -- these courses is reasonableness and balance. I think we have a confidence crisis right now with many folks and how do we really reinstall that confidence?

I think in terms of education, I'll give you a quick example. For instance, our association, the California Fresh Fruit Association, receives market access promotion funds, MAP funds from the federal government. As part of that process we have to go through, for our board that makes decisions having to with hiring, diversity training.

I was sent something recently, like eight modules of information to go through on diversity training. I looked at that. And if you looked at the timing involved it probably could take 50, 60 hours. And there was a lot of repetition. There was a lot of things. I'm just pointing out that as we get to the heart of this issue I think we need input from all points of view to make sure that it's balanced and reasonable. Part of the thing we can do with written material and videos and so forth is ease people's concern about bias.

And so, yeah, I -- in looking at educational sources, as far as requirements let's keep in mind that we -- we want to accomplish our goal. But what I always hear is that California and the cumulative impact of regulations; right? Remember, we have to compete in a worldwide market. So within reason I'm saying, sure, put it on the table. If we're -- if we're hitting a wall, and I think we are with the access issue, and we say what are

other ways that we can educate, let's look at those. Let's see what can be balanced and reasonable. I certainly wouldn't close the door on that.

CHAIRMAN GOULD: So you would advocate videos during the say safety or training program as part of the employee --

MR. BEDWELL: Again, within certain periods.

That's a general statement. I have to be careful about endorsing concepts that we don't know the details on. The devil is always going to be in the detail. But I'd say, look, if the goal is education let's figure out how to accomplish that goal. Let's not focus in on a means that is causing so much controversy.

CHAIRMAN GOULD: I don't know if my colleagues have any questions here, as well.

BOARD MEMBER RIVERA-HERNANDEZ: Barry, the employers currently pay for the employees to, what, do the training for pesticide training, the required training; is that accurate?

MR. BEDWELL: Yeah. I mean, you're really talking about non -- you mean the nonproductive time issue and compensation?

BOARD MEMBER RIVERA-HERNANDEZ: Yes.

MR. BEDWELL: Absolutely. I mean, we're -- we're going through a historic change in the way nonproductive

time is being interpreted. Of course, a lot of this came out the court case Blufer (phonetic) which was denied review before the California Supreme Court, which set into motion the payment of nonproductive time under piece rate. And as you may or may not know, there is a bill currently pending that is going through much, much discussion in Sacramento these last two days about how to address some of the liability issues under that court decision.

So clearly employers in California have a whole

So clearly employers in California have a whole different world to look at in terms of nonproductive time, particularly as it pertains to piece rate moving forward.

BOARD MEMBER RIVERA-HERNANDEZ: And -- and forgive me for not knowing the answer to this, but how much time are we talking about? How much time does an employer have to pay per employee for the current training that's required?

MR. BEDWELL: Well, it depends on how long that training is.

BOARD MEMBER RIVERA-HERNANDEZ: But what's the shortest amount of time that --

21 MR. BEDWELL: I don't know.

BOARD MEMBER RIVERA-HERNANDEZ: -- legal training can be done in?

MR. BEDWELL: Well, what is the shortest amount of time? What would it be?

1 UNIDENTIFIED MALE: We -- I'm sorry. We do 2 training. And to answer your question, it goes anywhere 3 (inaudible) meeting generally 15 to 30 minutes --4 BOARD MEMBER RIVERA-HERNANDEZ: Okay. 5 UNIDENTIFIED MALE: -- each. Of if you have 30 6 employees, that's a considerable sum of money. 7 BOARD MEMBER RIVERA-HERNANDEZ: Okay. I just 8 wanted to make sure I had an idea of what we were talking 9 about. 10 MR. BEDWELL: Yeah. 11 BOARD MEMBER RIVERA-HERNANDEZ: Okay. 12 CHAIRMAN GOULD: Another question we have is the 13 OSHA. Doesn't OSHA have the right to have access to your 14 property for the purpose of inspection? 15 MR. BEDWELL: For inspection, yes. But that's --16 CHAIRMAN GOULD: No, but -- no, but not in regard 17 to the alleged violation of the code. Don't they have a 18 right to have access to talk to employees? 19 MR. BEDWELL: To talk to employees, I'm not so 20 sure. I'm not going to give you a definite answer because 21 I'm, again, not an attorney (inaudible). For just talking 22 to employees? I'm not sure why they would be there just 23 talking to employees, I don't. I don't. I think they've 24 looked at education differently. 25 BOARD MEMBER RIVERA-HERNANDEZ: Thank you.

more about the association that represent?

MR. BEDWELL: Sure. The association?

MR. BLANCO: Who are the members, how many -
MR. BEDWELL: Fair enough.

MR. BLANCO: -- etcetera?

MR. BEDWELL: Yeah. The California Fresh Fruit

Association for 78 years was known as the California Grape
and Tree Fruit League. We're an association primarily of
grower-packer-shippers that has membership all the way from

Coachella Valley in the south up to Lake County in the

north. We are an organization that was formed way back in

1936 on a merger between the Northern California Grower and

Shippers Protected League and the Southern California Grape

MR. BLANCO: So for the record, can you tell us

17 blueberries, I should say, not strawberries, blueberries,
18 but all 13 permanent fresh fruit crops. Pretty much

Growers. Our job is to be the primary public policy

representative for the grapes, berries such as --

everything in the state with the exception of citrus and

20 avocados.

MR. BLANCO: And the kind of work done by farm workers, is that work paid by the piece of hourly or -
MR. BEDWELL: All -- all combinations of the

above. I think you'll find within our membership you'll --

25 you'll see a combination of rates. Depending upon the

particular commodity, one form may be more predominant than the other.

But I think that what you'll find is that historically our members are vertically integrated family operations that deal with packing -- excuse me, growing, packing, and shipping product.

MR. BLANCO: Do you think there would be an interest among your members to voluntarily let staff come on and educate?

MR. BEDWELL: I'm glad you brought up that point, because that was another point I should have made.

If we ever got into the access issue and access was granted my concern would be that employees' perception over why did the ALRB pick my employer? Why did he come by here? Did my employer do something wrong? And even if we say it was done randomly I'm concerned, again, that somebody says, ah-ha, something's going on at that place because I saw the ALRB show up over there. They're trying to educate people. So I think people would jump unfairly to conclusions.

So the idea of volunteering I think would be very concerning for folks in saying, well, what would -- how would my employees, how would other employees view it if I have people educating my workers and my neighbor does not?

You know, I would just like to point out that

we've been very successful in the education issues on heat illness. I mean, every late winter or early spring, for instance, we have, as an example, out in Easton here a -- and many associations get together, Manual Cunha with the Nisei Farmers League has been instrumental in helping put together, as well as other organizations, educational sessions for farm workers, for supervisors, for farm labor contractors. And I think we've gotten great traction. And we look at those statistics. We are very concerned about protecting workers health.

We're involved with labor intensive crops. Anybody that tells you that a good grower doesn't appreciate his workforce I don't think understands the situation. I'm not saying there's -- there's no people out there. And there's always exceptions to the rule. But in this world it is so different than 40 years ago. It is so different in terms of the needs and what we have, our relationships with our employers and their employees. I think we need to take a fresh look at this and make sure that when we talk about these issues we aren't tainted by past history.

CHAIRMAN GOULD: So could you tell us just a little bit more about these heat conferences that are held? How are they held and how are they conducted?

MR. BEDWELL: We do it in conjunction with

Cal/OSHA and, you know, the come out. We'll have presentations in both Spanish --

CHAIRMAN GOULD: Come out where? Where will they come out?

MR. BEDWELL: Well, this would be a hall. This is, for instance, a hall. This is the -- I may be wrong, it's the Portuguese Hall I think in Easton, a big, big hall. You can over 1,000 people. And I'm not saying that you're going to start out with 1,000 here on trying to educate about rights and the laws.

But the point is under the right circumstance you can do education that disseminates. Get the right people out there, understand what is being taught, and information will flow. It will flow.

CHAIRMAN GOULD: How are those -- well, do notices go to a number of farm workers about these -- about these meetings?

MR. BEDWELL: It will go through the employer network, the farm labor contractor network, and as well as Cal/OSHA itself advertising, certainly, to anyone who is in touch with that. I'm amazed to think that people -- and the comment was made that they didn't understand the worker committee, you know, situation. I would have to get a sense that's a very, very small amount out there.

I just think it would be extremely premature to

1 jump to access without exploring other effective means of 2 education. 3 BOARD MEMBER SHIROMA: One question. One follow-4 on question, Barry. 5 So you talked about -- someone said 15 to 30 6 minutes, it depends, on nonproductive time training for 7 workers. Now --8 UNIDENTIFIED MALE: No, I didn't say 9 nonproductive. 10 BOARD MEMBER SHIROMA: Okay. All right. 11 UNIDENTIFIED MALE: I said it's 15 to 30 minutes 12 mandated OSHA safety training. 13 BOARD MEMBER SHIROMA: Okay. Mandated --14 UNIDENTIFIED MALE: So it's mandated --15 BOARD MEMBER SHIROMA: Required by law? 16 UNIDENTIFIED MALE: So it's (inaudible) in the 17 sense that they are earning. 18 BOARD MEMBER SHIROMA: Thank you for that --19 UNIDENTIFIED MALE: (Inaudible.) 20 BOARD MEMBER SHIROMA: Thank you for that 21 clarification. I hope the court reporter caught that. 22 Yes. Yes, indeed. 23 So for supervisors, the supervisors who are out 24 in the field, is there a required training for them, 25 whether it's Cal/OSHA or --

1 MR. BEDWELL: Sure. 2 BOARD MEMBER SHIROMA: -- what have you? 3 MR. BEDWELL: Absolutely. If you'd like the 4 detail under the Heat Illness Prevention Regulations, and 5 particularly the update that we have just recently gone 6 through that set new trigger points for temperature and 7 shade up, the amount and so forth, the buddy system, what 8 happens above 95 degrees, I think if you looked at the 9 awareness level in 2005 on heat illness prevention and what 10 could be done and where we are today, I think it's light 11 years. I think it's absolutely light years. 12 So the question is, yeah, how do you -- how do 13 you understand where you are in terms of knowledge out 14 there about the act, number one? And then determine the 15 best means to make sure that you increase that knowledge. 16 BOARD MEMBER SHIROMA: Thank you. 17 MR. BEDWELL: Thank you. 18 MR. BLANCO: I actually have some questions --19 CHAIRMAN GOULD: Okay. All right. 20 MR. BLANCO: -- more questions for you in the 21 discussion of heat stress brought up. But first I want to 22 ask you another question about your membership. 23 Do -- are most of the -- your grower-members hire 24 their employees through a farm labor contract or direct 25 hire?

1 MR. BEDWELL: Well, that's -- again, it depends 2 upon the commodity and the area of the state. You'll see 3 various trends on that. I would -- I would say that on the 4 whole that a majority utilize farm labor contractors. 5 think particularly when you're talking about seasonal 6 picking, then multiple pickings at times, the use of farm 7 labor contractors is essential. And people, therefore, are 8 kept more steadily employed during these times of 9 fluctuations and variations and picking. But, yeah, 10 it's -- it's very much used. 11 MR. BLANCO: And in respect to heat stress, so 12 (inaudible) whether you know or not, or maybe you do know, 13 it's section 3395 of Title 8, is that the section that 14 deals with the preventive -- prevention --15 MR. BEDWELL: I would need to have the authority. 16 I'm really not good at memorizing these sections. 17 MR. BLANCO: I just wanted to see if you did know 18 so we're on the same page with that. 19 But as I understand it the -- the regulation 20 requires -- puts the responsibility on the employer to --21 to ensure that both supervisor and employees get training 22 on the -- on heat -- heat illness prevention. 23 MR. BEDWELL: Under heat illness prevention. 24 MR. BLANCO: Is that correct? 25 MR. BEDWELL: That's correct, yes.

MR. BLANCO: And -- and with respect to that kind of training, I guess (inaudible) that video that you had with you or --

MR. BEDWELL: Well, I think this is just one of the tools that is being used to make people aware, particular in the symptoms of heat illness.

MR. BLANCO: Do you know what other kind of training that the -- the Cal/OSHA is requiring for the Heat Illness Prevention Program?

MR. BEDWELL: Well, there -- there has to be a written program for heat illness prevention. And that is one of the things that obviously is checked when Cal/OSHA goes out. So everyone has to have a written program and evidence of educating their workers.

CHAIRMAN GOULD: What -- I guess what we are interested in, and maybe --

MR. BEDWELL: Yeah.

CHAIRMAN GOULD: -- maybe we should pursue this with others, as well, what is that evidence? What does that evidence consist of? What -- how do you show Cal/OSHA that you are communicating directly with employees about this?

MR. BEDWELL: I think there's documentation of these sessions and so forth that they have. And they'll -- they'll certainly go out and ask employees, as well, to

confirm, to say, you know, have you had the training?

CHAIRMAN GOULD: You say OSHA?

MR. BEDWELL: Cal/OSHA will, sir.

CHAIRMAN GOULD: How will they do that?

MR. BEDWELL: I think they -- they -- when they go out and they're conducting an inspection for the Heat Illness Prevention Regulations they'll -- they'll go out and talk to employees and bring it up, sure, as part of it. But understand, I don't want to say that we're comparing exactly apples and apples here. What I wanted to point out is the educational efforts under heat illness, and not necessarily the requirements.

I want to stress, the importance of education has to do with collaboration. I think the doctor mentioned that before. And it's important to understand and get all parties behind education. I think when you put in a controversial issue it's self-defeat.

CHAIRMAN GOULD: And just to -- and I'm not -- you were asked this in a different way. I don't want to hold you too long here but --

MR. BEDWELL: Well, no, it's fine. I know there are others who want to talk, too, so --

CHAIRMAN GOULD: I know. And you were asked about the idea of employers voluntarily agreeing, as Dr.

Mines indicated was the case with his work. And, I mean,

1 would -- would a program of access under which employers 2 voluntarily could agree to access be acceptable to you? 3 MR. BEDWELL: Well, I think there's a basic 4 difference between a survey where you're asking questions 5 and gathering information and an educational process where 6 you're trying communicate the extent of someone's rights. 7 CHAIRMAN GOULD: YES. MR. BEDWELL: I think the latter has all of the 8 9 potential for bias if you're not careful. The first is 10 probably more black and white, asking questions, getting 11 information. It's data. The second is much more 12 subjective in nature as you're trying to communicate. 13 that's why I think what we're looking for is evidence to 14 make sure that there is balance and reason and proper 15 communication. 16 Thanks very much. CHAIRMAN GOULD: 17 MR. BEDWELL: Thank you. 18 And --CHAIRMAN GOULD: Thanks. Thank you. 19 MS. SNELL: Our next witness is Maureen Keffer. 20 MS. KEFFER: Good afternoon. 21 MS. SNELL: Good afternoon, Ms. Keffer. 22 How are you employed? 23 MS. KEFFER: I'm the Director of the Indigenous 24 Program, formally called the Indigenous Farm Worker Program

and California Rural Legal Assistance.

25

1 MS. SNELL: And is true and correct copy of your 2 curriculum vitae -- does a clear and correct copy of your 3 curriculum vitae appear at Tab 6 of the Board's binder? 4 MS. KEFFER: it appears that it does, yes. 5 Did you coordinate a human rights MS. SNELL: 6 education program to benefit indigenous youth in Oaxaca, 7 Mexico in 2004 and 2005? 8 MS. KEFFER: I did. That's correct. 9 MS. SNELL: And did you become the director of 10 the CRLA Indigenous Program approximately two years ago? 11 MS. KEFFER: Yes, that's right. 12 MS. SNELL: And in between those two jobs did you 13 graduate from (inaudible)? 14 MS. KEFFER: I did, in 2011. 15 MS. SNELL: How long has CRLA had an Indigenous 16 Farm Worker Program? 17 MS. KEFFER: We have had an Indigenous Farm 18 Worker Program since about 1993, so the past 22 years or 19 SO. 20 MS. SNELL: Why did the program start? 21 MS. KEFFER: The program began, and I think Dr. 22 Mines alluded to this in his testimony, the program began 23 because CRLA has always employed community outreach workers 24 to do our workers' rights community outreach and education. 25 And the majority of those have historically been former

farm workers themselves, Spanish speakers who -- who conduct outreach to farm workers communities.

What we started finding in the late '80s and early '90s was that these outreach workers were encountering farm workers in the fields, not necessarily specific in the fields, but were encountering farm workers who didn't speak Spanish who they couldn't communicate effectively with. And at the same time there were some researchers who were beginning to uncover the fact that the -- the demographics of the farm worker population were changing in California. And so CRLA's executive director with some researchers to -- to conduct some initial investigation about this changing farm worker demographic and realized we needed to change our community outreach worker population to better meet the needs and to be better be able to communicate effectively with indigenous farm workers with this new population that we were seeing.

And so in 1993 we hired our first indigenous language-speaking community outreach workers. And that was the beginning of the Indigenous Farm Worker Program.

MS. SNELL: And what does your job as director of the indigenous programs entail?

MS. KEFFER: So I'm an attorney, and so I coordinate the -- the legal work of the program. And I also supervise a staff. We currently have four indigenous

community outreach workers working out of four different offices around the state. And so I supervise their outreach and education to the indigenous farm worker population. And I also co-counsel on farm worker rights' cases and representing indigenous community members and indigenous clients in conjunction with other attorneys at other CRLA offices.

MS. SNELL: Now, behind Tab 8 of the Board's binders there's a document, the Indigenous Program. Is that a description, an accurate description of your program?

MS. KEFFER: It is, yes. I believe that at the time it was written it indicated we had five indigenous community workers. But our staff has, unfortunately, had to be reduced to four.

MS. SNELL: Okay. And what languages does your four indigenous outreach workers speak?

MS. KEFFER: We have one Triqui speaker and three Mixteco speakers who speak different variants of Mixteco among them.

MS. SNELL: Have you encountered challenges in conducting outreach to the indigenous community?

MS. KEFFER: Yes. I personally have certainly encountered challenges because I am not indigenous, because I don't speak an indigenous language, and because even

though I'm fluent in Spanish, that still poses tremendous challenges just in terms of basic communication. Because as Dr. Mines mentioned, there are many, many indigenous farm workers who are not necessary fluent in Spanish or who are not fluent in Spanish at all. There's also the -- the problem of trust and being an outsider, being looked at as a foreigner and, you know, not having the same level of ingroup insider confidence and trust that -- that somebody from, you know, from a community, from a neighboring community might have. So -- so that certainly presents challenges.

There are logistical challenges, too, in connecting outreach to farm workers generally, and indigenous farm workers in particular, just in terms of the -- the really disbursed nature of -- of farm labor and farm worker housing. You know, CRLA over the years has invested tremendous amounts of money and resources, staff time, in trying to reach farm workers where they are and trying to find them and trying to set up community education and outreach meetings. And so -- so that certainly poses a challenge in terms of budget.

MS. SNELL: And is CRLA able to go to the job sites to -- to conduct outreach?

MS. KEFFER: No. We -- there -- there are no laws that treat us any differently than any other

individual who would probably be accused of trespass if they were going onto private farm property.

MS. SNELL: What methods have you found successful for outreach to indigenous farm workers?

MS. KEFFER: The -- the most effective outreach that I have observed in my time at CRLA has been in-person community meetings, generally workshops involving one or more CRLA community outreach workers, sometimes an attorney in addition to that. But always the community outreach worker is key because they are the -- the more direct link to the farm worker community.

With indigenous farm workers the -- the outreach and the education is always conducted in the indigenous language that people speak. So if we are doing a presentation for a group of Mixteco speakers, then one of our Mixteco-speaking community workers is the one who is conducting the presentation. It's generally an interactive discussion, practice-based kind of training. And we've been working for several years on developing a training methodology that is, you know, based on evidence and based on best practices in terms of adult learning and adult education. But that -- that almost always involves in-person workshops.

MS. SNELL: In your experience do most indigenous farm workers have access to a computer?

MS. KEFFER: My experience is that probably not. I can't say for sure because I haven't been in the houses of most indigenous farm workers. But I would say certainly that the ones that I have been in, I've never seen a computer. I think that there may be potential for access in public libraries and places like that. But I certainly never used a computer to communicate with any of my clients or with the indigenous farm worker population. It has not seemed to be an effective tool or an effective option for reaching indigenous farm workers.

MS. SNELL: What about smart phones, is that an effective tool for reaching farm workers that you experienced?

MS. KEFFER: Again, I haven't, no. I have not seen many indigenous farm workers with smart phones. Most do have cell phones but not smart phones.

MS. SNELL: Now how about reading ability of Spanish of English, what have you found in that part?

MS. KEFFER: Very, very few can read and write English. And only a small number are -- are what I would consider literate enough in Spanish to be able, for example, to understand a retainer agreement that we might have a client sign. So in the vast majority of cases where we're representing an indigenous language speaker we will have one of our indigenous language speaking community

workers or a telephone interpreter or an interpreter from the community do site translation of a document.

So that means actually taking the written document in Spanish and orally converting it into the indigenous language so that even though there may be some level of comprehension of the written Spanish and the -- the written document may help with ultimate comprehension, the -- the support of having the oral language interpretation into Mixteco or Triqui is what actually enables us to have the confidence that they're understanding the -- the message we're communicating.

MS. SNELL: Now, you mentioned that some or many -- perhaps many indigenous speak some Spanish. How did you decide the level of efficiency in speaking Spanish among the indigenous farm workers you worked with?

MS. KEFFER: Well, as I said, it does vary and there's a range. But there's an academic who -- who I respect very much, Dr. Gaspar Rivera Salgado from UCLA. And he often uses the term "market-level Spanish." And I think many other academics use that term, as well, in referring to the level of Spanish spoken by many indigenous language speakers.

So it's often the case that in these rural villages, indigenous villages, you'll have different variants of Mixteco or Triqui or other indigenous languages

that are spoken. And perhaps a Mixteco village borders on a Triqui village. And the reason that most people would be speaking Spanish is when they're going to the market and they're having interactions with people who are speakers primarily of another indigenous language and so their common language is Spanish, but it's at a level to conduct basic transactions in the market. It's not a level for understanding things and expressing things like what are your rights or more complicated ideas.

MS. SNELL: In your work can you rely on communication by the U.S. Mail?

MS. KEFFER: We try, but we can't rely on it exclusively. We struggle mightily to maintain contact with many of our clients via the mail. Even though we have a clause in our retainer agreement that says you must keep us updated on your mailing address, you know, we -- we struggle with returned mail more often than I -- than I would like to say. Our clients are very often changing addresses or don't have a reliable mailing address. And so we often find ourselves going to knock on the door of their house or call their friend or call their neighbor to try to track them down.

MS. SNELL: What about radio, can you rely on radio to do your outreach work?

MS. KEFFER: We certainly use it as a tool, but I

would not say that we can rely on it exclusively. We -- we definitely have worked in the past and continue to work with Spanish-language radio outlets and with indigenous-language radio outlets. There are no currently large-scale indigenous language radio outlets, but some like Radio de Lingua has a program once a week that's in Mixteco, sort of like the -- the farm worker who -- who spoke earlier, the way that Spanish-language radio was, you know, 20 or 30 or 40 years ago, you know, an hour a week, that's how Mixteco-language radio is now or Triqui-language radio.

So -- so access is pretty limited in terms of the amount of air time that's just available to indigenous language speakers and indigenous language listeners, radio listeners. We do find it to be a good thing to augment our in-person trainings, but we certainly can't rely on it.

MS. SNELL: And what about videos, is that something that you rely on?

MS. KEFFER: We have never relied on videos. We are working to develop videos. But the -- they are very much part of a plan, a larger training curriculum.

Certainly just -- and we have many copies of these Cal/OSHA

DVDs. There are some that have been put out by DPR and other, you know, pesticide education videos that have been translated into indigenous languages, and these are wonderful resources. But short of having a copy to

distribute to every indigenous-language speaker that we encounter and knowing that they have access to a DVD player, it doesn't end up being that effective without having the additional component of an in-person training where our staff can present the video and then field questions afterwards, etcetera.

There's also the issue of -- of language variation. And so we find that, you know, if -- if this heat stress video is in six different languages you could have six different versions just of Mixteco and -- and maybe not cover them all. So -- so the cost can be prohibitive to -- to rely solely on a technological solution.

MS. SNELL: Are you familiar with the Agricultural Labor Relations Act?

MS. KEFFER: Yes, I am.

MS. SNELL: Does CRLA educate workers about their rights under the ARLA?

MS. KEFFER: We do so in a very peripheral way.

CRLA has a set of priorities for our advocacy and for our workers rights' education. And the ALRA is not necessarily one of those priorities. It comes up a lot in the context of talking about other rights that workers have.

So, for example, very often when a community outreach worker is doing a training around workplace

violence, or around sexual harassment or discrimination, or workplace health and safety, you know, the -- the recommendation might be made or the information might be shared with the worker that you will be much more protected under not just anti-discrimination law, but under the ALRA if instead of complaining just on your own you complain as part of a group or on behalf of a group. You bring other people to the foreman to speak together about the problems that you're observing in the workplace.

So it certainly comes into play at times in our outreach, but it's not one of the main focuses of our outreach.

MS. SNELL: Are there legal restrictions on what CRLA can do with respect to educating that comes to (inaudible)?

MS. KEFFER: We do receive a large portion of our funding from the Federal Legal Services Corporation. And that comes with a set of regulations and restrictions around the kind of advocacy we can engage in and the kind of education of workers we can engage in. There are no restrictions specifically on the content of our worker education regarding the right to form a union, or the right to -- to collective bargain, or the right to engage in concerted activity.

But in terms of priorities, we have chosen not to

allocate our resources towards those, in part because some of the other restrictions that we have to abide by involve restrictions against organizing, restrictions against engaging in any kind of labor or related activities very specifically. And we would rather not tow that line as an advocacy organization and get ourselves in hot water with the regulators.

MS. SNELL: Have you filed or advised any worker to file a charge with the ALRB?

MS. KEFFER: I have never filed a charge with the ALRB, but I have had clients or applications for CRLA services in the past who I have referred to the ALRB to file charges.

MS. SNELL: And do you know what has become of those charges?

MS. KEFFER: I don't, no.

MS. SNELL: In your experience are indigenous farm workers afraid of the government or reluctant to -- to contact the government?

MS. KEFFER: Yes. CRLA is not a government agency. However, we are often confused with a government agency when -- when doing community outreach or when working with individual clients. And so we often suffer from the mistrust or the misperception, the mistrust that comes from that misperception, I should say.

My experience generally with indigenous farm workers and working with indigenous communities in Mexico is that historically indigenous communities have been exploited by government, both in Mexico and in the United States.

As Dr. Mines mentioned, there has been a lot of dishonesty. There's been a lot of negative outcomes that have resulted from indigenous communities and indigenous peoples' interactions with their governments in Mexico and, you know, with authorities and government agencies here in the United States. Just from the basic of, well, I don't understand the language that you're speaking and you don't understand the language that I'm speaking, so why is there going to be a real baseline level of trust, all the way up to, you know, witnessing abuses and real exploitation by government agencies.

So that's definitely contributed to a lot of caution on the part of indigenous community members that I've been in contact with, you know, proceeding very slowly and very cautiously, and with a pretty high degree of mistrust when it comes to interacting with anybody who is even perceived as being a government agency or official.

MS. SNELL: We were talking about some of the restrictions that you faced as a result of your planning situation. Are there restrictions with regard to

representing undocumented people?

MS. KEFFER: Yes, there are. We are only permitted to represent people with certain categories of legal status. So we -- we can represent U.S. Citizens. We can represent LPRs, Lawful Permanent Residents. And we can also represent certain individuals who are eligible for certain kinds of visa status like, UT, Wawanesa. And that does not prevent us, however, from providing broad legal community outreach and education regardless of their status. We can also provide referrals to other agencies. So it's not that someone who is undocumented is not allowed to walk through our office doors.

MS. SNELL: Do you believe there is a need for farm worker education regarding rights protected by the ALRA?

MS. KEFFER: I do, absolutely.

MS. SNELL: Why?

MS. KEFFER: I believe that there is a need for more farm worker education about their rights, period, under any law. I believe that there are far more farm workers with far less knowledge of their rights than ten CRLAs could ever cover the need for.

I also believe, just from countless encounters with clients and community members, and certainly supervising folks like our indigenous community worker

staff, that time and again people come into our office with legal issues that they have no even identified as legal issues, that, you know, they will be describing one problem that they've suffered in the workplace, and in the course of interviewing them about that problem three or four additional related or unrelated legal violations will come up. And often times those violations may have to do with rights protected under the ALRA. And that's why often times I have referred clients to the -- the ALRB because, you know, therein lies the expertise in those kinds of issues and the -- and the possibility for enforcing those rights.

So I absolutely think that there is a need for more worker education.

MS. SNELL: Now, in addition to your -- well, as part of your work with the Indigenous Program, did you testify in 2012 before the Judicial Council of California's Joint Working Group for California's Language Access Plan regarding the language needs of California's indigenous farm workers population?

MS. KEFFER: I did. It's a mouthful of a Joint Working Group, but I did, yes.

MS. SNELL: And was the Chief Justice of California (inaudible)?

MS. KEFFER: She -- yes, she was. It's actually

no longer operating. It's successor is now, I believe, the Implementation Task Force for California's Language Access Plan.

MS. SNELL: All right. And behind Tab 7 of the Board's binders do we have a copy of the testimony you offered to that (inaudible)?

MS. KEFFER: Yes. It's there, and also available on the Judicial Council website.

MS. SNELL: What were your recommendations for (inaudible) Language Access Plan?

MS. KEFFER: So my first recommendation was that the Judicial Council and that individual courts should look at data beyond the U.S. Census in determining language needs of the populations in their service area.

One thing that didn't really come up in -- in Dr. Mines' discussion, rather thorough discussion of farm worker demographics in California and nationwide is the fact that there has to be this other independent source of data and information that is NAWS and that are these other independent surveys and studies that he's conducted over the years because the census which is supposed to provide us with this data is just inadequate in that sense. It's inadequate at capturing information about farm workers because they are such a unique and transitory population that's really hard to reach. And it's especially

inadequate when it comes to capturing information about indigenous farm workers who are the most -- the most sort of vulnerable and marginalized and transitory of the farm worker population.

In addition, the census is not very good at capturing smaller language groups. So the census doesn't provide data on individual indigenous languages. The way that indigenous languages of Mexico are captured in U.S. -- U.S. Census and American Community Survey data is in these really large language families, which are basically the equivalent of like all Indo-European languages being under one umbrella. So Mixteco and Triqui and Nawa and all of these languages which are completely unrelated are lumped together, so you get no real data about numbers of actual language speakers.

So that was the first recommendation, to look at sources like the Indigenous Farm Workers Study, like NAWS, like other sources of data from community organizations to figure out what the language needs of the population are.

The second was to provide training to court staff and to judges on cultural sensitivity, on understanding the cultural backgrounds and the socioeconomic backgrounds of farm workers and of indigenous language speakers. And also training on how to identify when someone is an indigenous-language speaker and what they language they speak, how to

identify the right interpreter. And then finally, to provide more resources for recruitment and training of indigenous-language interpreters for the courts.

MS. SNELL: The Agricultural Labor Relations
Board is considering adopting a regulation that would allow
ALRB staff access to job sites to educate farm workers
about their rights under the ALRA. Do you think this
would -- do you support such a regulation?

MS. KEFFER: I do support such a regulation, in particular if it comes in conjunction with efforts on behalf of the ALRB to employee additional indigenous language speakers to conduct this in-person outreach, to work with interpreters when actual ALRB bilingual or trilingual staff are not available. Because I think that the effectiveness of in-person work site worker education is only going to be ensured if the people who are receiving the information speak and understand the same language as the people who are giving the information.

MS. SNELL: Thank you.

I don't have any further questions (inaudible).

CHAIRMAN GOULD: Member Shiroma?

BOARD MEMBER SHIROMA: Sure. Thank you.

Thank you very -- that was very insightful.

24 Thank you.

Just a question about when farm workers are in

this country for a period of time you have multigenerational families. And are some of the children who
are elementary school, high school, so forth, an integral
part of the communication scheme in terms of helping
parents understand the --

MS. KEFFER: They are.

BOARD MEMBER SHIROMA: -- complexities of living here in California?

MS. KEFFER: Yes, children can become an integral part of the communication scheme, which is really problematic. Because relying on children as interpreters and cultural brokers, you know, while often it's the only solution available it's not necessarily an effective solution. You know, think about the kid who interprets for her parents at her own parent-teacher conference, you know? And think about kids trying to convey really complicated or sophisticated information, or even not necessarily complicated or sophisticated but just information about things that they're not familiar with like workplace policies and procedures and practices and things like that.

So it's -- it's problematic that they play such a critical role. And it's also very often against the law because many of these institutions and agencies, like the courts and schools and doctors' offices and hospitals and legal service providers like us, if they're receiving

government funding they need to be providing language services. They need to be providing access in the language of -- of the people that they're serving.

 $\label{eq:board_board} \mbox{BOARD MEMBER SHIROMA:} \mbox{ I definitely hear you on } \\ \mbox{that.} \mbox{ Thank you.}$ 

BOARD MEMBER RIVERA-HERNANDEZ: Thank you so much for being here. Do you also work with non-indigenous farm workers?

MS. KEFFER: Yes. The vast majority of my clients are indigenous farm workers. But I have worked at CRLA in other capacities in the past, and some of my clients now are not indigenous.

BOARD MEMBER RIVERA-HERNANDEZ: I was wondering in regards to the questions about the technology, computers and smart phones. Is there a vast difference there or is it about the same? I know I'm asking you to be very general.

MS. KEFFER: Yeah. That's -- that's hard to say. I think if there is a group of farm workers who is more likely to have smart phones, it's certainly going to be a non-indigenous group of farm workers. But I would have a really hard time generalizing and saying that by and large non-indigenous farm workers do have access, whereas indigenous don't. I don't feel comfortable making -- making a judgment there.

BOARD MEMBER RIVERA-HERNANDEZ: And are there any other comments that you'd like to make in regards to the indigenous community or the proposed regulation that you haven't already provided?

MS. KEFFER: I don't think so. I appreciate the opportunity to talk with you, and I think the questions were thorough.

BOARD MEMBER RIVERA-HERNANDEZ: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN GOULD: I don't have any questions.

Thank you very much for you testimony and your time. Mr.

Blanco does, though, I think.

MR. BLANCO: I'm assuming that if indigenous farm workers had social media access, computers, smart phones, and for texting, that you would use those methods to connect with them?

MS. KEFFER: Yes. And the interesting thing is that the way that we are beginning to use computers and social media and smart phone and these kind of things is with non-farm worker indigenous youth, so basically children of indigenous farm workers who are trying to engage with around other issues, education rights, things like that.

We have seen social media be effective. We have a community outreach worker here in Fresno who is organizing an Indigenous Youth Conference and uses Facebook

and uses, you know, crowd-funding sites to raise money for that and to reach out to other indigenous youth. But we have not seen that among their parents' generation and don't think it would be effective in reaching their parents' generation.

MR. BLANCO: And what's -- has CRLA done any studies or do you have any information about -- regarding the average income of indigenous farm workers?

MS. KEFFER: I actually think that some of that information, particularly as compared to the income of non-indigenous or Mestiso farm workers, is available in -- in Dr. Mines' Indigenous Farm Workers Study. I don't know it off the top of my head, but I do know that there is a tremendous disparity in income, and also income mobility.

One of the really notable things in that study showed that the income of indigenous farm workers increases over time at a rate far, far lower, far, far slower than their non-indigenous counterparts. So basically their -- their working conditions and their income and their lives improve a lot less than your average farm worker the longer they're here in the United States.

MR. BLANCO: What -- what about -- why I was asking about income here, I have a smart phone and that smart phone costs a lot of money. And with that access plan I have to have -- in order to use that smart phone

with respect to data, YouTube, whatever, that also costs a lot of money.

MS. KEFFER: Yes.

MR. BLANCO: And I'm wondering if that is within the wherewithal of indigenous farm workers or native farm workers, as a matter of fact, to be able to afford that type of phone and plan?

MS. KEFFER: I would suspect that a very important reason why those of us who work with indigenous farm workers and farm workers in general don't tend to see many farm workers with smart phones is -- is the cost. I think it's absolutely out of reach for many, many farm workers.

MR. BLANCO: And just a concept of the fear of government, do you have any suggestions for us as to how to get around that? I know you've mentioned having folks who were speaking the same language to be able to communicate that; correct? Do you have any other ideas to how we —how we deal with that?

MS. KEFFER: Well, I think the suggestion of using networks is an interesting one. I think that, you know, understanding in a particular crop or in a particular area, not only that these farm workers speak Mixteco, but that this group of farm workers who works in strawberries in Santa Maria, there's a huge number of them who are from

San Juan Mixotec (phonetic). So we're not just going to find someone who speaks Mixteco from that region, but maybe even from that town or a neighboring town who is connected to their social and community networks in some way.

The same thing, you know, in Greenfield the -the workers in the peas in Greenfield are largely Triqui
speakers. And so you want to make sure you're having -you have somebody who is from similar networks. And I
think making those kind of intelligent decisions about who
you are using to conduct outreach and to make the
connections can be really helpful.

MR. BLANCO: And finally, so you mentioned that in talking to the workers about the problems that they may have that they've come to you about, about them complaining as a group, which under our act is called protected concerted activity. And you would think that most workers don't understand that concept? I mean, that's not something that automatically suggests to them that if they do so they receive protection?

MS. KEFFER: Yeah. That -- that is not something that I find is intuitively understood by the farm workers that I have come into contact with, the people who I interview because of problems in the workplace, or the people who I have worked with in just conducting general community education and outreach. There isn't a presumed

understanding that you're more protected if you complain in a group.

CHAIRMAN GOULD: What the significance of being protected is?

MS. KEFFER: No. I mean, retaliation is a really interesting concept that we have to unpack for workers a lot.

CHAIRMAN GOULD: All workers.

MS. KEFFER: Yeah. Absolutely. So with the -the farm workers community, whether it's indigenous or nonindigenous, when we are doing a presentation or a worker
outreach session about discrimination of heat stress or
workplace health and safety, an important component is
always explaining, you know, when you exercise your rights
you are protected from employer retaliation. You know, the
law says that your employer can not take adverse actions
against you if you have spoken out about a danger in the
workplace, etcetera.

But that concept of retaliation is one that has to be explained in some detail, in my experience. It's not something that's automatically, you know, understood that, well, they're not allowed to discriminate against me. But if I complain about discrimination I didn't know that that, you know, taking actions against me would be illegal.

And so I think that maps really well onto what

the protections of the ALRA are and the fact that workers don't intuitively understand that if they complain in a group they are protected against retaliation for that kind of complaint, etcetera.

CHAIRMAN GOULD: Finally, I note that you studies at Stanford Law School during the years that I've taught there. But I think until today we have not met.

MS. KEFFER: We have not had the pleasure until today.

CHAIRMAN GOULD: I bet you if I had met Ms. Garza I'd remember you. Thank you very much for your -- for your testimony.

MS. KEFFER: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN GOULD: It was a pleasure to meet you.

MS. SNELL: Thank you very much.

We have one more witness scheduled for this session. I know we're -- we've gone a little longer. Shall we go ahead and --

19 CHAIRMAN GOULD: Yes. Yes.

MS. SNELL: Okay. So the next witness I'd like to call is Fausto Santos.

And while Mr. Santos is coming forward, I just wanted to draw the Board's attention to materials from an expert witness who is unavailable to be here. His curriculum -- this is Dr. Seth Holmes. He's a Ph.D. and an

M.D. His CV appears behind Tab 4. And a statement that he's written pertaining to the issues we're addressing here today is behind Tab 5.

I spoke with Dr. Holmes and thought that he had a lot to offer. And then he went off to Berlin for a year to work on his thesis or his -- his next article. And he is now in the outback of Spain. But if the Board would like to hear from him by Skype, that might be possible at a future hearing.

CHAIRMAN GOULD: Thank you.

MS. SNELL: Good afternoon, Mr. Santos.

MR. SANTOS: Good afternoon, and thank you for h having me hear. (Speaking Mixteco.)

MS. SNELL: Mr. Santos, I understand that English is not your first language. Are you comfortable testifying today in English?

MR. SANTOS: Yes.

MS. SNELL: Okay. Thank you. Where are you

19 from?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

20

21

MR. SANTOS: I am from San Juan Mixotec from the state of Oaxaca in Mexico.

22 MS. SNELL: And what languages do you speak?

23 MR. SANTOS: I speak Mixteco Acto (phonetic),

24 Mixteco Baco (phonetic), Spanish. And now I practicing my

25 English.

	93
1	MS. SNELL: And doing very well.
2	MR. SANTOS: Thank you.
3	MS. SNELL: Are you currently employed?
4	MR. SANTOS: Yes.
5	MS. SNELL: Where do you work?
6	MR. SANTOS: I'm working with California Rural
7	Legal Assistance with the Indigenous Program.
8	MS. SNELL: Are you a community outreach worker?
9	MR. SANTOS: Yes.
10	MS. SNELL: And do you conduct community outreach
11	to the Mixteco community?
12	MR. SANTOS: Yes, that is my primary job since I
13	started working with CRLA in 1999.
14	MS. SNELL: Okay. Okay. Good. And at one time
15	were you a farm worker?
16	MR. SANTOS: Well, since I was a child. I
17	started working in the field when I was 13 years old, and I
18	continued working until I was hired by the CRLA.
19	MS. SNELL: And have you continued with your
20	education through your adult life?
21	MR. SANTOS: Yes. I started going to school when
22	I started working with CRLA when I was 38 years old.
23	MS. SNELL: What is the highest level you have
24	completed at this time?
25	MR. SANTOS: I finished college with an bachelors

(inaudible) art in Bakersfield College.

MS. SNELL: And what -- how old were you when you first came to the U.S.?

MR. SANTOS: I was 18 years old.

MS. SNELL: Okay. Now, can you describe what you do as an outreach worker?

MR. SANTOS: What I do with CRLA is conducting training for the indigenous workers. I go to the places where they are living and then I talk to the leader of that community or I talk to the person in charge over there and telling them about the services that we provide at CRLA, what services we have, what problems we have. Then ask them if they would like to hear us talking about those programs. And eventually if that person says that's fine, and then we go to provide training to -- to them.

MS. SNELL: Okay. And have you provided training to them on a number of different topics?

MR. SANTOS: Yes. Usually we talk about Labor Law, pesticides, access language, education, housing. It depends what people wants to hear, what is most important to them at that time.

MS. SNELL: You mentioned Labor Law. What type of training do you provide in that regard?

MR. SANTOS: About wages primarily, about minimum wage, their work time, overtime, paystubs, and heat stress,

1 everything about that related to the Labor Law. 2 Do you talk about the right to engage MS. SNELL: 3 in collective bargaining? MR. SANTOS: Yes, we do that. We tell them that 4 5 they have the right to organize and have a union or go to 6 talk to the employer by group. We usually do that. 7 MS. SNELL: Okay. And do you talk to them about 8 their rights under the Agricultural Labor Relations Act? 9 MR. SANTOS: To be honest, I didn't know much 10 about ALRB. So I usually do not mention that to them. 11 What are the primary farm crops your MS. SNELL: 12 clients work for? 13 They're working -- in the area where MR. SANTOS: 14 I live in Bakersfield they work in the grapes primarily. 15 Then after the grapes they go to harvest oranges, 16 nectarines, lemons, vegetables. 17 MS. SNELL: Do you work in the Bakersfield area? 18 MR. SANTOS: Yes, I do. 19 MS. SNELL: What approaches do you use to conduct 20 outreach? 21 MR. SANTOS: Well, I go to talk to the person or 22 to the leader of that community about the services that we 23 provide and how important these issues -- these issues are

meant to be for them, how this is going to benefit them if

they know the law, if they know what's going on. And if

24

25

the person sees or realize that it is important to them, then they allow access to go and give the training.

MS. SNELL: Over the past ten years how many indigenous farm workers have you had contact with, would you estimate?

MR. SANTOS: I don't know. I'm not sure. But (inaudible).

MS. SNELL: And I forgot to mention this, but did you participate in the Indigenous Farm Workers Study that Dr. Mines mentioned earlier?

MR. SANTOS: Yes. I was one of the indigenous persons who traveled with him to Mexico. And I was the main person who was with him and introduced him to the (inaudible) or to the (inaudible) community. And what I did was talk to the leaders about the survey and how important it's going to be for them and for (inaudible) the United States. And after I convince them about (inaudible) they allowed us to go and talk to the people in the community. And sometimes they are the one who carry the microphone to the people that — to the community to come to the city hall and hear Rick Mines about what he's going to do. And that was very easy for us and for him because eventually when we convinced the — the leader, he himself told the people to come for a meeting.

MS. SNELL: Okay. And is this what you did in

97 1 Mexico? 2 MR. SANTOS: Yes. And here, as well. 3 MS. SNELL: Okay. And when you introduced people 4 for the study here, what geographic area were you working? 5 MR. SANTOS: I was working in the Taft area and 6 south of Lamont. 7 MS. SNELL: How long did the interviews you did 8 for the Indigenous Farm Workers Study take? 9 MR. SANTOS: By hours or by the days? You mean 10 by the hours or by days? 11 MS. SNELL: Yeah. 12 MR. SANTOS: That depends. Some -- some 13 people -- some person needs more time than others. Sometimes it takes 15 minutes, 30 minutes, 45 minutes. 14 15 That depends because sometimes they want to hear about what 16 happened in Mexico, who we met in Mexico, who are the 17 families. Sometimes they want to see pictures. So that 18 depends with each person. 19 MS. SNELL: Okay. Now during the survey did you 20 ask such questions that were provided to you by Dr. Mines? 21 MR. SANTOS: Yes. Dr. Mines gave me a list of 22 questions to ask them. And then I were marking, you know, 23 each questions, yes or no.

sometimes approach people at the job sites in order to do

(Inaudible.) Now did you

Okay.

MS. SNELL:

24

25

these interviews?

MR. SANTOS: No, I don't. The only times that I go inside the field and talk to the employers is when I see the -- something wrong, if they don't have a shade, if they don't have water or a toilet or something is wrong, then I go to talk to the employer directly, but not to the workers.

MS. SNELL: Why?

MR. SANTOS: Because when I was working in the field when I was a child, usually if we talked to the foreman and workers the employer usually ask us what they ask you, what did you say? And sometimes we had to lie to them that it was like nothing to care about. Because if we say the truth about the work condition, about the shade or the water, usually the employers take a retaliation against us or they put us on the black list they call, they put our names on the list. And little by little they laid us off or they talk to the employers to not let us to work because we are -- we are very politic, that is how they call the workers when they talk about themselves, that this person is very politic and you shouldn't allow him to work with you because you're going to get in trouble.

MS. SNELL: With regard to the outreach work that you do, do you think you could do effective outreach work by using the U.S. Mail?

1 MR. SANTOS: I don't think so because farm 2 workers are usually, I believe, from one place or another 3 place. And they usually use say friends, (inaudible) or 4 the compadres. And when they (inaudible) go back and ask 5 for that. 6 MS. SNELL: And in your experience, how many of 7 the clients that you've dealt with have access to a 8 computer? 9 MR. SANTOS: Not one of them. 10 MS. SNELL: Not one of them? 11 MR. SANTOS: Not one of them. Because, first of 12 all, they speak Mixteco or other indigenous language and 13 they don't know how to use the computer. And as so usually 14 they have very low education. They don't know how to read 15 in Spanish or English and they are very afraid to use the 16 computers. 17 MS. SNELL: What about the radio, do you think 18 you could do your job effectively by doing radio 19 broadcasts? 20 MR. SANTOS: Well, I think that we can work with 21 the radio if they provide us time where we can give 22 information in the Mixteco language or in another language.

California Reporting, LLC (415) 457-4417

But if they don't allow us, that's going to be very

MS. SNELL: And how -- what is your

23

24

25

difficult.

1 understanding, do most indigenous people listen to the 2 radio -- radio programs? 3 MR. SANTOS: Yes. For example, Radio de Lingua 4 on Sundays, they give us four hours. And that's -- that's 5 four hours many, many people, probably about 1,000 of them 6 listen to Radio de Lingua because that's the only time that 7 people can feel free to speak in their own language and to 8 hear their traditional music and get information and 9 everything. 10 Do you feel it's important to MS. SNELL: 11 compliment the radio broadcast with your person -- persons 12 outreach? 13 MR. SANTOS: Yes. 14 MS. SNELL: Why is that? 15 MR. SANTOS: Because of the language. If the 16 people feel comfortable when somebody's talking their 17 language, they are going to listen to them more. 18 MS. SNELL: And when you're talking about legal 19 rights is it important for people to be able to ask you 20 questions? 21 MR. SANTOS: Yes. 22 MS. SNELL: In the course of your work have you 23 observed union activity? 24 MR. SANTOS: No. 25 MS. SNELL: Have you observed any organizing of

any --

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. SANTOS: No.

MS. SNELL: Based -- well, strike that.

Now, you've heard today that the Agricultural Labor Relations Board is considering adopting a regulation that would allow ALRB staff access to work sites to educate farm workers about their rights under the ALRA. Would you support such a regulation?

MR. SANTOS: Of course, because if some workers from the Board goes to that workplace and provide training and tell their workers about their right, the workers are going to feel important. They are going to feel that they have the same right as people who speak Spanish. what happens in the workplace in the field is that all the information that goes to them is in Spanish or English. And the people who does not speak Spanish or English and they speak only Mixteco or their indigenous language, they feel alone, they feel that they are aside from the others because they're not understanding what's going on. are not understanding, also, what information is given to them in general. Probably they're thinking that the information is only for people who understand Spanish or English.

But if someone goes and talks to them in general and give them information in their own language, they're

going to feel part of the group and they're going to feel that finally the government are protecting them. I don't have any further questions. MS. SNELL: Do you have any questions up

here?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

BOARD MEMBER SHIROMA: Well, let's see. I want to say thank you, Mr. Santos. Thank you very much for your work and your insights and the efforts that you make on behalf of the indigenous community.

MR. SANTOS: You're welcome.

CHAIRMAN GOULD:

BOARD MEMBER SHIROMA: Thank you. I just wanted to share that in my own family my stepson's grandfather came from Mexico. He was a full-blooded indigenous Indian, in his case, the story goes Ayaki (phonetic). And he was a farm worker. And so my stepson's family did the migratory trail of farm workers from Texas to California. And it's a very proud -- a very proud heritage, so I do thank you.

> MR. SANTOS: Thank you.

BOARD MEMBER RIVERA-HERNANDEZ: No. Just thank you for your testimony.

MR. BLANCO: I do have a couple of questions. With respect to farm labor contractors, are there any who are Mixteco?

MR. SANTOS: Yes. There are some farm labor contractors that are Mixteco. But they said they do not

1 provide information in the Mixteco language because the 2 supervisors, the foremen, they are Spanish speakers, so 3 they don't know Mixteco. 4 MR. BLANCO: That's it. 5 CHAIRMAN GOULD: Okay. Thank you very much, sir. 6 We appreciate it. 7 And we're going to now take a break until -- we 8 have -- we have said 4:30, but I think that given the fact 9 that we're running a little bit behind we'll reconvene at 10 4:45. Thank you. 11 (Off the record at 3:26 p.m.) 12 (On the record at 4:52 p.m.) 13 CHAIRMAN GOULD: Let's reconvene. If we can 14 quiet down, I'm told that a problem earlier on is that not 15 all the interpreters could hear us as clearly as they 16 wanted to or should be. So, we're going to try to speak 17 more slowly, and carefully and loudly. 18 The first witness we're going to turn to, on our 19 list, is Harold McClarty of HMC Farms. 20 Thank you very much, Mr. McClarty, for taking 21 your valuable time to come here this morning. 22 MR. MC CLARTY: Thank you. 23 CHAIRMAN GOULD: And you may say anything on the 24 concept of worker education and access that you would like

to say. I know that you were --

25

MR. MC CLARTY: I --

CHAIRMAN GOULD: I know you very well, so I know you are not a shrinking violet.

MR. MC CLARTY: No, I'm not a shrinking violet.

Just a little bit of background. I'm a farmer in Fresno
and Tulare Counties, and I farm stone fruit and grapes. We
have a lot of workers.

You know, I sat through some of the early morning session or the early afternoon session, and all I have to say was, you know, we -- we would not be successful in our operations without the workers. They are as valuable to us as anything we do. And I have to say that mistreatment or anything like that is just beyond our comprehension. We do whatever we can to ensure that we have a good workforce because we're a labor-intensive company. You know, the stone fruit is picked five or six times and it just takes a lot of work.

A couple of the things that I would -- just my observations, we do a lot of training. You know, we tell them of safety, about whether it be the shade, and all of those kinds of things. And I think, you know, at that point in time let's educate everybody as to all of their rights.

I mean, let's make sure it's done. I mean, at that point in time we post everything, we do everything.

There's an option to doing it at that point in time, at least that's what I'm looking at from my observation and my operations.

And I only speak for my operation because I can't speak for anybody else. But we believe, without question, that education of the worker and making sure that they know their rights, and making sure that their grievances are heard.

First, before they go to you guys, we'd like to take care of any problems we might have. And so, you know, we know that there is -- you can't have success with an unhappy workforce. I don't know what more to say than that. I just kind of apologize for not having anything prepared or anything. But if there's any questions about our operation, please ask.

CHAIRMAN GOULD: Well, I guess on thing, and my colleagues may have some questions as well, one thing that occurs to me is what your view of -- you have considerable experience. You are a very successful man. You're a very practical man. And you have -- I wonder what your view is of the ideas that have been discussed here this morning.

Now, what about the idea of worker education via the ALRB, or some other entity? What about the idea of access to company property to express that point of view? Whether that information -- what about the idea of, for

instance, we were talking this morning about videos, and what about making those part of a training program? What about the --

MR. MC CLARTY: Yeah, those --

CHAIRMAN GOULD: What about the above or some of the above?

MR. MC CLARTY: Not all of the --

CHAIRMAN GOULD: Or other ideas you might have.

MR. MC CLARTY: I think a video that explains it, you know, visually, to some extent. We don't -- Spanish is definitely the predominant language and all of our people speak Spanish. And, you know, we communicate in Spanish.

Interestingly, like my son-in-law, you know, when he was learning Spanish it was, okay, you speak to me in English, I speak to you in Spanish, and we'll both -- we'll both become better educated.

And that's -- the only reason I bring it up is it's kind of the -- it's kind of the relationship we try to have with workers.

The problem with the ALRB, and I don't mean to say this in any way disrespectful or whatever, we need to get past the bad blood. I mean, perceived or not, there's — and not necessarily with the Board, but with what has happened in the past with some of the people that I deal with, and I live with. It's just it has been perceived, or

reality, or whatever it is. Reality becomes -- perception becomes reality after a while.

But back to the question of education, yes, anything that we can do to educate the workers. They need to know their rights.

I think that -- I think Carmen said it. You know, 25, 35, or 40 years ago, I mean there was a -- there was a big disparity between education, and rights, and everything else.

And education today, it's you can -- when you go out in the field, you know that people, a great majority of the people know their rights. I think they absolutely need to have a vehicle by which they understand that they have their -- they have rights, you know, regardless of whether they're here legally or not. I mean, they have rights and they cannot be mistreated and that's important.

If there's a way that we can incorporate that message, can I say neutrally, if I'm being taken the correct way, I think it's one of -- I don't know of anybody that doesn't want to educate their workers as to their rights. I mean, you just can't do it. I mean, you don't want to do it. Does that make sense?

CHAIRMAN GOULD: Yeah, I think Mr. Barsamian, you know, at our August 3 meeting, and he'll be speaking here shortly, said that, you know, it dependent very much on who

was doing the work for the ALRB.

Not speaking of getting past the past, that we not mix this up with prosecutorial investigations and the like, that we not mix this up with, you know, legal problems that may be coming before the Board, but that we have a worker education group that is separate and apart from, you know, the investigations and the controversies that have existed in the past. He can — he can speak to this when he speaks.

But this is the gist of some of the things that I took from his remarks on August 3. And I wondered what you thought about the --

MR. MC CLARTY: You can come on my ranch any time you want, okay. I have found you to be the most fair person I have ever been around. And I say that with sincerity, I really do.

And what you're trying to do, and the Board I hope is following suit, is to -- the workers are what we're all about, okay. I would like to see both fringes go away because they've got -- there's an economic incentive on both ends. Let's focus on the workers. And whatever's best for the workers, okay, I give up on there, okay.

Does that make sense? I mean, this fighting that we have got going on between one end and the other end is not -- I don't think it's healthy for the worker, either.

1 That's just me. I'm not going to step on myself, either. 2 CHAIRMAN GOULD: No, you make a lot of sense to 3 me. 4 Do you have any questions? 5 BOARD MEMBER SHIROMA: Just thank you. 6 you, Harold, for coming this evening. 7 BOARD MEMBER RIVERA-HERNANDEZ: Thank you for 8 I want to know who currently does the training coming. 9 that you're required to do? Is that done in-house or do 10 you have a contract with somebody that comes out and does 11 that? 12 MR. MC CLARTY: Yes and yes. We do it in-house, 13 but we also have hired people to come out and do it. 14 Because, you know, the laws, they change all of the time. 15 So, we have to make sure that we're current, that we're 16 being -- that what they're being told is correct. We have 17 videos, we have, you know, the TV, we do the whole thing. 18 Interesting little story. I had Washington D.C.

people come out and somebody said, do you let them pick?

And I said, no, no, I don't want to do that. But they did, anyhow, they came out. And it took them half an hour to figure out how to do a ladder. I mean, it was really dangerous. They were there. They scared me.

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

But we can't let anybody do anything. And so we have -- we have what I call professionals, they're hired to

do this. You know, they speak the languages. Some of the languages, not all of them. And then we will do a -- we can, and we follow along and do it ourselves because we can look at our crew that we've known for years and if somebody looks a little confused, we're there to explain.

Because we send all of our people, also, to be educated. I mean it's that -- it's you need to do that, yes.

BOARD MEMBER RIVERA-HERNANDEZ: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN GOULD: Well, I don't have anything, except sort of retreading territory we've already been on. You know, I'm just interested in your ideas of actual access by ALRB staff. You mentioned that other government entities have access to private property and --

MR. MC CLARTY: Well, we -- let's say, take OSHA. You have a situation where OSHA will come out and they'll look at everything, and they'll allow you the opportunity to correct something without -- you know, you -- I don't know. You don't have any idea how many times we've tried to cooperate with the government and it really bites us.

And I'm talking about my friends down in Bakersfield, here or there, where they'll come over and they'll try to correct something and all of the sudden, whether it be the Air Regulation Board that you're not

supposed to have -- okay, well, don't come out and find these cups that are waiting here because they've been waiting here too long, or whatever. And then I've seen, you know, they're -- I hope you understand that piece of it.

I hope, I hope when this is all said and done, and we're through with this, that we can build some mutual trust between us so that no one says I don't want the ALRB on my -- you know, or on my ranch for whatever reason because they've got an ulterior motive. That's what I want to get out of this.

If it's there for workers and for workers' rights, and stuff like that, you know, I think it's part of what we do.

And I hope I've answered it. I'm trying not to be political, I'm not a political --

CHAIRMAN GOULD: I know that. And well, gosh, I very much appreciate the time. I know you're a very busy man and I am a great admirer of yours, and I wish I was half as smart as you are. And I really appreciate the fact that you would take the time and trouble to come out and talk to us about this. And I'm most grateful.

MR. MC CLARTY: Thank you. Thank you, guys, very much. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN GOULD: Next we'll turn to Ron

Barsamian, Esquire, Counselor.

MR. BARSAMIAN: And a whole host of other things.

CHAIRMAN GOULD: Yes.

MR. BARSAMIAN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Members of the Board. I'll be submitting written -- a written statement later on.

And because of that, I don't want to spend a lot of time talking about the legality of such a regulation or its basis. I'd rather have that in a written form.

But suffice it to say there's going to be some "Myrtle" (phonetic) stuff to come, from whichever side is looking at this.

What I'd rather do is get down to the pragmatic and practical situation that we're confronted with here. And, hopefully, by some of the things I bring up you take them as issues that have to be resolved. Things that may not have been foreseen when the concept was come up with.

First of all, though, I read your written statement that was issued earlier today and I just want to add to your comments about Mr. Barbosa. And this may be, you know, one of the last times we all get together here. And, yes, he has been the heart and soul of this agency as long as I've been doing it, certainly.

And I think all sides will tell you that when it comes down to the administrative issues, he's very well

respected by all sides.

CHAIRMAN GOULD: And we're very lucky to have him.

MR. BARSAMIAN: Very lucky. I'll bring up the issue that we brought up in Sacramento, and I think it caught some of the folks by surprise. And that's the nonproductive time issue.

Whether or not this is a State Agency that's coming in to talk with workers, work is going to be stopped. And this is only going to arise when it's a piece rate situation.

If we stop a crew to talk to anybody, ALRB even, it doesn't matter which agency it is, that's going to be nonproductive time. Labor Commissioner, Julie Su, has interpreted the Bluebird decision, the Supreme Court decision or the Supreme Court denial of an appeal to state that any and all time spent at the workplace has to be compensated.

And if they're being paid piece rate, any time not used in that productive activity for the piece rate has to be compensated.

Now, I know the intent may have been that growers wouldn't have to pay for this. It would be neutral in terms of cost.

Well, first and foremost, it's not going to be

neutral in terms of costs for the farmworkers. They're going to have to stop working. If they're not picking, or harvesting, or doing whatever else they're doing out there, it's not going to be cost neutral to them. They're going to lose some money. Certainly, lose time.

For the growers, under the current state of laws that's being interpreted by Commissioner Julie Su, we're going to have to pay for that. It doesn't matter what the intent is, we have to pay for it as growers.

And so that, of course, brings up all the other issues. How are you going to select which grower you're going to go visit? How are you going to decide what time of the day to go out there? If it's during the worktime, for instance. And if it's not during worktime, if the intent or one of the intentions is to do it during what I'll term "access periods" that we see under organizational access during lunchtime, before and after work, well, I really wouldn't want to be the union who has an NA filed, that all of the sudden has their time taken up by the ALRB coming in and taking their access period.

I think, also, some of the union representatives would tell you that the before work and after work is not really an effective time. Workers are coming in on carpools. They have training in the morning for what to do during the day. They have all kinds of things going on.

So, there's not a lot of time available for any kind of discussions apart from that in the morning. Lunchtime --

CHAIRMAN GOULD: So, I'm sorry, I didn't mean to interrupt you. But I wish that -- you've offered a number of ideas and you've raised a number of issues and I'm interested in your ideas about some of the issues that you're raising here.

MR. BARSAMIAN: Oh, I will.

CHAIRMAN GOULD: Okay. All right, you're not a shrinking violet, either.

MR. BARSAMIAN: I'm just throwing out stuff right now.

The access period during lunch, a half-hour's not going to be effective for what I think you have in mind. A half-hour is just to get the people together and they're, of course, eating.

I can't believe the ALRB's going to step up and say we'll pay for it. Budget problems aside, you're talking about a lot of money if you're talking about the entire industry.

And just to go through a few of the other issues, there is the issue that you already brought up that I raised in Sacramento about who would take the access. You left out one of my suggestions there and that was to have Ed go out and do it.

But, yes, I spend a lot of time with this agency and I've got to tell me it saddens me to see some of the staff folks and the attorneys being put in a no-win situation.

Now, I want to speak strongly about this. They can't do two jobs at once. They can't do three jobs at once, most certainly. But to expect them to be the investigators and prosecutors, and at the same time go out and be perceived by everybody else to be neutral when they're conducting educational discussions that's not fair to them. You've got some hard-working folks.

CHAIRMAN GOULD: Well, I think also you suggested, and I don't know, I don't want to put words in your mouth, but that there was a basic inconsistency between these roles.

MR. BARSAMIAN: Yes. We've seen it just between representational issues in unfair labor practices. If now we step away even from representational situations, we're going to pure education totally.

I'd like you to spend some time talking to some of the folks, the old-timers, if you will, that worked at OSHA when heat stress first came out. Their approach was multi-faceted. They didn't rely on any one approach. They had some very senior people, the most senior enforcement person at the time, Bill Krusha (phonetic), spent hours

driving up and down this valley reaching out to special interest groups on both sides. The Ag Association, CRLA, everybody else. He put together a lot of community meetings so that it wasn't during worktime. Provided for language services for all languages. Didn't rely on just video or print because some people the print doesn't mean much to them, they don't have a written language. We have to allow for that. You've made that very clear and I agree with you.

But what they didn't have to do is really come out and take any access time. When other agencies come out to the field, they're there momentarily. They're there for spot checks.

I conducted a situation involving OSHA just a couple of weeks ago. They came out, they spent about 20 minutes talking to one crew to find out what they had to say about heat stress and everything else. They checked the posters. And then they were gone. But it took them 20 minutes just to casually talk to one crew. And that's usually talking to small groups or one-on-one.

That is very difficult for me to perceive as a viable situation for what you have in mind in terms of trying to educate folks about the ALRB. That's not going to take 20 minutes.

We have an example that took place in 2013, where

the ALRB was voluntarily allowed on to take access. And I won't go into any more detail, other than to say with three teams working, and this was a large company, with three teams working it took them four days to get to crews that were working. And that didn't include everybody. There were some mechanic shops and other areas that weren't covered. That's just one company.

So, just the efficiency or lack of efficiency in such an approach, all by itself, is not going to work.

Now, I've heard some references to videos. There could be printed materials. There could be community outreach meetings. Again, I would point to OSHA, they didn't rely on any one thing.

And while there may be those who say this isn't true according to the way they read specifications, obviously, it's become a much safer situation for workers. Lack of guess, lack of situations that are valid reported situations to OSHA concerning heat stress. It's worked. Crews are stopped, now, at 12:00, 1:00, and they're not made to work all day. If they want to finish early, and that is especially true around piece rate.

Which means if you start taking time away during the day, especially in the mornings, to conduct any kind of access, the workday's already been shortened. Very few people work past six or seven hours anymore. They don't

even bump up anywhere near overtime.

And weather like this is stopping them even quicker because of the air quality. So, if you're taking a half-hour or 45 minutes out of a crew's time in the morning, you're taking away time that, number one, hurts the workers, although they may be compensated one way or the other.

But number two, it just means the work isn't going to get done and we are dealing with perishable products. You can't just leave stuff hanging around on trees and vineyards for an extended length of time. They have to be picked, they have to be put in cold storage.

That means there's another loss out there to the growers if it's not picked, that I think needs to be very seriously considered.

Which brings me to another issue which is how do you select who's going to get the access? What triggers it?

CHAIRMAN GOULD: Yeah.

MR. BARSAMIAN: Is it going to be random? Is the random selection method going to be such that it's fair for everybody?

And, I mean, we see that a lot in drug testing, for instance, just talking about statistics and how you go about doing a random selection.

But there's going to be a big difference between very large companies, with huge harvesting crews, and a dairy with five or six folks. Literally, it still may take the same amount of time for ALRB personnel to drive out to the location and talk. Are they going to spend their time talking to three or four people or are they going to try talking to crews of 50 or 60 people? Is that going to be the basis for deciding who gets the access?

What perception is that going to leave with the employees? Are they going to immediately presume that the company they're working for is in trouble? We think they will.

They see a lot of the other agencies coming around from time to time. That's almost become normal. But again, they're stopping for spot checks. They're not stopping everybody from work. They're not taking up their lunchtime. They're going out and checking the posters. They're having very brief discussions. If an investigation develops, they come back, conduct the formal investigation.

If all of the sudden the ALRB's coming out there, and taking an extended period of time -- it takes me a semester to teach this stuff at Fresno State. I don't know how you're going to do it in a half-hour. And that's with students that have to listen or I grade them accordingly.

So, I've got to wonder just how much information,

because I've heard from you and others that worked for the ALRB at the time, especially in Davis, that there's a lot of other subjects that you feel are important. So that people understand that and engaging in concerted activity can take into account exerting their rights because of these other laws.

Well, where do you start and stop that? Are you going to do full sexual harassment trainings at the same time as safety trainings? It's sort of an ever-expanding universe when you try to figure out what's going to be talked about.

CHAIRMAN GOULD: Well, of course, in this area, as you know, the question is not so much the substantive --

MR. BARSAMIAN: Right.

CHAIRMAN GOULD: -- issues and these other laws, like sexual harassment, or even heat, or OSHA problems. But, rather, what the workers perceive to be, what they deem to be unfair.

It's not whether there's a sexual harassment violation.

MR. BARSAMIAN: I understand that.

CHAIRMAN GOULD: So, I don't think -- I mean, I'm

23 very interested in --

MR. BARSAMIAN: But I'm taking into account that even if you give them a very basic explanation of these

other laws, just so they know what you're talking about when you're talking about concerted activity, for instance, it's going to take some time.

CHAIRMAN GOULD: Yeah, but it's not predicated upon law. It's predicated upon practices which the workers deem to be, rightly or wrongly, unfair.

MR. BARSAMIAN: Uh-hum. Take that baby to the hall.

CHAIRMAN GOULD: She's -- the baby is crying about what you're saying, not what I'm --

MR. BARSAMIAN: Well, give me the baby and I can put him to sleep.

CHAIRMAN GOULD: But on this business about how you -- I'd really like to get it, to the extent that you want to address this, what would be your recommendation to us as to how we go about selecting a particular employee? How do we select?

MR. BARSAMIAN: Oh, how to select? My thought is access, I don't think it's going to work. I don't think it's efficient enough for what you want to do. It may be something that you want to utilize in unique situations.

Certainly, right now, the only right to access the ALRB staff has -- I don't count investigations as access, as that's an investigation. Is going to be the noticing that occurs before a representational election.

And we see how long that takes. That takes a good half-hour and that's just to tell them about the balloting location, and what time, and come on out and vote.

What I would really, truly suggest is that you form a focus group, smaller than the Ad Hoc Committee, so that it can get work done, unless you leave Mr. Rosenthal out of it and then you can get the work done, anyway.

To literally come up with several different things that need to be done first. Access, to me, and I invite the discussion about access, but it's merely one means of communication. There's a lot more effective and efficient means that I think need to be looked at first.

Then, if you're not reaching particular groups, cultures, languages, go back and deal with that with a different approach to them. Which might be access. Which might be more time spent in their communities and call them together.

But get a focus group together involving labor, obviously, involving management, different industry segments. Not just vegetables, not just fruits. But wineries, dairies, all the other subgroups. Go through the associations, if you will.

I mean, growers know all about organizing and collective bargaining, if you will. Some of the associations that you know about, such as Western Growers,

that was formed to represent growers against railroads. So, they know all about collective bargaining rights.

That's not the issue. The issue is how do you get the information there in an effective way, where nobody gets hurt?

And I truly think that -- and I say this with all due respect, I truly think that looking at just access, you're barely skimming the top of the available alternatives out there. And in my mind, the most inefficient one there can be.

It's time of too much staff, you're not going to get to everybody. You're going to have associated problems depending on who's picked and why they're picked. How they would be picked, I don't know. I think I would look more at triggers than picking people at random so that people know --

CHAIRMAN GOULD: What kind of triggers?

MR. BARSAMIAN: Well, certainly if unfair labor practices are filed that might be one trigger, maybe NAs.

CHAIRMAN GOULD: But don't you kind of meet yourself coming around the corner here? Because what we want to do and I think what you're advising us to do is to separate --

MR. BARSAMIAN: I know, I know.

CHAIRMAN GOULD: Is to separate this from a

situation where we're in litigation.

MR. BARSAMIAN: That's why I say access can't be the solution to what you're looking for. I don't think it's going to be efficient enough. You're going to be choosing people at random and you may be missing the ones that you need to talk to. The groups of employees you need to talk to.

CHAIRMAN GOULD: But what about a mandatory video?

MR. BARSAMIAN: I hadn't heard that before.

Evidently, somebody suggested that today. I think a video would --

CHAIRMAN GOULD: No, nobody suggested it. I simply asked the question. Barry mentioned the videos.

MR. BARSAMIAN: Right now, we use videos quite a bit for sexual harassment training, safety trainings and stuff. So, a lot of the larger companies have AB capability to do that out in the field or in a meeting location that's local. That can be part of the orientation. To me, that makes more sense, it really does.

Number one, the interest groups can review the video and they're going to get past any problems about what's getting said or not said ahead of time.

But I still think the face-to-face idea you have is good, especially for certain groups, indigenous groups.

But I think that needs to be done more through the communities, just like the heat stress was. Not at the worksite. People are trying to work.

And like I said, we keep talking about what's it going to cost the growers. I've been talking about that during my whole session here. But think about the cost to the workers. They can't make up the time that they're going to lose while they're having access taken.

They already don't appreciate a lot of folks taking access during lunch and now they've got to have it during work. And it's a shortened workday already. It's just not the most efficient. It may be one of different, many different ideas we have going out there. I don't think you ought to look at just one idea.

It's going to take more than one approach.

Different segments are going to require more of something than another segment will. And those are my remarks. And I thank you for the time.

CHAIRMAN GOULD: Well, thank you. I'll turn to my colleagues to see if they have any questions.

MR. BARSAMIAN: Are you afraid?

MR. BLANCO: So, you're talking about various size of growers. So, can you give us a better picture for, again the benefit of the record, when you talk about the table grapes down in the Bakersfield area, what size grower

are we talking about?

MR. BARSAMIAN: Oh, on harvesting crews?

MR. BLANCO: Uh-huh.

MR. BARSAMIAN: Oh, you're talking anywhere from 70 to 800 folks to 1,500 to 2,000 real easy, and they're spread out. That's the other thing about San Juaquin versus other areas, it is spread out. So, if you're trying to target one grower, you could be all the way out in Maricopa, 50 miles away from everything else one day and that's still talking people.

You know, what's your bang for the buck that you're going to get out of doing that?

If you're talking about dairies, everybody's in one little place and you've got very few people. But now, you're only talking to very few people.

If you're talking about wineries, Napa and Sonoma, it's not so spread out mileage-wise. It's spread out because of the difficulty to get there because of the roads.

So, each part, each area has its own unique problems.

MR. BLANCO: And so an approach tailored, maybe again, whatever the approaches the Board decides on should probably take into consideration the kind of crop we're talking about, right?

1 MR. BARSAMIAN: The crop and the geographic area. 2 I think those are the two important things that need to be 3 considered. 4 MR. BLANCO: And we've spent a lot of time today 5 talking about the OSHA, but there are other State agencies 6 that --7 MR. BARSAMIAN: Yeah, there's just heat stress 8 with the one having done quickly --9 MR. BLANCO: Right. 10 MR. BARSAMIAN: -- and they stepped up and they 11 did it. 12 MR. BLANCO: And Labor Commissioner does go 13 out -- they go out into the field as well. 14 MR. BARSAMIAN: They do the same spot checks. 15 What we literally get are cars pulling up to the side of 16 the field and folks from three or four agencies all get out 17 together. 18 MR. BLANCO: That would be the Labor Enforcement 19 Task Force. 20 MR. BARSAMIAN: You betcha. So, you've got EDD. 21 You've got OSHA and OSHA sometimes comes out by itself. 22 The Feds, the DOLs usually follow them around. But they 23 all come out together. They all go out and check and see 24 if their posters are up there for their own particular

agency. At least there's some efficiency in that.

25

But they don't have a lot of time to start talking to a lot of workers.

MR. BLANCO: But is this where you get the -- I mean, do growers get the impression that workers feel that when these agencies show up that that means what you were talking about in terms of --

MR. BARSAMIAN: Yes, we've heard that from workers, absolutely. They don't know what's going on.

Many of the workers, for instance, if they're asked what do you know about heat stress? Time, and time, and time again they'll say I don't know anything. And then we end up going through -- we get a complaint, we go through the hearing, only to find out the worker had been trained the day before but they were afraid to talk to State officials.

So, I mean, you're not going to do that in a quick drive-by, so to speak, talking to some worker for five minutes. You obviously want to have a relationship between the speaker and the folks that you're trying to educate. You're not going to get that in five minutes.

CHAIRMAN GOULD: Okay, thank you. Thank you very much.

MR. BARSAMIAN: You're very welcome. Thank you.

MR. BLANCO: And you will be -- you'll be submitting your written comments, then, before October the

1 15th? 2 Absolutely. MR. BARSAMIAN: 3 MR. BLANCO: Okay, thank you. 4 CHAIRMAN GOULD: Thank you. 5 MR. BARSAMIAN: Thank you. 6 CHAIRMAN GOULD: All right, our next witness is 7 Leoncio Vasquez. Is he here? 8 MR. BLANCO: Yes, he's coming. Mr. Vasquez, 9 would you like an interpreter or would you like to testify 10 in English? 11 MR. VASQUEZ: I'll try today in English. 12 MR. BLANCO: Okay. But, I mean, we do have an 13 interpreter if you would like one. 14 MR. VASQUEZ: No, that's fine. 15 MR. BLANCO: Okay. Now, Mr. Vasquez, you're here 16 representing who? 17 MR. VASQUEZ: Well, my name is Leoncio Vasquez. 18 I'm the Executive Director of a National Center for the 19 Development of Indigenous Communities. We have four 20 offices providing assistance and support to the indigenous 21 population that are mostly farmworkers. 22 MR. BLANCO: Okay, and where are those offices 23 located? MR. VASQUEZ: We're based here in Fresno. 24 25 have a small office in Madera, Greenfield and Santa Maria.

MR. BLANCO: And what does your organization -- can you go further into what your organization does?

MR. VASQUEZ: Sure. So, probably, if I can read is there that I've prepared now --

MR. BLANCO: Sure.

MR. VASQUEZ: -- that kind of explains what we do. If I may?

MR. BLANCO: Sure.

MR. VASQUEZ: So, the Center -- the National Center for Development for Helping Indigenous Communities is a non-profit based in Fresno, with offices in Madera, Greenfield and Santa Maria.

We assist over 5,000 indigenous families through different programs relating to language, information and education through different programs about our rights as human beings, as workers, as immigrants to this country.

We also do cultural programs that somehow maintain our traditions as indigenous communities. We take into much consideration, working with this population, having the same community providing that information in our native language.

My office focuses its efforts on indigenous families that are immigrants that we saw in the 1980s, and throughout the 1990s and 2000s. We are new into this country and very different from other Mexicans that have

been traditionally migrating to the north. Different in terms of culture, language, in the way that we can see the world.

Without having any knowledge of this difference, before migrating, we were forced out of communities due to various irresponsible acts of a government and, of course, the powerful of the United States of America. Of just moving their (indiscernible) -- of a Mexican Government, as a child accepting our conditions that cannot be possible without measuring any consequences for its citizens.

That is what happened with the passage of 1994 North American Free Trade Agreement, forcing millions of farmers out of our communities to desperately search for survival means.

We end up in Oxnard, Santa Maria, Salinas,
Watsonville, throughout the Central Valley and other cities
of the U.S., accepting any type of work, for any
conditions, and for any pay. Not knowing about our labor
rights because this concept does not exist in our culture.

In my own experience as a farmworker, just like now in the picking, in the grape-picking season, working from sunrise to sunset, over 100 degrees, earning a minimum wage and too often below minimum wage, a lack of shades, fresh water to drink, clean restrooms or any restroom at all. Not having access to any information in our native

language or at least in Spanish about our labor rights.

Not being able to communicate with my coworkers and organize ourselves so that the grower pays attention to our needs and respects and will comply with the labor laws pertaining to workers.

This is the condition that we cannot deny having every single day, to every single farmworker out there.

For a strong work ethics that's not allowed us to complain.

We want to work and turn the land with our sweat and labor.

But a condition and the exploitation gets so extreme that we end up having permanent injury at work, without any benefit or even possible to navigate that (indiscernible) system of work-injuring process.

But too often, just like in the case of a foreman that I met, who wanted to protect his crew and the employer inventing excuses to expel him out of his job.

Or, the case where an injured farmworker had to deal directly with an employer, with the labor contractor negotiating so that the farmworker does not file for worker's compensation for his injury.

All this take place because farmworkers are not aware of their labor rights.

As far as I'm concerned, history has shown us over and over that employers, growers are so powerful in every sense of the word, and they use that power against

farmworkers who, we clearly know that the farmworkers do not have any political power. And too often, the system ends up on the side of those in power.

We just get paid whatever they want, no matter how many years we have worked with the same employer. When trying to get a raise, we get all kinds of excuses and intimidation for the more outspoken worker. That person gets fired on the spot to show the rest of the workers that the same thing will happen to them if they continue demanding any improvement of work or their pay.

Indigenous farmworkers, besides having low level of education, are not fluent in English. Are not fluent in Spanish, let alone English. They're not able to access any information online. Even though many have cell phones, they do not have the knowledge to search for information that will take them as farmworkers.

But even though they knew that it is impossible to do something about it because there's no legal assistance that can take any type of case and follow up from beginning to end.

Available agencies, such as (indiscernible) legal assistance has too many litigation in assisting farmworkers in all the cases that they may have.

Other agencies, such as the ALRB, focuses on various specific cases that in the end farmworkers get so

confused which case to take to what agency.

To end, it is -- I will say that it is definitely necessary to have more protection for farmworkers and make sure that employers comply with the laws, with the labor laws.

Letting an employer know ahead of time about a visit, an ALRB visit, does not make any sense. They fix anything properly for a visit so that at the time of a visit everything looks great. And a visit without the knowledge of an employer makes sense to make sure that everyone is protected.

But first, the harvest for fresh food are protected. So, I'm in favor of what you are trying to do just to have more protection for farmworkers and that they really understand what's going on. And, specifically, for the population that I represent, the indigenous communities that, again, I mentioned that they are the new immigrants to this community and lack a lot of information.

CHAIRMAN GOULD: Any questions?

BOARD MEMBER RIVERA-HERNANDEZ: How do the workers find out about your organization?

MR. VASQUEZ: Through word of mouth, mostly. We use La Promatora Moro, where members of our community, we, through the programs that we have we let them know what we do. We invite them to workshops, to meetings, to cultural

events. And we distribute information to them in their native language, about what we do.

We use the service of Radio Bilingual, which has a program for the Mixtec communities on Sundays, every Sunday, and we communicate with them through that radio station.

BOARD MEMBER RIVERA-HERNANDEZ: Thank you.

BOARD MEMBER SHIROMA: Thank you so much for your presentation today. And earlier -- earlier we heard about the cultural facilities within the indigenous community in terms of the leadership.

I was just curious, are you considered one of the leaders within the Oaxacan/Mixteco community in terms of leadership of this group?

 $$\operatorname{MR.\ VASQUEZ:}$$  If I'm a leader in the Mixteco community?

BOARD MEMBER SHIROMA: Uh-hum.

MR. VASQUEZ: I would say so. I mean, I'm working with an agency and it is a unique organization that very few exist in the State of California, that focuses its work on this population, taking into account the difference of culture and language.

And as agency, we employ workers that speak their native language in order to reach out to them.

BOARD MEMBER SHIROMA: Thank you very much.

1 Thank you. 2 Just a couple of more questions. MR. BLANCO: 3 So, you have a website? 4 MR. VASQUEZ: Yes, we have a website. 5 MR. BLANCO: And who is that website designed 6 Is it designed for Mixteco population or designed for 7 someone else? 8 MR. VASQUEZ: Well, I don't think it is designed 9 for our community. I know that's what we want to show. 10 But mostly, it is bilingual. What we try to do in 11 bilingual, it is in Spanish and English. But we want to 12 reach out to those who want to support this community. 13 Basically, that indigenous people are at the bottom of the 14 ladder. Meaning they earn less than everyone else. 15 get exploited at work very often. 16 So, we want to design programs at least to let 17 them know what are the labor rights, in their own language, 18 so that they can organize themselves and try to fight this. 19 Because it is a reality that we cannot deny. 20 MR. BLANCO: And why is it -- why are you not 21 trying to reach Mixteco community through your website? 22 MR. VASQUEZ: Well, it's not written as a -- and 23 it's not written, even, in our own language.

basically, we have some there that are expensive to make,

that are in the different language. And, hopefully, we

24

25

think that the children of indigenous families, that are born here, that are going to school, that are very savvy with technology, hopefully, they have some computers at home and they use it. They use the information that we provide.

But we don't depend on the website to reach out to our community.

MR. BLANCO: And is the community technologically, I guess, competent to -- I mean, to use the tools they would need to get to the website?

MR. VASQUEZ: As far as I know, and the individuals that I've had in contact with, no, they don't have access to technology. They don't have the means to purchase a computer. They don't have internet access to the places that they live. That's luxury that they cannot afford.

They prefer to purchase a gallon of milk and meals for the children, instead of having that type of technology.

CHAIRMAN GOULD: Okay, I don't have any questions. And I want to thank you very much for coming here and taking your valuable time. You speak with great authenticity and I'm grateful to you.

MR. VASQUEZ: Thank you. Thank you, all.
CHAIRMAN GOULD: Thank you.

I want to call, as our next witness, Anthony Raimondo.

MR. RAIMONDO: Good afternoon.

CHAIRMAN GOULD: Good afternoon.

MR. RAIMONDO: Chairman Gould and the Honorable Members of the Agricultural Labor Relations Board, than you for the opportunity to be heard here today. I greatly appreciate it.

My name's Anthony Raimondo. I'm a labor attorney here, in Fresno. I specialize in representing agricultural employers, primarily farm labor contractors and dairies.

But I represent some growers and some folks in other industries.

I've practiced before the Agricultural Labor
Relations Board and the National Labor Relations Board for
almost 15 years, now. So, I have some experience with both
agencies and with labor relations law.

I had the good fortune as a young attorney to be trained by Mr. Barsamian over here, and I think I gained a wealth of knowledge from that. So, I certainly second his statement about how complex and technical labor relations law is, and how important it is to have qualified practitioners in this area of law.

You've proposed to draft a regulation that would allow ALRB agents to force their way on to employers'

property and compel workers to listen to an educational presentation about how the agency can protect their rights.

I'm not aware of any State or Federal agency, any government agency at all that has such a power or even believes that it needs such a power.

We have agencies that have specific rights of access for the purpose of ensuring compliance, as Mr.

Barsamian mentioned, with the Labor Commissioner and OSHA, and other agencies. And we have agencies, which the ALRB already has a right of entry for purpose of investigations and enforcement.

But I've never heard of any agency that has tried this type of step. And I wonder what's so special about the ALRB and what's so special about agriculture that this is so needed?

In my experience, agencies that want to engage in outreach seek to work cooperatively to create opportunities by working with employers, by working with community agencies and organizations to do outreach in a multiplicity of ways. Not by compelled regulatory trespassing.

This proposal is particularly disturbing to me in light of what I've seen with the ALRB over the last few years. For many years, we saw a great deal of stability at the ALRB in terms of the staff, the attorneys, the investigators and the Regional Directors.

A few years ago we had what was apparently a purge of this agency and we saw a massive number of virtually all of the experienced personnel at the ALRB gone from their posts. Replaced by people who were very, very inexperienced.

For reasons that have never been publicly explained, the Agency saw fit to purge itself of its institutional memory, its institutional experience, and its institutional knowledge. I think that's a betrayal of many of the young attorneys and staff that you've brought on recently, who don't have anyone to learn from.

They don't have what I have. They don't have a Ron Barsamian, or Howard Sagaser, or some of these other folks out there who are more experienced. You have untrained personal that you're proposing to educate workers about their rights.

Chairman Gould, you were Chairman of the NLRB.

This is an agency that I practice in front of a lot and I have great respect for. They conduct investigations and all of their procedures are very consistent, very efficient and very professional.

I butt heats with them a lot, but I've always respected the training and qualifications of the folks that investigate and prosecute cases at the NLRB.

You're aware that the NLRB has filed published

procedures and case-handling manuals, available to any member of the public on the website, that create consistency in their procedure and provide a guideline for NLRB personnel to follow the law, pursue investigations and enforce the law in a manner that's consistent.

The ALRB doesn't have that. The Regional Director, at the National Labor Relations Board, is one of the most significant positions in the entire agency. As you know, this is a position that most -- more than any other decision of the Board has day-to-day impact on worker's rights by making decisions in real time. Whether it's investigations or representational matters, that directly impact workers' rights. These are critical positions.

We have an ALRB Regional Director in Visalia, who acknowledged under oath that before joining the ALRB in 2012, less than 10 percent of his experience was spent practicing labor relations law.

We have a recently departed Regional Director in Salinas with the same level of inexperience.

The Acting Regional Director in Salinas has the same level of experience.

CHAIRMAN GOULD: I think that the proposal before us does not propose or suggest that parties that are -- portions of the Board that have been involved in

adversarial proceedings, investigation and the like conduct this kind of work.

The idea has been that -- and Mr. Barsamian said it well, that worker education would have to be dealt with separately. And I don't know that -- of course, I'm interested in anything you have to say about the Board, and the Regional Directors. And we have our meetings, which you're welcome to attend and to come on.

But what we want to do here, in the interest of time and efficiency, is to zero in on the proposals that are before us.

MR. RAIMONDO: That's exactly what I'm talking about, Mr. Chairman. My challenge to you would be who's qualified to provide this education and training within this Agency?

Before you come to someone else's house, before you come to someone's ranch to educate workers, you need to spend your time and resources cleaning up your own house. The time that's being spent here, on these hearings, in contemplating this regulation, the resources that are being expended on this, if you really wanted to impact worker rights and protect worker rights, you would be expending those resources on developing case handling manuals, bringing in experienced NLRB personnel to conduct training on investigations, to conduct training on representational

issues, to correct this void of knowledge and void of experience that exists in the Agency.

You're putting the cart before the horse. You're asking an Agency that lacks internal institutional expertise to conduct education that they're not qualified to conduct.

Until you demonstrate that sort of expertise and experience internally, I don't see how anyone in this Agency is qualified to conduct these trainings.

You know, I've heard a lot of comments here today and I've heard these comments a lot about how this sort of thing is necessary in agriculture because of the vulnerability of the farmworker. That farmworkers are helpless. They're at risk. They don't know their rights and they can't assert their rights.

I don't see this. I haven't seen it as a representative of employers. When I represent clients, I've seen cases where indigenous crews have walked out of harvest, in the middle of Salinas, to demand a higher rate and they've gotten that higher rate. With no help from a union or any other organization because they organized themselves and demanded better working conditions for themselves.

In the last two years, I've been blessed to have the opportunity to represent Silvia Lopez and the workers

who have organized themselves at Gerawan Farms. These people are not afraid. They are not vulnerable. They know their rights and they've been fighting for two years to exercise those rights.

The greatest interference they have faced in exercising their protected rights was the misinformation and interference that they received from this Agency.

So, until those things are corrected, I don't know how this Agency can sit there and look at these workers in the eye, and tell them we're going to educate you. They know their rights. They're waiting to have them respected. They're waiting to have their votes counted, for over two years.

So, it's preposterous, to me, to suggest -frankly, I think it's insulting and I think it's
disrespectful, and I think it's downright unfair to
characterize these farmworkers as helpless victims.

What I have seen, in my interactions with farmworkers, both as a representative of management and in my opportunities to represent workers, themselves, are people who are very strong, who are very independent, who are perfectly capable of deciding the course of their own lives and exercising their own rights.

I don't see this vulnerability that compels the need for this. I see workers going to the EEOC, to the

DFEH, hiring private counsel from Los Angeles and San Francisco to sue farm employers, walking off the jobs to demand better working conditions.

I don't see these people who are afraid and hiding in the shadows. I see people who are strong in many ways, stronger than you and I.

Over the last two years, on many occasions I've gotten very discouraged in my representation of Silvia Lopez and I've thought about walking away from that case. And at times when I didn't feel like I had enough energy to take another step, it was their passion, and their commitment, and their courage that inspired me to continue and go forward.

So, I refuse to accept his tired trope as the farmworker as a helpless victim. It needs to be retired. And they need to be respected like any other human being, that they are perfectly capable of taking care of themselves.

(Applause)

CHAIRMAN GOULD: Are you finished?

MR. RAIMONDO: Yes.

22 CHAIRMAN GOULD: Okay. Are there any questions?

23 Thank you. Thank you very much.

MR. RAIMONDO: Thank you.

25 CHAIRMAN GOULD: Where's the next --

1 (Off-the-record discussion.) 2 MR. BLANCO: So, before we start with the next 3 panel, we have to do a little rearranging of the -- and 4 place some tables out here so they all can sit down. 5 CHAIRMAN GOULD: Oh, the tables. 6 MR. BLANCO: You guys can --7 (Off-the-record discussion and reorganization of 8 room.) 9 CHAIRMAN GOULD: Okay, so for our next witnesses 10 we have Silvia Lopez, and Michael Bravo, Jose De La Rosa, 11 Carlos Uribe, Rolando Padilla and Angel Lopez. And so, and 12 I think all of you want to testify together. And so, 13 that's why this table is being set up the way it is. 14 (Pause in Proceeding.) 15 CHAIRMAN GOULD: Okay. All right, so can we 16 proceed? Would you like to proceed? My understanding is 17 you would like to appear as a group and so we're ready to 18 proceed, we're ready to hear from you. 19 (Interpreter Translating.) 20 MS. SILVIA LOPEZ: I would like to do it in 21 English. 22 CHAIRMAN GOULD: Surely, you may speak in 23 whatever language you want to speak. But now, how is she 24 going to --25 MS. SNELL: She's going to speak in English and

that's --

CHAIRMAN GOULD: No, I know that. Okay, she's going to -- okay.

MS. SILVIA LOPEZ: Good afternoon, everybody. My name is Silvia Lopez and I'm a farmworker, 35 years as a farmworker in the Central Valley.

I'm here today because I heard that the ALRB's trying to go in the field and talk to workers. And for me, that's not -- that's not correct. Because I believe, myself personally, I have a very, very bad experience with the ALRB. And I would like to let everybody know that what's going, really, with the ALRB.

And I would like to talk a little bit about my bad experience with the ALRB more than two years ago.

CHAIRMAN GOULD: Ms. Lopez, what we want to do, both in the interest of time and relevancy, is to speak about this rule before us.

If you have -- I know that you have appeared before us in our public meetings and you are welcome at any time to speak before us at our public meetings about your complaints about the ALRB.

But what we want to do is focus upon this rule.

And you have said that this is a bad idea and we would like to hear from you on this.

Because if everyone comes forward and recounts

the experiences that they have in a wide variety of areas, we will be here for a very long time talking about what is not relevant, in our view, to this proposed rule.

MS. SILVIA LOPEZ: Okay.

CHAIRMAN GOULD: So, if I could hear from you, I welcome your --

MS. SILVIA LOPEZ: So, how many minutes do I have to speak?

CHAIRMAN GOULD: Well, we've set aside here -for the group we've set aside 25 minutes for the group.

MS. SILVIA LOPEZ: Okay. Okay, thank you. I don't agree with the ALRB to go and visit the workers at work because I don't want the ALRB to keep lying and continue lying to the farmworkers.

We've from Mexico, and maybe we're Oaxacan, from Indian Mexican, but we know how to defend ourselves.

And we know about our rights and we really strong, and we're not intimidated on defending our rights.

And I believe that everyone who knows me, they know that I'm not afraid to speak because I know my rights.

And I'm not just agreeing with the ALRB because I know that the ALRB in Visalia, California, specific, they agree with the union to shut our mouth and make us feel stupid that we can't defend ourselves.

So, I just think that educate our workers is

very -- my coworkers, and educate us between us. I think we're very, very smart to know our rights and defend our rights. And we don't need help from any union. And we don't want any union to force us with something that we don't want.

Just to tell you that I have very bad experience with the ALRB. For example, right now we just came in, when we got here the security told us that in order to not let the blue shirt come in this meeting. If you guys want a space, go rent a space for you guys.

I think that we --

CHAIRMAN GOULD: Who told you what?

MS. SILVIA LOPEZ: The security.

CHAIRMAN GOULD: He told you what?

MS. SILVIA LOPEZ: He told me, Nancy --

CHAIRMAN GOULD: Nancy?

MS. SILVIA LOPEZ: I don't know who's Nancy.

CHAIRMAN GOULD: I don't know who Nancy is.

MS. SILVIA LOPEZ: I don't know who's Nancy.

MS. SNELL: Security.

MR. RAIMONDO: I can shed light on this, if you'd like. What happened was a representative from the UFW told security to bar these workers from the door and not allow them to be at this public hearing.

CHAIRMAN GOULD: Okay.

1 MR. RAIMONDO: Thank you and we're grateful Mr. 2 Barbosa did intervene and did allow the workers access. 3 CHAIRMAN GOULD: Okay. 4 MR. RAIMONDO: But that's what happened. 5 CHAIRMAN GOULD: All right. 6 MS. SILVIA LOPEZ: So, if the UFW is here for the 7 worker or if the ALRB is here for the workers, so why they 8 trying to intimidate us like this, in this situation. 9 came in and the security was pushing us back, we don't need 10 the blue shirts here. If you guys want a space, go rent 11 your own space. So, I think that everybody has to know 12 that, what happened outside. 13 So, the ALRB went to visit me at my work, like 14 two years ago, and they want to talk, they want to lie to 15 my coworkers. There were like 40 coworkers with me there 16 and they want to tell them a lie. And at the moment that I 17 realized that the ALRB's not here for the worker. 18 here for supporting the UFW. And we want to stop that. 19 want something fair. We want justice. That's what we 20 want. 21 And I know that their purpose is to go out in the 22 field and help the UFW and I think that's not right. 23 That's all I'm going to say. 24 (Applause)

Do other people want to say

CHAIRMAN GOULD:

25

anything?

MS. LUCERO LOPEZ: Hello, I'm Lucero Lopez and I've been working at Gerawan since 2009. I have experience from two parts, parties, the ALRB and the UFW.

The only thing that I see is that the ALRB supports the UFW and I think that's not right. And I believe that's not right because the ALRB's supposed to be here for the farmworkers, only, not for an organization that gets money for campaign of government, or other politic things.

These, supposedly workers here, they are not workers from Gerawan. They're just people that they paid just to sit here. Why? Because I work there and I don't know them and I don't recognize their face. And I don't see them at the company, okay.

The dirty people, though, I'm not sure -
CHAIRMAN GOULD: We would be grateful if you

would keep your remarks to the proposed rule before us -
MS. LUCERO LOPEZ: Yes.

CHAIRMAN GOULD: -- rather than whoever happens to be in the audience.

MS. LUCERO LOPEZ: But I want to let you know that it's a lie, okay. It's a lie. And we need justice. We don't want you guys to protect the UFW, like the ALRB do, because that's not right. That's the main thing. And

well, people are going to lose their jobs if the UFW comes into our jobs. Right, because they're going to be taking money away from our paycheck. And we don't need that. We know how to defend our rights. We know how to talk. And if we want more raise in our salary, we can talk to the owner. Really, talk to Dan Gerawan and Mike. We can go speak that we want more salary. We don't need the other people to come and speak for us. And that's all my words to say.

CHAIRMAN GOULD: Anyone else wish to speak here?

MR. TORRES: (Through Interpreter.) Thank you all for giving me this opportunity and good afternoon. I hope you guys could listen and understand.

CHAIRMAN GOULD: And your name is?

MR. TORRES: Eduardo Luna Torres. I apologize for not answering my name before.

What I want to say, I want my rights to be respected. I don't want nobody to represent me. Because now, anybody doesn't like what they do, they leave. Like a lot of people say that they're mistreated and that's a big lie because they continue being in the same place. Nobody tolerates that right now because we all know our rights. And I don't let other people -- we don't let other people get inside our minds to control us.

The truth, I would appreciate very much if you

1 could help us to that our rights could be validated. 2 That's all, thank you. 3 CHAIRMAN GOULD: Okay. 4 MR. RINCON: (Through Interpreter.) 5 afternoon, my name is Angel Rincon. I'm here because we're 6 tired of so much abuse. I feel like that I feel abuse, 7 humiliated because they don't take us into consideration. 8 They don't take any consideration of rights. 9 THE INTERPRETER: May the Interpreter clarify 10 something, please? 11 CHAIRMAN GOULD: Sure. 12 MR. TORRES: Mr. Cesar Chavez, he humiliated us. 13 I feel that he made us vote, he made us sign and they said 14 that all the signatures were false, mine and my coworkers. 15 That's why I feel humiliated. 16 CHAIRMAN GOULD: We have to focus on the proposed 17 rule, which is in front of us. 18 MR. TORRES: I just want to say that you guys 19 take us for granted that we respect our rights. 20 MR. BARBOSA: (Through Interpreter.) Okay, I am 21 Antonio Barbosa and I am --22 CHAIRMAN GOULD: Executive Secretary. 23 MR. BARBOSA: I just want to explain something. 24 This meeting that's taking place here today, it has nothing 25 to do with unions. This has everything to do with

farmworkers.

(Applause.)

MR. BARBOSA: It has nothing to do with unions. This has everything to do with workers that work in the fields all over California, but they don't know their rights.

You're very fortunate that maybe you work in this area and a lot of you have testified that you know what your rights are, and you guys know how to exercise these rights. But that's not the subject of today.

MR. TORRES: There's no other time. When can we be heard?

MR. BARBOSA: This time, we have. We have a (inaudible) -- in Sacramento and you guys have to -- we have a lot of witnesses present that the table wants to consider. There's two positions, there's many positions. There's a lot of people that are interested in talking to the Board and telling them about their experiences. And all that has to do with field workers, a lot of them are indigenous, that they possibly don't know their rights. And they live in the Fresno area, or from Salinas, Visalia or Oxnard.

And I leave and I apologize for interrupting your testimony, but that's not the matter beforehand and that the attorneys are here to discuss.

1 (Applause.) 2 I hope that there is some time that MR. TORRES: 3 you guys can hear me and hear all the workers from Gerawan. 4 And for the first time, let us know our rights, and to 5 respect them. So I don't feel pressured and tired. 6 you very much. 7 CHAIRMAN GOULD: Anyone else from --8 (Through Interpreter.) Can I come MR. LOPEZ: 9 up? 10 CHAIRMAN GOULD: What is your name? 11 MR. LOPEZ: Angel Lopez. 12 CHAIRMAN GOULD: Oh, so we have you listed. 13 Good. 14 MR. LOPEZ: Good afternoon. I thank Mr. Barbosa 15 and the people that are sitting up here. My respect 16 all my coworkers, also. 17 (Applause) 18 CHAIRMAN GOULD: Could you repeat what he said, I don't know what he said? 19 20 THE INTERPRETER: He said wanted applause for Mr. 21 Barbosa, he deserves it. 22 CHAIRMAN GOULD: Oh. 23 (Inaudible) -- I have the pleasure of MR. LOPEZ: 24 knowing here and my respect to her, also. I don't want to 25 see, out in the field, anybody from the Labor Board.

would like to see those people out in the fields, parking on the -- I have my reasons to not talk about them because the gentleman said this is not the case.

In my personal experience, in my life experience, for some experience with my coworkers, I had a bad experience with the Labor Commission. I'm a nice person, I'm a peaceful person and a lot of people know me. The people that know me know that I'm friendly, I make friends and they like that about me.

And I want to say about the labor law that if they're going to go visit, the first people I said, Mr. Barbosa and the lady, I apologize I don't know your name.

CHAIRMAN GOULD: Which lady?

MR. LOPEZ: The Chinese --

(Laughter)

MR. LOPEZ: We would like to see them out in the fields and not any other people. I would trust both of them, if both of them would show up. But someone else, no.

We had a lot of bad experience with the labor law. They did our case, we voted. They had to cover our votes. I think that if they were going to count them, we would feel comfortable with those that want the union and those that don't want the union.

MR. BARBOSA: (Through Interpreter.) We cannot talk about that. You guys had the -- you guys had the

1 opportunity, an opportunity that lasted over 105 days. And 2 every person that had an interest in testifying gave 3 testimony. 4 UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: I apologize, may I --5 MR. BARBOSA: (Speaking Spanish) 6 MR. LOPEZ: I apologize. 7 (Applause.) 8 (Speaking Spanish) MR. BARBOSA: 9 MR. LOPEZ: I have no problem with that. 10 CHAIRMAN GOULD: Okay, thank you. Muchas 11 gracias. 12 MR. LOPEZ: I want to thank everybody. Thank you 13 for listening. And I want to see both of them in the 14 fields pretty soon. 15 CHAIRMAN GOULD: Okay, well, thank you. 16 we've got -- used just about this -- we have one more 17 speaker, okay. 18 MS. CASTRO: (Through Interpreter.) My name is 19 Gisela Castro. I've been working with Gerawan for 19 20 years. The only thing that I want to ask, that justice be 21 made for us. I know we cannot talk about this case right 22 now, but we want justice. If they're going to go to the 23 fields, they can go like Angel said, Mr. Antonio and the 24 people at the table. 25 We're tired of so much humiliation. They haven't

```
1
   respected us. They have humiliated us. We want justice,
2
   whether it be for us or for the people who are present
3
   here, I cannot say who. And I know we cannot talk about
4
   Silas, either. But I have something important to say about
5
   Silas. The president --
6
             CHAIRMAN GOULD: Yes, but again, we want to stay
7
   away from this case.
8
             MS. CASTRO: Okay, that's fine. The only thing
9
   that I'm asking and demanding is for justice to me made and
10
   for us not to be ignored. No more humiliation for the
11
   workers of Gerawan. Thank you.
12
             CHAIRMAN GOULD: Thank you. All right, thank you
13
   very much, all, for your participation.
14
              (Applause.)
15
             CHAIRMAN GOULD: We're turn to the --
16
              (Off-the-record discussion.)
17
             CHAIRMAN GOULD: We'll turn to the next witness
18
   which is Mr. Howard Sagaser.
19
              (Off-the-record discussion.)
20
             CHAIRMAN GOULD: All right, let's go ahead.
21
   Sagaser, please proceed.
22
             MR. SAGASER: Good evening, Chairman Gould, other
23
   Board Members.
24
             I would like to echo, at the beginning, Mr.
25
   Barsamian's comments about Antonio Barbosa. I've been
```

practicing before the Board since 1976 and I would say that if we could have him cloned and have him throughout the whole Agency, I think both sides would have great confidence in the Agency.

So, I'm going to miss him because he's no doubt -- I think --

CHAIRMAN GOULD: Well, he's not going anyplace. He's right here with us and we don't have to miss him.

MR. SAGASER: Well, I keep hearing rumors -CHAIRMAN GOULD: No, no, no. There's no validity
to any rumors. He's staying right here with us.

MR. SAGASER: Keep him as long as you can.

I think it's not really a rule that I'm going to address, but I think more of an idea or a concept. And I've submitted a legal paper there, which I think sets forth a lot of the legal problems with the idea of having this access.

And I would simply state that the conditions that supported the emergency regulation in 1975, where the California Supreme Court narrowly upheld access under those conditions cannot be justified today.

What this Board is considering is an exercise of police power. And I think when you're going to exercise the police power it has to be justified by conditions and in order to intrude upon constitutional rights.

And what we're talking about here is the constitutional rights of the property owners to not have outside interference with their property. And that's been recognized by the various courts, the United States Supreme Court, with CalOSHA coming onto private property without a warrant, the Leckier(phonetic) decision.

We've cited all kinds of various cases. When CalOSHA comes on, they make sure they get consent, no unnecessary interference. And I think the U.S. Supreme Court, in the Leckier decision make it very clear that access would be only allowed under extreme situations that would be justified on a case-by-case basis.

And I urge you to have your legal staff go back and reread the access rule case. You'll see there is no balancing against 1st Amendment rights against 5th because it wouldn't be justified.

It was only justified as an exercise of police power that existed at that time.

I'm not going to bore you with the details of the legal because I think the paper speaks for itself and I present it to you.

But one thing that you have to look at is if you're going to exercise a police power, why is this needed? Why, after 40 years? Why after 40 years, with the San Diego Nursery case is there this need for education?

And why does this agency? As I pointed out in my paper, there's over 500 Federal agencies and over 500 State agencies that could make the same justification that education, everybody is for education.

But we could have the Department of Fair and Public Housing, EEOC saying it's very important to go out and educate about their rights.

We could have the Registrar of Voters, the county clerk making the same pitch. We can have nutritional.

So, I think that if you're going to embark upon this course and actually come up with rules, I think the first hurdle you're going to have is showing that there are not alternative means of communication.

And I think this is the problem for justifying even the union access rule. What are we talking about that's changed in the landscape since 1975?

First off is the internet, and the website, cell phones. None of those alternatives of communication existed back then. But you've heard comments from the various agencies here, who have testified, that they have websites. The ALRB has their own website for education purposes. You have pamphlets.

And the Department of Fair Employment and Housing has been very effective in creating a pamphlet that's handed out to the workers when they're hired, explaining

sexual harassment.

There's no reason the ALRB couldn't develop a neutral pamphlet to be handed out, similar to the type of pamphlet handed out by the other agencies. And it would be neutral. It would be already -- we wouldn't be worried about what's being said out there in these educational seminars.

I echo Mr. Barsamian's comments about the interference with production. Who's going to pay for this, the cost on the employees? Can you reach them there? I think through the social media, whether it be Facebook or any of the other ones it would be good.

But I think what didn't exist is why not have your people go on to various radio stations and talk about their rights and do it.

In 1975, there's very few Spanish-speaking radio stations. Well, what I presented to you today and printed it off, there are over 150 Spanish-speaking radio stations in California, alone.

CHAIRMAN GOULD: Excuse me just a second. We've got to have a little bit of quiet back there because we're in a formal proceeding.

If you want to have some conversations, you can do it in the hallway out there.

Go ahead.

MR. SAGASER: I think that the same is for television. In 1975, when your access rule was enacted under emergency conditions, we didn't have the Spanish-speaking television stations.

I'm going to tell you there's 50 plus Spanish-speaking television stations in the United States. That when you go onto the cable, or these various channels, you have at least four major networks that are Spanish-speaking.

So, really, to get the message out and educate that there's so many alternative means that don't infringe upon constitutional rights. Billboards. You know, I've seen the billboards, going down the road, for both sides in the Gerawan dispute. It's a very effective way to get people's attention and directing them to website.

You know, you can consider outreach programs for the schools, the adult education, doing it there. I think the idea of having a video available for people that want it, that's fine. You can make it voluntary basis for people to show it.

But I think you have the UC Extension and their abilities to engage in outreach.

And that's just kind of a quick sampling from myself. So, I think that -- because once you get into the legal inquiry, it's going to be if you're going to intrude

upon a private, constitutional property right, you have to show that there's no other alternatives that are less restrictive. And I don't think that the showing can be made.

I think that, yes, there's a need for education. I agree with Mr. Raimondo in that we have to look at who's going to be doing the education, if you're not going to be doing it through pamphlets or through means where it's being controlled.

I think that it's been 40 years and I believe that a lot of comments you're hearing here is because of the lack of trust.

I think that in 40 years, I would think the agency would have built more trust than it has. And I think that's something, that as it goes forward -- and that's why Antonio, I think he has built that trust.

I can tell you that I've had bad experiences when it comes to worker education in the filed through the remedy process. I had agents go out and flat out tell the people that the company was bad and needed a union. So much for your Labor Code Section 1145 and 1149, which talks about going out and doing things in a neutral fashion.

So, I think a lot of the comments you're hearing here are predicated on a lack of trust, a lack of neutrality. And I think that if this Board weighs in to

the access and starts having agents go out and talking to groups, you're going to get all kinds of complaints, maybe civil rights violations.

But if you manage the content through radio ads, through pamphlets, these other sources you're not going to run those problems.

So, I will tell you that access, from a (inaudible) stand point, isn't the solution. Mandatory access on private property, from a legal stand point, cannot be justified.

And I would urge this Board to look at the alternative means and pursue those because I think education of people, of their rights, is a lofty goal. But it can't be done at the expense of constitutional rights.

And I'd be glad to answer any questions.

CHAIRMAN GOULD: So, I just wanted to -- I haven't had a chance -- I've just gotten your paper here and it will be part of our record.

But I wanted to make sure that you -- you're saying that the 1976 ruling of the California Supreme Court on access is -- would not be good law today, is that correct?

MR. SAGASER: That's correct. It couldn't be justified in any U.S. Supreme court, and Leckier has already spoken on that. It's a very narrow decision. If

you go back and read it, it was four/three. And it's saying that based on conditions that currently exist, again, there's no alternative means of education.

And I think what you're hearing from me, and everybody here, is that 40 years later the world has changed. There are alternate means of communication. And I'm sure I've overlooked a lot. But the message does get out there.

And that's why I'm saying that even then the California Supreme Court, in '75 and '76, the rules were probably made in '75 and the decision was in '76, they couldn't -- they didn't do a constitutional weighing of the interests because it couldn't be justified even then. They just said it's a proper exercise of police power on the conditions that currently exist at that time.

We've since had, and I've cited in my paper, the U.S. Supreme Court talking about the bill of rights registration law, saying it was a valid law at the time it was passed. There was a need. But in the year 2015, your police power can no longer be justified.

It's not unlimited. And I think when you have police power and it encroaches upon constitutional rights, that's a very dangerous zone for the Board to enter.

Particularly when I think there's cheaper and better alternative methods that you can reach a broader audience.

1 I think, you know, these stations, you've got the 2 public stations that are Spanish-speaking. So, you've got 3 a lot of people to go on and talk. A lot of these private 4 stations, I'm sure that allow your people to come on and 5 talk, and education. Your pamphlets, billboards, all of those things, your website. So, I'm not going to continue 6 7 to repeat myself. 8 But, yes, that decision is very narrow. 9 CHAIRMAN GOULD: Any questions from my 10 colleagues? 11 BOARD MEMBER SHIROMA: No, thank you. 12 BOARD MEMBER RIVERA-HERNANDEZ: Thank you. 13 MR. SAGASER: Thank you. 14 CHAIRMAN GOULD: Thank you very much. 15 Okay. Now, all right, we go now to -- Antonio, 16 you've arranged for a UFW panel. 17 Okay, do you want to speak next? Is our 18 interpreter still here? 19 MR. BLANCO: Yes, she is. 20 CHAIRMAN GOULD: Okay. All right. So, how would 21 you like to proceed? Who would like to speak, first? 22 UNIDENTIFIED FEMALE: From the first person on 23 the left. 24 MR. MARQUEZ: (Through Interpreter.) 25 afternoon, everyone. My name is Rafael Marquez Amaro.

am a fieldworker. I've been working for seven years in the peach industry, table grapes, and raisin grapes, and several -- many other jobs.

I want to thank you for giving me the space. I, like the rest of the workers, know what needs there are in the fields. That's why it's very important that you, as agents, go to the fields to take the message to me and all my coworkers. Because a lot of them don't know information about their rights. A lot of us do know them, but a lot of them don't.

That's why I'm asking that you, all of you, I'm sorry, along with other agencies, go directly to our work area. Thank you.

(Applause)

CHAIRMAN GOULD: Mr. Rodriguez.

MR. RODRIGUEZ: (Through Interpreter.) Good afternoon. Thank you for receiving us in this place. I'm here to support the proposal that you brought. It's very important for the conditions to work in the fields to have a change. This is our opportunity to let you all know that it's important for you guys to show up in the fields, and start checking more up close. It's not sufficient for the companies to shows us the videos, or flyers, where they're supposedly explaining our rights.

For me, it's more important that you guys send

out people to the crews to explain the rights that we have as fieldworkers.

The farmers don't like, as I was listening a while ago, they don't like to invest their money because they're going to take time from the company and from the labor law. But they're only protecting themselves.

That's why it's important to me and I support your proposal. A lot of workers that haven't been here in this country for that long, they speak different languages and they don't know their rights. That's why it's important that you guys check this up close and let us know about our rights. And different languages, that there's people that don't speak Spanish or any other language. Because there's a lot of violations inside the fieldwork. Thank you.

(Applause.)

CHAIRMAN GOULD: Next, Ana Rosa Romero.

MS. ROMERO: Good evening, everyone. My name is Ana Rosa Romero. And I'm here to let you guys know that it's a pretty good idea that you guys push the bills because (inaudible) -- for whoever wants to put in a complaint is we get off late from work and it's a long drive. So, it's a good idea for you guys to go and make sure like how everything -- you know, inform everyone about their rights.

Because like my coworkers, most of them, they don't know about their rights. So, it's a good idea for you guys to do that. Thank you.

(Applause)

CHAIRMAN GOULD: Thank you. Jared Romero (phonetic).

MR. ROMERO: (Through Interpreter.) Good afternoon. With all due respect to you guys, I disagree with the labor law. I'm here to support you because the reality is, it is necessary to be present in the fields. Why? Because the companies, they tell you certain things about the law when there's a violation. The labor law receives that, but doesn't receive the rest.

I've had a lot of experiences with young men that have been hurt in the fields. I haven't got hurt. But it hurts and you feel that. And that they do whatever possible to fire them instead of giving them the right of helping. You see this is many companies.

(Applause)

MR. ROMERO: And they've never done anything when a worker was abled -- thank God that the law is for this and they complied. Because it's always us that are damaged because of the abuse of the -- the mistreatment of the companies. We work with love because we have a family and they depend on us.

(Applause)

MR. ROMERO: But the companies take advantage of a Mexican worker that comes here.

THE INTERPRETER: And I apologize, I need to ask him to repeat the last part.

MR. ROMERO: Of a Mexican worker that comes here to try to better himself.

Another thing, I don't have words, but I feel bad. I've been here in California for nine years and I work every day to support my family. And I've seen this type of violation. That's why I approve that you guys go. And it's good for you guys to see this because --

(Applause)

MR. ROMERO: A lot of people have left these fields hurt and they forget about the leg as if they were some old tool and I --

(Applause)

CHAIRMAN GOULD: Esperanza Ruiz.

MS. RUIZ: (Through Interpreter.) Good afternoon. My name is Esperanza Ruiz. And I thank you very much for being present here, for listening to all the fieldworkers that are here. There's some few, but there's a lot, and some of them know their rights. But that's not true because if they knew their rights, they would be here to hear you guys and they would give other people that

information.

I have been a fieldworker for 15 years. And in those 15 years I've seen a lot of things. I've seen some improvements. Thanks to the agencies that are helping us, the workers, this has happened.

But, nevertheless, there's always new people coming every year that don't know their rights. So, it's important for you guys to come and talk to them.

For example, I just learned about a year ago about the rights that if there's two or more people that they want to request a change for the company, if a decision that's more complete, more strong. Now, I know. And if I'm with my coworkers and there's something about a salary, I try to talk to them to request a raise. I've learned a lot of things that --

(Applause)

MS. RUIZ: -- they came and given us information.

Now, to make this stronger, you guys come along and see

with your own eyes everything that's going on that I -
(Applause)

 $\label{eq:ms.RUIZ:} \mbox{I thank you for your time and God} \\ \mbox{bless you.} \mbox{ Thank you.}$ 

CHAIRMAN GOULD: And Ofelia Reyes, please.

MS. REYES: (Through Interpreter.) Good
afternoon. My name is Ofelia Reyes. What I've come to ask

that it's good that you guys go see the work in the field so that I can see like my coworkers see it. Because it's true, there's a lot of things that are out of control and that there are mistakes. And what I'm asking, that there's a lot of people that come from Mexico here and a lot of those don't speak Spanish or English. So, they can know their rights and it can be interpreted for the language of Mixteco, Zapoteco and other languages.

Other languages, a lot of violence and they need to know their rights. Because they don't know, they do whatever their bosses or their brothers tell them, whatever they want. So, that's what I'm asking for. And what I'm asking for is that if you go to the fields, that you take an interpreter so that you tell them and they know their rights.

And it's necessary, that's why I plea to you, I plea to you guys that it's necessary in the field. Thank you very much.

(Applause.)

CHAIRMAN GOULD: Okay, thank you to everyone.

And we will go, next, to the next witness who is Mr. Tal

Cloud, who is identified as a small business owner.

MR. CLOUD: Thank you, Chairman Gould. My name is Tal Cloud and I am a small business owner here in Fresno. I'm also involved in political issues with my

group, Common Sense Information. And I take -- I really don't take the side of anyone's part. I've been both ways. I've been on the union's side and the other side.

I take positions that are more related to what I feel right and what I feel are wrong.

So, I'm going to testify today about my concerns about these regulations and how they would apply based on the last 40 years of the ALRB's existence. And the fact that today, after 40 years of existence, you think that you have the skill sets to administer these regulations when California's State Legislature has provided a number of different areas where, you know, employees will know their rights.

So, you're saying that your skill set as a Board, as an organization will have more effect than what the Legislature has had over the last 40 years because, in your eyes, it's been a failure in terms of educating the workers. Which I totally disagree with.

I think the workers now have more rights and they understand their rights more now than they ever have.

But you're saying your organization can do this.

And if that's your mentality and that your organization has the skill set to administer these new rules, and create new rules, and go into the fields and educate the public, I want to look at, you know, some of the way your

organization is set up in the event that these agents of the ALRB will go then out in the field.

When I went today to look at your information of the Board, I want to read something from your front page about the Board.

It says, "The Administrative Law Judges who take evidence and make initial recommendations in the form of written decisions with respect to issues of fact or laws raised by all parties."

Which I've written that off because in many of the cases that I've read with the ALJ, representing your organization, that has not been the case.

Specifically, let me read the --

CHAIRMAN GOULD: Well, Mr. Cloud --

MR. CLOUD: I think you're giving everybody a lot of latitude.

17 CHAIRMAN GOULD: We have given everybody a lot of latitude. But what I'd like you to do is --

MR. COULD: Well, I --

20 CHAIRMAN GOULD: You're supposed to focus on this rule.

MR. CLOUD: Well, I am going to focus on this rule and the way I'm --

CHAIRMAN GOULD: In regard to a wide variety of

25 cases that may --

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

19

MR. CLOUD: Well, this is specifically one. Silas Shawver, who was an employee of yours --

CHAIRMAN GOULD: Come to our public meetings where --

MR. CLOUD: I do. Silas Shawver, who was an employee of yours, who theoretically could have had a whistle blower complaint, and that you all chose not to investigate, he -- when he was with the CRLA, he was not truthful about his conversations. ALG confirmed that they never filed the workers, that Shawver -- Shawver was the one that made that story up.

My point is that you all want to put rules, and you want people to come into the field and educate the employees. Yet, your organization has failed with the truth.

You, as an organization, you put a company through a 105-day trial, yet the ALJ, the same ALJ that worked on the Goven (phonetic) case, that didn't let the truth get in the way of the UFW argument, in fact was cited with not being truthful. In fact, the ALJ, he disregarded the information of the untruthful witness in the case of just believing what the employee says.

You say -- you say, after a 105-day trial, you've chosen not to give a ruling. Now, how does your organization have the ability to come out and --

CHAIRMAN GOULD: Mr. Cloud, we're focused on this proposed ruling today.

MR. CLOUD: Right. But how does that, how does that prepare -- if you go out into the field, whatever you say, how can any of us have trust that what you are going to do is right when you can't even follow your own rules to give a ruling on a case that should have been decided.

Now, had this been a smaller farm that didn't have the millions and millions of dollars to waste this time at your court hearing, then it would be a different story.

So, what I'm talking about today is that your organization is not capable of doing it. And the lack of poor leadership created by your predecessors and now it's on your hands because you've eliminated some of the people, you must deal with your own house, first.

Because your incompetence in directing your staff to do what's right for all parties, not just the UFW, it needs to change.

And we all know that you're not in business without unions, you're not in business without complaints.

But when you have people, that you allow to work for you, that aren't truthful, how then can you go into the field and educate employees about their rights?

So, my concern about these -- these regulations

that you're putting forward is that you don't have the mechanisms in place to allow truthful, honest people by the fact that your Boards are filled with people who have UFW connections and friendships, and they're not impartial.

So, until you, as an organization, can be impartial about the way you disseminate information and take information in, you shouldn't be, you know, trespassing on people's fields.

So, that's my point today. And I'm sure it's not something you want to hear, but I would suggest you get your house in order before you try to go ruin other farms and with misinformation. Because to date, you have not been truthful and much of your information from employees that work for your organization.

CHAIRMAN GOULD: Are you in agriculture, Mr. Cloud?

MR. CLOUD: I'm in agricultural packaging. I sell agricultural packaging throughout the Western United States. I'm a family-owned company that started with \$100, myself, my mother and my sister about 30 years ago. And we've been in this valley, now, for 30 years. Again, we sell from deep into Mexico to way north in Canada, Korea and Hawaii.

So, I'm in the agricultural packaging business and so I deal with people across all industries. And the

1 one thing that I know, there's not one farmer that I deal 2 with on a daily basis that wants anything negative to 3 happen to their employees. Because what's happening in 4 this country now is without our employees, we are nothing. 5 And without my employees, in my company, I am nothing. 6 And so I think the mentality that there's an 7 employer out there that wants to harm their employees 8 without giving information is wrong. Our employees are our 9 partners. And that's the way I think your Board needs to 10 look at employees. 11 CHAIRMAN GOULD: Any questions from my 12 colleagues? 13 BOARD MEMBER SHIROMA: Thank you. 14 BOARD MEMBER RIVERA-HERNANDEZ: No. 15 CHAIRMAN GOULD: Okay, thank you. 16 MR. CLOUD: Thank you. 17 CHAIRMAN GOULD: All right, the next --18 MR. BLANCO: I think there's somebody else. 19 have a potential addition that's not on the list. 20 CHAIRMAN GOULD: Okay. 21 MR. BLANCO: I don't know if she wants to come 22 Ms. Brown, do you want to come forward? Ms. forward. 23 Laura Brown. 24 MS. BROWN: Good evening. My name's Laura Brown. 25 I do government affairs for California Citrus Mutual.

a grower/trade association representing our State citrus growers.

I'm going to try very hard, I know it's been a long day. I think we call this a little bit of meeting fatigue. I'm going to try very hard not to repeat any sentiments that have already been expressed before me.

And I couldn't help thinking through the day about missed opportunities in this process. I think that a lot could have been done before this meeting happened and the series that you're about to embark upon on the Central Coast.

I think that there could have been outreach to associations, such as ours, that could reach out to employers and would have built a consensus in an effort of good faith to find solutions to this, and to hear the concerns and try to find common goals as far as how to go forward.

I know that there are current laws, regulations that growers are already complying with and they've been enforcing these through their grower -- through their employee handbooks, through meetings, through tailgates.

I know that issues, such as this, truly can't be taken care of in a tailgate. These are very complex issues and they need to be thoroughly understood by all of the employees at any given company.

But efforts, such as this, are being undertaken. And when we come into a situation like this, it's as if we're already implying guilt. Not to say that every employer is going to be perfect, but there are a lot of employers out there that are doing their absolute best to ensure that they're complying with the rules and regulations, and their employees are being treated fairly and justly.

Actually, in a prior life I used to work over on the Central Coast, and I worked conducting adult education for supervisors, for supervisors out in the fields. And we would conduct interviews regarding how to retain employees. Because the demand for labor in every aspect of agriculture is so how.

And when you ask a farmer, what is their number one challenge? It's a reliable workforce. If they're going to have the amount of people that they need to harvest a crop every day.

And so, they asked us to go out there and figure out exactly what it is that they can do to keep their employees in the field.

It saddens me to hear stories of people not being paid the minimum wage. I think that's a huge surprise to me. I don't think I've ever encountered that in my time with agriculture. If anything, growers are doing whatever

they can to pay above minimum ways. And they're doing incentive programs, healthcare. And they're trying to think outside the box about what they can do to create a positive working environment for their employees.

So, I truly don't like it when people come up here and complain and they don't offer alternatives.

I really appreciated the suggestion of a focus group. I think that that would be well worth your time as far as how to go forward and how to create something that would truly solve the problem.

I'd also like to see something along the lines of a train the trainer program. Perhaps if ALRB could conduct something along those lines.

It's very difficult for you to staff a training program that can truly go out and reach every single agricultural employer. But if you could create a program in which ALRB could train trainers of the different agricultural entities, and they can go forth and carry on trainings at their level, and we see this carried out in the heat prevention, pesticide safety. I think that's a role that can surely be taken on.

And I think you also have to do it in a very realistic way. You can't do a training with a room filled with 800 people. Because your idea is you want them to actually retain the information, want them to go share it

with their colleagues that weren't there. And I think it's really got to take a look at how do you approach education? How do you approach retention and information that's been shared? And, therefore, compliance.

And so, these are issues that I would like to propose. This has been -- I know this has been challenging sometimes. It's a challenging subject to teach, as well. But there's so many other avenues to go about this.

It's hard to go out into a field and asking for someone's time, because time is so valuable. Especially for a farmworker, especially for someone who's picking at piece rate.

I know when I did that we would offer incentives, such as an international phone card, and that was a way they were okay taking a little bit of time out of their day to answer some of our questions about their work environment.

And, you know, things like that are -- we have to think outside the box on something like this. We can't say that we're just going to send regulators out there to start meetings and to start informing employees because there are a lot of questions as far as how you're going to choose where to go.

You want to make sure that this is a fair process as you go forward. And so, that's what I would recommend.

CHAIRMAN GOULD: Well, it's duly noted and it's very good advice. I do want to not sort of correct, but just to amplify one point that you made. And that is that -- two, I want to make two points. One is that we have reached out. And perhaps we weren't -- I wasn't aware of your organization and should have reached out to you directly.

But we have reached out to a number of employer organizations and to employers, themselves. And we -- I mean, I created, this summer, this Ad Hoc Committee which is going to look at a number of things that we are thinking of doing.

And we've gotten feedback from them. We're getting feedback from them today and we'll get feedback from them in the future. Point number one.

Point number two, I'm not sure -- we want input.

I'm not sure that in all instances we can necessarily get

complete consensus. You know, in some instances we have to

proceed as we're obliged to proceed to implement this law

as written.

But your point is well taken that we need to get public input. And that's what our meeting was about in August. That's what it's about today and in the future.

And I'm very grateful to you for coming here and providing constructive advice to us.

1 I don't know, do my colleagues have some 2 questions here you want to put forth? 3 BOARD MEMBER SHIROMA: No. I appreciate it and 4 appreciate your laser-like commentary at the late hour. 5 Thank you. 6 CHAIRMAN GOULD: Cathryn? 7 BOARD MEMBER RIVERA-HERNANDEZ: No, thank you. CHAIRMAN GOULD: Eduardo? 8 9 MR. BLANCO: Yes. So, I just wanted to make sure 10 we had her contact information. 11 CHAIRMAN GOULD: Okay, thank you very much, Ms. 12 Brown. 13 (Off-the-record discussion.) CHAIRMAN GOULD: So, our next witness is Irma 14 15 Luna. Okay, we gotta proceed here. We have to -- okay, 16 let's proceed. Ms. Luna, would you please identify 17 yourself and tell us a little bit about yourself, and what 18 it is that you would like to say to our Board today. 19 MS. LUNA: Yes. Yes, good evening. My name is 20 Irma Luna. I'm currently employed with ALRB as a Field 21 Examiner at the Visalia Office. 22 I also consider myself a member of the community 23 here, in the valley. I've been in the valley for close to 24 20 years. Moved here in late 1996 from the State of 25 Washington. Ever since, I've lived here.

And just about the proposal that you guys are talking about in presenting, I think it's very, very important that there's outreach in the field work and to talk to workers. And most importantly, as we've heard from other experts here, that there's a lack of -- the language barrier, it's really huge in the valley. There's a lot of newcomers that do not speak the language, and speak their own language, which makes it a little bit harder.

I do understand that there are a lot of migrant farmworkers that do speak the language and have a little bit better knowledge of what their labor rights are. And I'm, you know, happy for them because that's good for them to put it in practice.

But you're still talking about farmworkers that are coming to this country every year, the new migrant farmworkers that are still lacking that, you know, part.

CHAIRMAN GOULD: When you say the language, you mean the Spanish language?

MS. LUNA: Mixteco, indigenous language. I speak Mixteco, myself. And having somebody to do that kind of education to the community, one-on-one, it's very effective. And especially if you have someone which speaks their own language, which would be very effective.

I understand that there's going to be a lot of other challenges, but if the effort is there to do it, I

think everything is possible.

MR. BLANCO: I just wanted the record to reflect that we requested Ms. Luna to speak today. And she's less of a volunteer than one might think.

And also that because of her being our only Mixteco-speaking employee, we thought that perspective would be one that the Board should hear from her with respect to the Mixteco community. And how outreach is an issue that she could speak upon because in her past she has worked for CRLA. For how many years?

MS. LUNA: Fifteen years for CRLA.

MR. BLANCO: And she also was one of the interviewers in the Dr. Mines --

MS. LUNA: Survey.

MR. BLANCO: -- indigenous survey. So that she has that perspective to provide to the Board on this issue.

And you've heard -- to cut things down to the bones of it, again, as Ms. Brown said, we've gotten to the point where we've heard a lot of folks essentially saying the same things.

But I did want to get your perspective on the technology issue and whether or not that segment of the farmworker population has access to that technology and uses it?

MS. LUNA: I've been to many farmworkers' homes

and that's something that I don't see. I visit many families for interviews for other reasons, and it's not so common. Some families do have it, but the family that I've talked to and visited, it's you don't find computers in their homes.

In keeping in touch with the people that I work with, it's very difficult because most of them tend to have like those rechargeable phones or their prepaid phone, with a card. You lose contact with them because it's not a phone that they have service, that they keep, you know, for year after year, like most of us do when we go through a phone company.

A lot of the people, they buy their phone on the corner store which, you know, has a certain amount of minutes in them and they just get rid of it. And it's hard to keep in touch with the farmworkers sometimes because of that.

MR. BLANCO: Now, also, there's commentary about trying to use methods of brochures, and written materials like that. But is there a problem with doing that as well, with the Mixteco community?

MS. LUNA: For the indigenous community, it doesn't make any sense to have any brochure in Spanish or in Mixteco because the majority of them, they would have to know how to read Spanish in order for them to understand

the written indigenous language. The written indigenous language is more for academics, not for farmworkers.

MR. BLANCO: Some of the -- we also talked about legal concepts and the complexity of some of these legal concepts. And I think Mr. Vasquez spoke to the point that -- and Ms. Keffer, I think as well, that a concept like protected concerted activity isn't something that somebody might normally think of as being a way to be able to advance a position and then have protection from what you're -- you know, from retaliation for speaking in a group.

And do you think it means, in the Mixteco community, do you think that that's true that they don't have any knowledge or awareness of that kind of a protection?

MS. LUNA: Well, I think what I can tell you is that they put it in practice a lot at work, but they don't know what it means. Because in our community, they're — they work in groups. And wherever they tend to settle, it's always by group. If a family moves to somewhere, they're going to be pulling other families and telling them about someone.

So, pretty soon people are coming from Guerrero or Moxaca and they know where to go because a family recommended that place.

So, whatever place works the same, it's usually a referral, a recommendation of somebody who is working there already. So, they tend to do a lot of things as a group.

But they're aware that it's protected and they will probably continue speaking for each other and protected each other. But they have no idea that it is protected under the Act. And if there is retaliation what or where can they go? A lot of people just don't know.

MR. BLANCO: And during your time with the CRLA, were you aware of the Agricultural Labor Relations Act?

MS. LUNA: At first, no. I honestly have to say no. It wasn't until a couple of years later that we worked with a group of workers that were fired for concerted activities. So, we worked for the portion of getting their money back. And then it was referred to the ALRB. That's how I found out more about the ALRB.

MR. BLANCO: I think I'm going to stop there.

CHAIRMAN GOULD: Okay.

MR. BLANCO: It gets more cumulative.

CHAIRMAN GOULD: Do either of you have questions?

BOARD MEMBER RIVERA-HERNANDEZ: Thank you. I was wondering about -- we've heard a lot about the trust issues and the networks, and how you gave access and overcome that obstacle. Is speaking the language enough or how have you

25 been able to do that with them?

MS. LUNA: One thing is the language, speaking the language. I think if they see somebody from an agency that speaks their language, you know, not immediately, but you do gain their trust if you work with known agencies, and like grass root organizations. It's you gain their trust that way.

But like Rick said, it's really important to go into their network, their leader, their head person of their "communidad", talk to that person. And they always have somebody who leads the community. And so, if you get to that person you gain their trust, and then pretty soon you gain the trust of their whole community from that, you know, part of their town.

BOARD MEMBER RIVERA-HERNANDEZ: And those employees that you have worked with or have come through the door, how have they found out about the ALRB?

MS. LUNA: You mean currently?

BOARD MEMBER RIVERA-HERNANDEZ: Uh-hum.

MS. LUNA: We have somebody, very rare walk into the office. Mostly, we get phone calls and they just get referred by other agencies, telling them to call us. And a lot of the calls are about wages and so then we have to refer them back. We get a lot of calls when it's about wages because it's -- in Spanish, they call us "La Ley Laboral", so immediately, you know, "Ley Laboral", they

must deal with wages. But then we get a lot of the calls by phone.

BOARD MEMBER RIVERA-HERNANDEZ: Thank you.

BOARD MEMBER SHIROMA: Okay, Ms. Luna, we really appreciate your service at the Agricultural Labor Relations Board in the Visalia Office.

My question is we heard a lot about "Radio Bilingue" and the once-a-week-four-hours of program for indigenous language programming.

Do you see that reaching a wide audience and perhaps growing over time, from once-a-week, for four hours?

MS. LUNA: Well, it has. At first, for a couple of years, it was -- at first it was one hour. And then it increased to two hours. And I'm not sure, but maybe like five years -- or four years, more or less, it increased to four hours every Sunday.

But during those four hours, only one hour is for, you know, any topic for, you know, community information. And it's usually from, I think, 10:00 to -- no, 11:00 to 12:00, I think, and the rest is basically for radio listeners to call in. Because from 2:00 and -- no, from 12:00 and on there's a connection with Oaxaca. So, a lot of the families that lived in Oaxaca, they'll listen to it and they'll call to send dedication to their family.

And vice-versa, people that live here, they'll call in and a lot of them in Oaxaca will listen to it. But that's specific time, only one hour is dedicated for any agencies that's pretty much open to go and do community education through the radio station.

MS. SNELL: Okay.

BOARD MEMBER RIVERA-HERNANDEZ: Have you ever participated in that program?

MS. LUNA: Yes, many times. It's because it's the only, right know, that does it in Mixteco. Actually, there's one that recently started, it's on air, and it's called (speaking Spanish), and it's down in Oxnard. But it's very new, so not many people know about it.

And they also have a space for agencies to do, you know, any kind of presentation.

BOARD MEMBER RIVERA-HERNANDEZ: Okay.

MR. BLANCO: And what about the Spanish TV stations, are they doing anything?

MS. LUNA: Yes, Univision have a program that's called "Arriba Valle Central". It's pre-recorded and it's also dedicated to, you know, give information to the public. And it's usually early in the morning, 5:00 in the morning. So a lot of people are, if not already heading out to work are getting ready, and I find it effective because a lot of people watch that program in the morning.

And, you know, they find out about agencies around. So, I find that effective because, you know, it's you're talking to somebody there on TV and they're listening to you. I've also done it in Mixteco on that TV station. MR. BLANCO: And do you know if that's -- so, that's here in the San Juaquin Valley area?

MS. LUNA: Yes.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

but I don't know.

MR. BLANCO: And do you know about any other parts of the State or do they have similar TV programs? MS. LUNA: I don't know. I would assume they do,

12 CHAIRMAN GOULD: Okay, well, thank you very much. 13 And I want to reiterate what my colleague has said, and 14 that is that we thank you very much for your work at the 15 Board and for your taking the time and trouble to testify

before us here, today. Particularly at this late hour.

And I want to conclude by saying that I thank all of you who have participated in this proceeding for your input and your valuable contribution.

As I said earlier, we will be continuing these hearings on the 14th in Salinas, and the 15th in Santa Maria. And we plan to schedule a similar hearing in Oxnard, soon thereafter.

Thank you very much, all.

BOARD MEMBER SHIROMA: Thank you.

## REPORTER'S CERTIFICATE

I do hereby certify that the testimony in the foregoing hearing was taken at the time and place therein stated; that the testimony of said witnesses were reported by me, a certified electronic court reporter and a disinterested person, and was under my supervision thereafter transcribed into typewriting.

And I further certify that I am not of counsel or attorney for either or any of the parties to said hearing nor in any way interested in the outcome of the cause named in said caption.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand this 16th day of September, 2015.

\_\_\_\_\_

Jacqueline Denlinger

## CERTIFICATE OF TRANSCRIBER

I do hereby certify that the testimony in the foregoing hearing was taken at the time and place therein stated; that the testimony of said witnesses were transcribed by me, a certified transcriber and a disinterested person, and was under my supervision thereafter transcribed into typewriting.

And I further certify that I am not of counsel or attorney for either or any of the parties to said hearing nor in any way interested in the outcome of the cause named in said caption.

I certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript, to the best of my ability, from the electronic sound recording of the proceedings in the above-entitled matter.

MARTHA L. NELSON, CERT\*\*367

September 16, 2015

