



November 1, 2022

VIA EMAIL

Lynne Fox, International President
Workers United, an SEIU Affiliate
22 South 22nd Street
Philadelphia, PA 19103

RE: Response to “National Bargaining Committee” Letter dated October 28, 2022

Dear Ms. Fox:

I received a letter dated October 28, 2022 from a group of individuals who referred to themselves as members of “Starbucks Workers United National Bargaining Committee.” As you know, Workers United did not seek or obtain any right to represent any Starbucks partners at any Starbucks store on a “national” basis. To the contrary, Workers United insisted on obtaining representation at each separate store as a distinct bargaining unit. This means the law requires both sides to negotiate in good faith for each group of partners at every location where Workers United has representation rights, with each single store having its own meetings specific to the represented partners who work in that individual store.

As I have stated previously, we celebrate the diversity that exists among Starbucks partners at each individual store. In each set of negotiations regarding partners at every single store location, we look forward to good faith bargaining focusing on interests of those particular partners.

I am sending you this response to the October 28 letter based on the possibility that you might not even be aware that the letter was sent. You were not copied on the letter (or the email that transmitted it) nor was any other Workers United representative. The more important reason that I am directing this response to you is the fact that the National Labor Relations Act makes Workers United the “exclusive” representative of those partners who work in particular Starbucks stores where Workers United has single store representation rights. For that reason, the law does not permit us to engage in bargaining with individual partners. Regarding Starbucks stores where Workers United has representation rights, we cannot lawfully negotiate with individual partners, which makes it inappropriate for us to engage in back-and-forth exchanges with particular represented partners regarding bargaining issues. It is equally inappropriate for Starbucks to have exchanges with any group purporting to address “national” issues because Workers United has no representation rights that are “national” in scope. To the contrary, at each Starbucks store where Workers United represents Starbucks partners, Workers United insisted on obtaining representation at each separate store as a distinct single-store bargaining unit.

At the same time, we have sympathy regarding some of the frustrations expressed in the October 28 letter about the bargaining process, but the October 28 letter fundamentally misunderstands – and, therefore, inaccurately describes – what has occurred in bargaining to date. For example, the letter does not acknowledge that Starbucks commenced bargaining with Workers United representatives, commencing earlier this year, in several sets of negotiations relating to particular Starbucks stores. Additionally, as indicated in my letter to you dated October 3, 2022, Workers United has repeatedly taken actions that have been responsible for the inability to move forward with bargaining. This misconduct by Workers United representatives has persisted in more recent weeks. Workers United continues to needlessly impose unlawful unilateral restrictions, limitations and requirements regarding how

bargaining must take place, which are now the subject of more than 22 unfair labor practice charges against Workers United that are pending resolution by the National Labor Relations Board. For these reasons, we strongly disagree with statements in the October 28 letter that suggest Starbucks has inappropriately handled any of these issues. More generally, based on the legal restriction that prevents us from negotiating with individual partners who are represented by Workers United, my failure to specifically address other aspects of the October 28 letter should not be construed as any indication that we agree with them.

Finally, to the extent that other aspects of the October 28 letter address the arrangements for bargaining or employment issues relating to Starbucks stores where Workers United has representation rights, those issues must be addressed in the separate sets of negotiations that are specific to each single store location where Workers United represents partners who work at that particular store. Because Workers United insisted on obtaining representation at each separate store as a distinct bargaining unit, the law requires both sides to negotiate in good faith for each group of partners, with each store having its own meetings specific to the represented partners who work in that individual store.

We look forward to making more progress in bargaining regarding important issues that matter at those Starbucks stores where Workers United represents partners. Because Workers United insisted on obtaining representation at each separate store as a distinct bargaining unit, we are especially committed to focusing on issues specific to the particular partners working at each single-store location, in addition to whatever common issues may exist. Because Workers United and Starbucks have designated their respective representatives to address details regarding bargaining dates, times, locations, and other issues, these matters – and the actual conduct of bargaining – should be handled by the particular representatives responsible for each set of negotiations.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'May Jensen', with a long, sweeping flourish extending to the right.

May Jensen
vice president, partner resources