

# HOUSE BILL REPORT

## 2SHB 1491

---

---

### As Amended by the Senate

**Title:** An act relating to prohibiting unjustified employer searches of employee personal vehicles.

**Brief Description:** Prohibiting unjustified employer searches of employee personal vehicles.

**Sponsors:** House Committee on Appropriations (originally sponsored by Representatives Orcutt, Chapman, Berry, Bronoske, Tharinger and Pollet).

### Brief History:

#### Committee Activity:

Labor & Workplace Standards: 2/8/23, 2/15/23 [DPS];

Appropriations: 2/23/23, 2/24/23 [DP2S(w/o sub LAWS)].

#### Floor Activity:

Passed House: 3/2/23, 87-10.

Senate Amended.

Passed Senate: 4/11/23, 45-4.

### Brief Summary of Second Substitute Bill

- Prohibits an employer from searching an employee's vehicle in the employer's parking areas, subject to certain exceptions.
- Provides for employee possession of their private property in their vehicle, unless prohibited by law.
- Prohibits retaliation, and provides for investigations and potential civil penalties by the Department of Labor and Industries.

---

### HOUSE COMMITTEE ON LABOR & WORKPLACE STANDARDS

**Majority Report:** The substitute bill be substituted therefor and the substitute bill do pass. Signed by 9 members: Representatives Berry, Chair; Fosse, Vice Chair; Robertson,

---

*This analysis was prepared by non-partisan legislative staff for the use of legislative members in their deliberations. This analysis is not part of the legislation nor does it constitute a statement of legislative intent.*

Ranking Minority Member; Schmidt, Assistant Ranking Minority Member; Bronoske, Connors, Doglio, Ormsby and Ortiz-Self.

**Staff:** Trudes Tango (786-7384).

---

## HOUSE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

**Majority Report:** The second substitute bill be substituted therefor and the second substitute bill do pass and do not pass the substitute bill by Committee on Labor & Workplace Standards. Signed by 30 members: Representatives Ormsby, Chair; Bergquist, Vice Chair; Gregerson, Vice Chair; Macri, Vice Chair; Stokesbary, Ranking Minority Member; Chambers, Assistant Ranking Minority Member; Corry, Assistant Ranking Minority Member; Berg, Chandler, Chopp, Connors, Couture, Davis, Dye, Fitzgibbon, Harris, Lekanoff, Pollet, Riccelli, Rude, Ryu, Sandlin, Schmick, Senn, Simmons, Slatter, Springer, Steele, Stonier and Tharinger.

**Staff:** Emily Stephens (786-7157).

### **Background:**

The Department of Labor and Industries (Department) has general investigative and enforcement authority over "conditions of labor" that are unlawful when detrimental to employee health. Conditions of labor include personal privacy. There are no specific statutes or Department rules regarding workplace searches.

Government employers are subject to federal and state constitutional privacy restrictions. Generally, a government actor needs a warrant supported by probable cause to conduct a search of private property, unless an exception applies. In the employment setting, an exception may apply when the employer has a compelling interest and narrowly tailors the search to achieve that interest.

Under common law, courts generally look to the circumstances, context, and nature of a search to determine whether an invasion of privacy has occurred. In the workplace, these factors may include the business reasons for the search, the intrusiveness of the search, and the degree of privacy of the object searched.

### **Summary of Second Substitute Bill:**

Employers or their agents may not search an employee's privately owned vehicle located on the employer's parking lots, garages, or access roads to the employer's parking lots or garages. An employee may possess any legally possessed private property in the employee's vehicle. An employer must not require, as a condition of employment, that an employee or prospective employee waive those protections.

The prohibition against searches does not apply to:

- vehicles owned or leased by an employer;
- lawful searches by law enforcement officers;
- when a reasonable person would believe that accessing an employee's vehicle is necessary to prevent an immediate threat to human health, life, or safety;
- when the employer requires or authorizes the employee to use the employee's vehicle for work-related activities and the employer needs to inspect the vehicle to ensure it is suited to conduct the work-related activities;
- security inspections on state and federal military installations and facilities;
- vehicles located on state correctional institution premises;
- specific employer areas subject to searches under state or federal law; or
- when an employee consents to a search based on probable cause that the employee unlawfully possesses: employer property; or controlled substances in violation of both federal law and the employer's written policy prohibiting drug use.

The employee's consent must be given immediately prior to the search and the employer may not require that the employee waive consent as a condition of employment. Upon consent, the employee may select a witness to be present during the search.

An employer may not take any adverse action against an employee for exercising any rights established under these provisions. Adverse action means any action taken or threatened by an employer against an employee for exercising the employee's rights, and may include: (1) denying or delaying wages owed; (2) terminating, suspending, demoting, or denying a promotion; (3) reducing an employee's work hours or altering a preexisting schedule; (4) reducing pay; and (5) taking action or threatening to take action based on the employee's or family member's immigration status.

The Department must investigate complaints and may issue civil penalties of not more than \$1,000 for a first violation, and not more than \$5,000 for subsequent violations. Each employee affected by a violation is a separate violation. Civil penalties are deposited in the supplemental pension fund. Regarding claims involving adverse action, the Department may also order appropriate relief, including ordering payment of any earnings the employee did not receive due to the adverse action, plus interest, and restoring the employee to the employee's former or equivalent position.

The Department may adopt rules to further define "probable cause" and "private property."

#### **EFFECT OF SENATE AMENDMENT(S):**

The Senate amendment: (1) codifies the bill in chapter 49.44 RCW, relating to prohibited labor practices, instead of the Industrial Welfare Act; (2) removes provisions related to enforcement by the Department of Labor and Industries (Department), including penalties and the requirement for the Department to adopt rules defining certain terms; and (3) removes the July 1, 2024, effective date.

**Appropriation:** None.

**Fiscal Note:** Available.

**Effective Date:** This bill take effect on July 1, 2024.

**Staff Summary of Public Testimony (Labor & Workplace Standards):**

(In support) This bill has been heard for several sessions. It will protect employees from arbitrary searches of their vehicles. This should be protected by the Constitution but is not. Employers conduct searches on a whim without any probable cause that the employee is in possession of property that is illegal. Employees have been disciplined for having legal items, such as an unopened bottle of wine or unopened beer, in their cars. Under the bill, employers would still have a right to search vehicles under probable cause circumstances.

(Opposed) None.

(Other) It is unclear how the Department will implement this bill as written. The Department would have to determine whether there was legitimate probable cause reasons to search and the Department generally does not make those types of determinations. There is no retaliation provision in the bill. The Department needs rulemaking authority and the bill will impact the Department's information technology system because this creates a new type of complaint that can be filed.

**Staff Summary of Public Testimony (Appropriations):**

(In support) Random searches of vehicles can result in simple purchases of groceries leading to the possible termination of employment. The ongoing implementation cost may be inflated, based on the Department of Labor and Industries' use of a comparison calculation to a complaint category that does not mirror this situation. The cost of inaction outweighs the cost of implementation.

(Opposed) None.

**Persons Testifying (Labor & Workplace Standards):** (In support) Representative Ed Orcutt, prime sponsor; Joshua Estes, Association of Western Pulp and Paper Workers; Justin Welte, Association of Western Pulp and Paper Workers Local 580; Russ Ipock, Association of Western Pulp and Paper Workers Washington Area Council; and Bill Sauters, Association of Western Pulp and Paper Workers Washington.

(Other) Tammy Fellin, Department of Labor and Industries.

**Persons Testifying (Appropriations):** Bill Sauters and Joshua Estes, Association of Western Pulp and Paper Workers Union.

**Persons Signed In To Testify But Not Testifying (Labor & Workplace Standards):**  
None.

**Persons Signed In To Testify But Not Testifying (Appropriations):** None.