STATE OF WASHINGTON

#### BEFORE THE PUBLIC EMPLOYMENT RELATIONS COMMISSION

In the matter of the petition of:

UNITED STAFF NURSES UNION, LOCAL

141, affiliated with the UNITED

FOOD AND COMMERCIAL WORKERS,

AFL-CIO

Involving certain employees of:

MASON GENERAL HOSPITAL

CASE 8109-E-89-1373

DECISION 3319-A - PECB

CERTIFICATION

Webster, Mrak and Blumberg, by <u>James H. Webster</u> and <u>Mark E. Brennan</u>, Attorneys at Law, appeared on behalf of the petitioner.

Steve Smith, Administrator, appeared on behalf of the employer.

MacDonald, Hoague & Bayless, by <u>Harold H. Green</u>, Attorney at Law, appeared on behalf of incumbent intervenor, Washington State Nurses Association.

Gibbs, Douglas, Theiler and Drachler, by Robert H. Gibbs, Attorney at Law, appeared on behalf of intervenor, District 1199NW, National Union of Hospital and Health Care Employees, SEIU, AFL-CIO.

This matter comes before the Commission on timely objections to prior rulings, filed by the Washington State Nurses Association (WSNA) under WAC 391-25-590(2). The petitioner received a conclusive majority of the ballots cast in a representation election conducted on November 6, 1989. WAC 391-25-650(1)(c) establishes the time for filing of briefs or written arguments on objections filed pursuant to WAC 391-25-590(2). No briefs or written arguments have been received from any party.

The rulings at issue are:

- 1. The Executive Director's rejection, in <u>Mason General Hospital</u>, Decision 3319 (PECB, 1989) of the WSNA's request for an indefinite delay of these proceedings pending the outcome of federal court litigation on the WSNA's claim that a "no raid" agreement exists between the unions involved here; and
- 2. The Executive Director's rejection, in a letter to the parties, of the WSNA's request that the Commission impound the ballots cast by employees in six different pending cases, so that the election results in all such cases might be tallied and announced simultaneously.

#### **DISCUSSION**

### The Request for Indefinite Delay

The Commission has reviewed the motions and arguments advanced by the WSNA on the claimed "no raid agreement" prior to the election, the written statement filed by Local 141 on that issue, and the objections themselves. We find no error.

The Direction of Election issued by the Executive Director reviews the language of the document at issue, the arguments advanced by the parties, the procedures followed by the National Labor Relations Board (NLRB) where it is asked to delay representation proceedings due to a "no raid" agreement, and the procedures followed by this Commission up to this time in such cases.

The "no raid" agreement was, at most, a contractual arrangement between its parties. The prevailing federal precedent in the 9th

District 1199NW filed written statements of position on similar issues in a number of other cases where it has intervened in representation proceedings initiated by Local 141. It consistently opposed the WSNA's motion in those cases.

Circuit holds that "treaties between two unions cannot override the Section 7 rights of workmen to select their own bargaining representative". Local 1547, International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers v. Local 959, International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Warehousemen and Helpers, 507 F.2d 872 (9th Circuit, 1974). Like Section 7 of the National Labor Relations Act, RCW 41.56.040 assures public employees the right to select representatives of their own choosing. Thus, labor organizations cannot contract among themselves to deprive this Commission of its statutory authority to conduct representation proceedings.

The 9th Circuit precedent, <u>supra</u>, also leaves the decision on whether to conduct representation proceedings in such situations to the discretion of the agency administering the collective bargaining statute. The document relied upon by the WSNA does not contain any expeditious procedure for resolving the WSNA's claims. The Executive Director properly exercised discretion to go forward with the processing of this representation case.

In claiming that "predatory conduct" by the USNU (and/or by certain former WSNA officials) destroyed the "laboratory conditions" for the conduct of a fair election, the WSNA relies upon events that occurred prior to the filing of the petition in this case. scope of "objections" under WAC 391-25-590 is limited to the period that the representation petition is pending before the agency. During the election campaign period that is subject to scrutiny here, the WSNA had an opportunity to fully apprise bargaining unit employees of its claims of misconduct by the USNU or former WSNA officials. Given these facts, we do not find that grounds existed for the requested indefinite delay of the election. Indeed, as the 9th Circuit has suggested, the right of bargaining unit members to select a representative of their own choosing is appropriately protected by allowing the election to proceed while any issue of the WSNA's contractual rights vis-a-vis the USNU and/or District 1199NW is resolved in federal court. (Id, 87 LRRM 3065).

## The "Simultaneous Tally" Issue

With respect to the "simultaneous tally" issue, the Commission has reviewed the WSNA's motion, the Executive Director's letter ruling and the post-election objections. Again, we find no error.

The Executive Director detailed resource limitations which preclude conducting elections in six hospitals at the same time. He went on to state multiple reasons for rejecting an impound and simultaneous tally: (1) Provisions of WAC 391-25-550 calling for the issuance of a tally "upon the closing of the polls"; (2) the refusal of the NLRB to order a simultaneous tally on similar cases then pending before it, so that the influence of one election result upon others could not be avoided; (3) the delay necessary to bring a recently filed seventh case and any additional cases that might be filed up to the same point in the procedure; (4) the delay which would occur at Mason General Hospital while elections in larger units were being conducted; (5) the likelihood of a need for runoff elections; and (6) the absence of direct effect of one election result on the result in another case.

The delay inherent in the procedure suggested by the WSNA would have contravened our long-standing and recently re-affirmed policy favoring prompt conduct of representation elections. See: <u>City of Redmond</u>, Decision 1367-A (PECB, 1982) and <u>Olympic Memorial Hospital</u>, Decision 3317-A (PECB, 1989).

#### FINDINGS OF FACT

The above-named petitioner timely filed a petition for investigation of a question concerning representation with the Public Employment Relations Commission, seeking certification as exclusive bargaining representative of certain employees of the above-named employer. Said petition was accompanied by a showing of interest which was administratively determined by the Commission to be sufficient.

- 2. The organizations listed above as intervenor timely moved for intervention in the proceedings, and said motions for intervention were granted.
- 3. These representation proceedings were conducted by the Commission in the bargaining unit described as:

All registered nurses and resident general duty nurses employed by the employer, excluding supervisors, confidential employees and all other employees.

4. All proceedings were conducted under the supervision of the Commission in a manner designed to afford the affected employees a free choice in the selection of an exclusive bargaining representative. A tally of the results was previously furnished to the parties and is attached hereto.

## CONCLUSION OF LAW

- 1. The Public Employment Relations Commission has jurisdiction in this matter pursuant to Chapter 41.56 RCW.
- 2. The authority to conduct representation proceedings that is conferred upon the Commission by RCW 41.56.050 through .080 is not subject to limitation by contractual arrangements among labor organizations, so that the objection filed by the Washington State Nurses Association concerning its request for a delay of the proceedings is without merit.
- 3. The authority to conduct representation proceedings that is conferred upon the Commission by RCW 41.56.050 through .080

is to be implemented by the expeditious conduct of elections under Commission policy and precedent, so that the objection filed by the Washington State Nurses Association concerning its request for impounding and simultaneous tally of ballots is without merit.

4. The unit described in paragraph 3 of the foregoing findings of fact is an appropriate unit for the purposes of collective bargaining within the meaning of RCW 41.56.060, and all conditions precedent to a certification have been met.

NOW, THEREFORE, it is

### **CERTIFIED**

The employees of the above-named employer in the appropriate bargaining unit described in paragraph 3 of the foregoing findings of fact have chosen:

## UNITED STAFF NURSES UNION, LOCAL 141

as their exclusive representative for the purposes of collective bargaining with their employer with respect to wages, hours and conditions of employment.

ISSUED at Olympia, Washington, this 29th day of January, 1990.

PUBLIC EMPLOYMENT RELATIONS COMMISSION

JANET L. GAUNT, Chairperson

MARK C. ENDRESEN, Commissioner

JOSEPH F. QUINN, Commissioner

E-9 1/78

## STATE OF WASHINGTON

## BEFORE THE PUBLIC EMPLOYMENT RELATIONS COMMISSION

# TALLY SHEET

NAME OF EMPLOYER <u>MASON GENERAL HOSPITAL</u>	CASE NUMBER 8109-E-89-1373
PART 1 - CROSS-CHECK OF RECORDS	
The undersigned agent of the Public Employm he/she has conducted a cross-check of recor sults were as follows:	
Number of Employees in Bargaining Unit	
Number of Employee Records Examined	·····
Number of Employee Records Counted as Valid	Evidence of Representation
PART 2 - SECRET BALLOT ELECTION	
The undersigned agent of the Public Employn the results of the tabulation of ballots ca case, and concluded on the date indicated b	st in the election held in the above
1. Approximate number of eligible voters	<u>74</u>
2. Void Ballots	
3. Votes Cast For: UNITED STAFF NURSES UNI	ON, LOCAL 141, UFCW, AFL-CIQ 40
4. Votes Cast For: WASHINGTON STATE NURSES	ASSOCIATION (WSNA) []
5. Votes Cast For: DISTRICT 1199NW, SEIU,	AFL-CIO 5
6. Votes Cast For: NO REPRESENTATION	<u>k</u>
7. Valid Ballots Counted.(total of 3, 4, 5	5, and 6)57
8. Challenged Ballots	
9. Valid Ballots Counted plus Challenged E	Ballots (total of 7 and 8) 57
10. Number of Valid Ballots Needed to Deter	mine Election <u>38</u>
Challenges are sufficient in number The results of the election appear to be	to affect the results of the election. inconclusive. $\frac{\# 3}{2}$
	PUBLIC EMPLOYMENT RELATIONS COMMISSION
DATE ISSUED November 6, 1989	By Keneth 1 Fatish
The undersigned acted as authorized observed ballots indicated above. We hereby certificately and accurately done, that the secretatat the results were as indicated above. For Mason Leneral Haspital Steve Smith	y that the counting and tabulating were cy of the ballots was maintained, and
For William Sallsant	For // 1
W 8/V// 1	

E-9 1/78

# STATE OF WASHINGTON

# BEFORE THE PUBLIC EMPLOYMENT RELATIONS COMMISSION

# TALLY SHEET

NAME OF EMPLOYER MASON GENERAL HOSPITAL	CASE NUMBER 8109-E-89-1373
PART 1 - CROSS-CHECK OF RECORDS	
The undersigned agent of the Public Employm he/she has conducted a cross-check of recorsults were as follows:	
Number of Employees in Bargaining Unit	
Number of Employee Records Examined	
Number of Employee Records Counted as Valid Evidence of Representation	
PART 2 - SECRET BALLOT ELECTION	
The undersigned agent of the Public Employment Relations Commission certifies that the results of the tabulation of ballots cast in the election held in the above case, and concluded on the date indicated below, were as follows:	
1. Approximate number of eligible voters	···· <u>74</u>
2. Void Ballots	
3. Votes Cast For: UNITED STAFF NURSES UNI	ON, LOCAL 141, UFCW, AFL-CIQ 40
4. Votes Cast For: WASHINGTON STATE NURSES	ASSOCIATION (WSNA) 11
5. Votes Cast For: DISTRICT 1199NW, SEIU,	AFL-CIO 5
6. Votes Cast For: NO REPRESENTATION	<u>1</u>
7. Valid Ballots Counted.(total of 3, 4, 5	5, and 6)57
8. Challe <b>nged</b> Ballots	
9. Valid Ballots Counted plus Challenged Ballots (total of 7 and 8) 57	
10. Number of Valid Ballots Needed to Deter	mine Election
Challenges are sufficient in number to affect the results of the election.	
The results of the election appear to be	inconclusive. $\frac{\#3}{1}$ conclusive favoring choice on line
	PUBLIC EMPLOYMENT RELATIONS COMMISSION
DATE ISSUED November 6, 1989	By Keneth Jotsh
The undersigned acted as authorized observed ballots indicated above. We hereby certify fairly and accurately done, that the secret that the results were as indicated above. For Mason Seneral Haspital Steve Smith	ers in the counting and tabulating of that the counting and tabulating were by of the ballots was maintained, and we also acknowledge service of this tally.
- June Jmun	
For fields Ballstut	For // 1