## STATE OF WASHINGTON

## BEFORE THE PUBLIC EMPLOYMENT RELATIONS COMMISSION

In the matter of the petition of:	)	
JIM SAUTER, et al.	)	CASE 13302-E-97-2215
Involving certain employees of:	)	DECISION 5986 - PECE
COMMUNITY TRANSIT	)	ORDER OF DISMISSAL
	)	

On July 14, 1997, Jim Sauter, Dennis Warnock, and B.J. Jones filed a petition for investigation of a question concerning representation with the Public Employment Relations Commission under Chapter 391-25 WAC, seeking to decertification of Amalgamated Transit Union, Local 1576, as exclusive bargaining representative of certain employees of Community Transit. The petition indicated that only four employees were involved, describing them as "security officers ... included in a unit of 270 bus drivers". A collective bargaining agreement filed with the petition described the covered bargaining unit as:

"Bargaining Unit." shall mean all Employees in the following positions:

- a. Coach Operators
- b. Dispatchers
- c. Instructors
- d. Associate Instructors
- e. Associate Supervisors
- f. Customer Information Specialist
- g. Customer Assistant Specialist
- h. Facility Maintenance Employee
- i. Safety & Security Officer
- j. Associate Safety & Security
- k. Part-time employees ..."

[Emphasis by **bold** supplied.]

Appendix G. to that collective bargaining agreement set forth wage rates for "Safety/Security Officer" and "Associate Safety/Security Officer" classifications, while other appendices to the contract set forth wages for other classifications listed in the contractual definition of "bargaining unit".

A letter sent to the petitioner on July 28, 1997, noted that the petition was deficient in two areas:

- 1. The petition was not accompanied by a showing of interest consisting of individual cards or letters. WAC 391-25-110.
- The petition appeared to seek a "severance decertification" of selected employees historically included in a larger bargaining unit. The Commission has long held that a "decertification" petitioner must take the existing bargaining unit as they find it, and that a group of employees cannot decertify only a portion of an existing bargaining unit. See, City of Seattle, Decision 1229-A (PECB, 1982). Similarly, neither the employer nor an incumbent exclusive bargaining representative is entitled to use a decertification petition as a vehicle for making adjustments to the bargaining unit then in existence. In this case, the petitioners seek to decertify the union only for a very small group that has historically been within a much larger bargaining unit.

The petitioner was given a period of 14 days in which to show cause why the petition should not be dismissed. No response has been received or filed from the petitioner. The petition must be dismissed.

NOW THEREFORE, it is

## ORDERED

The petition for investigation of a question concerning representation filed in the above-captioned matter is <a href="DISMISSED">DISMISSED</a>.

DATED in Olympia, Washington, this 26th day of August, 1997.

PUBLIC EMPLOYMENT RELATIONS COMMISSION

MARVIN L. SCHURKE, Executive Director

This order may be appealed by filing a petition for review with the Commission pursuant to WAC 391-25-390(2).