

STATE OF WASHINGTON

BEFORE THE PUBLIC EMPLOYMENT RELATIONS COMMISSION

KING COUNTY REGIONAL AFIS GUILD,

Complainant,

vs.

KING COUNTY,

Respondent.

CASE 127743-U-15

DECISION 12582-G - PECB

INTERIM ORDER OF COMMISSION

James M. Cline, Attorney at Law, Cline & Associates, for King County Regional AFIS Guild.

Susan N. Slonecker and *Lynne J. Kalina*, Senior Deputy Prosecuting Attorneys, King County Prosecuting Attorney Leesa Manion, for King County.

On June 30, 2025, the Commission issued *King County*, Decision 12582-F (PECB, 2025), on an appeal of an order of compliance, *King County*, Decision 12582-E (PECB, 2024). Since the issuance of Decision 12582-F, both parties have separately expressed observations or concerns to Executive Director Michael P. Sellars and Compliance Officer Dario de la Rosa about Decision 12582-F.¹ Specifically, the parties noted, accurately, that King County (county) had not appealed paragraph 1.a. of the order of compliance.

The Commission did not reverse any portion of the compliance officer's order. Instead, we modified the compliance officer's steps to compliance to provide clarity and promote a conclusion to this lengthy proceeding. The Washington State Legislature empowered the Commission to provide uniform and impartial adjustment of disputes arising out of employer-employee relations, RCW 41.58.005(1), and to assist in the settlement of disputes, RCW 41.58.020(1). The county and King County Regional AFIS Guild (guild) have been unable to resolve this dispute, at least since the guild filed its unfair labor practice complaint almost ten years ago on December 1, 2015. The

¹ Neither party filed a motion for reconsideration under RCW 34.05.470, which would have allowed the Commission to address the issue more promptly. However, in the interest of administrative efficiency and facilitating a resolution to this long-standing dispute, we have chosen to address the concerns raised to the agency.

delay in implementing a remedy adversely affects those employees affected by the statutory violation and the fulfillment of our mission. We therefore find it appropriate and within our authority to bring the proceedings to a conclusion.

Nevertheless, recognizing that our clarification was unexpected by the parties, we withdraw the portion of the decision clarifying how the county is to comply with the order to pay employees for the loss of overtime opportunities. Specifically, we withdraw the applicable portions of Decision 12582-F at pages six through seven and paragraph 1.a. of our order.

However, we remain committed to ending this case promptly. Accordingly, we invite the parties to file briefs providing their positions on the outstanding issues relating to paragraph 1.a and the appropriate resolution of paragraph 1.a. of the compliance officer's order in Decision 12582-E. Briefs shall be no longer than ten pages, are due on August 19, 2025, and must otherwise be filed in compliance with WAC 391-08-120 and WAC 391-45-350. The Commission will consider the parties' arguments and thereafter issue a final decision on compliance, incorporating the portions of Decision 12582-F that have not been withdrawn.

Of course, the parties are free to reach a mutually satisfactory resolution on the remaining portions of this dispute. If they do, they shall notify the compliance officer prior to August 19, 2025. If the executive director accepts compliance by August 19, 2025, the Commission will issue no further orders in the matter other than modifying Decision 12582-F to reflect the withdrawal provided here.

ISSUED at Olympia, Washington, this 25th day of July, 2025.

PUBLIC EMPLOYMENT RELATIONS COMMISSION

MARK LYON, Chairperson

ELIZABETH FORD, Commissioner

HENRY E. FARBER, Commissioner