

CASE NO. A1-045372

ITEM NO. 158

LOCAL GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEE-MANAGEMENT

RELATIONS BOARD

\*\* \*\* \*

In the Matter of a Petition )  
for Declaratory Ruling )  
by )  
CITY OF NORTH LAS VEGAS, )  
Petitioner. )

DECLARATORY RULING

For the Petitioner: ROY WOOFER, Esq. and TERRANCE P. MARREN

For the Respondent: NORMAN TY HILBRECHT, Esq.

For the EMRB Board: ELIZABETH S. FOREMASTER and SALVATORE C. GUGINO, Esq., Members of the Board

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

Petitioner's Complaint arises out of its dispute with the Respondent as to whether a layoff or reduction in force is a proper subject of arbitration under the arbitration clause of their collective bargaining agreement with Respondent. Petitioner refused to arbitrate a grievance concerning such layoffs or reductions-in-force. Respondents, however, proceed forward with the selection of an arbitrator, who in turn, stayed further hearing pending resolution of the Petition for Declaratory Ruling now before this Board.

1. AN EMPLOYER HAS THE RIGHT TO CONDUCT  
A REDUCTION IN FORCE

An employer has the right, pursuant to NRS 288.150(3), to lay off or conduct a reduction-in-force of its employees. However, the employer may choose, during negotiations, to bargain away that right pursuant to NRS 288.150(6).

.....

1                   2.   AN EMPLOYER MUST NEGOTIATE REDUCTION-  
2                               IN-FORCE PROCEDURES

3                   Although a layoff or reduction-in-force is not a mandatory  
4                   subject of bargaining under NRS 288.150(2), an employer is requi-  
5                   red to negotiate procedures for a reduction-in-force pursuant to  
6                   NRS 288.150(2)(t).

7                   3.   REDUCTIONS IN FORCE MAY, UNDER CERTAIN  
8                               CIRCUMSTANCES, BE ARBITRABLE

9                   A reduction-in-force is a matter subject to grievance and  
10                  arbitration procedures where the negotiated collective bargaining  
11                  agreement provides for such a procedure to settle disputes arising  
12                  out of the contract and the "reduction-in-force" clause is not  
13                  specifically excepted from said procedure. As pointed out in  
14                  Butcher's Union Local 229 v. Cudahy Packing Company, 50 Cal.Rptr.  
15                  713, 428 P.2d 849 (1967),

16                  "We follow the command of the United States Supreme  
17                  Court that 'doubts should be resolved in favor of arbi-  
18                  tration.' Although the issue here is subject to debate,  
19                  we surely cannot say with 'positive assurance' that the  
20                  arbitration section does not cover the controversy. We  
21                  interpret the arbitration provision as a viable and valu-  
22                  able means for the resolution of disputes that otherwise  
23                  might erupt into social harm."

24                               FINDINGS OF FACT

25                  1. That the arbitration clause of the collective bargain-  
26                  ing agreement between Petitioner and Respondent was in full force  
27                  and effect at the time the grievance concerning reduction-in-force  
28                  arose.

29                               CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

30                  1. That the CITY OF NORTH LAS VEGAS has the prerogative,  
31                  pursuant to NRS 288.150(3), to determine whether to lay off certain  
32                  of its employees;

                  2. That reduction-in-force is not a mandatory subject of  
bargaining under NRS 288.150(2), but is subject to the procedural  
negotiation requirements of NRS 288.150(2)(t);

1 3. That NRS 288.150(6) expands the scope of negotiability  
2 to include permissive subjects of bargaining which the employer  
3 may agree to;

4 4. That "reduction-in-force" may be subject to grievance  
5 and arbitration procedures where the negotiated collective bar-  
6 gaining agreement provides for such a procedure to settle disputes  
7 arising under the contract and the "reduction-in-force" clause is  
8 not specifically excepted from said procedure;

9 5. That the Board has original jurisdiction to determine  
10 issues arising out of the application or interpretation of NRS  
11 Chapter 288.

12 C O N C L U S I O N

13 Under the circumstances of this case, it is the opinion of  
14 this Board that the parties have adequate remedies available under  
15 the grievance or arbitration procedures of their contract or in  
16 the courts.

17 DATED this 6th day of August, 1983.

18 LOCAL GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEE  
19 MANAGEMENT RELATIONS BOARD

20 By Elizabeth S. Foremaster  
21 ELIZABETH S. FOREMASTER

22 By Salvatore C. Gugin  
23 SALVATORE C. GUGINO

24 Distribution:

25 Certified Copies: Roy Woofter, Esq.  
Norman Ty Hilbrecht, Esq.

26 XC: Russell D. Marchand, IAFF 1607  
27 Board Members  
28 Mailing List  
29  
30  
31  
32