STATE OF BEVADA LOCAL GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEE-MANAGEMENT RELATIONS BOARD

CITY OF NORTH LAS VEGAS, Complainant,

ITEM NO. 390-A

vs.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

27

CASE NO. A1-045608

INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF FIREFIGHTERS, LOCAL 1607, Respondent,

DECLARATORY ORDER

For Complainant:

Norman H. Kirshman, Esq. KIRSHMAN, HARRIS & COOPER

For Respondent:

Peter L. Ashman, Esq.

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

On June 13, 1996, the CITY OF NORTH LAS VEGAS (hereinafter "CITY") filed the original complaint which was amended June 24, 1996, against the INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF FIREFIGHTERS, LOCAL 1607 (hereinafter "LOCAL 1607"). The First Amended Complaint alleges that the totality of LOCAL 1607es conduct in negotiations for a successor agreement to replace the Collective Bargaining Agreement scheduled to expire on June 30, 1996, violated LOCAL 1607es duty to bargain in good faith. More specifically, CITY alleges that LOCAL 1607 effectively participated in "end run bargaining" by bypassing the CITY's designated negotiator and dealing directly with the City Manager and elected officials for the City of North Las Vegas, causing them to intervene in the negotiations. CITY further contends that positions taken by LOCAL 1607 regarding mandatory bargaining subjects were in violation of NRS 288.270(2)(b); that the use of the Nevada Arbitration Association (hereinafter NAA) constituted a conflict of interest due to the past relationship between LOCAL 1607's lead negotiator,

28

390A-1

Jim Fisher, and NAA; and that LOCAL 1607 created a deadlock in negotiations by creating an impasse in an attempt to premature, proceed to factfinding and, if necessary, last best arbitration utilizing NAA, who, CITY alleges, LOCAL 1607 perceives as more aligned with its objectives than American Arbitration Association (hereinafter AAA).

LOCAL 1607 denies that its conduct and positions taken during negotiations constitute a prohibited practice; and further denies that it created the impasse stating that the lead negotiator for the CITY, Thomas Stephens, declared the impasse; and states that Mr. Stephens knew of the relationship between LOCAL 1607's lead negotiator and NAA prior to the opening of negotiations; and asks this Board to deny the relief requested by CITY.

ADDITIONAL CASE FACTS

A Motion to Stay Factfinding and a Motion to Dismiss were both filed with this office on June 27, 1996. Deliberations on both motions were held during a special telephone conference Board meeting held July 19, 1996, noticed pursuant to Nevada's Open Meeting Law, and an Order, Item No. 390, was issued denying LOCAL 1607's Motion to Dismiss and granting CITY's Motion to Stay Factfinding.

DISCUSSION AND FINDINGS

As established through oral testimony, Complainant CITY is a local government employer as defined by NRS 288.060. Respondent LOCAL 1607 is an employee organization as defined by NRS 288.040. The Local Government Employee-Management Relations Board (hereinafter BOARD) maintains jurisdiction over this dispurpursuant to NRS Chapter 288.

390A-2

During the hearing held on August 28, 1996, both parties agreed to return to the bargaining table and resume negotiations. It was further agreed that, if necessary, any factfinding and/or binding arbitration will be submitted to Federal Mediation and Conciliation Services (hereinafter FMCS), not AAA or NAA. However, CITY representative, Norman Kirshman, addressed the issues concerning the circumstances and requested this BOARD issue a Declaratory Order addressing and determining what actions constitute "end run bargaining" under NRS 288.215.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

NRS 288.280(1)(e) states, "It is a prohibited practice for a local government employer or its designated representative willfully to: Refuse to bargain collectively in good faith with the exclusive representative as required in NRS 288.150. Bargaining collectively includes the entire bargaining process, including mediation and factfinding, provided for in this chapter." (emphasis added)

NRS 288.270(2)(b) states, "It is a prohibited practice for a local government employee or for an employee organization or its designated agent willfully to: Refuse to bargain collectively in good faith with the local government employer, if it is an exclusive representative, as required by NRS 288.150. Bargaining collectively encompasses the entire bargaining process, including mediation and factfinding, provided for in this chapter." (emphasis added)

These provisions, as noted above, require both sides to bargain in good faith directly with the <u>designated negotiator(s)</u> for each entity. Bypassing the negotiator, by either side, to

 secure changes in any part of the negotiation process could be considered "end run bargaining".

Oral testimony established that the Mayor of North Las Vegas was contacted on more than one occasion by union representatives and the Mayor subsequently met with Local 1607 for the purposes of eliciting a change in the ground rules, to-wit: to use NAA versus AAA. Subsequent to these contacts, the Mayor of North Las Vegas and City Manager of North Las Vegas met with Mr. Stephens, the City's lead negotiator, to persuade him to accede to Local 1607's position. Local 1607's contact with the Mayor was without prior knowledge or approval of Mr. Stephens.

Unlike Case No. A1-045374, City of Henderson, Petitioner, where the Board ruled that, "Attendance and participation by the Association at an open meeting did not violate NRS 288.270(2)(b) this BOARD finds that the actions of the members of the negotiating team of LOCAL 1607, in meeting with the City Manager and Mayor, are completely different than simply the attendance at an open meeting. Accordingly, although this BOARD holds that NRS 288.270(2)(b) does not render the local government employee organization, its members or its officers guilty of a prohibited practice by attendance or participation in a meeting open to the public, the solicitation of support from public officials to force a change in the already agreed upon ground rules to the negotiations can be construed as "end run bargaining" and a prohibited practice.

Conflicting testimony was heard regarding the perceived conflict of interest of the LOCAL 1607's lead negotiator and h. past relationship with NAA. Testimony was also heard regarding

the CITY having breached the ground rules when the CITY's lead negotiator spoke with the media. It appears both sides chose to ignore the ground rules when it met their purpose.

DECLARATORY ORDER

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED that, once established, the ground rules constitute an intergral part of the negotiation process and therefore are subject to the provisions under NRS 288.270. The integrity of the process of collective bargaining is at issue and the obligation to bargain in good faith is critical to that issue. The ground rules should not be changed in any manner through an end run by one side's bargaining team. Accordingly, any attempt by either side to contact, directly or indirectly, the principals or any third person who is not a designated bargaining representative for the other side, for the purposes of negotiating anything related to the bargaining agreement without prior written consent by the other side's authorized bargaining representative would constitute a prohibited practice in violation of NRS 288.270.

DATED this day of October, 1996.

rocal Government Employee-Management
Relations Board
By: e / / / / / / / / / Chairman
CHRISTON Chairman
By: Domina & Barings TAMARA BARENGO, Vice-Chairman
TAMARA BARENGO, Vice-Chairman
By: Maris Galdwater
DAVID GOLDWATER, Board Member

390A-5