

STATE OF NEVADA
LOCAL GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEE-MANAGEMENT
RELATIONS BOARD

NYE COUNTY LAW ENFORCEMENT
ASSOCIATION,

Complainant,

vs.

NYE COUNTY,

Respondent.

ITEM: 791

CASE NO. A1-046062

AMENDED ORDER

For Complainant: Nye County Law Enforcement Association and their attorney Richard Sergerblom, Esq.

For Respondent: Nye County and their attorney Brian Kunzi, Esq.

This matter came on before the State of Nevada, Local Government Employee-Management Relations Board ("Board"), for consideration and decision pursuant to the provisions of the Local Government Employee-Management Relations Act ("the Act"); NAC Chapter 288, NRS chapter 233B, and was properly noticed pursuant to Nevada's open meeting laws. A hearing was held in this matter on September 12, 2013 in Las Vegas, Nevada.

Prior to May 10, 2012, the juvenile probation officers of Nye County, of which there are currently a total of five, were part of a larger bargaining unit comprising all sworn peace officers in Nye County.¹ That unit is represented by the Nye County Law Enforcement Association ("NCLEA") as the bargaining agent for that unit.

At issue in this case is whether the County appropriately severed the five juvenile probation officers from the larger bargaining unit and established a new bargaining unit

¹ Prior to belonging to the law enforcement unit represented by NCLEA, the juvenile probation officers were part of a different bargaining unit represented by the Nye County Employees Association, which is a recognized organization that represents non-management regular employees of Nye County.

1 comprised solely of the juvenile probation officers under the terms of NRS 288.170. We
2 conclude that the County did not follow NRS 288.170 in the particular circumstances of this
3 case.

4
5 The actual dispute in this case arose in January of 2012 when the County received an
6 application from a group called the Nye County Association of Juvenile Probation Officers
7 (NCAJPO). In that application the NCAJPO proposed the creation of a bargaining unit that
8 consisted of "all personnel of the Nye County Association of Juvenile Probation Officers who
9 are peace officers and are not confidential employees who make decisions of management
10 affecting collective bargaining agreements." The NCAJPO sought to be recognized as the
11 bargaining agent for these employees.
12

13 At the hearing before the Board, the parties established the relevant facts by stipulation,
14 which was entered as Exhibit 7. That stipulation recounts that the County met with NCLEA
15 representatives twice, on April 26, 2012 and May 10, 2012, to discuss the issue of recognizing a
16 new organization to represent the juvenile probation officers. When no agreement was reached
17 at these meetings, the County immediately issued a letter dated May 10, 2012 which removed the
18 juvenile probation officers from the unit represented by NCLEA and recognized the NCAJPO as
19 representing a new bargaining unit comprised of the five juvenile probation officers.
20

21 The NCLEA then filed a prohibited labor practice complaint against the County, and in
22 response the County contended that the Board should treat this matter as an appeal of its
23 bargaining unit determination.
24

25 Analysis

26
27 The procedure for an employer to determine the scope of a bargaining unit is stated at
28 NRS 288.170. This procedure sets forth important statutory safeguards that are intended to

1 maintain stability in bargaining relationships and prevent mischief in the event that an employer
2 was inclined to abuse its authority to define the scope of a bargaining unit. As such, there are no
3 shortcuts to the statutory process.

4
5 That process requires a local government employer that has recognized one or more
6 employee organizations to consult with each such organization prior to determining whether a
7 particular group of employees constitutes an appropriate bargaining unit. NRS 288.170(1). The
8 evidence demonstrates that Nye County did not follow this process when it severed the five
9 juvenile probation officers from the larger law enforcement unit.

10
11 Specifically, the stipulation in evidence before the Board demonstrates that Nye County
12 met only with NCLEA and did not meet or consult with any of the other employee organizations
13 that it has recognized. This is contrary to the County's obligations under NRS 288.170(1). Additionally,
14 there is no indication that when the County did meet with NCLEA that it actually discussed the operative
15 question of the juvenile probation officers community of interest with the larger bargaining unit, as it is
16 required to do under NRS 288.170(1). Instead, the stipulation only states that the County and NCLEA
17 only discussed whether severing the juvenile probation officers was a mandatory subject of bargaining.
18 While the parties have apparently stipulated that there is a community of interest amongst the juvenile
19 probation officers, there is no indication that this was discussed or agreed to before the County severed
20 the juvenile probation officers into their own bargaining unit on May 10, 2012.

21
22 In short, the County was required to consult with each of its recognized organizations on the issue
23 of the community of interest concerning the juvenile probation officers and any other affected employees,
24 and to do so before taking any action to sever the juvenile probation officers from an existing bargaining
25 unit. That did not happen in this case. Consequently, the creation of a new bargaining unit consisting of
26 the five JPOs was in violation of NRS 288.170(1).

27
28 In order to remedy violations of the Act, the Board is authorized to restore the status quo that
existed before the violation occurred. NRS 288.110(2). In order to redress the violation that occurred in

1 this case, the juvenile probation officers must be returned to the larger bargaining unit from whence they
2 came.

3 We do note that nothing in this order precludes the County from future consideration of whether
4 the juvenile probation officers are an appropriate bargaining unit, provided that the County follows the
5 procedures of NRS 288.170 and that such a determination is based primarily upon the community of
6 interest amongst all employees concerned. NRS 288.170(1). Nor does anything in this order preclude an
7 aggrieved organization from properly filing an appeal of any future determination regarding the juvenile
8 probation officers under NRS 288.170(5).
9

10 The Board has also considered the merits of this case and determined that an award of
11 costs pursuant to NRS 288.110(6) is not warranted.

12 Based upon the forgoing, the Board makes the following findings of fact and conclusions
13 of law.
14
15

16 **FINDINGS OF FACT**

17 1. The Nye County Law Enforcement Association and Nye County were parties to a
18 collective bargaining agreement that ran through June 30, 2012. That agreement included
19 juvenile probation officers as classification covered by the agreement.
20

21 2. Nye County Law Enforcement Association is the recognized bargaining agent for a
22 bargaining unit of all law enforcement personnel employed by Nye County.

23 3. There are currently five juvenile probation officers employed in Nye County.

24 4. Sometime in 2008, the juvenile probation officer positions were placed in the bargaining
25 unit represented by Nye County Law Enforcement Association. Previously the juvenile probation
26 officers were part of a bargaining unit represented by the Nye County Employees Association.
27
28

1 5. In January of 2012, Nye County received an application from a group called the Nye
2 County Association of Juvenile Probation Officers, which requested that it be recognized as the
3 bargaining agent for the five juvenile probation officers.

4 6. In addition to the Nye County Law Enforcement Association, Nye County has recognized and
5 bargains with other employee organizations including the Nye County Employees Association.

6 7. The evidence in this case shows that Nye County did not discuss the issue of severing the five
7 juvenile probation officers from the law enforcement bargaining unit with any of its recognized
8 organizations other than the Nye County Law Enforcement Association
9

10 8. The evidence does not support an inference that the County discussed the issue of community of
11 interest of all the affected employees with the Nye County Law Enforcement Association on April 26,
12 2012 or May 10, 2012.

13 9. On May 10, 2012 Nye County issued a letter which simultaneously created a new bargaining unit
14 comprised of the five juvenile probation officers and recognized NCAJPO as the organization to represent
15 that unit.

16 10. If any of the foregoing findings is more appropriately construed a conclusion of law, it
17 may be so construed.
18

19 20 **CONCLUSIONS OF LAW**

21 1. The Board is authorized to hear and determine complaints arising under the Local
22 Government Employee-Management Relations Act.

23 2. The Board has exclusive jurisdiction over the parties and the subject matters of the
24 Complaint on file herein pursuant to the provisions of the Act.

25 3. The Board is authorized to hear and decide appeals of bargaining unit determinations, and
26 this matter is properly considered as such an appeal.
27
28

1 4. Pursuant to NRS 288.170, a local government employer must consult with each of the
2 organizations it has recognized on the issue of community of interest before it determines the
3 scope of a new bargaining unit.

4
5 5. Nye County failed to follow this process when it created a new bargaining unit on May
6 10, 2012 without first having consulted with each of its recognized organizations.

7 6. The evidence shows that Nye County and the Nye County Law Enforcement Association
8 discussed whether creation of the new unit was a mandatory subject of bargaining, but the
9 evidence does not show that Nye County had met its obligation to consult with the Nye County
10 Law Enforcement Association on the issue of community of interest.

11
12 7. The creation of a new bargaining unit comprised solely of juvenile probation officers was
13 in violation of the procedures stated in NRS 288.170.

14 8. Pursuant to NRS 288.110(2) the Board is authorized to restore the benefits of which a
15 party has been deprived when an employer violates the Act.

16
17 9. The Nye County Law Enforcement Association was been deprived of the benefit of
18 having the juvenile probation officers in the unit that it represents when the County unlawfully
19 created a new bargaining unit comprised solely of juvenile probation officers on May 10, 2012.

20 10. In order to remedy the violation committed by the County, the juvenile probation officer
21 positions must be restored to the general law enforcement bargaining unit that is represented by
22 the Nye County Law Enforcement Association.

23
24 11. An award of costs and fees is not warranted in this case.

25 12. If any of the foregoing conclusions is more appropriately construed a finding of fact, it
26 may be so construed.

27
28 ///

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 0
- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 0
- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8

DATED the 2nd day of December, 2013.

791 - 7

1 STATE OF NEVADA
2 LOCAL GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEE-MANAGEMENT
3 RELATIONS BOARD
4

5 NYE COUNTY LAW ENFORCEMENT)
6 ASSOCIATION,)

7 Complainant,)

8 vs.)

9 NYE COUNTY,)

10 Respondent.)

CASE NO. A1-046062

NOTICE OF ENTRY OF ORDER

11 To: Nye County Law Enforcement Association and their attorney Richard Sergerblom, Esq.

12 To: Nye County and their attorney Brian Kunzi, Esq.

13 PLEASE TAKE NOTICE that an ORDER was entered in the above-entitled matter on
14 December 2, 2013.

15 A copy of said order is attached hereto.

16 DATED this 2nd day of December, 2013.
17

18 LOCAL GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEE-
19 MANAGEMENT RELATIONS BOARD

20
21 BY Yvonne Martinez
22 YVONNE MARTINEZ, Executive Assistant
23
24
25
26
27
28

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 0
- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 0
- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8

Richard Segerblom, Esq.
700 South 3rd Street
Las Vegas, NV 89101

Brian Kunzi, Esq.
Nye County District Attorney
1520 E. Basin Avenue
Pahrump, NV 89060

YVONNE MARTINEZ, Executive Assistant