DAVID A. CONCEPCION California State Mediators 65 Stevenson Avenue and Conciliation Service Berkeley, California 94708 Arbitrator's Case No. 05-20-80 2 (415) 849-38324 5 IN PROCEEDINGS PURSUANT TO 6 CALIFORNIA PUBLIC UTILITIES CODE SECTION 28851 7 8 9 10 In the Matter of Unit Clarification ) 11 for 12 BARGAINING UNIT OF THE SAN FRANCISCO) 13 BAY AREA RAPID TRANSIT DISTRICT HEARING OFFICER'S 14 OPINION AND RECOMMENDATION Involving accretion of Emergency 15 Procedures Advisors to one of the established bargaining units. 16 17 18 19

These proceedings arise pursuant to California Public Utilities Code Section 28851 under which DAVID A. CONCEPCION was appointed by the Director of the California State Department of Industrial Relations to recommend to the Director disposition of this matter.

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

Hearing was held in Oakland, California on May 20, 1980. The parties to the proceedings were SAN FRANCISCO BAY AREA RAPID TRANSIT DISTRICT, hereinafter referred to as "BART," AMALGAMATED

TRANSIT UNION, DIVISION 1555, hereinafter referred to as "ATU," UNITED PUBLIC EMPLOYEES, LOCAL 390, hereinafter referred to as "UPE," and SAN FRANCISCO BAY AREA RAPID TRANSIT DISTRICT POLICE MANAGERS ASSOCIATION, hereinafter referred to as "BPMA." The parties were afforded the opportunity, of which they availed themselves, for presentation of testimony, for introduction of relevant exhibits, for examination and cross-examination of witnesses and for argument. Further, the parties stipulated to submission of past hearing briefs on or before June 23, 1980. All briefs were received in a timely manner.

11

12

13

14

15

10

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

### APPEARANCES

# On behalf of BART

Renee Benjamin Attorney at Law 800 Madison Street Oakland, California 94607

16

#### On behalf of ATU

17

Attorney at Law 18

Neyhart, Anderson, Nussbaum & Reilly 100 Bush Street, Suite 2600 19

San Francisco, California 94104

Alan N. Kopke

20

# On behalf of UPE

21 22

W. Daniel Boone

Attorney at Law

Van Bourg, Allen Weinberg & Roger

875 Battery Street

San Francisco, California 94111

24

23

25 [[]

26 /// order to be represented for the purpose of collective bargaining.

By direction, the Director initiated these proceedings which shall result in a recommendation to him as to disposition of this matter.

5

4

1

2

6

7 8

9

11

10

12 13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20 21

22

23

24

25

26

DISCUSSION

Historically, the Director of the Department of Industrial Relation has made unit determinations concerning BART. The current units were decided in 1973 and were followed by elections which resulted in recognition of certain labor organizations to represent the employee of the units as well as subunits. When BART created a new group of employees to meet its need to provide an attendant on its trains, in addition to the Train Operator, a question of who should represent these employees was also created. Emergency Procedures Advisors had existed at the time of initial unit determination they would have been afforded the opportunity of selecting their collective bargaining representative by ballot election. However, they were not, and as a result they should be accreted to a unit which is most representative of their community of interest.

BPMA contends that a sufficient community of interest exists between its organization and Emergency Procedures Advisors, based on duties performed as well as supervision, including training, justify accretion to BPMA. BART supports the BPMA position as logical and administratively convenient in that the function performed by Emergency Procedure Advisors involves not only safety and

## On behalf of BPMA

Ben K. Dabalos, President BART Policy Managers Association 800 Madison Street Oakland, California 94607

Larry I. Danner Executive Board Member BART Police Managers Association 800 Madison Street Oakland, California 94607

### BACKGROUND

Emergency Procedures Advisors are a class of employees created as a result of action by the Public Utilities Commission following a fire in the Transbay Tube on January 17, 1979. The essence of the Commission's action was that BART could resume service through the Tube provided a second attendant, that is, Emergency Procedures Advisors were on each train to assist in emergencies. Accordingly, BART hired twenty Emergency Procedures Advisors and placed them in the Department of Field Services under the supervision of BART Police Department management.

Emergency Procedures Advisors being new to BART were not represented for the purpose of collective bargaining. Consequently, on September 12, 1979, ATU filed a Petition for Unit Clarification with the California State Department of Industrial Relations noting that its Director is empowered under Section 28851 of the Public Utilities Code and Title 8 of the California Administrative Code, Section 15902 to determine the appropriate collective bargaining—unit within which Emergency Procedures Advisors shall be placed in

evacuation assistance, but also includes emergency response and security procedures. Further, the latter reasons prompted BART to place Emergency Procedures Advisors under its Police Department for administration and supervision.

While there is a functional community of interest, the fact that BPMA members are the supervisors of Emergency Procedures Advisors presents a conflicting employment interest adverse to effective representation and renders BPMA less suitable to accrete the Emergency Procedures Advisors than the other labor organizations which do not have a managerial relationship with these employees.

The primary function of Emergency Procedures Advisors is serve as the second uniformed attendant on each train in compliance with Decision No. 90144 of the Public Utilities Commission. In performing their duties Emergency Procedures Advisors respond to requests for assistance from Train Operators, Police Officers, BART Control and others, including the riding public. Also as a result of their duties, they interface with Station Agents, Consumer Affairs Representatives, Fire Vehicle Operators and Maintenance Personnel.

Emergency Procedures Advisors are part-time employees who ride trains as they transverse the Transbay Tube and Berkeley Hills Tunnel during peak rider periods. Their presence on the trains is primarily to assist the Train Operator in the event of an evacuation of the train; however, their typical duties also encompass maintaining compliance with policies and practices governing conduct on the trains, removing combustible materials, and performing crowd control

duties.

UPE's claim is based on a community of interest in terms of hours of work, employment benefits, job qualifications, training and skills, similarity of job function, contact with other employees, and integration of work functions with others. In its brief, UPE shows how it satisfies the foregoing criteria and concludes that its claim, if not predominant is equal to that of ATU.

There is no doubt that UPE can satisfy the basic application of the community of interest criteria; however, the strength of the claim is based on its representation of the only other part-time employees at BART and the similarity of the function performed by Consumer Affairs Representatives, of which there are two, as well as interaction with Maintenance Personnel and Fire Vehicle Operators in the event of an emergency, with those functions performed by Emergency Procedures Advisors. UPE concludes that the appropriate method of determination is an election in which Emergency Procedures Advisors may select either UPE or ATU.

UPE's suggestion of an election is not without merit; however beyond the community of interest is the effect of accretion on existing bargaining relationships including availability and authority of employer representatives to deal effectively with employee organizations. In this latter regard, Emergency Procedures Advisors being part of Police Service come under the Field Services Division. UPE has only one member in this Division. Consequently, accretion of Emergency Procedures Advisors to UPE would require that BART labor relations personnel situated in the Support and

Analysis function of Field Services gain extensive knowledge of the UPE contract in addition to its current administration of the ATU, BPMA and BART Police Officers Association contracts. (BPOA did not pursue accretion of the Emergency Procedures Advisors.)

Although the Emergency Procedures Advisors relate to employees who are members of BPMA and UPE the strongest correlation is to the Train Operators who are members of ATU. As was revealed at the hearing, the Emergency Procedures Advisors serve to observe what is happening on the train as a direct function and on behalf of the Train Operator, and it is through the Train Operator that they have their primary communication. Also, like the Train Operator, their primary duty station is on the train. The likeness of duties vary at the secondary level, but in an emergency if the Train Operator is unable to lead the evacuation that duty falls to the Emergency Procedures Advisors.

Moreover, the terms and conditions of employment designed for Train Operators are a product of where they work and it is the same place that the Emergency Procedures Advisors perform their primary duties.

Given the testimony and the able arguments setforth in the post-hearing briefs of the parties, each union has shown it is able and willing to represent the collective bargaining interest of the Emergency Procedures Advisors; however, the most substantial community of interest established by the evidence is with ATU.

25 | ///

26 | ///

# RECOMMENDATION

Accrete the Emergency Procedures Advisors the Transportation Sub-Unit represented by Amalgamated Transit Union, Local 1555.

Dated July 8, 1980

DAVID A. CONCEPCION, Hearing Officer

16.