# STATE OF CALIFORNIA DECISION OF THE PUBLIC EMPLOYMENT -RELATIONS BOARD



In the Matter of:

UNIT DETERMINATION FOR SERVICE EMPLOYEES OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA PURSUANT TO CHAPTER 744 OF THE STATUTES OF 1978 (HIGHER EDUCATION EMPLOYER-EMPLOYEE RELATIONS ACT)

Case Nos. SF-RR-1002, et al.
PERB Decision No. 245-H
September 30, 1982

Appearances: Robert J. Bezemek, Attorney (VanBourg, Allen, Weinberg & Roger) for United Health Care Employees, SEIU; Hirsch Adell and Glenn Rothner, Attorneys (Reich, Adell & Crost) and Les Chisholm for American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees, AFL-CIO; Christine A. Bologna, Attorney, Wayne Heine and Gerald B. Radeleff for California State Employees Association; Patrick J. Szymanski, Attorney (Beeson, Tayer, Kovach & Silbert) for Brotherhood of Teamster and Auto Truck Drivers, Local No. 70; Jerrold C. Schaefer and Judith Droz Keyes, Attorneys (Corbett, Kane & Berk) for the Regents of the University of California.

Before: Tovar, Jaeger, Morgenstern and Jensen, Members\*

I.

#### INTRODUCTION

The Higher Education Employer-Employee Relations Act

(HEERA or Act)<sup>1</sup> became effective July 1, 1979 as a result of

legislation enacted by the California Legislature in 1978. The

legislation granted jurisdiction over the HEERA to the Public

<sup>\*</sup> Chairperson Gluck did not participate in this decision.

<sup>1</sup>The HEERA is codified at Government Code section 3560 et seq. All statutory references hereafter are to the Government Code unless otherwise indicated.

Employment Relations Board (hereafter PERB or Board). Its terms extend the opportunity for collective negotiations to, among others, employees of the University of California and their designated representatives.<sup>2</sup> As an initial step in the representational process, PERB has authority to determine the appropriate units for employees of the University.<sup>3</sup>

Pursuant to rules and regulations adopted by the Board, 4 various employee organizations filed petitions with the Board describing the units they believed to be appropriate. Parties to the instant case then participated in the unit determination hearing conducted by a PERB hearing officer who thereafter transmitted the entire record along with his unit recommendations to the Board itself for decision.

In two decisions of this Board issued today (<u>Unit</u>

<u>Determination for Technical Employees of the University of</u>

<u>California</u> (9/30/82), PERB Decision No. 241-H, and <u>Unit</u>

<u>Determination for Clerical Employees of the University of</u>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup>In addition to providing exclusive representation of employees in appropriate units by employee organizations, HEERA also makes it unlawful for the employer or the employee organization to commit certain acts and requires the employer and the exclusive representative to meet and confer in good faith and endeavor to reach an agreement on matters within the scope of representation.

<sup>3</sup>Subsection 3563(a).

<sup>4</sup>PERB rules and regulations regarding HEERA are codified at California Administrative Code, title 8, section 50000 et seg.

California (9/30/82), PERB Decision No. 244-H), the Board determined that three units of technical employees and one unit of clerical employees were appropriate. Based on the evidence and the briefs submitted by the parties, as well as the hearing officer's recommendations, and pursuant to the statutory unit determination criteria, 5 the Board has determined that the following additional units are appropriate:

Systemwide Service Unit (excluding employees of Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory);

Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory Service Unit.

## THE SERVICE PETITIONS

### Positions of the Parties

The American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees (AFSCME) and the California State Employees Association (CSEA) have each petitioned for a systemwide unit of service employees, including employees of all nine campuses and the Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory, but excluding employees of the Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory (LLNL). The University supports their position. In opposition to these petitions are the petitions of United Health Care Employees, SEIU, Locals 102, 250 and 434 (SEIU), AFSCME Local 371, and

<sup>5</sup>See this Board's preceding decision, <u>Unit Determination</u> for Technical Employees of the University of California (9/30/82) PERB Decision No. 241-H, pp. 3-6, for a review of the statutory unit determination criteria. That discussion is incorporated herein by reference.

Brotherhood of Teamsters and Auto Truck Drivers Local 70 (Teamsters Local 70). SEIU's petition is for a unit composed of the service personnel employed at the University's medical facilities. AFSCME Local 371 petitions for a unit of custodial employees at the University of California, Berkeley (UCB).

Teamsters Local 70 has filed two petitions: one for a unit of truck drivers at UCB, University of California, San Francisco, Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory and systemwide administration; the other for a unit of laborers and gardeners at UCB6. Finally, Laborers International Union Local 1276 has petitioned for a unit of protective services officers at LLNL and has joined with the Alameda County Building and Construction Trades Council to petition for a unit of service and skilled crafts employees at LLNL.

For the reasons set forth below, we find the proposal of AFSCME and CSEA for a systemwide service unit to be more appropriate than the competing petitions. We also find that the service employees of LLNL petitioned for by Laborers Local 1276 constitute an appropriate unit.

## DISCUSSION

The hallmark of service employees is their performance of routine manual labor: "[t]he primary work functions of these

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>6</sup>In the alternative, Teamsters Local 70 argues that the truck drivers, laborers and gardeners should be included in individual campus service units or in a Bay Area service unit.

employees involve providing a proper physical environment and support services for students."7 Thus, the petitions of AFSCME and CSEA include such classifications as sports assistants, reprographic technicians, mail processors, ushers, storekeepers, custodians, parking attendants, cooks, food service workers, laundry machine operators, gardeners, automotive mechanics, laborers, truck drivers, laboratory assistants and odd jobbers. Included in the unit petitioned for by AFSCME and CSEA are classifications which could be considered "security" positions, such as security guards and protective service officers. These employees do not have peace officer status, and may thus be included in the unit notwithstanding subsection 3579(f), which directs that peace officers may not be included in any unit which contains employes other than peace officers. 8 No party opposes this inclusion nor does any party seek a separate systemwide security unit.

<sup>7&</sup>lt;u>Sweetwater Union High School District</u> (11/23/76), PERB Decision No. 4, at page 9.

<sup>8</sup>Subsection 3579(f) provides as follows:

<sup>(</sup>f) The board shall not determine that any unit is appropriate if it includes, together with other employees, employees who are defined as peace officers pursuant to subdivisions (d) and (e) of Section 830.2 of the Penal Code.

Service employees are distinguished from clerical employees by the lack of an office environment, and from technical and skilled craft employees by their lack of specialized education and training.

Thus, while their duties vary, service employees share a strong, functionally-related community of interest in that they perform physical laboring tasks to maintain the campus' physical environment and for which the required levels of skill and training do not greatly differ. As a consequence, working conditions also are similar, as well as benefits under the University's staff personnel policies. For purposes of representation on terms and conditions of employment, therefore, the interests of the University's service employees are substantially similar systemwide. In light of this community of interest, together with the University's concurrence in the appropriateness of a systemwide unit, we find that an effective meet and confer relationship is presented by the AFSCME/CSEA proposal. On this basis we determine that the AFSCME/CSEA proposal for a systemwide service unit (excluding LLNL) is appropriate. The class composition of this unit is attached hereto as Appendix A. The Petitions of SEIU, AFSCME Local 371 and Teamsters Local 70

The bulk of the University's service employees are in classifications which exist on every campus. Conversely, few classifications are unique to any single campus.

Significantly, the petitions for units of service employees filed by SEIU, AFSCME Local 371 and Teamsters Local 70 consist almost entirely of classifications which are systemwide. Thus, these petitions run afoul of the presumption in section 3579(c) that all employees in an occupational group be in the same representation unit. To rebut the presumption, section 3579(c) requires that the petitioner show not only that its proposed unit is appropriate under section 3579(a) criteria, but to show as well that including these employees in a systemwide service unit is inappropriate.

This none of the petitioners have done. There is no evidence in the record that the work performed by employees petitioned for by SEIU, AFSCME Local 371 and Teamsters Local 70 is not functionally the same as that performed by other employees in the same classifications. Nor is there evidence that those petitioned-for employees are not subject to the same systemwide personnel policies, wage structure and other working conditions as other employees in their classifications. Finally, while there is some evidence of a past history of separate representation for some of these employees, the evidence does not persuade us that the disruption of these existing representational relationships would be so damaging as to be found inappropriate.

Since none of the parties have shown that it would be inconsistent with HEERA unit determination criteria to include

all University service employees (excluding those at LLNL) in a single unit, the section 3579(c) presumption has not been rebutted. Thus, the petitions for units of service employees filed by SEIU, AFSCME Local 371 and Teamsters Local 70 are rejected.

# Petitions of Laborers Local 1276

Laborers International Union Local 1276 (Laborers) has filed a petition, together with the Alameda County Building and Construction Trades Council (Trades Council), to represent a unit of service and skilled craft employees of LLNL. It has filed another petition to represent a unit of protective services officers at LLNL.

In <u>Unit Determination for Skilled Craft Employees of the University of California</u> (9/30/82), PERB Decision No. 242-H, the Board found appropriate a unit of skilled craft employees of LLNL. That unit includes certain employment classes which are listed in the above-noted Laborers/Trades Council petition and which were found to be skilled crafts classes. Considering the remaining classes in the Laborers/Trades Council petition, we find that the employees in these classes share a substantial community of interest. The proposed unit would include nearly all the non-craft blue collar employees at LLNL, consisting of custodians, gardeners, laborers, vehicle drivers and mechanics, materials handlers and miscellaneous laboring specialists.

Thus, they are all unskilled or semi-skilled workers who, as

such, share a substantial community of interest. Because they share a common level of skills, they are likely to command similar rates of compensation. So, too, they generally work similar hours, and the physical nature of their work produces similar working conditions and concerns. Thus the meet and confer relationship between a single representative of these employees and the University would be an effective and efficient one.

The Laborers have also petitioned to represent the protective services officers (PSOs) of LLNL. The proposed unit would consist of just two classes: 950.0 protective services officer and 950.3 protective services officer-sergeant.

Although the Laborers petitioned for PSOs as a separate unit, we find that a separate representational unit for these employees would be inappropriate, and that the two petitioned-for classes should appropriately be included in the LLNL service unit which the Laborers, with the Trades Council, separately petitioned for.

Although they carry guns, PSOs do not have peace officer status. Because the Lab is closed to the public, their duties are different from those of the University peace officers who patrol the nine open campuses. PSO duties include checking clearance badges at entry points, escorting uncleared persons through the lab and securing classified information from their view, performing foot and motor patrol, traffic control

functions and classified document destruction. PSOs escort movement of hazardous or toxic materials through the laboratory and, in the event of a "spill," they set up traffic barriers and control the movement of personnel in the area. Unlike most laboratory personnel, the PSOs' schedule covers seven days a week, 24 hours a day.

Under EERA, in <u>Sacramento City Unified School District</u>
(9/20/77) PERB Decision No. 30, the PERB followed private
sector precedent and established a separate unit of security
guards, stating:

The employer is entitled to a nucleus of protection employees to enforce its rules and to protect it property and persons without being confronted with a division of loyalty inherent in the inclusion of security officers in the same unit with other classified employees. (Emphasis added.)

The policy of providing a separate unit is for the employer's benefit. Since in this case, the University opposes a separate security unit, there is no reason to apply that policy here. Instead, the unit determination for these employees must be based on the criteria set forth at section 3579(a) of HEERA.

On the basis of the section 3579(a) criteria and the record evidence, there is little to support the separate unitting of PSOs. Like the other service employees which the Laborers petitioned for jointly with the Trades Council, the PSOs are

relatively unskilled employees, performing for the most part routine physical tasks. Thus they are likely to command similar rates of compensation. Their interest in matters relating to hours is in common with custodians and other service classes which are on duty on shifts other than the day shift. So, too, because of the routine physical nature of their work they generally share a common interest in working conditions with the other service employees. Thus the meet and confer relationshp between the University and a single representative of the service employees would not be complicated by the inclusion of the PSOs. Little would be gained in subdividing the unskilled and semi-skilled classes which would offset the negative effects of fragmentation and proliferation of units. Therefore, in view of the Laborers' petitions to represent the service employees of LLNL, we approve as an appropriate unit a single unit of LLNL service employees which includes the service classes petitioned for by the Laborers in both their petitions.

#### ORDER

Based on the entire record in this case, the Public Employment Relations Board hereby ORDERS that:

1. A unit composed of all service employees of the University of California, but excluding those employed at the Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, is appropriate for the purpose of meeting and conferring in good faith pursuant to

Government Code section 3560, et seq. The employment classes included in this unit are set forth in the attached Appendix A.

- 2. A unit composed of all service employees at the Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory is appropriate for the purpose of meeting and conferring in good faith pursuant to Government Code section 3560 et seq. The employment classes included in this unit are set forth in the attached Appendix B.
- 3. Each of the units found appropriate shall exclude managerial, supervisory and confidential employees of the University.
- 4. Any technical errors in this ORDER shall be presented to the director of representation who shall take appropriate action thereon in accordance with this decision.
- 5. The Board hereby ORDERS a representation election in each of these units and the general counsel is hereby directed to proceed in accordance with California Administrative Code, title 8, part 3, division 4.

By the BOARD

# APPENDIX A

# SERVICE UNIT

4021	Sports Assistant
4022	Referee/Umpire
4041	Sports Event Attendant
4821	Mail Service Supervisor
4822	Senior Mail Processor
4823	Mail Processor
4824	Assistant Mail Processor
5062	Senior Storekeeper
5063	Stores Worker
5064	Storekeeper
5065	Assistant Storekeeper
5066	Delivery Worker
5101	Senior Custodian Leader
5102	Custodian Leader
51,03	Custodian
5112	Custodian Supervisor
5113	Assistant Custodian Supervisor
5114	Window Cleaner
5116	Senior Custodian
5117	Custodian
5123	Elevator Operator
5160	Window Washer

5166	Senior Light Fixture Attendant
5167	Light Fixture Attendant
52 <b>07</b>	Rescue Worker
5208	Assistant Rescue Worker
5326	Senior Security Guard
5327	Security Guard
5328	Proctor
5332	Parking Supervisor
5333	Senior Parking Representative
5334	Parking Representative
5335	Parking Assistant
5445	Assistant Food Service Manager
5450	Principal Food Service Supervisor
5451	Senior Food Service Supervisor
5452	Food Service Supervisor
5501	Principal Baker
5502	Senior Baker
5503	Baker
5505	Assistant Baker
5517	Meat Cutter
5521	Principal Cook
5522	Senior Cook
5523	Cook
5524	Assistant Cook
5538	Cook-Housekeeper

	·
5650	Principal Food Service Worker
5651	Senior Food Service Worker
5652	Food Service Worker
5821	Senior Head Linen Service Worker
5822	Head Linen Service Worker
5832	Senior Linen Service Worker
5833	Linen Service Worker
5835	Laundry Rotary Press Operator
5841	Senior Laundry Machine Operator
5842	Laundry Machine Operator
5863	Power Sewing Machine Operator
5864	Drapery Maker
6272	Head Usher
6273	Senior Usher
6274	Usher
6282	House Manager II
6283	House Manager I
6284	Assistant House Manager
6772	Senior Library Bookmender
6773	Library Bookmender
6774	Library Bookmender Trainee
8074	Laborer Supervisor
8075	Lead Laborer
8076	Laborer
8082	Tree Trimmer Supervisor

8083	Tree Trimmer
8085	Pest Control Supervisor
8086	Pest Control Operator
8095	Physical Plant Laborer/Gardener Supervisor
8096	Lead Physical Plant Laborer/Gardener (B)
8097	Physical Plant Laborer/Gardener (B)
8098	Physical Plant Laborer/Gardener (A)
8131	Grounds Supervisor
8132	Lead Groundskeeper
8133	Groundskeeper
8134	Grounds Equipment Operator
8148	Senior Farm Maintenance Worker
8149	Farm Maintenance Worker
8211	Building Maintenance Supervisor (except UCLA)
8212	Senior Building Maintenance Worker (except UCLA)
8213	Building Maintenance Worker (except UCLA)
8247	Physical Plant Operator Supervisor
8248	Physical Plant Operator
8371	Port Steward
8372	Senior Marine Cook
8373	Marine Cook
8453	Airport Services Worker
8454	Airport Services Helper
8475	Automotive Attendant
8483	Driver

8485	Principal Automotive Equipment Operator
8486	Senior Automotive Equipment Operator
8487	Automotive Equipment Operator
8524	Assistant Farm Machinery Mechanic
8525	Farm Machinery Attendant
8535	Laundry Truck Driver
8540	Principal Agricultural Technician
8541	Senior Agricultural Technician
8542	Agricultural Technician
8543	Farm Laborer
8552	Supervising Truck Driver
8553	Truck Driver
8563	Equipment Operator
9526	Assistant Animal Technician
9552	Botanical Garden/Arboretum Manager
9561	Senior Nursery Technician
9562	Nursery Technician
9606	Laboratory Helper
9608	Odd Jobber
566.1	Material Handler I

- 566.2 Material Handler II
- 566.3 Material Handler III
- 630.1 Custodian
- 630.2 Senior Custodian
- 630.3 Assistant Custodian Supervisor (B)
- 630.4 Custodian Supervisor
- 646.1 Protective Services Officer
- 646.2 Relief Sergeant
- 724.1 Technical Assistant I
- 724.2 Technical Assistant II
- 737.1 Garage Attendant
- 738.1 Bus Driver
- 738.2 Lead Bus Driver
- 739.1 Vehicle Mechanic
- 739.2 Lead Vehicle Mechanic
- 745.1 Truck Driver, Light
- 745.2 Truck Driver
- 745.3 Lead Truck Driver
- 799.1 Intern
- 799.3 General Helper

## SERVICE UNIT (LLNL)

Material Handler I 466.1 466.2 Material Handler II 466.3 Material Handler III Facilities Grade I - Custodian 491.1 Facilities Grade I - Laborer Facilities Grade I - Vehicle Driver I Facilities Grade II - Bunker Custodian 491.2 Facilities Grade II - Floor Waxer Facilities Grade II - Heavy Custodian Facilities Grade II - Print-out Custodian Facilities Grade II - Vehicle Driver II/Dispatcher Facilities Grade II - Window Washer Facilities Grade III - Gardener 491.3 Facilities Grade IV - Vehicle Mechanic Helper 491.4 491.6 Facilities Grade VI - Field Worker 491.7 Facilities Grade VII - Bunker Worker Facilities Grade VII - Concrete Sawer Facilities Grade VII - Dempster Dump Operator

Facilities Grade VII - Fence Erector

# SERVICE UNIT (LLNL) (Con't.)

- Facilities Grade VII Hammermill Operator
- Facilities Grade VII Hole Driller
- Facilities Grade VII Equipment Operator
- Facilities Grade VII Pest and Weed Controller
- Facilities Grade VII Road Repairer
- Facilities Grade VII Scientific Equipment Operator
- 491.9 Facilities Grade IX Truck Driver
  - Facilities Grade IX Vehicle Mechanic
- 492.0 Facilities Grade X Lead Truck Driver
- 493.8 Training Grade IX Motor Vehicle Mechanic Apprentice
- 493.9 Training Grade IX Motor Vehicle Mechanic Apprentice
  - (classroom instruction)
- 950.0 Protective Services Officer
- 950.3 Protective Services Sergeant