

**UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
BEFORE THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD
REGION 24**

**PUERTO RICO TELEPHONE COMPANY,
INC./VERIZON**

Employer

and

Case 24-UC-233

**HERMANDAD INDEPENDIENTE
DE EMPLEADOS TELEFONICOS, INC.**

Petitioner

DECISION

Upon a petition duly filed under Section 9(c) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, a hearing was held before a hearing officer of the National Labor Relations Board.

Pursuant to the provisions of Section 3(b) of the Act, the Board has delegated its authority in this proceeding to the undersigned.

Upon the entire record in this proceeding, the undersigned makes the following findings and conclusions¹:

I. ISSUES

The instant proceeding involves a petition filed by the Petitioner-Union, Hermandad Independiente de Empleados Telefonicos, Inc., involving the Customer

¹ Upon the entire record in this proceeding, the undersigned finds:

a. The hearing officer's rulings made at the hearing are free from error and are hereby affirmed.

b. During the past calendar year, the Employer, a local and long distance telephone communication provider as well as a data transmission services provider in Puerto Rico, derived gross earnings in excess of \$100,000. Accordingly, I find that it is engaged in commerce within the meaning of the Act and it will effectuate the purposes of the Act to assert jurisdiction herein.

Relations Development Officer.² The Union seeks that the unit be clarified to include this position. The Union asserts that many of the duties and responsibilities of the position were previously performed by employees who occupied bargaining unit positions. The Employer contends that the petition should be dismissed because it was untimely filed, and, in the alternative because the incumbents of these positions are managerial and/or closely related with management, and in any event, do not share a community of interest with the bargaining unit employees.

II. DECISION

For the reasons discussed below, it is concluded that the unit should not be clarified to include the Customer Relations Development Officer position since the unit clarification petition was untimely filed by the Union.³ Thus, the petition shall be dismissed.

III. BACKGROUND

The Employer is engaged in providing local and long-distance telephone services as well as data transmission services to consumers in Puerto Rico. The Petitioner-Union has represented a bargaining unit of professional and technical employees of the Employer since 1995.⁴ According to the instant petition, this unit consists of approximately 1540 employees. In 1999, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico privatized the Employer's predecessor and sold it to GTE. There is currently a

² The other positions included in the petition were withdrawn by the Petitioner during the hearing.

³ In light of these findings, it is unnecessary to reach the merits of the parties' arguments as to whether the position is managerial in nature or that they do not share a community of interest with other bargaining unit employees.

⁴ I take administrative notice of the Decision which issued in Case 24-UC-226 which notes that in 1995, the Employer was part of the Puerto Rico Telephone Company (PRTC) a Commonwealth-owned telecommunications company. The unit was originally certified by the Puerto Rico Labor Relations Board in 1995. In 1996, after the enactment by the U.S. Congress of the Federal Telecommunications Act of 1996, 47 U.S.C. Sec. 151 et. seq., PRTC separated its wireless division from the company and organized it as a separate corporation. In 1999 both wireless and line telecommunications companies were privatized by the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico and sold to GTE. In June 30, 2000, GTE acquired Bell Atlantic Corporation and consolidated its wireless operations into one wireless company known as Verizon.

collective-bargaining agreement in effect between the Employer and the Union which the parties negotiated from around August 19, 2003, until on or about March 30, 2004. The effective dates of the collective bargaining agreement which resulted from these negotiations are January 1, 2004, to December 31, 2008.

IV. STATEMENT OF FACTS:

The Union first sought the inclusion of the Customer Relations Development Officer position in Case 24-UC-229, filed on June 20, 2005, but the petition therein was later withdrawn.⁵ On December 21, 2005, the Union filed the instant unit clarification petition seeking to include in the bargaining unit the Customer Relations Development Officer position. The Customer Relations Development Officer position was first posted by the Employer on October 3, 2001, for the sales department. The position was also posted by the Employer for the wholesale department on several occasions effective from October 15, 2001, to October 19, 2001; February 7, 2002 to February 13, 2002; June 25, 2003, to July 1, 2003; July 16, 2003 to July 23, 2003; and May 26, 2004 to June 2, 2004. Information about the vacancy announcements was distributed through an e-mail broadcast to all employees which included a description of the duties of the position.

As a result of the creation of this new position, by letter dated October 8, 2001, Annie Cruz, Union's President, requested, a copy of the job description for the Customer Relations Development Officer position to the Employer. There is a dispute as to when the Employer provided to the Union the job description. The

⁵ The petition filed on June 20, 2005, included 36 petitions, among them, the Customer Relations Development Officer position. At the Regional Office's request, the Union withdrew this petition on December 21, 2006, and on that same date filed several unit clarification petitions dividing the original petitioned-for classifications into seven different groups and/or petitions.

Employer alleges that it was sent to the Union on April 30, 2003. The Union alleges that it did not receive the job description from the Employer until October 22, 2004.

The Union and the Employer began bargaining negotiations for a new collective bargaining agreement on August 19, 2003, and the parties ultimately executed a collective bargaining agreement on April 15, 2004, effective from January 1, 2004 through December 31, 2008.

Notwithstanding the Union's allegation that the Employer had not provided the Customer Relations Development Officer job description to the Union, on August 26, 2003, during bargaining negotiations, the Union, sought to include the Customer Relations Development Officer position as part of the appropriate bargaining unit, in addition to other newly created positions.⁶ The Employer, however, rejected the Union's proposal in that respect. On September 18, 2003, the Union withdrew its proposal regarding the inclusion of the Customer Relations Development Officer position, and other requested positions, and decided to defer the issue of the inclusion of the classification for resolution after negotiations before the appropriate forums.⁷ The unit description remained unchanged from the previous collective bargaining agreement that had expired by its terms.⁸

After the execution of the collective bargaining agreement, by letter dated August 26, 2004, the Union requested to the Employer a number of job descriptions, including that of the Customer Relations Development Officer. By letter dated October 4, 2004, the Employer responded that the Customer Relations Development Officer's job description had been previously submitted to the Union on April 30,

⁶ See Joint Exhibit 6.

⁷ See Joint Exhibit 7.

⁸ Prior to the extant agreement, the previous agreement was in effect from October 23, 1999 to October 22, 2003.

2003. In a letter dated October 13, 2004, the Union reiterated its request for said job description, among others, alleging that the job description had not been received by the Union. The Employer sent the Customer Relations Development Officer job description, among two others, to the Union on October 22, 2004. By letter dated May 24, 2005, the Union requested information regarding vacancies and number of employees in twenty-five positions, including the Customer Relations Development Officer position. At no time, after the execution of the collective bargaining agreement, the Union made any effort to negotiate and/or change the composition of the agreed upon bargaining unit to include the Customer Relations Development Officer position.

V. DISCUSSION

The Board has traditionally refused to entertain a unit clarification petition filed mid-way during the term of an existing collective bargaining agreement where the bargaining unit is clearly defined and the party filing the petition has not reserved its right to file the petition during the course of bargaining. Wallace-Murray Corp., 192 NLRB 1090 (1971). Notwithstanding this general rule, the Board recognizes a limited exception in cases where parties cannot agree on whether to include or exclude a disputed classification "but do not wish to press the issue at the expense of reaching an agreement." St. Francis Hospital, 282 NLRB 950, 951 (1987). In such a case, the Board will process a unit clarification petition filed "shortly after" the contract is executed so long as the party filing the petition did not abandon its position in exchange for bargaining concessions.

In this case, the Union reserved its right to pursue the matter of the inclusion of the Customer Relations Development Officer in the unit at the Board. The evidence does not show that the Union ever withdrew from this position or

Explore Litigation Insights

Docket Alarm provides insights to develop a more informed litigation strategy and the peace of mind of knowing you're on top of things.

Real-Time Litigation Alerts



Keep your litigation team up-to-date with **real-time alerts** and advanced team management tools built for the enterprise, all while greatly reducing PACER spend.

Our comprehensive service means we can handle Federal, State, and Administrative courts across the country.

Advanced Docket Research



With over 230 million records, Docket Alarm's cloud-native docket research platform finds what other services can't. Coverage includes Federal, State, plus PTAB, TTAB, ITC and NLRB decisions, all in one place.

Identify arguments that have been successful in the past with full text, pinpoint searching. Link to case law cited within any court document via Fastcase.

Analytics At Your Fingertips



Learn what happened the last time a particular judge, opposing counsel or company faced cases similar to yours.

Advanced out-of-the-box PTAB and TTAB analytics are always at your fingertips.

API

Docket Alarm offers a powerful API (application programming interface) to developers that want to integrate case filings into their apps.

LAW FIRMS

Build custom dashboards for your attorneys and clients with live data direct from the court.

Automate many repetitive legal tasks like conflict checks, document management, and marketing.

FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS

Litigation and bankruptcy checks for companies and debtors.

E-DISCOVERY AND LEGAL VENDORS

Sync your system to PACER to automate legal marketing.