UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
BEFORE THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD
FOURTH REGION

CROZER CHESTER MEDICAL CENTER Employer and	Case 04-RC-152289
PENNSYLVANIA ASSOCIATION OF STAFF NURSES AND ALLIED PROFESSIONALS Petitioner	

REGIONAL DIRECTOR'S DECISION AND DIRECTION OF ELECTION

For more than 20 years, the Employer has voluntarily recognized the Petitioner and its predecessor as the representative of the vast majority, but not all, of its registered nurses (RNs). The Petitioner now seeks an election to be certified as the representative of a unit of all of the Employer's RNs, including several classifications of historically unrepresented employees. The Employer contends, however, that the unrepresented RNs should have the opportunity to vote in a self-determination election to ascertain whether they wish to become part of the existing RN unit. A hearing was conducted on May 26, 2015, and the parties filed briefs. After considering the record and briefs, I have determined that the petition seeks an appropriate unit, and I shall order an election in that unit.

I. BACKGROUND AND FACTS

The Employer, Crozer Chester Medical Center, operates an acute-care hospital (the Hospital) in Upland, Pennsylvania. The Employer is part of the Crozer Keystone Health System, which also includes several other hospitals. Petitioner, Pennsylvania Association of Staff Nurses and Allied Professionals (PASNAP), filed a petition with the National Labor Relations Board under Section 9(c) of the National Labor Relations Act seeking to represent a unit of all full-time, regular part-time, and per-diem RNs, and graduate nurses, who are employed by the Employer at the Hospital or dispatched from the Hospital.

A unit of the Employer's RNs has been represented by several different unions since 1976. At that time, the Board certified the Pennsylvania Nurses Association (PNA) as the representative of an RN unit. PNA and the Employer negotiated several collective-bargaining agreements, the first of which was effective on June 20, 1977.

In 1993, however, the Crozer Chester Nurses Association/Pennsylvania State Education Association Health Care (CCNA/PSEA) submitted proof of majority status to the Employer, and, following a card check, the Employer voluntarily recognized it as the representative of the same unit that PNA represented. The voluntary recognition was embodied in a Recognition Agreement, dated November 1, 1993, which described the bargaining unit as:

> All regular part-time and full-time staff graduate nurses and registered nurses. Excluded are all other employees of Crozer including Clinical Specialist, Instructors-staff Development, Licensed Practical Nurses, all on-call nurses, Fire Medics, all graduate nurses who fail to be licensed by Pennsylvania within one (1) year, Assistant Clinical Coordinator, Clinical Coordinators and all Nurses above the rank of Clinical Coordinator, guards and supervisors as defined in the Act.

Following recognition, CCNA/PSEA and the Employer negotiated a series of collective-bargaining agreements, but CCNA/PSEA was never certified by the Board to represent this unit.

In April 2000, the unit's representative changed again. At that time, various local unions, including CCNA, terminated their affiliation with PSEA and formed PASNAP, the Petitioner in this case. On November 15, 2000, the Employer agreed to voluntarily recognize PASNAP as the unit's representative.[1] Since then, the parties have negotiated several collective-bargaining agreements, the most recent of which was effective from June 9, 2011 to June 8, 2014. As set forth in that agreement, the existing unit is as follows:

> CROZER hereby recognizes CCNA/PASNAP as the sole and exclusive bargaining representative of all regular part-time and full-time staff graduate nurses and registered nurses.
>
> Excluded from the bargaining unit are all other employees of CROZER including Nursing Supervisors, Shift Managers, Clinical Specialists, Clinical Educators, Licensed Practical Nurses, all On-Call Nurses, all Unscheduled PRN Nurses, all graduate nurses who fail to be licensed by Pennsylvania within one (1) year, Assistant Nurse Managers, Nurse Managers, and all nurses above the rank of

[1] At that time, PASNAP petitioned the Board for an amendment to the unit's earlier certification, but after the Employer voluntarily recognized PASNAP as the unit's representative, the Regional Director for Region 6 dismissed this petition, stating among other things, "Thus, the current representative was never certified by the Board."

Nurse Manager, employees covered by other collective-bargaining agreements, guards and supervisors as defined in the Act.[2]

The unit recognized by the Employer and set forth in the collective-bargaining agreement includes about 575 employees but does not include all of the Employer's RNs. There are approximately 43 other RNs in a variety of job classifications who are not currently represented. These classifications include Clinical Educators, RN PRN Casuals, Clinical Documentation Specialist, Clinical Specialist for Wound Care, Coordinator of Clinical Infomatics, System Analyst, Nurse Patient Navigator for the Cancer Center, RN Office Nurse CKHN, Burn Outreach Educator, Burn Research Nurse, and Clinical Assoc II NP Trauma. Some of these classifications were specifically excluded from the unit in the collective-bargaining agreement, and others were not mentioned.

Since the latest contract's expiration, the parties have negotiated for a successor agreement. During these negotiations, the Petitioner did not seek to change or expand the existing unit. The Petitioner now seeks a single unit which would include both the RNs in the voluntarily-recognized unit and the RNs in the classifications set forth above.

II. LEGAL PRINCIPLES

A. Self-Determination Elections

An *Armour-Globe* self-determination election may be conducted when the incumbent representative of employees in a partially-organized facility seeks to add a group of unrepresented employees to its existing unit. *Armour & Co.,* 40 NLRB 1333 (1942); *Globe Machine & Stamping Co*., 3 NLRB 294 (1937). The voting group in an *Armour-Globe* election must bring the existing bargaining unit into conformity with a unit that the Board would find appropriate for collective bargaining. See *National Broadcasting Co.,* 202 NLRB 396, 397 (1973). It is necessary to determine the extent to which the employees to be included share a community of interest with unit employees, as well as whether the employees to be added constitute an identifiable distinct segment of the work force so as to constitute an appropriate voting group. *St. Vincent Charity Medical Center*, 357 NLRB No. 79 (2011); *Warner-Lambert Co.*, 298 NLRB 993, 995 (1990), citing *Capital Cities Broadcasting Corp*., 194 NLRB 1063 (1972). The Board, however, has not directed self-determination elections where there is a question concerning representation in the historical unit and the incumbent union seeks to add a previously unrepresented fringe group. *Duke Power Co.,* 173 NLRB 240, 241 (1968); *D.V. Displays Corp.,* 134 NLRB 568, 571-572 (1961); *Lydia E. Hall Hospital,* 227 NLRB 573, 574 (1976). In these situations, the Board has ordered a single election in the overall unit. Id.

B. The Board's Health Care Rule

In 1989, after engaging in a notice and comment rulemaking process, the Board issued a Health Care Rule which set forth generally appropriate units in acute-care hospitals. See

[2] Although the parties stipulated that there was no change in the scope or composition of the unit at the time of either the Employer's 1993 recognition of CCNA/PSEA or its 2000 recognition of PASNAP, the 1993 and 2011 unit descriptions list some different exclusions.

generally, 52 Fed. Reg. 25142 et seq., 284 NLRB 1516 et seq. (1987); 53 Fed. Reg. 33900 et seq., 284 NLRB at 1528 (1988); 54 Fed. Reg. 16336 et seq., 284 NLRB at 1580 (1989). In doing so, the Board sought to avoid proliferation of health-care bargaining units and to limit the possible units to a reasonable, finite number of congenial groups that each displayed a community of interests within themselves and a disparity of interests from other groups. See 52 Fed. Reg. 25146, 284 NLRB at 1522; 53 Fed. Reg. 33905, 284 NLRB at 1536. The Rule, which was approved by the Supreme Court in *American Hospital Association v. NLRB*, 499 U.S. 606 (1991), provides that, except in "extraordinary circumstances" or where there are existing non-conforming units, the following units are appropriate in an acute-care hospital: (1) *all registered nurses;* (2) all physicians; (3) all professionals except for registered nurses and physicians; (4) all technical employees; (5) all skilled maintenance employees; (6) all business office clerical employees; (7) all guards; and (8) all nonprofessional employees except for technical employees, skilled maintenance employees, business office clerical employees, and guards.

The Board stated that where "extraordinary circumstances" exist, the unit will be determined through adjudication. However, the Board intended that the extraordinary circumstances exception would be limited to truly extraordinary situations and be construed narrowly so it could not be used as an excuse for unnecessary litigation or delay. See 52 Fed. Reg. 25145, 284 NLRB at 1521; 53 Fed. Reg. 33904, 33932, 284 NLRB at 1533, 1573; 54 Fed. Reg. 16344-16345, 284 NLRB at 1593. Accordingly, the party urging extraordinary circumstances bears a heavy burden to demonstrate that its arguments are substantially different from those that the Board considered in the rulemaking proceedings -- for example, that there are such unusual and unforeseen deviations from the range of circumstances already considered that it would be unjust or an abuse of discretion for the Board to apply the Rule. See *Boston Medical Center Corp.,* 330 NLRB 152, 167 n. 35 (1999); *Dominican Santa Cruz Hospital,* 307 NLRB 506, 507 (1992); *St. Margaret Memorial Hospital,* 303 NLRB 923 (1991), enfd. 991 F.2d 1146 (3rd Cir. 1993); 53 Fed. Reg. 33933, 284 NLRB at 1574; 54 Fed. Reg. 16345, 284 NLRB at 1593.

III. <u>ANALYSIS</u>

Under well-established principles, a labor organization that represents a voluntarily-recognized unit is entitled to the benefits of Board certification pursuant to a "*General Box* election." See *Bell Aircraft Corp.*, 98 NLRB 1277, 1278 (1952); *General Box Co*., 82 NLRB 678, 682-683 (1949). Thus, Petitioner is unquestionably permitted to have an election for purposes of gaining certification of the existing unit. The question to be determined in this proceeding is whether a single election should be directed in a unit that also includes the unrepresented RNs or whether an additional *Armour-Globe* self-determination election is required to determine whether the unrepresented employees wish to be represented as part of an overall unit of the Employer's RNs.

The Board has clearly decided that it is appropriate to conduct a single election when an incumbent union petitions for Board certification in a unit comprised of an historically recognized bargaining unit and additional unrepresented fringe employees, provided that the unit is appropriate. *Duke Power Co.,* 173 NLRB 240, 241 (1968); *D.V. Displays Corp.,* 134 NLRB 568, 571-572 (1961). In *Lydia E. Hall Hospital,* 227 NLRB 573, 574 (1976), the Board

specifically applied this single-election approach to an acute-care hospital by directing an election in a unit of RNs and graduate nurses, although the historical unit did not include the graduate nurses. The Board reasoned that by conducting a single election in the overall unit, it was "correcting the fringe defect in the historical unit by including those previously unrepresented employees in the unit." The Board further noted that the possible creation of a residual unit of graduate nurses would be at odds with the express Congressional policy against the proliferation of bargaining units in the health-care industry.[3] Similarly, the petitioned-for unit in this case, an all-RN unit, is appropriate because it includes employees in the fringe group and conforms to the Health Care Rule. Therefore, pursuant to *Duke Power* and *D.V. Displays*, a single election is warranted.

The Employer argues that *Duke Power* and *D.V. Displays* are inapplicable because in those cases, the Board stated that the unrepresented employees had been excluded from existing units based on "historical accidents." According to the Employer, the existing RN unit was not the result of a historical accident but was created pursuant to the 1976 certification. This argument is without foundation, however, because there is no evidence as to the reasons for the exclusion of the various classifications at the time of the certification or even as to whether all of the excluded classifications existed at the time the currently-recognized unit was established.[4] In any case, when the Board examines whether an exclusion is a "historical accident," an important factor is whether the excluded group would have been included in the historical unit if their unit placement had been presented to the Board originally. See *Century Electric Co*., 146 NLRB 232, 241 fn. 18 (1964); *D.V. Displays*, supra at 571. In this case the petitioned-for unit is a conforming unit under the Health Care Rule, so the unrepresented nurses would clearly have been included in the unit if this issue had been presented to the Board.

In contending that an *Armour-Globe* election should be conducted, the Employer asserts, relying on *Unisys Corp*., 354 NLRB No. 92, 95 (2009), and similar cases, that the Board will order a self-determination election if a union wishes to add unrepresented employees to an existing unit. The cases that the Employer relies on to support its position, however are inapposite as those cases involved *certified* unions petitioning for a self-determination election, not *General Box* elections. The Board has made clear that in cases where an incumbent union seeks certification of not only the historically recognized bargaining unit, but an additional group of employees, it will direct a single election in the overall unit. *Lydia E. Hall Hospital,* supra; *Duke Power Co.,* supra; *D. V. Displays Corp.,* supra.

The Employer further argues that the denial of a self-determination election deprives the historically unrepresented employees a democratic choice of representation, citing *Zia Co.,* 108 NLRB 1134, 1137 (1954). However, the Board directly addressed the same argument in *D.V. Displays,* supra at 571-572, stating, "the inclusion of these employees is the more democratic

---

[3] Although this decision issued before the Board's adoption of the Health Care Rule, it expressed concerns that are embodied in the Rule.

[4] The Employer never sought at the hearing to provide evidence as to the reason for the exclusions; although it made an offer of proof to introduce evidence of the job functions of the unrepresented RNs, this offer was only made in support of its argument that the excluded classifications lacked a community of interest with the historical unit.

approach because it gives all employees in the appropriate unit an equal voice in choosing a bargaining representative for that unit." Indeed, in *D.V. Displays*, the Board expressly modified *Zia,* stating that to the extent that "there is a question concerning representation in the historical unit and the incumbent union seeks to add a previously unrepresented fringe group whom no other union is seeking to represent on a different basis, we shall direct only one election which will include all the employees in the unit found to be appropriate." Id. at 571. [Footnote omitted]. In this case, the considerations on which the Board relied in *Duke Power* and *D.V. Displays* are particularly compelling because the Petitioner seeks a unit that conforms to the Board's Health Care Rule while the Employer requests a self-determination election in a relatively small non-conforming unit.

Accordingly, I find that the unrepresented fringe group of RNs is not entitled to a self-determination election and that an election should be held in the petitioned-for unit of all of the Employer's RNs.

IV. CONCLUSIONS AND FINDINGS

Based upon the entire record in this matter and for the reasons set forth above, I conclude and find as follows:

1. The Hearing Officer's rulings made at the hearing are free from prejudicial error and are hereby affirmed.

2. The Employer is engaged in commerce within the meaning of the Act, and it will effectuate the purposes of the Act to assert jurisdiction in this case.

3. Petitioner is a labor organization that claims to represent certain employees of the Employer.

4. A question affecting commerce exists concerning the representation of certain employees of the Employer within the meaning of Section 9(c)(1) and Section 2(6) and (7) of the Act.

At the beginning of the hearing, the hearing officer reviewed with the parties their positions regarding the appropriateness of the unit and any eligibility issues with regard to individual voters or classifications. At that time, the Employer contended, inter alia, that the historically unrepresented RNs do not share a community of interest with the existing bargaining unit. The hearing officer required the Employer to submit an offer of proof as to the evidence it intended to present on this issue. After the Employer made its offer, I reviewed it to determine if it was sufficient to sustain the Employer's position. Following this review, I decided that the offer of proof was insufficient, and I instructed the hearing officer to reject the offer and not to permit the Employer to present its proffered evidence. I hereby affirm my decision to reject the offer of proof and conclude that even if all the facts the Employer included in its offer are true, those facts are insufficient as a matter of law to sustain the Employer's position.

In its offer, the Employer requested to provide evidence in support of various community-of-interest contentions as to each of the disputed classifications. In summary, the Employer contended that unlike employees in the represented unit: employees in some of the classifications do not provide direct patient care and may be involved in credentialing other nurses in the unit, thus creating a possible conflict of interest with other RNs (Clinical Educators, Clinical Documentation Specialist, Coordinator of Clinical Infomatics, Burn Outreach Coordinator); employees in some classifications perform their job duties for the entire Crozer-Keystone Health System, not only for the Hospital, and may be based at other locations (Clinical Educators, Coordinator of Clinical Infomatics, Patient Flow Coordinator, CKHS Care Management Coordinator, Nurse Patient Navigator for the Cancer Center, Case Management Systems Specialist, Clinical Specialist for Wound Care, Lead Clinician for Appeals); one classification includes several retired employees who only work sporadically (PRNs); and one classification works exclusively in the medical office building adjacent to the hospital in a non-hospital setting (RN Office Nurse CKHN).

I did not permit the Employer to present community-of-interest evidence in support of its contentions because these contentions, even if true, would not constitute "extraordinary circumstances" under the Health Care Rule that would permit the certification of a unit that does not include all of the Employer's RNs. Although the Employer cites differences between the unrepresented employee classifications and employees in the existing unit, these differences are insufficient to meet the "heavy burden" to demonstrate that its arguments are substantially different from those which were carefully considered in the rulemaking proceedings. 53 Federal Register No. 170, PR 33933, 284 NLRB at 1574. See *St. Margaret Memorial Hospital*, supra, 303 NLRB at 924, fn. 4.

Additionally, the Employer claimed in both its pre-hearing Statement of Position and at the hearing that seven RNs are supervisors who are not eligible to vote. These RNs are in the following classifications: Coordinator CKHS Care Management, Patient Flow Coordinator, Case Management Systems Specialist, Practice Manager, and Lead Clinician for Appeals.[5] The Petitioner disagrees with this contention and maintains that these RNs are non-supervisory employees who fit within the unit description and are therefore eligible to vote.

Because this dispute concerns the eligibility of just seven individuals in a unit of more than 600 employees, I concluded that the dispute is not relevant to whether there is a question concerning representation and deals only with eligibility issues which are unnecessary to resolve

---

[5] The following individuals are in the disputed classifications: Melva Dill Jenkins, Elaina Fernandez, Joy Oakey, Richard Paulus, Terry Sandman, Starronda Scott, and Deborah Wingate.

In its pre-hearing Statement of Position, the Employer further contended that Nurse Practitioners and Liaison Home Health/Hospice are supervisors and lack of community of interest with the bargaining unit. However, the parties stipulated at the hearing that RNs who are employed by entities other than the Employer, such as Crozer-Keystone Health System, are excluded from the bargaining unit. As the Nurse Practitioners and the Liaison Home Health/Hospice are employed by other entities, these positions are excluded from the bargaining unit.

prior to conducting an election. As a consequence, I instructed the hearing officer not to allow the parties to present evidence on the question of whether the seven individuals are eligible to vote. I adhere to that ruling.

Therefore, consistent with Section 102.64 of the Board's Rules and Regulations, I shall direct an election in this matter, and I further order that the asserted supervisors may vote in the election, but their ballots shall be challenged since their eligibility has not been resolved. The eligibility or inclusion of these individuals will be resolved, if necessary, following an election.

5. In view of the foregoing and the record as a whole, consistent with Section 102.66(d) of the Board's Rules and Regulations, I find that the following employees of the Employer constitute a unit appropriate for the purposes of collective bargaining within the meaning of Section 9(b) of the Act:

> All full-time, regular part-time and per diem registered nurses and graduate nurses[6] employed by the Employer at the Crozer Chester Medical Center or dispatched from the Crozer Chester Medical Center, in Upland, Pennsylvania, excluding all other employees, guards, and supervisors as defined in the Act.
>
> Others Permitted to Vote: At this time, no decision has been made regarding whether the Coordinator CKHS Care Management, Patient Flow Coordinators, Case Management Systems Specialist, Practice Manager, and Lead Clinician for Appeals are included in, or excluded from, the bargaining unit, and these individuals may vote in the election, but their ballots shall be challenged since their eligibility has not been resolved. The eligibility of these individuals will be resolved, if necessary, following the election.

V. DIRECTION OF ELECTION

The National Labor Relations Board will conduct a secret ballot election among the employees in the unit found appropriate above. Employees will vote whether or not they wish to be represented for purposes of collective bargaining by Pennsylvania Association of Staff Nurses and Allied Professionals.

A. Election Details

The election will be held on **June 14, 2015 from 6:15 a.m. to 8:15 a.m., 4:30 p.m. to 5:30 p.m., and 6:15 p.m. to 8:15 p.m.** and **June 15, 2015 from 6:15 a.m. to 8:15 a.m., 4:30 p.m. to 5:30 p.m., and 6:15 p.m. to 8:15 p.m. in the Clark Auditorium at the Crozer Chester Medical Center located at One Medical Center Boulevard, Upland, Pennsylvania.**

---

[6] Employees in the unit are eligible to vote if they worked an average of four or more hours of work per week in the 13 weeks preceding the election eligibility date.

B. Voting Eligibility

Eligible to vote are those in the unit who were employed during the payroll period ending **May 31, 2015**, including employees who did not work during that period because they were ill, on vacation, or temporarily laid off. Employees engaged in an economic strike, who have retained their status as strikers and who have not been permanently replaced, are also eligible to vote. In addition, in an economic strike that commenced less than 12 months before the election date, employees engaged in such strike who have retained their status as strikers but who have been permanently replaced, as well as their replacements, are eligible to vote. Unit employees in the military services of the United States may vote if they appear in person at the polls. Also eligible to vote using the Board's challenged ballot procedure are those individuals employed in the classifications whose eligibility remains unresolved as specified above and in the Notice of Election. Ineligible to vote are (1) employees who have quit or been discharged for cause since the designated payroll period; (2) striking employees who have been discharged for cause since the strike began and who have not been rehired or reinstated before the election date; and (3) employees who are engaged in an economic strike that began more than 12 months before the election date and who have been permanently replaced.

C. Voter List

As required by Section 102.67(l) of the Board's Rules and Regulations, the Employer must provide the Regional Director and parties named in this decision a list of the full names, work locations, shifts, job classifications, and contact information (including home addresses, available personal email addresses, and available home and personal cell telephone numbers) of all eligible voters. The Employer must also include in a separate section of that list the same information for those individuals who, according to this direction of election, will be permitted to vote subject to challenge.

To be timely filed and served, the list must be *received* by the regional director and the parties by **June 3, 2015**. The list must be accompanied by a certificate of service showing service on all parties. **The Region will no longer serve the voter list.**

Unless the Employer certifies that it does not possess the capacity to produce the list in the required form, the list must be provided in a table in a Microsoft Word file (.doc or docx) or a file that is compatible with Microsoft Word (.doc or docx). The first column of the list must begin with each employee's last name and the list must be alphabetized (overall or by department) by last name. Because the list will be used during the election, the font size of the list must be the equivalent of Times New Roman 10 or larger. That font does not need to be used but the font must be that size or larger. A sample, optional form for the list is provided on the NLRB website at www.nlrb.gov/what-we-do/conduct-elections/representation-case-rules-effective-april-14-2015.

When feasible, the list shall be filed electronically with the Region and served electronically on the other parties named in this decision. The list may be electronically filed with the Region by using the E-filing system on the Agency's website at www.nlrb.gov. Once the website is accessed, click on **E-File Documents**, enter the NLRB Case Number, and follow the detailed instructions.

Failure to comply with the above requirements will be grounds for setting aside the election whenever proper and timely objections are filed. However, the Employer may not object to the failure to file or serve the list within the specified time or in the proper format if it is responsible for the failure.

No party shall use the voter list for purposes other than the representation proceeding, Board proceedings arising from it, and related matters.

D. Posting of Notices of Election

Pursuant to Section 102.67(k) of the Board's Rules, the Employer must post copies of the Notice of Election accompanying this Decision in conspicuous places, including all places where notices to employees in the unit found appropriate are customarily posted. The Notice must be posted so all pages of the Notice are simultaneously visible. In addition, if the Employer customarily communicates electronically with some or all of the employees in the unit found appropriate, the Employer must also distribute the Notice of Election electronically to those employees. The Employer must post copies of the Notice at least 3 full working days prior to 12:01 a.m. of the day of the election and copies must remain posted until the end of the election. For purposes of posting, working day means an entire 24-hour period excluding Saturdays, Sundays, and holidays. However, a party shall be estopped from objecting to the nonposting of notices if it is responsible for the nonposting, and likewise shall be estopped from objecting to the nondistribution of notices if it is responsible for the nondistribution.

Failure to follow the posting requirements set forth above will be grounds for setting aside the election if proper and timely objections are filed.

RIGHT TO REQUEST REVIEW

Pursuant to Section 102.67 of the Board's Rules and Regulations, a request for review may be filed with the Board at any time following the issuance of this Decision until 14 days after a final disposition of the proceeding by the Regional Director. Accordingly, a party is not precluded from filing a request for review of this decision after the election on the grounds that it did not file a request for review of this Decision prior to the election. The request for review must conform to the requirements of Section 102.67 of the Board's Rules and Regulations.

A request for review may be E-Filed through the Agency's website but may not be filed by facsimile. To E-File the request for review, go to www.nlrb.gov, select E-File Documents, enter the NLRB Case Number, and follow the detailed instructions. If not E-Filed, the request for review should be addressed to the Executive Secretary, National Labor Relations Board, 1099 14th Street, N.W., Washington, DC 20570-0001. A party filing a request for review must serve a copy of the request on the other parties and file a copy with the Regional Director. A certificate of service must be filed with the Board together with the request for review.

Neither the filing of a request for review nor the Board's granting a request for review will stay the election in this matter unless specifically ordered by the Board.

DATED: June 1, 2015

/s/ Dennis P. Walsh

DENNIS P. WALSH
Regional Director, Region Four
National Labor Relations Board
615 Chestnut Street, Suite 710
Philadelphia, PA 19106