

**UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
BEFORE THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD
DIVISION OF JUDGES
SAN FRANCISCO BRANCH OFFICE**

EL PASO ELECTRIC COMPANY

and

INTERNATIONAL BROTHERHOOD OF
ELECTRICAL WORKERS, LOCAL UNION
960, AFL-CIO

Cases 28-CA-20136
28-CA-20141
28-CA-20265
28-CA-20464
28-CA-20695
28-CA-20765
28-CA-20766
28-CA-20934
28-CA-20953

Mara Louise Anzalone, Esq., for the General Counsel.

Duane R. Nordick, International Rep., I.B.E.W.
of Wichita, Kansas, for the Charging Party.

Jarrett R. Andrews, Esq., & Dan C. Dargene, Esq.,
(Winstead, Sechrest & Minick), of Dallas, Texas.

Sylvia Porter, Esq. of El Paso, Texas
for the Respondent El Paso Electric Company.

SUPPLEMENTAL DECISION

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

JOHN J. MCCARRICK, Administrative Law Judge. This case was tried in El Paso, Texas on August 23 to 25, August 29 to September 1 and September 19 to 21, 2006, upon the order further consolidating cases, second consolidated complaint, as amended and notice of hearing issued on May 31, 2006 and the complaint issued on August 24, 2006 by the Regional Director for Region 28. On March 1, 2007, I issued my Decision in this case and found that Respondent violated Sections 8(a)(1), (3), (4), and (5) of the Act, inter alia, by deciding to close its Chelmont facility and transferring Chelmont employees to other facilities. On August 10, 2010, the Board issued its Decision and Order Remanding¹ case and severing for further explanation of the evidentiary basis, including credibility resolutions, for my decision or to the extent they were a factor or the Union could not have offered concessions that would have changed the Respondent's decision to close the Chelmont facility. Accordingly, on October 26, 2010, I gave the parties until November 5, 2010 to indicate if they wished the record reopened. No party having expressed a desire to reopen the record, on December 2, 2010, I gave the parties until January 7, 2011 to file supplemental briefs on the issue the Board remanded. Both Counsel for the General Counsel and Respondent have filed supplemental briefs.

¹ 355 NLRB No 71

Findings of Fact

.5 The second consolidated complaint at paragraph 10(o) alleges that Respondent violated Section 8(a)(5) of the Act by closing its Chelmont facility and transferring its CSR employees.

10 Respondent's Chelmont office was located in El Paso, Texas. The Chelmont office, the busiest of Respondent's outlying offices, handled walk up customer payments and requests for service. It had not been remodeled since 1995. It is acknowledged that the building was overcrowded and too small to adequately handle the heavy volume of customers. There were long-standing complaints of work stations not being ergonomic, a bathroom was not ADA compliant, and customer lines wound outside the front doors. While there was a report of a fight among customers in the lobby at the Chelmont office, there is no evidence that the frequency of security issues at Chelmont exceeded those at other outlying offices. Moreover, Lowe stated
15 that security was not an issue at Chelmont given the bullet proof glass at the teller's stations and the presence of a security guard during working hours.

20 In February 2005 a committee composed of Vice President of Customer Services Kerry Lore (Lore), Director of Customer Service Representatives Judy Kummrow (Kummrow), and Steve Checchia from Respondent's maintenance department began looking at other sites to replace the Chelmont office. Four buildings were considered, the last of which was visited by the committee in December 2005. In April 2005 Lore became involved in the decision to relocate Chelmont since the lease on the building was about to expire in July 2005. From April
25 to December 2005 Lore met monthly with Kummrow, Respondent's customer service representative, Supervisor Rose Lowe (Lowe), and Respondent's financial analyst, Clay Doyle (Doyle), to assess the options concerning Chelmont. The options considered were to stay at Chelmont and remodel the office, move to a new location and close the Chelmont office and create additional pay stations. A final recommendation was not made until Doyle completed the financial analysis in January 2006.² General Counsel's exhibit 19, page 512, reflects that the costs of staying at Chelmont with improvements would increase Respondent's costs by about \$140,187, a one-time expenditure for remodeling, leasing a new facility at 6400 Boeing would increase Respondent' costs by about \$1,319,967 per year, and buying the facility at 6400 Boeing would increase Respondent's costs by \$1,059,843 per year.
30

35 Lore testified without contradiction that among the factors considered in deciding to close the Chelmont facility was payroll expense, and expenses associated with the lack of an ADA accessible restroom, fire code noncompliance, climate control issues for employees, and nonergonomic employee work stations.³ In late January 2006 Lore met with Chief Operating
40 Officer Frank Bates (Bates) and recommended closing the Chelmont office and using pay stations based on the information in General Counsel exhibits 18 and. The financial report Doyle prepared, General Counsel's exhibit 19, page 513, in the box at the upper right, reflects that use of pay stations in lieu of Chelmont CSRs would save Respondent 33 cents per transaction or \$141,626 based upon Chelmont CSRs spending half their time processing
45 payments. A few days later Bates agreed with Lore's recommendation and said Chelmont would be closed. Six Chelmont CSRs were transferred to other facilities. Four went to the Call Center, one went to Fabens and one to Anthony. General Counsel's exhibit 19, the financial report Lore utilized in making her recommended decision, reflects that for 2006 Respondent budgeted \$192,089 for seven Chelmont positions, an average of about \$27,441. Lore stated that if Chelmont was closed and CSR employees transferred to Respondent's other locations where there were empty positions, there would be no change in overall payroll. However, Lore

² GC Exh.19.

³ GC Exh.18 at 518

admitted that two of the open positions at the Call Center were already built into Respondent's budget:

.5 JUDGE MCCARRICK: For accounting purposes, the open spaces at the Call Center, were those built into expenses, the open positions that weren't filled?

THE WITNESS: Were they --

JUDGE MCCARRICK: Were they built into your budget?

THE WITNESS: Our budget? Yes. They were already in the budget. That is correct.

10 Q BY MS. ANZALONE: Okay. But by filling two -- by using two Chelmont CSRs and putting them in open positions in the Call Center, you were down overall two CSR positions, correct?

A That would be correct.⁴

15 Later Lore reaffirmed that two budgeted positions were saved in closing Chelmont and moving two Chelmont CSRs into budgeted positions at the Call Center:

20 Q Okay. The next bullet point, Chelmont closing assumes no net reduction in staff costs because these resources would be reassigned to the Call Center, home agents, or the Fabens office.

Now that didn't ultimately turn out to be true because you reassigned two Chelmont employees to open positions that you therefore did not have to hire people for. Correct?

A Two of them, yes.

Q Okay.

25 JUDGE MCCARRICK: So you saved more money because you already budgeted the open positions.

THE WITNESS: Correct.

JUDGE MCCARRICK: And you no longer had two positions at Chelmont.

THE WITNESS: Correct.⁵

30 However, Lore stated Respondent did not know the two Call Center positions were vacant at the time it was considering the numbers, presumably when the recommendations were being assembled:

35 Okay. So underneath, it's hard to read, but payroll budget 7 FTE, is that full time employees?

A Right. They would not actually be at those locations. We would retain those seven employees.

Q Okay. And those were the CSRs at Chelmont?

40 A Six CSRs and one lead, team lead.

Q Oh, okay. Ms. Garcia?

A Yes.

Q Okay. So you built into this the cost of retaining the seven employees?

A Correct.

45 Q Even though two of them were being put into open spots at the Call Center?

A At the time, we didn't factor that in.

Q Okay.

A We didn't have those open positions at that time.

Q And you didn't have the open positions at that time when you were looking at these numbers?

⁴ Tr. pp 505–506.

⁵ Tr. p 524, ll 10–24.

- A No.
 Q Okay.
 A Not to my knowledge, no.
 .5 Q Okay. You're not sure?
 A It wasn't part of the discussion.⁶

10 However, General Counsel's exhibit 18 at 526 makes it clear that Respondent considered transferring Chelmont CSRs to the Call Center as early as August 2005 before the final decision on Chelmont was made by Bates.

15 Thus for the six CSRs who were transferred Respondent had budgeted about \$164,647 or six times \$27,441. In addition Respondent had budgeted for two unfilled positions at the Call Center at about \$54,882 or two times \$27,441. Total payroll for the eight positions was about \$219,529. By using the Chelmont CSR's at the Call Center to fill positions already budgeted, Respondent saved about \$54,882.

20 Lore also admitted that there would be additional expenses associated with making employee work stations more ergonomic and the bathroom ADA compliant. Clearly there would have been additional costs to make climate control more effective.

25 On February 1, 2006, Lore told Lowe to tell Human Resources Manager Hernandez of the decision to close Chelmont and for Hernandez to notify the Union. Lore also told Lowe that the Chelmont CSRs would be relocated and asked for Lowe's input. Lowe recommended to which offices the CSRs should be transferred and her recommendations were followed. On February 1, 2006, at 8:30 a.m. Hernandez notified Salazar that the Chelmont office was being closed and the CSRs reassigned. When Salazar expressed his shock at the decision to close Chelmont and said there had been no negotiations about the decision, Hernandez replied that the decision was not up for discussion. Hernandez said that the Chelmont CSRs were being
 30 sent to the downtown El Paso Call Center, the Fabens, and Anthony offices. According to Hernandez, Salazar raised the issue of three employees who were being transferred. Salazar said he would talk to the employees and get back to Hernandez. There is no dispute that before the decision to close Chelmont and relocate the CSRs no notice was given to the Union about either decision. Later on February 1, 2006 Lore met with the Chelmont CSRs and told them of
 35 the decision to close the Chelmont office on March 1, 2006 and send CSRs to the Call Center, Fabens and Anthony.

The Analysis

40 The Board in *Dubuque Packing*, 303 NLRB 386 (1991) concluded that a decision "to relocate unit work is more closely analogous to the subcontracting decision found mandatory in *Fibreboard* than the partial closing decision found nonmandatory in *First National Maintenance*." Id at 391. The Board formulated a test for determining whether an employer's decision is a
 45 mandatory subject of bargaining.

Initially, the burden is on the General Counsel to establish that the employer's decision involved a relocation of unit work unaccompanied by a basic change in the nature of the employer's operation. If the General Counsel successfully carries his burden in this regard, he will have established prima facie that the employer's relocation decision is a mandatory subject of bargaining. At this juncture, the employer may produce evidence rebutting the prima facie case by establishing that the work performed at the new location varies significantly from the work performed at the former plant, establishing that the work performed at the former plant is to

⁶ Tr. 530–531.

be discontinued entirely and not moved to the new location, or establishing that the employer's decision involves a change in the scope and direction of the enterprise. Alternatively, the employer may proffer a defense to show by a preponderance of the evidence: (1) that labor costs (direct and/or indirect) were not a factor in the decision or (2) that even if labor costs were a factor in the decision, the union could not have offered labor cost concessions that could have changed the employer's decision to relocate. Id

The record reflects that both direct and indirect labor costs were a factor in Respondent's decision to close its Chelmont facility. The Situational Analysis and Recommendation dated August 18, 2005, General Counsel's exhibit 18, establishes that payroll costs were a factor considered by Respondent in making the decision to close Chelmont. Doyle's financial report, General Counsel's exhibit 19, is further evidence that Respondent's labor costs of processing payments by CSR's versus payment centers was considered in making the decision to close its Chelmont facility. Respondent further saved labor costs by transferring two CSRs from Chelmont to positions already budgeted at the Call Center. Contrary to Respondent's argument, Lore's testimony did not establish that when Respondent made the decision to close Chelmont it did not know there were open positions at the Call Center. All Lore stated in this regard was open positions at the Call Center was not part of the discussion when she was looking at the numbers. From the context of her testimony, I find that Lore was referring to the discussions she had with the committee members in formulating the various options regarding Chelmont from April to December 2005, well before a final decision was made regarding Chelmont.

In addition there were indirect labor costs associated with the decision to close Chelmont. Ergonomic work stations, a non-ADA compliant bathroom, climate control, and fire code issues were all indirect factors affecting labor costs that Respondent considered in its decision to close the Chelmont facility. These were one time costs associated with remodeling.

Based upon the above cited factors, I conclude that both direct and indirect labor costs were a factor in Respondent's decision to close its Chelmont facility. Respondent has failed to establish by a preponderance of the evidence that labor costs were not a factor in its decision to close the Chelmont facility.

Respondent also has the burden to show by a preponderance of evidence that even if labor costs were a factor in the decision to close its Chelmont facility, the union could not have offered labor cost concessions that could have changed the employer's decision to relocate.

Respondent proffered no evidence on this issue and thus failed in its burden of proof to show the Union could not have offered labor cost concessions that could have changed the Respondent's decision to close Chelmont. Whether the Union could have offered labor concessions that would ameliorate the needed modifications to Respondent's Chelmont facility sufficient to satisfy Respondent's needs is not beyond the realm of possibility, particularly in view of the fact that the increased costs of remodeling were one time costs that could have been amortized by labor concessions over a period of years. This issue is now moot since the Union was never given such an opportunity but rather was presented with a *fait accompli*. I find that Respondent violated Section 8(a)(1) and (5) of the Act as alleged in the Complaint at paragraph 10(o) by closing its Chelmont facility and transferring its CSR employees.

Conclusions of Law

On the basis of the above findings of fact and the record as a whole and Section 10(c) of the Act, I make the following conclusions of law.

1. Respondent has been at all times material an employer engaged in commerce within the meaning of Section 2(2), (6) and (7) of the Act.

.5 2. The Union is, and has been at all times material, a labor organization within the meaning of Section 2(5) of the Act.

3. Respondent violated Section 8(a)(1) and (5) of the Act by deciding to close its Chelmont facility and transfer Chelmont employees to other facilities.

10 4. The unfair labor practices described above are unfair labor practices within the meaning of Section 2(6) and (7) of the Act.

15 Based upon the above findings of fact and conclusions of law, and on the basis of the entire record herein, I issue the following recommended Order.⁷

ORDER

20 1. The Respondent El Paso Electric, its officers, agents, successors, and assigns, shall cease and desist from changing the following terms and conditions of employment of employees in the following bargaining unit without notice to or bargaining with the Union by deciding to close its Chelmont facility and transfer bargaining unit employees to other facilities:

25 Including: The employees of El Paso Electric Company working in the following classifications in the **Power Supply Operating Departments**: Janitors, Apprentice Operator, Operator, Inside Operator, Senior Operator, and Working Supervisor; the employees of El Paso Electric Company working in the following classifications in the **Power Supply Division Maintenance Department**: Insulator, Helper, Helper/Apprentice, Apprentice Mechanic, Apprentice Electrician, Apprentice Laboratory Technician, Apprentice Instrumentation Technician, Mechanic, Electrician, Laboratory Technician, Instrumentation Technician, Electronic Specialist, Predictive Maintenance Technician, Working Supervisor, Vibration Specialist, Level II, Vibration Specialist, Level III, and Working Supervisor-Vibration Specialist; the employees of El Paso Electric Company working in the following classifications in the **Transmission and Distribution Division, Distribution Construction, Distribution Operations, Transmission Design and Maintenance**: Helper, Helper/Apprentice, Apprentice Lineman, Apprentice Cable Splicer, Apprentice Equipment Operator, Lineman, Cable Splicer, Equipment Operator, and Working Supervisor; the employees of El Paso Electric Company working in the following classifications in the **Transmission and Distribution Division Meter Testing/Service**: Helper, Helper/Apprentice, Apprentice Meter Technician, Meter Technician, Meter Laboratory Specialist, Service Worker, Inspector-Wiring and Meter Service Order Worker, and Working Supervisor; the employees of El Paso Electric Company working in the following classifications in the **Transmission and Distribution Division Substation and Relay Department**: Helper, Helper/Apprentice, Apprentice Electrician, Apprentice Equipment Operator, Apprentice Relay Technician, Equipment Operator, Electrician, Relay Technician, Relay Specialist, and Working Supervisor; the employees of El Paso Electric Company working in the following classifications in the **Transmission and Distribution Division Communications Department**: Helper, Helper/Apprentice, Apprentice Communication Technician, Communication Technician, and Working Supervisor; the employees of El Paso Electric Company working in the

⁷ If no exceptions are filed as provided by Section 102.46 of the Board's Rules and Regulations, the findings, conclusions, and recommended Order shall, as provided in Section 102.48 of the Rules, be adopted by the Board and all objections shall be waived for all purposes.

following classifications in the **Administrative Division Garage Section**: Janitor, Helper, Tool and Material Handler, Senior Tool and Material Handler, Apprentice Mechanic, Mechanic, Technician, and Working Supervisor; the following employees of El Paso Electric Company working in the following classifications in the **Treasury Services Warehouse Section**: Fuel Handler, Warehouse Helper, Tool and Material Handler, Senior Tool and Material Handler, Material Handler, Senior Material Handler, Material Truck Operator, Working Supervisor, and Working Supervisor-Power Supply; and **Miscellaneous**: Laborer (Temporary), and Laborer (After 1 Year) employees; all full-time and regular part-time Meter Readers, and Collectors, Technician-Sr. Electrical/Technician-Sr. HVAC/Technician-Jr. Electrical/Technician-Sr. Maintenance/Technician-Maintenance/Clerk-Facilities Services VI; and all full-time and regular part-time Customer Service Representatives I, II, II and Customer Service-Clerk-Telephone Center employees employed by the El Paso Electric Company at the telephone center at 100 N. Stanton, El Paso, Texas, and the outlying offices including Chelmont, Fabens and Van Horn, Texas, and Anthony, Hatch, and Las Cruces, New Mexico.

Excluding: All other employees, office clerical employees, dispatchers, professional employees, guards and supervisors as defined in the Act.

2. Take the following affirmative action designated to effectuate the policies of the Act.

a. Meet and bargain at reasonable times and places with International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, Local Union 960, AFL–CIO as the exclusive collective bargaining representative of the employees in the above mentioned unit and reduce to writing any agreement reached with the Union concerning the closing of its Chelmont facility and the transfer of CSR employees.

b. Within 14 days after service by the Region, post at its Texas and New Mexico facilities copies of the attached notice marked “Appendix”⁸ in both the English and Spanish languages. Copies of the notice, on forms provided by the Regional Director for Region 28, after being signed by the Respondents’ authorized representative, shall be posted by the Respondents immediately upon receipt and maintained for 60 consecutive days in conspicuous places including all places where notices to employees are customarily posted. Reasonable steps shall be taken by the Respondent to ensure that the notices are not altered, defaced, or covered by any other material. In the event Respondent has gone out of business or closed any of the facilities involved in these proceedings, the Respondents shall duplicate and mail, at its own expense, a copy of the notice to all current employees and former employees employed by the Respondents at any time since August 3, 2004.

45


⁸ If this Order is enforced by a Judgment of the United States Court of Appeals, the words in the notice reading “Posted by Order of the National Labor Relations Board” shall read “Posted Pursuant to a Judgment of the United States Court of Appeals Enforcing an Order of the National Labor Relations Board.”

.5 c. Within 21 days after service by the Region, file with the Regional Director a sworn certification of a responsible official on a form provided by the Region attesting to the steps that the Respondent has taken to comply.

Dated, Washington, D.C. March 2, 2011

10

15



John J. McCarrick
Administrative Law Judge

20

25

30

35

40

45

APPENDIX

NOTICE TO EMPLOYEES

Posted by Order of the
National Labor Relations Board
An Agency of the United States Government

FEDERAL LAW GIVES EMPLOYEES THE RIGHT TO

Form, join or assist a union
Choose representatives to bargain with us on your behalf
Act together with other employees for your benefit and protection
Chose not to engage in any of these protected activities

After a trial at which we appeared, argued and presented evidence, the National Labor Relations Board has found that we violated the National Labor Relations Act and has directed us to post this notice to employees in both English and Spanish and to abide by its terms.

Accordingly, we give our employees the following assurances:

WE WILL NOT do anything that interferes with these rights.

WE WILL NOT refuse to meet at reasonable times and places and bargain in good faith with INTERNATIONAL BROTHERHOOD OF ELECTRICAL WORKERS, LOCAL UNION 960, AFL-CIO (Union), as your certified collective bargaining representative in the following bargaining unit (unit):

Including: The employees of El Paso Electric Company working in the following classifications in the **Power Supply Operating Departments**: Janitors, Apprentice Operator, Operator, Inside Operator, Senior Operator, and Working Supervisor; the employees of El Paso Electric Company working in the following classifications in the **Power Supply Division Maintenance Department**: Insulator, Helper, Helper/Apprentice, Apprentice Mechanic, Apprentice Electrician, Apprentice Laboratory Technician, Apprentice Instrumentation Technician, Mechanic, Electrician, Laboratory Technician, Instrumentation Technician, Electronic Specialist, Predictive Maintenance Technician, Working Supervisor, Vibration Specialist, Level II, Vibration Specialist, Level III, and Working Supervisor-Vibration Specialist; the employees of El Paso Electric Company working in the following classifications in the **Transmission and Distribution Division, Distribution Construction, Distribution Operations, Transmission Design and Maintenance**: Helper, Helper/Apprentice, Apprentice Lineman, Apprentice Cable Splicer, Apprentice Equipment Operator, Lineman, Cable Splicer, Equipment Operator, and Working Supervisor; the employees of El Paso Electric Company working in the following classifications in the **Transmission and Distribution Division Meter Testing/Service**: Helper, Helper/Apprentice, Apprentice Meter Technician, Meter Technician, Meter Laboratory Specialist, Service Worker, Inspector-Wiring and Meter Service Order Worker, and Working Supervisor; the employees of El Paso Electric Company working in the following classifications in the **Transmission and Distribution Division Substation and Relay Department**: Helper, Helper/Apprentice, Apprentice Electrician, Apprentice Equipment Operator, Apprentice Relay Technician, Equipment Operator, Electrician, Relay Technician, Relay Specialist, and Working Supervisor; the employees of El Paso Electric Company working in the following classifications in the **Transmission and Distribution Division Communications Department**: Helper, Helper/Apprentice, Apprentice Communication Technician, Communication Technician, and Working Supervisor; the employees of El Paso Electric Company working in the following classifications in the **Administrative Division Garage Section**: Janitor, Helper, Tool and Material Handler, Senior Tool and Material Handler, Apprentice Mechanic, Mechanic, Technician, and Working Supervisor; the following employees of El Paso Electric Company working in the following classifications in the **Treasury Services Warehouse Section**: Fuel Handler, Warehouse Helper, Tool and Material Handler, Senior Tool and Material Handler, Material Handler, Senior Material Handler, Material Truck Operator, Working Supervisor, and Working Supervisor-

Power Supply; and **Miscellaneous:** Laborer (Temporary), and Laborer (After 1 Year) employees; all full-time and regular part-time Meter Readers, and Collectors, Technician-Sr. Electrical/Technician-Sr. HVAC/Technician-Jr. Electrical/Technician-Sr. Maintenance/Technician-Maintenance/Clerk-Facilities Services VI; and all full-time and regular part-time Customer Service Representatives I, II, III and Customer Service-Clerk-Telephone Center employees employed by the El Paso Electric Company at the telephone center at 100 N. Stanton, El Paso, Texas, and the outlying offices including Chelmont, Fabens and Van Horn, Texas, and Anthony, Hatch, and Las Cruces, New Mexico.

Excluding: All other employees, office clerical employees, dispatchers, professional employees, guards and supervisors as defined in the Act.

WE WILL NOT make changes to your terms and conditions of employment without prior notice to the Union in order to permit the Union to bargain with us about those changes.

WE WILL NOT decide to close our facilities or transfer our employees without first giving the Union notice or an opportunity to bargain.

WE WILL offer to bargain in good faith with the Union concerning these and other terms and conditions of employment of unit employees.

WE WILL reduce to writing and sign any agreement reached with the Union concerning these and other terms and conditions of your employment.

EL PASO ELECTRIC COMPANY

Date _____ By _____
(Representative) (Title)

The National Labor Relations Board is an independent Federal agency created in 1935 to enforce the National Labor Relations Act. It conducts secret-ballot elections to determine whether employees want union representation and it investigates and remedies unfair labor practices by employers and unions. To find out more about your rights under the Act and how to file a charge or election petition, you may speak confidentially to any agent with the Board's Regional Office set forth below. You may also obtain information from the Board's website: www.nlr.gov.

2600 North Central Avenue, Suite 1800
Phoenix, Arizona 85004-3099
Hours: 8:15 a.m. to 4:45 p.m.
602-640-2160.

THIS IS AN OFFICIAL NOTICE AND MUST NOT BE DEFACED BY ANYONE

THIS NOTICE MUST REMAIN POSTED FOR 60 CONSECUTIVE DAYS FROM THE DATE OF POSTING AND MUST NOT BE ALTERED, DEFACED, OR COVERED BY ANY OTHER MATERIAL. ANY QUESTIONS CONCERNING THIS NOTICE OR COMPLIANCE WITH ITS PROVISIONS MAY BE DIRECTED TO THE ABOVE REGIONAL OFFICE'S COMPLIANCE OFFICER, 602-640-2146.

THIS NOTICE AND THE DECISION IN THIS MATTER ARE PUBLIC RECORDS

Any interested individual who wishes to request a copy of this Notice or a complete copy of the Decision of which this Notice is a part may do so by contacting the Board's Offices at the address and telephone number appearing immediately above. The final decision and this notice are available in either English or Spanish.