

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA  
BEFORE THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

UPMC AND ITS SUBSIDIARY, UPMC  
PRESBYTERIAN SHADYSIDE, SINGLE EMPLOYER,  
d/b/a UPMC PRESBYTERIAN HOSPITAL AND  
d/b/a UPMC SHADYSIDE HOSPITAL

and

SEIU HEALTHCARE PENNSYLVANIA CTW, CLC

Cases 06-CA-102465  
06-CA-102494  
06-CA-102516  
06-CA-102518  
06-CA-102525  
06-CA-102534  
06-CA-102540  
06-CA-102542  
06-CA-102544  
06-CA-102555  
06-CA-102559  
06-CA--104090  
06-CA-104104  
06-CA-106636  
06-CA-107127  
06-CA-107431  
06-CA-107532  
06-CA-107896  
06-CA-108547  
06-CA-111578  
06-CA-115826

ORDER DENYING MOTION FOR FULL-BOARD RECONSIDERATION<sup>1</sup>

The Respondent's motion for reconsideration of the Board's Decision and Order reported at 366 NLRB No. 185 (2018) is denied. The Respondent has not identified any

---

<sup>1</sup> The National Labor Relations Board has delegated its authority in this proceeding to a three-member panel.

material error or demonstrated extraordinary circumstances warranting reconsideration under Section 102.48(c)(1) of the Board’s Rules and Regulations.<sup>2</sup>

Dated, Washington, D.C., December 11, 2018.

\_\_\_\_\_  
John F. Ring, Chairman

\_\_\_\_\_  
Lauren McFerran, Member

\_\_\_\_\_  
William J. Emanuel, Member

(SEAL)

NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

---

<sup>2</sup> The Respondent argues that the Board erroneously stated that the Respondent prepared and posted Environmental Support Services Employee Council meeting minutes. We agree. The record evidence was accurately stated by the judge: the Respondent prepared minutes of the monthly Environmental Support Services departmental meetings and posted those minutes on the departmental bulletin boards. The departmental meeting minutes included a summary of the ESS Employee Council reports. We do not find that this minor factual misstatement requires reconsideration of the entire issue. The judge’s decision correctly recited the facts, and the Board made clear that it was relying on the judge’s findings in affirming the violation. See slip op. at 5 (adopting the judge’s finding and noting that his decision on the issue “is well supported by the record”).

Chairman Ring did not participate in the Board’s underlying decision, and he expresses no view on whether it was correctly decided. He agrees, however, that the Respondent’s motion for full-Board reconsideration should be denied because it fails to establish any grounds warranting reconsideration under Sec. 102.48 of the Board’s Rules and Regulations.

Member Emanuel adheres to his dissents in the underlying decision, but he agrees that the Respondent has not raised any issue not previously considered or shown extraordinary circumstances warranting reconsideration.