On February 18, 2022, Aerospace Machinists Industrial District Lodge 751, International Association of Machinists and Aerospace Workers, ALF-CIO (Petitioner) filed a representation petition (the Petition) under § 9(c) of the National Labor Relations Act (the Act) seeking to represent a bargaining unit of maintenance technicians, critical facility engineers and leads employed by BGIS Global Integrated Solutions US LLC (Employer) at three of its Puget Sound area facilities, in Lynnwood, Seattle, and Olympia, Washington. There are currently no maintenance technicians employed in the petitioned-for unit; all of the current employees are critical facility engineers or lead critical facility engineers.

The Employer timely filed a Statement of Position contending that the petitioned-for unit in the three facilities do not share a community of interest distinct from those of employees at excluded locations. The Employer argues that the facilities are located far apart, are not functionally integrated, are not centrally controlled by management, and do not have a joint bargaining history. The Petitioner, on the other hand, contends that the petitioned-for employees do share a community of interest.

A hearing officer of the Board held a hearing in this matter and the parties subsequently filed briefs with me. As explained below, based on the record and relevant Board law, I find that the unit sought by Petitioner is not appropriate, because there is insufficient evidence in the record that the petitioned-for employees share a community of interest distinct from that shared with employees at other, excluded Employer locations, of which there are several in the same geographic region.

---

1 The names of the parties appear as amended at hearing.
I. RECORD EVIDENCE

A. The Employer’s Operation

The Employer is a facility management services company operating in the United States, Canada, the United Kingdom, Europe, and Australia. It contracts with building owners and operators to perform various types of work, including maintenance of buildings overall and specific portions of buildings or facilities within them, as well as maintenance of data centers, whether freestanding or within office buildings. It services 750 facilities in 42 states in the U.S. The U.S. portion of the business was founded in Seattle, Washington, and although it was acquired by a larger corporate structure five and a half years ago, human resources for the entire United States remains centralized in Seattle. The Employer employs more than 1,000 people in the U.S.

No organizational chart was entered in evidence, but there was testimony from Employer witnesses that the Employer divides its business into four main business lines: facility management, critical environments, servicing of chargers for electric vehicles, and commissioning and decommissioning of data centers. Only two of these divisions are at issue in this case, namely the integrated facility management (IFM) and critical environments divisions. Two of the petitioned-for facilities, Lynnwood and Olympia, are housed in the Employer’s critical environments division, while the Seattle facility is in the IFM division.

The three Employer witnesses, Vice President of Human Resources Sherry Pelletier, Operations Director for Critical Environments Bruce Hurley, and North American Vice President for Client Services (in the IFM division) Clinton Scott, described the division between IFM and critical environments as a distinction between ordinary buildings and data centers. These witnesses described IFM as involving light mechanical building maintenance, including such tasks as changing lightbulbs, moving furniture, and basic plumbing and electrical maintenance, and requiring generalized mechanical skills. In contrast, the Employer witnesses described critical environments work as highly specialized, high-technology, high-security maintenance to keep massive data centers cool, sterile, and continuously powered.

The three employee witnesses called by the Union cast doubt on whether this distinction between IFM and critical environments accurately reflects either standard definitions of industry terms or the nature of the work at each of the three facilities. According to the employee witnesses, in the facilities services industry, “critical facilities” are those facilities whose failure even briefly would cause significant impact to the building, property damage, human damage, or socioeconomic damage. These include power generators, chiller plants, backup fuel, cooling tower plants, uninterruptable power supply (UPS) to data servers, and air handlers. As discussed further below, all of the petitioned-for facilities include such critical elements and the majority of the work of the petitioned-for employees in each of the facilities consists of servicing such critical elements.
B. Seattle Facility

The petitioned-for Seattle facility is KOMO Plaza, an office building complex consisting of two towers, which house the KOMO television and radio broadcast facilities, data centers, and first-floor retail. The Employer’s HR and management witnesses described the facility in general terms as mixed-use retail-commercial space with a small amount of data servers on-site and stated that the Employer is contracted to provide service to only some of the data centers in the building and even for those does not service the server racks or cables, but only the cooling and power.

However, the two employee witnesses who work at the facility testified that the facility is in fact one of the three most important data centers on the West Coast, where international fiber optic cables from Asia terminate, and it consumes the second-most energy of any building in Seattle. They provided specific testimony, based on their daily work at the facility, that it comprises about 300,000 square feet, of which data centers occupy about 150,000 square feet and broadcasting equipment occupies about 50,000 square feet. Office space and extra-cold refrigeration for vaccines occupy the remainder. This facility is staffed 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. The buildings contain 9 generators, 6 chillers, and 7 cooling towers, as well as numerous air handlers, pumps, and UPSs, which ensure that critical equipment, such as servers, does not lose electric power even for an instant.3

There are five petitioned-for employees at the Seattle facility, all of them critical facilities engineers, although one maintenance technician used to work at the facility.

C. Lynnwood Facility

The Lynnwood facility is a 125,000-square-foot data center operated by Evoque, with which the Employer contracts (the Employer provides services at 17 other Evoque facilities around the country). The facility contains servers, generators, UPSs, fire alarms, chillers, and HVAC systems that the Employer contracts to keep running without interruption. The Employer does not staff this facility 24-7, but only 6 AM to 11 PM daily.

Operations Director Hurley testified generally that the equipment in Lynnwood differs from that in Seattle and Olympia but acknowledged that he had no direct knowledge of the Seattle KOMO facility. However, an employee witness, a critical facilities engineer who ordinarily works at the Seattle KOMO facility but temporarily worked in Lynnwood, testified that Lynnwood and Seattle KOMO have some of the same critical components. There is no evidence as to whether the Employer services the Lynnwood servers and cables themselves, or only the cooling and power for the facility.

There are four petitioned-for employees at the Lynnwood facility, all of them critical facilities engineers.

---

2 In its post-hearing brief, the Petitioner cited to a website for the Seattle site. However, no pages from such a website were entered in evidence, and it is not the sort of thing of which I can take administrative notice.

3 With the exception of the term “UPS,” there is no explanation in the record as to what these terms mean.
D. **Olympia Facility**

The Olympia facility is an approximately 280,000 square-foot data center for the State of Washington. It contains cooling towers, chillers, pumps, generators, switch gears, air handlers, risers, alarms, and UPSs, which the Employer contracts to keep running without interruption. There is no evidence as to whether the Employer services the servers and cables themselves, or only the cooling and power for the facility. The Employer staffs this facility 24-7.

There are six petitioned-for employees at the Olympia facility, all of them critical facilities engineers.

E. **Non-Petitioned-For Employer Facilities**

The Employer operates other facilities in the State of Washington besides the petitioned-for ones. However, there is no information in the record as to exactly how many. There was testimony that in addition to the petitioned-for facilities, the Employer services one AT&T data center in Olympia; “several” Puget Sound Energy (PSE) locations in Seattle for which the Employer provides general IFM; and one data center in Quincy, Washington. There was also testimony that the supervisor of the Seattle KOMO facility, Nick Irish, also oversees a building in Seattle identified only as 325 Eastlake (whether that is a PSE location was not made clear). There is no further evidence in the record regarding these facilities, except employee testimony, described below, regarding the nature of the work performed by employees based out of the PSE facilities.

F. **Community of Interest Factors**

1. **Skills, duties, and working conditions**

The HR and manager witnesses for the Employer testified that, under the Employer’s contract with the Seattle KOMO Plaza client, general building maintenance is its main responsibility at this facility. However, the employee witnesses testified that 99 to 100 percent of their work time was spent doing high-level maintenance of critical equipment, with very little time spent doing basic office facilities maintenance. Until recently, the Employer employed a maintenance technician, who, according to Seattle employee witnesses, performed all such basic facilities maintenance. The critical facilities engineer witnesses testified that they are responsible for maintaining generators, chillers, cooling towers, air handlers, pumps, and UPSs at the facility.

One of the witnesses formerly ran the crew of the nuclear reactor on a Navy submarine and testified that half the Employer’s staff at the facility similarly served on nuclear submarines. He explained that this facility required such high-level expertise because the systems at this facility cannot be allowed to fail, even briefly, and this was why employees with such backgrounds were recruited. The employee witnesses testified that the skills and duties required at the three petitioned-for facilities are similar, as all three spend the majority of their work time on maintenance of critical facilities.
Petitioner entered in evidence a letter from Tierpoint, one of the tenants of KOMO Plaza, describing its facilities there as “critical infrastructure” for data center and disaster recovery services and the employees there as necessary to ensuring continuity of such services. The Employer distributed copies of the letter to its Seattle KOMO employees in March 2020 for employees to carry in case they were traveling to the facility and were stopped and questioned as to whether they were essential personnel in the context of COVID. The Petitioner also entered in evidence a similar letter from the Employer regarding work at the University of Washington Medical Center (in Seattle), where KOMO Plaza employees worked temporarily in 2020. This letter also described these employees’ work as ensuring continuing operation of a “critical” facility.

While no employee who currently works at the Lynnwood facility testified, one current Seattle employee testified that he had worked temporarily at the Lynnwood facility and found it to be similar work and equipment there.

An Olympia employee testified that about 90 percent of his time is spent maintaining critical equipment, including cooling towers, chillers, pumps, generators, switch gears, air handlers, risers, alarms, and UPSs.

Employee witnesses noted that the work at PSE buildings in the Seattle area served by the Employer is quite different from that at the petitioned-for facilities, in that it is more basic facilities maintenance, such as changing light bulbs, fixing ballasts in light panels, unblocking toilets, and fixing water fountain pressure, rather than critical facilities work; however, he did not make clear how he knew this. The witnesses noted that although some of the PSE buildings are closer to Lynnwood than the Seattle KOMO facility is, when there was a need for extra temporary staff at Lynnwood, KOMO facility employees were sent there, rather than PSE-based employees, because the nature of the KOMO work and required skills are a closer match to Lynnwood.

There was no evidence entered in the record as to the nature of the work performed at the other non-petitioned-for Employer facilities in Western Washington, the AT&T data center in Olympia and the 325 Eastlake facility.

Employee wage scales are set by centralized HR. Lynnwood and Olympia employees earn between $75,000 and $90,000, whereas Seattle wages are somewhat higher because of the higher cost of living in Seattle (but no specific evidence as to Seattle wages was entered in evidence). The Employer maintains an employee handbook covering all U.S. employees. That handbook includes provisions on discipline, vacation, and sick leave, but there was no specific evidence in the record regarding what those provisions say (the handbook was not entered in evidence). However, an HR witness testified that, due to the city of Seattle’s sick and safe time law, Seattle employees (including the KOMO Plaza employees) receive different leave time than Lynnwood or Olympia employees. All the petitioned-for employees are offered the same medical, dental, vision, disability, 401(k), and employee assistance program benefits, as are employees at non-petitioned-for facilities.
There was general testimony that the Lynnwood employees work a different schedule than those at the Olympia and Seattle facilities, because Olympia and Seattle are staffed 24-7 while Lynnwood is not. There was no other evidence as to the schedules of any of the petitioned-for employees or of the schedules of employees at non-petitioned-for facilities.

If an employee at any of the three facilities seeks a raise other than those regularly scheduled, such a request would go through the management tree described below in section 4 and centralized HR would also be involved. A Seattle employee testified that he recently sent such a request to supervisor Nick Irish and Vice President Scott, who included an HR employee in an email acknowledging the request.

At the Olympia facility, because it is a State of Washington government site, all employees are required to provide proof of vaccination. There is no such requirement at the Seattle KOMO and Lynnwood locations.

There is no evidence in the record as to the wages of employees at other, non-petitioned-for facilities.

(2) Functional integration

The work of the petitioned-for employees at each of the three facilities is entirely separate from and unrelated to that of the other facilities, except that employees of each have been occasionally called upon to fill in at the other facilities (about which more below in the interchange section).

There is no evidence in the record as to how this lack of integration compares to the integration with other, non-petitioned-for Employer facilities, except that there was testimony that employees at the PSE facilities function as roving technicians for these buildings, which suggests that they move between various PSE sites in the course of their regular work schedule. As noted above, there was also employee testimony that employees from PSE facilities were not selected to fill in at the other facilities because PSE facility employee skills and duties do not match as well.

(3) Employee contact and interchange

There was testimony that one Olympia employee transferred from Olympia to Seattle KOMO and then back.

At least two Seattle KOMO employees were temporarily assigned to work at Lynnwood when the Employer first acquired the contract for the facility. Seattle KOMO employees were temporarily assigned to work at a University of Washington medical facility containing critical facilities (medical laboratories) when a large number of the employees there were out sick with COVID in 2020; the Employer no longer holds the contract for that building.

To get into each of the facilities requires badges issued by the Employer’s client for that specific facility. Employees cannot go into other facilities without the Employer’s first receiving
authorization from the client. Therefore, while there is no direct evidence on this point, it would appear that there is no regular contact among petitioned-for employees at the three different facilities.

Prior to COVID, the Employer held annual holiday parties to which employees from the three petitioned-for facilities were all invited.

There is no evidence in the record as to how this level of contact and interchange compares to contact and interchange with employees at non-petitioned-for Employer facilities, except that, as noted above, PSE employees are described as roving between buildings. There is no evidence as to whether employees from non-petitioned-for facilities were also invited to annual holiday parties.

(4) Centralized control of management and supervision

As noted above, no organizational chart was entered in evidence.

As noted above, the Employer divides its business between IFM, critical environments, and two other business lines not at issue here. The Employers does not further organize its U.S. business regionally but instead structures it by client. That is, its managers are responsible for individual clients’ portfolios, many of which include multiple facilities throughout the country. Perhaps as a result, the Employer appears to have highly centralized management nation- and even North America-wide and few layers of supervision between its chief executive officer (CEO) and petitioned-for employees.

Staff of the Seattle facility report up through the IFM division: The first-line supervisor of the Seattle facility is Assistant Critical Facility Manager Nick Irish, who reports to Vice President for Client Services North America Clinton Scott, who reports to Mike Greidanus, the chief operating officer for the Employer’s North American IFM division, as well as for the Employer’s entire Canadian operations. Greidanus reports in turn to the Employer’s CEO, Gordon Hicks. As noted above, Irish also supervises another building in Seattle, 325 Eastlake, and a building in San Jose, California; all three facilities are managed for one client, GI Properties.

Staff of the Lynnwood and Olympia facilities report up through the critical facilities division: There are currently no front-line supervisors of these facilities, so first-level supervision for both of them is currently being done by Senior Operations Manager William Krause, who reports to Operations Director for Critical Environments Bruce Hurley, who reports to Senior Vice President for Critical Environments Steve Meyers, who in turn reports to CEO Hicks.

The Employer maintains a consulting arm that supports both the IFM and critical environments divisions. In 2020 Jamie Brockamp, a senior manager in the critical environments division and a member of the consulting arm, was put in charge of temporarily transferring employees from the petitioned-for Seattle KOMO facility to a Seattle facility in the critical environments division (the University of Washington facility described above), in order to cover for a surge of COVID-related employee absences. Brockamp, rather than Clinton Scott, made the
decision to transfer the Seattle KOMO facility employees, despite being neither the manager of the Seattle KOMO facility nor a member of the IFM division. At an unspecified time during the tenure of the employee witnesses, Brockamp also temporarily supervised the Lynnwood facility.

Discipline is issued at each of the three facilities through the management tree described above, but centralized HR is also involved. Similarly, as described above, raises are granted through the management tree described above, with involvement by centralized HR.

For hiring, the manager of the site in question contacts centralized HR, which then does recruiting for the position and initial screening, after which hiring returns to the hiring manager. In the case of Seattle, that is Clinton Scott, whereas for Lynnwood and Olympia it is Bruce Hurley.

There is minimal evidence in the record as to where non-petitioned-for facilities fall within the Employer’s supervisory structure. There was testimony that Seattle KOMO supervisor Nick Irish also supervises 325 Eastlake, which would presumably place this facility in the IFM division. The PSE facilities (which may or may not include 325 Eastlake) are assigned to the IFM division. There is no evidence in the record as to which division the Olympia AT&T facility is assigned to, although it can be extrapolated from the label “data center” that the AT&T facility is within the critical environments division.

(5) Geographic proximity

Based on the addresses in the record, I take administrative notice that, according to Google Maps, the Seattle facility is 17.5 miles south of the Lynnwood facility and the Olympia facility is 63 miles south of the Seattle facility (the Lynnwood facility and the Olympia facility are therefore about 80 miles apart). I also take administrative notice that the State of Washington is divided into two main geographical regions, Western and Eastern Washington, by the Cascade Mountain Range and that the Puget Sound area is a region within Western Washington. All of the petitioned-for facilities are within the Puget Sound area, in Western Washington.

As noted above, there is little evidence in the record about other Employer facilities in Washington, but there is evidence that the Employer services one AT&T data center in Olympia; “several” Puget Sound Energy locations in Seattle; and one data center in Quincy, Washington, as well as a building in Seattle identified only as 325 Eastlake (whether that is a Puget Sound Energy location was not made clear). I take administrative notice that Quincy is approximately 160 miles from each of the petitioned-for facilities, in Eastern Washington, on the east side of the Cascades. I also take administrative note that the other mentioned facilities serviced by the Employer are within a few miles of one of the petitioned-for facilities, in the Puget Sound area.

II. ANALYSIS

A. Board’s Multi-Location Standard

The appropriateness of a multi-facility unit is determined by whether the employees in question share a community of interest, considering the following factors: (1) similarity in skills,
duties, and working conditions; (2) functional integration; (3) employee contact and interchange; (4) centralized control of management and supervision; (5) geographic proximity; and (6) bargaining history. See, e.g., Exemplar, Inc., 363 NLRB No. 157 (2016); Clarian Health Partners, Inc., 344 NLRB 332, 334 (2005); Bashas’, Inc., 337 NLRB 710, 711 (2002); Alamo Rent-A-Car, 330 NLRB 897, 897 (2002). In the multi-facility unit context, the question is simply whether the petitioned-for unit is an appropriate one; the Board’s single-facility presumption does not apply and does not need to be overcome. Hazard Express, Inc., 324 NLRB 989, 989 (1997) (citing NLRB v. Carson Cable TC, 795 F.2d 879, 886-87 (9th Cir. 1986); Capital Coors Co., 309 NLRB 322, 325 (1992)).

The Board has repeatedly emphasized that multi-facility units should correspond to employers’ administrative groupings. See, e.g., Exemplar, Inc., 363 NLRB No. 157, slip op. at 3 (2016). In addition, the Board will find a petitioned-for multifacility unit inappropriate if the petitioned-for group does not share a community of interest distinct from that shared with employees at other, excluded locations. Lab. Corp. of Am. Holdings, 341 NLRB 1079, 1082 (2004); Acme Markets, Inc., 328 NLRB 1208 (1999). See also AT&T Mobility Services, LLC, 371 NLRB No. 14, slip op. at 1 (2021) (holding that the standard articulated in PCC Structurals, Inc., 365 NLRB No. 160 (2017), applies only where additional employee classifications are at issue and not where additional locations are at issue).

Below I address the specific community of interest facts here. However, because the facilities at issue do not have a history of collective bargaining relevant to the question before me, I have not addressed this factor as a separate consideration.

B. Community of Interest Factors

(1) Skills, Duties, and Working Conditions

While the Employer witnesses generally claimed that the skills and duties of the petitioned-for employees at the three facilities are significantly different from each other, specific testimony from employees indicated that their skills and duties are quite similar. They maintain similar “critical” equipment and are expected to keep it running without interruption.

Wages for the petitioned-for employees are set by centralized HR and management and they are paid similarly (Seattle employees are paid somewhat more, but there was no evidence as to how much more). Petitioned-for employees have access to all of the same benefits, except that due to the city of Seattle’s sick and safe time law, Seattle employees receive additional sick leave time. The same is true for employees at non-petitioned-for facilities in Seattle.

The Seattle and Olympia facility are staffed 24-7, while the Lynnwood facility is not staffed overnight. There was no specific evidence about the schedules of the petitioned-for employees, but it can be extrapolated that some Seattle and Olympia employees work overnight shifts, while no Lynnwood employees do.
There was testimony that the skills, duties, and working conditions of employees working at the PSE buildings are quite different from those of the petitioned-for employees, but there was no evidence regarding those of employees at other non-petitioned-for facilities in Western Washington.

Based on the foregoing, I find that this factor weighs in favor of finding community of interest among the petitioned-for employees, but there is a lack of evidence that this community of interest is distinct from that of employees at excluded facilities.

(2) Functional Integration

The three facilities operate entirely independent of each other, except that the employees from one facility have on occasion filled in at the other facilities. As noted above, there is testimony in the record that employees at the non-petitioned-for PSE facilities do not fill in in this way, because of the differences in their skills, but there was no evidence as to whether employees from any other, non-petitioned-for facilities have filled in at any of the petitioned-for facilities.

Both because of the minimal level of functional integration among the three petitioned-for facilities and the lack of evidence as to integration with non-petitioned-for facilities, I therefore find that this factor weighs somewhat against finding community of interest.

(3) Employee Contact and Interchange

It appears that there is no regular contact between employees at the three different facilities. There is, however, evidence of limited temporary and permanent interchange, in that employees have temporarily filled in at the other facilities and at least one employee permanently transferred from Olympia to Seattle and then back again. There was also testimony that employees do not temporarily fill in between the non-petitioned-for PSE buildings and the petitioned-for facilities, but no evidence as to whether there was interchange with employees at other non-petitioned-for facilities.

Both because of the low level of contact and interchange among the three petitioned-for facilities and the lack of evidence as to contact and interchange with non-petitioned-for facilities, I therefore find that this factor weighs somewhat against finding community of interest.

(4) Centralized Control of Management and Supervision

The petitioned-for unit cuts across two of the Employer’s divisions, IFM and critical environments, with the Seattle KOMO facility placed within the IFM division and the Lynnwood and Olympia facilities placed within the critical environments divisions. Therefore, there is no common supervision or management among the three facilities lower than the CEO level.

However, there is a consulting arm that serves both divisions and on at least two occasions a manager who serves both in the critical environments division and in the consulting arm temporarily took over management of Puget Sound-area facilities, transferring employees from
Seattle KOMO to a University of Washington facility and to the Lynnwood, where they were under his supervision. Furthermore, the testimony of employee witnesses indicates that the Employer’s corporate distinction between the IFM and critical environments divisions does not reflect genuine differences in the work performed by employees at the three facilities.

Nevertheless, the Board does not second-guess employers’ choices as to how to organize their businesses, and the Employer divides its management structure between the IFM and critical environments divisions. As a result, with the temporary exceptions involving Jamie Bockamp and the consulting arm noted above, the petitioned-for facilities do not share management or supervision. It is unknown to what degree these facilities share management and supervision with non-petitioned-for facilities. Thus, based on the record evidence, the petitioned-for unit does not correspond to an administrative grouping of the Employer.

I therefore find that this factor weighs against finding community of interest.

(5) Geographic Proximity

The distances involved in this case are somewhat larger than the Board has typically addressed in making multi-facility determinations. See Bashas’, Inc., 337 NLRB 710, 711 (2002) (facilities within a 30-mile area); Alamo Rent-A-Car, 330 NLRB 897, 897 (2002) (facilities separated by 10 miles). However, all are within a two-hour’s drive of each other and all are within the Puget Sound region, Western Washington. However, so are several excluded facilities. Therefore, while the geographic distances between the petitioned-for facilities are not a major barrier to collective bargaining and they share a common geographic region, geography does not distinguish the petitioned-for facilities from other, excluded locations. See Lab. Corp., 341 NLRB at 1083 (while petitioned-for facilities were geographically proximate to each other, the fact that excluded facilities were similarly proximate weighed against finding community of interest).

I therefore find that this factor weighs against finding community of interest.

III. CONCLUSIONS

In determining that the unit sought by Petitioner is not appropriate, I have carefully weighed the community-of-interest factors. I conclude that the unit sought by Petitioner is not appropriate, because there is insufficient evidence to demonstrate that the petitioned-for employees share a community of interest distinct from employees at excluded facilities. Based upon the entire record in this matter and in accordance with the discussion above, I conclude and find as follows:

4 While Petitioner stated at hearing its willingness to proceed in any alternate unit, there is insufficient evidence to establish whether a larger unit, including some or all of the excluded Employer facilities in Western Washington, would be appropriate. Furthermore, the appropriateness of single-facility units was not litigated by the parties and therefore is not before me.
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 herein.5

3. The Petitioner is a labor organization within the meaning of § 2(5) of the Act and claims to represent certain employees of the Employer.

4. No question affecting commerce exists concerning the representation of certain employees of the Employer within the meaning of § 9(c)(1) and § 2(6) and (7) of the Act.

IV. ORDER

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the petition filed herein be, and it hereby is, dismissed.

V. RIGHT TO REQUEST REVIEW

Pursuant to Section 102.67(c) of the Board’s Rules and Regulations you may obtain a request for review of this Decision by filing a request with Executive Secretary of the National Labor Relations Board. The request for review must conform to the requirements of Sections 102.67(d) and (e) of the Board’s Rules and Regulations and must be filed by Tuesday, April 26, 2022. Pursuant to Section 102.5(c) of the Board’s Rules and Regulations, a request for review must be filed by electronically submitting (E-Filing) it through the Agency’s web site (www.nlrb.gov), unless the party filing the request for review does not have access to the means for filing electronically or filing electronically would impose an undue burden. A request for review may be E-Filed through the Agency’s website but may not be filed by facsimile. To E-File

5 At the hearing, the parties stipulated to the following facts: The Employer is a State of Washington limited liability corporation, providing facility management services for critical environments including data centers and facility management in, among other places, Seattle, Washington. During the past calendar year, a representative period, the Employer's gross revenues from all sales and performance of services exceeded $500,000. During the same time period, the Employer purchased goods and materials valued in excess of $50,000 directly from points located outside the State of Washington.
the request for review, go to www.nlrb.gov, select E-File Documents, enter the NLRB Case Number, and follow the detailed instructions. 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.
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