

Notice: This decision may be formally revised before it is published in the District of Columbia Register. Parties should promptly notify this office of any errors so that they may be corrected before publishing the decision. This notice is not intended to provide an opportunity for a substantive challenge to the decision.

**Government of the District of Columbia  
Public Employee Relations Board**

In the Matter of:	)	
	)	
American Federation of Government,	)	
Employees, Local 631,	)	
	)	
Complainant,	)	PERB Case No. 04-U-16
	)	Opinion No. 766
v.	)	Motion for Preliminary Relief
District of Columbia Water and	)	
Sewer Authority,	)	
	)	
Respondent.	)	
	)	

**DECISION AND ORDER**

**I. Statement of the Case**

The American Federation of Government Employees, Local 631 (“Complainant”) or “Union”), filed an Unfair Labor Practice Complaint and a Motion for Preliminary and Injunctive Relief, in the above-referenced case. The Complainant alleges that the District of Columbia Water and Sewer Authority (“WASA” or “Respondent”) violated D.C. Code § 1-617.04 (a)(1), (2), (3) and (4) (2001 ed.) by failing to comply with an arbitration award issued on August 29, 2003. (Compl. at p. 2). The Complainant is asking the Board to grant its request for preliminary relief. In addition, the Complainant is requesting that the Board order WASA to: (1) comply with the arbitrator’s award; (2) immediately allow Regina Smith, Adrian Smith and Harold Davis to return to work; (3) pay attorney fees; (4) pay costs; (5) post a notice to employees; (6) reinstate the Grievants to their housekeeping duties during the 180-day transfer period; (7) extend the 180-day transfer period by starting the 180 days from the date that the Board issues a decision in this matter; and (8) cease and desist from violating the Comprehensive Merit Personnel Act. (Motion at p. 4 and Compl. at p. 7).

The Respondent filed an answer to the Unfair Labor Practice Complaint denying all the substantive charges in the Complaint. In addition, WASA filed a response opposing the Complainant’s Motion for Preliminary Relief. In its response to the Motion, WASA argues that the Complainant has not satisfied the criteria for granting preliminary relief. Also, WASA argues that

if the Board grants preliminary relief in this case, it would violate Article 4 of the parties' collective bargaining agreement. (WASA's Opp. at p. 5) The "Motion for Preliminary and Injunctive Relief" is before the Board for disposition.

## II. Discussion

On January 21, 2001, WASA issued a Waste Water Treatment (WWT) Operator Certification Policy. Pursuant to that policy, WWT Operators were required to be certified. The policy language promulgated by WASA contains language that tracks much of the wording found in Article 27 of the parties' 1998 collective bargaining agreement (CBA). Article 27 of the CBA provides in pertinent part that "... [all] employees holding certain job positions should be certified or licensed." Exemptions to this licensing requirement were provided for employees who have a: (1) current license or certification; (2) minimum of 20 years in a related job at WASA or its predecessor and who have satisfactory work performance; or (3) minimum of 20 years of service and who have a prior license or certification. The above-noted exempted employees could retain their present position without obtaining an additional license or certification. In addition, the CBA provides that any employee who has a minimum of 20 years of service and certificate in Environmental Science or other job related studies from the University of the District of Columbia or its equivalent, is deemed licensed and/or certified, and therefore exempt from the provisions of Article 27.

Pursuant to Article 27, WASA agreed to assure that all other employees who were employed in these positions at the time this agreement became effective, would be trained and otherwise assisted in satisfying the licensing requirement. In order to accomplish this, WASA agreed to supply and pay for the training of employees for whom such licensing or certification is required as part of their job requirement. Furthermore, it was agreed that this training would be available for at least twelve (12) months before any certification or licensing test would be required. Also, any employee subject to this provision would be allowed to take the test at least twice before being deemed unable to continue in the affected position. Finally, if an employee fails the test, WASA agreed to train the employee for a minimum of six (6) months, prior to the second and third test, in those skill areas in which the employee was deemed deficient. Employees who wish to take the test again would only be required to be re-tested in the areas in which they were deemed deficient.

In the event an employee could not obtain the required certification or license after being trained and tested at least three times, that employee would be transferred to any vacant position for which he/she is qualified or can perform with minimum training, regardless of seniority.<sup>4</sup> Transferred employees would be allowed to take a re-test for a license or certification (in their original position)

---

<sup>4</sup> If the employee is transferred to a position of a lesser grade, that employee would retain his/her wage rate salary that was in effect at the time of the third test, for a period of one (1) year after being transferred to a lesser grade position.

Decision and Order  
Motion for Preliminary Relief  
PERB Case No. 04-U-16  
Page 3

whenever the test is scheduled.

On January 22, 2001, employees were notified that they had one year to obtain the necessary certification. To assist in meeting that requirement, WASA indicated that it would provide certification training and sponsor the certification examination at no cost.

Approximately two years later, on January 14, 2003, WASA contacted those employees that had not obtained the required certification. WASA informed these employees that effective January 26, 2003, they would be temporarily assigned to duties that did not require them to perform as certified WWT Operators. Specifically, the employees were notified that they would be assigned work that would include performing housekeeping tasks at WASA.

On July 22, 2003, seven bargaining unit members received a "Notice of Proposed Disciplinary Action." The July 22<sup>nd</sup> Notice informed these seven individuals that pursuant to Article 57 (discipline provision) of the CBA, they would be terminated because they failed to obtain the required certification.

AFGE filed for arbitration concerning the planned terminations. In an Award issued on August 29, 2003, the Arbitrator upheld AFGE's grievance. Specifically, he concluded that the CBA does not provide for an absolute guarantee of employment for those WWT Operators who did not obtain the necessary certification. However, he found that WASA should within 180 days of the Award attempt to transfer the seven Grievants to vacant positions. In addition, he determined that the date for determining when to apply the 20-year exemption would be October 4, 2001.

AFGE asserts that on September 12, 2003, WASA contacted the seven Grievants and informed them that pursuant to the Arbitrator's Award, the Grievants would be allowed an additional 180 days from the date of the Award (August 29, 2003) to be transferred to a vacant position. However, WASA notified the Grievants that they would not be able to return to work. Instead, they must use any available annual leave or compensatory leave. In addition, once their annual leave is exhausted, the Grievants would have to be placed on leave without pay. AFGE claims that as a result of WASA's actions, these employees are currently on a leave without pay status or on forced retirement. Furthermore, AFGE contends that these employees were not able to apply for "workers compensation or any other monetary benefits for individuals who do not have income." (Compl. at p. 3)

AFGE notes that WASA appealed the arbitrator's award and that this Board denied WASA's arbitration review request. However, AFGE asserts that despite the denial of WASA's arbitration review request, WASA has failed to comply with the terms of the arbitrator's award. Specifically, AFGE claims that WASA has failed to comply with the award by: (1) forcing the Grievants to use annual leave during this 180 day transfer period; (2) failing to transfer the Grievants to vacant

Decision and Order  
Motion for Preliminary Relief  
PERB Case No. 04-U-16  
Page 4

positions; (3) requiring the Grievants to compete for positions with inside and outside applicants; and (4) failing to evaluate each of the Grievants to determine what their range of skills and abilities are. (Compl. at pgs 4-5) AFGE asserts that WASA's actions violate D.C. Code § 1-617.04(a)(1), (3) and (4) (2001 ed.). As a result, AFGE filed an unfair labor practice complaint and a motion for preliminary relief.

The criteria the Board employs for granting preliminary relief in unfair labor practice cases is prescribed under Board Rule 520.15.

Board Rule 520.15 provides in pertinent part as follows:

The Board may order preliminary relief ... where the Board finds that the conduct is clear-cut and flagrant; or the effect of the alleged unfair labor practice is widespread; or the public interest is seriously affected; or the Board's processes are being interfered with, and the Board's ultimate remedy will be clearly inadequate.

The Board has held that its authority to grant preliminary relief is discretionary. See, AFSCME, D.C. Council 20, et al. v. D.C. Government, et al., 42 DCR 3430, Slip Op. No. 330, PERB Case No. 92-U-24 (1992). In determining whether or not to exercise its discretion under Board Rule 520.15, the Board has adopted the standard stated in Automobile Workers v. NLRB, 449 F.2d 1046 (CA DC 1971). There, the Court of Appeals-addressing the standard for granting relief before judgement under Section 10(j) of the National Labor Relations Act-held that irreparable harm need not be shown. However, the supporting evidence must "establish that there is reasonable cause to believe that the [NLRA] has been violated, and that remedial purposes of the law will be served by pendente lite relief." *Id.* at 1051. "In those instances where [PERB] has determined that the standard for exercising its discretion has been met, the basis for such relief [has been restricted to the existence of the prescribed circumstances in the provisions of Board Rule [520.15] set forth above.]" Clarence Mack, et al. v. FOP/DOC Labor Committee, et al., 45 DCR 4762, Slip Op. No. 516 at p. 3, PERB Case Nos. 97-S-01, 97-S-02 and 95-S-03 (1997).

In its response to the Motion, WASA disputes material elements of all the allegations asserted in the Motion. Specifically, WASA claims that on January 14, 2003, the Grievants were assigned to temporary positions that did not require them to be certified or licensed as WWT Operators. (Response at p. 3). WASA asserts that the "temporary assignments were to end on July 22, 2003; however, the time frame of the temporary assignments were extended as a good faith effort between Management and the Union [in order] to expedite the arbitration process. [Furthermore, WASA contends that the] parties understood that the affected employees [would] be placed on administrative leave or would remain in a work status, until receipt of the Arbitrator's decision. [ As a result, WASA claims that] when the Arbitrator's decision was awarded on August 29, 2003, the agreement

Decision and Order  
Motion for Preliminary Relief  
PERB Case No. 04-U-16  
Page 5

to keep the Grievants in their temporary work assignments ended [because the] Arbitrator [found that WASA is not] under an obligation to create a job for these employees." (WASA's Opp. at p. 2). WASA asserts that on September 11<sup>th</sup> and 12<sup>th</sup> they issued letters to the Grievants informing them of vacant positions and how they could apply for those positions. Also, WASA contends that the September letters instructed the Grievants that they would have to use annual leave because they could no longer perform their duties as WWT Operators.

It is clear that the parties disagree on the facts in this case. The Board has found that preliminary relief is not appropriate where material facts are in dispute. See, DCNA v. D.C. Health and Hospitals Public Benefit Corporation, 45 DCR 6067, Slip Op. No. 550, PERB Case Nos. 98-U-06 and 98-U-11 (1998).

The Board has held that "when a party simply refuses or fails to implement an award or negotiated agreement where no dispute exists over its terms, such conduct constitutes a failure to bargain in good faith and, thereby, an unfair labor practice under the CMPA." American Federation of Government Employees, Local 872 AFL-CIO v. District of Columbia Water and Sewer Authority, 46 DCR 4398, Slip Op. No. 497 at p. 3, PERB Case No. 96-U-23 (1996). In the present case, WASA acknowledges the existence of the arbitrator's award and claims that it has complied with the award. There appears to be a genuine dispute over whether WASA has complied and over some of the other terms of the award. Specifically, the parties disagree as to whether the Grievants may be placed on administrative leave or required to use annual leave or must be retained at work while they wait during the 180 day period to see if they can be transferred to a vacant position. In addition, they disagree over whether the Grievants were: (1) evaluated as required by the award and (2) told they had to compete for jobs along with inside and outside applicants. (See Compl. at p. 5). In view of the above, we believe that WASA's actions do not appear to be clear-cut and flagrant as required by Board Rule 520.15. Therefore, the question of whether WASA's actions occurred as AFGE claims or whether such actions constitute violations of the Comprehensive Merit Personnel Act, are matters best determined after the establishment of a factual record through an unfair labor practice hearing.

In the present case, AFGE's claim that WASA's actions meet the criteria of Board Rule 520.15, are little more than repetition of the allegations contained in the Complaint. Even if the allegations are ultimately found to be valid, it does not appear that any of WASA's actions constitute clear-cut or flagrant violations, or have any of the deleterious effects the power of preliminary relief is intended to counterbalance. WASA's actions presumably affect seven (7) bargaining unit members, who are affected by WASA's decision to place them on annual leave or leave without pay for 180 days while they wait to see if they will be transferred. However, WASA's actions stem from a single action (or at least a single series of related actions), and do not appear to be part of a pattern of repeated and potentially illegal acts. While the CMPA prohibits District agencies from engaging in unfair labor practices, the alleged violations, even if proved do not rise to the level of seriousness that would undermine public confidence in PERB's ability to enforce the CMPA. Finally, while some

Decision and Order  
Motion for Preliminary Relief  
PERB Case No. 04-U-16  
Page 6

delay inevitably attends the carrying out of the Board's dispute resolution processes, AFGE has failed to present evidence which establishes that these processes would be compromised, or that eventual remedies would be inadequate, if preliminary relief is not granted.

The facts of this case do not satisfy any of the criteria prescribed by Board Rule 520.15. Specifically, we conclude that AFGE has failed to provide evidence which demonstrates that the allegations, even if true, are such that the remedial purposes of the law would be served by pendente lite relief. Moreover, should violations be found in the present case, the relief requested can be accorded with no real prejudice to the Grievants following a full hearing. Therefore, we find that the facts presented are not appropriate for the granting of preliminary relief.

We believe that the root of the issue regarding the 180-day transfer period involves a dispute over the terms and interpretation of the arbitrator's award dated August 29, 2003. Specifically, the parties have a disagreement concerning whether the Grievants are to be returned to work or may be required to use available annual leave, compensatory leave or leave without pay, during the 180-day transfer period. We are remanding these issues to the arbitrator and directing the arbitrator to resolve the parties' dispute regarding these issues. The arbitrator's determination in this regard will be binding in both this case (PERB Case No. 04-U-16) and PERB Case No. 03-U-52<sup>5</sup> to the extent that it raises the same issues. Furthermore, since the parties have been disputing this award for over a year, we are directing that the parties contact the arbitrator within five days of receipt of this decision in order to schedule a hearing with the arbitrator. Also, we are directing that if the arbitrator's schedule permits, this matter should be scheduled for a hearing within forty five days of this decision.

We are referring all other issues involved in PERB Case Nos. 03-U-52 and 04-U-16 to a Hearing Examiner for a determination concerning whether WASA's actions occurred as AFGE claims and whether such actions constitute violations of the Comprehensive Personnel Act. This referral includes the issues of whether WASA reviewed the Grievants' qualifications as required by the arbitrator and whether the Grievants were required to compete with other inside and outside applicants for positions.

For the reasons discussed above, the Board: (1) denies the Complainant's request for preliminary relief; and (2) consolidates this case with PERB Case No. 03-U-52 and directs the development of a factual record through an unfair labor practice hearing which will be scheduled before November 15, 2004. In addition, we are remanding the question of whether the Grievants

---

<sup>5</sup>PERB Case No. 03-U-52 involves an unfair labor practice complaint filed by AFGE, Local 631. In their complaint AFGE, Local 631, claims that WASA violated D.C. Code § 1-617.04 (a)(1), (3), (4) and (5) (2001 ed.) by retaliating against seven employees because they won a favorable award from arbitrator Jonathan Kaufman. PERB Case No. 03-U-52 also involves a dispute concerning the terms of the award dated August 29, 2003.

Decision and Order  
Motion for Preliminary Relief  
PERB Case No. 04-U-16  
Page 7

should have been returned to work or could be required to use leave during the 180-day transfer period, to the arbitrator for clarification of his award as it relates to this issue.

**ORDER**

**IT IS HEREBY ORDERED THAT:**

- (1) The Complainant's Motion for Preliminary and Injunctive Relief is denied.
- (2) This case (PERB Case No. 04-U-16) and PERB Case No. 03-U-52 are remanded to the arbitrator for a decision clarifying the terms of the arbitrator's award dated August 29, 2003. Specifically, the arbitrator shall only consider the issues of whether the Grievants were required to be returned to work or could be required to use available annual leave, compensatory leave or leave without pay during the 180-day period noted in the award. All other issues involved in PERB Case Nos. 03-U-52 and 04-U-16 shall be referred to a Hearing Examiner for a consolidated hearing.
- (3) The Board's Executive Director shall refer the consolidated unfair labor practice complaint to a Hearing Examiner and schedule a hearing under the expedited schedule set forth below.
- (4) A hearing shall be scheduled in this case before November 15, 2004. The Notice of Hearing shall be issued seven (7) dates prior to the date of the hearing.
- (5) Following the hearing, the designated Hearing Examiner shall submit a report and recommendation to the Board no later than twenty-one (21) days following the conclusion of written closing arguments or post-hearing briefs.
- (6) Parties may file exceptions and briefs in support of the exceptions no later than seven (7) days after service of the Hearing Examiner's Report and recommendation. A response or opposition to the exceptions may be filed no later than five (5) days after service of the exceptions.
- (7) Pursuant to Board Rule 559.1, this Decision and Order is final upon issuance.

**BY ORDER OF THE PUBLIC RELATIONS BOARD**  
**Washington, D.C.**

October 13, 2004

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

This is to certify that the attached Decision and Order in PERB Case No. 04-U-16 was transmitted via Fax and U.S. Mail to the following parties on this the 13<sup>th</sup> day of October 2004.

Carol Mason-Loubon  
Labor Relations Specialist  
D.C. Water and Sewer Authority  
5000 Overlook Avenue, S.W.  
3<sup>rd</sup> Floor  
Washington, D.C. 20032

**FAX & U.S. MAIL**

Barbara Milton, President  
AFGE, Local 631  
620 54<sup>th</sup> Street, N.E.  
Washington, D.C. 20019

**FAX & U.S. MAIL**

Steve Cook  
Labor Relations Manager  
D.C. Water and Sewer Authority  
5000 Overlook Avenue, S.W.  
3<sup>rd</sup> Floor  
Washington, D.C. 20032

**FAX & U.S. MAIL**

Julio A. Castillo  
Julio A. Castillo  
Executive Director