RECEIVED

Jul 22 2024 03:56PM EDT

Notice: This decision may be formally revised within thirty days of issuals TREGTEOFIC GOLISMEIA the District of Columbia Register. Parties should promptly notify this office of any PUBLIC EMPLOYEE RELATIONSDE CARD publishing the decision. This notice is not intended to provide an opposite the advisor to the decision.

Government of the District of Columbia Public Employee Relations Board

In the Matter of:))
Yonah Bromberg Gaber, et al.))) PERB Case No. 23-S-03
Complainants))) Opinion No. 1880
V.)
American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees, Local 1808))
Respondent)))

DECISION AND ORDER

I. Statement of the Case

On May 6, 2024, the Board issued Opinion No. 1870 in the above-captioned case, dismissing the Complainants' allegation that the American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees, Local 1808 (AFSCME) violated the Comprehensive Merit Personnel Act (CMPA)¹ by failing to provide a reasonable opportunity for all its members to vote in an internal union election. On May 20, 2024, the Complainants filed a Motion for Reconsideration (Motion) of Opinion No. 1870. AFSCME opposes the Complainants' Motion.

For the reasons stated herein, the Complainants' Motion for Reconsideration is denied.

II. Discussion

The Board has held that to prevail on a standards of conduct claim, a complainant must demonstrate that they are an aggrieved individual who has suffered an actual personal injury.² In Opinion No. 1870, the Board determined that the Complainants did not demonstrate that they had suffered an actual personal injury.³ Thus, the Board dismissed the Complaint for lack of standing.

¹ D.C. Official Code § 1-617.03(a)(1) and (4).

² Allison et al. v. FOP/DOC Labor Comm., 61 D.C. Reg. 9085, Slip Op. No. 1482 at 3-4, PERB Case No. 14-S-04 (2014).

³ Bromberg Gaber, et al. v. AFSCME, Local 1808, Slip Op. No. 1870 at 6, PERB Case No. 23-S-03 (2024).

Decision and Order PERB Case No. 23-S-03 (MFR) Page 2

In their Motion, the Complainants argue that the Board should reconsider its dismissal because two Complainants were unable to vote in the March 30, 2023, union election, thereby suffering a personal injury.⁴ Of the two individuals named, only one is a Complainant. Thus, the Board will exclusively consider whether she has standing.⁵ The record includes affidavits from that individual, which assert that she was unable to attend the March 30, 2023, election because she was scheduled to work at that time, and because she found public transportation unreliable and impractical. Additionally, the Complainants argue that she was hindered from voting by the limited battery power of her electric wheelchair.⁶

The Board has held that allegations of inconvenient meeting times and places leading to low turnout, standing alone, may not establish a standards of conduct violation.⁷ Such allegations must be supported by an allegation of actual injury.⁸ Here, the record shows that unlike the other Complainants, the Complainant in question was scheduled to work and was unable to vote in the March 30, 2023, election, thereby suffering an actual injury. Thus, she alone has standing to bring the Complaint.

Regarding the merits of the aggrieved Complainant's claim, the Board has established that a union's conduct must be arbitrary, discriminatory or in bad faith, or be based on considerations that are irrelevant, invidious, or unfair for the Board to find a standards of conduct violation.⁹ The March 30, 2023, election was held on a Thursday morning, when most D.C. branch libraries are closed.¹⁰ Additionally, the Woodridge Library (where the March 30th election was held) is not the furthest branch from a Metro station and was accessible to all members by Metro bus.¹¹ Thus, the election time and location maximized members' ability to participate. The Board has found no evidence that AFSCME's conduct was arbitrary, discriminatory or in bad faith, or based on irrelevant, invidious, or unfair considerations. Therefore, the Board finds that AFSCME did not commit an unfair labor practice.

For the reasons stated, the Motion for Reconsideration is denied. The Complainants have not provided any authority that would compel the Board to reach a different result. Absent such authority, the Board will not overturn its decision.¹²

⁴ Motion at 2 (citing Complainants' Response to AFSCME's Exceptions at 5).

⁵ Where a group of individually named members files a standards of conduct complaint, the Board will exclusively consider allegations brought by named complainants who allege that they suffered an actual personal injury. *See Bryan v. FOP/DOC Labor Comm.*, 68 D.C. Reg. 43, Slip Op. No. 1797 at 1, fn. 1, PERB Case No. 20-S-03 (2021). ⁶ Complainants' Post-Hearing Brief at 3-4.

⁷ *Richardson v. FOP/DOC Labor Comm.*, 60 D.C. Reg. 16000, Slip Op. No. 1426 at 3-4, PERB Case No. 11-S-01 (2013).

⁸ *Id.* (citing Butler v. FOP/DOC Labor Comm., 46 D.C. Reg. 4409, Slip Op. No. 580 at 1, fn. 1, 4, PERB Case No. 99-S-02 (1999)),

⁹ Renee Jackson v. Teamsters Local Union No. 639, a/w International Brotherhood of Teamsters, 63 D.C. Reg. 7573, Slip Op. No. 1572 at 3, PERB Case No. 14-S-02 (2016).

¹⁰ *Plan a Visit*, DC Public Library, https://www.dclibrary.org/plan-visit.

¹¹ Hearing Transcript at 57-58, 208. The Woodridge Library is less than 1.5 miles from the Rhode Island Ave-Brentwood and Brookland-CUA Metro stations, while the Palisades Library is more than 2.5 miles from the nearest Metro station, Tenleytown -AU.

¹² FOP/MPD Labor Comm. v. MPD, 60 D.C. Reg. 12058, Slip Op. No. 1400 at 6, PERB Case No. 11-U-01 (2013).

Decision and Order PERB Case No. 23-S-03 (MFR) Page 3

<u>ORDER</u>

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED THAT:

- 1. The Motion for Reconsideration is denied.
- 2. Pursuant to Board Rule 559.1, this Decision and Order is final upon issuance.

BY ORDER OF THE PUBLIC EMPLOYEE RELATIONS BOARD

By vote of Board Chairperson Douglas Warshof and Members Renee Bowser, Mary Anne Gibbons, and Peter Winkler.

July 18, 2024

Washington, D.C.

APPEAL RIGHTS

A final decision by the Board may be appealed to the District of Columbia Superior Court pursuant to D.C. Official Code §§ 1-605.2(12) and 1-617.13(c), which provides 30 days after a decision is issued to file an appeal.