

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA  
**FEDERAL LABOR RELATIONS AUTHORITY**  
Office of Administrative Law Judges  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20424-0001

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS VETERANS AFFAIRS MEDICAL CENTER COATESVILLE, PENNSYLVANIA  Respondent	
and  NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES, LOCAL R3-35, SEIU, AFL-CIO  Charging Party	Case No. BN-CA-90660

NOTICE OF TRANSMITTAL OF DECISION

The above-entitled case having been heard before the undersigned Administrative Law Judge pursuant to the Statute and the Rules and Regulations of the Authority, the undersigned herein serves his Decision, a copy of which is attached hereto, on all parties to the proceeding on this date and this case is hereby transferred to the Federal Labor Relations Authority pursuant to 5 C.F.R. § 2423.34(b).

PLEASE BE ADVISED that the filing of exceptions to the attached Decision is governed by 5 C.F.R. §§ 2423.40-2423.41, 2429.12, 2429.21-2429.22, 2429.24-2429.25, and 2429.27.

Any such exceptions must be filed on or before **FEBRUARY 14, 2000**, and addressed to:

Federal Labor Relations Authority  
Office of Case Control  
607 14th Street, NW., Suite 415  
Washington, DC 20424-0001

SAMUEL A. CHAITOVIZ

Chief Administrative Law

Judge

Dated: January 11, 2000  
Washington, DC

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA  
**FEDERAL LABOR RELATIONS AUTHORITY**  
Office of Administrative Law Judges  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20424-0001

MEMORANDUM  
2000

DATE: January 11,

TO: The Federal Labor Relations Authority

FROM: SAMUEL A. CHAITOVITZ  
Chief Administrative Law Judge

SUBJECT: U.S. DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS  
VETERANS AFFAIRS MEDICAL CENTER  
COATESVILLE, PENNSYLVANIA

Respondent

and  
CA-90660

Case No. BN-

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENT  
EMPLOYEES, LOCAL R3-35, SEIU, AFL-CIO

Charging Party

Pursuant to section 2423.34(b) of the Rules and Regulations, 5 C.F.R. § 2423.34(b), I am hereby transferring the above case to the Authority. Enclosed are copies of my Bench Decision, the service sheet, and the transmittal form sent to the parties. Also enclosed are the transcript, exhibits and any briefs filed by the parties.

Enclosures

**FEDERAL LABOR RELATIONS AUTHORITY**  
Office of Administrative Law Judges

OALJ

00-13

WASHINGTON, D.C.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS VETERANS AFFAIRS MEDICAL CENTER COATESVILLE, PENNSYLVANIA  Respondent	Case No. BN-CA-90660
and  NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES, LOCAL R3-35, SEIU, AFL-CIO  Charging Party	

Stephen M. Pahides, Esq.  
For the Respondent

Alfred Gordon, Esq.  
Julie McCarthy, Esq.  
For the General Counsel of the FLRA

Edward Smith, Esq.  
For the Charging Party

Before: SAMUEL A. CHAITOVITZ  
Chief Administrative Law Judge

**BENCH DECISION AND ORDER**

A hearing was held in this case on December 15, 1999, in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. Pursuant to section 2423.31 (d) of the Federal Labor Relations Authority (Authority's) Rules and Regulations, all parties jointly moved for a bench decision. I granted the motion at the close of the hearing and issued a Bench Decision and Order. This Decision and

Order is set forth<sup>1</sup> in the transcript of the hearing in this case, page 188, line 7 through page 200, line 10. Pursuant to section 2423.31(d) of the Authority's Rules and Regulations, a copy of these pages is excerpted and attached hereto and made a part hereof, as Attachment A. Further, a copy of the proposed Notice is attached hereto and made a part hereof, as Attachment B.

Issued, Washington, DC, January 11, 2000.

—

Judge

---

SAMUEL A. CHAITOVITZ  
Chief Administrative Law

---

<sup>1</sup>

1/ Page 198 lines 23 through 25, are corrected to read as follows:

B: Refusing to abide by arbitrators' decisions, including those that designate an off-site location for arbitration hearings.

ATTACHMENT A

7 BENCH DECISION

8 THE COURT: Okay. You' ll forgive me. On the  
9 record. This is a proceeding under the Federal  
Service  
10 Labor Management Relation Statute, based on the  
charge  
11 filed by the National Association of Government  
12 Employees, SEIU, AFL-CIO, NAGE Local R3-35, which I  
13 will refer to as Local R3-35, versus the United  
States  
14 Department of Veterans Affairs, Veteran, Veteran  
15 Administration, Veteran Affairs Medical Center,  
16 Coatesville, Pennsylvania, called the VA Medical  
17 Center. The regional director for the Boston region  
of  
18 the FLRA issued a complaint and notice of hearing,  
19 alleging that the, am I going too fast?

20 COURT REPORTER: No, Your Honor.

21 THE COURT: No? That the VA Medical Center  
22 violated Section 7116(a) (1), (5) and (8) of the  
statute  
23 by failing to comply with an arbitrator's order, by  
24 refusing to recognize Local R3-35's designation of  
its  
25 president Bailey as its representative, and by  
refusing

EXECUTIVE COURT REPORTERS, INC.  
(301) 565-0064





1 him access and to hold arbitration hearings at a  
2 location, and to hold arbitration hearings at a  
3 location off the premises. Respondent filed an  
answer  
4 denying the allegations. The parties requested that  
I  
5 issue a bench decision. A hearing was held, and the  
6 bench decision is issued, is being issued. Okay.

7  
8 The National, NAGE and Local R3-35 are labor  
9 organizations under 5 U.S.C. Section 7103(a) (4) and  
the  
10 U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs, Veterans Affairs  
11 Medical Center in Coatesville. The respondent is an  
12 agency under 5 U.S.C. Section 7103(a) (3). NAGE is  
the  
13 certified exclusive representative of a nationwide  
14 consolidated unit of employees appropriate for  
15 collective bargaining at VA. NAGE Local R3-35 is an  
16 agent of NAGE for representing a unit of about nine  
17 hundred non-professional employees at the  
respondent's

18 medical center in Coatesville, Pennsylvania. They  
have  
19 entered into a master agreement, Article 48, Section  
3  
20 of that agreement provides that arbitrations will be  
21 held during regular shift hours and at the facility.

22 During the time covered by the, the occurrences  
23 here, Gary A. Devansky was chief executive officer of  
24 the VA Medical Center, and George R. Pearson was the  
25 chief human resources management, chief of human

EXECUTIVE COURT REPORTERS, INC.  
(301) 565-0064

1 resources management, and they were both supervisors  
2 and/or managers under 5. U.S.C. Section 7103 (8),  
(10)  
3 and (11), and were acting on behalf of the VA Medical  
4 Center. Mark Bailey is president of Local R3-35 and  
5 was recently reelected to another three year term.  
Mr.

6 Bailey worked for respondent until January, until  
7 January, 1997, when he was removed for sexual  
8 harassment. As part of his removal, VA Medical  
Center

9 restricted Mr. Bailey from accessing Respondent's  
10 premises for all purposes, including union  
11 representation, except to get medical care which he  
was

12 entitled to as a veteran. The Merit Systems  
Protection

13 Board administrative judge on July 30th issued a  
14 decision sustaining the VA Medical Centers removal of  
15 Mr. Bailey.

16 Between January of 97, and July 30 of 99, the  
17 respondent or the VA Medical Center and Local R-35,  
or

18 R, yeah, dash 35, had two arbitrations at the  
19 Coatesville Community Center, and four impact and  
20 implementation sessions at the Coatesville Community  
21 Center.

22 During August of 99, another arbitration was held

23 at the Coatesville Community Center. Mr Bailey was  
24 present at all arbitrations and impact and  
25 implementation sessions.

EXECUTIVE COURT REPORTS, INC.  
(301) 565-0064

P. 191

1 The Coatesville Community Center is one to two  
2 miles from the VA Medical Center campus, a four or  
five  
3 minute auto ride. The campus of the VA Medical  
Center  
4 is a number of buildings. Building 16, where  
5 arbitrations are held, is the building where  
6 arbitrations are held. Employees involved in patient  
7 care are from a fifteen to a five-minute, an eighteen  
8 to a five-minute walk to Building 16.  
9 By letter dated April 7th, 1999, Arbitrator John  
10 M. Skonier scheduled an arbitration hearing in FMCS  
11 Case Number 98-11919, to take place on September  
15th,  
12 1999 at ten a.m. in the human resources conference  
room  
13 at the Department of VAMC, first floor, building,  
first  
14 floor, Building 16, 1400 Black Horse Hill Road,  
15 Coatesville, Pennsylvania.  
16 On September 9th, the charging party's attorney,  
17 Edward Smith, sent a facsimile letter to attorney

18 Stephen Pahides, representing the VA Medical Center,  
19 which stated as follows Mr. Mark D. Bailey, Senior,  
20 president, NAGE, Local R-35, will serve as my  
technical

21 representative. As you are aware, the Agency has  
22 prohibited Mr. Bailey's presence on facility grounds  
23 for the purpose of union representation.  
Accordingly,

24 in accordance with past practice and to ensure that  
the

25 local union is represented at the hearing, I must

EXECUTIVE COURT REPORTERS, INC.  
(301) 565-0064

1 insist that the arbitration hearing take place at the  
2 Coatesville Community Center.

3 On September 14th, 1999, Arbitrator John M.  
4 Skonier, how does he pronounce his name?

5 MR. GORDON: Skonier.

6 THE COURT: Skonier, conducted a conference  
7 call in the subject federal mediation arbitration,  
8 during which NAGE was represented by attorney Smith.

9 The respondent was represented by attorney Stephen  
10 Pahides, and its executive officer, Gary Devansky.  
The

11 respondent did not raise the safety of employee  
12 concerns at, during this conference call. Only the  
13 efficiency of the Agency and the terms of Article 48,  
14 Section 3 of the contract. During the conference  
call,

15 Arbitrator Skonier ruled that the hearing in the case  
16 is to be conducted at the Coatesville Community  
Center.

17 He confirmed this by a letter of the same day, saying  
18 the VA Medical Center had waived the contract  
19 provision.

20 Okay. I think those, as I see it, are the  
21 relevant facts. Let me say that although there was  
22 some dispute as to whether or not the arbitrator did,  
23 in fact, rule upon during the conference call. I  
find

24 that he did, because I think that Mr. Smith's memory  
of

25 what occurred was a little better than the, than the

EXECUTIVE COURT REPORTERS, INC.  
(301) 565-0064

P. 193

1 others. Plus, his letter was written in the past  
2 tense. I have held, not I hereby held or am holding.

3 So it seems, and, and its written the same day as the  
4 conference call.

5 Okay. Discussion. Actually, its Conclusions of

6 Law and recommended Order. Section 7121(a), one

7 second, (a) and (b) of the, of the statute provides

8 that the parties shall have a grievance and  
arbitration

9 proceeding in their collective bargaining agreement.

10 The Authority has held that the, a failure to proceed

11 with the arbitration violates the statute, Section

12 7116(a)(1) and (8). For that, see Department of  
Labor,

13 10 FLRA 316 (1982). This failure to proceed includes

14 disagreement with procedural rulings. Again, see the

15 Department of the Army, the 83rd U.S. Reserve  
Command,

16 11 FLRA 55 (1983). And it involves disputes as to  
the

17 location of any such arbitration. See, U.S.  
Department

18 of the Air Force, Griffis Air Force Base, Roane, New  
19 York, 39 FLRA 1117 (1991).

20 Basically, here we had an arbitrator's award that  
21 was clear, perhaps erroneous. I don't know that.  
But

22 the scheme of the statute is when you pick an  
23 arbitrator, you have to live with that arbitrator,  
and

24 then if you don't like what he did, you can appeal  
his

25 decision. The Agency did not appeal his decision.

EXECUTIVE COURT REPORTERS, INC.  
(301) 565-0064

P. 194

1 They might not have been able to. I agree, cause it  
2 was, it was not a final decision. It was merely a,  
an

3 interim one. But the, the normal procedure is you  
4 continue, and then in the end, you can raise it all.

5 But you have to continue. Okay.

6 I find the, the Authority has held recently that  
7 in U.S. Penitentiary, Leavenworth, Kansas, 55 FLRA  
704,

8 but more particularly, their case number DE-CA-60349,  
9 which starts at page 712, they, they discuss that

10 agency's ability to designate a representative. And  
11 basically, as the case has set forth, and we could  
all

12 talk about a, the, a union's right to designate its



13 representative. The union can designate them, and  
14 unless there are special circumstances, management  
has

15 to deal with that employee.

16 I find in this case, because of the nature of, of  
17 Mr. Bailey's conduct, there was special  
circumstances.

18 However, remember that I've already found that  
failure

19 to hold the hearing off the base, off the VA facility  
20 is a, is a violation of (1) and (8). If I haven't  
made

21 that clear, I'm making it clear. The question is is  
22 there also a (1) and (5) here. If this hearing were  
to

23 be held on the VA Medical Center, I think the VA

24 Medical Center was, was perfectly within its  
authority

25 to deny Mr. Bailey access to the premises, and I  
think

EXECUTIVE COURT REPORTERS, INC.  
(301) 565-0064

P. 195

1 these, the special security concerns and the whole  
2 little discussion here by the Authority, abbreviated  
3 and, and somewhat glib, I think applies.  
4 However, its dealing with access. From, they  
5 talk about entering, they, they, denying the person,  
6 the president, precluding the president from entering

7 the penitentiary. And the, the respondent has  
8 demonstrated special circumstances warranting its  
9 refusal to grant the president access to the  
10 institution for representational purposes. And I  
think  
11 that if there was nothing more, respondent in this  
case  
12 would have been privileged, was privileged in denying  
13 Mr. Bailey access. However, we have here an  
arbitrator  
14 saying no, hold the hearing off the premises. I  
don't  
15 see where these special circumstances privilege the,  
16 the Agency from dealing with Mr. Bailey off the  
17 premises. And by its refusing to go off the  
premises,  
18 and not allowing him on the premises, which it was  
19 privileged to do, it was in effect denying the union  
20 the ability to name Mr. Bailey as its representative  
in  
21 this case. Therefore, I say by refusing Mr. Bailey  
22 access to the facilities, while at the same time,  
23 refusing to participate in the hearing off the site,  
24 the Agency was violating Section 71, 7116(a)(1) and  
25 (5). But that s only in light of the arbitrator's

EXECUTIVE COURT REPORTERS, INC.  
(301) 565-0064

P. 196

1 order. If this were to be held on the premises, I

2 submit special circumstances perhaps would, would  
have

3 privilege in my view, although its dictum in this  
4 case, would have privileged the Agency from denying  
Mr.

5 Bailey access.

6 So I do find just so that I make this nice and  
7 neat that the phone hook-up offer was not a  
sufficient

8 offer of representation. That's, I find  
9 unsatisfactory. I do find in, in, in keeping with  
the

10 somewhat novel language of this decision, still  
11 referring to the Leavenworth case, that, that the  
12 respondent did not preclude the, the, Mr. Bailey from  
13 entering the penitentiary in order to prevent the  
union

14 from carrying out its representative activities. I  
say

15 you are privileged to do it. As they would say,  
16 security trumps union representation. They like that  
17 trump stuff. They must play bridge is all I can  
think

18 of.

19 However, having said that, and, and noting that  
20 you had offered to meet with other union  
21 representatives, the power of a union to designate  
its

22 own representatives is of utmost importance. It is  
the

23 nature of the union. It is a, a representative  
24 organization and, therefore, who it designates to  
25 represent it is of the highest order. So, by  
refusing

EXECUTIVE COURT REPORTERS, INC.  
(301) 565-0064

P. 197

1 to meet on the base, which you were privileged to do,  
2 but by at the same time refusing to comply with an  
3 arbitrator's order, I find that you, you violated  
your  
4 duty to bargain in good faith, because you, in effect  
5 denied the union the right to designate Mr. Bailey.  
6 In the same way, or along the same line, I find  
7 that there was also an independent violation of  
8 7116(a)(1) because this kind of a denial of the union  
9 its right to designate Mr. Bailey as its  
10 representative, is independent interference with  
11 employee's rights to organize and be represented.  
12 With respect to the unions request for expenses,  
13 I'm sorry Mr. Smith is not here, but they required  
14 to file disclosure, too. He was very upset when the  
15 respondent wanted to put in something that perhaps  
was  
16 not in the disclosure. They didn't file any  
17 disclosure. They didn't indicate they were asking  
for  
18 expenses. The parties had no opportunity to prepare

19 for such a request, nor did I.

20 Further, I find that the Equal Access to Justice  
21 clearly doesn't apply, because that's to allow  
22 respondents who feel they have been improperly  
pursued

23 by the general counsel to seek some small recompense.

24 But the Back Pay Act doesn't apply either. This  
wasn't

25 a prohibited personnel practice. There was no back  
pay

EXECUTIVE COURT REPORTERS, INC.  
(301) 565-0064

P. 198

1 involved. So I find that that doesn't apply. As far  
2 as the remedy, as, just as a, a good or novel,  
3 everybody's saying we need novel remedies to make our  
4 act more effective. A: I'm not sure you can order  
an

5 agency to pay funds as such. I think there may be  
some

6 problems with that as a remedy, as a punishment. But  
7 also, I just don't think it's appropriate here. As I  
8 say, this is not, this is a closed case. I think  
that,

9 that the Agency was privileged in denying Mr. Bailey  
10 access to its premises. And I just don't think  
11 expenses are appropriate in this case.

12 For an Order, I ORDER the following: Pursuant to

13 Section 2423.29 of the Federal Labor Relations  
14 Authorities Rules and Regulations and Sections 7118  
of  
15 the Federal Service Labor Management Relation  
statute,  
16 the United, the Veterans Administration Medical  
Center  
17 in Coatesville, Pennsylvania shall cease and desist  
18 from refusing to participate in the hearing in the  
19 arbitration proceeding in FMCS, case number 98-11919  
at  
20 the Coatesville Community Center, or any other  
location  
21 as ordered by Arbitrator John M. Skonier. We'll,  
22 that's A.  
23 B: refusing to abide by the arbitrator's  
24 decisions, including those that designate an off-site  
25 location for arbitration hearings.

EXECUTIVE COURT REPORTERS, INC.  
(301) 565-0064

P. 199

1 C: refusing to recognizing NAGE Local R3-35  
2 president Mark D. Bailey, Senior as the union's  
3 designated representative by refusing to abide by an  
4 arbitrator's decision concerning location of  
hearings.  
5 And in any like or related manner, interfering with,  
6 restraining or coercing bargaining unit employees in

7 the exercise of their rights assured by the statute.

8 You'll take the, take the affirmative, the

9 following affirmative action in order to effectuate  
the

10 purposes and policies of the statute: participate in

11 the arbitration proceeding in FMCS, case number 98-

12 11919 at the Coatesville Community Center, or any  
other

13 location as ordered by Arbitrator John M. Skonier and

14 abide by arbitrator's decisions, including those that

15 designate an off-site location for arbitration

16 hearings.

17 Post at the, post a notice to all employ, post at

18 the VA Medical Center, Coatesville, Pennsylvania,

19 copies of the attached notice to all employees on  
forms

20 furnished by the Federal Labor Relations Authority.

21 Upon receipt of the forms, the notice shall be signed

22 by the chief executive officer of the VA Medical

23 Center, Coatesville, and shall be posted and  
maintained

24 for sixty consecutive days in conspicuous places,

25 including all places where notices to employees are

EXECUTIVE COURT REPORTERS, INC.  
(301) 565-0064

P. 200

1 customarily posted. Reasonable steps shall be taken  
to

2 ensure that the notice and order are not altered,  
3 defaced or covered by any other material. What was  
4 that? That was B.  
5 C, D, I'm sorry. Pursuant to Section 242330 of  
6 the Authority's rules and regulations, notify the  
7 regional director, Federal Labor Relations Authority,  
8 Boston region, in writing, within thirty days from  
the  
9 date of this order as to what steps have been taken  
to  
10 comply.

11 That's my decision. Now, let me tell you the  
12 procedures. When I get the transcript, I'll read it  
13 over, certify it and issue a, a notice which will go  
14 along, which will basically track the order. At that  
15 point, when I certify it, the parties can take  
16 exceptions if they desire. Are there any questions?

17 MR. GORDON: No, Your Honor.

18 THE COURT: Then the hearing is closed.

19 (Whereupon, the hearing was concluded at 3:27  
20 p.m.)

21





ATTACHMENT B

**NOTICE TO ALL EMPLOYEES**

**POSTED BY ORDER OF THE**

**FEDERAL LABOR RELATIONS AUTHORITY**

The Federal Labor Authority has found that the U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Center, Coatesville, Pennsylvania, has violated the Federal Service Labor-Management Relations Statute, and has ordered us to post and abide by this Notice.

**WE HEREBY NOTIFY EMPLOYEES THAT:**

WE WILL NOT refuse to participate in the hearing in the arbitration proceeding in FMCS Case Number 98-11919 at the Coatesville Community Center, or at any other location as ordered by Arbitrator John M. Skonier.

WE WILL NOT refuse to abide by arbitrators' decisions, including those that designate an off-site location for arbitration hearings.

WE Will NOT refuse to recognize NAGE, Local R3-35 President, Mark Bailey Sr., as the Union's representative, by refusing to abide by an arbitrator's decision concerning the location of hearings.

WE WILL NOT in any like or related manner, interfere with, restrain, or coerce our employees in the exercise of their rights assured them by the Federal Service Labor-Management Relations Statute.

WE WILL participate in the arbitration proceeding in FMCS Case Number 98-11919 at the Coatesville Community Center, or at any other location as ordered by Arbitrator John M. Skonier, and will abide by arbitrators' decisions, including those that designate an off-site location for arbitration hearings.

---

(Agency)

Dated: \_\_\_\_\_ By: \_\_\_\_\_

—

(Signature)

(Title)

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.

If employees have any questions concerning this Notice or compliance with its provisions, they may communicate directly with the Regional Director, Boston Regional Office, Federal Labor Relations Authority, whose address is: 99 Summer Street, Suite 1500, Boston, MA 02110, and whose telephone number is: (617)424-5730.

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I hereby certify that copies of this **DECISION** issued by SAMUEL A. CHAITOVITZ, Chief Administrative Law Judge, in Case No. BN-CA-90660, were sent to the following parties:

**CERTIFIED MAIL AND RETURN RECEIPT**

**CERTIFIED NOS:**

Alfred Gordon, Esquire  
Federal Labor Relations Authority  
99 Summer Street, Suite 1500  
Boston, MA 02110

P168-060-131

Julie McCarthy, Esquire  
Federal Labor Relations Authority  
99 Summer Street, Suite 1500  
Boston, MA 02110

P168-060-132

Stephen Pahides, Esquire  
VAMC, Regional Counsel  
5000 Wissahickon Avenue  
P.O. Box 13106  
Philadelphia, PA 19101

P168-060-133

Edward Smith, Esquire  
NAGE, Local R3-35, SEIU  
317 S. Patrick Street  
Alexandria, VA 22314

P168-060-134

---

CATHERINE L. TURNER, LEGAL TECHNICIAN

DATED: JANUARY 11, 2000  
WASHINGTON, DC