

State of New Hampshire

PUBLIC EMPLOYEE LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

TEAMSTERS LOCAL 633 OF NEW

HAMPSHIRE

Complainant

v.

TOWN OF RYE, NEW HAMPSHIRE

Respondent

CASE NO. M-0594:7

DECISION NO. 92-117

APPEARANCES

Representing Teamsters Local 633:

Thomas D. Noonan, Business Agent

Representing Town of Rye:

Robert Tawney, Chief Negotiator

Also appearing:

Paula S. Snyder, Town of Rye Janet Thompson, Town of Rye

BACKGROUND

On March 25, 1992, Teamsters Local 633 of New Hampshire (Union) filed unfair labor practice (ULP) charges against the Town of Rye (Town) alleging that certain actions by the Town or its agents were intended to discourage membership in an employee organization in violation of RSA 273-A:5 I (c). The Town denied the commission of any unfair labor practice charges in its answer filed April 7, 1992. This case was then set for hearing and heard by the Board on June 23, 1992.

FINDINGS OF FACT

1. The Town of Rye is a public employer of municipal employees as defined by RSA 273-A:1 X.

- 2. Teamsters Local 633 of New Hampshire is the duly certified bargaining agent for Town employees.
- 3. On January 2, 1992, the Rye Board of Selectmen posted a memorandum to "all Town Employees" to "request that Town Employees please consider waiving their 1992 wage increases."
- 4. By letter of January 7, 1992, to Paul Paradis, President of the Rye Town Employees' Association (a copy of which was provided to Teamsters Representative Tom Noonan), the Board of Selectmen indicated that they would like to meet with members of the Rye Town Hall Employees' Association on Monday, January 20, 1992 at 6:30 p.m. "to discuss the waiving of the 1992 wage increases."
- During a Budget Workshop meeting of the Selectmen held on January 13, 1992, the Recreation Director, appearing as a department head was asked by Selectmen Paula Snyder if she "would be agreeable to follow the other Town employees if they did not take their 6% increase." The Recreation Director gave no firm response, saying she would "have to think about it."
- 6. While the position of Recreation Director is in the bargaining unit, the incumbent in that position is not a member of the union.
- 7. The pending ULP was filed relative to the position of Recreation Director, not relative to the individual in that position.
- 8. There is no evidence of record that the individual holding the position of Recreation Director ever felt or complained that the alleged conduct of Selectmen Snyder discriminated against her conditions of employment or discouraged here membership in an employee organization.
- The individual holding the position of Recreation Director neither sought nor encouraged the filing of the pending ULP.

DECISION AND ORDER

Our findings in this case disclose neither discriminating conduct relative to employment practices nor evidence of discouraging membership in an employee organization. Thus, there has been no violation of RSA 273-A:5 I (c).

This Board finds that:

- No unfair labor practice has been committed.
- The unfair labor practice charge is DISMISSED.

So ordered.

Signed this 14th day of July, 1992.

DWARD J /HASELTINE

Chairman/

By unanimous vote. Chairman Edward J. Haseltine presiding. Members Seymour Osman and Richard E. Molan.