#### 71 FLRA No. 86

# UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE (Petitioner)

0-PS-37

# DECISION ON REQUEST FOR GENERAL STATEMENT OF POLICY OR GUIDANCE

December 13, 2019

Before the Authority: Colleen Duffy Kiko, Chairman, and Ernest DuBester and James T. Abbott, Members

### I. Statement of the Case

Pursuant to § 2427.2 of the Authority's Regulations,<sup>1</sup> the Petitioner requests that the Authority issue a general statement of policy or guidance regarding the Federal Service Impasses Panel's (the Panel's) mandatory authority to respond to a request for assistance following parties' use of alternative dispute resolution procedures in conjunction with the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service and other attempts to resolve an impasse.<sup>2</sup> Specifically, the Petitioner asks us to issue guidance on the analysis used by the Panel to determine whether an impasse exists.<sup>3</sup>

## II. Background

The Petitioner explains that its request was prompted by what it described as "dilatory tactics" employed by "some unions" that "needless[ly] delay" the resolution of impasses that have been submitted to the Panel.<sup>4</sup> To address these concerns, the Petitioner asks the Authority to resolve three questions:

 What are the responsibilities of the Panel to ensure that a union does not use a ratification procedure to prevent agencies from exercising

- their statutory rights to impasse procedures?
- 2. Can the Authority clarify when impasse is reached in the context of a failed ratification vote?
- 3. Is an article that [the Panel] imposes subject to union ratification even if the ground rules require a ratification vote on the entire agreement?<sup>5</sup>

#### III. Discussion

Upon careful consideration of the Petitioner's request, we find that it is not appropriate for resolution through the issuance of a general ruling.<sup>6</sup> These questions would most appropriately be addressed in the context of the facts and circumstances presented by parties involved in an actual dispute.<sup>7</sup> Accordingly, we deny the request.<sup>8</sup>

### IV. Order

We deny the Petitioner's request.

Order Denying Request for a Gen. Ruling, 9 FLRA 823, 824 (1982)).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> 5 C.F.R. § 2427.2.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Petitioner's Request (Request) at 1.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> *Id.* at 5.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> *Id.* at 1, 5.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> *Id.* at 2.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>6</sup> 5 C.F.R. § 2427.5.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>7</sup> E.g., Gen. Counsel, 51 FLRA 409, 412 (1995) (citing Order Denying Request for Gen. Ruling, 14 FLRA 757, 758 (1984);

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>8</sup> Chairman Kiko notes that while the parties may understandably experience frustration throughout the collective-bargaining experience, the Federal Service Labor-Management Relations Statute provides avenues of redress, such as grievances, unfair-labor-practice charges, and the like. Parties may take advantage of these avenues as appropriate.