

**UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
BEFORE THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD
REGION 28**

TRAX INTERNATIONAL CORPORATION

Employer

and

Case 28-RC-375549

**INTERNATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF
MACHINISTS AND AEROSPACE WORKERS,
LOCAL SC3311, AFL-CIO**

Petitioner

DECISION AND DIRECTION OF ELECTION

On November 21, 2025, International Association of Machinists and Aerospace Workers, AFL-CIO, Local Lodge SC3311, AFL-CIO (the petitioner or the Union) filed the petition in the instant case seeking to add, through an *Armour-Globe* self-determination election, 11 employees classified as system administrators (petitioned-for unit) employed by Trax International Corporation (the Employer) at the U.S. Army Yuma Proving Ground, Yuma, Arizona (Yuma facility) to the existing bargaining unit represented by Petitioner of approximately 700 employees.

The Employer contends that the petitioned-for unit are professional employees within the meaning of Section 2(12) of the Act and/or confidential employees as defined by Board precedent. The Employer further contends that petitioned-for-unit do not share a community of interest with the existing bargaining unit represented by the Petitioner and therefore should not be included in the existing bargaining unit. The Employer requests dismissal of the petition and, in the alternative, contends that the petitioned-for unit constitutes a separate, appropriate unit.

A hearing was held before a hearing officer of the National Labor Relations Board (the Board) on December 5, December 12, December 17, and December 18, 2025. The parties were afforded the opportunity to present evidence and to state their respective positions on the record. No post-hearing briefs were filed.

At the hearing, the parties stipulated, and I find, that Petitioner is a labor organization within the meaning of Section 2(5) of the Act, that the Employer is an employer engaged in commerce within the meaning of Section 2(6) and (7) of the Act and is subject to the jurisdiction of the Board.

The Parties further stipulated that the petitioned-for unit constitutes an identifiable, distinct voting group on the basis of their similarity of their skills, compensation, working

conditions, and job duties. The parties also stipulated that there are no other labor organizations representing or claiming to represent the employees in the petitioned-for unit.

The issues addressed below include whether the system administrators: are professional employees within the meaning of Section 2(12) of the Act; are confidential employees under Board precedent; and share a community of interest with employees in the existing bargaining unit under the Board's traditional community of interest standard. Further, I address whether, under the *Armour-Globe* framework, a self-determination election should be conducted to permit the system administrators to vote on whether they wish to be included in the existing bargaining unit represented by the Petitioner.

I. PROFESSIONAL EMPLOYEES

A. Facts

1. The Employer's Business Operations and Organizational Hierarchy

The record reflects that the Employer has a current services contract with the United States Department of Defense (DOD), referred to as the Mission Test Support Services Contract, providing services at the Yuma facility. The record further reflects that the Employer's Department Manager has operational oversight responsibilities of the Employer's services performed at the Yuma facility. System administrators directly report to separate supervisors employed by the Employer at the Yuma facility, who, in turn, report to the same Group Manager employed by the Employer at the Yuma facility.

2. Nature of System Administrator Job Duties

The record contains written position descriptions for System Administrators I, II, III, and Cybersecurity Systems Administrators IA (Information Assurance) (collectively, position descriptions). The position descriptions describe duties involving system and network monitoring, configuration and maintenance of servers and workstations, troubleshooting and resolution of technical issues, and implementation of system security updates and compliance requirements. The position descriptions further reference the development and use of scripts, automated toolsets, and related automation techniques to support system operations and maintenance. The System Administrator II and Cybersecurity Systems Administrator IA position descriptions also reference the use of approved tools, including approved Army IA tools, automated audit tools, and standardized Microsoft tools.

System administrators apply patches and security updates to systems, identify the source of irregular systems behavior when issues arise, and document troubleshooting steps and corrective actions so that solutions may be shared with other employees working on similar systems. System administrators also monitor system and security logs, review change notifications, and verify that systems remain updated and compliant with applicable DOD security requirements. Additionally, system administrators troubleshoot malfunctioning systems and equipment, including systems associated with radar operations, assist technical personnel in maintaining system functionality, and ensure that operational data is moved, stored, secured, and

backed up as required. System administrators may also develop scripts or automated solutions to address system issues affecting multiple users or systems, including scripts used to restore user accounts disabled due to inactivity or other operational conditions.

3. How System Administrator Work is Performed

System administrator position descriptions indicate they perform troubleshooting, system maintenance, and issue resolution. System administrators are not assigned work through daily task checklists and are not required to follow predetermined scripts when performing their duties. Rather, system administrators investigate and resolve system and network issues as they arise, including identifying potential causes of irregular system behavior and selecting appropriate corrective actions.

System administrators consult with system users to determine system needs and address issues arising following system changes or updates. When troubleshooting system issues, system administrators review system logs, analyze system conditions, and determine whether problems are isolated or affecting multiple systems. In some instances, system administrators coordinate with other system administrators to compare system conditions and determine whether a problem is occurring across multiple systems. System administrator work differs from the duties of bargaining unit service desk employees that typically follow scripts and checklists when performing assigned tasks. Complex or unresolved issues are typically escalated to system administrators for further analysis and resolution.

4. System Administrator Job Output

The system administrator position descriptions describe responsibilities such as troubleshooting, remediation, and corrective actions, without any reference to production quotas or fixed numerical output requirements. System administrators perform technical work requiring the application of specialized knowledge in system administration, cybersecurity, and network support. System administrators identify the source of system issues through review of system logs, analysis of system conditions, and investigation of system environments. Corrective actions implemented by system administrators vary depending on the system involved, the issue presented, and operational conditions affecting the system. Corrective actions may include implementing system configuration changes, deploying software packages or updates, or applying other remediation measures tailored to the specific system condition identified.

5. Knowledge Required to Perform System Administrator Work

System administrator position descriptions specify job responsibilities involving system administration, network operations, and cybersecurity compliance activities. The Cybersecurity Systems Administrator IA position description further references duties performed in accordance with DOD security requirements, including Security Technical Implementation Guides.

System administrator position descriptions reflect varying educational and qualification requirements across classifications. The System Administrator I position description requires a high school diploma or equivalent and permits qualification through multiple pathways,

including an associate's degree or military training combined with relevant experience, or a bachelor's degree combined with limited experience. The position also requires that the employee obtain industry certifications within specified timeframes. The System Administrator II position description includes a bachelor's degree in a related field as one qualifying option and also permits qualification through several years of relevant experience in information assurance, cybersecurity, or system administration. The System Administrator III position description similarly lists a bachelor's degree in a related field but permits qualification through combinations of experience and technical training. The Cybersecurity Systems Administrator IA position description requires a high school diploma or equivalent and permits qualification through relevant experience or an associate's degree or higher in a related field.

System administrator candidates are evaluated during the hiring process on technical subjects including networking concepts, the TCP/IP (Transmission Control Protocol/Internet Protocol) Model, subnetting (creating a subnetwork), VLANs (Virtual Local Area Networks), IP addressing, computer configuration management, Active Directory and Group Policy, hardware troubleshooting, operating system familiarity, and cybersecurity-related topics. System administrator candidates are assessed on possessing required job skills, acquiring new technical knowledge, completing assigned work, adhering to productivity expectations, and resolving routine technical issues without assistance.

B. Parties' Positions

1. Petitioner's Position

The Petitioner contends that system administrators are not professional employees within the meaning of Section 2(12) of the Act. The Petitioner asserts that system administrator work is technical in nature and performed within established systems and procedures. The Petitioner maintains that the record does not establish that system administrator work is predominantly intellectual and varied work, requiring the consistent exercise of independent professional judgment, any output that cannot be standardized to a given period of time, or a requirement of advanced knowledge customarily acquired by a prolonged course of specialized intellectual instruction.

2. Employer's Position

The Employer contends that system administrators are professional employees within the meaning of Section 2(12) of the Act. The Employer maintains that system administrators perform complex, predominantly intellectual work, exercise discretion and independent judgment in diagnosing and resolving system issues, and perform work that cannot be standardized to a given period of time. The Employer further asserts that system administrators require advanced knowledge in a field of science or learning, supported by educational qualifications and industry certifications.

C. Analysis

1. Legal Standard

Section 2(12)(a) of the Act defines “professional employee” as follows:

The term "professional employee" means—

(a) any employee engaged in work

(i) predominantly intellectual and varied in character as opposed to routine mental, manual, mechanical, or physical work;

(ii) involving the consistent exercise of discretion and judgment in its performance;

(iii) of such a character that the output produced or the result accomplished cannot be standardized in relation to a given period of time;

(iv) requiring knowledge of an advanced type in a field of science or learning customarily acquired by a prolonged course of specialized intellectual instruction and study in an institution of higher learning or a hospital, as distinguished from a general academic education or from an apprenticeship or from training in the performance of routine mental, manual, or physical processes [...]

These statutory requirements are conjunctive, and the party asserting professional status bears the burden of establishing that all four statutory elements are satisfied. Failure to establish any one element precludes a finding of professional employee status. *American Medical Response of Connecticut*, 330 NLRB 317, 318 (1999) (*AMR*).

In determining whether employees are professionals within the meaning of Section 2 (12), the Board examines the actual requirements and duties of the position, rather than the education, credentials, or experience of individual incumbents. *General Dynamics Corp.*, 213 NLRB 851, 857 (1974) (*General Dynamics*). Because professional employees are excluded from mixed units absent self-determination, the Board has consistently construed the professional employee definition narrowly. *Id.*

2. Application

a. Section 2(12)(a)(i): Predominantly intellectual and varied work

To satisfy Section 2(12)(a)(i), system administrator work must be predominantly intellectual and varied in character, as opposed to routine mental, manual, mechanical, or physical work. *General Dynamics*, 213 NLRB at 857; *AMR*, 330 NLRB at 318. In *AMR*, the Board held that work involving technical problem solving and variability in tasks does not establish predominantly intellectual and varied work where employees apply technical skill within established procedures and frameworks. 330 NLRB at 318. Similarly, in *General Dynamics*, the Board distinguished professional work from skilled technical work performed within prescribed systems and guidelines. 213 NLRB at 857.

Viewed under this lens, the record reflects that system administrators perform technical work involving system administration, troubleshooting, application of update and patches,

monitoring system and logs, and responding to system and network issues as they arise, including issues escalated from the service desk. System administrators perform recurring operational tasks within established systems and environments, including applying updates and patches in accordance with DOD and Army cybersecurity requirements, monitoring logs, responding to known categories of system issues, and implementing corrective actions consistent with established technical and operational protocols, approved tools, and DOD security requirements.

While system administrator duties involve technical knowledge and problem solving, the record does not establish that the work is predominantly intellectual and varied within the meaning of Section 2(12)(a)(i), as opposed to skilled technical work performed within established systems and procedures. Accordingly, the Employer failed to meet its burden to establish this Section 2(12)(a)(i) element necessary to show that system administrators are professional employees.

b. Section 2(12)(a)(ii): Consistent exercise of discretion and judgment

Section 2(12)(a)(ii) requires that employees consistently exercise discretion and independent judgment in the performance of their duties. *Id.* The discretion contemplated by the Act must be of a professional character and must exceed the exercise of technical judgment within established systems, procedures, or guidelines. *Id.*

The record reflects that system administrators exercise some judgment in diagnosing system behavior, identifying potential causes of system or network issues, and selecting appropriate steps to address those issues. On occasion, system administrators create scripts or determine when such scripts should be deployed based on system conditions, including circumstances affecting multiple users. However, the record establishes that system administrators must comply with established operational frameworks. System administrator corrective action is subject to defined security requirements, approved tools, standardized procedures, and coordination with applicable network, maintenance, or cybersecurity authorities when performing certain actions affecting systems or networks.

While system administrators exercise some discretion in certain situations, the record does not reflect that such discretion is exercised consistently or as a defining feature of the position. Rather, the record reflects that system administrators apply technical judgment within established systems, procedures, and compliance requirements, as opposed to consistently exercising any independent judgment as required by Section 2(12)(a)(ii). Accordingly, the Employer failed to meet its burden to establish this Section 2(12)(a)(ii) element necessary to show that system administrators are professional employees.

c. Section 2(12)(a)(iii): Output cannot be standardized to a given period of time

Section 2(12)(a)(iii) requires that the output produced or result accomplished cannot be standardized in relation to a given period of time. *AMR*, 330 NLRB at 318. The time required for system administrators to resolve system issues varies depending on the nature of the problem and system conditions, and the duration of troubleshooting and corrective tasks. However,

system administrators perform recurring operational duties on an ongoing basis, including monitoring systems, applying updates, responding to known categories of issues, and implementing corrective actions within an established operational environment. The record does not establish that such system administrator technical troubleshooting cannot be standardized within the meaning of Section 2(12)(a)(iii).

Moreover, in *AMR*, the Board held that variability in task duration alone does not satisfy this element where employees perform recurring duties within an ongoing operational framework. *Id.* Accordingly, the record does not establish that system administrator output cannot be standardized to a given period of time within the meaning of the Act. Accordingly, the Employer failed to meet its burden to establish this Section 2(12)(a)(iii) element necessary to show that system administrators are professional employees.

d. Section 2(12)(a)(iv): Requires Specialized Education

Section 2(12)(a)(iv) requires advanced knowledge customarily acquired by a prolonged course of specialized intellectual instruction and study in an institution of higher learning, as distinguished from knowledge acquired through experience, technical training, or routine instruction. *General Dynamics*, 213 NLRB at 857; *E.I. du Pont de Nemours*, 289 NLRB 627, 628 (1988).

As noted above, system administrator position descriptions reflect varying educational and qualification requirements across each classification. Each system administrator classification and Cybersecurity System Administrator IA position requires, at minimum, a high school diploma or equivalent. Further, these positions expressly permit qualification through alternative combinations of formal education, relevant work experience, military training, and required certifications. Although the System Administrator II position lists a bachelor's degree in a related field as one qualifying option, it also permits qualification through relevant experience. Similarly, the System Administrator III position lists a bachelor's degree in a related field, but its position description does not require completion of a prolonged course of specialized intellectual instruction as a mandatory condition of employment.

System administrators are also required to obtain industry certifications, including CompTIA Security+ (global certification that establishes the essential skills required for core security functions and a career in information technology security), within certain specified timeframes. The record reflects variation in formal education achieved among the Employer's system administrators, ranging from a high school diploma to post-secondary education. The Board has consistently held that industry certifications, technical training, and experience-based qualifications do not constitute a prolonged course of specialized intellectual instruction within the meaning of Section 2(12)(a)(iv). *E.I. du Pont de Nemours*, 289 NLRB at 628. Where a position permits qualification through experience or technical training in lieu of formal academic study, the advanced-knowledge requirement is not satisfied. *General Dynamics Corp.*, 213 NLRB at 857.

Thus, the record does not establish that system administrators require advanced knowledge customarily acquired by a prolonged course of specialized intellectual instruction.

Accordingly, the Employer failed to meet its burden to establish this Section 2(12)(a)(iv) element necessary to show that system administrators are professional employees.

3. Conclusions

Based on the foregoing and record as a whole, I conclude that the Employer failed to meet its burden to establish that system administrators are professional employees within the meaning of Section 2(12) of the Act.

II. CONFIDENTIAL EMPLOYEES

A. Facts

1. System Administrator Duties and Access

System administrators review system logs and monitor system activity to ensure compliance with established procedures and to identify irregular activity, including attempts to run unauthorized software or other irregular system behavior, and reported such irregular activity to appropriate staff.

System administrators maintain elevated system permissions associated with maintaining system access and user permissions necessary for system operation. System administrators have the ability to view system activity and system settings, including user actions, system performance information, and settings associated with user profiles and log-in permissions. System administrators may review such information retrospectively through system logs and related system monitoring tools. System administrators also have access to certain Employer operational and proprietary business information stored on systems they maintain, including invoicing and billing information reflecting hours worked by individual employees, hourly billing rates charged to the government, and related financial data associated with contract performance. Additionally, system administrators have access to government performance evaluations issued under the Employer's award fee contract, potentially affecting the Employer's profit margin.

The record reflects that system administrators do not typically have access to employee attendance record, investigate or handle employee grievances, or participate in any grievance-related matters.

2. Employer's Organization and Supervision

The Employer's organization begins at the program management office and is divided into departments including maintenance and engineering, information technology, electronics instrumentation and data collection, business operations, and safety. The organization is further divided into groups and sections associated with contract performance requirements. System administrators fall within the Performance Work Statement (PWS) group under the Employer's contract.

System administrators work in multiple locations throughout the Yuma facility, including Building 2100 and other areas at the Yuma facility containing its supported equipment and systems. Some system administrators work near one another, while others work in locations closer to the systems they support, including radar, optics, or electronic warfare systems. determined primarily by operational needs. The record reflects that system administrators do not typically work near bargaining unit employees. Other information technology work at the Yuma facility is performed by different IT professionals, including government personnel and other contractor employees.

The Employer's System Administrator Organization chart (org chart) reflects that for purposes of workflow and timekeeping approval, four system administrators, including one employed by a subcontractor, report to supervisor Calvin Williams, two system administrators report to supervisor Telesforo Garza, four system administrators, including one employed by a subcontractor, report to supervisor Josue Figueroa (collectively, three supervisors), and one system administrator reports to group manager Vladimir Gurrola (Group Manager). This org chart shows that the three supervisors report to the Group Manager and the Group Manager Reports to Department Manager R. Alan Cordrey.

The record reflects that the three supervisors approve employee time sheets and confirm attendance for invoicing and timekeeping purposes, but they do not assign system administrators work. The record further reflects that the three supervisors do not supervise bargaining unit employees. The record does not reflect that system administrators assist or act in a confidential capacity to individuals who formulate or effectuate labor relations policy.

B. Parties' Positions

1. Petitioner's Position

The Petitioner contends that the system administrators are not confidential employees. The Petitioner maintains that the record does not establish that the employees assist or act in a confidential capacity to individuals who formulate, determine, or effectuate labor relations policy. The Petitioner asserts that access to operational or personnel data does not constitute access to confidential labor relations information.

2. Employer's Position

The Employer contends that system administrators have access to confidential information, including employee data and Employer internal records. The Employer maintains that such access supports a finding that the employees are confidential employees under Board precedent.

C. Analysis

1. Governing Board Standard

Section 2(3) of the Act excludes confidential employees from the Act's protections. The Board defines confidential employees as those who assist and act in a confidential capacity to individuals who formulate, determine, or effectuate labor-relations policy. *Macy's, Inc.*, 361 NLRB 12 (2014); *Boeing Co.*, 337 NLRB 152 (2001). The party asserting confidential employee status bears the burden of proof. *Crest Mark Packing Co.*, 283 NLRB 999, 999 (1987).

The Board applies a strict labor-relations nexus test, requiring a showing that the employee:

- (1) maintains a confidential relationship with a managerial employee who exercises labor-relations authority; and
- (2) regularly assists or acts in a confidential capacity with respect to labor-relations matters.

Waste Management of Puerto Rico, 339 NLRB 262, 262 fn.2 (2003); *Intermountain Electric Assn.*, 277 NLRB 1, 3–4 (1985).

The Board has consistently held that access to business, financial, proprietary, operational, or technical information, without more, does not establish confidential employee status. *Boeing Co.*, 337 NLRB at 153 (2001); *Chrysler Corp.*, 173 NLRB 1046, 1048 (1969). Further, occasional, incidental, or speculative exposure to personnel or employment-related information is insufficient. The employee must have regular access to confidential labor-relations material or regularly assist labor-relations decision-makers. *Intermountain Electric Assn.*, 277 NLRB at 4 (1985); *B.F. Goodrich Co.*, 115 NLRB 722, 724 (1956).

2. Application

a. Relationship to Labor-Relations Policymakers

The record does not reflect that system administrators assist or act in a confidential capacity to managers who formulate, determine, or effectuate labor-relations policy. Further, the record does not identify any individual to whom system administrators report who exercise labor relations authority, nor does it reflect that system administrators report to human resources personnel or labor relations officials. Additionally, the record shows that the supervisors to whom system administrators report do not formulate or effectuate labor relations authority.

Absent evidence that system administrators assist individuals who formulate or effectuate labor-relations policy, the Board's confidential employee standard is not satisfied. *Macy's, Inc.*, 361 NLRB 12 (2014); *Boeing Co.*, 337 NLRB 152, 153 (2001). Accordingly, the Employer has not met its burden to establish that system administrators maintain a confidential relationship

with labor relations policymakers or regularly assist such individuals in labor relations to constitute confidential employees under Board precedent.

b. Access to Confidential Labor-Relations Information

Likewise, the record does not establish that system administrators have regular access to confidential labor relations information. The record does not show that system administrator monitoring or reporting functions involve access to the Employer's labor relations strategy, bargaining proposals, grievance evaluations, or personnel decision-making related to collective bargaining matters. Additionally, system administrators do not have access to employee attendance records, and there is no record evidence establishing that system administrators access grievance files, disciplinary records, collective-bargaining materials, or communications concerning the Employer's labor relations policy.

Although the record reflects that system administrators have access to certain Employer financial and proprietary business information, including its billing, invoicing, and performance evaluations affecting its profit margins, the Board has consistently held that access to such information does not establish confidential employee status where it is unrelated to labor-relations policy or collective bargaining strategy. *American Radiator & Standard Sanitary Corp.*, 119 NLRB 1715, 1720–1721 (1958); *Intermountain Electric Assn.*, 277 NLRB 1, 4 (1985). Further, the Board has consistently held that technical or operational access, even where systems contain sensitive information, does not confer confidential employee status absent a labor-relations nexus. *Boeing Co.*, 337 NLRB 152, 153 (2001); *Chrysler Corp.*, 173 NLRB 1046, 1048 (1969).

Accordingly, the Employer had failed to meet its burden to establish that system administrators have regular access to confidential labor-relations material sufficient to constitute confidential employees under Board precedent.

c. Grievance Handling and Labor Relations Investigations

The record reflects that system administrators have no involvement in grievance handling or grievance-related investigations. The Board has recognized that the absence of grievance-handling responsibilities weighs against a finding of confidential employee status because such duties typically involve assisting labor-relations decision-makers. *Hampton Roads Maritime Assn.*, 178 NLRB 263, 264 (1969); *Waste Management of Puerto Rico*, 339 NLRB 262 (2003). Accordingly, the Employer failed to meet its burden to establish that system administrators assist or act in a confidential capacity to individuals who handle grievances or labor relations investigations.

3. Conclusions

Based on the foregoing and record as a whole, the record does not establish either a labor-relations nexus or regular access to confidential labor-relations information, and the Employer has failed to meet its burden to establish that system administrators are confidential employees under Board precedent.

III. COMMUNITY OF INTEREST

A. Facts

1. Job Functions

a. System Administrators

System administrators monitor system activity, including reviewing system logs, configuring and maintaining systems, and troubleshooting system and network issues affecting computers and servers. Their duties include installing system updates, changing configurations, testing system functionality, applying security measures in accordance with established requirements to maintain system operations. In performing this work, they use administrative tools and scripts to support system maintenance and performance, including conducting system scanning and implementing corrective actions.

b. Bargaining Unit Employees

Bargaining unit employees perform operational duties using computer systems to carry out assigned tasks. In the course of their work, bargaining unit employees utilize established systems and applications to perform assigned functions. Bargaining unit employees may also identify system-related issues during the performance of their assigned duties and report those issues for resolution. Bargaining unit help desk employees provide initial support for system-related issues, including receiving user reports, documenting issues, and performing troubleshooting using established procedures and tools, including structured processes and checklists. When help desk employees are not able to resolve these issues, they are escalated for further handling.

2. Skills and Training

a. System Administrators

As noted above, system administrators perform duties related to system monitoring, configuration, troubleshooting, and cybersecurity implementation. System administrators possess training, certifications, and experience related to information technology, cybersecurity, and system administration, including certifications such as CompTIA Security+. System administrators also acquire knowledge regarding networking concepts, system configuration, operating systems, and cybersecurity practices, using administrative tools and scripts. System administrators perform troubleshooting, including analyzing system conditions, identifying issues, and implementing corrective measures, including testing system functionality following changes.

b. Bargaining Unit Employees

The record reflects that some bargaining unit employees, including service desk employees, possess CompTIA Security+ certification. The record is not clear whether other

bargaining unit employees possess any certifications. Bargaining unit employees also receive training related to system use in the performance of their assigned duties, including instruction on system use, issue identification, and applicable procedures used in the course of their work. Bargaining unit help desk employees follow established procedures and guidelines to perform troubleshooting functions, including the use of structured processes and checklists, and receive training related to system use, issue identification, and escalation procedures. Help desk employees perform initial troubleshooting of system-related issues and, when issues are not resolved through established procedures, escalate those issues for further handling within defined processes for issue identification and resolution.

3. Functional Integration

As described above, system administrators perform system monitoring, configuration, and troubleshooting functions, and bargaining unit employees use computer systems and applications in the performance of their assigned duties. Bargaining unit help desk employees provide initial support for system-related issues and escalate unresolved issues to system administrators for further handling.

4. Contact and Interaction

System administrators have contact with bargaining unit employees regarding system-related issues and system use. Bargaining unit help desk employees communicate system-related issues to system administrators when issues are not resolved through initial troubleshooting. System administrators communicate with users, including bargaining unit employees, regarding system issues and system performance and in connection with system updates and modifications. The record does not include detailed evidence regarding the extent to which system administrators and bargaining unit employees have any routine contact outside of such system-related interactions.

5. Interchange

The record does not reflect that system administrators are assigned to perform the duties of bargaining unit employees, nor does it reflect that bargaining unit employees are assigned to perform system-level duties performed by system administrators. The record does not reflect temporary assignments, rotation, or cross-utilization between system administrator positions and bargaining unit positions.

The record provides at least two examples of a bargaining unit employee becoming systems administrators but does not flesh out details regarding either instance. Likewise, the record references one example of a PC technician position moving to a system administrator position but does not otherwise provide any details. The record also contains an example of a photographer becoming a bargaining unit help desk employee and then later becoming a system administrator but again fails to provide any details regarding these two job changes.

6. Supervision

As noted above, the record does not show that system administrators and bargaining unit employees share the same supervision. There are three supervisors for system administrators, who report to a group manager, that reports to a department manager. The approximately 700 bargaining unit employees report to this same department manager, who is responsible as the final signatory for their performance evaluations, oversees discipline recommendations, participates in hiring and firing, as well as broader operational oversight of employees within this department.

7. Terms and Conditions of Employment

a. System Administrators

System administrators are paid a biweekly salary, are not subject to Department of Labor (DOL) wage determinations, and are classified as exempt under the Fair Labor Standards Act (FLSA). The Employer does not maintain a fixed salary for system administrator positions, with compensation varying based on the individual candidate's experience and education, and may include adjustments to classification level and negotiated compensation elements. The Employer posts its exempt positions using a base position classification and may adjust the level of the position or compensation based on a candidate's qualifications. The record reflects that one System Administrator 2A position had an annual salary of approximately \$71,000, and another system administrator position had an annual salary of approximately \$80,623.00. System administrators may receive additional compensation, including a sign-on bonus of approximately \$5,000, as well as varying unspecified amounts of additional bonus compensation.

System Administrators are assigned scheduled shifts with identified reporting times and are required to notify management when varying their work hours, and that they may be directed to work varied schedules, including all shifts, weekends, holidays, and overtime as needed. System administrators are eligible for the employer's corporate benefit programs and may elect benefit options, and further reflects that vacation is accrued at the rate of two weeks per year. System Administrator positions are also subject to various conditions of employment, including background checks, drug testing, physical requirements, and the ability to obtain and maintain a security clearance.

The Employer conducts annual performance evaluations for its system administrators, including metrics for their skills and knowledge, productivity, quality of work, and customer service. The Employer uses these evaluations determine system administrator progression to higher classifications. System administrators who do not meet the Employer's expectations may be placed on performance improvement plans.

The Employer's employee handbook applies to its System Administrators. System administrators do not wear uniforms but must follow the Employer's dress code.

b. Bargaining Unit Employees

Bargaining unit employees are subject to DOL wage determinations and are not classified as exempt under FLSA. DOL wage determinations establish bargaining unit employee hourly wage rates. The parties' collective bargaining agreement reflects that bargaining unit employees are compensated on an hourly basis, with wage rates established by classification and set forth in Exhibit A of the CBA. These base hourly wage rates range from approximately \$20.59 per hour in Year 1 to approximately \$51.41 in Year 3. The agreement further reflects scheduled wage increases and additional compensation in the form of premiums, including hazard pay and shift differentials, where applicable.

The parties' collective bargaining agreement reflects that bargaining unit employees' hours of work, including scheduling and overtime, are governed by Article Seventeen, and that employees are provided with paid leave pursuant to Article Twenty-One. It further reflects that employees are eligible for health and welfare benefits, retirement-related benefits, and additional benefit programs pursuant to Article Twenty-Seven, including provisions regarding continuation of benefits during certain leaves of absence.

Bargaining unit employees do not wear uniforms, but they must follow the Employer's dress code. The Employer's employee handbook applies to its bargaining unit employees to the extent it does not conflict with the parties' collective bargaining agreement.

8. *Work Location and Organizational Structure*

System Administrators perform work on systems located in multiple areas at the Yuma facility, including radar, optics, electronic warfare, and telecommunications. The record does not include detailed evidence describing the full organizational hierarchy of bargaining unit employees or describing the extent of shared or separate work locations between bargaining unit employees and system administrators.

9. *Bargaining History*

The record reflects that since about 2016, the Employer and the Union have a history of collective bargaining applicable to its bargaining unit employees employed at the Yuma facility. The parties' current collective bargaining agreement, effective June 1, 2024 through May 31, 2027, recognizes the Union as the exclusive collective bargaining representative for hourly employees at the Yuma facility, excluding specified classifications. System administrators have never been included in the existing bargaining unit of any of the parties' collective bargaining agreements.

B. Parties' Positions

1. *Petitioner's Position*

The Petitioner contends that the system administrators share a sufficient community of interest with employees in the existing bargaining unit. The Petitioner asserts that the employees

work at the same facility, operate within the same operational environment, and interact with bargaining unit employees in the course of performing their duties. The Petitioner maintains that any distinctions in classification, compensation structure, or timekeeping practices do not preclude inclusion.

2. Employer's Position

The Employer contends that the system administrators do not share a sufficient community of interest with the existing bargaining unit. The Employer asserts that system administrators have distinct classifications, duties, compensation structures, and timekeeping practices. The Employer maintains that interchange between classifications is limited and that the differences between system administrators and bargaining unit employees weigh against inclusion.

C. Analysis

1. Legal Standard

In determining whether the petitioned-for employees share a community of interest with employees in the existing bargaining unit, the Board examines the totality of the circumstances, considering such factors as job functions, skills and training, functional integration, contact, interchange, supervision, and terms and conditions of employment. *American Steel Construction, Inc.*, 372 NLRB No. 23 (2022). No single factor is determinative, and the Act requires only that the unit be an appropriate unit, not the most appropriate unit. *Overnite Transportation Co.*, 322 NLRB 723 (1996).

2. Application

a. Job Functions

As discussed above, bargaining unit employees use computer systems and equipment in the course of their assigned duties, including identifying system-related issues through system use and performing initial troubleshooting through structured processes. System administrators perform system-level functions, including monitoring system activity, configuring systems, implementing updates, and troubleshooting system and network issues affecting those systems.

These job functions are related in that bargaining unit employees operate within the systems that system administrators maintain and support. Issues identified through system use by bargaining unit employees are addressed through troubleshooting and system-level intervention performed by system administrators. The record reflects that system administrators perform broader system-level responsibilities, including configuration and system maintenance, that are not performed by any bargaining unit employees.

Based on the foregoing and the record as a whole, I find that the factor of job functions weighs in favor of finding system administrators share a community of interest with bargaining unit employees.

b. Skills and Training

As noted above, system administrators possess training, certifications, and experience related to system administration, cybersecurity, and system-level troubleshooting, including knowledge of networking, system configuration, and administrative tools. Bargaining unit employees receive training related to system use, issue identification, and troubleshooting procedures, including structured processes and escalation protocols, and certain service desk employees possess CompTIA Security+ certification. The skills and training associated with system administrator positions reflect a greater depth of technical knowledge and system-level responsibility than any bargaining unit employees. However, system administrators and bargaining unit employees perform work involving system use, identification of system issues, and troubleshooting functions within their respective roles. Thus, while the level and scope of skills and training differ, the work of system administrators and certain bargaining unit employees involves related technical functions connected to system operation and issue resolution.

Based on the foregoing and the record as a whole, I find that the factor of skills and training weighs in favor of finding system administrators share a community of interest with bargaining unit employees.

c. Functional Integration

The work of system administrators and bargaining unit employees is functionally integrated through the operation and maintenance of shared systems used in the Employer's operations. Bargaining unit employees rely on those systems in performing their assigned duties, while system administrators perform work necessary to maintain system functionality, performance, and operational readiness.

As described above, bargaining unit help desk employees serve as an initial point of contact for system-related issues and escalate unresolved issues for further handling, and system administrators address those issues and perform the updates, configuration, and maintenance necessary to support continued system operation. System administrators also perform work affecting systems used in operational areas, including radar, optics, electronic warfare, and telecommunications. Thus, there is a functional connection between the work performed by system administrators and the work performed by bargaining unit employees, through their shared systems.

Based on the foregoing and the record as a whole, I find that the factor of functional integration weighs in favor of finding system administrators share a community of interest with bargaining unit employees.

d. Contact and Interaction

System administrators and bargaining unit employees have contact in connection with their shared system use and system-related issues. As noted above, help desk employees

communicate system-related issues and escalate unresolved issues, and system administrators communicate with users, including bargaining unit employees, regarding system issues, system performance, and system updates or modifications. Additional contact occurs when system administrators perform work on systems located in operational areas where bargaining unit employees perform their duties. The record reflects that the frequency and extent of this contact varies depending on system conditions and the occurrence of technical issues, and does not establish continuous or routine interaction outside of such system-related contact.

Based on the foregoing and the record as a whole, I find that the factor of contact and interaction weighs in favor of finding system administrators share a community of interest with bargaining unit employees.

e. Interchange

As noted above, system administrators and bargaining unit employees perform distinct functions within their respective roles, and the record does not show that they are assigned to perform each other's duties. There is no evidence of temporary assignments, rotation, or cross-utilization between system administrator positions and bargaining unit positions.

The record reflects that a few individuals have moved into system administrator positions from other bargaining unit positions, including service desk and technician positions, showing progression from bargaining unit positions into system administrator roles rather than the interchange of duties between bargaining unit employees and system administrators. However, the record does not demonstrate interchange in system administrators and bargaining unit employees performing job duties.

Accordingly, I find that the factor of interchange is neutral with respect to finding system administrators share a community of interest with bargaining unit employees.

f. Supervision

As noted above, system administrators are organized within a supervisory structure that includes a Department Manager, Group Manager, and Supervisors. Although the record does not establish common supervision between system administrators and bargaining unit employees, the record shows that the bargaining unit employees report to the same Department Manager. Accordingly, I find that the factor of supervision weighs against finding system administrators share a community of interest with bargaining unit employees.

g. Terms and Conditions of Employment

The terms and conditions of employment for system administrators and bargaining unit employees differ in several respects. As discussed above, system administrators are compensated on a salary basis, classified as exempt employees, and are not subject to wage determinations. Their compensation may vary based on experience and education, and they may receive additional compensation such as bonuses. They are also subject to performance evaluations used in determining progression.

In contrast, bargaining unit employees are compensated on an hourly basis pursuant to wage rates established in the collective bargaining agreement and applicable wage determinations. Their wages, hours, overtime, and other terms and conditions of employment are governed by collectively bargained provisions, including premium pay, scheduling, and benefits.

Based on the foregoing and the record as a whole, I find that the factor of terms and conditions of employment weighs against finding system administrators share a community of interest with bargaining unit employees.

h. Work location and Organizational Structure

As noted above, system administrators are assigned within a department separate from instrumentation areas and perform work on systems located in multiple areas throughout the facility depending on the systems they support. Bargaining unit employees perform work in operational areas where equipment is located, including radar and optics areas, which consist of multiple buildings, and may perform work downrange in connection with mission-related operations. While system administrators and bargaining unit employees perform work in some of the same operational areas, the record does not establish the full organizational structure for all bargaining unit employees or quantify the extent of shared or separate work locations.

Accordingly, I find that the factor of work location and organizational structure is neutral with respect to finding system administrators share a community of interest with bargaining unit employees.

i. Bargaining History

As noted above, the Employer and the Union have an established history of collective bargaining, including successive collective bargaining agreements covering bargaining unit employees at the facility. Those agreements govern bargaining unit classifications and terms and conditions of employment. System administrator classifications have never been included in any of the parties' collective bargaining agreements. Based on the foregoing and the record as a whole, I find that the factor of bargaining history weighs against finding system administrators share a community of interest with bargaining unit employees.

3. Conclusions

Considering the totality of the circumstances, the petitioned-for system administrators share a community of interest with the existing bargaining unit employees within the meaning of *American Steel Construction, Inc.*

As discussed above, the job functions of system administrators and bargaining unit employees are related through the use and support of the same systems, and their work is functionally integrated through the identification, escalation, and resolution of system-related issues. System administrators perform work necessary to maintain and support systems used by bargaining unit employees in the performance of their duties, the record reflects ongoing contact

between system administrators and bargaining unit employees in connection with system use and system-related issues, and system administrators and bargaining unit employees are overseen by the same Department Manager.

The record also reflects differences between the groups, including distinctions in their direct supervision, their terms and conditions of employment, and the lack of evidence showing any interchange in performing their duties. System administrators are salaried and exempt employees who are not covered by the collective bargaining agreement, while bargaining unit employees are hourly employees whose wages and working conditions are governed by that agreement.

These differences do not outweigh the relationship between the work performed by system administrators and bargaining unit employees, including their functional integration, related job functions, and contact in the performance of system-related work. The Board does not require that employees be identical in all respects, but only that they share a sufficient community of interest to make the petitioned-for unit appropriate.

Based on the foregoing and the record as a whole, I find that the system administrators share a sufficient community of interest with the bargaining unit employees to find that the petitioned-for unit is an appropriate unit.

IV. *ARMOUR-GLOBE* SELF-DETERMINATION ELECTION

A. Facts

As amended during the hearing, the Petitioner seeks to represent the systems administrators and requests a self-determination election to permit these employees to vote on whether to join the existing bargaining unit represented by the Petitioner at the Employer's facility at the Yuma facility. The Employer declines to recognize the Petitioner.

The petitioned-for-unit is as follows:

Included: All full-time and regular part-time systems administrators employed by the Employer at the U.S. Army Yuma Proving Ground, Arizona.

Excluded: All other employees, office and clerical employees, managers, guards and supervisors as defined in the Act.

There are no other labor organizations representing or claiming to represent employees in the petitioned-for unit. The parties stipulated that the petitioned-for-unit constitutes an identifiable, distinct voting group on the basis of their similarity of skills, compensation, working conditions, and job duties.

B. Parties' Positions

1. Petitioner's Position

The Petitioner contends that the petitioned-for system administrators constitute an identifiable and distinct voting group and that the record raises a question concerning representation warranting an *Armour-Globe* self-determination election. The Petitioner requests that the employees be permitted to vote on whether to be included in the existing bargaining unit.

2. Employer's Position

The Employer contends that a self-determination election is not warranted. The Employer maintains that the distinctions between the petitioned-for employees and the existing bargaining unit weigh against inclusion and that the petition should be dismissed.

C. Analysis

1. Legal Standard

When a labor organization seeks to represent employees who are not presently included in an existing bargaining unit that it represents, and seeks a self-determination election to permit those employees to vote on whether to be included in that unit, the Board applies the principles set forth in *Armour & Co.*, 40 NLRB 1333 (1942), and *Globe Machine & Stamping Co.*, 3 NLRB 294 (1937). The Board will direct such an election where the petitioned-for employees share a community of interest with the unit employees and where the petitioned-for employees constitute an identifiable, distinct segment that is an appropriate voting group. See *Warner-Lambert Co.*, 298 NLRB 993, 995 (1990).

2. Application

The parties have stipulated that the petitioned-for-unit employees constitute an identifiable, distinct voting group, and as detailed above, I have found that the petitioned-for system administrators share a community of interest with the existing bargaining unit employees. Based on the foregoing and the record as a whole, I find there is a valid question concerning representation for the instant petition such that the petitioned-for employees should be afforded the opportunity to vote in an *Armour-Globe* self-determination election regarding whether to be included in the existing bargaining unit represented by the Petitioner.

V. CONCLUSION

1. The rulings at the hearing are free from prejudicial error and are hereby affirmed.

2. The Employer is engaged in commerce within the meaning of the Act, and it will effectuate the purposes of the Act to assert jurisdiction herein.¹
3. The Petitioner is a labor organization within the meaning of Section 2(5) of the Act and represents certain employees of the Employer.
4. A question affecting commerce exists concerning the representation of certain employees of the Employer within the meaning of Section 9(c)(1) of the Act.
5. The system administrator classifications at issue are not professional employees within the meaning of Section 2(12) of the Act.
6. The system administrator classifications at issue are not confidential employees under Board precedent.
7. The system administrator classifications at issue share a community of interest with the employees in the existing bargaining unit.
8. The following employees of the Employer constitute an appropriate voting group for the purposes of collective bargaining within the meaning of Section 9(b) of the Act:

All full-time and regular part-time system administrators employed by the Employer excluding all other employees, managers, confidential employees, and guards and supervisors as defined by the Act.

There are approximately 11 employees in the voting group found appropriate.

DIRECTION OF ELECTION

The National Labor Relations Board will conduct a secret ballot election among the employees in the unit found appropriate above. Employees will vote whether or not they wish to be represented for purposes of collective bargaining by International Association of Machinists and Aerospace Workers, AFL-CIO, Local Lodge SC3311.

¹ The parties stipulated to the following commerce facts:

The Employer, Trax International Corporation, a State of Nevada corporation, provides services under contract with the United States Department of Defense under the Mission Test Support Services Contract being performed principally at the U.S. Army Proving Ground Yuma, Arizona. During the last twelve months, a representative period, the Employer provided services valued in excess of \$50,000 directly to the United States Government thereby having a substantial impact on the national defense of the United States.

A. Election Details

The manual election will be held on **Wednesday, May 27, 2026**, from 5:30 a.m. to 6:30 a.m., and 11:30 a.m. to 12:30 p.m. at the Employer's facility located at the U.S. Army Yuma Proving Ground, Yuma, Arizona, at the Conference Room in Building 2535.

B. Voting Eligibility

Eligible to vote are those in the unit who were employed during the payroll period ending **Sunday, May 3, 2026**, including employees who did not work during that period because they were ill, on vacation, or temporarily laid off. In a mail ballot election, employees are eligible to vote if they are in the unit on both the payroll period ending date and on the date they mail in their ballots to the Board's designated office.

Employees engaged in an economic strike, who have retained their status as strikers and who have not been permanently replaced, are also eligible to vote. In addition, in an economic strike that commenced less than 12 months before the election date, employees engaged in such strike who have retained their status as strikers but who have been permanently replaced, as well as their replacements, are eligible to vote. Unit employees in the military services of the United States may vote if they appear in person at the polls.

Ineligible to vote are (1) employees who have quit or been discharged for cause since the designated payroll period, and, in a mail ballot election, before they mail in their ballots to the Board's designated office; (2) striking employees who have been discharged for cause since the strike began and who have not been rehired or reinstated before the election date; and (3) employees who are engaged in an economic strike that began more than 12 months before the election date and who have been permanently replaced.

C. Voter List

As required by Section 102.67(1) of the Board's Rules and Regulations, the Employer must provide the Regional Director and parties named in this decision a list of the full names (that employees use at work), work locations, shifts, job classifications, and contact information (including home addresses, available personal email addresses, and available home and personal cell telephone numbers) of all eligible voters.

To be timely filed and served, the list must be *received* by the regional director and the parties by **Friday, May 8, 2026**. The list must be accompanied by a certificate of service showing service on all parties. **The region will no longer serve the voter list.**

Unless the Employer certifies that it does not possess the capacity to produce the list in the required form, the list must be provided in a table in a Microsoft Word file (.doc or docx) or a file that is compatible with Microsoft Word (.doc or docx). The first column of the list must begin with each employee's last name and the list must be alphabetized (overall or by department) by last name. Because the list will be used during the election, the font size of the list must be the equivalent of Times New Roman 10 or larger. That font does not need to be used but the font must

be that size or larger. A sample, optional form for the list is provided on the NLRB website at www.nlr.gov/what-we-do/conduct-elections/representation-case-rules-effective-april-14-2015.

When feasible, the list shall be filed electronically with the Region and served electronically on the other parties named in this decision. The list may be electronically filed with the Region by using the E-filing system on the Agency's website at www.nlr.gov. Once the website is accessed, click on **E-File Documents**, enter the NLRB Case Number, and follow the detailed instructions.

Failure to comply with the above requirements will be grounds for setting aside the election whenever proper and timely objections are filed. However, the Employer may not object to the failure to file or serve the list within the specified time or in the proper format if it is responsible for the failure.

No party shall use the voter list for purposes other than the representation proceeding, Board proceedings arising from it, and related matters.

D. Posting of Notices of Election

Pursuant to Section 102.67(k) of the Board's Rules, the Employer must post copies of the Notice of Election accompanying this Decision in conspicuous places, including all places where notices to employees in the unit found appropriate are customarily posted. The Notice must be posted so all pages of the Notice are simultaneously visible. In addition, if the Employer customarily communicates electronically with some or all of the employees in the unit found appropriate, the Employer must also distribute the Notice of Election electronically to those employees. The Employer must post copies of the Notice at least 3 full working days prior to 12:01 a.m. of the day of the election and copies must remain posted until the end of the election. For purposes of posting, working day means an entire 24-hour period excluding Saturdays, Sundays, and holidays. However, a party shall be estopped from objecting to the nonposting of notices if it is responsible for the nonposting, and likewise shall be estopped from objecting to the nondistribution of notices if it is responsible for the nondistribution. Failure to follow the posting requirements set forth above will be grounds for setting aside the election if proper and timely objections are filed.

RIGHT TO REQUEST REVIEW

Pursuant to Section 102.67 of the Board's Rules and Regulations, a request for review may be filed with the Board at any time following the issuance of this Decision until 10 business days after a final disposition of the proceeding by the Regional Director. Accordingly, a party is not precluded from filing a request for review of this decision after the election on the grounds that it did not file a request for review of this Decision prior to the election. The request for review must conform to the requirements of Section 102.67 of the Board's Rules and Regulations.

A request for review must be E-Filed through the Agency's website and may not be filed by facsimile. To E-File the request for review, go to www.nlr.gov, select E-File Documents, enter the NLRB Case Number, and follow the detailed instructions. If not E-Filed, the request for review

should be addressed to the Executive Secretary, National Labor Relations Board, 1015 Half Street SE, Washington, DC 20570-0001, and must be accompanied by a statement explaining the circumstances concerning not having access to the Agency's E-Filing system or why filing electronically would impose an undue burden. A party filing a request for review must serve a copy of the request on the other parties and file a copy with the Regional Director. A certificate of service must be filed with the Board together with the request for review. Neither the filing of a request for review nor the Board's granting a request for review will stay the election in this matter unless specifically ordered by the Board.

Dated at Phoenix, Arizona this 6th day of May, 2026.

/s/ Cornele A. Overstreet

Cornele A. Overstreet, Regional Director