

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
BEFORE THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

MASS GENERAL BRIGHAM INC.
Employer

and

Case 01-RC-345183

MASSACHUSETTS NURSES
ASSOCIATION
Petitioner

ORDER

The Employer's Request for Review of the Regional Director's Decision and Direction of Election is denied as it raises no substantial issues warranting review.¹

¹ In denying the Employer's request for review, we agree with the Regional Director that the employees in the petitioned-for multi-facility unit share a community of interest and, therefore, the petitioned-for unit is appropriate. See *Exemplar, Inc.*, 363 NLRB 1500, 1501 (2016). The petitioned-for employees have overlapping education and training, similar skills, and are all paid hourly with only slight variations in wage rates, all of which favor the petitioned-for unit. See *Capital Coors Co.*, 309 NLRB 322, 325 (1992). There is functional integration among the petitioned-for employees, as they all work on distinct but connected aspects of the Employer's occupational health and workers' compensation system, and they nearly all serve on the on-call rotation providing systemwide support to employees in all of the Employer's facilities. See *Stormont-Vail Healthcare, Inc.*, 340 NLRB 1205, 1208–1209 (2003). All of the petitioned-for employees have permission to fill-in as clinical nurses, and some employees schedule their clients' appointments in other employees' clinics. See *Presbyterian/St. Luke's Medical Center*, 289 NLRB 249, 249–250 (1988). The employees share centralized labor-relations and personnel policies, they all have the same second-level supervisor, and the petitioned-for unit conforms to the Employer's own administrative grouping of these facilities in its Workplace Health department. See *Exemplar, Inc.*, 363 NLRB at 1503; *Stormont-Vail*, 340 NLRB at 1208 (mandating the inclusion of outlying clinics that fell under the same administrative or supervisory grouping as the other facilities in the unit). Finally, although there is little evidence of interchange; there is significant geographic distance between the petitioned-for facilities; and the petitioned-for employees are split in terms of their job duties (with some performing direct clinical care duties and others performing administrative work), we find that these differences are outweighed by the commonalities described above.

In denying review, Member Mayer emphasizes that although there is significant geographic distance between the facilities involved in this proceeding, the petitioned-for unit conforms to departmental lines established by the Employer, and the Employer's alternative proposed units would involve similar or even greater distances between facilities.

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

JAMES R. MURPHY

CHAIRMAN

DAVID M. PROUTY,

MEMBER

SCOTT A. MAYER

MEMBER

Dated, Washington, D.C., June 29, 2026.