

**UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
BEFORE THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD
REGION 19**

REAL YOU ELECTROLYSIS

Employer

and

Case 19-RC-387648

**INDUSTRIAL WORKERS OF THE WORLD -
PORTLAND GMB**

Petitioner

DECISION AND DIRECTION OF ELECTION

Real You Electrolysis (“Employer”) operates a facility providing permanent hair removal services in Vancouver, Washington (“Vancouver facility”). Industrial Workers of the World – Portland GMB (“Petitioner”) filed the instant petition seeking to represent a bargaining unit of all electrologists working for the Employer at the Vancouver facility.

A Board hearing officer held a hearing in this matter on June 4, 2026. I have carefully reviewed the evidence and the brief filed by the Petitioner, which I have duly considered.¹ The only issue presented in this case is whether the petitioned-for single-facility unit, limited to employees at the Vancouver facility, is an appropriate unit for bargaining, or whether the unit also must include employees at the Employer’s other facility located in Lakewood, Washington (“Lakewood facility”).

The Board has delegated its authority in this proceeding to me under §3(b) of the National Labor Relations Act (Act). For the reasons discussed below, based on the record, Petitioner’s brief, and relevant Board law, I find that the record establishes the petitioned-for unit is an appropriate unit for the purposes of collective bargaining. Accordingly, I have directed the petitioned-for election in this case.

¹ As the Employer failed to timely file its position statement, at the hearing, pursuant to the Board’s Rules and Regulations sections 102.63(b)(1) and 102.66(d), the Employer was precluded from raising any issue or presenting any evidence relating to any issue, cross-examining any witness concerning any issue, and presenting argument concerning any issue that it failed to raise in a timely position statement. Under Rules section 102.66(d), a party is precluded from raising any issue, presenting any evidence relating to any issue, cross-examining any witness concerning any issue, and presenting argument concerning any issue that the party failed to raise in its Statement of Position, with the exception of raising or presenting evidence relevant to the Board’s statutory jurisdiction. See *Williams-Sonoma Direct, Inc.*, 365 NLRB 111, 111 fn. 1 (2017) (regional director correctly precluded employer from litigating appropriateness of petitioned-for unit based on employer’s failure to timely serve statement of position on the petitioner); *IKEA Distribution Services, Inc.*, 370 NLRB No. 109 (2021) (same, but noting that fact that party is precluded from litigating unit does not divest regional director of statutory responsibility to determine the appropriateness of the unit, and that regional director is not free to disregard record evidence indicating petitioned-for unit is inappropriate simply due to preclusion).

I. RECORD EVIDENCE

A. Employer's Organizational Structure

The Employer provides its clients with permanent hair removal through a process called electrolysis. According to the record, there are approximately 24 electrologists that are employed by the Employer. Approximately 15 electrologists work at the Vancouver facility and approximately 9 electrologists work at the Lakewood facility. The Employer also currently employs one sanitation technician at each of its Vancouver and Lakewood facilities respectively, as well as a part-time marketing associate who works at the Vancouver facility.

Anna Lantry ("Lantry") and Leah LaFavor ("LaFavor") are the co-owners and head of the operation. Reporting to the co-owners is Director of Operations, Zarek Lee ("Lee"). Reporting to Lee are other managers, such as the IT manager and the location-specific managers for the Vancouver facility and the Lakewood facility. At the Vancouver facility, LaFavor and Lee currently act as location managers, along with Vancouver location manager Jayden Lentz. The location managers for the Lakewood facility are Maya Audrey and Autumn Graham.

B. Control Over Daily Operations and Labor Relations

Director of Operations Lee oversees all human resource and labor relations functions for both facilities. This includes interviewing, hiring, discharging, promoting, transferring, laying off, and recalling employees. The local managers participate to a certain degree in these labor relations functions by conducting initial interviews with potential employees or recommending discipline or discharge of current employees. However, ultimate decision authority with respect to personnel decisions resides with Director of Operations Lee. Location managers have authority to schedule specific employee hours and client assignments. Employee leave is generally approved through Lee; however, location managers have the authority to grant employee leave requests. Location managers primarily handle client relation issues at the respective facilities, such as billing and scheduling. Location managers also help with ordering inventory for each facility and the assignment of certain tasks related to the day-to-day operation of each facility.

Payroll records are kept centrally with Lee. Other documents, such as tax-related documents, personnel records, clerical records, and building records, are physically located at the different locations. These records are also digitized and centrally accessible.

C. Similarity of Employee Skills, Functions, and Working Conditions

All electrologists perform permanent hair removal, by using a metal probe to deliver electricity to the hair follicle, causing localized damage to the areas that generate hairs. The electrologists go through the same training and perform the same basic work at both locations. Employees at both locations are covered by the same human resource policies and work rules. Furthermore, the electrologists at both locations have the same pay structure, are on the same benefits plan, and work similar hours. Likewise, the opportunities for advancement and the training programs are the same at either location.

D. Employee Interchange or Contact

The record reflects that the Employer has the ability to transfer electrologists between the Lakewood and Vancouver locations, as the job functions of electrologists are identical at both locations. Electrologists at each facility have their own assigned offices with personalized name plates outside the offices. While the option exists for electrologists to work at either location, the record shows only one permanent transfer of an electrologist from the Lakewood facility to the Vancouver facility that occurred in about February 2026. Once transferred to the Vancouver facility, that electrologist worked solely at the Vancouver facility. The record does not contain any evidence of mandatory transfers of any sort for employees between the Vancouver facility and the Lakewood facility. Further, the record does not show any temporary transfer of electrologists between the locations in which an electrologist that works at the Vancouver facility performs regular electrologist work at the Lakewood facility or vice versa.

The only record evidence regarding employees temporarily going to a different location for work purposes relates to electrologists from the Lakewood facility traveling to the Vancouver facility for training purposes. The Employer's training of electrologists is split into two phases. The first phase is the initial onboarding process. All employees, including the electrologists that work at the Lakewood facility, go through an initial two-to-three-week training at the Vancouver facility. The second phase of training for employees is what the Employer calls schooling. Schooling is comprised of 600 hours. The first 200 hours of schooling are conducted via Zoom videoconference, while the remaining 400 hours of schooling are performed in person at the Vancouver facility. The record reflects that a sole electrologist, Odd Valentine ("Valentine"), who normally works at the Lakewood facility has performed the 400 hours of in-person schooling at the Vancouver facility. Valentine did not perform any regular electrologist work at the Vancouver facility during their schooling. The record also does not show Valentine being trained or working at the Vancouver facility after completing the schooling. Further, there is no evidence that any employee who regularly works at the Vancouver facility receives training at the Lakewood facility. Finally, in terms of training, the record shows that the Employer sent location manager Jayden Wentz from the Vancouver facility to train employees at the Lakewood facility.

The record contains little evidence of contact between the electrologists at the Vancouver and Lakewood facilities. Electrologist Jacklyn Eup ("Eup") testified at hearing that during her time working at the Vancouver facility, she has not had a phone conversation or email correspondence regarding work matters with any electrologists at the Lakewood facility. Eup testified that there was a Google Chat that employees at both locations can access via Employer provided computer terminals. Eup testified that after checking Google Chat during the beginning of her employment, she stopped using Google Chat after working for the Employer for a few weeks.

E. History of Representation and Bargaining

The record reflects neither evidence of prior representation of electrologists working for the Employer, nor evidence of prior bargaining between the parties.

F. Geographic Distance

The Employer only operates the Vancouver facility and the Lakewood facility, which are located approximately 120 miles apart and are both in the State of Washington.

II. LEGAL ANALYSIS

The Board has long held that a petitioned-for single-facility unit is presumptively appropriate, unless it has been so effectively merged or is so functionally integrated that it has lost its separate identity. The party opposing the single-facility unit has the heavy burden of rebutting its presumptive appropriateness. To determine whether the single-facility presumption has been rebutted, the Board examines (1) central control over daily operations and labor relations, including the extent of local autonomy; (2) similarity of employee skills, functions, and working conditions; (3) the degree of employee interchange; (4) the distance between locations; and (5) bargaining history, if any exists. See, e.g., *Trane*, 339 NLRB 866 (2003); *J & L Plate, Inc.*, 310 NLRB 429 (1993).

As set forth below, I find that the factors of the degree of employee interchange, the extent of local autonomy in labor relations, and distance between locations weigh in favor of a single-facility unit and conclude that the petitioned-for single-facility unit is appropriate.

A. Central Control over Daily Operations and Labor Relations

The Board has made clear that “the existence of even substantial centralized control over some labor relations policies and procedures is not inconsistent with a conclusion that sufficient local autonomy exists to support a single local presumption.” (citations omitted) *California Pacific Medical Center*, 357 NLRB No. 21, slip op. at 2 (2001). Thus, “centralization, by itself, is not sufficient to rebut the single-facility presumption where there is significant local autonomy over labor relations. Instead, the Board puts emphasis on whether the employees perform their day-to-day work under the supervision of one who is involved in rating their performance and in affecting their job status and who is personally involved with the daily matters which make up their grievances and routine problems.” (citations omitted) *Hilander Foods*, 348 NLRB 1200, 1203 (2006). Therefore, the primary focus of this factor is the control that facility-level management exerts over employees’ day-to-day working lives.

The record establishes that labor relations for both the Vancouver facility and Lakewood facility are centralized through Director of Operations Zarek Lee. Lee handles all payroll, interviewing, hiring, disciplinary actions, terminations for both locations. While local managers may have some involvement in personnel decisions, the location managers primarily handle the day-to-day operations of the respective clinics, such as issues with clients, cleaning, daily assignment of tasks, scheduling, billing, and inventory. As such, while the record establishes that key decisions regarding hiring, firing, promotion, transfers, leave, and discipline are centralized with Lee, it is the location managers that are overseeing the electrologists day-to-day functions. As such, I view this factor as not rebutting the single-facility presumption.

B. Similarity of Skills, Functions, and Working Conditions

The similarity or dissimilarity of work, qualifications, working conditions, wages and benefits between employees at the facilities the Employer contends should be in the unit has some bearing on determining the appropriateness of the single-facility unit. However, this factor is less important than whether individual facility management has autonomy and whether there is substantial interchange. See, for example, *Dattco, Inc.*, 338 NLRB 49, 51 (2002) (“This level of

interdependence and interchange is significant and, with the centralization of operations and uniformity of skills, functions and working conditions is sufficient to rebut the presumptive appropriateness of the single-facility unit.”)

Here, the electrologists at both facilities go through the same training, perform the same job functions, receive the same benefits, and are subject to the same employee policies and pay structure. Given that there is very little to no difference between the two facilities, I find that this factor weighs in favor of overcoming the single-facility presumption.

C. The Degree of Employee Interchange

Employee contact is considered interchange where a portion of the work force of one facility is involved in the work of the other facility through temporary transfer or assignment of work. However, a significant portion of the workforce must be involved and the workforce must be actually supervised by the local branch to which they are not normally assigned in order to meet the burden of proof on the party opposing the single-facility unit. *New Britain Transportation Co.*, 330 NLRB 397, 398 (1999). For example, the Board found that interchange was established and significant where during a 1-year period there were approximately 400 to 425 temporary employee interchanges among three terminals in a workforce of 87 and the temporary employees were directly supervised by the terminal manager from the terminal where the work was being performed. *Dayton Transport Corp.* 270 NLRB 1114 (1984). On the other hand, where the amount of interchange is unclear both as to scope and frequency because it is unclear how the total amount of interchange compares to the total amount of work performed, the burden of proof is not met, including where a party fails to support a claim of interchange with either documentation or specific testimony providing context. *Cargill, Inc.*, 336 NLRB 1114 (2001); *Courier Dispatch Group*, 311 NLRB 728, 731 (1993). Also important in considering interchange is whether the temporary employee transfers are voluntary or required, the number of permanent employee transfers, and whether the permanent employee transfers are voluntary. *New Britain Transportation Co.*, supra.

Here, the record evidence suggests that there is little to no interchange between employees at the Vancouver and Lakewood locations. The record shows only one known instance of an electrologist that permanently transferred from one location to another on a voluntary basis. Of note, as the records reflects that this was not a mandatory transfer, but a voluntary one, the interchange carries less weight in the Board’s analysis than mandatory transfers. *Id.* The record contains zero evidence of temporary transfers of electrologists from one facility to another for the purpose of doing regular electrologist work.

While the record reflects some training, both in the form of initial on-boarding and schooling, that required electrologists that work at the Lakewood facility to be physically present at the Vancouver facility, as well as some managers going back and forth to between the two facilities to provide training to the electrologists, this is insufficient to establish interchange. While the 400 hours of schooling that was required of electrologist Odd Valentine represents a significant amount of time for employees to be engaged in interchange between two facilities, the workers of one location must be doing the work of the other location, not merely engaging in training. Nothing in the record reflects that those who are schooling are performing the regular work of electrologists. Further, there is no evidence that after training or schooling electrologists were expected to work at a location aside from their “home” facility.

Thus, with respect to the factor of interchange and contact, the record evidence weighs against rebutting the single facility presumption.

D. Distance between Locations

While significant geographic distance between locations is normally a factor in favor of a single-facility unit, it is less of a factor when there is evidence of regular interchange between the locations, and when there is evidence of centralized control over daily operations and labor relations with little or no local autonomy, particularly when employees at the facilities otherwise share skills, duties, and other terms and conditions of employment, as well as are in contact with one another. *Trane*, supra at 868.

As stated above, the Vancouver facility and the Lakewood facility are separated by approximately 120 miles. This significant distance between the two facilities, when coupled with the fact that there is little to no interchange between the locations, weighs against rebutting the single facility presumption.

E. Bargaining History

The absence of bargaining history is a neutral factor in the analysis of whether a single unit facility is appropriate. *Trane*, supra at 868, fn. 4. Thus, the fact that there is no bargaining history in this matter does not support nor does it negate the appropriateness of the unit sought by Petitioner and is a neutral factor.

III. CONCLUSION

In determining that the single-facility unit sought by Petitioner is appropriate, I have carefully considered the record evidence and weighed the various factors that bear on the determination of whether a single-facility unit is appropriate. In particular, I find that the lack of regular and substantial interchange between the Vancouver employees and Lakewood employees and the significant distance between the Vancouver and Lakewood locations, coupled with the absence of a bargaining history and the fact that no labor organization has sought to represent a multi-location unit outweighs the centralized operations and labor relations, and the common skills and functions of the electrologists at both locations in reaching my conclusion that the single-facility unit sought by Petitioner is appropriate. Therefore, based upon the entire record in this matter and in accordance with the discussion above, I find and conclude as follows:

Based upon the entire record in this matter and in accordance with the discussion above, I conclude and find as follows:

1. The hearing officer's rulings made 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.²

² The parties stipulate to the following commerce facts: The Employer, Real You Electrolysis LLC, is a Washington limited liability company with an office located at 907 Harney St. Suite 100, Vancouver, WA 98660 engaged in the

3. The Petitioner is a labor organization within the meaning of Section 2(5) of the Act and claims to represent 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) and Section 2(6) and (7) of the Act.
5. The following employees of the Employer constitute a unit appropriate for the purposes of collective bargaining within the meaning of Section 9(b) of the Act:

All full-time and regular part-time electrologists at its facility located at 907 Harney St. Suite 100 Vancouver, Washington 98660; but excluding all other employees, Store Managers, IT Managers, Owners, Director of Operations, Instructors, guards and supervisors as defined by the Act.

There are approximately 9 to 15 employees in the unit found appropriate herein.

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 Industrial Workers of the World - Portland GMB.

A. Election Details

The election will be held on **Tuesday, August 4, 2026** from 11:30 a.m. to 12:30 p.m. at 907 Harney St. Suite 100 Vancouver, Washington 98660.

B. Voting Eligibility

Eligible to vote are those in the unit who were employed during the payroll period ending **Friday, July 10, 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.

business of providing permanent hair removal services. Withing the past twelve months, a representative period, the Employer received gross revenue in excess of \$500,000, and purchased and received goods and services valued in excess of \$50,000 directly from points located outside the State of Washington.

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(l) 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, July 24, 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.nlrb.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: July 22, 2026



RONALD K. HOOKS, REGIONAL DIRECTOR
NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD
REGION 19
915 2nd Ave Ste 2948
Seattle, WA 98174-1006



United States of America
National Labor Relations Board
NOTICE OF ELECTION



19-RC-387648

PURPOSE OF ELECTION: This election is to determine the representative, if any, desired by the eligible employees for purposes of collective bargaining with their employer. A majority of the valid ballots cast will determine the results of the election. Only one valid representation election may be held in a 12-month period.

SECRET BALLOT: The election will be by SECRET ballot under the supervision of the Regional Director of the National Labor Relations Board (NLRB). A sample of the official ballot is shown on the next page of this Notice. Voters will be allowed to vote without interference, restraint, or coercion. Electioneering will not be permitted at or near the polling place. Violations of these rules should be reported immediately to an NLRB agent. Your attention is called to Section 12 of the National Labor Relations Act which provides: ANY PERSON WHO SHALL WILLFULLY RESIST, PREVENT, IMPEDE, OR INTERFERE WITH ANY MEMBER OF THE BOARD OR ANY OF ITS AGENTS OR AGENCIES IN THE PERFORMANCE OF DUTIES PURSUANT TO THIS ACT SHALL BE PUNISHED BY A FINE OF NOT MORE THAN \$5,000 OR BY IMPRISONMENT FOR NOT MORE THAN ONE YEAR, OR BOTH.

ELIGIBILITY RULES: Employees eligible to vote are those described under the VOTING UNIT on the next page and include employees who did not work during the designated payroll period because they were ill or on vacation or temporarily laid off, and also include employees in the military service of the United States who appear in person at the polls. Employees who have quit or been discharged for cause since the designated payroll period and who have not been rehired or reinstated prior to the date of this election are *not* eligible to vote.

SPECIAL ASSISTANCE: Any employee or other participant in this election who has a handicap or needs special assistance such as a sign language interpreter to participate in this election should notify an NLRB Office as soon as possible and request the necessary assistance.

PROCESS OF VOTING: Upon arrival at the voting place, voters should proceed to the Board agent and identify themselves by stating their name. The Board agent will hand a ballot to each eligible voter. Voters will enter the voting booth and mark their ballot in secret. **DO NOT SIGN YOUR BALLOT.** Fold the ballot before leaving the voting booth, then personally deposit it in a ballot box under the supervision of the Board agent and leave the polling area.

CHALLENGE OF VOTERS: If your eligibility to vote is challenged, you will be allowed to vote a challenged ballot. Although you may believe you are eligible to vote, the polling area is not the place to resolve the issue. Give the Board agent your name and any other information you are asked to provide. After you receive a ballot, go to the voting booth, mark your ballot and fold it so as to keep the mark secret. **DO NOT SIGN YOUR BALLOT.** Return to the Board agent who will ask you to place your ballot in a challenge envelope, seal the envelope, place it in the ballot box, and leave the polling area. Your eligibility will be resolved later, if necessary.

AUTHORIZED OBSERVERS: Each party may designate an equal number of observers, this number to be determined by the NLRB. These observers (a) act as checkers at the voting place and at the counting of ballots; (b) assist in identifying voters; (c) challenge voters and ballots; and (d) otherwise assist the NLRB.

WARNING: This is the only official notice of this election and must not be defaced by anyone. Any markings that you may see on any sample ballot or anywhere on this notice have been made by someone other than the National Labor Relations Board, and have not been put there by the National Labor Relations Board. The National Labor Relations Board is an agency of the United States Government, and does not endorse any choice in the election.



United States of America
National Labor Relations Board
NOTICE OF ELECTION



VOTING UNIT

EMPLOYEES ELIGIBLE TO VOTE:

Those eligible to vote are: All full-time and regular part-time electrologists at its facility located at 907 Harney St. Suite 100 Vancouver, Washington 98660 who were employed during the payroll period ending July 10, 2026.

EMPLOYEES NOT ELIGIBLE TO VOTE:

Those not eligible to vote are: All other employees, Store Managers, IT Managers, Owners, Director of Operations, Instructors, guards and supervisors as defined by the Act.

DATE, TIME AND PLACE OF ELECTION

Tuesday, August 4, 2026	11:30 a.m. to 12:30 p.m.	907 Harney St. Suite 100 Vancouver, Washington 98660.
-------------------------	--------------------------	--

EMPLOYEES ARE FREE TO VOTE AT ANY TIME THE POLLS ARE OPEN.

	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA National Labor Relations Board 19-RC-387648	
OFFICIAL SECRET BALLOT For certain employees of REAL YOU ELECTROLYSIS		
Do you wish to be represented for purposes of collective bargaining by INDUSTRIAL WORKERS OF THE WORLD - PORTLAND GMB?		
MARK AN "X" IN THE SQUARE OF YOUR CHOICE		
YES ☐	SAMPLE	NO ☐
DO NOT SIGN OR WRITE YOUR NAME OR INCLUDE OTHER MARKINGS THAT WOULD REVEAL YOUR IDENTITY. MARK AN "X" IN THE SQUARE OF YOUR CHOICE ONLY. If you make markings inside, or anywhere around, more than one square, return your ballot to the Board Agent and ask for a new ballot. If you submit a ballot with markings inside, or anywhere around, more than one square, your ballot will not be counted. The National Labor Relations Board does not endorse any choice in this election. Any markings that you may see on any sample ballot have not been put there by the National Labor Relations Board.		

WARNING: This is the only official notice of this election and must not be defaced by anyone. Any markings that you may see on any sample ballot or anywhere on this notice have been made by someone other than the National Labor Relations Board, and have not been put there by the National Labor Relations Board. The National Labor Relations Board is an agency of the United States Government, and does not endorse any choice in the election.



United States of America
National Labor Relations Board
NOTICE OF ELECTION



RIGHTS OF EMPLOYEES - FEDERAL LAW GIVES YOU THE RIGHT TO:

- Form, join, or assist a union
- Choose representatives to bargain with your employer on your behalf
- Act together with other employees for your benefit and protection
- Choose not to engage in any of these protected activities
- In a State where such agreements are permitted, the Union and Employer may enter into a lawful union-security agreement requiring employees to pay periodic dues and initiation fees. Nonmembers who inform the Union that they object to the use of their payments for nonrepresentational purposes may be required to pay only their share of the Union's costs of representational activities (such as collective bargaining, contract administration, and grievance adjustment).

It is the responsibility of the National Labor Relations Board to protect employees in the exercise of these rights.

The Board wants all eligible voters to be fully informed about their rights under Federal law and wants both Employers and Unions to know what is expected of them when it holds an election.

If agents of either Unions or Employers interfere with your right to a free, fair, and honest election the election can be set aside by the Board. When appropriate, the Board provides other remedies, such as reinstatement for employees fired for exercising their rights, including backpay from the party responsible for their discharge.

The following are examples of conduct that interfere with the rights of employees and may result in setting aside of the election:

- Threatening loss of jobs or benefits by an Employer or a Union
- Promising or granting promotions, pay raises, or other benefits, to influence an employee's vote by a party capable of carrying out such promises
- An Employer firing employees to discourage or encourage union activity or a Union causing them to be fired to encourage union activity
- Making campaign speeches to assembled groups of employees on company time where attendance is mandatory, within the 24-hour period before the mail ballots are dispatched
- Incitement by either an Employer or a Union of racial or religious prejudice by inflammatory appeals
- Threatening physical force or violence to employees by a Union or an Employer to influence their votes

The National Labor Relations Board protects your right to a free choice.

Improper conduct will not be permitted. All parties are expected to cooperate fully with this Agency in maintaining basic principles of a fair election as required by law

Anyone with a question about the election may contact the NLRB Office at (503)326-3085 or visit the NLRB website www.nlrb.gov for assistance.