

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
BEFORE THE NATIONAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

TOUCHSTONE CLIMBING, INC.
Employer

and

Cases 20-RC-369707
20-RC-370234
32-RC-369681
32-RC-370217

WESTERN STATES REGIONAL
JOINT BOARD, WORKERS UNITED
Petitioner

ORDER

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

¹ In listing the factors to rebut the single-facility presumption, the Acting Regional Director cited the Board's decision in *Audio Visual Services Group, LLC*, 370 NLRB No. 39 (2020). We observe that *Audio Visual Services Group* involved a petitioned-for multi-facility unit; although there is some overlap in the relevant factors, the Board's test for rebutting a single-facility presumption is distinct, with one critical difference being that there is a "heavy burden of overcoming the presumption" that a single-facility unit is appropriate." *California Pacific Medical Center*, 357 NLRB 197, 197 (2011); see also *Trane*, 339 NLRB 866, 867 (2003) (listing factors for overcoming single-facility presumption).

The Employer contests the applicability of the single-facility presumption because certain classifications were dispatched from the Employer's headquarters to work at facilities. The Employer cites no precedent that supports its position, and the Board has previously found, applying the single-facility presumption, that the existence of roving employees did not negate the separate identities of the facilities. See, e.g., *RB Associates*, 324 NLRB 874, 874 (1997); *Purnell's Pride, Inc.*, 252 NLRB 110, 115 fn. 32 (1980), reaffirmed in rel. part 265 NLRB 1190 (1982); *Dixie Bell Mills, Inc.*, 139 NLRB 629, 631 fn. 3 (1962).

With respect to the Employer's rebuttal burden, we agree with the Acting Regional Director that the Employer did not rebut the presumptive appropriateness of the petitioned-for single facility units, especially given the significant local autonomy over employment decisions at the individual facilities and the lack of meaningful interchange between employees based at each facility. As for the geographic distance between the facilities, we do not rely on the Acting Regional Director's statement that the distance between facilities, standing alone, "matters very little." Rather, we find that, because the Employer contends that the only appropriate unit includes the roving

Because the Request for Review is denied, the Employer's request to consolidate this case with Cases 32-RC-377918 and 32-RC-377926 is denied as moot.

JAMES R. MURPHY, CHAIRMAN

DAVID M. PROUTY, MEMBER

SCOTT A. MAYER, MEMBER

August 13, 2026, Washington, D.C.

classifications and all facilities across the Bay Area of California, and because those facilities are up to fifty miles apart, the geographic distance between the facilities does not support rebutting the presumptive appropriateness of the petitioned-for single-facility units. Moreover, the fact that two of the facilities are geographically close is not particularly significant when no party is asserting that the unit should consist of only those two facilities.