

**STATE OF MICHIGAN
EMPLOYMENT RELATIONS COMMISSION
LABOR RELATIONS DIVISION**

In the Matter of:

DAVISON TOWNSHIP,
Public Employer,

-and-

POLICE OFFICERS LABOR COUNCIL,
Petitioner-Labor Organization.

MERC Case No. R15 J-090
Hearing Docket No. 15-060456

APPEARANCES:

Keller Thoma, P.C., by Richard W. Fanning, Jr., for the Public Employer

Brendan J. Canfield, Staff Attorney, for the Petitioner

DECISION AND DIRECTION OF ELECTION

Pursuant to Section 13 of the Public Employment Relations Act (PERA), 1965 PA 379, as amended, MCL 423.213, this case was heard at Detroit, Michigan on January 22, 2016, by David M. Peltz, Administrative Law Judge for the Michigan Administrative Hearing System, acting on behalf of the Michigan Employment Relations Commission (Commission). Based on the entire record, including post-hearing briefs filed by the parties on or before March 11, 2016, we find as follows:

The Petition and Positions of the Parties:

The Police Officers Labor Council (POLC or Union) represents a bargaining unit consisting of police officers employed by Davison Township (Township or Employer). In the petition, which was filed with the Commission on October 8, 2015, the POLC seeks to accrete to its unit the classification of dispatcher/clerk.¹ The Township contends that the petition is inappropriate because the dispatcher/clerk position lacks a community of interest with the police officers in Petitioner's bargaining unit, all of whom are eligible for arbitration under the Compulsory Arbitration of Labor Disputes in Police and Fire Departments Act, 1969 PA 312,

¹ The petition was originally filed by the POLC's sister organization, the Governmental Employees Labor Council (GELC), on October 8, 2015. On December 21, 2015, the POLC moved to amend its petition to substitute itself for the GELC. The Township did not oppose that motion.

MCL 423.231-247. (Act 312). The POLC asserts that the dispatcher/clerks are Act 312 eligible because they are employed by the Township as emergency telephone operators and, in that capacity, they dispatch calls for service as a regular and continual part of their job.

Findings of Fact:

Davison Township covers just over 34 square miles in Genesee County and has about 20,000 residents. It is governed by a five-member Board of Commissioners, which includes the township supervisor, treasurer, clerk, and two trustees at large. The Township has approximately 42 full-time employees and two part-time employees, as well as various seasonal and temporary workers. In addition to Petitioner's bargaining unit, the POLC represents a separate unit consisting of police lieutenants. None of the remaining Township employees are represented for purposes of collective bargaining.

Rick Freeman is the chief of the Davison Township Police Department. Below him are four lieutenants, thirteen police officers and the two dispatcher/clerks who are the subject of this petition. The dispatcher/clerk position is currently held by Mary Pavelock and Kim Skellenger. Pavelock was hired by Davison Township as a dispatcher/clerk in 1991, while Skellenger began working in that position in 1998.²

The police department provides 24/7 coverage for the Township. Police officers work in one of three shifts running from 6:00 a.m. to 2:00 p.m., from 2:00 p.m. to 10:00 p.m., and from 10:00 p.m. to 6:00 a.m. Each shift is staffed by two to three officers. The detective bureau shift is from 8:00 a.m. through 4:00 p.m. Pavelock works weekdays from 7:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m., while Skellenger's hours are Monday through Friday from 8:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. The workstation for the dispatcher/clerks is at the front desk of the police department.

The Township is a member of Genesee County Central Dispatch, an independent consortium of all municipalities within Genesee County, with the exception of the City of Fenton. Central Dispatch answers and dispatches all 911 calls originating within the County, including calls for police services. Residents in areas served by Central Dispatch are encouraged to call 911 for all emergency services. The website for the Davison Township Police Department contains instructions in bold type directing citizens to call 911 for "emergency calls and after hours."

The police department has its own phone number, which is listed on the Township's website, along with a directory of extensions for individual employees. Pavelock and Skellenger are responsible for answering the department phone line, as well as responding to citizens who walk into the police department seeking information or assistance. Police officers or lieutenants fill in for the dispatcher/clerks when neither Pavelock nor Skellenger is available during their

² Although the Township website identifies Pavelock as a "property custodian" and Skellenger as a "records clerk," both women were issued identification cards by the police department in 2000 that list their job titles as "dispatcher/clerk." Chief Freeman helped to create these items and his signature appears on each card. Moreover, Freeman testified at hearing that the position held by Pavelock and Skellenger has historically been referred to as dispatcher/clerk. For that reason, the position will be referred to by the dispatcher/clerk designation throughout this decision. In any event, job titles are not determinative, as it is the nature of the work performed by the position that is relevant. See e.g. *Saginaw Valley State Univ*, 29 MPER 28 (2015).

normal shifts. After normal business hours, a recording instructs callers to leave a message or dial 911. Calls made to 911 are never transferred to the police department's phone line.

Despite the Township's appeals to citizens to dial 911 for emergency calls, Skellenger and Pavelock testified that they regularly receive requests for officers, or "calls for service," on the department's phone line or from individuals who have walked into the police station. According to Skellenger, calls for service may involve either emergency or non-emergency situations. When a call for service is received, the dispatcher/clerk takes the individual's name, the address where the officer is needed, the nature of the call, and any other pertinent information and then relays that data to an available officer. The responding officers then notify Central Dispatch that they have been sent on a call by the Township.

Once the officers have been dispatched, Skellenger and Pavelock monitor radio traffic in case additional information is needed by the responding officer. They also provide a complaint number to an officer in the field. In responding to inquiries from the responding officers, it may be necessary for Skellenger and Pavelock to look up information on the Law Enforcement Information Network (LEIN), a computer system allowing police officers and other law enforcement personnel to retrieve certain records, including licenses, vehicle registrations, and warrants.

The Township's dispatcher/clerks answer every call for service that is received and never direct citizens to hang up and call 911. If a call comes in from outside of the department's jurisdiction, Skellenger testified that she will either direct the caller to contact the appropriate dispatch location or do so herself on the caller's behalf. Skellenger testified that if it was an emergency situation, she might even dispatch an officer to the scene herself.

In addition to the telephone and radio, the dispatcher/clerks each have a computer at their desk, which is equipped with computer-aided dispatch (CAD) software and the Netviewer program. These applications allow the dispatcher/clerks to create dispatch calls, view calls for service generated by Central Dispatch, monitor the location of officers who are out in the field and communicate with them by text messages. Pavelock and Skellenger can also use Netviewer to enter in a call for service that is to be dispatched by Central Dispatch.

At hearing, Pavelock and Skellenger listed several examples of the types of calls for service they have received while working for the Township. These include: breaking and entering; retail fraud in progress; report of suspicious vehicles; welfare checks, including for potential suicides; malicious destruction of property; larceny from automobiles; vehicular accidents; criminal sexual assault; domestic violence; intoxicated and reckless drivers; harassment and stalking; and reports of shots fired. On cross-examination, Skellenger clarified that some of the calls for service described above may have been instances in which she is merely monitoring the situation on the radio and the actual dispatching was done by Central Dispatch.

Pavelock and Skellenger are responsible for all clerical tasks in the police department, including preparing warrants, typing and filing records and accident reports, processing Freedom of Information requests, handling incoming and outgoing mail and receiving questions and complaints from members of the public who walk into the department. In addition, Pavelock is tasked with ensuring that the department's LEIN records, training, and practices are up-to-date.

She also performs duties relating to the evidence and property room. In addition to the clerical duties described above, Skellenger is responsible for compiling reports and data for the Township’s crime reporting statistics. Skellenger testified that she spends approximately half of each day performing clerical duties.

Pavelock and Skellenger testified that dispatch responsibilities take precedence over their clerical work and that they are required to monitor the police radios and be ready to answer calls even when they are performing other duties. Pavelock estimated that she receives 6 to 7 calls for service per day and that approximately 30 percent of her time is spent performing dispatch functions. Skellenger testified that on average she receives 12 calls for service each day which precipitate her dispatching officers and that about 50 percent of her day is typically spent on dispatch. However, neither Pavelock nor Skellenger relied upon any official departmental records as the basis for their calculations.

The dispatcher/clerks maintain a spiral-bound notebook in which they document information relating to their duties, including calls for service. This notebook, which Pavelock and Skellenger refer to as “the logbook,” typically lists the time of the call, the address, and sometimes a phone number or the name of the responding officer. Not all calls for service are documented in the logbook. Rather, Skellenger testified that she might not use the logbook if a police officer is physically nearby when the call for service is received and she is able to hand the information directly to the officer.

At hearing, counsel for Petitioner asked Skellenger to read through the logbook and list all of the entries she recorded during the month of December 2015, a month in which there were 23 weekdays. Skellenger listed the following instances in which she dispatched Township officers:

12/1/15	- Possible breaking and entering in progress.
12/2/15	- Suspicious vehicle in school parking lot; LIEN check indicated owner had a personal protection order which prevented him from coming in contact with a woman living nearby - Welfare check for a suicidal subject.
12/4/15	- Suspicious vehicle report.
12/8/15	- Suspicious vehicle report.
12/9/15	- Call generated through 911 system regarding a threat at school. Skellenger notified police chief and the school’s liaison officer, who is also a Township police officer
12/15/15	- Suspect inside an apartment. - Possible stalker/sex offender in area.
12/17/15	- Gun found in storage unit.

12/23/15	- Suspicious vehicle. - Man exposing himself to children.
12/29/15	- Unsecured house with firearms inside.

Skellenger testified that the above entries do not necessarily constitute a complete list of all of the calls for service she received in December 2015. However, she testified that if there had been any other serious emergencies, she would have documented them in the logbook, and that any omitted calls likely involved instances of fraud or harassment. No evidence was introduced regarding dispatch work performed by Pavelock in December 2015, although Skellenger testified that she “assumes” her co-worker took calls for service that month.

Chief Freeman’s office is located approximately 12 feet from the dispatcher/clerk’s workspace, separated by a file room. Freeman monitors the police radio all day via a speaker in his office. Freeman testified that he could “count on one hand” the number of emergency calls for service dispatched by Pavelock and Skellenger within any given year and that he had no recollection of the dispatcher/clerks handling the litany of calls for service listed by Skellenger. According to Freeman, the only emergency calls handled by the dispatcher/clerks in the past year were a breaking and entering call and an incident in which someone walked into the station complaining of an active domestic violence situation. Freeman acknowledged, however, that there may have been calls for service of which he was not aware.

Freeman defined an emergency call for service as “[l]oosely . . . a call that would require my officers to run lights and sirens for the protection of life or property.” However, he conceded that the decision whether to turn on lights and sirens is left to the discretion of the officers. Although Freeman testified that a call to check on a suspicious vehicle or an unsecured house is generally not an emergency, he acknowledged that it could be one depending on the circumstances.

At hearing, the Employer introduced a document that Freeman prepared with Pavelock’s assistance. The document shows the number of calls for service, both emergency and non-emergency, handled by the Township’s police department versus those calls handled by Central Dispatch. The data was derived from the CAD system, statistics from Central Dispatch and the Officer Activity Logs (OALs) which each Township police officer is required to maintain on a daily basis. The report compares the number of calls for service reported by Central Dispatch versus the number of calls listed in the Township’s OALs.

For example, the OALs prepared by the individual department’s officers list 8,918 calls for service in 2014, while the records from Central Dispatch establish that the 911 facility was responsible for dispatching Township police officers on 8,086 calls, or 91 percent of the total calls for service listed in the OALs.³ Although that would seem to suggest that the Township dispatched the remaining 832 calls for service, or 9 percent of the total calls for services listed on the OALs,

³ The 2014 data is generally consistent with the statistics for 2012, 2013 and 2015.

the record suggests that the total number of calls handled by Pavelock and Skellenger in 2014 was likely much lower, as explained below.

Freeman testified that although the report indicates that there was an 832 call variance between the Central Dispatch records and the OALs, that does not mean that the dispatcher/clerks were actually responsible for handling all of those additional calls. First, the OAL data includes calls received on weekends when Pavelock and Skellenger were not working. Moreover, a substantial portion of the total number of calls listed on the OALs occurred during the third shift, between 10:00 p.m. to 6:00 a.m., when Pavelock and Skellenger were not at work. The OAL data indicates that the Township officers handled an average of 6.3 calls per day during the third shift in 2014. The largest number of calls for service that year, 11.3 per day, were handled by officers working the second shift from 2:00 p.m. to 10:00 p.m. The hours worked by the dispatcher/clerks overlap primarily with the first shift, during which the Township's officers handled an average of 6.9 calls per day in 2014. As noted, those figures include calls dispatched by both the Township and Central Dispatch.

Freeman testified that differences in recording methods must also be taken into account when evaluating the data. Freeman explained that when a call for service is handled by Central Dispatch, it is documented as a single call regardless of the number of officers who respond. In contrast, each time an officer is dispatched on a call, whether by Central Dispatch or by the Township, that officer records the call separately on his or her OAL. However, there was no evidence presented establishing the number of times that more than one officer was dispatched on a call for service in 2014 or even any testimony explaining in general the department's policies and procedures with respect to dispatching multiple officers to a scene.

The State of Michigan has specific training and certification requirements for dispatchers assigned to 911 facilities, none of which Pavelock or Skellenger satisfy.⁴ However, Skellenger attended a "professional dispatcher" course in 1999, which provided instruction in answering calls, obtaining information, and remaining calm and professional. Pavelock took the same course in 1997. In addition, both of the dispatcher/clerks have received training in domestic violence and "how to handle people with tact and skill," as well as training in operating the LEIN system and the 800MHz radio. In 2015, Pavelock and Skellenger attended a screening of an FBI training video on active shooter response. Neither of the dispatcher/clerks have ever received training specific to the CAD system.

There were no Employer-created position descriptions for the dispatcher/clerk position entered into evidence at hearing. The Union did present a "position summary" which Pavelock and Skellenger drafted in March of 2014, prior to the filing of the instant petition. At the time, management had requested that all clerical and administrative personnel create position summaries for the purpose of evaluating wage levels. Pavelock and Skellenger submitted their position

⁴ These requirements apply to dispatchers employed at a primary public safety answering point, which is defined as a "communications facility operated or answered on a 24-hour basis assigned responsibility by a public agency or county to receive 9-1-1 calls and to dispatch public safety response services, as appropriate, by the direct dispatch method, relay method or transfer method." MCL 484.1102. The requirements for 911 dispatchers include completion of a 40-hour basic training course. See Mich Admin Code, R 484.801-805.

summary to Chief Freeman and the Township's personnel committee. Thereafter, the dispatcher/clerks did not receive any request from the Employer to make changes or corrections to the document. The position summary states, in pertinent part:

Under the direct supervision of the Chief of Police.

Receive calls for service, dispatch emergency personnel to various locations throughout Davison Township, and assist in police investigations of criminal matters. Accurately perform clerical and recordkeeping functions, and maintain the front desk office and dispatch area in an orderly manner. Relay follow-up and supporting information to Township emergency personnel, working within the specific departmental policies and standard operating procedures.

These examples do not include all of the duties which the employee is expected to perform. To perform this job successfully, an individual must be able to perform each essential function satisfactorily.

Receive and assist with calls for information and service regarding emergency and non-emergency inquiries from citizens and emergency personnel. Obtain all information necessary for the accurate, prompt, and efficient delivery of services. Determine the nature and urgency of calls, dispatch Police Department Personnel, relay and communicate vital and necessary information to field units, and assure adequate response of personnel as the situation dictates.

Monitor LEIN for administrative messages requiring an immediate response. Monitor radio traffic of other public safety departments in the area and proactively react to situations that could involve Davison Township.

* * *

Maintain . . . Dispatch Log

Discussion and Conclusions of Law:

PERA prohibits public employees from striking. MCL 423.202. “[A]s a necessary tradeoff for the prohibition against striking” in police and fire department disputes, the Legislature enacted Act 312, which provides for compulsory arbitration for labor disputes in police and fire departments. *Metropolitan Council 23, AFSCME v Center Line*, 414 Mich 642, 650 (1982). See also, *Jackson Fire Fighters Ass'n v City of Jackson*, 227 Mich App 520, 523 (1998). Only certain employees are eligible for arbitration under Act 312, specifically, “employees engaged as policemen, or in fire fighting or subject to the hazards thereof, emergency medical service personnel employed by a police or fire department, or an emergency telephone operator employed by a police or fire department.” MCL 423.232(1). Emergency telephone operators are defined in § 2(2) of Act 312, MCL 423.232(2), as persons “employed by a police or fire department for the purpose of relaying emergency calls to police, fire, or emergency medical service personnel.”

We have long recognized the availability of Act 312 arbitration to be a significant factor in defining the appropriate unit. In *City of Dearborn Heights*, 1984 MERC Lab Op 1079, we held

that, upon objection by one of the parties, we would no longer include Act 312-eligible positions in the same bargaining unit as non-eligible positions. See also *City of Southfield (Public Safety)*, 1993 MERC Lab Op 36, 42. In the instant case, Petitioner contends the dispatcher/clerks share a community of interest with the Township's police officers because they perform emergency telephone dispatching duties and are emergency telephone operators within the meaning of Section 2(2) of the Act. The Employer asserts that Pavelock and Skellenger do not dispatch emergency calls with any regularity and, therefore, it would be inappropriate to include them in a unit with police officers who are eligible for Act 312 compulsory arbitration. Instead, the Township contends that the dispatcher/clerks should be considered part of a residual unit of unrepresented clerical employees. However, the Township concedes that if the dispatcher/clerks are found to be Act 312 eligible, they should be accreted to Petitioner's bargaining unit.

Over the years, we have had many occasions to determine the Act 312 eligibility of employees who perform both clerical and dispatch duties. For example, in *Village of New Haven*, 1988 MERC Lab Op 601, the union filed a petition seeking to accrete the position of dispatcher/secretary to its bargaining unit of police department employees. The dispatcher/secretary was responsible for answering and dispatching emergency police, fire, and ambulance calls during the hours of 8:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. Monday through Friday. She also performed clerical functions, including typing correspondence for the chief, typing complaints and warrants, preparing walk-in reports from citizens and performing matron functions. The record indicated that the dispatcher/secretary handled between three and ten emergency calls per day. We concluded that regardless of the specific number of calls the position handled per day, the dispatcher/secretary was an emergency telephone operator within the meaning of Section 2(2) because dispatching duties were a regular part of her responsibilities. In so holding, we emphasized that the relatively small percentage of time a position spends on dispatch duties versus other job functions is not determinative of Act 312 eligibility.

At issue in *City of Grosse Pte Farms*, 1979 MERC Lab Op 488, was the Act 312 eligibility of the clerk-dispatcher position. The clerk-dispatcher worked at the front desk of the police department performing general clerical functions, as well as answering the phone and police and fire radio consoles. Calls included information and personal calls for members of the department, as well as calls for police assistance, general complaints, and burglar and fire detection alarm calls. The clerk-dispatcher also operated the LEIN database and assisted the police officer at the front desk in dispatching cars. She also screened requests and dispatched police and fire cars when necessary. During a one-year period prior to the hearing, the clerk-dispatcher spent at least 10 percent of her time dispatching police units and approximately 90 percent of her time performing clerical and other support functions. The clerk-dispatcher worked weekdays from 8:00 a.m. to 4:30 p.m. She alternated answering calls with a police officer who was also stationed at the front desk. We held that the clerk-dispatcher was an emergency telephone operator under the Act. Although the clerk-dispatcher spent the vast majority of her time performing clerical functions, she needed to be prepared to answer the phone regarding emergency matters at all times. For that reason, we concluded that emergency telephone operator duties were a continual part of her job function.

Flint Charter Twp, 1995 MERC Lab Op 50, involved a petition for Act 312 arbitration filed by Teamsters, Local 214. The employer challenged the petition, claiming the communications system operators employed by the Township were not eligible for Act 312

arbitration, in part, because they were not employed as emergency telephone operators. The evidence established that in addition to performing routine clerical duties, the communications operators relayed emergency calls to police and answered both emergency and non-emergency requests for assistance. Although the communications operators directed callers to a centralized 911 dispatch center, they nevertheless dispatched one of the Township police officers to the scene as well. The record indicated that as many as twelve calls were received per day. In addition, the communications operator checklist included a sequence in emergency dispatch. We held that the communications operators were Act 312 eligible because they were trained in emergency dispatch procedures and dispatched emergency calls to police officers on a more than an occasional basis.

Although Davison Township is a member of Genesee County Central Dispatch and citizens are encouraged to call 911 in the event of an emergency, it is undisputed that emergency and non-emergency calls for service are received on the department's phone line. Pavelock and Skellenger testified without contradiction that when such a call is received, they are responsible for obtaining the necessary information, ascertaining the nature and degree of the situation and, if appropriate, dispatching emergency personnel to the scene. The only exception is when one of the dispatcher/clerks is on leave or away from her desk and a police officer or lieutenant is brought in to provide backup. Dispatch responsibilities take precedence over Pavelock and Skellenger's clerical duties and they are required to monitor the police radios and be ready to answer calls, even when they are performing clerical functions. Although they have not received the extensive training required of 911 operators, Pavelock and Skellenger have both attended a "professional dispatcher" course and have received instruction relevant to their dispatch functions, including operating the police radio and the LEIN system. These duties and skills were set forth in a position summary created by the dispatcher/clerks and submitted to management well before the instant petition was filed.

It is clear from the record that Pavelock and Skellenger are responsible for answering calls for service received by the department and dispatching officers to the field. However, the number of emergency calls received by the dispatcher/clerks is a more difficult question to resolve based upon the evidence presented by the parties. The Township's own statistical analysis indicates that there were 832 emergency and non-emergency calls for service in 2014 that were not handled by Central Dispatch. That results in an average of 2.27 calls per day. Pavelock and Skellenger only work weekdays, which means that they were at work 260 days in 2014, or 71 percent of the total days in the calendar year. Extrapolating the data, Pavelock and Skellenger would have been responsible for dispatching an average of 1.6 emergency and non-emergency calls per workday. Although this data certainly suggests that Pavelock and Skellenger dispatch emergency calls on more than an occasional or isolated basis, it is difficult to draw any specific conclusions from the Township's analysis without any evidence establishing the specific number of times multiple officers were dispatched based upon each call for service.

Chief Freeman testified that he could recall only two instances in the past year in which Pavelock and Skellenger dispatched an emergency call. However, Freeman admitted that he does not regularly review the logbook and that there may have been calls for service handled by the dispatcher/clerks of which he was not aware. Freeman seemingly attempted to minimize the role Pavelock and Skellenger play in dispatching emergency calls by narrowly defining "emergency" to mean instances in which his officers are required to "run lights and siren for the protection of life or property." However, he conceded that the decision whether to run the lights and siren is a

matter left within the discretion of each individual officer. In addition, Freeman acknowledged that several of the call types handled by the dispatcher/clerks could be considered emergencies depending on the circumstances. For these reasons, we decline to adopt the narrow definition of “emergency” proffered by Freeman. See e.g. *City of Detroit (Police Dep’t)*, 2000 MERC Lab Op 83, 84, in which “emergency” was defined by the employer as any situation requiring a police, fire or medical services unit to be sent to the scene.

For their part, Skellenger and Pavelock estimated that they each handle between six and twelve calls per day and that they spend 30 to 50 percent of their time performing emergency dispatch functions. At hearing, Skellenger described the calls for service she received in December of 2015, based upon entries she made contemporaneously in the logbook maintained by the dispatcher/clerks. Skellenger testified that she dispatched police officers at least twelve times during the month of December 2015, including calls pertaining to a breaking and entering in progress, a suspicious vehicle in a school parking lot, a subject discovered inside an apartment building, and a threat made to a school. Although Pavelock was not questioned about specific logbook entries at hearing, Skellenger testified that her fellow dispatcher/clerk also likely dispatched calls that month.

While it is evident from Skellenger’s testimony that the dispatcher/clerks do not dispatch a large number of calls on a daily basis, the record is sufficient to establish that they handle emergency calls on a more than occasional basis and that dispatching calls is a regular part of their responsibilities. Compare *City of Detroit*, (telephone communication operators who were not handling emergency calls on a daily “regular” or “continual” basis not eligible for Act 312); *Cheboygan Co.*, 1998 MERC Lab Op 647 (corrections officer/dispatchers were not Act 312 eligible where they transferred emergency calls to a regional dispatch center and did no actual dispatching themselves); *Genesee Twp.*, 1994 MERC Lab Op 210 (office clericals who spent approximately one minute per week fielding emergency calls were not emergency telephone operators under the Act); *Ingham Co.*, 1987 MERC Lab Op 326 (communications operators who merely relayed emergency information to a 911 center were not eligible for compulsory arbitration). Given that Pavelock and Skellenger must be ready to answer emergency calls for service and dispatch officers at all times throughout their shifts, we conclude that they are emergency telephone operators within the meaning of § 2(2) of Act 312.

We find that the dispatcher/clerks share a community of interest with the Township police officers based upon their Act 312 eligibility and, therefore, we will direct an election in which the dispatcher/clerks may vote whether they wish to accrete to the bargaining unit represented by Petitioner.

DIRECTION OF ELECTION

Based upon the findings and discussion above, we conclude that a question of representation exists within the meaning of Section 12 of PERA. In accord with the above discussion, we shall direct an election amongst the following employees:

All clerk/dispatchers employed by Davison Township.

