

Steering Committee:

Jonathan G. Axelrod,  
Co-Chair  
Robert E. Paul, Co-Chair  
Ann H. Franke  
Ira F. Jaffee  
Joyce A. Mader  
Patrick J. Szymanski  
David M. Vaughn

SECTION

Labor Relations

Committees:

Employee Benefits  
Equal Employment Opportunity  
Individual Rights &  
Responsibilities  
Private Sector  
Public Sector

May 15, 1987

Rosemary M. Collyer  
General Counsel  
National Labor Relations Board  
1717 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20570

Re: Realignment of Regional  
Office Jurisdictions

Dear Ms. Collyer:

The Steering Committee of the Labor Relations Section of the District of Columbia Bar has appointed a subcommittee to review the Board's proposed realignment of regional office jurisdiction. Although the members of the subcommittee and many members of the Section have nationwide practices, we have chosen to limit our position statement to the proposed changes only insofar as they affect Region 5. The views expressed herein represent only those of the Labor Relations Section of the District of Columbia Bar and not those of the District of Columbia Bar or of its Board of Governors.

The Labor Relations Section opposes any change in the jurisdiction of the Baltimore Regional Office. In part, our position is based upon the old maxim "if it ain't broke, don't fix it." The Baltimore Regional Office has historically done an outstanding job in stabilizing labor relations in Maryland, Virginia and the District of Columbia. We believe that any diminution in Region 5's geographic jurisdiction will necessarily affect labor relations in the area as the affected practitioners and clients must adapt to new personalities and practices.

As practitioners with clients in southwest Virginia, members of the Labor Relations Section benefit from Baltimore's accessibility. We can meet with Regional personnel and accompany clients to the Regional Office on only hours' notice and at minimal expense to our clients. A similar trip to Winston-Salem necessitates substantial costs in both time and out-of-pocket expense, both of which must be passed on to our clients.

Rosemary M. Collyer  
May 7, 1987  
Page two

As Washington, D.C. lawyers, we also benefit from access to the Resident Office here. On many occasions, we have filed papers with the Resident Office rather than the Regional Office. We would lose this advantage for our southwest Virginia clients.

We also believe that the Regional Office's current statewide jurisdiction in Virginia benefits the Board in its relationships with the federal judiciary, with employers and with unions. Judges in the federal district court for the Western District of Virginia are accustomed to dealing with attorneys from Region 5. The good will developed by Region 5 attorneys in Roanoke may be adversely affected if Region 5 cedes that jurisdiction. At the same time, the good will developed by Region 4 attorneys in the Pennsylvania courts may not transfer to Region 5 attorneys.

In sum, the Labor Relations Section recommends that the geographic jurisdiction of Region 5 not be altered.

Jonathan G. Axelrod  
Charles I. Cohen  
Jacqueline W. Mintz  
Steven R. Semler  
Special Committee of  
the Labor Relations Section