

Teamsters Broken Promises at United Airlines

IBT Election Violations in SFO!

Rich Petrovsky and Teamsters officials found guilty of election violations; campaigning for Hoffa's re-election using your dues money, union time, materials and union offices. This constitutes election fraud.

Election Office finds IBT B/A Rich Petrovsky and Locals 986/856 guilty of numerous election violations. The illegal actions of these union officers may cost the membership tens of thousands of dollars to remedy.

UAL Mechanics and Related deserve better union representation with a union and leadership that will fight for the membership and not their Union Bosses re-election. These union reps cannot claim ignorance of the law. The actions of these individuals were deliberate and planned to illegally alter the outcome of an election.

We will present the facts; you decide. Please read the protest decision from the Teamsters Election Supervisor.

Do not allow the Teamsters to make any more mistakes concerning your contract and your future.

Rich Petrovsky and Locals 986/856 Guilty of Election Fraud!

OFFICE OF THE ELECTION SUPERVISOR
for the
INTERNATIONAL BROTHERHOOD OF TEAMSTERS

IN RE: JOSEPH PRISCO,)	Protest Decision 2010 ESD 6
)	Issued: July 8, 2010
Protestor.)	OES Case No. P-007-062510-FW
)	
)	
_____)	

Joseph Prisco, a member of Local Union 986, filed a pre-election protest pursuant to Article XIII, Section 2(b) of the Rules for the 2010-2011 IBT International Union Delegate and Officer Election ("*Rules*"). The protest alleged that Local Unions 986 and possibly 856 used union resources to support the Hoffa-Keegel 2011 campaign.

Election Supervisor representatives Christine Mrak and Rochelle Goffe investigated this protest.

Findings of Fact

Local Unions 986 and 856 jointly represent approximately 3,000 aircraft maintenance employees of United Airlines (UAL) at UAL’s San Francisco ("SFO") base. These employees were previously represented by the Airline Mechanics Fraternal Association (AMFA) for roughly five years until the IBT won a decertification election in 2006. From 1947 through roughly 2000, the employees were represented by the International Association of Machinists. Although other members of these local unions have participated in previous IBT International officer elections, this is the first time the UAL employees at the SFO base have participated in the process.

The bargaining unit is divided between the two local unions. Employees whose surnames begin with the letters A through L are represented by Local Union 856, the remaining employees by Local Union 986. Representation is provided by a full-time business agent from each local union, 5 full-time chief shop stewards, a grievance committee chair, a grievance committee secretary, 3 employee assistance program representatives, and a number of shop stewards. The business agents are employed and paid by their respective local unions; the remaining representatives are UAL employees. While the chief shop stewards are paid by UAL to work full-time on union business, the line shop stewards are each granted 5 hours’ pay per week by UAL for union business. UAL provides the unions with office space and telephone equipment on UAL property to perform union business.

The local unions hold joint, monthly craft meetings for UAL unit members at Local Union 856’s hall off UAL property. The meetings are conducted jointly by the business agents from Local Unions 986 and 856. These meetings are scheduled to follow the end of each of the 3 shifts that unit members work; each meeting is typically attended by about 20 members, who sign in on a sheet just outside the door of the meeting room.

At the craft meetings held May 20, 2010, accreditation petitions for Hoffa-Keegel 2011 were placed on the table next to the sign-in sheet. In addition, they were circulated inside the meeting

July 8, 2010

room during the pre-meeting time while members gathered and snacked on union-provided pizza or donuts. Further, in at least one meeting held that date, petitions continued to circulate during the formal portion of the meeting, while business agent Rich Petrovsky addressed members from the podium and encouraged them to sign the petitions. Petrovsky also called attention to the petitions before the meeting started. Paul Molenberg, the Local Union 856 business agent with UAL unit responsibility, told our investigators that he saw something circulating during the meeting but did not know it was an accreditation petition until after the meeting was over. When he learned what it was, he took no action to remedy the situation.

Petrovsky became business agent for Local Union 986 in April 2008. This is his first IBT International officer election. He told our investigators that he received about 50 blank accreditation petitions by mail at his home from Theresa Chambers, the administrative assistant to his local union's principal officer, Christopher Griswold. Chambers told our investigator that she mailed the petitions to Petrovsky on personal time with postage received from Sean Harren, the local union's president. The post-it note she attached to the petitions she sent Petrovsky told him to call Griswold. The package Petrovsky received did not contain any instructions describing permissible and impermissible means of circulating the petitions. Petrovsky told our investigators he tried to reach Griswold and Chambers on their union phone numbers on work time to ascertain whether he was to circulate the petitions to members of both local unions or just to members of Local Union 986; he said he was never able to reach them. Griswold conceded to our investigators that he failed to speak with or otherwise train Petrovsky on the *Rules'* requirements. Griswold explained that nearly all of his local union's officers and business agents have been through an International officer election and are familiar with the *Rules*, so he has not seen the need to give instructions concerning how to circulate the petitions.

Petrovsky said he gave the petitions to the chief shop stewards to circulate and did not circulate any himself. Meetings for line shop stewards are held each Tuesday at the union conference room provided by UAL on UAL property. Like the monthly craft meetings, the weekly steward meetings are held at the end of each of the 3 shifts. At the steward meeting held June 8, Petrovsky distributed the accreditation petitions to shop stewards and asked them to circulate the petitions among members. Petrovsky explained to the stewards that an election was coming up and that the petitions were "nomination petitions." He instructed the stewards to circulate the petitions only on break time so as not to violate UAL's no-solicitation rule. He also instructed the stewards to return the completed petitions to him by June 18.

Petrovsky also asked grievance committee chair Dan Johnston to contact stewards to remind them to get their petitions turned in; Johnston did so on work time from the union office telephone and using his union-provided cell phone. In addition, Johnston distributed petitions at the steward meetings held June 15 and 22 (Petrovsky did not attend the June 15 or 22 meetings as he was off work for a period following a June 13 motorcycle accident. However, he called into the office regularly). Johnston told our investigators that he had no training in the *Rules* and passed out the petitions and made the follow-up phone calls merely because Petrovsky directed him to do so.

Petrovsky received some signed petitions back at the UAL-provided union office, but he was disappointed at the response. Accordingly, he sent an email to the 5 chief shop stewards criticizing them for lack of effort, telling them why they should support General President Hoffa, and exhorting them to go out and collect petitions. The email was sent on a union-provided

Prisco, 2010 ESD 6

July 8, 2010

email network, on which the business agents, the chief stewards, and the other full-time union representatives for UAL have addresses. The email, which also copied Local Union 856 business agent Molenberg, read as follows:

Hi “Guys”,

I MUST have ALL petitions turned in TODAY for the Hoffa/Kiegel [*sic*] nominations! They will need to be mailed “overnight” as soon as they are received as the deadline for us to turn them in (and still have them be valid) is upon us!

I spoke with Dan Johnston yesterday and asked that he pass this request along during the Stewards meetings yesterday. That said, please take time today to go out and collect any petitions that have not been turned in.

Quite frankly, I am appalled at the lack of response from our stewards to get this very simple task taken care of! There should have been an overwhelming submission of petitions within the first few days after I passed them out to the stewards during their meeting 2 weeks ago! I know it would have been when we were stewards on the floor!!

THESE FORMS MUST BE IN WASHINGTON D.C. BY FRIDAY THE 25TH , so you can see why it is imperative to get this done right away!!!!

Thank you all for getting this done. Hoffa pushed hard to get UAL mechanics into the Teamsters from the top level! The Teamsters will be the best thing that has happened to us and it is time for us to “pony up” and get these turned in

According to its time stamp, this email was sent June 23 at 10:46 a.m. As the email instructed, chief steward Greg Sullivan forwarded Petrovsky’s email later that day to line steward Prisco, the protestor here, with a message indicating that “[a]nyone interested in signing this petition should come down to the craft meeting tomorrow at Local 856 or contact Dan Johnston ASAP.”

This protest followed.

In addition to the foregoing, investigation also showed that the accreditation petitions on the sign-in table at the May 20 craft meeting were placed there by Local Union 856 business agent Earl Averette. Averette has been a business agent for 15 years. He told our investigator that he wanted to get some signatures on the petition so he dropped a couple off at the sign-in table for the May 20 craft meeting. He said he did not stay for the meeting, however. Averette said that as he was driving home from the local union hall, he realized that he should not have left the petitions on the table; when he picked up the petitions the next day, he simply put them in his desk drawer and did not turn them in. They remained in his desk drawer until he gave the original petitions to our investigator.

Investigation further showed that an accreditation petition was placed on the sign-in table by a person the investigation did not identify at the craft meeting held June 24. Chief steward Patrick Conlan saw the petition and signed it that date.

July 8, 2010

The elected and appointed leadership of Local Union 856 denied any knowledge that its business agents and chief stewards had circulated accreditation petitions on union time, in union meetings, or using union facilities or equipment.

Griswold, Local Union 986's principal officer, told our investigators that, after he received the protest and confirmed that Petrovsky did the things complained of, he talked to Todd Thompson of the Hoffa-Keegel 2011 campaign. According to Griswold, Thompson told him that the local union had "screwed up."

Hoffa-Keegel 2011 maintains a website, www.hoffa2011.com, on which the accreditation petitions were available for download prior to June 30. Instructions listed on the website for circulating the petitions included the following:

No Union or Employer resources may be used to circulate, copy, distribute, collect, or return the completed petitions. This means that you may not use Union or Employer provided e-mail, fax, mail privileges, etc., to send or receive petitions or petition related materials.

Our investigation uncovered no evidence that this instruction or the substance of it was communicated to the business agents, chief stewards, stewards, or other members who circulated petitions in the UAL unit at SFO.

No allegation was made or evidence presented that union personnel, facilities, equipment or other resources were used to obtain accreditation petitions at other worksites under the jurisdiction of Local Union 986 or Local Union 856.

Analysis

This case presents textbook examples of the improper use of union resources to support a candidate. Such use violates the *Rules* because 1) it takes the assets and facilities members provided for the purpose of mutual aid and protection against the employer and diverts them to the unauthorized purpose of benefiting a candidate; 2) it gives an advantage to that candidate that is not granted to an opposing candidate; and 3) it improperly conveys to the membership that the union as an institution supports a candidate.

Several provisions of the *Rules* prohibit campaigning on union time (whether the time is paid directly by the union or, as the result of a collective bargaining agreement, by the employer), or using union facilities, equipment or personnel to campaign. Thus:

- *Article VII, Section 12(b)*: "All Union officers and employees, if members, retain the right to participate in campaign activities, including the right to run for office, openly to support or oppose any candidate, to aid or campaign for any candidate, and to make personal campaign contributions. However, such campaigning must not involve the expenditure of Union funds. Accordingly, officers and employees (and other members) of the Union may not campaign on time that is paid for by the Union."

July 8, 2010

- *Article VII, Section 12(c)*: “Union funds, facilities, equipment, stationery, personnel, etc. may not be used to assist in campaigning unless the Union is reimbursed at fair market value for such assistance, and unless all candidates are provided equal access to such assistance and are notified in advance, in writing, of the availability of such assistance.”
- *Article XI, Section 1(b)(3)*: “No labor organization ... may contribute, or shall be permitted to contribute, directly or indirectly, anything of value, where the purpose, object or foreseeable effect of the contribution is to influence, positively or negatively, the election of a candidate ... No candidate may accept or use any such contribution. These prohibitions extend beyond strictly monetary contributions made by a labor organization and include contributions and use of the organization’s stationery, equipment, facilities and personnel.”
- *Article XI, Section 1(b)(6)*: “No Union funds or other things of value shall be used, directly or indirectly, to promote the candidacy of any individual. Union funds, facilities, equipment, stationery, personnel, etc. may not be used to assist in campaigns unless the Union is compensated at fair market value for such assistance, and unless all candidates are provided with equal access to such assistance and are advised in advance, in writing, of the availability of such assistance.”
- *Article XI, Section 1(b)(7)*: “No member may campaign for him/herself or for any other candidate during time that is paid for by the Union or by any employer.”

Additional provisions govern campaign activity during union meetings. Thus:

- *Article VII, Section 5(a)(3)*: “The Local Union need not allot time for campaigning during any of its meetings. However, if campaigning during such meetings is permitted, the Local Union shall notify all candidates for the positions for which such campaigning will be permitted of the opportunity to speak at least five (5) days prior to the meeting and shall divide the time equally between those candidates (or candidates’ credentialed representatives) who request an opportunity to speak. The order of appearance shall be determined by lot.”
- *Article VII, Section 5(a)(4)*: “A Local Union shall not discriminate or permit discrimination in favor of or against any candidate in conjunction with its meetings or otherwise. This requirement shall apply not only to formal presentations by or on behalf of candidates but also to informal campaign activities, such as, for example, comments on candidates during meetings, literature distribution at meetings, literature distribution tables, etc.”

Finally, several *Rules* provisions address a candidate’s responsibility with respect to union or employer support of campaigning:

- *Article XI, Section 1(b)(13)*: “Candidates are strictly liable to insure that each contribution received is permitted under these Rules. Prohibited contributions must be returned promptly.”

July 8, 2010

- Article XI, Section 1(b)(15): “Ignorance by a candidate, by a union and/or by an employer that union or employer funds or other resources were used to promote a candidacy shall not constitute a defense to an allegation of a violation of these Rules.”

Accreditation petitions may be circulated without violating these provisions. But canvassers cannot circulate petitions on union- or employer-paid time; cannot do so using union- or employer-provided facilities such as meeting halls and offices; cannot advance their petition drive with union- or employer-provided equipment, including by example telephones, computers, email networks, and sign-in tables; and cannot promote or circulate petitions at union meetings unless advance written notice is given to all candidates of the availability of the meeting for such purpose. The narrow exceptions to these requirements permit canvassers to use union- or employer-paid vacation time or lunch or break period time (Article VII, Section 12(b)) and canvass in employer-provided parking lots used by rank-and-file members to park their personal vehicles (Article VII, Section 12(e)).

Business agent Petrovsky violated the provisions that prohibit campaigning on union time by distributing accreditation petitions at craft and steward meetings, by directing chief stewards to follow-up with stewards about petitions, and by sending the June 23 email. All those chief stewards who complied with Petrovsky’s directives with respect to the petitions also campaigned on union time.

Petrovsky violated the provisions that prohibit use of union facilities for campaigning by speaking in support of the petitions at the May 20 craft meeting held at Local Union 856’s hall and at the June 8 steward meeting held in the union conference room at the union office on UAL property. He committed further violations by using the union office to deliver his directive to chief stewards to follow-up on petition circulation.

Petrovsky violated the provisions that prohibit use of union equipment for campaigning by using the union email network to transmit the June 23 email and by directing the chief stewards to follow up with stewards concerning the petitions, reasonably anticipating that they would do so using union phone lines or union cell phones. The chief stewards who followed Petrovsky’s directive by using union equipment also violated the *Rules*.

Business agent Molenberg, the Local Union 856 business agent with UAL responsibility, violated the *Rules* by permitting campaign activity to occur during a union meeting that he co-hosted and taking no action to stop it or to remedy the violation.

Business agent Averette violated the Rules by placing accreditation petitions on the sign-in table for the May 20 craft meeting; in doing so, he made use of the union hall and union equipment to campaign. Averette substantially cured this violation with respect to the accreditation petitions by recognizing the violation after the fact, not turning the signed petitions into the Hoffa-Keegel 2011 campaign, and by surrendering them instead to our investigator. However, the placement of the petitions on the sign-in table constituted campaigning of a type that is not permitted in a local union hall.

When Local Union 986 principal officer Griswold commenced the chain of events that resulted in the Rules violations set forth above by sending the petitions via his assistant to Petrovsky, he undertook an obligation under the *Rules* to insure that the business agent his local

July 8, 2010

union employed did not use union time, facilities, equipment or personnel to support a candidate. Griswold failed to meet this obligation. A post-it note on a stack of accreditation petitions mailed to a subordinate telling the subordinate to call is not sufficient to convey to that person the proper and improper means of circulating the petitions. Instead, Griswold had an affirmative obligation to communicate the *Rules*' requirements to all those whom he asked to circulate the petitions. That he, as Local Union 986's principal officer, was ignorant of what Petrovsky did until after the protest was filed is no defense to the *Rules* violations. Similarly, the elected leadership of Local Union 856 may not rely on their asserted lack of knowledge that their business agents and chief stewards conducted campaign activity on union time and using union facilities and equipment as a defense to a protest that the local union violated the *Rules*.

Finally, Hoffa-Keegel 2011 bears responsibility for the *Rules* violations found here. The petitions were circulated on its behalf and for its benefit. It had a responsibility to insure that union resources were not used to aid in that task. The notice included on the campaign's website warning that union or employer resources could not be used to circulate the petitions was effective only for those who saw it. In the instant case, the website notice would have been seen by the person who accessed the petition for download from the site. There is no evidence that the notice was conveyed to those who did not view the site directly. The website encouraged circulation of the petition form to collect signatures, and downloaded forms could easily be – and we find here were – passed to individual canvassers for circulation who have not seen the website. The campaign should have exerted more effort to communicate these requirements to the canvassers, either directly or through intermediaries.

Accordingly, we GRANT the protest.

Remedy

When the Election Supervisor determines that the *Rules* have been violated, he “may take whatever remedial action is deemed appropriate.” Article XIII, Section 4. In fashioning the appropriate remedy, the Election Supervisor views the nature and seriousness of the violation as well as its potential for interfering with the election process.

We find that the use of union resources to support the Hoffa-Keegel 2011 campaign's petition drive at the UAL SFO unit continued over an extended period, from at least May 20 through June 24, 2010, and involved multiple and repeated acts of union- or employer-funded support. Each such act had the purpose, object or foreseeable effect of supporting the candidates on the Hoffa-Keegel 2011 slate. The immediate impact of these acts included the following: 1) diverting member-funded resources from grievance administration and contract enforcement to campaign activity on behalf of particular candidates; 2) conveying to members employed at UAL SFO that their local unions supported the candidacies of the Hoffa-Keegel 2011 slate members; and 3) granting advantages to the Hoffa-Keegel 2011 slate members that were not granted to others by promoting their candidacies and obtaining petition signatures on their behalf.

These violations require remedies from the local unions and from the Hoffa-Keegel 2011 campaign.

We order Local Unions 986 and 856 to cease and desist from providing union support to any candidate, whether for International office or for delegate or alternate delegate to the IBT

July 8, 2010

convention. Specifically, we order the local unions, their officers, agents, chief stewards, stewards, and members to refrain from any campaign activity on union- or employer-paid time (except vacation or paid lunch or break time), and from using union- or employer-provided facilities, equipment, and other resources for such campaign activity (except as permitted by the *Rules* in employer parking lots).

We further order Local Unions 986 and 856 to post the notice attached to this decision on all bulletin boards on which union notices are posted at each and every worksite under the jurisdiction of either local union and to maintain such posting through December 15, 2010. The purpose of this notice is to educate the members of each local union of the *Rules*' requirements, to notify them that their local union leadership violated the *Rules*, and to inform them that their local union cannot and does not support any candidate or slate of candidates for International office. Although the *Rules* violations found here occurred at UAL SFO, members of either local union employed at other worksites have an interest in knowing that the local union to which they belong impermissibly provided material support to candidates for International office. A widely posted notice also will provide a deterrent to further misuse of union- or employer-provided resources to campaign. These notices must be posted within 5 business days of the date this decision issues. Within 3 business days thereafter, the principal officer of each local union (or his designee) must file an affidavit of compliance with our office attesting that the notice was posted as required, identifying the bulletin board sites at each worksite on which it was posted and the name and title of the individual with responsibility for posting the notice at each site. Once posted, no notice may be defaced or covered up and must be maintained for the posting period. Notices that are defaced must be replaced promptly.

We hold that each Hoffa-Keegel 2011 accreditation petition that contains the signature of any member of Local Union 986 or 856 employed at UAL SFO is invalid. Accordingly, we will not permit them to be used for any purpose authorized by Article X of the *Rules*. We order this remedy because of the pervasive use of union- and employer-funded time, facilities, equipment, and other resources used to obtain the signatures and the substantial likelihood that most (if not all) such signatures were obtained through the impermissible use of these resources. In the event that Hoffa-Keegel 2011 seeks accreditation petition signatures from members employed at UAL SFO for the existing or an expanded slate following the date this decision issues, it must do so using petitions that are readily distinguishable, by distinctive format and dating, from those we find invalid here.

The foregoing remedy seeks to correct the advantage Hoffa-Keegel 2011 obtained in securing accreditation petition signatures from UAL SFO members by invalidating those petitions. The remedy does not, however, undo the benefit Hoffa-Keegel 2011 obtained from the campaign activity associated with the petition circulation, which activity occurred using union- or employer-funded time, facilities, equipment, and other resources. Thus, canvassers on union time and using union facilities and meetings spoke in support of Hoffa-Keegel 2011 slate members. Further, union officials on union time and using union equipment exhorted stewards to obtain petition signatures, supplying them with talking points to use in their canvassing. Such campaign activity calls for a remedy addressed to the campaign message communicated to members at union meetings and through the use of union resources that supported the Hoffa-Keegel 2011 campaign. Under the circumstances presented here, we find that the best tool available to us to level the playing field between the Hoffa-Keegel 2011 campaign and other candidates for International office is to require Hoffa-Keegel 2011 to pay the expenses of a

July 8, 2010

mailing to all members of Local Union 986 and 856 who are employed at UAL SFO. We so order. We reject as inadequate a remedy to grant campaign time during one or more craft or steward meetings because much of the activity we find violated the *Rules* here did not take place in meetings.

The remedial mailing we order here is available to any candidate for IBT General President or, if a member of a slate for which a slate declaration form has been filed with our office, to the slate that includes the candidate for IBT General President. Notice of intention to access the remedy ordered here may be given at any time but no later than November 15, 2010 by email to Hoffa-Keegel 2011 with copy to our office. The mailing may be completed at any time but no later than December 1, 2010. We place these time limits on the availability and accomplishment of the mailing because the violation we find here took place in the context of accreditation petition canvassing and we limit the remedy to the period during which accreditation petitions may still be circulated. As the *Rules* permit submission of accreditation petitions through December 15, 2010 (Article X, Section 3), a mailing occurring up to and including December 1 may still impact that effort.

Each candidate for IBT General President or slate that includes such a candidate is entitled under the remedy we order here to a mailing separate from the mailing granted to any other candidate for IBT General President or his/her slate. The expense for which the Hoffa-Keegel 2011 campaign is liable under this remedy is the cost of #10 envelopes, mailing labels or address-labeling process, paper and printing (including plate-making) for a one-sheet, two-sided flyer printed on white paper in black ink, and first class postage. The Hoffa-Keegel 2011 campaign is not responsible for artwork or layout expense associated with the mailing. If any candidate seeks to use other than white paper and/or ink in addition to or instead of black, the incremental cost, if any, of such enhancements is the responsibility of that candidate and not Hoffa-Keegel 2011. Local Unions 986 and 856 shall supply the address list of its members at UAL SFO (current within 30 days of the date the mailing is to take place) to the mail house designated by any candidate or slate accessing this remedy. Hoffa-Keegel 2011 shall provide such guarantee of payment as the designated mail house shall reasonably require and shall do so in a time that will not delay the mailing.

In the brief history of this election cycle, we have found *Rules* violations against Hoffa-Keegel 2011 in each of the 3 protests lodged against it. *Gegare*, 2010 ESD 1 (May 31, 2010), *aff'd*, 10 EAM 1 (June 14, 2010); *Gegare*, 2010 ESD 4 (June 24, 2010), *remanded for further investigation as to remedy*, 10 EAM 3 (July 8, 2010); and *Zuckerman & Gegare*, 2010 ESD 5 (June 28, 2010), *appeal withdrawn*, 10 EAM 2 (July 7, 2010). In each case, the campaign could have avoided the violation by instructing its operatives and supporters on the relevant requirements of the *Rules*. Specifically in *Zuckerman & Gegare*, we ordered the campaign “to cease and desist from accepting contributions of material, albeit involuntary, support from employers and the IBT that are the result of the actions of the campaign or its supporters in conducting campaign activity where it is impermissible to do so.” In the present case, we find again that Hoffa-Keegel 2011 could have avoided the violation by insuring that those campaigning on its behalf were properly instructed on the *Rules*’ requirements. We intend that the remedial mailing ordered here will underscore this imperative, in addition to leveling the field with other candidates.

Prisco, 2010 ESD 6

July 8, 2010

A decision of the Election Supervisor takes immediate effect unless stayed. *Lopez*, 96 EAM 73 (February 13, 1996).

Any interested party not satisfied with this determination may request a hearing before the Election Appeals Master within two (2) working days of receipt of this decision. The parties are reminded that, absent extraordinary circumstances, no party may rely upon evidence that was not presented to the Office of the Election Supervisor in any such appeal. Requests for a hearing shall be made in writing, shall specify the basis for the appeal, and shall be served upon:

Kenneth Conboy
Election Appeals Master
Latham & Watkins
885 Third Avenue, Suite 1000
New York, NY 10022
Fax: (212) 751-4864

Copies of the request for hearing must be served upon the parties, as well as upon the Election Supervisor for the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, 1801 K Street, N.W., Suite 421 L, Washington, D.C. 20006, all within the time prescribed above. A copy of the protest must accompany the request for hearing.

Richard W. Mark
Election Supervisor

cc: Kenneth Conboy
2010 ESD 6

Prisco, 2010 ESD 6
July 8, 2010

DISTRIBUTION LIST (BY EMAIL UNLESS OTHERWISE SPECIFIED):

Bradley T. Raymond, General Counsel
International Brotherhood of Teamsters
25 Louisiana Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20001
braymond@teamster.org

David J. Hoffa
Hoffa Keegel 2011
1100 Connecticut Avenue, N.W., Ste. 730
Washington, D.C. 20036
hoffadav@hotmail.com

Ken Paff
Teamsters for a Democratic Union
P.O. Box 10128
Detroit, MI 48210-0128
ken@tdu.org

Barbara Harvey
1394 E. Jefferson Avenue
Detroit, MI 48207
blmharvey@sbcglobal.net

Fred Gegare
P.O. Box 9663
Green Bay, WI 54308-9663
kirchmanb@yahoo.com

Scott D. Soldon
Previant Goldberg
1555 North RiverCenter Drive, Ste. 202
P.O. Box 12993
Milwaukee, WI 53212
sds@previant.com

Fred Zuckerman, President
Teamsters Local Union 89
3813 Taylor Blvd.
Louisville, KY 40215
fredzuckerman@aol.com

Robert M. Colone, Esq.
P.O. Box 272
Sellersburg, IN 47172-0272
rmcolone@hotmail.com

Joseph Prisco
2414 Ohatch Dr.
San Pablo, CA 94806
jgprisco@yahoo.com

Teamsters Local Union 986
1198 Durfee Avenue
South El Monte, CA 97133
info@teamsters986.org

Teamsters Local Union 856
453 San Mateo Avenue
San Bruno, CA 94066
teamsters@ibt856.org

Christopher Griswold
Teamsters Local Union 986
1198 Durfee Avenue
South El Monte, CA 97133
Cgriz009@teamsters986.org

Rich Petrovsky
Teamsters Local Union 986
1198 Durfee Avenue
South El Monte, CA 97133
rpetrovsky@teamsterssfo.com

Paul Molenberg
Teamsters Local Union 856
453 San Mateo Avenue
San Bruno, CA 94066
pmolenberg@teamsterssfo.com

Earl Averette
Teamsters Local Union 856
453 San Mateo Avenue
San Bruno, CA 94066
eaverette@ibt856.org

Dan Johnston
Teamsters Local Union 856
453 San Mateo Avenue
San Bruno, CA 94066
djohnston@teamsterssfo.com

Prisco, 2010 ESD 6

July 8, 2010

Pat Conlan
Teamsters Local Union 856
453 San Mateo Avenue
San Bruno, CA 94066
pconlan@teamsterssfo.com

Greg Sullivan
Teamsters Local Union 986
1198 Durfee Avenue
South El Monte, CA 97133
gsullivan@teamsterssfo.com

Christine Mrak
2357 Hobart Avenue, SW
Seattle, WA 98116
chrismrak@gmail.com

Rochelle Goffe
1234 22nd Avenue, E
Seattle, WA 98112
rochellegoffe@gmail.com

Jeffrey Ellison
214 S. Main Street, Suite 210
Ann Arbor, MI 48104
EllisonEsq@aol.com

OFFICE OF THE ELECTION SUPERVISOR
for the INTERNATIONAL BROTHERHOOD OF TEAMSTERS

1801 K STREET, N.W., SUITE 421 L

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20006

202-429-8683

877-317-2011 TOLL FREE

202-429-6809 FACSIMILE

electionsupervisor@ibtvote.org

www.ibtvote.org

Richard W. Mark
Election Supervisor

July 8, 2010

TO: All members of Teamsters Local Union 986 and Teamsters Local Union 856

FROM: Richard W. Mark, Election Supervisor

The Rules for the 2010-2011 IBT International Union Delegate and Officer Election (“Rules”) prohibit local union officers, business agents, and staff from campaigning for candidates for IBT International office on union time or using union facilities, equipment or personnel.

The Election Supervisor has determined that local union personnel at United Airlines’ San Francisco base campaigned for the Hoffa-Keegel 2011 slate on union time and using union offices, telephones and email network. This activity violates the *Rules* because local unions cannot take sides in any union election.

The Election Supervisor will not tolerate violation of the *Rules*. The Election Supervisor has ordered Local Unions 986 and 856 not to provide support to any candidate for IBT office and to post this notice on all worksite bulletin boards where members of these local unions work.

The Election Supervisor has issued this decision in *Prisco*, 2010 ESD 6 (July 8, 2010). You may read this decision at <http://www.ibtvote.org/protests/2010/2010esd006.htm>.

Any protest you have regarding your rights under the *Rules* or any conduct by any person or entity that violates the *Rules* should be filed with Richard W. Mark, 1801 K Street, N.W., Suite 421L, Washington, D.C. 20006, telephone: 877-317-2011, fax: 202-429-6809, email: electionsupervisor@ibtvote.org.

This is an official notice of the Election Supervisor and must remain posted on this bulletin board until December 15, 2010.