



Lee Saunders
President

Laura Reyes
Secretary-Treasurer

Richard Abelson
Judicial Panel Chairperson

Judicial Panel Members:

Kahim Boles
Philadelphia, PA

Richard Gollin
Jersey City, NJ

Michael Hanna
Portland, OR

Sheila Hill
Catonsville, MD

Keith January
Detroit, MI

Gerard Jolly
Grove City, OH

Theodorah McKenna
Los Angeles, CA

Dayton Nakanelua
Honolulu, HI

Steve Preble
Itasca, MN

Jim Tucciarelli
Staten Island, NY

October 4, 2016

JUDICIAL PANEL CASE NO. 16-80
Local 375 Administratorship

GREETINGS:

Enclosed is the decision in the above-captioned case.

In Solidarity,

Richard Abelson
Judicial Panel Chairperson

RA:spp

cc: Lee Saunders, President
Laura Reyes, Secretary-Treasurer
William Luyre, Chief of Staff
Judith Rivlin, General Counsel
Mike Sukal, Director OFS
John English, Administrator, Local 375
Henry Garrido, Executive Director, DC 37
Chris Wilgenkamp, Deputy Administrator, Local 375
Former Local 375 Officers

JUDICIAL PANEL CASE NO 16-80

Local 375 Administratorship

On August 29, 2016, International President Lee Saunders placed Civil Service Technical Guild, Local 375, AFSCME, AFL-CIO, under an administratorship pursuant to Article IX, Section 37 of the AFSCME International Constitution.

Brother John English, AFSCME Area Field Services Director, was appointed to serve as the Administrator of the local, and Brother Chris Wilgenkamp, District Council 37 Director of Technology and Membership Services, was appointed to serve as the Deputy Administrator of the local. The officers of Local 375 were notified of the International President's action and informed they were suspended from their officer positions. The matter was referred to the Judicial Panel for hearing pursuant to Article IX, Sections 39 and 40 of the International Constitution.

In imposing the administratorship, the International President stated:

On August 12, 2016, the Judicial Panel forwarded to this office its preliminary decision in Case No. 16-64 - Local 375 Election Protest. I have reviewed the issues presented in that case, as well as the Judicial Panel's findings. I am of the opinion that the conduct that occurred is a continuation of a pattern demonstrated through numerous other Judicial Panel decisions, such that I find the existence of an emergency situation in New York City, Civil Service Technical Guild, Local 375, AFSCME, AFL-CIO. Specifically, I am of the opinion that the local is acting in violation of the International Constitution by its repeated engagement of conduct that violates several provisions of the Bill of Rights for Union Members, including their right to fair and democratic elections and their right to full

participation in the decision making processes of the union. I am further of the opinion that such conduct cannot or will not be immediately remedied by the local. Therefore, in accordance with Article IX, Section 37 of the International Constitution, I am placing Local 375 under administratorship, pending notice and hearing, effective immediately.

An administratorship hearing board consisting of Judicial Panel members Brother Kahim Boles, Sister Sheila Hill and Brother Steven Preble was appointed to conduct the hearing in this matter. By notice dated September 1, 2016, the suspended officers of Local 375 were notified that a hearing would be held on September 16, 2016, in New York, New York. All testimony was given under oath and a transcript was made by a professional court reporter.

The International President was represented by Sister Nicole Pollard, a member of the Federation and Associate General Counsel for the International Union. Brother Michael Troman and Sister Stacey Moriates, both members and suspended officers of Local 375, represented those who opposed the administratorship. All interested members present at the hearing were given an opportunity to present their views on the matter.

DISCUSSION

President Saunders' stated reason for imposing an administratorship upon Local 375 was his opinion that the local union was acting in violation of the AFSCME International Constitution. His opinion was based upon conduct recently at issue in Judicial Panel Case No. (JPC) 16-64, as well what he perceived to be a pattern of conduct

demonstrated through numerous prior Judicial Panel decisions. He found the conduct in these cases to violate the Bill of Rights of Union Members set forth in the International Constitution. He specifically cited to two provisions of the Bill of Rights that protect members' right to fair and democratic elections and their right to full participation in the decision making processes of the union. President Saunders' stated reason for taking this action on August 29, 2016, was his opinion that the conduct that gave rise to his concerns could not or would not be immediately remedied by the local.

Our charge as an administratorship hearing board is to determine if a subordinate body committed any of the enumerated acts in Article IX, Section 37 of the AFSCME International Constitution. In this case we must specifically decide if Local 375 was acting in violation of the Constitution's provisions that provide for the Bill of Rights of Union Members. In making this determination we will review the concerns expressed by President Saunders that gave rise to the imposition of the administratorship.

Judicial Panel Case No. 16-64

Local 375 represents approximately 7,800 professional technical employees of New York City and its related agencies. (Tr. 47) In between meetings of the membership's delegate body the local is governed by an executive committee that consists of the local's seventeen (17) elected officers and presidents of the local's chapters. (Tr. 49-52) The local conducted its regularly scheduled election of officers, as well as the election of delegates to District Council 37 and the Central Labor Council, in December

2015.¹ (Tr. 53) In this election each of the officer positions were contested, with two to seven candidates running for each office. (IP-5; Tr. 53-54) Many of the candidates in the election have held elected office within the local in the past. (Tr. 58) The candidates ran as members of one of two slates, and some ran as independent candidates. (Tr. 54) At the conclusion of the December 2015 election there were several positions for which no candidate received a majority of the votes cast and a run-off election was required. (Tr. 55)

Following the December 2015 election, a protest was filed by seven (7) members of a slate headed by Brothers Mike Troman and Mitchell Feder. (Hereinafter "Troman Protest")(Tr. 56; IP-1) The relevant portions of the Troman Protest alleged that members of a slate headed by Brother Claude Fort and Sister Michelle Keller improperly used employer (City work emails) and union (chapter web domains and local union newsletter) resources to campaign. It was their contention that this conduct provided an "*unfair advantage*" over other candidates and "*[did] not offer the same opportunities to reach members.*" The Troman Protest specifically asked the Judicial Panel to find that the conduct violated Article 4 of the AFSCME Bill of Rights for Union Members, as well as other provisions of the AFSCME International Constitution and federal law that govern the conduct of elections.

¹ Under Article XII, Section 9.C. of the Local 375 constitution all officers serve as automatic delegates to the AFSCME International Convention by virtue of the office. (HB-3) The election of delegates to the AFSCME Convention, as well as District Council 37 and Central Labor Council, are subject to the election provisions of the Labor-Management Reporting and Disclosure Act.

The Judicial Panel held a hearing to consider the Troman Protest and issued its decision on February 24, 2016, as JPC 16-11. (IP-1) The decision was rendered by Brother Richard Abelson, the Chairperson of the Judicial Panel. In this decision he found that candidates on the Fort/Keller slate, and members who supported them, improperly used chapter domain names and the local union's newsletter to promote their candidacy. Although the protest was filed against members of the Fort/Keller slate, Brother Abelson found that violations involving the use of City work email addresses and a chapter web domain were also committed by other candidates. He specifically found:

A substantial majority of the above-described emails supported the Claude Fort Slate. There were several emails submitted at hearing which contained information which were supportive of other candidates not running on the Fort Slate. Post-hearing, Sister Michelle Keller submitted a significant number of emails which were sent to work emails by Brother Feder, Brother Antonio Donas, and through the Local375@Chapter8.info and other Local 375 addressees, which supported other slates or which attacked the Claude Fort Slate. (IP-1 @ 4)

Brother Abelson's decision explained at length that the conduct of the candidates on both slates violated not only the AFSCME International Constitution, but federal law - the LMRDA - as well. To remedy these violations, Brother Abelson vacated the results of the officer and delegate elections and ordered that the elections be rerun. (IP-1) A copy of the findings and decision in JPC 16-11 was mailed to all candidates in the December 2015 election. (Tr. 26; IP-1)

A rerun election involving the same candidates was held a couple of months later in April 2016. (Tr. 56-57) This election also resulted in the need for run-off elections. (Tr. 57) Following the run-off elections, eight (8) members of the Fort/Keller slate filed protests with the Judicial Panel. (Hereinafter "Fort Protest") (IP-2) The relevant portions of the Fort Protest were similar to the Troman Protest in that they alleged that members of Troman/Feder slate violated the AFSCME International Constitution by their use of employer (City work emails) and union (chapter web domains and meetings) resources to promote their candidacy. It was also alleged that their conduct violated Article X, Section 2F of the International Constitution as a refusal or deliberate failure to carry out the legally authorized decision of the Judicial Panel in JPC 16-11.

The Judicial Panel scheduled another hearing to consider the Fort Protest and on April 12, 2016, Brother Abelson issued his preliminary decision in JPC 16-64. He again found that the candidates, and/or those who supported them, improperly used local union related web domain addresses to promote their candidacy. He also found that members of both slates continued to engage in conduct previously found in JPC 16-11 to violate the International Constitution and the Election Code. (IP-2) (*"These emails were sent by or on behalf of both the 'Team Claude Fort' [Fort/Keller] slate and the 'New Direction' [Troman/Feder] slate running for office."*) Brother Abelson expressed his frustrations concerning the reoccurrence of the violations and stated:

... There was a presumption by the undersigned, which has obviously been proven to be unfounded, that based on [the JPC 16-11] decision - which is a lawful order of the Judicial Panel - there would be no improper emails by any slate or candidates, or by anyone on their behalf, to Local 375 members

on the employer email system in the rerun of the election. Yet candidates for office, and advocates for such slates of candidates, on both the 'Team Claude Fort' slate and the 'New Direction' slate sent emails to the members' City of New York email addresses in violation of, at a minimum, the AFSCME Constitution, the AFSCME Local Union Election Manual, and the decision in Judicial Panel Case No. 16-11.

* * *

The undersigned is extremely concerned that there are individuals who are acting to undermine the election process in Local 375 to create chaos and to damage the democratic nature of the election process. It appears that these individuals intentionally planted a time-bomb in the rerun election by sending out emails to the City of New York email addresses of Local 375 members in order to provide them with the basis of protesting the election at a future date if the result was not what they desired. There were also emails sent by individuals who apparently lacked the self-control to avoid improperly responding on the members' City of New York email addresses to what they consider unfair or erroneous attacks.

In his decision, Brother Abelson reached the following conclusion:

The evidence established that the conduct which violated the Election Code, Appendix D of the International Constitution did not abate after the initial election, and if anything, has become ingrained in Local 375. The total disregard of the Election Code and the decision in Judicial Panel Case. No. 16-11 has seriously undermined the members' rights to a free and fair election. The level of dysfunction and what appears to be intentional resistance to comply with the Election Code by those who seek to hold office in Local 375 is of great concern. It appears to the undersigned that ordering a new election, assuming one is warranted, would continue what

appears to be a now endless spiral of ignoring AFSCME's Election Code and would further the dysfunction now evident in this local union.

Brother Abelson referred his findings and concerns to President Saunders.

Other Judicial Panel Cases

In JPC 16-64, Brother Abelson noted the following in footnote 2:

I note that internal charges and counter-charges filed by members of 'Team Claude Fort' slate and the 'New Direction' slate against members of the other slate are now pending before the Judicial Panel. This continues a long and unfortunate history of the Judicial Panel being called upon dozens of times to address alleged and at times, proven conduct, that reflects unabated infighting which has negatively impacted the governance of Local 375.

Brother John English testified that there has been a political divide within the local union for many years and the relationship between some members of the local's leadership could be described as "rabid opponents." (Tr. 58-59) He has attended several Local 375 executive committee and delegate body meetings in his capacity as the Area Field Services Director and describes those meetings as "*dysfunctional*" and "*chaotic*." (Tr. 60-61, 113) He testified that the chaos at these meetings has on occasion created gridlock that interfered with the ability of the local to conduct even routine business, such as the adoption of meeting minutes or the ability to maintain a quorum. (Tr. 60-62; 78, 96, 101-102) These matters were reported to the Eastern Region Director at the

International Union (Tr. 115). Brother English also testified that prior to the administratorship he had spoken with several members of Local 375 who expressed frustration with the local leadership's "*bickering, the infighting and the inability to actually work productively for their members.*" (Tr. 64) He stated that the fighting within the local also presented itself in Judicial Panel cases. (Tr. 116)

Sister Elizabeth Perrow, who for twenty-eight years has served as the Assistant to the Judicial Panel Chairperson, presented a historical summary of cases involving officers and members of Local 375 that have been heard and decided by the Judicial Panel, or are currently pending before the Panel. (Tr. 27-38; IP-3) These cases were filed between 2001 and 2016. The summary consists of 96 cases in total, of which 69 involved internal union charges and 27 involved protests to the conduct of union elections. (Tr. 29-30) Four of the charge cases in the summary are currently pending with the Judicial Panel. Sister Perrow also presented complete copies of each of the Judicial Panel decisions. (Tr. 30-32; IP-4A-C)) She testified that she had become familiar with the names of the individuals who appeared as parties in these cases and that she recognized most of them as being officers of the local union. (Tr. 32-33)

Brother English testified that in many of the Local 375 Judicial Panel cases the Panel has concluded that the local did not protect the democratic rights of the membership. (Tr. 63-64) He referred to the Judicial Panel's recent decisions in 16-11 and 16-64 as examples of how the local has failed to protect the rights of the membership to a fair election. He also stated that binding decisions made by the delegate body and the

executive committee are routinely ignored and that this in effect nullifies the participation of the membership. (Tr. 64, 78-79)

Brother English's testimony included evidence that prior to the imposition of the administratorship, President Saunders, on two occasions, expressed his concerns about the nature and frequency of the Judicial Panel cases to the local union's leadership. (Tr. 68) He first expressed his concerns in a letter to Sister Stacey Moriates, dated September 15, 2014, and copied to the members of the local's executive committee. (IP-7) In this letter President Saunders informed the local that ". . . *the serial charges being filing by officers and members of Local 375 have, for the most part, become little more than personal and often, petty grievances between the same group of officers and members. . . Local 375 should be focused on these threats and protecting its membership, instead of engaging in a never ending filing of charges and countercharges.*" In an effort to reduce the conflict within the local, as well as the burdensome cost to the Judicial Panel, President Saunders asked the leadership within Local 375 to participate in mediation before filing charges and to take original jurisdiction over the local's cases. To assist the local, President Saunders arranged for International Union staff to establish a mediation process and conduct a training on internal union judicial procedures. Brother English testified that the Local 375 executive committee formally adopted mediation procedures, which were in place at the time of the administratorship; however, he stated that only one member has used the services since 2014. (Tr. 72-76; IP-8 & 9) He also testified that since President Saunders' letter was sent to the leadership, approximately 24 cases have

been filed directly with the Judicial Panel, rather than with the local union as suggested. (Tr. 70-71))

In a second letter dated March 14, 2016, addressed to Brother Claude Fort and also copied to the Local 375 executive committee, President Saunders again conveyed his concerns about the local's conduct. (IP-7A) He summarized a number of internal union cases involving Brother Fort and other local union officers, and expressed his concern that the cases demonstrated a "*disregard for [the] obligations to abide by the governing documents of the International Union and Local 375*" and noted that "*the implications of this continued course of conduct on Local 375's ability to properly represent its membership is of great concern to me.*"

FINDINGS

The AFSCME International Constitution begins with a Preamble that states in relevant part:

Unions are under a solemn obligation to represent members forcefully and effectively in negotiations with management and to conduct internal union affairs according to democratic standards.

The Preamble is immediately followed by what is arguably the most important provision of the AFSCME International Constitution - *The Bill of Rights of Union Members*. These rights are incorporated into the constitutional provisions that follow and define the democratic standards AFSCME, its subordinate bodies and its members are obliged to adhere to when conducting the union's affairs.

Paragraph 4 of the Bill of Rights sets forth the right of union members to participate in internal union elections that are governed by uniformly applied rules and free from undue influence. This provision states:

Members shall have the right to fair and democratic elections, at all levels of the union. This includes due notice of nominations and elections, equal opportunity for competing candidates, and proper election procedures which shall be constitutionally specified.

Paragraph 7 of the Bill of Rights sets forth the rights of every member to have a voice in their union and to have that voice honored when it represents the will of the majority. It states:

Members shall have the right to full participation, through discussion and vote, in the decision-making process of the union and to pertinent information needed for the exercise of this right. This right shall specifically include decisions concerning the acceptance or rejection of collective bargaining contracts, memoranda of understanding, or any other agreements affecting their wages, hours, or other terms and conditions of employment. All members shall have an equal right to vote and each vote cast shall be of equal weight.

President Saunders is of the opinion that there was a pattern of conduct within Local 375 that violated these rights. He also does not believe that the local is capable or willing to take corrective action to protect these rights. We agree with President Saunders on both points.

We have reviewed the Local 375 cases decided by the Judicial Panel and find that in recent years there have in fact been several decisions in which officers and members of the local have engaged in conduct that has interfered with the rights of the membership. These cases illustrate that similar, and in some cases identical, conduct occurred repeatedly notwithstanding prior warnings from, and discipline imposed by, the Judicial Panel. A close look at these cases reveals that the members found guilty of conduct that infringed upon the rights of the membership were primarily those who have been elected, or sought election, to officer and other leadership positions of trust. Contrary to statements made at the hearing by some who opposed the administratorship, President Saunders' decision was not based solely upon the conduct of any one member - namely Brother Claude Fort - or upon any specific act that occurred after the May 2016 rerun election. (Tr. 212-214) Rather his letter stated that his decision was based upon a pattern of conduct demonstrated through prior Judicial Panel decisions, which upon review show that they involved many of the local's officers, including those who were recently elected.

The recent decisions in JPC 16-11 and 16-64 are commanding examples of the pattern of conduct that concerned President Saunders. In those cases, members of the local seeking to hold officer positions, and others, demonstrated their lack of regard for rules of fairness and equal opportunity. As the discussion above illustrates, members of both slates engaged in the prohibited conduct not only in the initial election, but in the rerun election that was specifically ordered to eradicate the undemocratic behavior that denied the membership the opportunity to fairly select its representatives. The local had

been warned by the Judicial Panel in a prior case that this type of conduct violated the International Constitution. (JPC No. 14-45, Local 375, Chapter 2 Election Protest (*"The use of the employer's email to campaign is strictly prohibited in Appendix D of the International Constitution. Such use by a candidate or candidate's slate is cause for ordering the election to be rerun."*))) Moreover, the officers and members involved in the election, through their own admissions as stated in their protests to the Judicial Panel, were aware that such conduct: provided *"an unfair advantage," "[did] not offer the same opportunity to each members," "violates Article 4 of the AFSCME Bill of Rights,"* and amounted to *"the refusal or deliberate failure to carry out a legitimate authorized decision of the Judicial Panel."* (IP-1 Troman Protest; IP-2 Fort Protest) Notwithstanding the warnings, the admonishments in JPC 16-11 and the admissions, these members intentionally continued to engage in conduct that violates the union's rules and federal law.

Brother Ahmed Shakir, a member of the Troman/Feder slate who opposed the administratorship, testified that the City emails in the rerun election were sent in an effort to defend the members of the Troman/Feder slate against emails that were being circulated by other candidates. He specifically stated: *"we [had] to reply back to the members whatever [Claude Fort] is writing wrong about us."* (Tr. 205-206) This response illustrates precisely the conduct that gave President Saunders concern and a belief that those responsible for running the local union would not and could not comply with the provisions of the International Constitution. It not only represents a lack of self-control as noted by Brother Abelson in JPC 16-64, but the disregard for rules and procedures

when it serves a self-interest. No matter what the circumstances, there can never be a justifiable explanation for doing so, especially when done at the expense of the memberships' rights.² These violations not only had an impact on the members' fundamental rights, but also the union's economic interests as Brother John English testified that the local wasted in excess of \$135,000 of the member's dues monies to cover the costs of the initial and rerun elections. (Tr. 79)

The pattern of conduct within the local union controlled by self-interest and a disregard of authority is also reflected in cases heard by the Judicial Panel that involve officers of the local who have refused to carry out, or comply with, motions adopted by the member's elected representatives. Recent examples of such cases involving the suspended officers of Local 375 include: JPC. No. 16-49, Sona et al. v. Donas (officer refused to comply with executive committee motion to prohibit the use of recording devises at meetings); JPC No. 14-41, Shakir et al. v. Feder (treasurer refused to implement executive committee motion to distribute checks to charitable organizations); JPC No. 14-12, Keller et al. v. Feder (treasurer intentionally delayed the issuance of check payments authorized by the executive committee. Judicial Panel noted: "*It is another example of*

² Brother Mitchell Feder and others appeared at the hearing in opposition to President Saunders' decision to state their view that the conduct in JPC 16-64 should not serve as a basis for the administratorship because the rerun election was supervised by the International Union and complaints about the continued use of City email addresses were brought to the International Union's attention prior to the May 2016 vote count. We find these facts to be irrelevant to this matter before us and the argument unpersuasive. The AFSCME International Constitution does not authorize the International President, nor his representatives, to rule upon or take any action to enforce the election rules. That authority rests almost exclusively with the Judicial Panel. The responsibility for behavior during the course of an election rests solely upon the candidates themselves. In this case the candidates are responsible for the unrefuted evidence that members of both slates continued to send campaign related communications to City email addresses in violation of the International Constitution.

Brother Feder using his position as treasurer to impose his will on the local contrary to motions that were passed.”)

Conduct of this nature not only violates Article X, Section 2(F) of the International Constitution³, but it interferes with the rights of the membership to fully participate in the decision-making process of the union. This right is not limited to questions put directly before the membership as a whole, but extends to the questions before those who are elected to represent the membership’s interests. When elected representatives vote upon a question and obtain the necessary support, that vote becomes the decision of the membership. Full participation does not end with their votes, but rather includes proper and complete implementation of the matter decided. When those decisions are ignored it effectively silences the voices of the membership and nullifies their votes. The Panel made a similar finding in a prior Judicial Panel decision involving Local 375 in which the president failed to recognize motions related to parliamentary procedures. JPC 09-54, Fathi v. Fort & Grant (“*When the chair of a meeting refuses to recognize or act on properly made motions or challenges to the chair’s rulings and the chair determines the outcome of the votes based on the time of day or the length of the meeting, rather than the votes cast by the delegates, the rights of the minority and the will of the majority are both thwarted.*”)

It is apparent from the record that at the time President Saunders imposed the administratorship upon Civil Service Technical Guild, Local 375, he had legitimate

³ Article X, Section 2.F. is violated upon the refusal or deliberate failure to carry out legally authorized decisions of the International Convention, the International President, the International Executive Board, the Judicial Panel, or of the convention or executive board of a subordinate body of which the accused is a part.

concerns related to a pattern of conduct within the local union that interfered with the fundamental rights of the membership. This conduct has been intentional and continuous. This is certainly the case in the rerun election at issue in JPC 16-64 where several of the candidates (many of whom were local officers) acted in blatant disregard of the chairperson's decision. This type of behavior demonstrates the unwillingness of those in leadership positions to protect the rights of the membership when it serves their self-interests. While this conduct was egregious in the recent elections, the evidence shows that it has been ingrained in the local's history for many years. (JPC 13-45, Fathi v. Kenny et al. (members of the executive committee voted to support a motion that violated a previously issued Judicial Panel decision); JPC 12-155, Keller et al. v. Thomas, Rosenberg & Constantine (officer failed to pay a fine imposed by the Judicial Panel in a timely manner); JPC 11-45, Fort et al. v. Thomas et al. (executive committee member denied his right to free speech at a union meeting); JPC 10-112, Fathi et al. v. Kenny (officer failed to comply with a decision of the executive committee concerning submission of reports); JPC 10-22, Thomas et al. v. Fort (president failed and refused to comply with various motions adopted by the executive committee); JPC 09-54, Fathi v. Fort & Grant (president failed to recognize the parliamentary decisions of delegates in accordance with Robert's Rules of Procedure); JPC 08-70, Fathi et al. v. Fort (president reduced and eliminated release time in violation of legally authorized decision of the executive committee); JPC 08-85, Feder et al. v. Fort (president's refusal to recognize or act upon a proper parliamentary challenge); JPC 08-69, Ader et al. v. Fort and Shakir (president's failure to recognize or act upon properly made motion); and, JPC 03-13,

Lovett v. Fort (president failed to comply with a lawful decision of the executive committee concerning release time.) This history has led some members and officers of the local union themselves to request that the International Union place Local 375 under an administratorship. (Tr. 191, 218-219, JPC 14-42 Charge)

Conduct within the local union of this nature has been unabated despite the admonishments in numerous Judicial Panel decisions and expressions of concern from the International President. The division and dysfunction that underlies this conduct has remained notwithstanding attempts by the International Union to provide the local union with instruction, resources and training. Those who were in office at the time the administratorship was imposed cannot distance themselves from this conduct or behavior as the evidence shows that many of them were directly involved. The evidence presented at the hearing demonstrates that the local union is unwilling or unable to alter its course of conduct on its own. The failure and/or refusal to do so constitutes an emergency situation and an appropriate basis for an administratorship.

DECISION

Based upon the above findings, it is the decision of this administratorship hearing board that President Saunders acted appropriately when he imposed an emergency administratorship upon Civil Service Technical Guild, Local 375, AFSCME, AFL-CIO.

October 4, 2016

Kahim Boles - Philadelphia, PA

Sheila Hill - Catonsville, MD

Steven Preble - Deer River, MN

Judicial Panel Members

AFSCME, AFL-CIO