

MINUTES OF THE REGULAR MEETING OF THE
BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF
COUNTY SANITATION DISTRICT NO. 29
HELD AT THE OFFICE OF THE DISTRICT

March 13, 2019
1:30 o'clock, P.M.

The Board of Directors of County Sanitation District No. 29 of Los Angeles County met in regular session.

There were present: Larry Forester, Director from Signal Hill
Edward H. J. Wilson, Director from Signal Hill
Lori Y. Woods, Director from Signal Hill
Tina Hansen, Chairperson, Director from Signal Hill

Absent: Robert D. Copeland, Director from Signal Hill

Also present: Kimberly S. Christensen, Secretary to the Board

RE: PUBLIC COMMENTS
ITEMS NOT POSTED
ON AGENDA

The Chairperson announced this was the time for public comment. The Secretary then called the following speakers:

Ms. Debbie Treadwell, Insurance & Claims Coordinator, Financial Management Department, addressed the Boards regarding employee negotiations. Written speaker notes were submitted to the Secretary and are attached as well as on file.

Ms. Denice Guerrero, Administrative Secretary, Facilities Planning Department, addressed the Boards regarding employee negotiations. Written speaker notes were submitted to the Secretary and are attached as well as on file.

Ms. Elizabeth Weiland, Administrative Secretary, Financial Management Department, addressed the Boards regarding employee negotiations. Written speaker notes were submitted to the Secretary and are attached as well as on file.

Ms. Wendy Harris, Stationary Mechanic, Wastewater Management Department, addressed the Boards regarding employee negotiations. Written speaker notes were submitted to the Secretary and are attached as well as on file.

Ms. Melissa Fischer, Supervising Engineer II, Engineering Department, addressed the Boards regarding employee negotiations. Written speaker notes were submitted to the Secretary and are attached as well as on file with supporting documents.

As reported in the Status Report, the Chief Engineer and General Manager responded to comments and updated the Directors on the subject matter.

RE: MINUTES
held February 13, 2019, were approved.

Upon motion of Director Woods, duly seconded and unanimously carried, the minutes of the regular meeting

RE: DISTRICT EXPENSES
seconded and unanimously carried, were approved:

The following expenses for the month of December 2018 were presented and upon motion of Director Woods, duly

Local District Expenses:	
Operations & Maintenance (O & M)	\$ 51,810.24
Capital	1,742.28
Allocated Expenses:	
Joint Administration	4,532.77
Technical Support	7,018.37
Joint Outfall	93,904.62
Total Expenses	<u>\$159,008.28</u>

RE: SERVICE CHARGE REPORT
RECEIVE AND ORDER FILED
SET PUBLIC HEARING FOR
APRIL 9, 2019, AND GIVE
REQUIRED NOTICE

Prior to meeting in regular session, the Chief Engineer and General Manager updated the Directors on the Districts' wastewater rates for the various Boards meeting today, as recorded in the Status Report presented on this date.

In regular session, a report titled *County Sanitation District No. 29 Service Charge Report for Fiscal Year 2019-20*, prepared in accordance with Section 5473 of the Health and Safety Code of the State of California and which establishes the formula for the calculation of a sewage unit that represents the average daily quantity of sewage flow and strength from a single-family home (SFH), was presented.

A letter discussing this matter, together with a copy of the Preliminary Budget and the Service Charge Report, accompanies the agenda. In this District, the current service charge rate per SFH is \$28.31 per month (\$339.75 per year) and no change is being proposed for fiscal year 2019-20. Owners of multiple dwelling units and commercial properties are charged in proportion to their use compared to a SFH. This item is consistent with the Districts' Guiding Principles of commitment to fiscal responsibility and prudent financial stewardship, and to plan for both short-term and long-term needs to minimize the need for significant rate increases.

The preliminary budget provides a comparison with the current 2018-19 budget and a breakdown of the items included in the budget. It is divided into three sections: anticipated expenses, projected revenues, and revenues to or expenses funded from reserves. In preparing the preliminary budget, it is projected that the general revenue sources available to the District for meeting expenses during the coming fiscal year include a pro rata share of the ad valorem (property) taxes, service charges, industrial wastewater surcharges, grants, state low-interest loans, interest income, and contract revenue. In addition, monies will be utilized from the Joint Outfall Capital Improvement Fund (a restricted fund for the accumulation of connection fees paid by new users) to cover the cost of expansion-related capital projects. Lastly, any surplus will be placed in designated reserves to be used to help fund the construction of future capital improvements.

A final budget will be presented to the Board for consideration in June as part of the overall budgetary process, adoption of which will authorize budget appropriations. In addition, the Board must take certain administrative actions that are required of all agencies that receive ad valorem taxes. These include establishing by resolution the amount of the tax levy the District will request from the Los Angeles County Tax Collector, and adopting a limit on authorized expenditures of tax proceeds.

The budget has been prepared in accordance with the Joint Administration and Joint Outfall Agreements. These agreements allocate Joint Administration and Joint Outfall costs to each signatory District according to the ratio of the number of sewage units in a District to the total number of sewage units in all the Districts signatory to each agreement. A sewage unit represents the average daily sewage flow and strength (measured in terms of chemical oxygen demand and suspended solids) from a single-family home. This method of allocating costs considers flow as well as the strength of sewage from all types of users and is the most equitable way to distribute Joint Administration costs.

District No. 29 is unique in that it is responsible for the ownership, operation, and maintenance of the City of Signal Hill's local sewer system. As a result, the costs associated with the local facilities, on a per sewage unit basis, are higher than those of other Districts. This, in turn, is the primary reason why the service charge rate in District No. 29 is higher than that of the other Districts in the Joint Outfall System.

A recommendation was made that, in accordance with Section 5473 of the Health and Safety Code, the Board instructed the District Clerk to publish newspaper notices to inform the public of the date, time, and place for a public hearing on the Service Charge Report, and that the public hearing be set for April 9, 2019, at 6:00 p.m. at Signal Hill City Council Chambers, 2175 Cherry Avenue, Signal Hill, California, for the purpose of public discussion of the adopted service charge and industrial wastewater surcharge rates and in order to continue to collect these charges on the next property tax roll. After the public hearing is closed, the Board must adopt the Service Charge Report in order to ensure collection of the service charge through property tax billing.

Upon motion of Director Woods, duly seconded and unanimously carried, the *County Sanitation District No. 29 Service Charge Report for Fiscal Year 2019-20* was ordered filed with the Clerk of the District and the Board does hereby fix April 9, 2019 at 6:00 p.m. at Signal Hill City Council Chambers, 2175 Cherry Avenue, Signal Hill, California, as the place for a public hearing on *County Sanitation District No. 29 Service Charge Report for Fiscal Year 2019-20*, the Report having been duly filed with the District Clerk.

The Clerk of this Board shall cause notice of the filing of the Report and the time and place of the public hearing to be published once a week for two successive weeks in the *Signal Tribune*, a weekly newspaper printed and published within the District, and in such other publications as are deemed appropriate by the Chief Engineer and General Manager.

Upon motion of Director Woods, duly seconded and unanimously carried, the meeting adjourned in memory of Director Hadjinian's cousin, Emil Miller, from the City of Montebello, to Tuesday, April 9, 2019 at 6:00 p.m. at the Signal Hill City Council Chambers, 2175 Cherry Avenue, Signal Hill, California.

TINA HANSEN
Chairperson

ATTEST:

KIMBERLY S. CHRISTENSEN
Secretary

/ak

Good Afternoon

I am Debbie Treadwell, the Insurance and Claims Coordinator for the Districts with 32 years of service, a member of the Confidential Unit, and a former union representative. I am here today to stand up as a member of the Confidential Unit. Apparently an email was sent directly to you, the Board of Directors, from the Board Secretary, with a letter signed by the two representatives of the Confidential Unit.

This letter was sent without the knowledge of many Unit members. I'm befuddled. It appears the intent of the letter is to state that Management did not have a role in the Unit's decision to decertify and that there was no coercion or collusion with Management.

To begin, this letter was sent by two employees within the Human Resources Department without consent from the actual Unit, using Districts direct resources to the Board.

The letter conveniently focuses on Management's long-held viewpoint in the ongoing labor issues and unsurprisingly leaves out important facts from the Fact-Finders Report regarding the 7% swap. The Fact-Finder's Report clearly states they recommend contract language that does not relinquish vested pension rights or provide any additional rights not in effect.

This is the ongoing battle.

The Confidential Unit is small, with only 30 employees.

The Unit decertified from the union with the minimum required number of employees who signed an uncirculated petition, only 10 signatures were needed. The petition was submitted on a Friday, decertification declared on Monday; then less than 24 hours were given to vote on one new representative because the other one was appointed by the Human Resources Secretary on Wednesday. Members were given less than 24 hours to provide their input and concerns before the reps met with Management on Friday. They then signed tentative agreements on Friday even though a large concern among the Unit was wanting to know what was going to be signed **before** it was signed. There were two more meetings with Management without updates to the Unit. On Wednesday the Proposal was approved by the Personnel Committee. Then a call for votes from the Unit was on Friday with votes due by the following Thursday. But, the Tuesday prior to voting, 5 minute time slots were offered to voice all of your concerns, between Noon and 1pm. FIVE minutes. Between Noon and one. The final agreement was posted on the Districts' intranet on Monday, November 5th. 24 calendar days -- 3 weeks. Doesn't that sound rushed to you?

Now, it appears Management is utilizing the Confidential Unit to appeal to you, the Board of Directors, without consent or knowledge from the full Unit.

To me this appears deceptive and wrong and these facts should be brought to your attention.

Hello, my name is Denice Guerrero, I am an Administrative Secretary, and as part of the Confidential Unit, I am here to state that a number of us in the unit were not made aware of this action that they took as our “representatives.”

In this letter, they used words such as “hostility” to describe those that did not agree with their terms and “peaceful” to describe their actions. This letter is a misrepresentation. What it does represent is only THEIR opinions of what happened and they should not have signed it as if they were representing the unit.

The Confidential unit is made up primarily of Human Resources staff, and other staff that works very closely with Management, which makes me one of the minority that voted NO on accepting that agreement.

I agree with Debbie’s statement that the entire “negotiation” process was totally rushed. I don’t believe we were given a reasonable amount of time to review and process our terms as they state. Unfortunately, I am part of a unit where my vote is canceled out but I am here today because I want my voice to be heard.

"I am Elizabeth Agredano Weiland, a 34 year employee of the Sanitation Districts and former "elected" union representative of the Confidential Unit. Regarding the 3/5/2019 letter you received signed by the two employees from the HR Department, I ask you Directors;

don't you find it interesting that this letter was sent to you directly by the Chief Engineer's Secretary?

Do you recall the Chief Engineer's Secretary ever sending you correspondence directly from other bargaining units?

In all fairness, is this now a precedent on how future communications with all the other bargaining units will be handled?

Going forward are you allowing our agency's current managers to pick and send the bargaining unit letters that support only their narrative and to withhold all those that don't?

Please be advised that the letter that you received from the two employees from the HR Department "Confidential Unit Representatives" was not actually copied to the confidential unit membership.

Doesn't it seem odd that they didn't share such an important letter with those that they claim to represent if all they wanted to share was the TRUTH? I can tell you that these so called TRUTHS are misleading if not FALSE.

Do you find it interesting that the HR Manager's Secretary spearheaded the petition to decertify AFSCME representation of the 30-member unit? That the process was rushed and not at all anonymous? or that the two "Confidential Unit Representatives" employees from the HR Department, both report directly to the HR Manager. Is this really a success to be proud of?

I believe this letter illustrates the problem with current Management's willingness to "WIN" at all costs even if that cost is a damaged agency reputation, plummeting employee morale, inability to retain and hire the required skilled staff, and the overall lack of trust in Management.

Yes, the Confidential Unit received its COLAs, but the authors of the March 5th letter to you **Did Not** protect the Confidential Unit's Vested Pension Rights as recommended in the FACT FINDER's report.

Directors, I ask you to see the real TRUTH and to take a step towards achieving a fair resolution of this protracted labor dispute and re-establishing a respectful working environment by immediately restoring the other employees' withheld COLAs and without ignoring those parts of the FACT FINDER's report that require real negotiations.

We can all be winners here!!

FOR BOARD MEETING ON MARCH 13, 2019
BY ROBERT MAJESKE

I am Wendy Harris, stationary mechanic, at the Joint Plant in Carson and member of the Blue Collar Unit. I am reading the following on behalf of Robert Majeske, Sr. Electrical and Instrumentation Technician, who works at Tulare Lake Compost in the Central Valley, a 3-hour drive away, so he could not be here in person.

Ladies and Gentleman of the Board,

As you should be aware of by now, the Blue Collar Unit of the Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County, has filed a petition to decertify SEIU local 721 as its representative. It is a noble effort undertaken with the support of a majority of members in the unit, with the unit's best interest at heart.

HOWEVER, through INTIMIDATION AND COERSION, from SEIU and PARTIZANSHIP on the part of management, this effort is being SABOTAGED. To give you the background, I am reading into the record an email with attachments that was sent to District human resources (Jennifer Allen), and copied to the Assistant Chief Engineer (Robert Ferrante) and the Chief Engineer (Grace Robinson-Hyde). This email was sent on March 7, 2019 and has yet to receive a response.

All-

On Jan 30, 2019 Jennifer Allen of the Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County was delivered an original copy of a petition, on behalf of the Blue Collar Unit of the same, in regards to Decertification of Service Employees International Union (Local #721). The following day a statement was issued by Jennifer Allen stating, "The petition for decertification is currently being reviewed."

The petition at the time of submittal contained 374 individual signatures. As of Jan 31, 2019 the total number of employees in the blue collar unit was found by Human Resources to be 687. At the time of submittal the Petition contained 54.4% of the total number of employees in the Blue Collar Unit.

Allowing time for recognition of the petition, and vetting, we then began inquiring about the status of our effort to exercise our rights under the Employee Relations Resolution and existing Public Employee Relations Board Law. After the vetting process we were informed that now the petition only contained signatures of 48.9% of the total number of employees in the Blue Collar Unit.

It seems that, during the vetting process, the Human Resources department of the Sanitation Districts of Los Angeles County found a way to eliminate just enough signatures, to not have an apparent simple majority on the petition.

The petitioners requested on several occasions to review / receive an explanation for this fact, and have yet to receive ANY WRITTEN POLICY THAT STATES SOME REVIEW OF THE PETITION FALLS TO

DISTRICT HUMAN RESOURCES PERSONEL, AND WE HAVE NOT RECEIVED THE WRITTEN GUIDELINES USED FOR EVALUATION OF SIGNATURES.

At nearly every request for information we have been STONEWALLED.

The Blue Collar Unit cannot allow a vote to proceed until the following issues are addressed:

1. Verification of Petition signatures determined by HR to be invalid
2. SEIU misconduct including interference and coercion
3. A clear path of appeal for any decision made solely by HR, Management or SEIU
4. Qualifying criteria required for Chief Engineer to call an election

It is completely inappropriate to proceed with an election when there has not been agreement on the number of valid signatures submitted. We request an itemized list of employee names whose signatures were invalidated, the reason for invalidation of each signature, and a copy of the governing protocol that governs invalidation for the reasons given. Should we dispute the findings of Human Resources, please indicate the appropriate authority that we can appeal your decision to. There cannot be an election before we have agreement on the signature count.

Jennifer Allen has informed us that the vote count is irrelevant because the Chief Engineer can call for an election regardless of the percentage of votes cast in favor of decertification. If that is true, we want an explanation of why Blue Collar is treated different from other units. In a letter dated March 5, 2019 (attached) from representatives of the Confidential Unit, it is stated that, "The Unit started a petition within the unit for decertification from AFSCME. From the Unit's employees, 53% signed the petition. The petition gave the Unit the power to become self-represented and decertify from AFSCME." We know that 53% really meant only 1 signature more than 50% and the Chief Engineer did not require an election by the Confidential Unit when barely they had more than 50% voting in favor of decertification. Why are we being told that the percentage is irrelevant? And we submitted more than just 1 signature above 50%. Why would the Chief Engineer make us have an election when she did not make the Confidential Unit hold an election?

Furthermore, we are curious why Human Resources has reported to us that the Blue Collar Unit total number of employees is 687, when the head of Human Resources told all employees at the staff meeting on Jan 23, 2019 that the total number in the Blue Collar Unit is 664. Did we grow by 23 members in one week?! It seems we cannot trust the numbers coming from Human Resources and we request an independent verification of the actual total Blue

Collar employees as of Jan 31, 2019. If we truly have 664, then we need 333 votes to decertify without a vote. Since even Human Resources states we have 48.9% of 687 – OR 336
SIGNATURES – WE HAVE ENOUGH SIGNATURES FOR DECERTIFICATION WITHOUT AN ELECTION.

SEIU misconduct is documented in the letter dated Feb 21, 2019 (attached); also sent to Jennifer Allen on Feb 22, 2019. Most significantly, SEIU is spreading the false information that decertification would leave the Blue Collar Unit without a contract. This is sending fear through the unit and an election cannot take place under this condition. As recently as Monday, March 4, 2019, an SEIU representative told Blue Collar employees at JWPCP that at a meeting the prior Thursday, the Chief Engineer stated that if Blue Collar decertifies, then our contract will be taken away. We request a clear written statement from Chief Engineer and Jennifer Allen confirming that our contract will remain in place after decertification, *with no modifications.*

We have been told that the Chief Engineer authority to call an election comes from the Employee Relations Resolution. We find detailed instructions about how to conduct an election “if” an election is called by the Chief Engineer in Section 8. But we don’t find anything that tells us the “qualifying criteria” that allow the Chief Engineer to call for an election? Can an election be called at any time for any unit? We don’t think so. Then, what defines that? Who or what is the correct body that we can appeal the Chief Engineer’s decision for an election to?

Since, against our wishes for all the reasons listed above, Human Resources put in motion activity to implement an election, we request your written response to this letter no later than March 11, 2019.

Robert Majeske

That is the end of the March 7th email. In addition, Robert Majeske goes on to state:

Management also allowed the Technical Support Unit to decertify without an election based upon submission of a petition containing “...signatures from a majority of employees...” I am entering into the record this memo from Jennifer Allen dated January 17, 2018. Similarly, the White Collar Unit decertified without an election based on a petition with a majority of signatures. Management’s failure to treat the Blue Collar Unit the same as the Confidential, Technical Support, and White Collar Units constitutes discrimination. That is a violation of the Miliias-Meyers-Brown Act.

On March 11, 2019, SEIU posted a flyer on bulletin boards at Districts facilities [hold up the flyer] – I am entering this into the record. This flyer is full of false statements designed to terrorize the Blue Collar into backing down from decertification from SEIU. Here’s an example: “If you decertify your union, you’ll start from zero when our contract is no longer valid...The best way to protect yourself is to vote “YES” to keep our Union [SEIU].”

IN LIGHT OF THE FACT THAT DISTRICT MANAGEMENT HAS NOT MAINTAINED TRANSPARENCY AND HAVE ALLOWED THIS FARCE THEY ARE CALLING A "FAIR ELECTION" TO CONTINUE, WE ASK THE BOARD TO:

- 1: ISSUE A STATEMENT OF CENSURE AGAINST THE BEHAVIOR OF SEIU AND THE MANAGEMENT INVOLVED.
- 2: INVOKE 3RD PARTY REVIEW OF THE BLUE COLLAR DECERTIFICATION PETITION
- 3: ISSUE AN ORDER TO THE CHIEF ENGINEER TO DECERTIFY SEIU local 721 AS REPRESENTATIVE OF LACSD BLUE COLLAR BASED UPON 3RD PARTY VALIDATION OF THE PETITION,.

Those that lead public agencies have a duty of transparency and fairness and service...not only to the people their agency serves, but also those who serve in that agency. DO YOUR DUTY.

I am Wendy Harris and I wish to inform the Districts ; Board of directors that I, ~~we~~ along with another female, filed charges today against SEIU for Discrimination, intimidation and Bullying. I am not Thelma or Louise, as they have alledge, nor have I ever falsified any Districts Documents, and threats of me receiving disciplinary actions are unacceptable. There is no way a decertification vote can take place until these and other issues are resolved

Board Speech
13 March 2019
Melissa Fischer

1 I am entering into the record this email dated March 5, 2019, from Robert Majeske of the Blue Collar Unit to Jennifer Allen, Manager of Human Resources [ATT 1]. In it, Majeske asks, “When a unit decertifies a union is the current MOU/contract still valid through the original end date?”

Mr. Majeske has not received an answer. From the 5th to the 13th is a full week, Ms. Allen. As you are present, would you care to answer Mr. Majeske’s question – Does the contract remain valid?

2 No? I am entering into the record this email dated March 12, 2019, from Mr. Majeske to Jennifer Allen [ATT 2]. In it, Majeske reminds, “I have yet to receive an answer on these.” Ms. Allen, are you sure you cannot provide an answer right now?

3 No? I am entering into the record this email dated July 12, 2017, from Brenda Wilcox of the White Collar Unit to Jennifer Allen [ATT 3]. In it, Ms. Wilcox asks Ms. Allen to review a recap of a meeting and let Wilcox if anything is incorrect. The email includes the statement, “The Terms and Condition[s] would not change if the White Collar Unit decides to Decertify.”

I am entering into the record the response from Ms. Allen, an email dated July 17, 2017 [ATT 3]. In it, beneath the statement that the terms and conditions would not change, Ms. Allen has typed, “A decertification would not invalidate an existing agreement.”

Ms. Allen is unable to respond to the Blue Collar’s identical query regarding whether the Blue Collar MOU will remain valid after they decertify. But she was able to respond in five calendar days when asked the same question by the White Collar Unit.

4 I am entering into the record this email dated October 4, 2017, from Rebecca Urac of the Technical Support Unit to Jennifer Allen [ATT 4]. In it, Ms. Urac asks, “When a unit decertifies a union is the current MOU/contract still valid through the original end date?”

I am entering into the record the response from Ms. Allen, an email dated October 4, 2017 [ATT 4]. In it, beneath Ms. Urac’s question, Ms. Allen has typed, “A unit decertification does not invalidate or end an agreement.”

The responses from Ms. Allen to both Technical Support and White Collar are not specific to those units. They state that ANY unit’s decertification does NOT invalidate or end AN agreement – meaning the same is true for the Blue Collar. Ms. Allen was able to provide an answer to Ms. Urac within forty minutes, but she is unable to provide a clear and correct answer to the question of Mr. Majeske?

5 That’s curious because the wording of Mr. Majeske’s question is identical to the wording of Ms. Urac’s question. Are you aware that the Miliias-Meyers-Brown Act or “MMBA” Section 3506.5 prohibits discrimination? Why are you not respectfully providing Blue Collar with the same clear information that you provided to White Collar and Technical Support Units?

6 When taken in combination with the speech of Mr. Majeske delivered eloquently here by Ms. Wendy Harris – unfortunately cut short today, one sees a collection of unethical and coercive conduct ongoing

right now by both SEIU and management. Their conduct works in concert to engender confusion and fear amongst Blue Collar workers. This is no environment in which to conduct an election.

In fact, as pointed out in Mr. Majeske's talk, two issues must be resolved before it is even possible to know if an election should be held:

1. Independent 3rd party verification of the count of decertification signatures;
2. Independent 3rd party verification of the total number of Blue Collar employees as of January 31, 2019.

This 3rd party effort could very well result in confirmation that the decertification petition contains valid signatures in excess of 50% of the membership. Failure, then, to allow the Blue Collar to decertify without an election would constitute discrimination by the same management that permitted three other units – Confidential, White Collar, and Technical Support – to decertify without an election based on petitions with a majority of signatures.

In no event can an election take place under the current atmosphere of coercion by SEIU. I am entering into the record a letter dated February 21, 2019 from Robert Majeske to Bob Schoonover, President of SEIU [Att 5]. In the letter, Mr. Majeske asked SEIU to cease and desist the coercion of Blue Collar employees, including:

“ ...

- Representative Earl Thompson a worksite organizer for SEIU local 721, verbally claiming on several sites on separate occasions that if SEIU is decertified, LACSD will no longer be able to honor the current Memorandum of Understanding because SEIU will “...take the contract with them, because SEIU owns it.”
- Representative Robert Mejia a worksite organizer for SEIU local 721, stating that the payroll inequalities for different regions are “Discrimination” by LACSD and therefore legally actionable.
- On several sites and on several occasions, members of the UNIT asking pertinent questions of our Union representatives directly pertaining to relevant issues at hand were shouted down by the representatives themselves.”

In addition, Directors, you have been given a copy of a scare poster disseminated by SEIU to Blue Collar employees. This is aggressive bullying.

A copy of the Schoonover letter was provided by Mr. Majeske to Ms. Allen on February 22, 2019. Given that the HR Manager is aware of the aggressive tactics of SEIU, her refusal to provide an accurate statement as to the Blue Collar agreement remaining valid after decertification appears especially egregious. It is really a violence to every Blue Collar employee to leave them swimming in confusion and fear. Please take note, Ms. Allen, my speech serves as notice to you that you are in violation of the Districts' Code of Conduct which prohibits violence in the workplace.

Furthermore, it is Ms. Allen who has ratcheted up the pressure by calling for the State to commence implementation of an election. If Ms. Allen's assessment of the petition signatures is honest, then she and the Districts have nothing to lose by pausing to allow 3rd party confirmation of this. The refusal to suspend the election and allow an impartial evaluation reeks of a cover up.

7

Directors: What Robert Majeske asked of you - Ditto!

Management: Please remove your fraudulent CORE VALUES from our website. I'll enter this webpage into the record [Att 6]. There is no Integrity in your discriminatory and mentally violent treatment of Blue Collar employees. What claim can you make to Leadership when your own employees must speak at Board meetings in order to communicate with you? As for your supposed commitment to "...responsive and courteous Service", enough has been said.

Blue Collar: Why do you think management is stooping to such despicable and shameful levels to keep you in SEIU? Management knows that if they lose you, they lose everything. To everyone in the Blue Collar Unit, please know that you are extraordinary human beings deserving of respect and dignity. You are not alone. We stand with you. We have your back.