

**THE PUBLIC REVIEW BOARD  
INTERNATIONAL UNION, UAW**

APPEAL OF:

ERIC TRUSS, Member,  
UAW LOCAL UNION 600,

Appellant

-vs-

CASE NO. 1777

UAW LOCAL UNION 600 GENERAL COUNCIL  
(Dearborn, Michigan)  
REGION 1A  
(THE UNITED AUTOMOBILE, AEROSPACE  
AND AGRICULTURAL IMPLEMENT  
WORKERS OF AMERICA),

Appellee.

---

**DECISION**

(Issued April 25, 2018)

PANEL SITTING: Prof. James J. Brudney, Chairperson, Prof. Janice R. Bellace, Prof. Harry C. Katz, and Prof. Maria L. Ontiveros.

APPEARANCES: Francyne B. Stacey, Ron Lare, Judith Wraight, and Eric Truss on behalf of appellant; Philip Mayor, James C. Johnson, Jr., Rick Isaacson, Mark D. Liburdi, Allen Wilson, and Sarah Ogdahl Laws on behalf of the International Union; Kenneth Grigsby, Beth Cox, and Mark Depaoli on behalf of Local Union 600.

Eric Truss argues that the integrity of the ballots cast in the Local 600 DDMP Unit bargaining committee election has been tainted to such an extent that the entire election should be rerun.

**FACTS**

Eric Truss was one of seven candidates for two positions on the bargaining committee at the Dearborn Diversified Manufacturing (DDMP) Unit in elections conducted by UAW Local Union 600 on May 4 and 5, 2017. The election was

conducted by the CPA firm of Clarence H. Johnson, PC under the direction of the Local 600 Election Committee. Based on the initial election count, Eric Truss was one of the two top candidates for the bargaining committee positions, and candidate Danny Riffle was not.

On May 8, 2017, candidate Danny Riffle requested a recount of the ballots in the bargaining committee race. His request states:

“I, Danny Riffle, would like to request a recount of the DDMP bargaining committee spot where 5 votes separated the three top people.”<sup>1</sup>

On May 10, 2011, after the recount, the following results were reported for the bargaining committee election in the DDMP Unit:

BARGAINING COMMITTEE

1	Danny “Riff” Riffle	157
2.	Deanna Craig	156
3.	Eric Truss	155
4.	Ralph Ripple	140
5.	Ken Gilmer	72
6.	Herman Moore	33
7.	James Tluczek	8
	Voids and Blanks	<u>117</u>
	Total	838 <sup>2</sup>

Based on the recount, the top two candidates, Danny Riffle and Deanna Craig, were declared the winners.

On May 11, 2017, Eric Truss requested a recount of all the ballots cast in the May 4 and 5 bargaining committee election for the DDMP Unit.<sup>3</sup> Truss argued that a recount of all the ballots would ensure that the results were accurate for all of the candidates and not just the top three. Truss also requested the right to inspect all of the void ballots that were not counted. The Local 600 Election Committee denied Truss’s request for a recount on May 15, 2017. Election Committee members Beth Cox and Kenneth Grigsby explained that a recount was granted for the top three candidates because of a five-vote difference, but a candidate is not entitled to a recount of the ballots cast for all of the candidates. In addition, the Election Committee stated that a candidate does not have the right to inspect void ballots.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Record, p. 3.

<sup>2</sup> Record, p. 4.

<sup>3</sup> Record, p. 6.

<sup>4</sup> Record, p. 7.

Truss appealed the Election Committee's ruling to the Local 600 General Council during a meeting on June 5, 2017. After discussion, the General Council voted to adopt the report of the Election Committee.<sup>5</sup> Truss appealed the General Council's decision to the International Executive Board (IEB) on June 14, 2017.

In his appeal to the IEB, Truss reported that the bargaining committee election on May 4 and 5, 2017, produced the following results:

BARGAINING COMMITTEE

1.	Deanna Craig	158	1 <sup>st</sup> place winner
2.	Eric Truss	156	2 <sup>nd</sup> place winner
3.	Danny Riffle	153	
4.	Ralph Ripple	140	
5.	Ken Gilmer	72	
6.	Herman Moore	33	
7.	James Tluczek	8	
	Voids and Blanks	<u>118</u>	
	Total	<u>838</u>	
	First ballot given	1	
	Ballots issued	419 <sup>6</sup>	

Truss pointed out that after the recount on May 10, 2017, there was still only a one vote margin of victory between him and Deanna Craig, so that his request for a full recount should have been granted. Truss requested an equal opportunity for a recount of all the ballots, including the voids and blanks, in the presence of a challenger to guarantee that the reported results are accurate for all the candidates and to confirm the number of ballots issued and the number of ballots voided.<sup>7</sup>

Acting on behalf of President Dennis Williams, Administrative Assistant Allen Wilson conducted a hearing on Truss's appeal on October 18, 2017. On November 1, 2017, Wilson supervised a second recount of the ballots cast for the top three candidates in the bargaining committee race at Local 600. As a result of that recount, Wilson reported the following results in the DDMP bargaining committee election:

---

<sup>5</sup> Record, p. 9.

<sup>6</sup> Record, p. 10.

<sup>7</sup> Record, p. 12.

## "OFFICIAL ELECTION RESULTS:

#38	Craig	157
#40	Riffle	157
#42	Truss	154 <sup>8</sup>

Wilson commented that the different outcome was caused by a challenged ballot that did not clearly identify the voter's intent. His report states:

"The only noticeable change occurred when a challenger questioned the validity of a ballot that, subjectively, did not identify the clear intent of the specific voter. This 'challenged ballot' did not alter the results of the race and it was deemed as non-outcome determinative by the Election Committee."<sup>9</sup>

Wilson acknowledged Truss's argument that all of the ballots should have been recounted, but he found that the Local Union's recount was consistent with the *UAW Guide for Local Union Election Committees*. Wilson asserted that Truss had no right under the UAW Constitution to inspect the void ballots, but he reported that he had recounted the void ballots during the recount conducted on November 1, 2017. Wilson's report states:

"In addressing the appellant's additional protest where it concerns his request to have an opportunity '...to inspect all the voided ballots that were not counted in the recount of May 10,' we have determined that it has no Constitutional merit. However, it must be noted under the supervised recount conducted by Administrative Assistant Wilson, that all voided ballots for the outcome determinative candidates' race were recounted and properly assigned to the correct candidate."<sup>10</sup>

Wilson stated that local union elections are presumed to be valid and that the results of an election will not be overturned in the absence of clear evidence that some improper practice occurred to such a degree that it could have affected the outcome. Wilson declared that Truss failed to produce evidence that any impropriety occurred in the tabulation of the ballots cast in the bargaining committee race. His report states:

"Nonetheless, without any direct evidence and/or witness declarations that some impropriety may have occurred, the appellant is simply engaging in unconcealed conjecture and speculation. And at no point has the

---

<sup>8</sup> Record, p. 15.

<sup>9</sup> Record, p. 31.

<sup>10</sup> Record, p. 32.

appellant shown any evidence that would support that the outcome of this election was affected by any inappropriate or outcome determinative behavior.”<sup>11</sup>

Based on these conclusions, Wilson denied Truss’s appeal. The IEB adopted Wilson’s report as its decision. President Williams provided Eric Truss with a copy of the IEB’s decision on November 29, 2017.<sup>12</sup> Truss appealed the IEB’s decision to the Public Review Board (PRB). We heard the parties in oral argument on April 14, 2018.

## ARGUMENT

### **A. Attorney Francyne B. Stacey on behalf of Eric Truss:**

Eric Truss won the original election conducted on May 4 and 5, 2017. Candidate Danny Riffle requested a recount. The official results of the election reported on May 10, 2017, gave Danny Riffle four additional votes and subtracted votes from other candidates and the void ballots. The CPA firm has never offered any explanation for these decisions. We do not know why ballots originally counted for Craig and Truss were counted for Riffle in the recount. Were these ambiguous ballots? What was the ambiguity and who resolved it? The CPA’s report does not explain. The CPA firm that conducted the recount only reported the votes cast for the top three candidates. There is no record of any challenge to these ballots or question about the voter’s intent.

There is also no explanation for why a vote recorded on a ballot that had been rejected as void could have been reactivated as a vote for Danny Riffle. The *Guide for Local Union Election Committees* requires void ballots to be clearly marked and placed in a separate envelope. The number of void ballots could not have changed if they were handled properly. After the first recount, Truss’s challenger Ron Lare asked to examine the void ballots and this request was denied. The process was not transparent. Once the outcome of the election was changed by the recount, what legitimate reason can be asserted for the Election Committee’s refusal to recount all of the ballots in the bargaining committee race, including the void ballots?

### **B. Ron Lare on behalf of Eric Truss:**

The process followed by Local 600 relegated challengers to a purely symbolic function. You could not actually see what the counters were doing. The challengers had no role in determining how votes were assigned or how any ambiguities were resolved. The rules for challengers in the *Guide* would have addressed our concerns about the resolution of ambiguous ballots. The *Guide* states in paragraph 9 under “Rules for Challengers”:

---

<sup>11</sup> Record, p. 33.

<sup>12</sup> Record, p. 17.

“During the tally of ballots, challengers may challenge the accuracy of the way votes are read from marked ballots and recorded on tally sheets and should state any objection to Election Committee members as soon as possible so that any necessary corrective action can be taken.”<sup>13</sup>

Simultaneous counting makes this task impossible. Prior to the recount on November 1, 2017, Administrative Assistant Allen Wilson instructed Truss to bring four challengers so they could observe the recount being conducted at four separate tables. The Election Committee denied Allen Wilson’s request to have four challengers present. I also want to point out that the official election results dated November 1, 2017, do not reveal the number of voids and blanks, the total number of votes cast, or the total number of ballots issued.

### **C. Eric Truss:**

I first ran for office in 2001. This is my second election appeal to the PRB. I can accept the results of a fair election, but there were too many irregularities in this one. Administrative Assistant Allen Wilson agreed to a recount during the hearing on October 18, 2017, but only for the top three candidates. When the recount was scheduled, I made several requests. I asked that all the ballots be counted to verify the number of ballots issued and the number of votes cast. I asked that void ballots be sealed in a separate envelope or container. I asked that one CPA count the ballots so that Administrative Assistant Wilson and the challengers could observe the ballots being counted. Wilson ruled that the ballots would be counted in the same manner used during the general election. Wilson advised me to have four challengers present in order to witness the count at multiple counting stations.

I arrived for the recount with four challengers, but Election Committee Chairperson Kenneth Grigsby stated I could only have one challenger. My challenger was Ron Lare. Lare was not present to view the unsealing of the ballot box for the recount. He observed that all of the ballots, including the voids and blanks, were mixed together in the briefcase of the CPA, James Johnson. This situation caused the issue of a re-challenged ballot to arise. The ballots were counted simultaneously by multiple people making it impossible for a single challenger to observe each ballot and perform his function as described in the *Guide*.

As a result of these improprieties my appeal should be granted and a new election conducted. I am not asking for a third recount. The mismanagement of the ballots has called the election results into question. Another recount would only result in another questionable outcome. Therefore, I am demanding that for the integrity of the UAW democratic process and for the voting membership of the DDMP Unit, a new election be conducted for bargaining committee members.

---

<sup>13</sup> *Guide for Local Union Election Committees*, p. 60.

**D. Philip Mayor on behalf of the International Union:**

All the ballots cast in Local 600's triennial election were counted on May 6, 2017 by the accounting firm Clarence Johnson, PC. The CPA firm recorded the results for all seven candidates on a tabulation sheet. There were 419 ballots distributed. The voters could select two of the candidates listed on the ballot, so there were potentially 838 votes. If a voter only selected one candidate that would be considered a blank. There were 118 void or blank ballots in the first count.

The Johnson firm has counted the ballots in Local 600's elections for many years. The firm followed the same procedures they always follow. Johnson supervised the tabulation of the ballots by 60 to 70 employees of the firm. Each one of the counters prepared a tally sheet of his or her assigned ballots. The results from the tally sheets were added together to determine the election results. Once the results were determined, Johnson put all of the ballots in a box, taped the box shut, and personally took it back to his office. The box was then stored in a locked location. The ballots were never left unsupervised and no member of Local Union 600 has access to the ballots while they are in the CPA firm's custody. Because the ballots are all secured by the CPA firm, they are not formally sealed in front of the candidates' challengers. The Johnson firm also does not store the voided and blank ballots separately from the other ballots.

The CPA firm also performed the May 10 recount. To perform the recount, Johnson took the ballots for the DDMP Unit bargaining committee out of the box and put them in a folder. He personally transported the folder to the location of the recount. At no point did any candidate or member of the Election Committee have unsupervised access to the folder or the ballots. During the recount, Johnson's team reviewed every ballot cast in the DDMP bargaining committee race, including the void ballots. However, since the only results close enough to trigger a recount were the top three candidates, the team only kept a tally of the ballots cast for those candidates. This is standard operating procedure in Local 600 recounts and is the manner in which the Johnson firm has previously conducted the Local's recounts. Neither Truss nor his challenger complained about this process at the time.

During the recount on May 10, one formerly voided ballot was included in the tally. As a result of the recount, Craig lost two votes and Truss lost one. All four reassigned votes were counted for Riffle. We do not know why the votes reflected in these ballots were subtracted from Craig's and Truss's totals and added to Riffle's. The decision to credit the votes in this way would have been made by the counters. The counters in the May 10 recount evaluated the ballots for the top three candidates as if this were a new election. That is why it was possible for a previously void ballot to be counted. Every one of the ballots cast in the DDMP bargaining committee election was re-examined during this recount.

Truss wrote to the Election Committee on the day after the first recount requesting an additional recount and that all of the ballots be counted. He did not argue

that the election results had been tainted because the ballot box was unsealed without the challengers being present or that the procedure used for the recount prevented his challenger from performing his functions. Truss did not raise his complaints about the Local Union's failure to follow the recommendations of the *Guide* in his appeal to the IEB and so the report prepared by Administrative Assistant Wilson does not address these arguments. For this reason, the Public Review Board should not consider these arguments.

Even if the Board were to consider Truss's arguments based on the *Guide*, they have no application here, because the Local used the services of a CPA. The recommendations of the *Guide* are directed to local union members conducting elections. They are designed to instruct people who do not perform these functions as part of their daily work. The *Guide* gives members advice for avoiding common errors that people might not be aware of. The use of a CPA to conduct an election is an alternative to these precautions. Local 600 avoids the pitfalls described in the *Guide* by using a CPA to count the ballots.

The second recount on November 1, 2017 was conducted in the same manner as the May 10 recount. Administrative Assistant Wilson determined that only the votes for the top three candidates needed to be tallied, but here again, every single ballot was examined. All ambiguous ballots were brought to the attention of the Election Committee to determine whether they should be counted. During this recount, Truss's challenger, Ron Lare, only objected to the handling of a single ballot. The Election Committee determined that the ballot in question should be voided because the voter's intentions could not be discerned. Lare believed that the intent of the ballot was clear and that the voter intended to vote for Truss. Because Truss was behind by three votes in this final tally, the challenged ballot could not have affected the outcome of the election. Administrative Assistant Wilson determined, therefore, that it did not need to be counted.

Wilson initially informed Truss that he could bring four challengers to the supervised recount. However, the Local Election Committee objected to this order because it deviated from the standard operating procedure for Local 600 elections. Truss's challenger, Ron Lare, stood on the opposite side of the table from the people counting the ballots. Wilson also stood by the table and walked back and forth. From this vantage point, Wilson was able to monitor any issues that arose about ambiguous or voided ballots. Wilson repeatedly asked Lare if he had any difficulties keeping track of the counting. Lare assured Wilson that he was having no difficulties. Lare never objected to the counting or asked that it be slowed down. Truss has not shown that the results of the recount would be any different if there had been more challengers in the room.

Some of Truss's arguments suggest that he may be under the impression that the CPA firm did not review all of the ballots when it conducted the recounts. If this were true, the recounts might be considered unfair. But that is not what happened. The firm reviewed every single ballot. During the November 1 recount, Administrative

Assistant Wilson supervised the process to make certain that no errors occurred. Because every ballot was reviewed, there is no risk that any votes that should have been counted for Truss were not. The recount was fair and should not be disturbed.

Finally, Truss claims that he should have been permitted to inspect the ballots that were considered void. Local 600 denied this request because candidates do not have the right to inspect void ballots. It is the duty of the candidate's challenger to inspect and challenge ballots while the election is under way. Challenger Lare had an opportunity to challenge how the ballots were counted during all three vote counts. During the supervised recount, he only challenged one voided ballot. That ballot proved not to be outcome determinative. There was no impropriety in the handling of the voided ballots.

**E. James C. Johnson on behalf of the International Union:**

We had over seventy people working over the three-day period during the voting and subsequent count of the ballots on May 4, 5, and 6, 2017. During the day of the count, we count the ballots for each unit separately with challengers for that unit and contest observing. We used ten counters to count the ballots case in the DDMP Unit bargaining committee election.

After the ballots are counted, we report the unofficial results of the election to the Election Committee. The official results of the election are provided in writing after any recount. The recount in the DDMP Unit took place on May 10 at the Local Union 600 hall. I was present during the recount along with four counters. There was apparently some kind of human error in the first count of the ballots, so the results of the recount were different than the unofficial results reported on May 6, 2017.

When a counter has a question about how a ballot should be counted, he will raise his hand and I go over and examine the ballot. If I cannot resolve the issue raised by the counter, we refer it to the Election Committee for a determination. In the case of a clearly ambiguous ballot, however, the counter might not raise any issue with me. If the voter checked the boxes for all seven candidates, for instance, the counter would just turn the ballot over and not count it. There would be no need to raise any question about it. In this election, there were two ambiguous ballots in the first tally of the ballots and one in the recount. The ambiguous ballots had boxes checked and then other candidate's names circled and we had to decide whether the voter's intent was clear. A ballot with extraneous marks on it would be considered void and the votes recorded on that ballot would not be counted. There may have been ten to twelve ballots in that category. We do not keep track of the number of void ballots. The number of void and blank ballots reported on the official results is merely the number of votes counted subtracted for the number of potential votes.

**F. Rebuttal by Eric Truss:**

In my previous attempts to be elected to the DDMP bargaining committee, the local union has always manufactured some reason to challenge my candidacy. For years, one slate of candidates has been successful in these elections for the DDMP bargaining committee. In the 2017 election, I defeated one of the incumbent slate's candidates. The fact that a recount changed that result is, by itself, a reason to conduct some further investigation. That investigation has confirmed that some kind of manipulation took place. Danny Riffle gained four votes and that has never been justified or explained. They never even attempted to explain.

The International Union claims that my challenger Ron Lare had an opportunity to challenge how the ballots were counted during all three counts. The International Union asserts that Lare never objected during the November 1, 2017 recount, or asked that the process be slowed down. They fail to report, however, that Lare asked at the beginning of the recount process how many total ballots were given out, and how many voided ballots existed. His request to see the voided ballots in a separate pile was denied. He was told the number of ballots returned was unknown. The November 1, 2017, election results no longer even mention void or blank ballots. The International Union also does not report the fact that Lare was not permitted to speak before the General Council when I presented my appeal.

In its notice of this hearing, the PRB pointed to some questions raised by the record. The International Union has not responded to those questions. Two ballots were added to the November recount. The PRB asked how this could have occurred and there has been no response. The International Union's only response to these concerns has been to say, this is our procedure; this is what we do. Whatever the local did to produce this result has now been baked in and would not be addressed by a recount. Once again, I am no longer asking for another recount. I am asking that the integrity of the UAW democratic electoral process be restored with a new election.

**DISCUSSION**

We believe Truss is reading the requirements of the *Guide* too literally.<sup>14</sup> The recommendation in the *Guide* that the ballot box should be sealed and stored in a safe place until being unsealed in the presence of challengers does not apply when the election is conducted by a professional accounting firm. The notion of "sealing" the ballots described in the *Guide* does not require a physical seal. Sealing the ballot box is synonymous with securing the ballots. The ballots in this case were secured by being transferred to the custody of the CPA firm.

---

<sup>14</sup> The *Guide* states, on page 71:

"During this period, the ballots should be kept in a safe place where they can be locked and sealed, and all challengers should be notified of the place of safekeeping and be entitled to be present when the ballots are originally locked and sealed and later when the seals are broken."

We also understand the point made by Administrative Assistant Rick Isaacson during oral argument that this is a committeeperson election conducted in accordance with Article 45, §2 of the Constitution, which only requires that the election be conducted democratically, rather than an election of officers subject to the more stringent requirements of Article 38. Nevertheless, Truss and his constituents are entitled to an adequate explanation of decisions made with respect to the ballots in the bargaining committeeperson race. In this respect, the CPA firm's recount process and its report of the recount results fall short.

In response to Truss's request for a report reflecting all of the ballots cast in the bargaining committee race, the International Union has repeatedly asserted that every single ballot was examined during both the May 10 and the November 1 recount. Yet, there is no report in the record reflecting such an examination. In preparation for the hearing on this appeal, we asked the Union to explain how a vote that was originally interpreted as being for Truss could subsequently have been credited to Riffle. The only explanation we received for these reassigned votes was the possibility of human error. If human error affected the count of the votes for the first three candidates to such an extent that four votes for Danny Riffle were originally counted for other candidates or else rejected as void, there may well have been similar errors affecting the 253 votes attributed to the seven unsuccessful candidates. The International Union's reference to the standard operating procedure followed at Local Union 600 does not justify the lack of transparency in this tabulation process. In a situation where votes are being transferred from one candidate to another and three vote tallies produce three different election results, a full report and meaningful reconciliation of the ballots for all the votes cast in the election should have been prepared.

We learned during oral argument that the CPA firm never independently confirmed the number of void ballots in the bargaining committeeperson's race. The number reported combined both void and blank ballots. Thus, it was not possible to determine from the report how many blank ballots there were and how many void ballots there were (some that had been deemed void in one count might not have been deemed void in another recount.) The report of void and blank ballots in the official election results turned out to be a meaningless figure derived mathematically. The number does not reflect the actual number of void and blank ballots, not only because the two categories were combined but also because the number reported was simply the arithmetic difference between the number of potential votes and the votes actually counted. There was no actual physical count of blank and of void ballots. A void ballot is not the same as a blank ballot. These two categories must be reported separately.

Declaring a ballot in a local union election void disenfranchises the voter who cast that ballot. This is a serious decision that requires uniform and consistent rules. James Johnson reported during oral argument that counters sometimes exercised discretion to declare ballots void without consulting any member of the Election Committee. There may have been good reason to reject the ten to twelve ballots Johnson estimated to have been included in the void category, but there was no way for the candidates to challenge this, nor do we have any way to review the appropriateness

of these determinations. The fact that a vote recorded on a void ballot was subsequently counted for one of the candidates suggests that the criteria used by the counters to void ballots was not uniformly applied. When the margins of victory are this close, the CPA firm must account for every ballot that was returned and every vote that was counted.

As these problems with the CPA's report of the election results and the recounts became apparent during oral argument, our discussion turned to the appropriate remedy. Administrative Assistant Isaacson stated that if there is a problem with the recount, the remedy should be another recount. Truss expressed concern that the ballots may have been altered in some way so that a recount would only confirm the tainted results. It is occasionally necessary to rerun an election when a sufficient level of disarray in the electoral process is established, but when the electoral process itself has not been compromised, a credible recount is the preferable remedy. The kind of improprieties that would require a new election are not present here. There has been no indication that anyone had an opportunity to tamper with the ballots. As we have noted, the ballots were secured by being placed in the custody of the CPA firm during the entire period following the election. There has been no claim of dishonesty or bias on the part of the CPA firm's employees.

A new election necessarily changes the outcome from the original, because of changes in the unit population. Ideally, the issues raised by this appeal should be resolved with an accurate count of the ballots that were cast by the members who voted in the election on May 4 and 5, 2017. Truss has raised legitimate concerns about the recounts and the reported results of those recounts. In order to address those concerns, we direct the parties to arrange for a recount of the ballots in the DDMP bargaining committee race to be conducted in a manner that addresses the deficiencies in the CPA's report Truss has identified.

The report of this recount should include every vote cast for each of the seven candidates in the DDMP bargaining committee election. Each of the candidates should be allowed a sufficient number of challengers so that the entire process of counting the ballots can be observed. Uniform and consistent rules for voiding ballots should be set forth in writing. Every void ballot should be identified and the reason for declaring it void explained. The number of void ballots must be reported. The number of blank ballots should be reported, including ballots where only one candidate was selected. Any questions about voter intent should be referred to the Election Committee. If any of the challengers dispute the Election Committee's determination of how a vote should be counted, the physical ballot should be referred to the PRB Executive Director for examination to resolve the issue.

In order to avoid the reporting deficiencies that required this remedy, we recommend that the Local 600 Election Committee reconsider its policy of reporting only the top candidates when conducting recounts in very close elections. There is nothing in the Constitution that forbids reporting the recount of all the ballots in these circumstances. The Election Committee's primary objective should be to ensure a

credible result. That objective was undermined by the Election Committee's policy in the DDMP bargaining committee election. Furthermore, the Local Election Committee should work with the CPA firm in the future to establish a method for completing a meaningful reconciliation and report on all the ballots issued in any election.

The International President's staff should give the PRB Executive Director notice of the date when the recount of the ballots will take place, which should be no later than May 15, 2018. If the Election Committee and the challengers cannot agree about how to record the votes from any of the ballots or whether those ballots should be set aside as void, the disputed ballots should be forwarded to the PRB Executive Director by overnight delivery service. The Director will provide a ruling to resolve any issues by May 21, 2018.

It is so ordered.