

STATE OF NEW JERSEY  
PUBLIC EMPLOYMENT RELATIONS COMMISSION

In the Matter of

BERGEN COUNTY BOARD OF CHOSEN FREEHOLDERS  
Public Employer

and

BERGEN COUNTY CIVIL SERVICE ASSOCIATION  
COUNCIL NO. 5

Petitioner

Docket No. RO-126

and

LOCAL UNION NO. 84, a/w INTERNATIONAL BRO-  
THERHOOD OF TEAMSTERS, CHAUFFEURS, WAREHOUSE-  
MEN AND HELPERS OF AMERICA

Intervenor

DECISION AND CERTIFICATION OF REPRESENTATIVE

A directed election was held on July 19, 1972 involving Local Union No. 84, International Brotherhood of Teamsters (hereinafter Local 84) and the Bergen County Civil Service Association, Council No. 5 (hereinafter Council No. 5) among "blue collar" employees employed by the County of Bergen including foremen and employees employed in the following departments: General Services; Sheriff's Office; County Police Department; Shade Tree Commission; Department of Public Works; Mosquito Commission; Sanitary Landfill; Public Safety Education; County Jail; and Child Welfare Department.<sup>1/</sup> Of approximately 416 eligible voters, 166 votes were cast for Council No. 5, 119 for Local 84. In addition there were five void ballots and 13 votes cast against the participating employee representatives.

Following the directed election, Local 84, on July 25, 1972,

<sup>1/</sup> On June 21, 1972, in P.E.R.C. No. 69, the Commission directed that a secret-ballot election be conducted among the employees in the unit found appropriate as set forth above. Council No. 5 had originally petitioned for a unit of all blue-collar employees employed by the Bergen County Board of Chosen Freeholders. Local 84 had petitioned for a unit, narrower in scope, of all Road, Highway, Bridge and Maintenance employees employed by the Board of Freeholders. A third employee organization, Local 25, Marine Division, International Union of Operating Engineers (hereinafter Local 25) petitioned for a unit of all Dredgemen employed by the Board of Freeholders. The Commission, in P.E.R.C. No. 69, sustained Council 5's position that a unit of all blue-collar employees employed by the Board of Freeholders was the appropriate unit and dismissed the petitions of Local 25 and Local 84. Since Local 84 had a 10% showing of interest in the county-wide blue-collar unit, it was permitted to participate as an intervening employee organization in the directed election pursuant to Section 19:11-13 of the Commission's Rules and Regulations.

filed timely objections with regard to conduct affecting the results of the aforementioned election of July 19, 1972. The objections were as follows:

Confirming advise of today Local 84 hereby objects to conduct affecting outcome of election. Bergen County Council No. 5 and its parent body falsely and fraudulently advertised in its newspaper ~~sent~~ to hundreds of eligible voters prior to the election that the Commission had dropped Local 84 from the ballot deceiving eligible voters. Newspaper also asserted to the eligible voters that council had negotiated new benefits for the unit with county officials prior to the election, effectively suggesting prior recognition by the county, more than a hundred did not vote and nonvoters and voters were made to believe Teamsters were not on the ballot. Newspaper article being mailed to you today. Copies of telegram sent to Seymour Chase, Esquire, and Richard Nelson for the other parties.

In response to the Commission's request that it more specifically delineate its objections, Local 84 submitted the following statement concerning its first objection:

As you can ascertain from the copy of the "Civil Service News" of the New Jersey Civil Service Association and its Council 5 (dated Saturday, July 8, 1972) same falsely and fraudulently asserts that Local 84, I.B.T. had been removed from the ballot in the above matter and that the election involved the Council and Local 25 of the Operating Engineers.

The text of the newspaper article speaks for itself. Said newspaper was transmitted to hundreds of employees in the bargaining unit, thereby misrepresenting to them that the Teamsters would not be on the ballot as a result of PERC's decision. Employees who came to vote and those who did not come to vote were under the false impression from the article.

As you records note, there were over one hundred eligible voters who did not vote and the final result was very close. The conduct of Civil Service Association and its Council 5 in this regard affected the outcome of the election by deceiving eligible voters as to the PERC decision and as to the participation of Teamsters Local in the election.

In support of its first objection Local 84 enclosed a copy of the aforementioned July 8, 1972 edition of "The Shield".<sup>2/</sup> The pertinent

2/ Local 84 referred to "The Shield" as the "Civil Service News" in setting forth their objections.

portion of this newspaper article as it relates to Local 84's first objection is as follows:

Meanwhile the collective bargaining or representation election under Chapter 303, Laws of 1968, has dwindled down to a two-way contest between Bergen Council and Local 25 of the Operating Engineers, AFL-CIO.

TEAMSTERS OFF

Dropped from the ballot by the Public Employment Relations Commission (PERC) was Local 84 of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters, Chauffeurs, Warehousemen and Helpers of America, presumably for not showing a sufficient percentage of petitioners.

In its investigation of the merits of Local 84's first objection, the Commission has determined upon examination of all pertinent correspondence sent to both employee organizations and the public employer that on July 7, 1972 approximately 20 Notices of Election with attached sample Official Secret Ballot were sent to the County Administrator Richard L. Nelson with copies to Seymour Chase and Edward A. Cohen, on behalf of Council No. 5 and Local 84, respectively.<sup>3/</sup> These notices and attachments were then posted in all apposite County facilities in order to effectively inform eligible employees of the specifics of the July 19, 1972 election.<sup>4/</sup> The sample Official Secret Ballot graphically illustrated that the two participating employee representatives in the election were Local Union 84 and Council 5. In addition, the Notice of Election, itself, specifically stated that, "Any employee who desires to obtain any further information concerning the terms and conditions under which this election is to be held or who desires to raise any question concerning the holding of the election, the voting unit, or eligibility rules may do so by communicating with the Executive Director or his agent in charge of the election." The Commission's address and telephone number were set out in the Notice of Election.

Despite the alleged widespread distribution of the July 8, 1972 edition of "The Shield",<sup>5/</sup> it is apparent that the eligible voters were indeed in a position to know the truth of the statements asserted within the "The Shield" and relied on by Local 84 in their first objection as a result of the posting of the aforementioned PERC materials clearly marked as being the only official notice regarding the aforementioned election.

<sup>3/</sup> See attached Appendices A and B.

<sup>4/</sup> At no time, either before or after the election of July 19, 1972 did any party to the election allege that the above notices were not posted in all appropriate locations.

<sup>5/</sup> Local 84 has submitted no evidence indicating the extent to which the Shield's normal distribution reached the employees involved in this election, nor has it attempted to establish proof of its claim that the Shield was "sent to hundreds of eligible voters prior to the election..." We will assume, therefore, that whatever exposure the employees had to the questioned article, if any, came about through the newspapers' normal circulation and that no effort was made to make a special distribution, concentrating on eligible voters.

The Commission finds, in addition, that Local 84, as a result of its own campaigning efforts, effectively rebutted the misrepresentations contained within "The Shield" article in question pertaining to the employee organizations that would be on the ballot on July 19, 1972.

According to the sworn statement of Raymond DeMilia, the former Recording Secretary of Local 84 and its new Secretary-Treasurer, dated September 29, 1972, literature on behalf of Local 84 was distributed at all appropriate locations within Bergen County on Monday, July 17, 1972, two days before the election. On Tuesday, July 18, 1972, Mr. DeMilia and another officer from Local 84 drove a sound truck to the areas where the eligible Bergen County employees worked that displayed signs that requested that the employees vote for Local 84 on the succeeding day. It, thus, appears that the officials of Local 84, themselves, effectively rebutted the allegations within "The Shield" article in question which stated that Local 84 had been dropped from the ballot by PERC.

The Commission, thus, finds that although the statements within the July 8, 1972 edition of "The Shield" alleging that Local 84 had been dropped from the ballot by the Commission are misrepresentations, these assertions did not have a significant impact on the election in question since the posting of the official PERC notices and the aforementioned actions of Local 84 itself unequivocally informed eligible employees of the true specifics of the July 19, 1972 election well in advance of the actual balloting.

Thus, the first objection is overruled.

In response to the aforementioned Commission request for clarification of its objections, Local 84 submitted the following statement concerning its second objection:

[T]he article (within "The Shield" dated July 8, 1972) represents to the eligible voters that negotiations took place between the Council and Bergen County representatives resulting in new benefits to the voters coming in the face of the election. It is necessarily implicit from said article that the Council was recognized by Bergen County in order that the negotiations could take place despite the then forthcoming election.

If the article is not true, then the voters have been falsely advised with respect to the subject matter, improper conduct which affected the outcome of the election. If the article be true, of course, then objection is made not only to the conduct of Council 5, but also the conduct of Bergen County itself in recognizing and in negotiating with Council 5 for increased benefits for the eligible employees in the face of the then forthcoming election, the purpose of the election being to determine the appropriate bargaining representative.

The newspaper article itself, if accurate, makes known to the eligible employees, in advance of the election, the implicit recognition of Council 5 and the negotiations and result of negotiations between the Council and Bergen County.

The pertinent portion of the article at issue from the July 8, 1972 edition of "The Shield", as it relates to Local 84's second objection, is as follows:<sup>6/</sup>

Four new benefits for county employees will result from a conference held last week between Pres. Edward DeAndrea of Bergen Council No. 5, New Jersey Civil Service Association, and three representatives of Bergen County.

"Mr. DeAndrea outlined the gains as follows:

1. A one and one-half percent pay increase across the board, retroactive to Jan. 1, to bring the total pay raise from five and one-half percent, the limit under President Nixon's pay-freeze order in Phase I, to a seven percent total.

2. Hospitalization insurance coverage, paid by the county, for immediate dependents of the county employees as of Jan. 1, next.

3. Shift differentials as follows: for the midnight to 8 A.M. shift, 20 cents an hour additional; for 4 P.M. to midnight shift, 15 cents an hour additional.

4. Longevity pay of an added \$200 a year after 10 years of work, \$400 for 15 years, \$600 for 20 years.

Conferring with Pres. DeAndrea at the County Administration Building here were Daniel Fogarelli (sic), Clerk of the Board of Freeholders, County Personnel Director Walter Babcock, and Asst. Personnel Director Edward Penn.

. . .

In a message to all county blue-collar employees, Pres. DeAndrea asked:

Why waste your vote on a union that can't do anything for you that Bergen Council No. 5 can't also do, and can do better, and can do for less than a quarter of the annual dues you will have to pay to the union?

'Let's all vote for Bergen Council No. 5 to represent you as your exclusive collective bargaining agent, and we'll prove to you that we get results without making empty promises.'

<sup>6/</sup> The July 8, 1972 edition of "The Shield" was the only item of evidence submitted by Local 84 in support of their second objection as earlier set forth.

The Commission has carefully examined all the statements solicited from representatives for the Board of Chosen Freeholders, Council No. 5, and Local 84 regarding this matter, pertinent articles published in the Hackensack-based newspaper, "The Record",<sup>7/</sup> and other relevant documents.

First, in answer to one of the alternative complaints of Local 84, namely, that if the article is accurate, then the employer improperly recognized and negotiated with Council No. 5, the Commission finds that the employer did not grant recognition or negotiate with Council No. 5 prior to the July 19, 1972 election. This particular matter can be clarified upon careful examination of events surrounding the June 12, 1972 issuance of Albert Heller's fact-finding Report and Recommendations in the matter of the impasse between the Bergen County Board of Chosen Freeholders and the Law Enforcement Employees bargaining unit (Docket No. FF-235).

Mr. Heller's fact-finder's report, which was quickly accepted by the law enforcement group, called for salary increases averaging approximately 7.4% and for specific fringe benefits, including the County's payment of health insurance premiums for dependents at a rate of 50% for 1972 and 100% for 1973; effective as of January 1, 1972, the payment of night shift pay differentials; and the institution of a longevity program. On June 20, 1972 as reported the next day on the front page of the afternoon Bergen County newspaper "The Record" sympathizers from several employee organizations joined Bergen County law enforcement officers picketing the county administrative complex in order to focus county-wide attention on the June 21, 1972 meeting of the Bergen County Board of Freeholders during which the Freeholders would consider the aforementioned fact-finder's report. On June 21, 1972, as reported the next day on the front page of "The Record", the Board of Freeholders at a public meeting agreed to accept the fact-finder's recommendations concerning the law enforcement bargaining unit and at the same time, it announced that other county workers - 3,500 in all - would receive parity with the law enforcement contract this year, including additional pay to bring their increase levels up to those promised the police.<sup>8/</sup>

According to the statement received from Richard L. Nelson, County Administrator for Bergen County, several days after this public meeting, the president of Council No. 5, Edward DeAndrea, asked the County Personnel Director, Walter Babcock and the Clerk of the Board, David Focarelli, whether the aforementioned newspaper accounts concerning the new benefits to be accorded to "all other county employees" were accurate. Mr. Babcock and Mr. Focarelli then replied that these accounts were indeed accurate. Thereafter, the "Shield" article in question appeared in the

<sup>7/</sup> "The Record" with a daily circulation of 155,000 has the largest circulation of any evening newspaper in the State of New Jersey.

<sup>8/</sup> The Commission need not comment upon the propriety, in general, of such a unilateral grant prior to an election since the act of granting benefits is not objected to here.

July 8, 1972 edition of this newspaper.

It is important to note that Local 84 has submitted no independent evidence to support the claim that negotiations may have occurred between Council No. 5 and the Board of Freeholders prior to the election. Under the Commission's Rules and Regulations, Section 19:11-19(i), the burden of proof lies with the objecting party. The apposite newspaper accounts and statements from all the parties regarding this matter establish the unilateral nature of the benefits granted to all other County employees in light of the Freeholders' acceptance of the aforementioned fact-finder's report concerning the 400 members of the County-wide law enforcement unit.<sup>9/</sup>

However, in their conditionally phrased second objection, Local 84 asserted that if the section of the suspect "Shield" article was not accurate in its implications, then the voters were falsely advised by the misrepresentations contained within said article, thus improperly affecting the outcome of the election.

In its investigation of the merits of this second facet of Local 84's second objection the Commission takes the position that it is not appropriate to consider the statements complained of in Local 84's second objection in isolation, without regard to what had occurred both prior to and after the publication and distribution of the "Shield" issue in question. Therefore, it is incumbent upon the Commission at this time to carefully chronologize certain critical events that occurred prior to the election of July 19, 1972 in order to determine the effects, if any, that the "Shield" article was likely to have had on the outcome of the election.

As stated previously, approximately two weeks prior to the publication and distribution of the "Shield" article at issue the Bergen County Board of Chosen Freeholders had asserted at the widely publicized meeting of June 21, 1972 that all other county employees would receive parity with the law enforcement unit contract for the 1972 fiscal year (later signed on July 5, 1972), including additional pay to bring their increase levels up to those promised the police, as beneficiaries of the County's acceptance of the aforementioned fact-finder's report. The "Shield" edition in question was published July 8, 1972.

A fair reading of the article in question leads to the conclusion that Council No. 5 was responsible for obtaining the benefits cited. In view of our finding above concerning how these benefits came to be granted, it is totally inaccurate to attribute any responsibility to Council No. 5 in obtaining these benefits. Thus, any publication which expressly or by implication makes such attribution misrepresents the fact. In this case, however, we find that the misrepresentation was cured by reason of

---

<sup>9/</sup> A contract was entered into between the County of Bergen and the Law Enforcement Group, on July 5, 1972 that incorporated the fact-finder's recommendations previously set forth.

the fact that a prior publication of the Bergen "Record" had already established the truth of the situation in circumstances that would lend greater credence to its account, i.e., the report in the Bergen "Record" was contemporaneous with the event and was published in a paper having general circulation with no known special interest to serve. If the Commission is to presume that through its normal distribution, the "Shield" article received certain exposure among eligible employees, then it must make an equal presumption that the "Record", through its normal distribution, received at least equal exposure to the same group.

The Commission thus finds that the eligible employees involved in the Bergen County election were in a position to know the truth of the "statements" asserted within the "Shield" article and relied on by Local 84 in sole support of their second objection. The Commission also concludes that the timing of the distribution of the "Shield" issue in question also served to attenuate any effect that the statements referred to in Local 84's second objection might have had on the outcome of the contested election.

In closing, the Commission believes that it is necessary to analyze whether Local 84 had constructive and/or actual notice of "The Shield" article in question sufficiently far in advance of the election of July 19, 1972 to give Local 84 time to obtain a copy of the "suspect" article and prepare a counter statement.<sup>10/</sup>

On the matter of constructive notice, the Commission finds that Local 84 had adequate constructive notice of "The Shield" article at issue well in advance of the election of July 19, 1972. The Commission has ascertained that the July 8, 1972 edition of "The Shield", with an approximate circulation of 35,000 was generally distributed during the latter part of the week ending on Saturday, July 8, 1972 to its subscribers throughout the State. If Local 84 relies, as it does, on the widespread distribution of this "Shield" edition as an element in its objections, then it must charge itself with the same knowledge it imputes to the employees. The Commission, thus, concludes that as a result of the distribution of "The Shield" issue in question, Local 84 had constructive notice of both the existence and substance of this article approximately ten days before the election of July 19, 1972.

On the matter of actual notice regarding "The Shield" article at issue, Raymond DeMilia's aforementioned affidavit of September 29, 1972

<sup>10/</sup> As set forth earlier, the Commission has found that the eligible employees were in a position to know the truth of the "statements" contained within "The Shield" edition at issue even though these employees apparently had not been exposed to any counter statements prepared by Local 84 which specifically referred to "The Shield" article in question. The Commission, however, feels it necessary to analyze the above matter to determine whether or not the timing of the distribution of "The Shield" article in question foreclosed Local 84 from obtaining a copy of this article and responding to it, which could have served to further minimize the impact of "The Shield" article under investigation.



stated that both he and apparently Theodore Nalikowski, the late Secretary-Treasurer of Local 84, personally first became aware of the existence of "The Shield" article at issue on the morning of July 17, 1972, approximately 54 hours before the start of the election on July 19. However, Mr. DeMilia asserted within his sworn statement that a copy of "The Shield" article was not first obtained by Local 84 until the morning of Thursday, July 20, 1972, the day after the election, notwithstanding his own admission that the article in question was known to have contained at least one "potentially" damaging misrepresentation.<sup>11/</sup>

The Commission thus finds that Local 84, in spite of constructive and actual notice of the existence of "The Shield" article in question well in advance of the election of July 19, 1972, did not obtain a copy of said article until the day after the election. The timing of the distribution of the "Shield" article in question, however, did not foreclose Local 84 from expeditiously obtaining a copy of this article which would have enabled this employee organization to personally respond to the allegations contained therein.

Thus, Local 84's second objection is also overruled.

Having received a majority of the valid ballots cast, Council No. 5 will be certified.

CERTIFICATION OF REPRESENTATIVE

IT IS HEREBY CERTIFIED that Bergen County Civil Service Association, Council No. 5 has been designated and selected by a majority of the employees in a unit of all "blue-collar" employees employed by the County of Bergen including foremen and employees in the following departments: General Services, Sheriff's Office, County Police Department, Shade Tree Commission, Department of Public Works, Mosquito Commission, Sanitary Landfill, Public Safety Education, County Jail and Child Welfare Department; but excluding all other Bergen County employees, policemen and supervisors within the meaning of the Act and all employees of Bergen Pine County Hospital; as their representative for the purposes of collective negotiations. Pursuant to N.J.S.A. 34:13A et seq., the said organization is the exclusive representative of all employees in such unit for the purpose of collective negotiations with respect to terms and conditions of employment.

BY ORDER OF THE COMMISSION

*John F. Lanson*  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Acting Chairman

DATED: January 9, 1973  
Trenton, New Jersey

<sup>11/</sup> Raymond DeMilia's affidavit of September 29, 1972 states specifically that both he and Theodore Nalikowski were informed on the morning of July 17, 1972 that a recent edition of "The Shield" had stated that the Teamsters were not going to be on the ballot for the election.

# APPENDIX A

July 7, 1972

Mr. Richard L. Nelson  
County Administrator  
County of Bergen  
Administrative Building  
Hackensack, New Jersey 07601

Seymour Chase, Esquire  
Council No. 5  
1 Warren Street  
Hackensack, New Jersey 07601

Edward Cohen, Esquire  
1150 Raymond Boulevard  
Newark, New Jersey

Re: County of Bergen  
and  
Local Union #34, IFT  
Bergen Co. CBA Council #5  
Project No. EQ-126

Gentlemen:

This will serve to advise the parties that the matters pertaining to the election ordered by the Public Employment Relations Commission Decision #59 and discussed at a meeting on June 29, 1972 have been approved by the Executive Director.

If it hasn't already been submitted, the public employer is requested to submit an alphabetical list of all eligible voters, pursuant to said agreement, to the undersigned with copies to each of the employee organizations.

Should any employee organization have any question regarding the inclusion or exclusion of eligible voters from this list, please communicate with the undersigned. All parties shall be entitled to have an equal number of observers at the election. Observers must be non-supervisory employees of the public employer.

Copies of the Notice of Election are enclosed. The employer is requested to post same immediately.

Very truly yours,

Kevin B. Powers  
Assistant to Executive Director

KBP:JB

Enc. *Mailed 7-7-72 w/enc*



STATE OF NEW JERSEY  
PUBLIC EMPLOYMENT RELATIONS COMMISSION

---

# NOTICE OF ELECTION

---

**PURPOSE OF THIS ELECTION** This election is to determine the representative, if any, desired by the eligible employees for purposes of collective negotiations with their employer. (See VOTING UNIT in the attachment to this Notice of Election, for description of eligible employees.) A majority of the valid ballots cast will determine the results of the election.

**SECRET BALLOT** The election will be by SECRET ballot under the supervision of the Public Employment Relations Commission. Voters will be allowed to vote without interference, restraint, or coercion. Electioneering will not be permitted at or near the polling place. Violations of these rules should be reported immediately to the Executive Director or his agent in charge of the election.

An agent of the Commission will hand a ballot to each eligible voter at the voting place. Mark your ballot in secret in the voting booth provided. DO NOT SIGN YOUR BALLOT. Fold the ballot before leaving the voting booth, then personally deposit it in a ballot box under the supervision of an agent of the Commission.

A sample of the official ballot is shown in the attachment to this Notice.

**ELIGIBILITY RULES** Employees eligible to vote are those described under VOTING UNIT in the attachment to this Notice of Election, including employees who did not work during the designated payroll period because they were out ill or on vacation or temporarily laid off, and also including employees in the military service. Employees must appear in person at the polls in order to be eligible to vote. Ineligible to vote are employees who quit or were discharged for cause since the designated payroll period and who have not been rehired or reinstated prior to the date of this election.

**CHALLENGE OF VOTERS** An agent of the Commission or an authorized observer may question the eligibility of a voter. Such challenge MUST be made before the voter has deposited his ballot in the ballot box.

**AUTHORIZED OBSERVERS** Each of the parties may designate an equal number of observers, this number to be determined by the Executive Director or his agent in charge of the election. These observers (a) act as checkers at the voting place and at the counting of ballots, (b) assist in the identification of voters, (c) challenge voters and ballots, and (d) otherwise assist the agent of the Commission.

**INFORMATION CONCERNING ELECTION** The Commission's Rules and Regulations provide that only one valid representation election may be held in a 12-month period. Any employee who desires to obtain any further information concerning the terms and conditions under which this election is to be held or who desires to raise any question concerning the holding of an election, the voting unit, or eligibility rules may do so by communicating with the Executive Director or his agent in charge of the election.

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, POST OFFICE BOX 2209, TRENTON, N. J. 08625  
PHONE (Area Code 609) 292-6780

---

**THIS IS THE ONLY OFFICIAL NOTICE**

VOTING UNIT

EMPLOYEES OF THE COUNTY OF BERGEN

THOSE ELIGIBLE TO VOTE ARE: ALL BLUE COLLAR EMPLOYEES EMPLOYED BY THE COUNTY OF BERGEN INCLUDING FOREMEN AND EMPLOYEES IN THE FOLLOWING DEPARTMENTS: GENERAL SERVICES (INCLUDING BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS AND THE GARAGE), SHERIFF'S OFFICE, COUNTY POLICE DEPARTMENT; SHADE TREE COMMISSION, DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS, MOSQUITO COMMISSION, SANITARY LANDFILL, PUBLIC SAFETY EDUCATION, COUNTY JAIL AND CHILD WELFARE DEPARTMENT WHO WERE EMPLOYED DURING THE PAYROLL PERIOD ENDING JUNE 17, 1972.

THOSE NOT ELIGIBLE TO VOTE ARE: ALL OTHER BERGEN COUNTY EMPLOYEES, POLICEMEN, SUPERVISORS WITHIN THE MEANING OF THE ACT AND ALL EMPLOYEES OF BERGEN PINES COUNTY HOSPITAL.

DATE, HOURS AND PLACE OF THE ELECTION

DATE: JULY 19, 1972

HOURS: 1:00 P. M. - 4:00 P. M.

PLACE: SEE ADDENDUM

COUNTY OF BERGEN

LOCAL UNION #84  
AFFILIATED WITH THE  
INTERNATIONAL BROTHERHOOD  
OF TEAMSTERS, CHAUFFEURS,  
WAREHOUSEMEN AND HELPERS  
OF AMERICA

BERGEN COUNTY CIVIL  
SERVICE ASSOCIATION  
COUNCIL #5

NEITHER

COUNTY OF BERGEN

VOTING LOCATIONS

ALL ELIGIBLE VOTERS ARE TO APPEAR IN PERSON AT THE DESIGNATED POLLING PLACES AS FOLLOWS:

1. ADMINISTRATION BUILDING: MAIN AND ESSEX STREETS, HACKENSACK GENERAL SERVICES; CHILD WELFARE, SHERIFFS OFFICE MAINTENANCE, GENERAL SERVICES (BUILDINGS, GROUNDS, GARAGE), COUNTY JAIL MAINTENANCE
2. DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS: 70 ZABRISKI STREET, HACKENSACK COUNTY POLICE MAINTENANCE, DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS, SHADE TREE COMMISSION, MOSQUITO COMMISSION, SANITARY LANDFILL, PUBLIC SAFETY EDUCATION