φ.

MEun

Carlin Associates Suite 426 · 12900 Lake Avenue

	•				
1					· ·
2			፣ ነ ብጥ ፒ ፒን	esses .	
3					
4	Name	Dir.	Cross	Redirect	Recross
5	Hall	11	42	-	-
6	D'Aoust	79	174	218	226
7	Aguirre	237 .	244	-	Res
8	Rodowski	262	281	297	300
9					
10		•		•	<i>:</i>
11					
12					
13				-	
14					
15					
16					
17 18					
19					
20					
21					
22					
23					

Carlin Associates
Suite 426 12900 Lake Avenue

ıL,

24

ا ا				•
i				
2				
3				
4		E	XHIBITS	
5	Examiners	Marked	Admitted	·
· 6	1	9	- .	•
7	2	263	263	
	Complainant	*s		•.
8	1	24	-	•
9	2 3	24 24	<u></u> ,	
10	4 5	224 24	-	•
11	1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	24	28	•
12	8 9	24 24	29 .	
. 13	10 11	24 24	30	
. 14	12 13	24 24	31	
.	14 15	24 24	- -	
. 15	16 17	24	34	
16	18 19	24 24	34	
17	Agency		•	
18	1	80 82	80	
19	1 2 3 4 5	89	80 83 93 138	
20	5	137 137	138	
21	6	138	138	
22		-	au au us us	
23				
24				
25				

Carlin Associates
Suite 426 12900 Lake Avenue

PROCEEDINGS

EXAMINER MAGID:

Morning Session 8:30 a.m.

I declare this

hearing open. The September 4, 1986. My name is Martin K. Magid. I have been assigned by the EEO Commission to conduct a hearing on the complaint Lauren of discrimination, filed by the Complainant Lauren L. Hall against the Veterans Administration;

Formal Complaint Number 054-086-X0097. The date of the Formal Complaint is April 17, 1985.

The Complainant is appearing on her own one behalf without representation. Appearing on behalf of the Agency is Franklin Winslow.

This hearing is a continuation of the investigatory process. The purpose of the hearing is to give the Complainant an opportunity to be heard on her complaint and to supplement the investigative record through the examination and cross-examination of witnesses.

To balance the record, the Agency is also afforded an opportunity to examine and cross-examine witnesses.

My function is to serve as presiding officer and to assure that an equitable, orderly

mku

MKU

and expeditious hearing is conducted which produces all relevant facts necessary to resolve this Complaint in a fair and impartial manner.

A pre-hearing conference was conducted on August 27, 1986. At that time the parties discussed settlement of the complaint. However, that discussion did not result in a settlement. Also, at the pre-hearing conference the parties discussed the issues to be heard at the hearing, the witnesses approved to testify and the procedures to be followed at the hearing.

The issue to be heard is defined as follows:

Was the Complainant discriminated against on the basis of a physical handicap, obstructive lung disease, when the Agency failed to provide her with a smoke-free work area.

On May 23, 1986, the Agency submitted a request for hearing witnesses to the Examiner. That request included five witnesses who would testify about one subject and three witnesses to testify about a second subject.

On May 27, 1986, the Examiner responded to the Agency's request by requesting that the Agency either select one witness from

each group as a proposed hearing witness or else justify why more than one from each group was necessary.

On June 5, 1986, the Agency modified its witness request and requested only two witnesses and they were both approved. They are Ronald D'Aoust, that's D' A-o-u-s-t, one of the alleged discriminating officials, and Martin W. Aguire, A-g-u-i-r-e.

The Complainant requested no witnesses and, therefore, she will be restricted to her own testimony.

Also, at the pre-hearing conference, the parties were notified as they had been notified in writing in the past, that the Examiner deemed this case was probably appropriate for a bench decision, since it appeared to meet the criteria under the EEOC regulations.

Also, following the pre-hearing conference, at the request of both parties, the Examiner viewed Complainant's work place in the McNawara Federal Building.

At this time I will provide each party an opportunity to comment on my summary of the pre-hearing conference and an opportunity to

MKhy

1	object for the record to any of the rulings made
2	at the pre-hearing conference.
3	MS. HALL: No comments.
4	EXAMINER MAGID: Mr. Winslow?
5	MR. WINSLOW: I don't know if
6	you made a ruling regarding the policy at TACOM at
7	the time or not, but you did indicate you planned
8	to introduce that as evidence and also to consider
9	it.
10	EXAMINER MAGID: Right, I was
11	going to come to that.
12	MR. WINSLOW: That was not
13	ruled on at the time. I'm going to object.
14	EXAMINER MAGID: Any other
15	. objections?
16	MR. WINSLOW: No, thank you.
17	EXAMINER MAGID: Before we
18	proceed to opening statements, I want to state on
19	the record that Mr. Joseph Wiley is present in the
20	hearing room. Mr. Wiley is the District Director
21	of the Detroit Office of the Equal Employment
22	Opportunity Commission and is here today as an
23	observer.
24	It is now time for opening
25	statements. The Complainant will be given the

opportunity to proceed first and the Agency will 1 2 give its statement. 3 Ms. Hall? 4 MS. HALL: I would again 5 like to open by apologizing. I'm not going to be 6 good at this. This is my first EEOC hearing, and 7 I really don't know exactly how the proceedings 8 go. So, I hope you're all very patient. 9 The only opening statement I can think of to make is that cigarette smoke is a 10 hazard both to the people who smoke and to the 11 people who have to breathe the by-product of it. 12 There is a wealth of information on 13 cigarette smoke available to the V.A. 14 I think the V.A. has the opportunity 15 16 and the know-how and the ability to make changes 17 in the work place to benefit their employees, and they failed to do this. 18 And, I simply can't breathe where I 19 have to work. And I think the V.A. should do 20 21 something about it. That's it. 22 Okay, thank you. 23 EXAMINER MAGID: Mr. Winslow? 24

MR. WINSLOW:

25

I think I'll

waive opening statement.

(Whereupon, Examiner's Exhibit 1 was marked for identification and entered into the record)

EXAMINER MAGID: All right.

the parties copies of the document that I had received from an installation of the Department of the Army, and this is three-page directive to all Army installations throughout the country initiating its no smoking policy in both civilian and non-civilian areas in both Army-owned installations and installations in which Department of the Army personnel were working in GSA quarters.

I told the parties at that time that my intent was to offer it as an Examiner's exhibit, and I gave it to them at the pre-hearing conference so they would not be surprised by the document and so they could prepare any objections to its admission.

I'm now marking it as proposed Examiner's Exhibit 1, and I'm going to ask
Ms. Hall if she has any objections to its
admission?

MS. HALL:

No.

б

1	EXAMINER MAGID: Mr. Winslow?
2	MR. WINSLOW: Yes, the V.A.
3	would have an objection to that as an Exhibit, and
4	we have a policy on that question in the Veterans
5	Administration on that issue, and we feel that
6	it's inappropriate and irrelevant what the Army
7	should establish as their policy on smoking.
8	EXAMINER MAGID: Are you going to
9	offer such policy into evidence?
10	MR. WINSLOW: Yes, indeed.
11	EXAMINER MAGID: All right, then,
12	I'll hold off on ruling on Examiner's Exhibit l
13	until such time as the Agency offers its own
14	policy or at the conclusion of the hearing if the
15	Agency does not offer such a policy.
16	So, a ruling on proposed Examiner's
17	Exhibit 1 is deferred at this time.
18	All right, it is now time for the
19	presentation of testimony of witnesses.
20	As I mentioned at the pre-hearing
21	conference, Ms. Hall, the Complainant goes first.
22	Do you wish to testify in this
23	matter?
24	MS. HALL: Is this the time
25	when I should enter any written evidence?

1	EXAMINER MAGID: Are you going to
2	testify?
3	MS. HALL: I assumed he
4	would just ask me questions.
5	EXAMINER MAGID: The reason I'm
6	asking is if you are going to offer any testimony
7	orally, you have been sworn as a witness.
8	Is it your intention to offer sworn
9	testimony?
10	MS. HALL: Yes.
11	LAREN HALL,
12	having been first duly sworn, was
13	examined and testified as follows:
14	EXAMINER MAGID: All right,
15	Ms. Hall, you may proceed to offer testimony.
16	MS. HALL: I don't really
17	have that much testimony to offer except that I
18	hired in at the V.A. about two years ago under its
19	disability program, assuming that they were, in
20	fact, an equal opportunity employer, and I was put
21	in a room where I ended up being discriminated
22	against.
23	Cigarette smoke causes me extreme
24	physical and emotional stress.
25	EXAMINER MAGID: How soon after

1	you were hired did the atmosphere in the room
2	begin to affect you?
3	MS. HALL: The day I
4	started.
5	EXAMINER MAGID: What day after
6	you started did you first call the Agency's
7	attention to your problem?
8	MS. HALL: The day I
9	started.
10	EXAMINER HAGID: Who did you talk
11	to on that first day?
12	MS. HALL: In personnel I
13	had talked to them prior to this about the fact
14	that I needed a non-smoking work atmosphere. I
15	hired in as a disabled person with obstructive
16	lung disease.
17	I was amazed that they would put me
18	in with, I think it was, three smokers.
19	EXAMINER MAGID: Who did you talk
20	to in personnel about your problem before you
21	hired in?
22	MS. HALL: Bob Rudowski.
23	EXAMINER MAGID: Sob Rudowski?
24	MS. HALL: Yes.
25	EXAMINER MAGID: Is he the

1 Personnel Manager? 2 MS. HALL: He was the head 3 of vocational rehabilitation hire-ins. know what his exact title would be. 5 EXAMINER MAGID: He was the personnel officer? MS. HALL: He was the head personnel officer. 8 9 EXAMINER MAGID: Excuse me. 10 Mr. Winslow, would you please not shake your head 11 to the witness. Oh, I'm sorry. . 12 MR. WINSLOW: EXAMINER MAGID: She is not a · 13 ligitator, and she does not know how to respond to 14 15 something like that. All right, Ms. Hall. 16 He was in charge 17 MS. HALL: of vocational rehabilitation hiring, I was under 18 the impression. He was the one I dealt with 19 exclusively in seeking employment with the V.A. 20 He was the one who interviewed me and tested me 21 22 before I got an appointment to be interviewed by Beverly Keith who was the supervisor in the typing 23 24 pool.

EXAMINER MAGID:

25

Beverly Keith is

1	the supervisor to whom you were assigned?
2	MS. HALL: Yes, and she was
3	the one I complained to on the first day of my
4	employment when they put me in the pool of a whole
5	batch of smokers.
6	EXAMINER MAGID: Had you spoken
7	to her prior to your employment?
8	MS. HALL: She interviewed
9	me, yes.
10	EXAMINER MAGID: Did you tell her
11	about your obstructive lung disease?
12	MS. HALL: No.
13	I assumed Personnel would take care
14	of this. She was just another person I dealt
15	with. I just assumed they had lines of
16	communications that were adequate.
17	EXAMINER MAGID: Go on.
18	When you complained on your first
19	day, what was the result of your complaints?
20	MS. HALL: She moved my
21	desk, or moved me to another desk, and she said
22	something about, "Oh, boy, are you in the wrong
23	place. * Either she said that or Donna said it.
24	EXAMINER MAGID: Who is Donna?
25	MS. HALL: Donna was an

1	assistant supervisor.
2	EXAMINER MAGID: What was the
3	result of your move? Did it help the situation?
4	MS. HALL: Not really
5	because the room is not well ventilated and if
6	someone lights a cigarette in a far corner, within
7	about sixty seconds, you're going to get hit with
8	the fumes.
9	EXAMINER MAGID: After your first
10	day, did you make other complaints?
11	MS. HALL: I made
12	complaints the whole two years that I worked there
13	to no avail.
14	I have complained to Bruce, who was
15	the team leader, to Donna who was the assistant
16	supervisor, to Beverly, to Ron D'Aoust, who is
17	Beverly's supervisor, to Mr. Rudowski, to
18	Mr. Ciach.
19	EXAMINER MAGID: When was the
20	first time you made a request for a smoke-free
21	work area?
22	MS. HALL: Exactly in those
23	words?
24	EXAMINER MAGID: Well, tell me
25	when you think the first time was that you made

that request?

б

MS. HALL: Right after I started, I told them this was severely affecting me. It affects not just my health, but my work performance is badly affected by it.

And, I made many, many requests that they accommodate me in some manner, and they never even took me seriously in my opinion.

EXAMINER MAGID: Why do you believe they didn't take you seriously?

MS. HALL: Because nothing was ever done.

It seemed like they just kept putting me off. They just kept telling me, "We're going to do something; just be patient," and nothing would be done.

So, I don't think it was even taken seriously until I filed an EEOC complaint and even then very little was done.

evidence in the complaint file in Affidavits and other documents that the Agency made some attempt to have its employees voluntarily stop smoking.

How serious were those efforts?

MS. HALL:

I really don't

1	have a lot of firsthand information on that
2	because all the meetings were held were held when
3	I was either absent or on leave. I was never
4	privy to any of the meetings, and I understand
5	there were several. I don't know how it was
6	presented.
7	I know what the reaction was by
8	fellow employees. It was extremely negative.
9	EXAMINER MAGID: What do you mean
10	by "extremely negative"? Do you mean there was
11	hostility?
12	MS. HALL: A great deal of
13	hostility toward me.
14	EXAMINER MAGID: By everyone or
15	just the smokers?
16	THE WITNESS: Just the general
17	atmosphere.
18	It's like when you are in a boat with
19	20 people and you're the one rocking it. The
20	other 19 people aren't going to be too thrilled
21	with you.
22	It's difficult to explain, but just
23	the general attitude toward me was very often
24	negative.

25

EXAMINER MAGID: Did anybody say

anything?

I'm sorry, I didn't hear that last comment.

often negative, especially after I would hear rumors that there had been a meeting. I wasn't even supposed to know these meetings were going on, I guess.

EXAMINER MAGID: They never informed you of those meetings?

MS. HALL: No.

EXAMINER MAGID: When these meetings took place on days that you were not at work, were you aware prior to your leave that those meetings were going to take place?

MS. HALL: Once I was.

I heard my supervisor, Beverly Keith, say that she was going to have -- she was going to have a meeting. It was right around the time I filed another complaint about the smoking.

She said to another employee something about, "I have to have a meeting this afternoon, and if you don't stop acting like that, I'm going to have to get everyone and have it now."

1	I heard that there had been another
2	meeting, and I think it was about smoking. I got
3	mostly secondhand information. So, it's difficult
4	for me to put my finger on exactly what goes on up
5	there. The only other information I had about
б	meetings were from EZOC counselors.
7	EXAMINER MAGID: That was after
8	you saw an EEO Counselor?
9	MS. HALL: Yes, sir.
10	EXAMINER MAGID: Other than the
11	meeting that you knew was going to take place, how
12	many other staff meetings on smoking were there
ŀ	
13	that you found out after the fact?
13 14	that you found out after the fact? MS. HALL: I can't say for
·	
14	MS. HALL: I can't say for
14 15	MS. HALL: I can't say for sure. My supervisor, Beverly Keith, told me that
14 15 16	MS. HALL: I can't say for sure. My supervisor, Beverly Keith, told me that she had met with the smokers on another occasion.
14 15 16 17	MS. HALL: I can't say for sure. My supervisor, Beverly Keith, told me that she had met with the smokers on another occasion. So, I knew about that and I saw her meeting with
14 15 16 17	MS. HALL: I can't say for sure. My supervisor, Beverly Keith, told me that she had met with the smokers on another occasion. So, I knew about that and I saw her meeting with them.
14 15 16 17 18	MS. HALL: I can't say for sure. My supervisor, Beverly Keith, told me that she had met with the smokers on another occasion. So, I knew about that and I saw her meeting with them. EXAMINER MAGID: You were hired
14 15 16 17 18 19	MS. HALL: I can't say for sure. My supervisor, Beverly Keith, told me that she had met with the smokers on another occasion. So, I knew about that and I saw her meeting with them. EXAMINER MAGID: You were hired in as a GS-3; is that correct?
14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	MS. HALL: I can't say for sure. My supervisor, Beverly Keith, told me that she had met with the smokers on another occasion. So, I knew about that and I saw her meeting with them. EXAMINER MAGID: You were hired in as a GS-3; is that correct? MS. HALL: That's correct.

1	(Whereupon, a short recess was
2	taken off the record)
3	EXAMINER MAGID: Between the time
4	of your hiring and the time you filed your EEO
5	complaint with the EEO Counselor, had you been
6	evaluated as to your performance?
7	MS. HALL: I really don't
8	recall. When was my complaint filed? Do you have
9	that? You said the original Complaint was
10	April 17?
11	EXAMINER MAGID: Well, your
12	complaint was filed April 17, 1985, so you saw the
13	Counselor at some day prior to that.
14	Do you know when you received your
15	first performance evaluation?
16	MS. HALL: I think it was
17	after that, but I'm not really positive.
18	EXAMINER MAGID: Prior to that
19	date, April 17, 1985, did your supervisor or any
20	other management employee comment on your
21	performance?
22	MS. HALL: I don't recall
23	offhand.
24	EXAMINER MAGID: Did anyone ever
25	complain about your work performance?

	1
1	MS. HALL: In an official
2	capacity, I don't believe so. There were some
3	comments made as to my error rates.
4	EXAMINER MAGID: Were you
5	promoted to GS-4 at the earliest possible time
6	that you could have been promoted to a GS-4 so far
7	as you know?
8	MS. HALL: As far as I
9	know.
10	EXAMINER MAGID: Go ahead.
11	Did you have anything else to offer?
12	HS. HALL: Not really.
13	EXAMINER MAGID: You mentioned
14	prior to going on the record that you had some
15	documents that you wished to introduce.
16	Do you wish to introduce them?
17	MS. HALL: If they're
18	appropriate. I would like to introduce some
19	documents on the effects of secondhand smoke.
20	Should I be commenting on them at
21	all?
22	EXAMINER MAGID: The procedure is
23	to offer them into evidence and allow Mr. Winslow
24	the opportunity to object to their admission and
25	then if they're admitted, then you can make some

1 comments about them. 2 HS. HALL: These are some 3 studies on the effects of cigarette smoke and 4 secondhand cigarette smoke, and I would like to 5 have them admitted. 6 EXAMINER MAGID: You have not 7 made copies of these; is that correct? 8 MS. HALL: That's correct. 9 **EXAMINER MAGID:** Is this the entire package that you wish admitted? 10 11 MS. HALL: These are little news things that have information that I was going 12 to comment on. I don't know if they should be 13 admitted or not. 14 It's up to you. 15 EXAMINER MAGID: If you want to offer them into evidence, you can 16 offer them. And, then, we'll have to wait for a 17 determination to see if they're admitted. 18 19 MS. HALL: If I hang onto them -- if I want to make comments on the effects 20 of secondhand smoke, is this the time I should do 21 it, or should I be skipping it entirely? 22 The appropriate 23 EXAMINER MAGID: time, I would believe, would be for you to make 24 those comments as a part of a closing statement. 25

The purpose of your testimony is to offer facts into evidence. Now, you can testify as to the effects of the smoke in your work area on you. If you wish to offer evidence as to the effects of secondary smoke in general, you may be challenged on your competence to do so, since you're not a physician or physiologist.

MS. HALL: Would I be challenged if I were quoting from studies or, say, the Surgeon General?

from those studies if those documents are admitted as evidence, or if they are generally recognized as authoritative in the field; and that would have to be determined by you making an offer as to their authenticity and as to the expertise behind them.

I would have no problem, and I don't believe that Mr. Winslow would have any problem, although I can't speak for him, if you were to comment in general as part of a closing statement on the effects of secondary smoke.

MS. HALL: I should hang onto these?

EXAMINER MAGID: That's up to

1	you.
2	If you wish to offer them as
3	evidence, I will accept them as a proposed
4	exhibit, and we will deal with them as a proposed
5	exhibit.
6	MS. HALL: I think I want
7	to hang onto these.
8	EXAMINER NAGID: I'm going to
9	mark these documents.
10	You don't have any objection to that,
11	do you?
12	MS. HALL: No.
13 14	(Whereupon, Proposed Complainant's Exhibits 1 through 19 were marked for identification and entered into the record)
15	EXAMINER MAGID: All right, I
16	have marked these documents PCB-1 through 19. PCE
17	will be the designation for Proposed Complainant's
18	Exhibits. And, they are proposed Exhibits 1
19	through 19, and as soon as I get them into order,
20	I'm going to allow Mr. Winslow to view them.
21	MS. HALL: I have one
22	other.
23	EXAMINER MAGID: One other
24	document?
25	MS. HALL: It's a copy of a

1 performance standard for my job. 2 Is that already a part of the record. 3 or should I ask that it be --4 EXAMINER MAGID: Let's let 5 Mr. Winslow start dealing with these other б documents, 1 through 19, and while he is reviewing, them you can make a search through the 8 file to see if that document is in there. Look at Exhibit C-8 and C-9 and see 10 if that is what you're asking? Yes, that's it. MS. HALL: 11 Is it Page 4 and 12 EXAMINER MAGID: 13 5? The line count 14 MS. HALL: is different, but it's not relevant to this. 15 I would object 16 MR. WINSLOW: 17 to all of these--the proposed exhibits--except Number 8 on the grounds that there has been no 18 foundation laid for the opinion that is given in 19 those documents, and they're not relevant to the 20 question of whether an accommodation had been 21 22 attempted which is reasonable in this particular 23 case. They deal entirely with a matter 24

which is highly controversial and in the public

sector, the press. And, it seems to me they don't actually bear on the question involved in this case which is a question of discrimination.

EXAMINER MAGID: Thank you, Mr. Winslow.

The Proposed Complainant's Exhibit 1 is a pamphlet of the American Lung Association regarding secondhand smoke. There is no indication on the document as to the author of the document or the background data or research which goes into the material contained in the pamphlet.

I'm going to sustain the objection to proposed Complainant's Exhibit 1.

Proposed Complainant's Exhibit 2 is another pamphlet of the American Lung Association, and I'm going to sustain the objection on the same grounds.

Proposed Complainant's Exhibit 3 is an article from the proceedings of the Third World Conference on Smoking and Health, the 1975 conference. The author is identified is Director of an allergy clinic the Saint Joseph Hospital in Toronto, Ontario. The author is Norman Epstein, M.D.

I'm unfamiliar with Doctor Epstein

and with his allergy clinic and the hospital.

There being no other information to support the expertise, I'm going to sustain Mr. Winslow's objection.

б

Proposed Complainant's Exhibit 4 is a paper, entitled "Passive Smoking and Lung Cancer," by Tachisi Kuriama, M.D., the Epidemiology Division, National Cancer Research Institute of Tokyo. I am unfamiliar with Doctor Kuriama and with the organization to which he belongs. I do not know where his article appeared. I'm going to sustain Mr. Winslow's objection.

Proposed Complainant's Exhibit 5 is an article, entitled "The Effects of Tobacco Smoke on the Non-smoking Cardiopulmonary Public," published by Charles F. Tate. It is undated and there is no indication as to what publication this appeared in. Charles F. Tate is identified as an M.D. from the University of Miami School of Medicine. I'm going to sustain Mr. Winslow's objection on Proposed Complainant's Exhibit 5.

Proposed Complainant's Exhibit 6 is a document, a four-page document which contains graphs and tables indicating the amount of pollution in public buildings.

It is not stated where this document appeared. It's apparently put out by an organization called Action on Smoking and Health, Washington, D. C. It is copyrighted by James L. Repace. I'm unfamiliar with the organization and with Mr. Repace. I'm going to sustain Mr. Winslow's objection on 6.

Proposed Complainant's Exhibit 7 is a document, entitled "Health Consequences of Smoking, Chronic Obstructive Lung Disease," a report by the Surgeon General 1984.

It's a publication of the United
States Department of Health and Human Services.
And, the document— the part that Ms. Hall has
offered as an exhibit is entitled, "Chapter 4,
Passive Smoking." I think reports of the Surgeon
General are generally accepted is authoritative.

I'm going to overrule Mr. Winslow's objection, and Proposed Complainant's Exhibit 7 is admitted.

(Whereupon, Complainant's Exhibit 7, having been previously marked, was admitted into evidence)

EXAMINER MAGID: Mr. Winslow has no objection to Proposed Complainant's Exhibit 8. Therefore, it is admitted. It is a fact sheet of

the EEOC on procedures for filing a discrimination complaint. The form of the document is OPA-4/84.

б

There being no objection, Proposed Complainant's 8 is admitted.

(Whereupon, Complainant's Exhibit 8, having been previously marked was admitted into evidence)

EXAMINER MAGID: Proposed

Complainant's Exhibit 9 is apparently several documents.

The first page is entitled,

"Executive Director's Report," and apparently this
also is a publication of the organization Action
on Smoking and Health. The second page is a
reprint of an article from the New York Times of
Saturday, November 3, 1984, entitled, "EPA Study
Links Deaths of Non-smokers to Cigarettes."

Starting with the third page, is a draft of May 1, 1984, of an article apparently written by James L. Repace and Alfred H. Lowrey; subtitle "A Quantitative Assessment is Made of Non-smokers Lung Cancer Risks from Breathing Ambient Tobacco Smoke."

I do not know where this article finally appeared, if ever, and, again, I do know Mr. Repace nor do I know Mr. Lowery, who is

identified as a Ph.D. in the naval research laboratory, and this document is a draft.

б

I'm going to sustain Mr. Winslow's objection to Proposed Complainant's Exhibit 9.

Proposed Complainant's Exhibit 10 is four page document and apparently it appears to be a press release of an organization called Action on Smoking and Health, acronym ASH, entitled, *Smoking Should Be Restricted in Public Places.*

I'm going to sustain Mr. Winslow's objection on the grounds of lack of authoritativeness of this document.

Proposed Complainant's Exhibit 11 is a copy of Public Law 91-596, the Occupational Safety and Health Act 97, and a copy of at least some of the legislative history of Public Law 91-596. These documents being a matter of record from the Congress of the United States, I'm going to overrule Mr. Winslow's objection and Complainant's Exhibit 11 is admitted.

(Whereupon, Complainant's Exhibit 11, having been previously marked, was admitted into evidence)

EXAMINER MAGID: Proposed

Complainant's Exhibit 12 is a document from the

New England Journal of Medicine, March 27, 1980,

entitled, "Small Air Ways Dysfunction in Non-smokers Chronically Exposed to Tobacco Smoke," an article by James R. White, Ph.D. and Herman F. Frobb, M.D.

The Examiner will take notice that the New England Journal of Medicine is one of the most authoritative medical publications in the United States.

I'm going to overrule Nr. Winslow's objection and Proposed Complainant's Exhibit 12 is admitted.

(Whereupon, Complainant's Exhibit 12, having been previously marked was admitted into evidence)

EXAMINER MAGID: Proposed

Complainant's Exhibit 13 is a copy of an article

by Norman Epstein, entitled "The Effect of Tobacco

Smoke Pollution on the Eyes of the Allergic

Non-smoker."

There is a notation that states it was distributed by the Action on Smoking and Health, or ASH. There is no indication where this article was published and, again, I'm not familiar with Norman Epstein.

I'm going to sustain Mr. Winslow's objection regarding Proposed Complainant's Exhibit

13.

б

Proposed Complainant's Exhibit 14 is a special report, entitled "The Health Risks of Passive Smoking: It's a Growing Case for Control Measures in Closed Environment," by Neville M. Lefcoe, M.D., Mary Jane Ashley, M. D., Linda L. Peterson, Ph.D., and John J. Keays, Bachelor of Science and Masters of Public Health.

with a Canadian organization or universities.

And, I am unfamiliar with them and with their organization and there is no other evidence as to -- I'm sorry there is some indication that this article was published in a journal called Chest on July 1, 1983. I'm not familiar with the journal called Chest and whether or not it's a jury publication.

I'm going to sustain Mr. Winslow's objection to Proposed Complainant's Exhibit 14.

Proposed Complainant's Exhibit 15 is a paper presented by James L. Repace of the U. S. Environmental Protection Agency presented to the Pifth World Conference on smoking and health in Winnipeg, Canada, from July 10 through 15, 1983.

I have indicated before, I'm

unfamiliar with Mr. Repace and I am unfamiliar with his work.

I'm going to sustain Mr. Winslow's objection on Proposed Complaint's Exhibit 15.

Proposed Complainant's Exhibit 16 is one page from part of May 8, 1984, Detroit Free Press, which includes a question and answer in the column, "Today's Q and A" regarding air pollution in a building.

I'm going to sustain Mr. Winslow's objection as to the lack of authoritativeness on Proposed Complainant's Exhibit 16.

Proposed Complainant's Exhibit 17 is a one-page document which lists examples -- it's apparently a listing of court cases in which there are examples where smoking is not a job requirement matter.

It also contains some editorial matter on the subject of smoking as a job requirement and some conclusions as to whether smoking should or should not be allowed on the job.

I'm going to accept both

Complainant's Exhibit 17 for the sole purpose of
the listing of court cases; and for that purpose

it will be accepted. I will state on the record I do not necessarily accept the conclusions of the editorial list of whoever the editorial list may be on this document.

So, Complainant's Exhibit 17 is admitted in part; the part that I've stated.

б

(Whereupon, Complainant's Exhibit 17, having been previously marked, was admitted into evidence)

EXAMINER MAGID: Proposed

Complainant's Exhibit 18 is three pages from the

Journal of the American Medical Association,

May 19, 1978, an article entitled, "Non-smokers'

Rights: A Public Health Issue."

The article is by Jeffrey E. Green,
M.D. of the Georgetown Emergency Medical Center.

I'm going to accept Proposed Complainant's Exhibit
18 into evidence. The Examiner will take notice
the Journal of the America Medical Association is
generally regarded as an authoritative publication
in its field.

Complainant's Exhibit 18 is admitted.

(Whereupon, Complainant's Exhibit 18, having been previously marked, was admitted into evidence)

EXAMINER MAGID: Proposed

Complainant's Exhibit 19 is a two page article

1 reprinted from the International Journal of 2 Cancer, entitled, "Lung Cancer and Passive 3 Smoking. " Apparently, the article was published 5 in 1981. I'm unfamiliar with the International б Journal of Cancer, and I'm unfamiliar with the 7 authors of the article itself, who are Dimitrios 8 Trichopoulis, Anna Kalandidi, Loukas Sparros and 9 Brian MacMahon. Proposed Complainant's Exhibit 19 is 10 denied admission, and I'm sustaining Mr. Winslow's 11 12 objection. At the appropriate time when we have 13 an opportunity, we'll make copies of the exhibits 14 which have been admitted into evidence for the 15 16 parties. All right, Ms. Hall, you may 17 18 continue. What's next? MS. HALL: 19 EXAMINER MAGID: Do you have 20 anything else that you would like to say? 21 MS. HALL: May I comment on 22 your objections? 23

EXAMINER MAGID:

24

25

No.

We are now back in the mode where you

1	are to give testimony as to factual matters.
2	Let me ask an you couple of
3	questions, Ms. Hall, and maybe it will prompt some
4	comments of your own.
5	Did anybody at the Veterans
6	Administration ever tell you that they would
7	consider changing the configuration of the walls
8	in the typing pool to accommodate you?
9	MS. HALL: Ron D'Aoust told
10	me that they would not.
11	EXAMINER MAGID: When did he tell
12	you that?
13	MS. HALL: I don't
14	remember; quite awhile ago.
15	EXAMINER MAGID: Did he tell you
16	why they wouldn't?
17	MS. HALL: It was a
18	budgetary concern; the reason why they wouldn't.
19	EXAMINER MAGID: Do you remember
20	the exact words that he said to you when he told
21	you that?
22	Ms. HALL: Not offhand.
23	EXAMINER MAGID: Did he name a
24	dollar amount that was involved?
25	MS. HALL: No.

1	He told me it was something about
2	that these budgets were made far, far in advance;
3	that it simply wasn't in the budget and there were
4	"X" number of dollars and that was it; it simply
5	wasn't in the budget.
6	EXAMINER MAGID: Did anyone else
7	ever mention the changing of the walls to you?
8	MS. HALL: Not that I can
9	recall, no.
10	EXAMINER MAGID: So, that was the
11	only time that the changing of the walls was
12	discussed with you?
13	MS. HALL: Yes.
14	EXAMINER MAGID: Did you suggest
15	that to Mr. D'Aoust, or did he bring it up to you?
16	MS. HALL: He brought it up
17	to me.
13	EXAMINER MAGID: In what context?
19	MS. HALL: I believe it was
20	in the context of why nothing was being done.
21	EXAMINER MAGID: Did anyone ever
22	tell you that one the reasons that let me back
23	up a minute.
24	Did you ever suggest to any of your
25	supervisors or anybody in managment that they

1	should ban smoking altogether in the typing room?
2	MS. HALL: Yes.
3	EXAMINER MAGID: What was their
4	response?
5	MS. HALL: I have had many
6	responses to that.
7	EXAMINER MAGID: Tell us all that
8	you can remember.
9	Ms. HALL: Okay, when I
10	brought it up to Mr. D'Aoust, he said something to
11	the effect that what I wanted was change and that
12	was the problem and that change came slowly.
13	I can remember bringing it up to
14	Beverly, and she said that she couldn't do that.
15	At one point she promised to crack down and when
16	nothing happened, I asked her what happened with
17	the crack down, and she said, "Well, if Ron
18	couldn't stop them, you should never expect me to
19	be able to do it."
20	EXAMINER MAGID: Before we leave
21	Beverly, did she tell you why she couldn't do it?
22	MS. HALL: No.
23	EXAMINER MAGID: She gave you no
24	reason?
25	MS. HALL: No.

1 EXAMINER MAGID: Go ahead to the 2 next person. 3 MS. HALL: I believe I 4 talked to Mr. Clach about it, and his response was 5 that nothing would be done to ban smoking in the б near future, and I should perhaps be looking elsewhere to work, perhaps in the private sector, 7 and that they are weren't going to do anything and 8 9 that I shouldn't expect that anything would be 10 done at any time. I brought it up to Mr. Clowney--his 11 first name is Gordon--and he said he felt the 12 whole issue had been blown out of proportion and 13 that they had to consider the rights of the 14 smokers because they were under terrible pressure 15 16 these days and that things shouldn't be made more 17 difficult for them. 13 EXAMINER MAGID: Who was he 19 referring to that were under considerable 20 pressure? 21 MS. HALL: Smokers. Smokers were 22 EXAMINER MAGID: 23 under considerable pressure? That's correct. 24 MS. HALL:

EXAMINER MAGID:

25

So, he did not

1	want to increase the pressure on them; is that the
2	inference?
3	MS. HALL: Apparently so.
4	EXAMINER MAGID: Is he a smoker?
5	MS. HALL: No, he is not.
6	EXAMINER MAGID: Did he explain
7	or did you ask what he meant by "you shouldn't
8	increase the pressure on them*?
9	MS. HALL: I think he meant
10	that there was pressure by society because of the
11	fact that there was smoker I'm not entirely
12	sure on that. I'm tying to remember the entire
13	conversation. That is the best I can do right
14	now.
15	EXAMINER MAGID: Did you discuss
16	a smoking ban with anyone else?
17	MS. HALL: With team
18	members, counsel supervisors.
19	EXAMINER MAGID: Did they act as
20	a supervisor or supervisors at the time?
21	MS. HALL: To a limited
22	degree.
23	EXAMINER MAGID: All right, well,
24	tell me about the team leader.
25	MS. HALL: Both team

1	leaders are non-smokers, and I discussed these
2	issues with them.
3	EXAMINER MAGID: What are their
4	names?
5	MS. HALL: Donna. I don't
6	know Donna's last name. She is now a supervisor
7	who took over Beverly Keith's place. And Bruce.
8	There was another team leader named JoAnne and
9	awhile back, I used to discuss it with her.
10	EXAMINER MAGID: JoAnne?
11	MS. HALL: That's correct.
12	EXAMINER MAGID: What did your
13	conversations with them involve?
14	MS. HALL: They had
15	problems with the smoke too. They simply said
16	nothing would ever change and everyone was
17	basically powerless to do anything about it, and
18	that was about it.
19	EXAMINER MAGID: Okay, did
20	anybody every bring up Martin Aguire and his
21	handicap as a reason for not accommodating you?
22	MS. HALL: No.
23	I learned about that when I received
24	this document.
25	EXAMINER MAGID: None of your

1	supervisors ever brought that up to you?
2	MS. HALL: No.
3	EXAMINER MAGID: Do you know
4	Martin Aguire?
5	MS. HALL: Yes.
б	EXAMINER MAGID: Does he smoke
7	constantly?
8	MS. HALL: He smokes very
9	heavily. I don't know if I would call it
10	"constantly."
11	EXAMINER MAGID: Did you ever
12	have a conversation with him about your problem?
13	MS. HALL: No.
14	EXAMINER MAGID: All right, is
15	there anything else that you would like to say
16	before I allow Mr. Winslow to cross-examine you?
17	MS. HALL: No.
18	EXAMINER MAGID: All right,
19	Hr. Winslow, cross-examination.
20	CROSS-EXAMINATION
21	BY MR. WINSLOW:
22	Q. I believe you stated that you had
23	told Bob Rudowski that you would require a smoke
24	free area to work in; is that a correct
25	understanding of what you testified to?

1	Á. I informed Mr. Rudowski that I had
2	obstructive lung disease and that I had to avoid
3	any kind of toxic substance, including cigarette
4	smoke.
5	Q. That was before you were hired?
6	A. That's correct.
7	Q. Did you tell him the degree to which
8	you were allergic or affected by such smoke?
9	A. I told him I had obstructive lung
10	disease and that I needed to avoid it.
11	Q. Was it to the extent of the
12	description that you gave him of the severity of
13	your problem?
14	A. Yes.
15	He didn't question me any further so
16	I didn't elaborate.
17	Q. Had you had any difficulty in
8 1	previous places of employment where you have
19	smokers?
20	A. Yes.
21	Q. Where?
22	A. I had a problem with Deaconess
23	Hospital.
24	Q. What were the circumstances there?
25	A. By wirtue of the air I was breathing,

1	I worked in a small room where there were many
2	smokers, and I developed a lung problem.
3	Q. What was the outcome of that
4	situation?
5	A. What type of outcome?
6	Q. Well, did they resolve the problem
7	for you?
8	A. They fired me.
9	Q. And, did you take any action
10	regarding the way in which they handled the
11	problems you faced?
12	A. Yes.
13	Q. What was that?
14	A. I filed a Worker's Compensation
15	claim. I filed for unemployment, and I filed what
16	I think is called either a civil or probate suit.
17	I don't know what the technical terminology would
8 £	be.
19	Q. You filed a lawsuit against them?
20	A. That's correct.
21	Q. How did the lawsuit come out?
22	A. Which one?
23	Q. The lawsuit against Deaconess
24	Hospital.
25	A. The compensation case?

1 Q. No, the hospital? 2 They're both the same. A. 3 Did you go through a administrative Q. 4 .proceeding with the Worker's Compensation case and 5 did that same case go into the courts? 6 That's correct. Α. 7 Q. All right, what was the final outcome 8 of the case? 9 There was a jury trial and they found A. 10 in my favor. 11 Did you recover any money damage for 12 the injuries you received? 13 Yes, I did. Did you tell Mr. Rudowski or Beverly 14 0. Keith when they interviewed you that you had this 15 problem and you had been able to recover any such 16 damages for any injuries suffered at Deaconess 17 18 Hospital? Do you mean did I walk in and tell 19 20 them I sued an employer? 21 0. Yes. No, I didn't. 22 Α. You indicated that you filed a 23 Q.

Worker's Compensation claim and also that you sued

24

25

on that claim.

other employees bother you at any other place you worked?

- A. The bothered me some at IRS, but it was a different situation because it was a warehouse with a 30-foot high ceiling, and it was about a quarter of a block long and it wasn't the same situation.
 - Q. Did you complain there?
 - A. Yes.

- Q. To whom?
- A. My supervisor.
- Q. Did they resolve the problem for you?
- A. Somewhat.

They would slow down for awhile and they start up again and I would complain, and they would slow down.

It was only a temporary position, though, so I was doing my level best to get out of there anyway. It wasn't the same situation as the V.A. It was also a place where I wasn't at a particular work station. I could leave the area. I could go to different areas in the warehouse and still work.

Q. When you came to work are for the V.A., did you see the place you were going to work

1 before you were hired? Sort of. Like, just walked in the 2 A. 3 door, sat down with my back to the room. I got a quick glance is about all. 4 5 I'm sorry? 0. I got a quick glance. 6 Α. 7 How long did this quick glance take? Q. The amount of time it takes to walk 8 Α. in the door and sit with your back to the room. 9 To a woman? Is that what you said? 10 0. I sat with my back to the room during 11 my interview. 12 What woman are you talking about? 13 0. Α. Back to the room. 14 At the time that you were that you 15 were being interviewed, did you know that that was 16 the room you were going to be working in? 17 I believe I assumed it was; I 18 probably assumed it was. 19 who did you talk to in that room? 20 Q. Beverly Keith. 21 Α. And, how long did the interview take? 22 Q. I don't know; maybe ten minutes. 23 Α. Were there other employees working at 24 Q.

the time in the room besides Beverly Keith?

4	A. Yes.
2	Q. Were any of them smoking?
3	A. I don't know. I wasn't facing the
4	room.
5	Q. Was there any reason that you
6	couldn't turn around and look?
7	A. Yes, I was being interviewed and
8	trying to get a job.
9	Q. Did Ms. Keith tell you to look at
10	her?
11	A. No, but she was talking to me and I
12	was reading the requirements of the job during the
13	interview, and when I talk to someone, I face
14	them.
15	Q. Did you finish your answer to the
16	question?
17	A. Yes.
18	Q. Were there any interruptions during
19	that conversation when Beverly left you?
20	A. Not that I can recall.
21	Q. Did you talk to anyone else in the
22	room at the time?
23	A. Not that I recall.
24	Q. Where were you seated at that time?
25	A. Next to Beverly Keith's desk.

1 Q. How did you enter the room? In other words, how did you get in the room when you came 2 3 What route did you take? in? 4 I believe I came in through the front 5 door. Is the front door the door that 6 Q. 7 enters into the mailing area that leads to 8 Mr. D'Aoust's office? 9 Yes, I believe that is the door I Α. 10 came in. 11 That's the door you came in? 12 I think so. A. So, when you entered the room, you 13 Q. 14 actually were facing the people working in the 15 room, were you not? Α. 16 Yes. Did you notice anyone smoking at that 17 Q. 13 time? No. I didn't. 19 Α. If you had had the experiences that 20 Q. you have already recounted regarding your problem 21 with smoking at Deaconess Hospital and at the IRS, 22 why did you not consider the circumstances under 23 24 which you were being hired?

I did consider them.

- Q. Same subject I'm talking about?
- A. I did.

б

- Q. Did you? What did you decide?
- A. Well, I saw the computer terminals and I assumed there is never any smoking around computer terminals as far as I know, and I just assumed that there was no smoking. You can't smoke and type. It doesn't work. It's just why would they have smoking in there? It just didn't make sense. It didn't occur to me that there could be smoking in there.
- Q. When you say "computer terminals," are you talking about word processing equipment?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. Are you telling me that you assumed from the fact that people were using word processing equipment that they would not be smoking while they were using it?
 - A. Yes.

That is pretty unusual to allow smoking around any kind of computer equipment.

I have taken computer classes and we're never allowed to smoke around our computer terminals.

Q. Where have you taken classes?

A. Wayne State University.

In the IRS building, I took a class on computer terminals where they had a room in computer terminals, and you weren't allowed to smoke in there because of the computer terminals.

- Q. In the employment that you have had, did any employer allow smoking at a computer terminal and at a word processing terminal?
 - A. No.

б

- Q. Have you worked in areas before where there were word processing terminals?
 - A. No.

In the IRS, I'm pretty sure they don't allow it around the computers. That's my answer.

- Q. Are you identifying a computer and a word processor as the same thing?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. You don't recognize any difference between those?
 - A. Not really.

It is the same equipment I used at IRS when I took their course and they didn't allow smoking around it, except that theirs is called Commodore and yours is I.B.M.

1 Q. This is on a training course you're 2 talking about; is that correct? 3 A. No. 4 This isn't where you worked? 0. 5 That's correct, but it was not a 6 training room. It was a room -- it might have 7 been a training room, but it was a room where 8 people worked also. 9 Did you observe a word processor in Q. the personnel office while you were interviewed by 10 11 Mr. Rudowski? 12 No, I didn't. Α. Did you notice anyone smoking in that 13 0. 14 room? .15 I don't recall anyone smoking, no. Α. I just dealt with Mr. Rudowski. I 16 don't recall. It was a long time ago, but I don't 17 13 recall dealing with anybody but Mr. Rudowski. 19 Do you have any grounds for feeling 20 that the Personnel Service would tell Beverly that 21 you had a disability of this nature and this 22 severity before you were hired? 23 I'm sorry, I didn't hear the 24 question.

BY MR. WINSLOW:

Q. What I'm trying to find out is:

Did anyone give you any indication

for your belief or any -- what basis do you have

for your belief or speculation that someone in

personnel told Beverly about your disability and

the severity of it before you were hired? That's

what I'm trying to find out.

EXAMINER MAGID: I don't believe she has ever testified that she knew that she was told. She speculated that Beverly had access to the records and, therefore, I think that was the nature of her testimony.

MR. WINSLOW: I thought the testimony—and if I'm wrong, we'll pursue it a different way—but I thought her testimony was that she thought that Personnel must have told Beverly about it and it was speculative matter on her part.

EXAMINER MAGID: Let's ask directly.

Do you believe that Personnel told Beverly Keith about your disability?

MS. HALL: I don't know. I would have no way of knowing.

1 I would just assume that they would 2 be competent enough not to put someone in a position that physically they couldn't do. They 3 4 wouldn't hire a blind person and say, "Here, read 5 this and type it. " б EXAMINER MAGID: I don't think 7 that was the question. The question was whether you did 8 9 assume that Ms. Keith was told? MS. HALL: Yes, that is 10 absolutely correct. I did assume. 11 EXAMINER MAGID: 12 basis for your assumption? 13 MS. HALL: The basis for my 14 assumption is that I dealt with the disability 15 coordinator in the office -- the vocational 16 rehabilitation disability coordinator -- whose job 17 it is to place disabled people in jobs they are 18 capable of doing. I assume he was competent in 19 20 doing this. 21 EXAMINER MAGID: So, you assumed that as part of his job, he would have told the 22 prospective supervisor about it's disability; is 23 that correct? 24 Yes, that there MS. HALL: 25

was a disability that would possibly affect the job performance. I would assume he would be responsible for telling that supervisor that before.

I also had no knowledge of who actually did the hiring and who actually made determinations. So, I didn't know the role, and I I still don't know, the role that Beverly may or may not have played in hiring me.

BY MR. WINSLOW:

15.

Q. I'm not sure if I asked this before, but I want to make sure at least that I understand your answer to it.

What, specifically, if anything, did he tell Mr. Rudowski about your disability beyond the fact that you had obstructive lung disease and that you needed to avoid inhaling toxic substances including cigarette smoke?

Just how much further than that did you describe your disability?

- A. He didn't ask anything more and I didn't tell him anything more. I stated I had obstructive lung disease, and what I've already told you.
 - Q. You didn't tell him anymore

voluntarily and he didn't ask?

- A. That's correct.
- Q. Why do you say that you feel that your supervisors, and I guess it was particularly Mr. D'Aoust, never took you seriously when you complained about your problem?

You stated that they told you, "We're going to do something," but you really didn't think they were going to do anything.

What basis do you have for feeling that way?

- A. Because they kept saying, "Yes, we're going to do something," and they kept not doing anything.
- Q. When you may "they didn't do anything," what do you mean "they didn't do anything"? What did they not do that you felt they should have done?
- A. I felt they should have stopped the smoking in the work area.
 - Q. Did they do anything else?
- A. They did things that in my opinion made it look like they were doing things, but in actuality they weren't doing anything.

They tended to do things around times

б

when they -- they did nothing at all, basically, until the EEOC complaint was filed. Then, they proposed doing several things none of which they did.

б

- Q. Did what? I'm sorry. I missed what you said.
- A. They proposed doing several things none of which they did.

I was told by the EEOC Counselor that they were going to stop the smoke in the work area and they didn't.

- Q. Who told the EEO Counselor that that happened happen?
- A. She told me that Ron D'Aoust was going to have the smokers sign statements to the effect that they wouldn't smoke in the work area; that it was going to be in writing that they wouldn't smoke in the work area.

I later found out that this was supposed to be a voluntary thing. So it had no effect at all.

They had already been asked not to smoke there, and it had no effect at all.

If anything, to retaliate, usually after these meetings, they would come in and smoke

more.

2

3

1

Q. Who?

Α.

4

The people who were smoking in the Many of them tended to come in and smoke room,

5

more.

б

0. I'm asking the question, who?

7

I can't give the names off the cuff right now. That was a long sometime ago.

9

8

thing has been going to for two years.

10

Were the supervisors aware that they Q.

11

smoked even more after those meetings?

12

Α. Yes.

13

Beverly Reith made the comment that

14

she was -- I said to her, I believe it was after

15

the meeting -- they had a meeting with Ron -- I said to her they were smoking even more, and she

16

said, "Yes, they are."

17

There was a memo circulated by

19

18

Mr. Clowney stating to please use courtesy when

20

using tobacco substances, as others may not be

21

able to tolerate them as well and as she

22

distributed it, there were a group of smokers in

23

the back of the room who were laughing and joking

24

about it.

She said that was just a joke to

25

them, and that they were smoking even more in retaliation.

In addition, I have had many instances where people would walk by my desk. They would go out of their way to walk by my desk with lit cigarettes, and my supervisors were made aware of that also.

- Q. Your supervisors were what?
- A. Made aware of that also.
- Q. Who was made aware of that?
- A. Beverly Keith and Ron D'Aoust and Donna.
 - Q. Did they do anything about it?
- A. They would meet with people, but it really wouldn't do any good. They might stop for a day or two, but then it would start happening again. There was an actual no smoking sign posted near the entrance to where one of the last places they moved me and this was also disregarded by smokers.

BY MR. WINSLOW:

- Q. I'm sorry, what did you say was put there?
- A. Ron D'Aoust after another EEOC complaint was filed outside the reproduction area

they moved me.

2.3

They had me surrounded by about three or four smokers at one point and they moved me to the back which was then two desks away from one smoker and three desks way from another or something like that.

And the entrance near the back, they posted a no smoking sign because people would continually go back and forth to my desk. Even though it's out of their way to go back there, even though it's out of their way to go back in the hall way, they would go back and forth by my desk, people would congregate and meet out in the hallway, which was maybe seven or eight feet from my desk and they would stand there and talk and smoke.

The repairmen in the hallway would smoke while they were working. That was like five, ten, fifteen feet away from my desk.

- Q. What repairmen?
- A. I don't know; just the people working in the building.
 - Q. Maintenance people?
- A. Right, but it was largely disregarded.

1 BY MR. WINSLOW: 2 Q. 3 Α. 4 5 6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Do you mean the sign?

Yes.

I believe you indicated that Mr. Clowney had told you that he didn't want to put any more pressure on the smokers in the pool than they already had because they were already under considerable pressure, and you felt that was pressure by society.

What do you mean by the "pressure by society*?

- I don't mean anything about it. think that is what he meant by it.
- What did you conclude that he was Q. talking about?
- Just what I said. I concluded that he didn't say society as such. He just said smokers were under so much pressure as it was. He didn't want to put any more pressure on them, and that he felt the whole issue had been overblown.
 - Did he say that?
 - Yes, he did.

Do you remember MS. HALL: you were asking me what I felt or what they had

done to accommodate me?

EXAMINER MAGID:

Yes.

MS. HALL: The other claim they were making is that they would put fans in there. I don't know why fans is to be considered an accommodation. It just blows air around.

But, they said they bought fans specifically for my use, and I'm not aware of having any right to use these fans to begin with.

One of them was specifically designated as JoAnne's fan. She was a team leader, and I wasn't allowed to touch it. The other was in the back of the room and everybody used it and there were virtually verbal knock-down-drag-outs about the fan.

people would threaten to beat each each other up and stuff over it. Now, there is one fan right now in the back that blows smoke at me, not away from me.

The fans are put away for the winter. The the last time Beverly Keith went through the room, and she grabbed the fan from the back and said, "This is winter. You don't use any goddamned fans in the winter." She grabbed it and put it somewhere.

1 EXAMINER MAGID: Was it worse 2 than when the fans were not there? 3 MS. HALL: The fans blow 4 the smoke around. I suppose that helps sort of. 5 It doesn't make any appreciable difference that I б can discern at all. You feel just as lousy. You 7 tend to be a little cooler at least. 8 BY MR. WINSLOW: 9 In the wintertime did you need the Q. 10 fan to keep cool? 11 Α. No. 12 In the wintertime, the temperature varies a great deal in there. Sometimes it's very 13 hot and sometimes it's very cold. The heating 14 system and cooling system don't seem to be 15 functioning all the time. 16 Do they adequately remove the smoke 17 from the air? 18 19 Α. No. Where in other parts of the building 20 are you affected by the smoke? 21 Yes. 22 Α. Restrooms? Cafeteria? 23 24 Restrooms. I stay in the non-smoking Α. section of the cafeteria. 25

1	Q. Are there people smoking in the
2	cafeteria?
3	A. In the smoking section.
4	Q. Does that bother you too?
5	A. A little. It's again a different
б	type of area. It's not enclosed the way the pool
7	is. The ceiling is very high and it's very large.
8	EXAMINER MAGID: Do you feel
9	better in the cafeteria in the non-smoking
10	section?
11	MS. HALL: Yes.
12	BY MR. WINSLOW:
13	Q. Do you feel anyone has a right to
14	smoke?
15	A. I don't believe that legally there is
16	a "right to smoke."
17	Q. Do you have any Court cases or
18	arbitration cases or any other documentation that
19	states that in federal buildings, there is no
20	right to smoke?
21	A. In the Federal Building?
22	Q. Yes.
23	A. I'm not a lawyer.
24	Q. Do you know if any of the cases
25	mentioned in Complainant's Exhibit 17 deal with

1 federal employees and smoking in federal 2 buildings? Do you know (handing document.) 3 A. No, there is nothing there that I 4 could recognize. 5 EXAMINER MAGID: I notice. б Mr. Winslow, that one of the cases mentioned on 7 this page is Dephenthal vs. CAB, 681 Fed. 2d. at 8 Page 1039 (1982) case. I'll be curious to see 9 that case since the CAB is a federal Agency. 10 BY MR. WINSLOW: Is it your position that all work 11 12 places should be smoke free; all federal work 13 places should be smoke free? 14 EXAMINER MAGID: Mr. Winslow, I 15 don't think we have to get into her philosophy as 16 to all other federal installations and work 17 places. 18 I think we're dealing with a specific 19 situation here. 20 The reason I BY MR. WINSLOW: 21 asked that question is, I gather this is a matter somewhat of principle with her and that she feels 22 23 that this is not just a personal problem but a 24 matter of a cause, so to speak.

EXAMINER MAGID:

25

It may be true

1	that she feels that way, Mr. Winslow, but the
2	relevance of her opinion on that subject is not
3	connected to this case.
4	This case is dealing with matters
5	relevant to whether the Agency accommodated her
6	handicap if she is, indeed, a qualified
7	handicapped person, and we're dealing with this
8	work place.
9	MS. HALL: In answer to
10	EXAMINER MAGID: I raised my own
11	objection to his question.
12	MS. HALL:your question
13	about the cases.
14	EXAMINER MAGID: Oh, about the
15	. case? Go ahead.
16	MS. HALL: I'm not aware
17	and I don't know for sure, but I think there was
18	Pletton versus Department of the Army.
19	examiner magid: That was a
20	federal court case?
21	MS. HALL: Yes, I believe
22	it was an BEOC case that I believe the BEOC
23	determined that there was a failure to accommodate
24	them by the Department of Army, and I don't know
25	if they made any sort of statement on the

ļ	so-called right of smoking.
2	EXAMINER MAGID: Do you have the
3	citation for that case?
4	MS. HALL: What is a
5	citation?
6	EXAMINER MAGID: Do you have the
7	numbers that will indicate where I could find that
8	case in a law book?
9	MS. HALL: Not offhand.
10	I might be able to get it for you,
11	but I think that that's what you introduced into
12	evidence. I think that may be a result of that
13	case. I'm not sure.
14	EXAMINER MAGID: Go ahead.
15	Mr. Winslow, go ahead. You may continue with your
16	questioning.
17	BY MR. WINSLOW:
18	Q. Have you attempted to find a job in
19	this Agency or in this building where you would
20	find the conditions which you feel are necessary
21	to protect your health?
22	A. Yes, I have.
23	Q. What have you done?
24	A. I was on their placement list because
25	I had a far exceed. I was in the far exceed

category.

I was on a special placement list where you could qualify for 5, 7 line positions. I also requested to be put on their clerical list and I have been through several interviews with the V. A. I've been through several interviews with the V. A. Hospitals and with the post office.

Q. Have you found any of those positions would provide you with a smoke free environmental work place?

A. No.

I was told outright that because of the smoke, I would not be hired in some of those positions. The other ones, I just wasn't hired for. I was questioned extensively about the smoking problem on virtually all the interviews with the V.A. positions and I did not get any of the jobs.

- Q. Did the people who were interviewing know that you had this problem at the time?
 - A. I'm pretty sure they did.
 - Q. Were they people with the V.A.?
 - A. Yes.
 - Q. All of them?
 - A. No.

Are you just talking about the 1 Q. 2 applications you had for jobs working at the V.A.? 3 A. Right. Then they would all be V.A. people. 4 5 Was that before you got this job? б A. No. 7 This is transfer attempts that I have 8 I also tested for a border guard job . made since. 9 where I would be working pretty much by myself but they said I was too old. 10 11 BY MR. WINSLOW: 12 Q. You were to old? 13 Α. Too old. 14 So, if you don't smoke and you're not 15 25, you can't get a job. 16 I have checked for some other positions too. I have tested and qualified for 17 18 air traffic controller position and I never heard 19 from them and now I'm too old. 20 0. Do they have smoke free areas? Probably not, but no worse than the 21 Α. 22 pool. 23 Q. Do you consider the pool to be a 24 worse area than, let's say, other areas in the 25 V.A. that be an ideal place to work?

A. It has been in the past.

б

lő

There have had up to as many as eight smokers which was just horrendous. In addition, it's attached to the main room where Ron D'Aoust's office is that has another at one time, I think, eight smokers which is attached to another room that has about 20 smokers.

So, it's hard to say which place is worse, but at one point the pool was pretty close to the worst.

- Q. How is it now?
- A. I don't know. I haven't been to other places in the V.A. recently very much.
- Q. How is the pool now as far as smoking?
 - A. It's bad.

It just takes one digarette in the place, and the whole room fills up and there is just no ventilation.

I suspect it has something to do with those machines. I don't know why but the smoke stays there and it's almost like it attracts it.

You watch the smoke and it's just drifts right toward you. I don't know what sort of electrical things happen with machinery and

1 ventilation and air exchanges and smoke and all 2 that. 3 I know that I have read some articles 4 about it, but I'm not a scientist any more than 5 than I'm a lawyer. When somebody lights up, within 60 seconds, you can be in the far corner of 6 7 the room and you're getting hit with it, and it's В devastating right now; far worse than it was when 9 I started there. 10 I don't even know if I could get a 11 job anyplace else right now. 12 MR. WINSLOW: I'm all done. Do you have any 13 EXAMINER MAGID: 14 other testimony you wish to offer yourself, 15 Ms. Hall? 16 MS. HALL: No. 17 EXAMINER MAGID: Let me see if I 18 have any questions I have to ask. 19 All right, I have no questions to 20 ask. 21 Thank you for your testimony, 22 Ms. Hall. 23 All right, now it's time for the 24 Agency to present witnesses. Would it be appropriate and useful to take a five-minute break 25

1	while you get your first witness, Mr. Winslow?
2	MR. WINSLOW: Yes, sir.
3	(Whereupon, a short recess was taken
4	off the record).
5	EXAMINER MAGID: Back on the
6	record, I do have one or two questions that I
7	would like to ask you, Ms. Hall.
8	Are you a member of a labor Union in
9	your employment at the V.A.?
10	MS. HALL: Yes, I am.
11	EXAMINER MAGID: What Union is
12	that?
13	MS. HALL: The V.A.
14	Union.
15	EXAMINER MAGID: Have you spoken
16	with a Union representative or steward about your
17	problem?
18	MS. HALL: Yes.
19	EXAMINER MAGID: What has been
20	the Union's response?
21	MS. HALL: Well, I was told
22	that it's pretty much an inactive Union.
23	EXAMINER MAGID: It's what?
24	MS. HALL: It's not a very
25	active Union.

1	If the Union made a move to help me,
2	the smokers would object and regardless of what
3	they did, if management didn't want to do
4	something about a situation, they wouldn't do it.
5	It simply wasn't that active a Union.
6	EXAMINER MAGID: Did you seek to
7	file a grievance regarding the smoking problem in
8	the office?
9	MS. HALL: I think I did,
10	and I was told that if you filed a grievance, I
11	couldn't go with the EEOC and I think
12	EXAMINER MAGID: Who told you
13	that?
14	MS. HALL: I think the
15	Union president.
16	EXAMINER MAGID: So, the Union
17	declined to accept your grievance?
18	MS. HALL: I did file
19	something with them. I don't know if I actually
20	filed an official grievance, but the Union
21	president is the one that negotiated the
22	non-smoking sign outside of reproduction.
23	EXAMINER MAGID: Did anybody in
24	the Union ever tell you that smokers have the
25	right to continue smoking under the Union

1	agreement?
2	MS. HALL: No.
3	EXAMINER MAGID: Are you familiar
4	with the contract?
5	MS. HALL: NO.
6	EXAMINER MAGID: Have you ever
7	looked into it to see if it mentions anything
8	specifically about smoking?
9	MS. HALL: I think I asked
10	about it. I believe the BEOC Counselor told me
11	that the V.A. simply didn't have a policy on
12	smoking.
13	EXAMINER MAGID: That's what the
14	EEO Counselor told you?
15	MS. HALL: I believe that
16	is what she told me, yes.
17	EXAMINER HAGID: Do you have any
18	questions on that, Mr. Winslow?
19	MR. WINSLOW: No.
20	EXAMINER MAGID: Do you have
21	anything you would like to add yourself regarding
22	the testimony you've just given about the Union
23	and smokers rights under the Union contract, if
24	any?
25	MS. HALL: No.

1	EXAMINER MAGID: Mr. D'Aoust,
2	state your name, please?
3	THE WITNESS: Ronald J.
4	D'Aoust, D'A-o-u-s-t.
5	EXAMINER MAGID: Mr. D'Aoust, are
Ę	you aware that you have been named as an alleged
7	discriminating official in this matter?
8	THE WITNESS: Yes, I am.
9	EXAMINER MAGID: As an alleged
10	discriminating official, you have certain rights
11	in this matter. You have the absolute right to
12	testify today and you also have the right to be
13	accompanied during your testimony by a
14	representative of your own choice.
15	Now, you came into the hearing room
16	unaccompanied by anyone who was not previously
17	here. Shall I assume from that that you waive
18	your right to representation during your
19	testimony?
20	THE WITNESS: Yes, I do.
21	EXAMINER MAGID: You have been
22	called as a witness by the Agency to offer
23	testimony regarding matters raised by the
24	Complainant in her discrimination complaint
25	against the Agency.

1	You are here on official duty. And
2	you are assured ty EEOC regulations of freedom
3	from a reprisal for your testimony.
4	We do require that you testify either
5	under oath or affirmation. Do you have any
6	objection to taking an oath?
7	THE WITNESS: No, I don't.
8	RONALD J. D'AOUST,
9	having been first duly sworn, was
10	examined and testified as follows:
11	EXAMINER MAGID: State your full
12	name, please?
13	THE WITNESS: My full name is
14	Ronald John D'Aoust.
15	EXAMINER MAGID: Are you employed
16	by the Veterans Administration?
17	THE WITNESS: Yes, I am.
18	EXAMINER MAGID: In what
19	capacity?
20	THE WITNESS: I'm the Chief of
21	the Administrative Division.
22	EXAMINER MAGID: All right,
23	Nr. Winslow?
24	Before you begin your testimony,
25	Mr. Winslow, let me ask the witness if he recalls

1	giving an Affidavit in this matter and as
2	identified as Exhibit B-4 of the Complaint file.
3	Let me show it to you, Mr. D'Aoust.
4	THE WITNESS: Yes.
5	EXAMINER MAGID: Do you recall
6	giving that affidavit?
7	THE WITNESS: I do, yes.
8	EXAMINER MAGID? Have you
9	reviewed it recently?
10	THE WITNESS: I looked at it
11	yesterday.
12	EXAMINER MAGID: At the time you
13	gave the affidavit, was everything that you stated
14	in it true and correct to the best of your
15	knowledge and belief?
16	THE WITNESS: Yes, it is.
17	EXAMINER MAGID: In looking at it
18	yesterday, is it still the case that everything
19	you said in it is true and correct to the best of
20	your knowledge and belief?
21	THE WITNESS: Yes, it is.
22	EXAMINER MAGID: Now, you may
23	proceed, Mr. Winslow.
24	MR. WINSLOW: I want to
25	clarify one thing if I may.

1	EXAMINER MAGID: Excuse me,
2	before you get into the substance, Mr. Winslow,
3	are you going to offer that as an exhibit?
4	MR. WINSLOW: Yes, I am.
5	(Whereupon, Proposed Agency Exhibit l was marked for identification and entered
6	into the record).
7	EXAMINER MAGID: Proposed Agency
8	Exhibit 1, it's a one-sheet on both sides,
9	Veterans Administration, Circular 00-79-3,
10	Pebruary 1, 1979, entitled "V. A. Smoking Policy."
11	It's signed at the end by Rufas H. Wilson, Deputy
12	Administrator.
13	Ms. Hall, I'm going to show this
14	MR. WINSLOW: I gave her a
15	copy.
16	EXAMINER MAGID: Ms. Hall, do
17	have any objection to the admission of Proposed
18	Agency Exhibit 1?
19	MS. HALL: No.
20	EXAMINER MAGID: All right, there
21	being no objection, Agency Exhibit 1 is admitted.
22	(Whereupon, Agency Exhibit 1, having been previously marked, was admitted
23	into evidence)
24	BY MR. WINSLOW:
25	Q. Can you tell me whether this, to the

best of your knowledge, constitutes the V.A. Policy on smoking in the work place? A. Yes. To my knowledge, this is the last official document that V.A. has put out on the smoking policy of the Agency. Q. In other words there has been nothing further published on this question? Α. No. Q. Does it represent the practice in the Agency? Yes, it does. Tell me what that policy is as you Q. interpret this document? EXAMINER MAGID: Excuse me, Mr. Winslow, won't this document speak for itself? Well, if I may, MR. WINSLOW: I want to direct the Examiner's attention to Subparagraph Four under Paragraph 3 on the reverse side, and the rest of these are all in two pages because that's the way I reproduced it.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

. 15

15

17

13

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

At the top, there's a couple of lines that are opposite Subparagraph Pour, and I just want of the call the Examiner's attention to that statement, and if I may read it to the witness:

1 "In establishing and continuing a 2 smoking policy in work areas under their 3 jurisdiction, supervisors should strive to 4 maintain an equitable balance between the rights 5 of smokers and non-smokers. " 6 Is that your understand of the V.A. 7 policy, Mr. D'Aoust? 8 Yes, it is. 9 (Whereupon, Proposed Agency Exhibit 2 was marked for identification and entered into the record) 10 Proposed Agency 11 EXAMINER MAGID: Exhibit 2 was just handed to me by Mr. Winslow. 12 It's a Veterans Administration memo 13 of June 12, 1985, directed to all employees from 14 the Director; Subject: Information update, and 15 16 includes several subjects. One of them is smoking and I assume that that's the relevant part that 17 Mr. Winslow is interested in. 18 Do you have copy of this document, 19 20 Ms. Hall? MS. HALL: Yes. 21 EXAMINER MAGID: Do you have any 22 objections to the admission of Proposed Agency 23 24 Exhibit 2?

MS. HALL:

25

No.

1	EXAMINER MAGID: There being no
2	objections, Agency Exhibit 2 is admitted.
3	(Whereupon, Agency Exhibit 2, having been
4	previously marked, was admitted into evidence)
5	BY MR. WINSLOW:
6	Q. Can you tell me, Mr. D'Aoust, who
7	prepared this memorandum?
8	A. The Director prepared the memorandum.
9	EXAMINER MAGID: What Director is
10	that? In Washington, D. C?
11	THE WITNESS: No. Gordon
12	Clowney, the Regional Director.
13	BY MR. WINSLOW:
14	Q. Does this set forth the policy of the
15	Regional Office on this question as far as you
16	know?
17	A. Yes, it does.
18	Q. Do you have any personal knowledge of
19	the reason that this memorandum or, let's say, the
20	paragraphs on "quit smoking policy" are set forth
21	in this memo?
22	A. The Director periodically puts out
23	information and up date memoranda to all employees
24	and this one, for example, has a paragraph on
25	productivity and effectiveness on the savings

bonds campaign and on smoking.

The reason he puts out memoranda is just to let the people know what's going on, what are the issues in the office and his feelings on them.

At the time, June 12, '85, I was in the pool asking people to try to the limit their smoking, and the Director thought it might be a good idea to spread this sort of word throughout the office to give a sort of Regional Officewide information update on that.

- Q. Was this an effort on his part to support you in your efforts to reduce the smoking in the pool, if that is what you were doing?
 - A. I believe it was, yes.
- Q. What role did you play in the hiring of Laren Hall?
- A. As a Division Chief, I had the responsibility to -- well, I have the request to fill the vacancies, and I give to the personnel division a list of people based on rosters of individuals who we have interviewed and I recommend that we pick the top two or three candidates, depending on how many openings we have.

1 I take the recommendations of my 2 typing pool supervisor as to who she believes are 3 the best candidates off the personnel management 4 roster that we get to interview. 5 Q. Do you make any conscientious effort б or not to hire people who are handicapped? 7 I try to pick the best person to fit 8 the job we have available. 9 I do try to, when I can, pick Veterans Readjustment Act; VRA eligible; Viet Nam 10 11 Veteran Unemployed, handicapped. But, basically, 12 it is the best qualified person who comes up on 13 the list. 14 When Ms. Hall was hired, what Q. personal role did you have in her selection? 15 16 I would have carried the 17 recommendation of the CTA supervisor; that Ms. Hall was the best person to pick off the 18 19 register of the Centralized Transcription 20 Activity, CTA. The typing pool. That's 21 EXAMINER MAGID: 22 supervisor-~ I have three THE WITNESS: 23 subordinate supervisors and from the typing pool, 24

I see about a seventy-five percent turnover every

25

1 year, and I don't have the time or the expertise 2 to figure out who is the best candidate for the 3 typing pool. 4 I let the supervisor make her own 5 selections and unless I see something real strange in the application, I go along with the 6 7 recommendation. BY MR. WINSLOW: 8 9 Is it your testimony, Mr. D'Aoust, Q. that that's what happened in the hiring of 10 Ms. Hall, or is that your general procedure? 11 It's my general procedure, and it's 12 Α. 13 what happened. You do have a specific recollection 14 Q. 15 in the hiring of Ms. Hall? 15 Α. No, not really particularly. I would 17 have done it the same way I've done all the rest 18 of them. Let me ask the question this way: 19 Q. Did you interview Ms. Hall 20 21 personally? No, I didn't. 22 A. How is this interviewing normally 23 Q. 24 conducted?

I request to fill a vacancy.

25

A.

personnel division goes the office of personnel management for a list of eligibles.

They send out letters to the eligibles, asking them to come in for an interview. The personnel division normally gives them a sort of "this is who we are" kind of interview, saying this is the Veterans Administration Regional Office. The job we have is a typing pool job. For this job, we would like you to take a timed test for speed and accuracy.

Once they finish the test, the employee would then be referred to the division or divisions who have vacancies for that sort of a job.

when people come down for interviews for typing pool jobs, personnel takes them directly to the typing pool and the interviews are conducted in the pool by the typing pool supervisor.

pool, if there is another division looking for clerical help, they might be routed over to that other division for interviews there, but normally that is our last contact with the potential employees.

25

1 said that Laren was complaining that there was too 2 much smoke in the pool, and she was having 3 problems breathing because of it. 4 Was any action taken to deal with 5 this complaint on the part of Beverly? б Α. At the time we asked the smokers in 7 the pool to see if they could cut down on their 8 smoking and we positioned Laren's desk as close as we could to the front door of the typing pool. 9 10 Do you have a layout of that room by Q. 11 chance? 12 I just happen to. (Whereupon, Agency Exhibit 3 was 13 marked for identification and entered into the record) 14 15 EXAMINER MAGID: I was handed 16 Proposed Agency 3, which appears to be an office 17 layout. Ms. Hall, do you have any objections 18 to the admission of proposed Agency Exhibit 3? 19 20 MS. HALL: Yes, I do. 21 I can't tell anything about what it is. I can't tell anything about the measuring. 22 I would suspect this would be a 23 24 diagram of what the teletype area is now; not what it was like at the time we are discussing. 25

1 EXAMINER MAGID: All right, I'm 2 going to let Mr. Winslow lay a foundation for the 3 admission of this document by engaging in some voir dire of Mr. D'Aoust. 4 5 BY MR. WINSLOW: 6 All right, Mr. D'Aoust, first of all, Q. 7 the heavy lines on this layout appear to have been 8 added from some other document. 9 What was the other document? 10 No other document. What we have done 11 with this -- just to layout. 12 EXAMINER MAGID: Explain how this 13 document came to be and what it is. 14 THE WITNESS: I have 15 blueprints of our building. The grids on this 16 floor map are five-foot squares. The portion of 17 this floor that I photocopied here is the portion 18 of the floor that includes the typing unit, the 19 publications unit, the teletype unit and the 20 entrance to the typing unit from the mail room. 21 The typing unit EXAMINER MAGID: is identified as CTA? 22 Right, CTA. 23 THE WITNESS: 24 BY MR. WINSLOW: Where is the mail room? 25 Q.

The mail room would be the lower 1 A. right corner of the map. 2 You don't have that marked; is that 3 Q. correct? 4 I don't. 5 What we have plotted with these heavy 6 lines are the current locations of the desks, the 7 typing desks in the typing pool. 8 Laren's right. They have changed 9 slightly over -- they change all the time, but 10 they have changed since her hiring on but not 11 significantly. Just a couple fewer desks now than 12 there were then. 13 I was in this EXAMINER MAGID: 14 office at the invitation of the V. A. and Ms. Hall 15 on the August 27, Mr. D'Aoust. Have they changed 15 the since then? 17 No. 18 THE WITNESS: At that time I EXAMINER MAGID: 19 observed that the desks were not 90 degrees to the 20 wall. This document shows that the desks are 90 21 degrees? 22 I just sort of THE WITNESS: 23

penned in this as approximately where all these

24

25

desk are.

EXAMINER MAGID: This document also shows the desks are five feet long. Are the desks five feet long?

THE WITNESS: No, 39 inches for the most part.

BY MR. WINSLOW:

- Q. Are you saying this is not a scale document as far as the desk locations are concerned?
- A. They're approximate locations. The desks would be within the five foot square that the desk is actually located.

What is the

EXAMINER MAGID:

purpose of your offering this into evidence?

MR. WINSLOW: All I'm trying
to do is lay some foundation for the discussion as
to where Ms. Hall and the other people were
located as he is describing the movement of these
people around in this area.

He spoke, for example, of the front of the room and the front door. It's not clear to me which is the front door and which is the front of the room.

I think if he describes while using such a diagram, where these places are, it would

be a lot easier for everybody.

required to use the Federal Rules of Evidence, I would be required to deny the admission of this document for failure to lay a proper foundation.

However, since we're not required to comply with those rules I'm going to accept it into admission although it may not be an exact replica and it may be used for Mr. D'Aoust's testimony and the testimony of others.

Agency Exhibit 3 is admitted.

(Whereupon, Agency Exhibit 3, having been previously marked, was admitted into evidence)

BY MR. WINSLOW:

- Q. Now, will you tell us where it front door is?
- A. We consider the front door of the typing pool to be at the lower right-hand corner.

 This is the front door. (Indicating on document)

The supervisor's desk is immediately to the left on entering the front door of the typing pool.

Q. Now, you indicated where you had moved Ms. Hall when you first received word that she was having trouble with the smoking in the

1 area. 2 I want you to tell or show us where 3 she was placed in this room at that time? 4 A. Laren's desk was here. 5 EXAMINER MAGID: You will have to 6 describe it verbally, so the court reporter can 7 take it down. 8 THE WITNESS: It's about 20 9 feet inside the door slightly on the left of the 10 front entrance to the typing pool. 11 BY MR. WINSLOW: 12 Was this where she was originally located when she was hired or was this where she 13 14 was moved to? I'm not sure. 15 A. Point to it 16 EXAMINER MAGID: 17 again. This position. 18 THE WITNESS: 19 BY MR. WINSLOW: You are pointing to the desk that 20 0. appears directly above the supervisor's desk on 21 22 the sheet, right? 23 Right. Α. I'm not sure if that was the first 24 desk she was ever assigned, but that's where Laren 25

spent her first several months in the typing pool.

Q. Why did you put her there?

б

lő

A. Normally, when a new employee is hired, we try to cluster them around the supervisor just because the new employee has many more questions to be answered by the supervisor; format, forms, whatever.

Then, after the smoking question was raised, we kept her in that position and attempted to move the smokers to the opposite corner of the room.

- Q. You're pointing again. I would like you to describe where this corner is?
- A. Laren's desk is in the lower right-hand corner, and we moved the smokers to the upper left-hand corner.
- Q. Is that the so-called back of the room?
 - A. Back of the room, yes.
- Q. And, there is a door on that wall and when I say, "that wall," I'm talking about the so-called back of the room.

EXAMINER MAGID: Excuse me, when you're talking about who was at the back of the room, was it Laren at the back of the room or the

1	smokers?
2	THE WITNESS: The smokers were
3	in the back corner.
4	MS. HALL: May I interject
5	something?
6	EXAMINER MAGID: You'll have an
7	opportunity.
8	MS. HALL: I think it's
9	more accurate if we hold it up side down.
10	EXAMINER MAGID: You will have an
11	opportunity to cross-examine.
12	BY MR. WINSLOW:
13	Q. In other words, the smokers were in
14	the upper if you are holding the thing so you
15	can read the printing on it in the upper left-hand
16	corner.
17	A. Right.
18	Q. Is that correct?
19	A. That's correct.
20	Q. And, the door that goes into the
21	publication from the pool is in the upper
22	right-hand corner; is that correct?
23	A. Yes, it is.
24	Q. Now, at the time that Laren was
25	hired, were there two supervisors desks near the

1	so-called front door on the opposite side of the
2	room?
3	A. Right.
4	Q. Whose desks were they?
5	A. What supervisors?
6	Q. What supervisors.
7	A. Supervisor Beverly Keith, and next to
8	her would have been the group leader, Donna
9	Shephard.
10	Q. When these prospective employees are
11	interviewed, how do they normally enter the room?
12	A. They would normally come in through
13	the front entrance.
14	Q. Can they see the other typist when
15	they come in?
16	A. Yes, it is one open room.
17	Q. How big is this room; not square
18	feet?
19	A. How big.
20	EXAMINER MAGID: You said each
21	aquare is five feet.
22	THE WITNESS: It's 2,900
23	square feet. It's fifty-five feet long by
24	fifty-five feet wide and there is a little cut out
25	out of it.

1	BY MR. WINSLOW:
2	Q. When you moved the smokers up in
3	the upper left-hand corner, did that solve the
4	problem?
5	A. No, it didn't, not to Laren's
6	satisfaction.
7	EXAMINER MAGID: Let's ask your
8	opinion about it. In your opinion did it solve
9	the problem?
10	THE WITNESS: I saw it as a
11	way to help.
12	EXAMINER MAGID: That wasn't the
13	question, Mr. D'Aoust. The question was whether
14	it cured the problem?
15	THE WITNESS: I thought it
16	did.
17	EXAMINER MAGID: You thought that
13	there was no longer any smoke getting near
19	Ms. Hall?
20	THE WITNESS: I thought it was
21	as good a cure as I could come up with at the
22	time.
23	BY MR. WINSLOW:
24	Q. Was there anything further done then
n e	as that point that amparently did not catiafy

Ms. Hall?

A. Well, several weeks later, maybe a couple months later, I'm not quite sure of the time, Laren again complained that although we had asked, people hadn't quite stopped smoking in there.

I called all the smokers in my office and asked them personally to try to limit their smoking as much as possible. Some did and some didn't. Then there was a lot of smoke coming in from the mail activity, the mail room, coming in at the front door.

- Q. At this meeting?
- A. No, subsequent to this.

We asked and she said there might be less smoke in the back because smoke doesn't normally come in from publications.

The publications area is a large room, probably twice the size of the typing pool. It had stacks and stacks of forms and pamphlets, papers stock, in general.

We don't allow smoking in the paper stock area. So, we ended up moving Laren's desk to the rear of the room.

EXAMINER MAGID: Excuse me, why

1	don't you allow smoking in there?
2	THE WITNESS: Because of a
3	fire hazard.
4	EXAMINER MAGID: Do employees
5	work in there?
6	THE WITNESS: Yes, they do.
7	EXAMINER MAGID: So, those
8	employees who do work in there are not permitted
9	to smoke in there?
10	THE WITNESS: That's correct.
11	EXAMINER MAGID: Because of the
12	hazard of fire?
13	THE WITNESS: Right.
14	EXAMINER MAGID: And, fire would
15	obviously be a danger to their health and safety;
16	is that correct?
17	THE WITNESS: And to the
18	building safety also, yes.
19	BY MR. WINSLOW:
20	Q. Let me ask this:
21	Do I understand that there is no
22	smoking allowed at all in the publications area or
23	that the no smoking ban is limited to the stacks
24	where the forms are stored?
25	A. At the time it was limited to the

stacks to the forms area itself. There was smoking permitted and done near the photocopy machine, at the desk of the two employees who worked in that unit.

- Q. You say "at the time."

 Has that policy been changed?
- A. Yes, it has.

б

- Q. What is the change?
- A. Around last Christmastime, the GSA authorized new wall covering on the fourteenth floor in the corridor area.

Laren was already sitting in the back of the room by the publications door.

The the guy who put up this wall paper was smoking one of the most outrageous cigars I had ever smelled. Laren mentioned between that guy's cigar and the glue they were using to put the wallpaper up, she was having problems breathing.

we then made it a policy that there was no smoking in the corridor area leading into the publications unit and no smoking in publications at all.

we cleared this with the employees who worked there. Neither of them smoked.

1	Occasionally, their visitors would. But we put an
2	ash tray outside the door leading to the
3	publications area and put signs up saying "Smoking
4	Prohibited in this Publication Reproduction Area."
5	EXAMINER MAGID: In order to
6	implement that policy, was the Union consulted?
7	THE WITNESS: Yes, they were.
8	EXAMINER MAGID: What was the
9	nature of the consultation?
10	THE WITNESS: I wasn't part of
11	the conversation, but the Director, Mr. Clowney,
12	and Artie Pierce, who was the Union president, got
13	together and decided that this was something that
14	we could do to accommodate Laren and it wouldn't
15	inconvenience the Union members who were involved
16	in this.
17	EXAMINER MAGID: Because they
18	didn't smoke?
19	BY MR. WINSLOW:
20	Q. Whose idea was it, if you know?
21	A. I'm not sure whose idea. I think it
22	may have been Artie's idea.
23	EXAMINER MAGID: When you say
24	"whose idea," what idea are you talking about?
25	THE WITNESS: The idea to post

1	the "No Smoking" signs leading into publications.
2	EXAMINER MAGID: "You're
3	testifying it was the Union's idea to post no
4	smoking signs?
5	THE WITNESS: I think it was.
6	EAMINER MAGID: Whose idea was
7	it to bring in the Union in the first place?
8	THE WITNESS: I don't know.
9	EXAMINER MAGID: Was there any
10	written agreement with the Union which permitted
11	the Agency to change this past practice by making
12	a new no smoking order?
13	THE WITNESS: I don't believe
14	there is, no.
15	EXAMINER MAGID: All right,
16	Mr. Winslow?
17	BY MR. WINSLOW:
18	Q. Was not part of this proposal or was
19	a part of this proposal the idea of putting an ash
20	stand immediately next to the door running into
21	the publications area underneath the sign that
22	we're talking about?
23	A. Yes.
24	The lead clerk in the publications
25	unit is the Union steward for the fourteenth

floor. It may have been his idea originally to Artie that he wouldn't mind and Stan wouldn't mind-

- Q. Who is Stan?
- A. Stanley Odomshik is the other person who works in the publications room.
 - Q. You have two?
 - A. Two.

Q. I want to back track if I may one step.

You stated that ordinarily new employees, such as Laren, would be positioned near the supervisors so that they could ask questions and they would have more occasion to do so than more seasoned employees.

Is there any other reason why you would place a new employee or certain specific employees in that particular spot?

A. Well, there is:

On the left side of the room, the window side of the room, is wired for our word processing system and normally it takes awhile before a new employee is familiar enough with what we do to get any kind of extra production done by putting them on a word processor.

Other than that, no.

The reason for keeping them in that lower right-hand quadrant would be to keep them near the supervisors for questioning and answering.

- Q. If a employee were not working at a level that you felt was adequate, would you conclude that it could be desirable to have them in that spot?
 - A. Yes.

- Q. Why?
- A. Normally, if someone is not performing adequately, if they have problems either with the quantity of work or the quality of of work, the quantity of work produced depends a lot on how much time you spend at your desk.

So, we try to keep them, if quantity is the problem, under the eyes of the supervisor and make sure they're not out roaming around and not typing.

If quality is the problem, we need them there to ask the group leader, "Should this be done; should this verb be third person singular; how do you spell something; those kinds of questions."

Q. Have you ever had any problems in either of those respects with Laren's work?

A. No.

Laren is one the best typist I have.

Q. So far, I think we have Laren up someplace near the door at the back of the room in an effort to try to isolate her from the smokers if I understood what you said.

Where were the smokers, then, at that point?

A. The typing pool ranges from have 18 to 25 people in it. I do have a high turnover in the typing pool. The number of smokers in the pool ranges from 5 to 6. It just depends on who we hire and who happens to smoke.

I can't be positive of who was sitting where at any given time because people move around; you know, reassigned duties on word processors. Certain kinds of jobs needed to be pushed out, and you have to rearrange some of the seating arrangements.

But, in general, we have had smokers at the back corner desk, the upper left corner desk, the desk next to that.

Elaine smokes not normally on the job

in the position below that. Occasionally, back here in the third position over. "Right now, we have a typist sitting right here who smokes, but normally they would be grouped in this area.

Q. Do you have any problems in relocating these people?

A. I have problems in relocating the word processing qualified typists and we have a few people and probably right now I've got seven word processors sitting there--word processing terminals--and I think I have eight people who know how to use them; eight production typists.

The group leaders and supervisors know how to use them but they don't.

So, I'm somewhat limited on who I can move out of that corner or that two line strips.

- Q. Is that where the word processors are located?
 - A. Yes.
 - Q. Along the windows?
- A. Along the windows and ten feet in from the windows.

The way the building is set up the wire trenches run north and south in the middle of the five-foot grids. So, I've only got wires

1 strung from the word processors down from these Li rw. 2 two lines. 3 Q. If you hire new people, do you consider whether they smoke or they don't smoke 4 5 when you hire them? No, we don't. б Α. Why not? 7 Q. I'm looking for the person who can 8 kick out work. I think we're pretty blind to 9 other characteristics. I want someone who can 10 type a lot of lines and can type them accurately. 11 We don't ask people if they smoke or not smoke. 12 If you ban smoking in that area--and 13 Q. I think this is an obvious answer--could you hire 14 the best qualified individual? 15 I don't believe we could, no. 16 Α. Do you have any EXAMINER MAGID: 17 basis for that belief other than conjecture? 18 The best typists THE WITNESS: 19 I have smokes right now. He was hired subsequent 20 to Laren. 21 EXAMINER MAGID: I don't 22 understand your answer. Do you have any basis for 23 24 believing? That I couldn't THE WITNESS: 25

1	get the best qualified typists if I banned
2	smoking?
3	EXAMINER MAGID: Yes.
4	For example, what makes you think
5	that that best typist would not have accepted the
б	job in the work area?
7	THE WITNESS: I have no way of
8	knowing if they would or would not have accepted
9	the job. All I'm saying is that I have a
10	potential of losing a good candidate. It depends
11	on the individual.
12	EXAMINER MAGID: If you have a
13	seventy percent turnover, you have a potential for
14	losing a lot of good and poor candidates, smoking
15	and non-smoking, don't you?
16	THE WITNESS: I do.
17	EXAMINER MAGID: Do you have any
18	basis for believing if you ban smoking in that
19	area that people would refuse the job because of
20	that?
21	THE WITNESS: I have no way of
22	knowing that.
23	EXAMINER MAGID: All right.
24	BY WINSLOW:
25	Q. Have some of the employees who smoke

¥	indicated that they feel that they have a right to
2	smoke?
3	A. Yes, smokers' rights have been a
4	question.
5	Q. How serious a question?
6	A. In the statement given to the EEO
7	investigator, Mr. Drawn
8	EXAMINER MAGID: Are you going to
9	talk from hearsay now, from what you read in the
10	complaint file?
11	THE WITNESS: From what I read
12	in the complaint file.
13	EXAMINER MAGID: I think
14	Mr. Winslow is asking you from personal knowledge.
15	THE WITNESS: I've never asked
16	individuals if not smoking would create a big
17	problem with that. I've never gone to any
18	individual employee and said, "If we stopped
19	smoking, would you die?" I've never come out and
20	said that to anyone.
21	EXAMINER MAGID: You have not?
22	BY MR. WINSLOW:
23	Q. Have you had any problem in convicing
24	these people that they should voluntarily quit
25	smoking?

A. Yes, I have.

б

I have had several of the smokers in my office more than a couple of times asking them to cut down on their smoking.

Laren has occasionally mentioned either directly to me or through the supervisor to me that an employee was wandering around with a cigarette lit coming by her desk.

I'll call that employee in and say, "Look, we have tried to ask you to limit your smoking to your desk area if you can."

Because the nature of their jobs,
it's tough to keep them tied to their desks all
the time. They have to get up and get forms which
are in the rack at one of the back walls. They
have to get up and ask questions of the
supervisors and group leader about format.

And, people have indicated to me, yes, they would have problems, but they don't think about it when they stand up from their desks, and they you walk around with it.

Q. Have you had any occasion that they deliberately resented or harassed Laren by walking by her desk unnecessarily with a cigarette in their hands; that they have been resistive to your

efforts to get them to confine their smoking if 1 that's is what you've done? -- " 2 I don't think resistive, no. I would 3 relate it more to not thinking before they stand 4 5 up and walk. I will ask the question a different 6 Q. 7 way. Do you think they were cooperative? 8 Yes, I do think they have have 9 A. cooperated in general. 10 So far, we have Laren up in the what 11 I call the right rear corner of the room. 12 like for you to tell me what next was done to try 13 to alleviate this problem? 14 Ι£ I'm assuming it was not resolved. 15 that's not true tell me it was solved? 16 No, it wasn't solved by that move. 17 Α. We purchased a couple of window fans 18 in an attempt to blow the smoke away from Laren. 19 Let me interrupt you. When you say 20 Q. window fans, do you mean you put fans in the 21 22 window? No. 19-inch square fans that you 23 normally see in windows. The windows in the 24 building don't open; so we have them sitting on

1 desks and cabinets to try to blow the smoke away. 2 EXAMINER MAGID: You were talking 3 about the 19-inch fans that you purchased and what you did with them. 5 THE WITNESS: We put the fans 6 in the room, turned them on, hoping they would 7 improve the situation around Laren's desk and try 8 to keep the smoke in one area. BY MR. WINSLOW: 9 Were the fans directed at Laren? 10 11 No, I think away from Laren, blowing away from her deak. 12 So, you think. Why do you say you 13 Q. 14 think? I didn't watch the placement of fans 15 every day, and they do get moved around 16 periodically but for the most part, they would 17 have been pointing towards the smokers. 18 19 EXAMINER MAGID: If they were brought in to solve the problem regarding 20 Ms. Hall, why were they moved every day? 21 THE WITNESS: The fans 22 presented a problem in themselves. They did blow 23

paper around and the typing pool is a mass of

paper. They got in the way with certain people.

24

1 It depends on who was at their desk that day. 2 wouldn't want the fans blowing directly on to 3 someone. The typing pool has a high absentee 5 rate, higher than anywhere else, and often there is someone missing and you would move the fan onto 7 that desk for that day. 8 0. Is that because of sick leave that 9 you have a high absentee rate? 10 Sick leave, annual leave, leave A. 11 without pay. Is that sick leave due to an excess 12 0. amount of smoke in the room? 13 If you know. EXAMINER MAGID: 14 15 THE WITNESS: No, not 15 generally. BY MR. WINSLOW: 17 18 Have any of the employees complained 19 about the way in which they have been obliged to 20 take sick leave because of the fans themselves? 21 Α. No. Have any of them complained that they 22 Q. 23 were cold as a consequence? Yes, they complain, "The fan is 24 blowing on me and I'm in a draft. Repoint the 25

fan; turn it off."

- Q. In other words, the need for shifting the fans around was, one, somebody might be using the desk that the fan was sitting on so you would put it on the a desk where there was nobody stationed on the day in question; and, two, on the need to keep the fan from blowing on someone who might be directly in front of it. Is that what you're telling us?
 - A. Right.
 - O. How did that work?
- A. It worked all right during the summer months when it was hot and stuffy in the building.

In the winter when it got cold is when the complaints about the blowing draft really started to come up.

Our building tends to be hot in the summer and cold in the winter, and when it's cold several people complained about the added coldness of having air being blown over the tops of their heads.

- Q. What control do you have personally or do the supervisors have over the air conditioning and heating system in the building?
 - A. We have no control over it.

Q. Why not?

A. Our building is GSA leased space.

GSA regulations require that the temperature be in a certain range. I believe it's up to 85.

I'm not real sure, but there is a maximum range for the summer and a minimum range for the winter and GSA is the one who supposedly adjusts the thermostats as to maintain the building at that range.

They also have control over the air circulation in the building. The building is on for the most part a closed air system. In the summer, the reason GSA uses a closed air system is so they don't have to cool outside air and in the winter so they don't have to heat outside. They just move the air that's in the building already.

- Q. If there is smoke in the building in any location would it be circulated into the typing pool?
 - A. Yes, it would be.
- Q. Is there any difference between the air conditioning or air handling in the typing pool than that elsewhere in the building?
 - A. Not generally.

Most places in the building depend on air circulating through the plenum which is the space between the ceiling panels and the floor above. There is about a five-foot space up there where the air sits and moves whenever they turn on the blowers.

O. Where does it come out?

б

- A. The comes out along the cracks along the window ledges and through the ceiling trenches like this one up here. (Indicating.)
- Q. Does this in any way limit the arrangements that you could have in the typing pool, for example, to provide a separate enclosed space for an individual?
 - A. Yes, it does.

unless you install a separate air conditioning system in a room, you're tied to the building's air conditioning system, and the building's air conditioning system reuses the same air over and over again, blowing from one side of the building to the other.

so, anywhere on the fourteenth floor is going to receive air from the window cracks and ceiling vents the same as anywhere else on the fourteenth floor.

1	Q. Have you considered the possibility
2	of putting a separate walled area area around
3	Laren's desk?
4	A. No, we haven't.
5	Q. When I say that, I don't mean has
6	this been done. I'm asking have you considered
7	the possibility?
8	A. We considered it.
9	On the floor map again if you would
LO	look at it, there is a tiny little room and it's
11	marked as Room 1444 on this floor map.
12	Q. Why don't you point to it if you
13	will?
14	A. It's in the lower right-hand corner.
15	That room contains our old dictation system which
Ló	we replaced in the last two years.
17	The room is relatively empty now,
8 1	although we have now installed some printers in
9	there for a new computer system we have. For a
20	few weeks we tried to station Laren's desk in
21	there in that room.
22	EXAMINER MAGID: Excuse me,
33	Mr. D'Aoust, I think the question asked was
24	whether you considered adding walls.
25	THE WITNESS: Right.

1 EXAMINER MAGID: In essence, a 2 private office for Ms. Hall. 3 THE WITNESS: Not seriously, 4 no. 5 BY MR. WINSLOW: Why not seriously? б 7 For one thing it would require GSA's 8 approval to change walls and open space. It would require funding from V.A. Central Office in 9 Washington to the rent clause and the idea of a 10 11 centralized transcription activity, part of that 12 idea is to have all of your typists in view of the 13 supervisor so she can control their activities. We really just didn't have the money, 14 and a separate office wouldn't help because she 15 would be getting the same air from the vent that 16 she would be getting on the floor. 17 EXAMINER MAGID: You say you 18 haven't had the money. How much money? 19 THE WITNESS: Installing two 20 walls and a door would probably cost seven or 21 eight thousand dollars. 22 BY MR. WINSLOW: 23 How do you know? 24 Q. The reason for the complete square in 25 Α.

the typing pool is because we moved this wall out five feet and erected a little partial wall and put in a door. And that move there cost six thousand dollars to install one wall and a door. **EXAMINER MAGID:** You never got an estimate for putting walls up for Hs. Hall; is that correct? THE WITNESS: No. So, you don't **EXAMINER MAGID:** know how much it cost? That's correct. THE WITNESS:

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

13

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

As part of my duties as Chief of the Administrative Division, I'm in charge of space and I'm also in charge of funding those kinds of moves.

And, we have had walls moved and installed in other places; some of them we pay for, some of them, private agencies. We also provide space or service organizations.

'Paralyzed Veterans had a wall moved recently and they paid for it, and the price tends to be in that range.

But you never EXAMINER MAGID: specifically got a bid or an estimate regarding putting up walls for Ms. Hall, nor did you ever

1 make a request funds or that purpose; is that 2 correct? 3 THE WITNESS: That's correct. I said we hadn't seriously considered it. 4 5 EXAMINER MAGID: It crossed your mind, but it never got much further than that; is 6 7 that correct? Actually, it 8 THE WITNESS: crossed my mind and I don't believe that would 9 10 help. You didn't 11 EXAMINER MAGID: 12 persue it because you didn't believe it would 13 help? 14 THE WITNESS: Right. 15 BY MR. WINSLOW: Was that belief also based on your Q. 16 experience with the cost of such projects in other 17 areas where you had to remove a wall? 18 Not so much the cost as the fact that 19 20 it wouldn't change the way the air moves. 21 Whether or not, what I'm trying to find out is--and I gather that you've more or less 22 23 answered this -- in your job you have experience with the cost of establishing this kind of 24 25 arrangement; is that correct?

A. Yes.

Q. And, you have a pretty go feel just from your own experience as the person responsible for establishing space of what this would cost?

- A. Yes, I have.
- 0. Is that correct?
- A. Yes.

EXAMINER MAGID: Do you have any idea what the effect would be if you did put up such walls for an essentially private office for Ms. Hall?

Do you know whether a separate ventilation system or air filters, those types of machines that stand, alone and don't depend on the building ventilation, do you have any idea what the cost, if any, of those would be?

THE WITNESS:

If you created a small office, and you want to move the air at all, you would almost need to install a separate air moving system.

On this floor there is a small office over here that doesn't have contact with the windows, and because it doesn't have contact with the windows, it misses that air incoming flow.

It's probably the stuffiest room we have.

EXAMINER MAGID: The question that I'm asking, Mr. D'Aoust, is whether in your consideration as to whether new walls would help, did you quarter that you could have put in air filters to interrupt the natural flow so that the air that does flow into that little office would be filtered? Did you ever consider that?

THE WITNESS: No, I didn't consider that.

EXAMINER MAGID: Okay.

THE WITNESS: In keeping with

building a new office, no.

BY MR. WINSLOW:

Q. Do you understand you to say that if you would have enclosed the area that Ms. Hall occupied, it would be not only necessary to erect walls but also to provide an entirely separate heating and ventilating and cooling system to serve that office and that in conjunction with that you probably would put in some type of filtering system to filter out the smoke that might come through the normal system, or through system, because somewhere you would have to have the air coming from.

A. Yes, you would have to do that.

1	Q. I think you would have to have
2	someplace.
3	EXAMINER MAGID: Excuse me,
4	Mr. Winslow.
5	You're coming awfully close to
б	testifying yourself and if not testifying, you're
7	coming awfully close to presenting leading
8	questions of your own witness.
9	MR. WINSLOW: I'm trying to
10	clarify for my mind and your mind what it is going
11	to entail.
12	EXAMINER MAGID: My mind is
13	clear, Mr. Winslow.
14	If yours is not, please ask questions
15	that are not so leading.
16	BY MR. WINSLOW:
17	Q. Would a filter solve the problem? If
18	you were to erect a separate office, is that all
19	you would need to do?
20	A. I'm not sure a filter would be all
21	you would need. You would also need an air
22	circulation system.
23	Q. That is my question.
24	That is exactly what I'm trying to
25	get out.

EXAMINER MAGID: Mr. Winslow, are you getting close to the end of your examination or shall we break for lunch? Let's go off the record. ---000----(Whereupon, a short discussion was held off the record) ---000---(Whereupon, the morning session was adjourned at 12:05 p.m.) ---000---

1 PROCEEDINGS 2 Afternoon Session 3 1:00 p.m. 4 EXAMINER MAGID: Back on the S record, Mr. D'Aoust is still on the witness stand. We're back from lunch. 7 All right, Mr. Winslow? 8 CONTINUED DIRECT EXAMINATION 9 10 BY MR. WINSLOW: So far we had moved Laren to the rear 11 12 of the room near the door. What was done next to resolve the 13 14 problem? Actually, there were no more seat 15 moving changes that were done to resolve the 16 17 problem. Laren at that time asked if we were 18 going to train her on the word processor. Having 19 her on the right-hand side of the room meant that 20 she couldn't be trained on the computer terminals 21 because they're tied to those two wire lines that 22 run to the left side of the room. 23 We ended up moving Laren to the lower 24

left-hand corner of the room to a word processing

station, there again trying to get around the

system as a computer terminal operator at the same

time keeping her as far as we could from the

smoking computer operators in the back of the

room.

So, this is Laren's current desk

So, this is Laren's current desk here, lower left-hand corner.

Q. Let me ask a question:

There is one desk that is in the--or at least something is indicated there I assume it's a desk--in the very lower left-hand corner; yet, when I observed you pointing, you seemed to be pointing to a desk that was in front of that one?

A. Yes.

- Q. And, that that was Laren's desk: Who sits at the one in the very lower corner?
- A. The one at the lower corner is actually the system control unit. It is the main display that controls the entire computer system for the V.A.

There are actually 21 terminals scattered through four floors, and that terminal is the controlling terminal for all of them.

We use it for training in parts of

e use it for craiming in pares o

of the day, we have to use it for control purposes.

There is no desk attached to that terminal. It's just a terminal all by itself.

- Q. What else was done, if anything, to try to accommodate Laren's lung problem?
- A. In March of '85, which is about the time Laren was filing the EEO complaint originally, we had one of our teletypists get promoted.

Teletype is also under my control.

It's a separate unit. They're in this room below the typing pool. Sonya was the teletypist, Grade 4 teletypist, and she got promoted to the Personnel Division Secretary position. At that time I had an opening in teletype.

The reason we thought to try to cross train Laren over there was the teletype room has a separate air conditioning system. We installed two, one and a half ton air conditioners in the ceiling of that room to ensure that that air in that room met the criteria for the computer equipment that is in there.

We have a system known as Vadats.

Vadats is our teletype contact with all the other

V.A. Agencies. Our data processing direct link is
through Vadats.

We also have in that room the central
processing unit for the computer system. That is
an I.B.M. 5520 system and it requires cooling not

We can't guarantee that in our building because GSA lets the heat get higher than that in here. So, we had to install these air conditioners in the ceiling.

Once Sonya left that position, the other two employees who were in that room didn't smoke. So, we had no one smoking in a room with three tons of air conditioning in the ceiling. It's an enclosed room.

Laren cross trained there for a couple of weeks, a few hours a day, and on April 25--I happened to have kept records of some this stuff because it was an issue at the time.

EXAMINER MAGID: When did you

review those records?

to exceed 75 degrees.

8.

THE WITNESS: Yesterday.

EXAMINER MAGID: Do you have

copies of those records?

1 THE WITNESS: I do. 2 EXAMINER MAGID: All right, at an 3 appropriate time, we will need to see a copy of those records. 5 THE WITNESS: On April 25, I б called Laren in my office to give her the letter 7 from the Director saying we acknowledge receipt of 8 the EEO complaint. 9 At that time, I asked her, "How about 10 going in teletype? What do you think of that 11 job?" 12 At the time Laren was noncommital. She really didn't see herself as a teletypist. 13 She didn't think it had the promotion potential 14 that the typing pool positions have. 15 16 I explained to her it was a lateral; they were both Grade 4 positions because by that 17 time we had promoted Laren to the target grade in 18 the pool which is a Grade 4 typist. 19 Laren came in September of '84 and 20 this is March of '85; so she had her six months 21 and was eligible for the grade increase. 22 Was she promoted 23 EXAMINER MAGID: as soon as she was eligible for that grade 24

25

increase?

THE WITNESS:

Yes.

She trained a few more hours in teletype through the next couple of weeks and on May 2 we talked again; and on May 2, she declined my offer of a lateral transfer saying it wasn't the job she wanted to do. She felt it didn't have the promotional potential the typing pool had.

I explained that several people had been promoted out of teletype to Grade 5 positions in other positions, but she didn't see that as the tact to go.

Subsequent to that, we tried to make an opening in the finance division not a division under my control and in the voucher audit section, and we detailed Laren over there.

It's a bigger room, hopefully with fewer smokers, but I'm not sure that that's true. She was over there for a few weeks, maybe even a month and the detail ended, and she came back to the typing pool.

Then, the next action was to be moved up to the front to be on the computer equipment.

BY MR. WINSLOW:

- Q. What documentation do you have?
- I have reports of contact.

I have reports of con

I usually jot down notes to myself after talking to employees; otherwise I forget what I said and what they said. So, I usually do them within a day or two, usually the same day though.

- O. Are those the notes?
- A. Yes, here's the two that I mentioned, the April 25 note and the May 2 note.
- Q. Does the other document relate to something else?
- A. Yes, the other document is dated July 2, '85.

EXAMINER MAGID: Is that the day she declined the job?

THE WITNESS: No, she declined on May 2. On July 2, Laren had just come back from being off for a couple of days. Her lung condition was bothering her and she had gone to personnel to file a Worker's Compensation claim, and she stopped to let me know she had done that.

At the same time she stated that I should fire her or transfer her to some location where she would not be affected by the smoking typists.

I explained that I did not want to or

1 have any reason to fire her, and that I had no typist position that was not exposed to cigarette 2 3 smoke because by this time we had filled the vacancy in teletype that had existed and offered 5 her the lateral. Are the skills the same, basically, Q. 7 in a teletype job is in the typing pool? 8 Yes, there is a lot of transfer skill. 10 The teletypist works at a computer key board, typing on a visual display terminal. 11 The basic difference as a typist you're typing 12 text documents, narration from dictation. 13 14 The teletypists pieces are transferring written code sheets, alpha numeric 15 16 strings of information onto a computer scan and 17 transmitting it. That is what the EXAMINER MAGID: 18 19 teletypists are doing? They're both THE WITNESS: 20 basically data transcription proceedings. They're 21 taking data from one and putting it onto something 22 23 else. EXAMINER MAGID: One is jibberish 24

and the other is intelligible information.

1 THE WITNESS: That's right. 2 Knowing our dictators, they could both be jibberish, but the jobs are very similar. 3 Normally, two of the current 5 teletypists came from the typing pool originally. б It's a lateral move. It has been a path between those two. In fact, I have considered in the past and still may detail people out of the typing 9 pool. They can become a teletypist within a day 10 or two. EXAMINER MAGID: Is it within 11 12 your authority to unilaterally transfer people back and forth? 13 I can detail THE WITNESS: 14 people for a period not to exceed two weeks. 15 EXAMINER MAGID: But you can't 16 17 transfer them without their permission? THE WITNESS: No. 18 I can detail them without their 19 20 permission. BY MR. WINSLOW: 21 Are both jobs basically typing jobs? 22 Both jobs basically are typing jobs. 23 You're dealing with a typing key board with both 24 25 jobs.

1	. MR. WINSLOW: Do you want us
2	to introduce them?
3	EXAMINER MAGID: I'd like to see
4	them, please.
5	These are the notes that you reviewed
6	prior to your testimony; is that correct?
7	THE WITNESS: Yes.
8	EXAMINER MAGID: You gave
9	testimony today based on the material in these
10	notes; is that correct?
11	THE WITNESS: I just did now,
12	right.
13	EXAMINER MAGID: Were these
14	written by you on the dates indicated?
15	THE WITNESS: Yes, they were.
16	EXAMINER MAGID: Ms. Hall, I'm
17	going to show you these documents and allow you to
18	review them. If you wish them admitted into
19	evidence, let me know.
20	MS. HALL: I have a
21	somewhat different version of the conversations.
22	EXAMINER MAGID: Notwithstanding
23	that, would you like any of those three documents
24	admitted into evidence?
25	MS. HALL: Do you mean it's

1	up to me?
2	EXAMINER HAGID: If you wish to
3	offer them as a Complainant's Exhibit for some
4	reason that you believe is relevant, you have the
5	right to offer them.
6	MS. HALL: Fine.
7	EXAMINER MAGID: You do wish them
8	admitted?
9	MS. HALL: Yes.
10	EXAMINER MAGID: Mr. Winslow, do
11	you have any objection to the admission of these
12	documents?
13	MR. WINSLOW: I'm a little
14	confused. I thought they were going to be our
15	exhibits.
16	EXAMINER MAGID: Well, let's make
17	them joint exhibits then.
18	MR. WINSLOW: I take it, Ron,
19	you don't have any objection or you want to have
20	them introduced; is that correct?
21	EXAMINER MAGID: Wait a minute.
22	It is not up to Mr. D'Aoust.
23	MR. WINSLOW: I know, but I
24	want to find out from him so I know what position
25	I should take.

1	EXAMINER MAGID: Mr. D'Aoust, do
2	you have any personal objection to the admission
3	of these documents?
4	MR. WINSLOW: I don't see
5	anything wrong with them. I would like to have
6	them entered.
7	EXAMINER MAGID: All right, I'm
8	going to put them in as to date order.
9	It was your intent to offer them.
10	Would you desire them to be marked as Agency
11	Exhibits?
12	MR. WINSLOW: Yes.
13	EXAMINER MAGID: Agency Exhibit 4
14	is a report of contact signed by Mr. D'Aoust on
15	April 25, 1985. The person contacted was Laren
16	Hall. That is Agency Exhibit 4 and it is
17	admitted.
18	(Whereupon, Agency Exhibit 4 having been previously marked, was admitted into
19	evidence)
20	(Whereupon, Agency Exhibit 5 was marked for identification and entered into the
21	record)
22	EXAMINER MAGID: Agency Exhibit 5
23	is a report of contact signed by Mr. D'Aoust, the
24	person contacted, Laren Hall. The date of the
25	contact May 2, 1985.

1 Ms. Hall has stipulated to its 2 admission also so it is admitted. 3 (Whereupon, Agency Exhibit 5, having been previously marked, was admitted into evidence) 5 (Whereupon, Agency Exhibit Number 6 was marked for identification and entered into 6 the record) 7. Agency Exhibit 6 EXAMINER MAGID: 8 is report of contact signed by Mr. D'Aoust; person 9 contacted, Laren Hall; date of contact July 2, 1985. And, this document is also admitted. We'll 10 11 have copies made as soon as possible. 12 (Whereupon, Agency Exhibit Number 6, having been previously marked, was admitted into evidence) 13 EXAMINER MAGID: You may use 14 them, Mr. Winslow, if you wish. 15 16 MR. WINSLOW: No. BY MR. WINSLOW: 17 Let me backtrack a minute: 18 Q. Mr. D'Aoust, did you have Laren 19 herself attend any of these meetings where you 20 spoke to the employees about the problems with 21 22 smoking in the typing pool? Not the ones in my office because we 23 were all smoking, but we made a few announcements 24

in the pool jointly with the the supervisor,

1 Beverly Keith and I. 2 We made a couple of requests to all 3 the employees that we have an employee with a lung problem, and if we could limit smoking it would be 5 appreciated. 0. What form did these take, these 7 announcements? Was this verbal, written, what? 8 A. Verbal announcements. 9 Are you saying that you just stood up and hollered at everybody or what did you do? 10 11 CTA is a big room. We usually call 12 people to the front for passing out information in general; we have a new form we have to type or a 13 14 new format, our letterhead has changed. It was one of those sorts of 15 16 meetings. I think a couple of those meetings. Were you there? 17 Q. 18 Yes. A. 19 How many times? Q. I believe I was in two of them? 20 Α. 21 Was Laren there? 0. 22 Α. I believe so. You spoke of having called in those 23 Q. who smoked on some occasions. I would like to 24

know how many times?

1 A. I think it was twice. 2 Was that in your office? Q. 3 In my office. A. Was Laren at those? Q. 5 A. No, she wasn't. 6 Q. Why? 7 Α. 8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

A. Well, I was addressing myself to the smokers, asking them as a personal request from me to them. You know, "I can't tell you not to smoke but I can ask you not to."

I even suggested that if they needed a cigarette, to come in my office and smoke it, go to the rest rooms and smoke.

I told them, "I realize you're under pressure and sometimes under pressure people want to smoke a cigarette and we can't stop you from doing that, but all I asked is that they try to limit it as much as they could."

- Q. Did you observe anything that was said or done that their reaction was extremely negative or there was a spirit of hostility and perhaps Laren was believed to have been rocking the boat; that was a general attitude of these people?
 - A. No, I don't think so.

1 Their attitude was more, *I'll do 2 what I can to help. " 3 I try to run my division on kind of a friendly basis, and this was a friendly request 5 from me to them. And, I think they took it that way too. It wasn't anything that I was trying to 6 force them to do; just be real nice if we could. 7 8 Did you indicate to Winnie Busby that Q. 9 you were going to put out something in writing to 10 inform your employees in the pool that they were not to smoke? 11 No, I didn't. 12 A. Did you put anything out to that 13 0. effect? 14 Not in writing, no. 15 Did you put out anything otherwise, 0. 16 verbally that told them they could not smoke? 17 No. 18 A. Why not? 0. 19 Because I felt that it was the right 20 Α. of the smokers to continue to smoke if they wanted 21 I didn't feel that I had it within my power 22 to stop them from smoking. 23 Why not? Q. 24

Α.

25

It's always been policy that people

can smoke at their desks throughout the Regional 1 Office. It's also been that way. 2 EXAMINER MAGID: When you say 3 "it's always been that way," do you mean that that 4 activity has always taken place, or there has 5 always been a written or spoken policy to that б 7 effect? THE WITNESS: There has always 8 been a written or spoken policy that smoking is 9 allowed at your desk. 10 Do you think 11 EXAMINER MAGID: there may be a written policy to that effect? 12 THE WITNES: There is an 13 exhibit that we entered earlier about the V.A. 14 smoking policy, which indicates that both 15 management has to balance the rights of the 16 smokers and the rights of the non-smokers. 17 Is it your EXAMINER MAGID: 18 testimony that this Agency Exhibit 1 is the last 19 policy statement that you have seen on the 20 subject? 21 That is the last THE WITNESS: 22 Agency policy I've seen, right. 23 . EXAMINER MAGID: Is it your 24 testimony that it is the last Agency policy? 25

1	THE WITNESS: As far as I
2	know, yes.
3	EXAMINER MAGID: Are you aware
4	that Item Number 7 on the Agency Exhibit 1 says
5	"This circular expires June 30, 1980"?
6	THE WITNESS: Yes, I am aware
7	of that.
8	EXAMINER MAGID: Then, this
9	Agency exhibit expired by it's own terms on that
10	date, didn't it?
11	THE WITNESS: Yes, it did.
12	EXAMINER MAGID: Does that mean
13	there is no Agency policy on smoking?
14	THE WITNESS: It could mean
15	that.
16	BY MR. WINSLOW:
17	Q. Has there been any change in the
13	practice?
19	A. No, no change in practice.
20	Q. From 1980 to the present?
21	A. No.
22	Q. Was the practice the same prior to
23	1980 as it is his now?
24	A. Yes, it is.
25	Q. Suppose you've indicated to the

1 people in the pool that they couldn't smoke, what would you have to do to accomplish that? 2 3 Well, it would be a change in practice and a change in policy which would have 5 to be cleared through the Union because we would б be changing part of the way we have always done 7 it; customary practice. 8 Would this be a change in working Q. conditions? 9 It would be a change in working 10 A. 11 conditions. 12 Q. Does a change in the working conditions have to be reviewed with the Union? 13 14 Yes, a change in working conditions 15 is a grievable decision under the Union contract. Do you have a 16 EXAMINER MAGID: 17 copy of the Union contract? I could get one. 18 THE WITNESS: EXAMINER MAGID: Were you 19 intending to offer it into evidence, Mr. Winslow? 20 I will introduce 21 MR. WINSLOW: 22 testimony of Mr. Rodowski regarding these matters at the stage where I question him. 23 EXAMINER MAGID: Is it your 24 testimony that you are going to present Mr. 25

1	Rodowski?
2	MR. WINSLOW: If I may.
3	EXAMINER MAGID: You will have to
4	make a request for it and then state what he is
5	going to rebut.
6	MR. WINSLOW: Right.
7	EXAMINER MAGID: Regardless of
8	whether he is approved as a rebuttal witness, I
9	would like a copy of the Union contract.
10	There has been enough discussion
11	about it that I would like to see it.
12	BY MR. WINSLOW:
13	Q. Let me ask a couple of questions:
14	Do you know whether a change in
15	working conditions is required by federal law to
16	be brought to the attention of the Union and
17	failure to do so will constitute an unfair labor
18	practice as opposed to a grievance?
19	A. I'm not really expert this that part,
20	but I would imagine.
21	EXAMINER MAGID: Your answer is
22	you don't know?
23	THE WITNESS: I don't know.
24	BY MR. WINSLOW:
25	Q. Did you consult with the Union on

1	this question by the way?
2	EXAMINER MAGID: Which question?
3	MR. WINSLOW: On the question
4	of whether smoking could be banned in that room.
5	THE WITNESS: I didn't
6	personally.
7	When Laren first brought up the
8	question, I referred her immediately to the Union
9	because what she was asking was a change in
10	practice, and we would be changing the bargaining
11	unit employees; the conditions of the bargaining
12	unit employees that the Union employees were
13	working under, trying to get it out of my
14	jurisdiction.
15	I asked the Union to try to solve it
16	for me.
17	EXAMINER MAGID: You didn't
18	yourself after having been requested to provide a
19	no smoking area try to approach the Union and try
20	to get its concurrence; is that correct?
21	THE WITNESS: Actually, it
22	didn't work out that way.
23	EXAMINER MAGID: Well, do you
24	have an answer to that question, Mr. D'Aust?
25	THE WITNESS: What was the

1	question?
2	EXAMINER MAGID: Would you read
3	the question?
4	(Previous question read back)
5	THE WITNESS: That's correct.
6	I called Artie Pierce, and I laid out
7	to Artie what the situation was:
8	" I have an employee who wants to make
9	the pool a non-smoking area. I don't think I can
10	do it."
11	EXAMINER MAGID: Is that what you
12	told?
13	THE WITNESS: That's what I
14	told Artie.
15	EXAMINER MAGID: You told him you
16	didn't feel you had the authority to do it?
17	THE WITNESS: Yes, and I asked
18	him to see what he could do.
19	The Union and management work
20	relatively well together; but on issues like
21	this, Artie didn't seem to have an answer either
22	because he was weighing the rights of the smoking
23	members and the non-smoking members at the same
24	time.
25	EXAMINER MAGID: He was weighing

1	the numbers. Is that what he told you?
2	THE WITNESS: I don't know if
3	he was weighing the numbers. He called back and
4	said, "Hey, Ron, there is not much I can do. I
5	have smokers to consider and I've got non-smokers
6	to consider."
7	EXAMINER MAGID: What is his
8	title with the Union?
9	THE WITNESS: He is actually
10	the V.A. National Council President.
11	EXAMINER MAGID: What is he
12	locally?
13	THE WITNESS: He is also the
14	local union president.
15	BY MR. WINSLOW:
16	Q. Do you have any other employees who
17	you have hired in your time in this job who are
18	handicapped?
19	A. We have several handicapped people,
20	yes.
21	Q. Do you have any who are suffering
22	from some type of respiratory disease?
23	A. None that I know of.
24	Q. Have you made any effort to
25	accommodate the handicapped or the individual when

1 you've hired someone? 2 Yes, we have. 3 Q. If you hire someone, how do you 4 evaluate whether or not you're going to need to 5 accommodate that individual's handicap? 6 It would depend on the handicap and what limitations it places on their 7 8 employment. 9 0. When you hired Laren, did you know 10 the extent or nature of the handicap with which 11 she came to work? 12 No. I didn't. Α. 13 EXAMINER MAGID: Did you ask? THE WITNESS: No. 14 Why not? MR. WINSLOW: 15 Did you know EXAMINER MAGID: 16 that she was hired under a severely handicapped 17 18 program? No, I didn't. 19 THE WITNESS: What we get from personnel on an 20 interviewee is a copy of their SF-171, the 21 application for federal employment and eventually, 22 not on the day of the interview, I get to see the 23 typing test results and that is all I saw. 24 The 171, the form I got didn't 25

indicate it was under any special hiring chapter or hiring restriction. She was one of several typists interviewed that day; potential typists interviewed that day. All I saw was the application itself.

BY MR. WINSLOW:

- Q. How would you know if the person had a handicap?
- A. Some of the of them are easy. The blind typists, for example, but unless they come up and tell me this is a problem, I really don't have any way of knowing that they need accommodation.
- Q. If you were to ask an individual if they had a handicap, would this in your mind at least raise a possibility of a discrimination complaint if you should fail to hire that individual?

A. Yes.

I could see us running into trouble if we ask off the top, "Do you have a handicap?" And, then, for some reason or other the tests results or for any other reason didn't hire them, I could see us the recipient of a lawsuit on that issue.

1	Q. Do you smoke?
2	A. Yes, I do.
3	Q. A lot?
4	A. I don't think so.
5	EXAMINER MAGID: Would you quit
6	if there was a no smoking policy inaugurated?
.7	THE WITNESS: Yes, I would.
8	EXAMINER MAGID: Would you quit
9	your job?
10	THE WITNESS: Would I quit my
11	job?
12	EXAMINER MAGID: Yes.
13	THE WITNESS: No. I only
14	smoke on my job. I don't smoke at home, I don't
15	smoke in my car. In fact, when I took this job, I
16	didn't smoke.
17	BY MR. WINSLOW:
18	Q. Why do you smoke now?
19	A. It kind of relaxes me. I believe it
20	helps me calm down sometimes.
21	Q. In other words, you attribute your
22	smoking basically to your job pressure?
23	A. Yes.
24	EXAMINER MAGID: Has any
25	physician attributed your need to smoke to the job

1	pressure?
2	THE WITNESS: No.
3	My doctor would like me to quit also.
4	BY MR. WINSLOW:
5	Q. Now, is this, at least in part, the
6	reason you feel that if you were to ask the
7	employees in the typing pool to discontinue
8	smoking that that would increase the pressure on
9	some of the these people from the work that
10	they're trying to do?
11	A. I believe so, yes.
12	EXAMINER MAGID: I'm sorry, I
13	don't know what it is that you believe.
14	THE WITNESS: I believe that
15	if we made the typists who do smoke in the work
16	place stop, that would increase the pressure on
17	them more. They wouldn't be as relaxed. They
18	might not be able to produce as good a quality of
19	work that they do now.
20	EXAMINER MAGID: Isn't that
21	conjectural?
22	THE WITNESS: Yes, it is.
23	EXAMINER MAGID: Isn't it also
24	conjecture that if you did put a ban on smoking
25	that the productively of the other employees, of

1 the non-smokers, might increase and thereby 2 balance it all out? 3 THE WITNESS: That's possible. 4 EXAMINER MAGID: But you really 5 don't know, do you? 6 THE WITNESS: Right. 7 BY MR. WINSLOW: 8 This conjecture is based in part on Q. 9 your own experience? 10 Α. Yes. 11 Do you really feel that Laren has a genuine health problem? 12 13 Α. Yes, I do. If you had known of the degree of 14 severity of this problem when she was hired, how 15 would that have affected your decision? - 16 (No Response) 17 Α. That is a tough question and I'm 18 asking that so you will give me a good answer. 19 If I knew that her lung condition was 20 Α. so severe that she couldn't handle the working in 21 the pool, I would have probably have asked 22 personnel if there is a way we could get out of 23 24 hiring her, yes. EXAMINER MAGID: I think the 25

question was, if you had known what her lung 1 condition was at the time, would you have hired 2 3 her? Would you have hired her if you knew 5 that she had a disease such as obstructive lung disease, and you did not know she would perform as 6 7 a performer, would you have hired her? 8 THE WITNESS: I really don't 9 It's something that I will never see. know. 10 EXAMINER MAGID: If you had known 11 at the time of her hiring that she did have 12 obstructive lung disease, and, yet, she would 13 become one of your top typists, as you've 14 testified she is, would you have hired her with 15 that knowledge? THE WITNESS: Yes. 16 So, you would do 17 EXAMINER MAGID: 18 it all over again? Yes, I would. 19 THE WITNESS: 20 BY MR. WINSLOW: 21 If you had been aware of the severity Q. of her problem--physical problem--and I believe 22 you said you would not have hired her, or at least 23 you would have gone to personnel and tried to 24

figure out a way to get out of it, and you would

1	not have hired her, would you have then been in a
2	position where you would have been faced with an
3	EEO complaint?
4	EXAMINER MAGID: Faced with what?
5	BY MR. WINSLOW:
6	Q. Would you have been faced with an EEO
7	complaint under those circumstances?
8	A. I believe we would have been liable
9	for discrimination, yes, in our hiring practices.
10	EXAMINER MAGID: I don't
11	understand the relevance of that, since he already
12	is faced with an EEO complaint.
13	MR. WINSLOW: We're caught
14	either way. That's the point I'm trying to make.
15	EXAMINER MAGID: By failing to
16	accommodate?
. 17	MR. WINSLOW: Yes.
18	EXAMINER MAGID: You can be
19	caught either way, by an applicant or employee,
20	but I don't see the relevance of it.
21	MR. WINSLOW: Let me go a step
22	further with that question:
23	BY MR. WINSLOW:
24	Q. Is there some point at which the
25	seriousness of such a problemphysical

problem--would overcome all other considerations, such as, the ability of the individual to do well as a typist and perform in a highly satisfactory manner on the job?

- A. Yes, I believe there are disabilities that would prevent people from doing that type of job.
- Q. Under those circumstances is what I'm asking; under the circumstances you have in the pool.
 - A. Right.

- Q. Okay, does this really get down to the question, then, of whether the individual is qualified to do the job by reason of their health?
 - A. Yes, it does.

I think that the applicant knows better than the interviewer what limitations they have. We have a five, ten, fifteen minute interview and a typing test and a form that says what you've done before to go by in picking people.

In the typing pool we pick ten or fifteen new people a year at least. It is my feeling that applicants know better whether or not they can handle that job than I do.

If they can't spell, if they can't type fast enough, we won't pick them and I won't feel we're discriminating. If they are blind--we have two blind typists in the pool--and I have altered slightly the kind of work they do.

They transcribe hearings, mostly because it's straight typing, there are not a lot of paragraphs involved. It's nothing that they have to use their eyes for.

If someone came into the typing pool deaf and blind, I would be a little hurt because although I could hire a deaf typist, and have them transcribe a written work sheet, I couldn't have them do a full range of duties.

In fact, I couldn't have them doing anything because they couldn't take data from one medium and put it in another. It's really up to the applicant to say—and we happen to do it all the time—I can't stand to sit in a room and all day and type; it's not the kind of job I want.

And they turn us down. I've lost some very good typists.

EXAMINER MAGID: Let's go off the record for a moment.

б

1	(Whereupon, a short discussion was
2	held off the record.)
.3	BY MR. WINSLOW:
4	Q. Is there anything else that you feel
5	that you could reasonably have done to accommodate
6	Laren's physical disability problem?
7	A. No, not a reasonable accommodation.
8	Q. What do you mean reasonable?
9	A. Not the accommodations that I have
10	control over. I can't stop people from smoking.
11	I can't build a new room. I can't.
12	Q. Why not?
13	A. Why not?
14	I have three thousand dollars in *86
15	to use or construction funds. To build a room, I
16	would have to go in and get Central Office
17	permission.
18	EXAMINER MAGID: Did you try?
19	THE WITNESS: I don't think
20	it's a reasonable accommodation.
21	EXAMINER MAGID:. You don't think
22	trying to get Washington's approval do you
23	think trying to get Washington's approval is
24	beyond your ability or beyond a reasonable thing
25	to do?

1	THE WITNESS: I think it's
2	beyond a reasonable accommodation as I saw the
3	problem.
4	EXAMINER MAGID: Do you mean
5	trying to get approval for a separate room would
6	be beyond reason?
7	THE WITNESS: Yes, sir.
8	EXAMINER MAGID: The mere
9	attempt? What you're saying is the mere attempt o
10	get headquarters approval for another room is
11	unreasonable? Is that what your testimony is?
12	THE WITNESS: Yes.
13	EXAMINER MAGID: Why?
14	THE WITNESS: Opinion. This
15	is my opinion.
16	EXAMINER MAGID: Well, if that is
17	what it's based on, let's have it.
18	THE WITNESS: The Regional
19	Office has 320-some employees. If we built a room
20	for someone, I can see maybe five or six other
21	people coming up with the same complaint.
22	EXAMINER MAGID: Other people
23	with obstructive lung disease?
24	THE WITNESS: Obstructive lung
25	disease allergic to cigarette smoke,

1	hypersensitivity to smoke. Many conditions
2	could I don't like the way my neighbor chews
3	his gum if you are taking it to the that
4	extreme.
5	EXAMINER MAGID: Do you
6	think that the National Headquarters of the
7	V.A. would look at a request to accommodate
8	somebody with obstructive lung disease in the same
9	way than it would be at the request to accommodate
10	somebody who doesn't like their neighbor chewing
11	gum?
12	THE WITNESS: No, but I don't
13	feel that that's within our realm to ask.
14	EXAMINER MAGID: In your personal
15	realm or your office's realm, or what
16	THE WITNESS: Certainly not
17	within my realm.
13	EXAMINER MAGID: Would it be
19	within your realm to suggest to your boss that a
20	request should be made to Washington for
21	construction funds to accommodate this handicapped
22	employee?
23	Would that be within your realm?
24	THE WITNESS: That would be
25	within my realm.

1	EXAMINER MAGID: Did you do that?
2	THE WITNESS: No.
3	EXAMINER MAGID: Why not?
4	THE WITNESS: In my opinion it
5	is not the way to go.
6	EXAMINER MAGID: Why didn't you
7	do it?
	do it:
8	THE WITNESS: Because I don't
9	want to be building separate rooms for people.
10	EXAMINER MAGID: If that is the
11	only solution, why not?
12	THE WITNESS: Well, I had
13	hoped that some of these other solutions would
14	work. I don't think that is the only solution.
15	EXAMINER MAGID: What was the
16	simplest lowest cost solution that you know would
17	cure Ms. Hall's problem?
18	THE WITNESS: Transfer to
19	teletype.
20	EXAMINER MAGID: I'm not talking
21	about transferring her to another job because you
22	can't do it without her permission.
23	What would be the simplest, lowest
24	cost solution to cure her problem as a clerk
25	typist who has obstructive lung disease?

1	THE WITNESS: End smoking in
2	the building.
3	EXAMINER MAGID: Did you
4	recommend to your boss that that be done; not in
5	the building, but in the V.A.?
6	THE WITNESS: Well, I think
7 -	you would have to do it in the building.
8	EXAMINER MAGID: I'm asking you,
9	Mr. D'Aoust don't spar with me, please did
10	you ask your boss to do it?
11	THE WITNESS: No, I didn't.
12	EXAMINER MAGID: Go on,
13	Mr. Winslow.
14	BY MR. WINSLOW:
15	Q. Is the budget under which Veterans
16	Administration Regional Office operates a
17	consideration to you in the recommendations that
18	you might or might not make regarding the
19	construction of a room?
20	A. Yes, it is.
21	Q. Why is it?
22	A. Regional Office funds are limited.
23	Q. How are they limited?
24	A. They're very limited.
25	Prior to becoming Chief of Admin, I

was the station budget officer.

We have 320-some employees, we are given an allocation from Central Office based on the congressional allocation for the Agency.

Ninety-five percent of our station allocation of funds goes into salary.

For fiscal year '86, we have a station allocation of 9.6 million dollars of which 525 or 526 thousand dollars was all the money we had that was not earmarked directly for salary and fringes, payroll costs.

Of that 524 thousand dollars, I control 95 percent of it as the Chief of Admin. Other than that, I have to pay a quarter of a million dollars a year in telephone costs.

thousand dollars to spend on supplies, maintenance agreements, repairs agreements, minor construction, training, leasing of vehicles, just a myriad of small expenses, but they all add up to where I end up pinching money at the end of each quarter. There is not really enough to do the things we have to do.

We have to clear any requests for funds with Central Office. If I work the typing

1	pool overtime, a couple of hours on a Wednesday
2	night, that is if I work ten people, that is ten
3	times two, that is twenty hours of work at an
4	average overtime rate of 14 dollars an hour, we
5	would have to go into Central Office to request
6	that 280 dollars.
7	EXAMINER MAGID: Mr. D'Aoust, is
8	it your testimony that you didn't believe there
9	was any money in the budget to accommodate?
10	THE WITNESS: There is no
11	money in the budget.
12	BY MR. WINSLOW:
13	Q. Apart from that, assume you were to
14	propose that a room be built without using money
15	that you have budgeted, ask for extra money, what
16	chances do you think you would have?
17	EXAMINER MAGID: Don't you think
18	that is conjecture?
19	MR. WINSLOW: I don't think
20	so.
21	EXAMINER MAGID: Let's get his
22	qualifications for answering that.
23	Who would that request have to go to,
24	Mr. D'Aoust?
25	THE WITNESS: The request

would have to be made by the Director to the

Deputy Chief Benefits Director for field

operations and in that section of Central Office.

It would be the space and supply management

division of the Deputy Chief Benefits Director's

Office.

EXAMINER MAGID: What is is your knowledge of that organization that would allow you to give an informed estimate of the probability of them approving the request? What do you know about the organization that gives you the ability to accurately predict how they will act on any individual item?

of this year, there was a real good chance that the V.A. as an Agency was going to take up to ten days of furlough time because there wasn't enough money in the congressional--

EXAMINER MAGID: I don't think you're answering the question, Mr. D'Aoust.

I'm aware of the furlough times by Agencies, but I don't think you're answering my specific question about a request for construction funds to accommodate a handicapped employee and the probability of its being approved.

What do you know about the 1 2 organization in Washington that would allow you 3 give an accurate opinion? THE WITNESS: I only know that 4 they were very short on money. 5 BY MR. WINSLOW: 6 7 Have you had occasions when such requests have been made? Do you know of other 8 instances where similar requests for extra money 9 have been made as the budget man on your prior job 10 11 here from what you know now? Are you speaking EXAMINER MAGID: 12 of other requests to accommodate handicapped 13 employees? 14 Not specifically MR. WINSLOW: 15 handicapped employees, but any other requests for 16 additional money that would fall within this 17 general area of extra expense. 18 Yes. 19 THE WITNESS: have gone to Central Office to ask them for 20 additional minor construction funds for certain 21 22 projects. Would those EXAMINER MAGID: 23 be construction funds that would be required 24 because of some regulatory provision requiring the

Agency to provide a certain service that was 1 2 necessary? THE WITNESS: 3 Yes. We would have to submit a cost 4 benefit analysis showing how perhaps not in that 5 fiscal year but in a reasonable pay back time, 6 this change that we're requesting would end up 7 8 saving the Agency money. Have you ever 9 EXAMINER MAGID: had a situation, Mr. D'Aoust, where you've had to 10 send in a request to the National Headquarters 11 that said the Veterans Administration has a 12 handicapped employee on its hands. 13 That handicapped employee requires 14 certain accommodations in order to accommodate 15 that employee. We must see spend one thousand 16 dollars or any number you please. We, therefore, 17 request approval for that one thousand dollars. 18 Have you ever had such a situation? 19 No, we have not. 20 THE WITNESS: BY MR. WINSLOW: 21 Now, have you ever had special 22 requests that I have described denied by Central 23 24 Office?

No.

Α.

1 Once they leave here, they're pretty much in final form, and we talked them through the 2 3 Central Office, and they have already pretty much agreed with the principle. 5 Several of them have been delayed a б couple of fiscal years because of lack of funds, 7 but ultimately they do tend do get done. 8 What would you do with this office if 9 Laren Hall left, if one was ability? 10 A. I have no idea. 11 You're speaking EXAMINER MAGID: of the separate room such as has been suggested 12 13 MR. WINSLOW: Yes. Well, if we THE WITNESS: 14 built one for Laren, we would probably have to 15 build it around a word processing terminal because 16 that's where she gives me my best production. I 17 would problem have to put someone in that room 18 just so that terminal would be used. 19 BY MR. WINSLOW: 20 Would the room have any purpose at 21 Q. that point? 22 Α. No. 23 Is there a possibility that she could 24 Q. get another better job? 25

1 A. I would think Laren has a good chance 2 of getting a better job, yes. 3 EXAMINER MAGID: What would happen if one of your blind typists left, and you 5 had some equipment that was used to accommodate a 6 blind person and you hired a sighted person. 7 Would you send the equipment back? 8 THE WITNESS: There are 9 provisions to do that. We haven't done any equipment changes for the blind typists. 10 11 EXAMINER MAGID: Do you provide special equipment for them? 12 13 THE WITNESS: No. 14 Actually, they use a Sony hearing 15 conference recorder. In fact, I have two blind 16 typists and a sighted typist doing the same sort 17 of work using the same equipment. accommodations that were made or them is Christine 18 gets to take extra breaks with her dog so we don't 19 problems with our carpet. And, I changed their 20 work rate standards because they can't quite type 21 as fast as a sighted typist can. 22 EXAMINER MAGID: So, you 23 accommodate them by allowing to lower production? 24 Yes. 25 THE WITNESS:

BY MR. WINSLOW:

- Q. You indicated that you were responsible for space?
 - A. Yes, I am.
- Q. And for estimating the costs of setting up enclosures; walls?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. And, as a consequence of that position, that responsibility in your job, that you have a pretty fair idea of what it would cost--and I'm going to ask you for a ballpark figure of what it would cost to provide the kind of room that Mr. Magid has described.

You haven't said it, but I assume in order to get adequate supervision, it would have to be a glass enclosure with adequate ventilation, heating and whatnot.

what would you estimate that would cost? Just a ballpark figure. I realize that you haven't gotten an estimate.

- A. Well, if I could build it against an existing wall, better against a pair of existing walls, I would only need two walls and a door.
- Q. Do you have a place where it could be put in that kind of a location where there is a

1 word processor because, remember, you have to have 2 a word processor? 3 I would probably have to build three 4 walls, using the window as a fourth wall and a 5 door. Probably about seven thousand dollars for 6 the room. 7 To provide a separate air system, 8 assuming we made the room a reasonable size, not 9 so small she couldn't turn around in, probably a 10 10-foot square room, I would probably need about a half ton air conditioner in the ceiling. 11 That would cost about 15 hundred 12 13 dollars to install, probably a maintenance 14 contract for about a hundred dollars a year. 15 EXAMINER MAGID: So, the total was 85 hundred dollars; is that correct? 16 THE WITNESS: Yes. 17 BY MR. WINSLOW: 18 You think you could provide her with 19 Q. a room for 85 hundred dollars? 20 21 Α. I could try. I have no way of knowing. 22 This is a ballpark figure? 23 I send a request to GSA with my price Α. 24 estimates and they always kick it up 20 or 30 25

1	percent.
2	Q. That's why I say, what do you think
3	it would cost?
4	EXAMINER MAGID: Didn't you state
5	it would cost 85 hundred dollars?
6	THE WITNESS: Probably.
7	EXAMINER MAGID: This is all
8	conjecture because you did not get prices?
9	THE WITNESS: Yes.
10	BY MR. WINSLOW:
11	Q. Do you think you would have any
12	chance of getting that kind of approval from
13	Central Office?
14	EXAMINER MAGID: Didn't we go
15	through that?
16	This is as to his competence to
17	determine what the National Office is going to do
18	on any particular incident involving a request to
19	accommodate a handicapped employee.
20	MR. WINSLOW: We didn't have
21	any number.
22	EXAMINER MAGID: He has no
23	history of having made such a request.
24	MR. WINSLOW: I understand.
25	EXAMINER MAGID: Go on,

1	Mr. D'Aoust.
2	MR. WINSLOW: Are you going to
3	let me ask that question?
4	EXAMINER MAGID: Go ahead; ask
5	it.
6	THE WITNESS: No, I don't
7	think they would under the current funding
8	situation.
9	MR. WINSLOW: I have nothing
10	further.
11	EXAMINER MAGID: Okay,
12	Cross-examination, Ms. Hall?
13	Why don't we take a five-minute
14	break.
15	(Whereupon, a short recess
16	was taken off the record)
17	EXAMINER MAGID: Back on the
18	record, cross-examination, Ms. Hall?
19	MS. HALL: Okay, on Agency
20	Exhibit 3 there were several additional desks
21	initially that are not shown on here.
22	How do I add those in?
23	EXAMINER MAGID: I think the
24	proper thing to do is ask him if he remembers that
25	there were other desks in there and if he

doesn't--if he affirms the authenticity of Agency 1 2 Exhibit 3--it's up to you to provide rebuttle 3 testimony at the close of scheduled witnesses. Do you remember, Mr. D'Aoust, if 5 there are other desks that should be there? 6 THE WITNESS: We took a six 7 position cut in the pool and ended up moving out six desks over the last fiscal year. 8 The extra desks there would have been 9 one here and there would have been another one 10 11 here. EXAMINER MAGID: We really need 12 to know where they are for the record. 13 14 Let's go off the record. 15 (Whereupon, a short discussion was 16 held off the record) State what you EXAMINER MAGID: 17 told me off the record, Ms. Hall, and ask 18 Mr. D'Aoust if that is true. 19 CROSS-EXAMINATION 20 BY MS. HALL: 21 Mr. D'Aoust, you had several other 22 desks that were close to my desk; at least three? 23 None of these were anywhere near the 24 left side of the room. Most of whom had smoking 25

1 employees at them at various times during the 2 entire two years of my employment at the V.A. 3 that true, Mr. D'Aoust? 4 Yes, somewhat. 5 As we hired new typists in, we tried 6 to group them up towards the front and some of the 7 new typists we hired were smokers. I know Javan 8 was sitting there for awhile and she smoked. 9 EXAMINER MAGID: All right, he 10 has answered your question. Now, do you have any 11 other questions? 12 BY MS. HALL: 13 Is Jackie Pfiser a new person? Α. 14 No. A. 15 Yet, she was not in the left-hand Q. 16 corner. 17 EXAMINER MAGID: Ms. Hall, you can only ask questions now. You can't engage in 18 any discussion with the witness. You will have 19 20 another chance at rebuttal. 21 BY MS. HALL: How many desks away from me was 22 Jackie Pfiser when she was sitting in the seat 23 closest to the door that you proceeded to put me 24

in after she left? Do you remember.

1	Would you like me to show you?
2	A. Sure. (Indicating on diagram)
3	Q. Was she new?
4	EXAMINER MAGID: Excuse me when
5	you talk about "here" and "there," there's going
6	to be nothing on the transcript.
7	THE WITNESS: When we moved
8	you to the upper, right-hand corner I believe
9	Jackie Pfiser was over in here somewhere?
10	MS. HALL: No, she was
11	here. She was at the desk closest to the door
12	leading to reproduction is which nowhere near the
13	left-hand corner of the room as you stated.
14	EXAMINER MAGID: Ms. Hall do you
15 ^	have a question?
16	BY MS. HALL:
17	Q. You talked in your statement that I
18	had received details ahead of other people who
19	should have these details because of seniority.
20	Which details were these?
21	EXAMINER MAGID: What is the
22	relevance of that?
23	MR. HALL: There were
24	several details into other areas that I never had
25	any access to. They were also details into the

1	reproduction area which is a non-smoking area that
2	people with less seniority were given.
3	EXAMINER MAGID: Should she have
4	gotten detailed because of her seniority into the
5	publications area that she did not get?
6	THE WITNESS: No.
7	Publication employees are a different
8	position classification.
9	EXAMINER MAGID: So, she could
10	not have been detailed into that area?
11	THE WITNESS: No. Those
12	aren't typist positions.
13	BY MS. HALL:
14	Q. What about Ted? He is a typist in a
15	pool?
16	A. Do you mean, the one or two days that
17	he went in there?
18	Q. He disappeared for substantial
19	periods of time and part of that time he was in
20	reproduction.
21	A. Ted was a temporary employee we
22	hired.
23	EXAMINER MAGID: He was not in
24	her category?
25	THE WITNESS: No.

1	Laren is a career conditional typist.
2	Ted was a temporary employee. I had him in the
3	pool, I had him in
4	EXAMINER MAGID: We can deal with
5	others, Ms. Hall, if they were similarly situtated
6	with you; if they are other typists. We have to
7	compare you to similarly situated people.
8	MS. HALL: The fact that he
9	was a typist but not career conditional? That is
10	the difference?
11	EXAMINER MAGID: Yes.
12	BY MS. HALL:
13	Q. This is Agency Exhibit 1.
14	It says here "In a V.A. the Agency's
15	objective will be accomplished through two program
16	efforts; an Agencywide educational program."
17	What educational program has the
18	Agency had about smoking?
19	A. This is a 1979 circular.
20	Q. You stated this.
21	A. There may may have been when the
22	Agency talks about educational programs
23	EXAMINER MAGID: Can you answer
24	her specific question, please? Do you recall what
25	it is?

1	THE WITNESS: I would imagine,
2	at the time they probably sent posters around.
3	EXAMINER MAGID: Is it your
4	testimony that you don't know the answer?
5	THE WITNESS: I don't know the
6	answer.
7 ·	EXAMINER MAGID: It's okay to say
8	you don't know the answer, Mr. D'Aoust, if you
9	don't.
10	BY MS. HALL:
11	Q. Okay, it says, "Employees should have
12	the opportunity to attend voluntary smoking
13	cessation programs.*
14	What voluntary smoking cessation
15	programs have been offered by the V.A.?
16	A. We have contracted out that kind of
17	thing, and it's an employee counseling service and
18	the employee's health service that do run the
19	program on the eleventh floor for employees
20	throughout the building.
21	Q. You have never used American Lung
22	Association or American Cancer Society like it
23	says here?
24	A. Not that I know of.

Q. No other Government agencies?

1	A. The other Government Agency would be
2	the Employee Counseling Service that the HEW
3	Department of Health, Education and Welfare.
4	Q. What would have they done; do you
5	know?
6	A. You see their notices on the bulletin
7	board periodically they're having weight control,
8	drinking problems, they had a smokers program last
9	year, I believe.
10	Q. "The facilities Director will issue
11	instructions implementing smoking policy
12	appropriate to the facility."
13	What policies have been implemented,
14	if any, since this expired in 1980?
15	A. I don't know.
16	Q. It says, "Establishment of no smoking
17	areas should be investigated. Plan more space for
18	employees who desire no smoking areas to be
19	accommodated. #
20	What investigation was there?
21	A. I don't know of any.
22	EXAMINER MAGID: There was no
23	investigation as far as you know?
24	THE WITNESS: As far as I
25	know Whom the circular came out. I was pretty

1 far removed from management. 2 BY MS. HALL: 3 It says "Efficiency of work unit Q. should not be impaired. " 5 In the exhibits that I put into б evidence earlier there are several paragraphs 7 indicating the effects of both direct smoking and 8 passive smoking. 9 MS. HALL: Shall I read them into the record? 10 No. I don't want 11 EXAMINER MAGID: 12 them read into the record. They will stand by 13 themselves. They will be read. 14 BY MS. HALL: They indicate the cost of smoking to 15 16 both those who do it and those who breath it by 17 way of other people smoking is quite high. How would the efficiency of the work 18 19 unit be impaired by eliminating the sick leave 20 caused by these illnesses that are specifically 21 evidenced by the Surgeon General and the various 22 other agencies? 23 I don't know. It says, "An equitable balance should 24

be maintained between the rights of smokers and

1 non-smokers. * 2 This policy--the V.A. smoking 3 policy--doesn't state a specific right to smoke. 4 Is there a law or a policy somewhere 5 that says so-and-so has the right to smoke? What 6 legal foundation is there for that; do you know? 7 A. No. 8 I would imagine it's customary 9 practice. 10 So, as far as EXAMINER MAGID: 11 you know, that is the answer; customary practice? 12 You do not know of any specific 13 policy; is that correct? THE WITNESS: 14 Right. BY MS. HALL: 15 It says, "Management officials 16 Q. responsible for implementing this policy shall 17 inform employees in writing of provisions 18 19 applicable to them." 20 What have you submitted in writing to employees to make them aware of this policy or the 21 policy of the V.A. to try to accommodate employees 22 who "desire no smoking areas"? 23 I personally have not issued any 24 A.

policy statements. The Director's information

1	memo addresses it somewhat.
2	Q. But he never
3	A. Actually, the circular is rescinded.
4	I don't have a copy of this. The
5	first time I saw it was yesterday. My manual is
6	relatively current but rescinded material, I don't
7	keep.
8	EXAMINER MAGID: And you do not
9	have anything comparable in your manual; is that
10	correct?
11	THE WITNESS: That's correct.
12	BY MS. HALL:
13	Q. Were their others on the floor who
14	complained about the smoke?
15	A. Complained? No.
16	There were other people who mentioned
17	it. There were no others that complained about
18	the smoke. There are a couple of people who have
19	mentioned it, but as far as complaints, no.
20	EXAMINER MAGID: When you say
21	that there were no complaints, what are you
22	referring to by "complaints"? What does one have
23	to do in order to consider that a complaint is
24	filed or a complaint is registered?
25	THE WITNESS: They could come

1	into my office and ask me or mention it to me. It
2	hasn't been done.
3	EXAMINER MAGID: What do you call
4	those situations where people have mentioned it to
5	you?
6	You did say several people did
7	mention it to you, and you don't consider those
8	complaints. Do you consider those a round of
9	approval?
10	THE WITNESS: No.
11	EXAMINER MAGID: What is a
12	complaint?
13	THE WITNESS: There were no
14	formal complaints.
15	EXAMINER MAGID: You mean nothing
15	was submitted to you writing?
17	THE WITNESS: Right.
18	EXAMINER MAGID: But, people did
19	mention several times that they did not like
20	smoking. They did not like the atmosphere?
21	THE WITNESS: Right.
22	BY MS. HALL:
23	Q. Do you remember JoAnne?
24	A. Yes.
25	Q. Do you remember quite a few instances

1 for her where she had problems with smoke? 2 I never heard it from JoAnne. 3 Do you remember her when she and Q. 4 Jackie Pfiser got into a knock-down-drag-out 5 between her and Jackie Pfiser between smoking and б the fans? Would you consider that a complaint on 7 the part of Johnne? 8 I remember the fight, but I didn't 9 realize it was over smoking. I thought it was a 10 personality clash between two individuals. 11 Did Beverly Keith ever mention to you that I had been threatened with physical harm by 12 13 another employee because of my objections to him 14 smoking? 15 No, I hadn't heard that. 16 You said that you couldn't change 0. 17 things without Union consent? 18 Yes. Α. In this folder here there is a 19 20 critical element for the typing pool. There is now a new set of critical elements that are 21 22 different from that. 23 Did you get consent of the Union before you changed those? 24

25

I did, but I don't need the Union's

approval to change production standards. I need 1 the Union's approval to change work environment. 2 If I tell you you have to type eight 3 hundred lines a day and I raise it to nine 4 5 hundred, I can do that. The Union could grieve. They could 6 grieve it but I have the right to do that 7 unilaterally although I do consider the Union. 8 Wouldn't the EXAMINER MAGID: 9 same be true of no smoking? 10 Let's assume arguendo you do have the 11 right to put up a no smoking area and then their 12 recourse is to grieve the issue, isn't it? 13 The Union THE WITNESS: 14 contracts says that production requirements and . 15 performance standards are not grievable under 16 unfair labor laws. That is a management decision. 17 I need "X" number of lines per 18 typist, but a change in working conditions 19 themselves--dimming the lights, making a 20 non-smoking area--that is considered a change in 21 work policy, work practice, as opposed to 22 performance. 23

EXAMINER MAGID:

action must be taken by management before that is

24

25

136

What sort of

1 done? 2 According to the Union contract, 3 what does the Union contract say specifically? 4 Does it say we must meet and confer before it's 5 Does it say we must get the Union's okay? 6 Does the Union have veto power? What does it say? 7 THE WITNESS: The Union 8 doesn't have veto power. 9 I believe we are required by the 10 contract to inform them of changes. 11 So, if you sent EXAMINER MAGID: a note to the Union saying, "We're going to put up 12 on a No-smoking area," and you put up a no smoking 13 area, that would satisfy the Union contract; is 14 15 that correct? . ` THE WITNESS: I think so. 16 MR. WINSLOW: I would like to 17 object to this line of questioning because I don't 18 think the witness is qualified to really answer 19 20 the question. If we're going to deal with personnel 21 and contract questions, we need a personnel man in 22 23 here. I think you EXAMINER MAGID: 24 brought up the Union contract on direct 25

examination, Mr. Winslow, and I think

cross-examination by Ms. Hall and supplemental

examination by me are appropriate.

BY MS. HALL:

So, I'm going to overrule your objection.

Q. You stated that a few weeks after I started, you met with smoking employees.

Would that have been after I approached you and asked you to meet with them stating that I thought you were legally required to do so and that was only six months later?

- A. The first time met with them was very shortly after you were hired--the first time I heard that you had a lung problem--and I said that the air in the pool was just too bad. I met with them then; that would have been October or November '84 the first time.
- Q. You said it would be an inconvenience for the smokers to ban smoking in the room. You said that you could ban it in reproduction because the employees were approached and it was not an inconvenience. You had their consent; is that correct?
 - A. Right.

1 It came from the Union and the Union 2 was agreeing that no one in there had a complaint 3 that stopping smoking would cause the any 4 problems. 5 Q. Did you ask all the employees 6 affected using the hallways that you banned it in 7 for their permission to ban it in the hallway? 8 A. Employees using the hallway? 9 Q. Yes. It's a main hallway coming in 10 and out. 11 Did you ask everyone's consent to ban 12 it there? No, because the employees shouldn't 13 A. be going in there. 14 The answer is EXAMINER MAGID: 15 "no," you did not ask all employees who used the 16 hallway as a regular practice whether you should 17 ban smoking? 18 Right. THE WITNESS: 19 I should say, I didn't ban smoking in 20 the hallway. I banned it in the publications 21 reproduction area. 22 23 BY MS. HALL: I thought you stated earlier that it 24 Q. was banned also in the hallway?

No, we put an ashtray out in the 1 2 hallway. EXAMINER MAGID: It was my 3 understanding too by your testimony that you did 4 ban it in that part of the hallway. 5 Are you changing that? Do you recall 6 giving that testimony? 7 If I said that. THE WITNESS: 8 I didn't mean that they banned it in the hallway. 9 The hallway going into publications is kind of a 10 little offshoot hallway. It's this doorway here 11 that we're talking about (indicating on diagram). 12 EXAMINER MAGID: The doorway in 13 14 the--The doorway THE WITNESS: 15 going into the publications unit. 16 They placed an ashtray here and the 17 sign that says, "You're entering publications 18 reproduction area. There is no smoking in this 19 20 area." 21 I didn't mean we banned it in the 22 whole hallway. EXAMINER MAGID: Did other 23 employees besides the employees who regularly work 24 in the publications area go into the publications 25

1	area to get publications and/or to transact other
2	business?
3	THE WITNESS: Yes, they would
4	go in there to pick up forms.
5	EXAMINER MAGID: And, some were
6	smokers and some were not smokers?
7	THE WITNESS: Yes.
8	EXAMINER MAGID: And, those who
9	were not smokers, were not asked; is that correct?
10	THE WITNESS: That's right.
11	We put up a sign asking that they put out their
12	cirgaretts before they go in.
13	BY MS. HALL:
14	Q. Did I complain to you about
15	retaliation after that happened?
16	A. Into publications?
17	Q. After you banned the smoking in the
18	reproduction area?
19	A. I don't recall.
20	Q. Do you recall me specifically
21	mentioning that people were walking up to my desk
22	and going, "Oops" with a with cigarette and
23	running back away and that she would run by with
24	it behind her back, and that still at the end of
25	the evening people would congregate down there,

1 three or four smokers at the time, still even with this no smoking area? 2 Yes, I remember that. 3 Α. I called Deborah to my office after 4 you mentioned that she was doing that. She said, 5 "I don't think about it. I get up and when I do 6 remember, I go back and try to put out my 7 cigarettes. * 8 Does that account for the ooing and 0. 9 10 giggling? 11 A. Yes. Have I complained to you also that 12 Q. this situation had continued throughout the month; 13 that she is still coming around my desk? 14 We have talked about it, probably 15 even last month, when she was visiting with Betty. 16 Betty's desk is two or three desks away from 17 18 yours. Betty's desk is the desk next to 19 Q. mine, about three feet from my desk? 20 21 Α. Yes. And after he you mentioned it to me I 22 talked to Deborah again. I told her, "If you are 23

24

25

desk. *

going to visit Betty, leave your cigarette at your

1	Q. But, you don't think there is any
2	continuing hostility or mood changes by other
3	employees or any hostility directed toward me or
4	ridiculing or anything of that nature?
5	A. I haven't seen that.
6	Q. You don't consider any of that to be
7	ridicule or harassment at all?
8	A. I don't think it is intentional on
9	their part.
10	Q. You don't?
11	A. I don't think they're trying to
12	ridicule you or anything like that. I think
13	they're just trying to do their job, take their
14	breaks and do their usual things.
L5	Q. And standing at Betty's desk
16	EXAMINER MAGID: Just ask
17	questions, okay?
L 8	He doesn't have to agree with you
9	regarding the hostility. You may think it was
20	hositlity. He doesn't have to agree.
21	BY MS. HALL:
22	Q. Is it part of Deborah Jordan's job on
23	work time to stand next to Betty's desk to smoke?
24	A. Not during work time.

25

Q.

Is it necessary on break time when in

1	the memo from the Director, he specifically asked
2 ·	employees who smoke to do so on lunch time and
3	during breaks?
4	EXAMINER MAGID: You're speaking
5	of Agency Exhibit 2?
6	MS. HALL: That's correct.
7	BY MS. HALL:
8	Q. Do you feel that smokers observe that
9	in the pool?
10	A. Well, right now, there are at least
11	three typists who only smoke on their breaks and
12	lunch. Elaine Johnson.
- 13	EXAMINER MAGID: What was the
14	question? Could we have that read back?
15	(Previous question read back)
16	EXAMINER MAGID: Can you answer
17	that specifically?
18	THE WITNESS: Some do. I
19	think three out of our current six smokers do.
20	BY MS. HALL:
21	Q. Who would be the other two besides
22	Elaine?
23	A. Sue Lesko. These are brand new
24	employees.
25	EXAMINER MAGID: Just try to

1 answer the question, Mr. D'Aoust. 2 THE WITNESS: - Sue Lesko and 3 Jan Alfred, I think her name is. BY MS. HALL: 5 0. And, the other three who don't? б And the other three Lori Pletcher and 7 Deborah Jordan and Martin Aquirre. 8 You stated some smokers need to be 9 positioned nearer to me because they work on the 10 5520. 11 Is Lori Fletcher a 5520 operator? No. Lori Fletcher is not on the 5520. 12 Α. Yet, she is only two desks away. Why 13 14 is that necessary? Lori Fletcher has job performance 15 I have asked her to consult with Judy 16 problems. Sutterer. Judy has about a zero percent error 17 rate as far as making typographical mistakes. 18 Lori Fletcher's rate is about 19 forty-some percent. I have asked Lori and Judy to 20 sit right next to each other. I have asked Lori 21 to check when she is not sure if a word should be 22 23 pluralized. Is Judy a 5520 operator? 24 Q.

25

Judy was trained but not now because

1	she is pregnant.
2	Q. She is on another typewriter, right?
3	A. Yes.
4	Q. And, Lori Fletcher couldn't be
5	situated nearer to one the team leaders, say
6	Shavan, who doesn't have a problem with cigarette
7	smoke, since Judy isn't even a team leader.
8	EXAMINER MAGID: You're asking
9	many questions about where people sit. Let me ask
10	you a question.
11	Do you believe that any seating
12	arrangement will resolve your problem?
13	THE WITNESS: Probably not.
14	EXAMINER MAGID: What is the
15	relevance of the seating arrangement?
16	MS. HALL: Because they're
17	claiming it's an accommodation.
18	I don't feel, number one, that it is
19	an accommodation and better than that, they
20	haven't made the so-called accommodations they're
21	claiming they did.
22	EXAMINER MAGID: Go ahead.
23	BY MS. HALL:
24	Q. You said the pool has an absenteeism
25	rate.

In view of that high absenteeism 1 rate, have you ever looked into how many illnesses 2 might be lung or pulmonary related; therefore 3 possibly related to cigarette smoke such as bronchitis? 5 Α. Yes. 6 The leave usage in the pool isn't 7 primarily sick leave. It's annual leave for many 8 9 reasons. Mr. D'Aoust, did EXAMINER MAGID: 10 you hear the question? 11 I don't think THE WITNESS: 12 it's due to bronchitis. 13 EXAMINER MAGID: The question was 14 whether you've done a survey? 15 No, I haven't THE WITNESS: 16 done a survey. 17 18 BY MS. HALL: When you run out of sick leave, you 19 Q. go into leave without pay. So, some of that leave 20 without pay that you're talking about--21 I'm going to EXAMINER MAGID: 22 rule that we don't need anymore questions on sick 23 leave and annual leave, since he has made no 24 survey and he doesn't know the answer.

BY MS. HALL:

Q. You made mention of the budget before, and I didn't really understand most of it. So, this may be a totally irrelevant question.

Do you remember a conversation with me about a year ago when you mentioned that you were way under budget for that year. It was right before the new machines came in, and you said you were going to get the more expensive one because you were so far under budget?

A. Which machine? The new dictation system that we got. I had proposed to Central Office a dictation system made by Sony, and originally, they had allocated 65 thousand dollars for this dictation system.

We went out and got bids. The low bid was from Lanier and their bid was only 28 thousand dollars. But, Central Office makes the choice on what system to get and their choice was take the low bidder and it was never funds that the station actually had. It was just money allotted to that purchase.

Q. You made mention of a small room on your diagram that you attempted to put me in.

Is that commonly referred to as "the

1	closet"?
2	A. The equipment room, right.
3	Q. The closet.
4	As it used to store old things you
5	don't use; empty boxes, things like that
6	A. Yes.
7	Q. When was my desk moved into there?
8	A. I don't really remember. It wasn't
9	in there very long.
10	Q. You would have had to have someone
11	take and move the desk which would have meant
12	allocating funds?
13	Do you have something that says you
14	allocated this labor to move this desk into that
15	room?
16	A. No.
17	Q. Would it be accurate to say that my
18	typewriter was put on a table and there was a
19	chair put in there and a tiny little fan?
20	A. Yes, that's what we did.
21	Q. There was no desk?
22	A. No.
23	Q. You made mention that there is a
24	small room on this floor with no ventilation and
25	it is the stuffiest room in the entire V.A.

1	How would you think the closet would
2	compare, airwise?
3	A. Probably about the same. Any small
4	room that you make in the building has a problem.
5	Even this room gets probably much warmer than the
6	open areas on either side of it.
7	Q. Did it also have open electrical
8	circuits on the walls from the machinery?
9	A. Yes.
10	Q. So, it's extremely hot in there; is
11	that correct?
12	A. Yes.
13	Q. Do you recall me complaining that
14	people were going by and pointing and laughing
15	because I was in the, quote, closet? Do you
16	remember me complaining to you about that?
17	A. I don't remember.
18	Q. Can you explain why several people
19	were put on 5520 training with less seniority than
20	me ahead of me?
21	EXAMINER MAGID: Is that relevant
22	to this case?
23	MS. HALL: I think so.
24	EXAMINER MAGID: In what way?
25	MS. HALL: When you go into

the pool, that is the eventual goal to get off the typewriter on the more advanced work. As you become better at your job, you qualify to go on the 5520.

EXAMINER MAGID: What does that have to do with whether the Agency accommodated your handicap?

MS. HALL: Because I feel I was discriminated against in terms of my work load. I was given harder work.

examiner MAGID: Your option at point was to raise the issue at that point, to file a complaint about it. If it took place more than 30 days ago and if you've not raise a reprisal complaint in connection with this case, it's not relevant.

BY MS. HALL:

Q. Okay, in the teletype room you said you installed separate air conditioners to meet the computer requirements.

why is it that you can install a machine for a computer requirement but not for people requirements?

A. No offense, but the computers are the way that we transmit data and if our Vadats

1 equipment shuts down our station would be out of 2 touch with the rest of the Agency. We wouldn't be able to get data to 3 the benefits payments computers in lines. EXAMINER MAGID: Is it your 5 testimony, Mr. D'Aoust, that the machines are more 6 than people? Is that what you're trying to say? 7 In this case, THE WITNESS: 8 We need to have those machines work. 9 yes. And, you can get EXAMINER MAGID: 10 along without the people? 11 I don't think we THE WITNESS: 12 can get along without the people, but in order to 13 move data, we need those machines running. 14 15 BY MS. HALL: Okay, you said that I approached you 16 about not taking the job in teletype. 17 Do you recall that I told you about a 18 conversation that Beverly Keith and I had in which 19 she told me that prior to this point she had not 20 done anything about the smoking in the pool, and 21 that if I would consider staying there, she would, 22 in fact, crack down on the smokers and that that 23

is why I opted to to remain in the pool?

I had been promised. Do you recall

24

1	telling you that I had been promised this remedy?
2	A. I don't really recall that.
3	Q. You don't recall that?
4	A. No.
5	Q. Do you recall me also stating that I
6	took the typist job specifically to get 5520
7	training?
8	A. Yes, you did mention that.
9	Q. How many word processors are there in
10	the rest of the V.A.?
11	A. Fifteen.
12	Q. So, they're kind of all over.
13	How many positions have teletype
14	machines at them?
15	A. None.
16	Q. None?
17	A. None.
18	Q. Does the teletype machine involve a
19	lot of memorizing of codes and things to get
20	it to work?
21	A. No.
22	It's pretty much There are canned
23	forms and after you draw up the format then, it's
24	a matters.
25	O. But you to learn the format?

1	A. Yes.
2	Q. And, they're pretty abstract. There
3	not stuff that is just common sense? There is
4	specific machine language formats?
5	A. Yes.
6	Q. So, you would have to specifically
7	learn those?
8	A. Yes.
9	Q. And, in the pool, is it a little bit
10	more that if you have basic grammar and spelling,
11	you type. As Mr. Magid mentioned, jibberish
12	versus intelligible information?
13	A. That's true but the teletype formats
14	are less complex than the 5520 operating
15	instructions.
16	The 5520 is a word processor. In
17	order to turn out reasonable work, you've got to
18	do a lot more than teletype.
19	EXAMINER MAGID: Just answer the
20	questions that are asked, please.
21	BY MS. HALL:
22	Q. Does the person who was to train in
23	the on the teletype a smoker?
24	A. Yes, she was.
25	Q. And, she was allowed to smoke in the

1	room?
2	A. It is my understanding that she
3	didn't smoke in the room while she trained you.
4	Q. Do you know why the ashtray was
5	there?
6	A. Sonya used to take breaks in the
7	teletype room.
8	Q. So, people not only work in the
9	teletype room smoking but they take breaks in the
10	teletype room as well?
11	A. I think it would have only been
12	Sonya.
13	Q. Then, it wouldn't have been a very
14	non-smoking area?
15	EXAMINER MAGID: Are you
16	testifying now about the teletype room at the time
17	that Ms. Hall agreed to try it out?
18	THE WITNESS: Yes.
19	EXAMINER MAGID: It was staff
20	training person was a smoker who did smoke in the
21	room?
22	THE WITNESS: No.
23	Sonya had been promoted to the
24	division secretary position in personnel but Sonya
25	was also the most experienced teletypist we had;

1	so when we brought Laren in to learn how to use
2	the system, Sonya would came down and show her the
3	format.
4	But, the agreement I had with Sonya
5	was that she wouldn't smoke while training Laren.
. 6	EXAMINER MAGID: And, is it your
7	testimony that she did not smoke while training
8	her?
9	THE WITNESS; As far as I
10	know, yes.
11	EXMAINER MAGID: Did you observe
12	her in there with Laren?
13	THE WITNESS: Yes, I did, and
14	she wasn't smoking at the time.
15	BY MS. HALL:
16	Q. But you don't know why the ashtray
17	was in there, if there was no smoking?
18	A. Right.
19	Q. The next person you put in there on
20	detail was Jackie Pfiser who was also a smoker.
21	Do you recall my specifically asking
22	you if you would make the teletype room a
23	non-smoking area?
24	EXAMINER MAGID: Is her
25	preliminary question contained within her question

1 correct; that Ms. Pfiser was assigned to the 2 teletype room and Ms. Pfisher was a smoker and did 3 smoke in the teletype room? 4 THE WITNESS: After Laren 5 declined, we hired from the outside a woman who 6 came in and didn't work out at all, and we 7 terminated her. 8 Then, I detailed Jackie Pfisher from 9 the typing pool into teletype and Jackie Pfiser is 10 a smoker and did smoke in the teletype room. 11 EXAMINER MAGID: She did smoke in 12 the teletype room in the presence of Ms. Hall? Laren had opted 13 THE WITNESS: 14 out already. 15 EXAMINER MAGID: There was no overlap between Ms. Hall and Ms. Pfiser? 16 No. 17 THE WITNESS: 18 BY MS. HALL: Then, anyone could have been detailed 19 for any one of these jobs in there that was a 20 smoker, and I would have been in the same 21 22 position. EXAMINER MAGID: Ms. Hall. 23 anything is possible, but that didn't happen, did 24 it? 25

- Q. Do you recall me asking you to make it a non-smoking area?
 - A. No, I don't remember.
 - Q. You don't recall that?

You said that to have people not smoke in the room would add to their job pressure.

How do do you think the people--I don't know if I can say this--Beverly made a statement that ten different people had made a statement objecting to smoke.

Do you feel that their being around the smoke added pressure to their job as much or possibly even more so than the smokers not smoking might have had pressure?

- A. It's possible. I don't know.
- Q. Did you consider that at all when they were ten people who complained?
- A. I don't know of ten people complaining. I know that you mentioned it. Bruce had mentioned it.

EXAMINER MAGID: The information that is in the file someplace is that prior to Ms. Hall, ten people had complained about the smoking in the typing pool.

1 THE WITNESS: I don't know. 2 EXAMINER MAGID: You weren't 3 aware of that? THE WITNESS: No. 5 BY MS. HALL: 6 Q. You said any kind of physical change 7 in the room would have to pay for itself. 8 I don't know if this is repetitive, 9 but do you think in view of the information on 10 passive smoke and in view the information that has 11 been readily available for years on smokers and 12 the relationship to their smoking and the amount 13 of time off on jobs, do you think that banning smoke in the pool might pay for itself eventually? 14 15 Do you think it would pay for itself in terms of the health of your employees? 16 I don't know. 17 How much would it cost you to ban 18 Q. 19 smoke in the pool? I have no way of knowing. 20 A. It would cost me potential unfair 21 labor practice suits, potential EEO complaints 22 from people who hired in knowing the--23 EXAMINER MAGID: What would be 24 the out of pocket cost if you banned smoking?

1	THE WITNESS: No out of pocket
2	costs.
3	EXAMINER MAGID: No out of pocket
4	costs. Thank you.
5	BY MS. HALL:
6	Q. Can you tell me why you can
7	accommodate Mr. Aguirre's disabilities but not
8	mine?
9	A. The accommodations I give for his
10	disabilities cost me nothing.
11	All we do for Marty is change his
12	lunch hour when he is at an AA meeting. He is not
13	gone any extra time.
14	Q. Have I missed a lot of sick time
15	because of cigarette smoking?
16	A. I believe you have, yes.
17	Q. Does that cost you?
18	A. It costs me lost production, yes.
19	Q. And, you stated that out of pocket
20	expenses for not having smoking in the room would
21	be nothing?
22	A. Out of expenses, yes. We might have
23	to put some signs up but that's it.
24	MS. HALL: That's it.
25	EXAMINER MAGID: That is all you

1	have?
2	All right, I have a few questions,
3	Mr. D'Aoust.
4	Do you remember your testimony that
5	as far as you could tell, there was no hostility
6	to Ms. Hall after you met with the smokers in your
7	office; do you recall your testimony?
8	THE WITNESS: Yes.
9	EXAMINER MAGID: Agency Exhibit
10	2, which is the Director Clowney's memorandum
11	acknowledging that there was laughter and
12	belittlement by smokers against those with
13	respiratory ailments of which there was one in
14	your unit; is that correct?
15	THE WITNESS: Yes.
16	EXAMINER MAGID: How is it that
17	Mr. Clowney knew about those actions and you did
18	not?
19	THE WITNESS: I believe Laren
20	brought it up in her conversation with the
21	Director.
22	EXAMINER MAGID: And, he believed
23	her; is that correct?
24	THE WITNESS: Yes.
25	EXAMINER MAGID: And, she had not

1	brought it up to you?
2	THE WITNESS: Not that I can
3	recall.
4	EXAMINER MAGID: In your
5	Affidavit, Exhibit B-4 of the Complaint File,
6	Mr. D'Aoust, you stated that changes in past
7	practice would require the approval of the Union.
8	Do you recall giving that affidavit
9	testimony?
10	THE WITNESS: Yes.
11	EXAMINER MAGID: Yet, you have
12	testified here today of changes that you have made
13	in the smoking conditions in a couple of
14	situations.
15	And, you've also testified that the
16	Union's approval was not required; that the Union
17	did not have veto power but that they simply had
18	to be informed.
19	How do you reconcile the difference
20	between your testimony today and what you stated
21	in your affidavit?
22	THE WITNESS: Well, I'm not
23	well versed on what is allowed and what is not
24	allowed by the Union.
25	EXAMINER MAGID: You made a

1	statement here which at the top of the hearing
2	today you said was true then and is true now
3	regarding what is required and there is a
4	difference in your affidavit testimony and your
5	testimony before us here today.
6	THE WITNESS: I believe that
7	changing past practice would require the Union's
8	approval to avoid an unfair labor suit.
9	EXAMINER MAGID: To avoid a
10	grievance?
11	THE WITNESS: No, to avoid an
12	unfair labor practice action.
13	EXAMIER MAGID: Would require
14	their concurrence? Does that mean the Union does
15	have a veto?
16	MR. WINSLOW: I would object.
17	The witness is not qualified to answer these
18	questions.
19	EXAMINER MAGID: Well, the
20	witness has made testimony regarding what the
21	Union contract does require, and I'm probing the
22	previous testimony on that.
23	You're objecting to that,
24	Mr. Winslow? I'm overruling your objection.
25	THE WITNESS: No. I think that

1	changing something that is a work practice leaves
2	the Agency open to an Unfair Labor Act violation.
3	EXAMINER MAGID: But leaves the
4	Agency open to a charge; is that correct?
5	THE WITNESS: That's correct.
6	EXAMINER MAGID: And a charge is
7	not necessarily a loss, is it?
8	THE WITNESS: Not necessarily.
9	EXAMINER MAGID: Doesn't every
10	Union have the ability to file a charge if they
11	wish to do so or a Complaint in Court?
12	THE WITNESS: Yes, they do.
13	EXAMINER MAGID: And, that does
14	not necessarily mean they're correct; isn't that
15	right?
16	THE WITNESS: That's true.
17	EXAMINER MAGID: Doesn't the mere
18	fact that they can file a charge mean that
19	anything that management does leaves them open to
20	a charge being filed?
21	THE WITNESS: NO.
22	There are things that are covered
23	under the Union Contract and there are other
24	things that the Union contract specifically says
25	the Union has no discussion in this.

1	EXAMINER MAGID: Did you consult
2	with your labor relations people regarding
3	Ms. Hall's request to you to make the work area a
4	no smoking area?
5	THE WITNESS: No. We really
6	don't have labor relations people.
7	EXAMINER MAGID: You do somewhere
8	in this Agency, don't you?
9	THE WITNESS: I talked to
10	Personnel; I talked to the Director.
11	EXAMINER MAGID: Did you consult
12	with whoever it is that gives you guidance on
13	labor relations matters?
14	THE WITNESS: Yes, I did.
15	EXAMINER MAGID: Who was that?
16	THE WITNES: The personnel
17	officer and the Director.
18	EXAMINER MAGID: What did they
19	advise?
20	THE WITNESS: To do what we
21	have done; to take the actions we have taken.
22	EXAMINER MAGID: Did you talk
23	with them specifically about making the area a no
24	smoking area?
25	THE WITNESS: Yes, and it was

1 decided, no, that this wasn't something that we as 2 an Agency was going to do. And, when we did make 3 publications a non-smoking area, that was an agreement between the Union and us saying they had 4 5 no problems with us making a non-smoking area out 6 of publications. In fact, they suggested that we 7 make an announcement. I have it in my 8 EXAMINER MAGID: 9 notes, Mr. D'Aoust, that you thought it would be 10 unreasonable to ask your boss about banning 11 smoking. 12 Now, I may be incorrect in my notes, 13 but it seems to me if you did, indeed, say that 14 earlier today that that contradicts what you have 15 just said that you did request your boss to make 16 that a no smoking area. 17 Now, what is true? THE WITNESS: Mr. Clowney and 18 19 I talked about eliminating smoking in the pool. I never specifically said to him, "I want to make 20 21 that a non-smoking area. * 22 EXAMINER MAGID: Why not? Because I feel 23 THE WITNESS: 24 that smokers have rights.

EXAMINER MAGID:

25

Because you're a

1	smoker?
2	THE WITNESS: No. I think in
3	general that smokers have rights too.
4	EXAMINER MAGID: And, you have
5	not been able to us so far where these rights are
6	enumerated and what those rights are, have you?
7	THE WITNESS: No, I haven't.
8	EXAMINER MAGID: Can you
9	recollect at this moment where those rights are
10	stated as to what the smokers rights are, or where
11	I may find them? Do you believe there is a
12	constitutional right to smoke?
13	THE WITNESS: I don't know.
14	I doubt very seriously if smoking is mentioned in
15	the Constitution.
16	EXAMINER MAGID: Are you familiar
17	with the cost of accommodations to other
18	handicapped people in the Agency? In the Regional
19	Office, that is.
20	THE WITNESS: Not really, no.
21	EXAMINER MAGID: For example,
22	your earlier testimony was that accommodating
23	Ms. Hall by way of making a separate room for her
24	for proper ventilation would cost at the minimum
25	85 hundred dollars?

Yes. THE WITNESS: 1 EXAMINER MAGID: 2 Could you 3 compare that with the cost of other accommodations that have been made? 5 THE WITNESS: No, I've never 6 compared against the cost of any other 7 accommodations. 8 EXAMINER MAGID: All right, I 9 have no more questions, Mr. D'Aoust, at this time. 10 Do you have any more redirect? 11 Yes, I would MR. WINSLOW: 12 like to. 13 REDIRECT EXAMINATION BY MR. WINSLOW: 14 There was a reference made somewhere 15 in the cross-examination about a survey. I don't 16 remember what it was. 17 Can you refresh my memory as to why 18 there was no survey? Well, you didn't answer 19 whether there was a survey -- the reason for not 20 21 making a survey. What I'm trying to find out is, what 22 was that question; what did that question relate 23 to when Laren asked it. 24

25

I believe she asked if we had ever

1	conducted a survey as to determine how much of
2 '	other sick leave was due to bronchitis.
3	Q. Well, that was one where she asked
4	about a survey, but she you had also asked about
5	another survey.
6	EXAMINER MAGID: Excuse me, let's
7	go off the record.
8	(Whereupon, a short discussion was
9	held off the record)
10	EXAMINER MAGID: Back on the
11	record.
12	BY MR. WINSLOW:
13	Q. When you considered Ms. Hall for the
14	job in the teletype room, did you actually make a
15	offer of that job to her?
16	A. We began by cross training her.
17	Q. Just answer my question.
18	A. And then I did ask her if she would
19	like to take that job.
20	Q. Was that an offer?
21	A. Yes.
22	EXAMINER MAGID: If she had said
23	"yes," she would have been processed and would
24	have become a teletypist?
25	THE WITNESS: Yes, it's on one

of those reports of contact.

BY MR. WINSLOW:

- Q. It was a bona fide offer as far as you're concerned?
 - A. Yes.
- Q. Now, she has raised the question of what is to stop you from putting somebody that smokes in the teletype room when you had another opening.

My question is: What is to stop you from putting someone in the teletype room where there is another opening?

- A. Nothing is to stop me, other than I might take Laren into consideration when filling that position. But I would probably take the best qualified, smoker or non-smoker.
- Q. Would that fall within the ambience of smokers rights?
 - A. I believe so.
- Q. If you had attempted to solve her problem by putting her in the teletype room, how do you feel -- would this have been one of your main considerations in deciding who to place in there with her to work?
 - A. Yes.

1	I was offering it to Laren
2	noncompetitively as a straight lateral transfer.
3	Q. You're talking about if you had to
4	put somebody else in there later?
5	A. If I had to put somebody else in
6	there later?
7	Q. Yes.
8	Would you ever consider the fact that
9	this was the only way you would have been able to
10	solve this problem for her when you made the
11	choice, "Well, I'm going to have to put somebody
12	else in there. Shall I put a smoker in there?"
13	A. If there were two candidates and one
14	of them smoked and one didn't, I would pick the
15	non-smoker.
16	EXAMINER MAGID: Let me ask you a
17	couple of questions about that.
18	The teletype room has space for two
19	operators; is that correct?
20	THE WITNESS: Three.
21	EXAMINER MAGID: At the time you
22	were considering putting Ms. Hall in, would she
23	have been the second or third?
24	THE WITNESS: The third.
25	EXAMINER MAGID: And, the other

1	two were non-smokers; is that right?
2	THE WITNESS: Right.
3	EXAMINER MAGID: Could you have
4	made that a non-smoking area just as you did in
5	publications? Then, if a smoker had applied,
6	would you then have turned down a smoker for the
7	next teletype position?
8	THE WITNESS: Possibly.
9	BY MR. WINSLOW:
10	Q. I will show you two exhibits, one of
11	which carries a date of 1980 when it was to be
12	rescinded automatically.
13	Is that still station policy as far
14	as you know?
15	A. Yes, it is.
16	EXAMINER MAGID: Are you talking
17	about Agency Exhibit 1?
18	MR. WINSLOW: I'm talking
19	about the memo now, Exhibit 2, the Director's
20	memo.
21	BY MR. WINSLOW:
22	Q. Was that still policy as far as you
23	know?
24	A. Yes.
25	Q. Does that recognize the rights of an

2 3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18 19

20

22

21

23

24

25

individual employee to smoke as you read it?

Yes, I believe it acknowledges the Α. right of people to smoke.

If there is a change in policy--and again looking at this from your job as Chief of Administration, responsible for publishing policy statements and distributing those that come from Central Office, if there is a change in policy, would it be in writing?

Yes, it would be.

If Exhibit 1 terminated, as Mr. Magid has indicated it states that it would, on June 30, 1980, and there has been no written statement to supersede it, do you consider it to be still in effect?

I really don't know. I think it's an historical document at this point.

EXAMINER MAGID: Does that mean you think it's not in effect?

THE WITNESS: If a survey team came in from Central Office and cited the Director for not following this rescinded circular it wouldn't hold up, but I don't think the Agency policy has changed any since the circular was issued.

1 BY MR. WINSLOW: 2 Q. That was my next question. 3 If, in fact, it is not an effective document but you have no document that would 4 5 supersede it, then does it actually state what the 6 policy is at the present time even though 7 unpublished. 8 EXAMINER MAGID: Is that a legal 9 question that you're asking him? 10 MR. WINSLOW: I think it is. 11 I want him to tell me what the policy is at the 12 V.A. EXAMINER MAGID: We can listen to 13 14 what he thinks it is, but I think you're asking 15 legal policy, and I don't he is a lawyer. Can we go off 16 THE WITNESS: the record for a minute? 17 EXAMINER MAGID: 18 For what 19 purpose? 20 THE WITNESS: It's about the 21 rescinded sick leave. There is a circular that is self rescinding that we are to be courteous to our 22 clientele. We all were amused when the thing self 23 rescinded, but I don't think that that means that 24

we were not longer required to be courteous to the

people we serve. 1 I think the same thing holds true for 2 this. I think the Agency would come out with a 3 new policy statement if the intent of this was no 4 longer in effect. 5 EXAMINÉR MAGID: It may be that 6 the intent of the document may still be in effect, 7 8 but when the document itself says this circular 9 expires June 30, 1980, isn't that a self recession 10 statement? Yes, it is. 11 THE WITNESS: 12 BY MR. WINSLOW: Does the policy have to be in 13 Q. 14 writing? I don't think the policy has to be in 15 16 writing, no. That is what I'm trying to get 17 Q. 18 through. The policy doesn't have to be in 19 20 writing. Then, do you think that what is said 21 Q. 22 here is now still unwritten policy regarding 23 smoking and non-smoking in the V.A.? 24 A. Yes, I do. Is that opinion based on your

1	experience as Chief of the Administrative Division
2	from what you know about the way the Veterans
3	Administration is established and maintained?
4	A. Yes. It is a qualified "yes."
5	No one is ever going to be able to
6	hold anything on that circular if it is rebutted.
7	Q. That isn't my question.
8	A. Circulars are self rescinding all the
9	time, and the action which initiated the
10	promulgation of that circular in 1979 is probably
11	still in effect.
12	Yes, I think this is still the
13	Agency's policy.
14	MR. WINSLOW: That's all I
15	wanted to know.
16	No further questions.
17	EXAMINER MAGID: Ms. Hall, do you
18	have anything further?
19	MS. HALL: Yes.
20	RECROSS EXAMINATION
21	BY MS. HALL:
22	Q. If this is still the Agency's policy
23	did you have when I questioned you before you
24	said "no," as to most of these, or "I don't know."
25	Do you know why it's such an

unfamiliar document to everyone and why most of this stuff isn't even recognized as something or done?

A. I don't know.

I hadn't seen the circular until yesterday. I didn't realize the V.A. had a written policy at any time about what the V.A.'s policy on smoking and someone smoking is.

As far as what the Circular in '79 requires people to do, if it wasn't put into some other circular or put into a manual someplace, I doubt seriously if anyone is doing what those circulars require.

Q. One more question:

You stated that you had consulted with the Director and personnel about what could or could not be done to accommodate me, and you basically followed their advice?

- A. I followed their advice.
- Q. Did you have things that you proposed to them that they overruled that might accommodate me, such is putting me in other more acceptable areas like reproduction or places like that?
 - A. No.

When you worked overtime, I think we

put you back in pub just to get you out of the smoke filled typing pool. But, no, they didn't overrule me.

It was a group discussion: What should we do? No, we don't want to do that. It wasn't anything that I said, "Let's do this" and they said, "no."

- Q. Did you ever propose that I be moved to reproduction to alleviate the problem?
- A. No, because I don't need any extra help in reproduction most of the time. You would be working out of your classification.
- Q. I'm mean move me, still typing back there, like you did on overtime?
- A. We talked about it one time, but we were limited because of the old Lanier dictation system which was tied to the floor and in order to move you, we would would have had to rewire.
- Q. Did any of the people you consulted actually have the final word, say, the Director or personnel people? Did they actually say, "Yes, we can or will do that," or "No, we can't or will not do that"?
- A. I followed what the Director determined our Regional Office actions would be.

1	Q. What was that? On the particular
2	question I asked you as to moving me to
3	reproduction issue, what did the Director or
4	personnel man tell you that you could do or could
5	not do?
6	A. Actually, I never proposed that as
7	something we could do.
8	Again, with publications, you would
9	be well out of sight of supervision of CTA.
10	There would be no one to ask questions of. At the
11	time we considered that, we would have had to
12	somehow pipe dictation to you which we couldn't do
13	because of the limitation of the Lanier loop
14	system.
15	No, it was never seriously
16	considered.
17	Q. Is there a transcription machine in
18	the closet?
19	A. Probably. There is one now.
20	Q. Was there a transcription machine for
21	me to do dictating off of when you put me in the
22	closet?
23	A. I think there was. I don't know,
24	Lari. It was only a couple of days and I wasn't

even in there.

1	Q. Do you recall whether or not I was
2	even on dictation when you put me in the closet?
3	A. No.
4	EXAMINER MAGID: No more
5	questions?
6	I just have a couple, Mr. D'Aoust.
7	At the time that Director Clowney the
8	memorandum which is Agency Exhibit 2, he was
9	familiar with the obstructive lung disease that
10	Ms. Hall; is that correct?
11	THE WITNESS: Yes.
12	EXAMINER MAGID: Was he also
13	aware at the same time of Mr. Aguirre's smoking
14	tendencies?
15	THE WITNESS: No.
16	I think we hired Marty after June of
17	185.
18	EXAMINER MAGID: When was he
19	hired?
20	THE WITNESS: I really don't
21	know.
22	MR. WINSLOW: Hay I have a
23	couple more questions?
24	
25	

1		FURTHER
2		REDIRECT EXAMINATION
3	BY MR. WINSL	OW :
4	Ω.	What kind of employee is Mr. Aguirre?
5	Α.	Right now Marty is kicking out more
6	lines than a	nyone else.
7	Q• _	Top producer?
8	Λ.	I think in several months of late, he
9	has been the	top producer.
10	Q.	How is he as far as accuracy; do you
11	know?	
12	A.	He does a very nice job.
13	Q.	When you refer to this smoke filled
14	typing pool,	are you telling me that this area is
15	worse than of	ther areas of a similar nature in the
16	building?	
17	A.	No.
18		I don't believe the typing pool would
19	be any worse	than most areas in the building.
20	Q.	Did you consider the V.A. Regional
21	Office to be	smoke filled?
22		I mean I'm questioning your use of
23	that term.	
24	Α.	I said "smoke filled"?
25	Q.	You said "smoke filled typing pool."

1	A. No, we were talking about ambient
2	smoke? There is smoke in this room right now
3	simply because of its being pumped in by the
4	building air system.
5	I don't mean "smoke filled" in the
6	sense that there is a blue cloud rolling out of
7	the typing pool every day.
8	Q. That's why I'm asking. That was the
9	impression I was getting. Is that the impression
10	you wanted to give?
11	A. No.
12	EXAMINER MAGID: Anything based
13	on his questions, Ms. Hall?
14	MS. HALL: One quick
15	question.
16	FURTHER RECROSS-EXAMINATION
17	
18	BY MS. HALL:
19	Q. Do you recall me saying to you on
20	many occasions that smoke was affecting my
21	production negatively? It caused me to have
22	excessive error rates and made me sick?
23	A. Yes, I do.
24	Q. Can you tell me why that has less an
25	effect on me than Mr. Aguirre's need to smoke in

order to maintain his the top production?

A. In order to satisfy you, I would have to do things I can't do. Your production and your quality of work is very good, and you're not near being considered for termination because of failing to meet production or quality goals.

From my point as a manager, I'm willing to live with your above average performance and Marty's excellent performance.

I'm not sure because I know right now that you are doing 118 percent of goal and Marty is doing 132 percent of goal. But, I'm not sure that if we stopped smoking completely that you would go up to 132 percent, and Marty would only drop to 118. I'm not sure.

- Q. Are you sure I wouldn't go to 132.
- A. No.

MS. HALL: That's all.

EXAMINER MAGID: Thank you for

your testimony, Mr. D'Aoust.

Now, as an alleged discriminating official, I'm going to allow you at this point to offer anything that you think would be useful to our determination here that you think you have not been asked.

_ _

Now, I realize you have an affidavit on file and you can testify for some several hours and, yet, there may be something that you wish to appear in the record that you have not been asked.

This is your opportunity to put anything you wish concerning this matter into the record.

THE WITNESS: I really don't have anything to add. I think we have covered just about everything.

My personal feeling on this is that I don't believe we have discriminated against Lari. We hired her, we promoted her on time with the minimum-exact minimum-waiting period. We have given her choices of assignments. I've tried to talk to the other people who are affecting her, but even if we stopped smoking in the pool, I really don't think it would clear the air enough to help her condition.

I think this building has one air system, as I mentioned before, and you didn't want me to say it, but I if we would have to ban smoking in the pool, we would have to ban smoking in the whole building because the whole building shares the same air space because of GSA's heating

and cooling idea that its' cheaper to reheat used air and recool used air.

I look for the day that GSA will probably ban smoking in all of its buildings, and that would solve this problem. But, until that happens I think that we tried to accommodate Lari. I don't think I have discriminated against her, and I didn't think the Agency really has.

That's all I have to say.

EXAMINER MAGID: Thank you,

Mr. D'Aoust, and I caution you not to discuss your
testimony outside of this hearing room.

(Witness Excused)

examiner Magid: Mr. Aguirre, my name is Martin K. Magid. I've been assigned by the EEOC to conduct a hearing in this case.

You have been called as a witness regarding testimony regarding matters raised by the Complainant in her Discrimination Complaint against the Agency.

You are here on official business, and you are assured by EEOC regulations of freedom from reprisal for your testimony.

We do require you testify either under oath or by affirmation. Do you have any

1	objections to taking an oath	?
2	THE WITNESS:	No.
3	EXAMINER MAGID:	All right, would
4	you stand and raise your righ	it hand, please?
5	MARTIN AGUIF	RRE,
6	having been first duly	sworn, was
7	examined and testified	as follows:
8	EXAMINER MAGID:	State your full
9	name, please?	
10	THE WITNESS:	My name is
11	Martin William Aguirre.	
12	EXAMINER MAGID:	Are you employed
13	by the V. A.?	
14	THE WITNESS:	Yes, I am.
15	EXAMINER MAGID:	In what
16	capacity?	
. 17	THE WITNESS:	Clerk typist.
18	EXAMINER MAGID:	Okay,
19	Mr. Aguirre, do you recall gi	ving the EEO
20	investigator an Affidavit in	this case?
21	THE WITNESS:	Yes, I do.
22	EXAMINER MAGID:	Have you
23	reviewed that affidavit late	.y?
24	THE WITNESS:	No, I have not.
25	EXAMINER MAGID:	At the time that

1	you gave that affidavit, which is Exhibit B-11 in
2	the complaint file, was everything that you stated
3	in it true and correct to the best of your
4	knowledge and belief?
5	THE WITNESS: Yes, it was.
6	EXAMINER MAGID: Do you recall
7	what is in it?
8	THE WITNESS: Yes, I do.
9	EXAMINER MAGID: To the best of
10	your knowledge and belief today, is everything
11 .	that is contained in that affidavit true and
12	correct?
13	THE WITNESS: Yes.
14	EXAMINER MAGID: All right, thank
15	you very much.
16	Mr. Winslow?
17	DIRECT EXAMINATION
18	BY MR. WINSLOW:
19	Q. How long have you worked in the
20	typing pool?
21	A. One year as of the Third of
22	September.
23	Q. Do you remember being called in to
24	Mr. D'Aoust's office with the other people that
25	smoked in the pool to discuss the possibility of

restricting the amount of smoking that was done in 1 2 the pool? 3 A. Not while I've been here, I don't recall. 5 Do you remember any such similar б meeting that was held on that same subject with 7 Beverly Keith, the supervisor in the pool? 8 Α. Yes. 9 She had asked us -- well, actually she hadn't asked us -- she told us not to go by 10 11 Lari's desk with lit cigarettes and to keep our 12 smoking at our own desks. 13 Do you smoke? Q. 14 Yes, I do. A. How does cigarette smoking affect 15 Q. 16 your health? Well, my understanding is that 17 Α. cigarette smoking is not good for one's health. 18 However, my reason for smoking is linked to my 19 alcoholism. 20 Smoking is an addiction. It's a very 21 difficult one to break. I have tried and was 22 unable to due to the fact that because I'm an 23 alcoholic, cigarettes give me, I guess, a -- what is 24

the word-- .

- Q. Release?
- A. Well, I use it basically as a relaxant. When I get nervous or tense, it helps me to relax or when I'm anxious or things of that nature, I will smoke to help myself calm down and relax.
- Q. Did drinking do the same thing for you?

EXAMINER MAGID: What was that?

BY MR. WINSLOW:

- Q. Does drinking do it the same thing for you?
- A. That was basically the excuse for drinking was to, I guess, numb the fears of day-to-day living and anxiety, anger, things of that nature, just by drowning it with alcohol and then you don't feel any more.

In terms of my alcoholism, when I do get anxious or fearful, tense, at those times quite often the compulsion to drink does arise and smoking helps in one sense to calm me down.

I'm a very nervous person by nature and it also helps to relieve that compulsion to drink.

Q. Were you hired as a handicapped

1	person with this problem?
2	A. Yes, I was.
3	Q. Did you tell anyone that you had the
4	problem when you came to apply for the job?
5	A. Yes.
6	EXAMINER MAGID: The handicap was
7	alcoholism?
8	THE WITNESS: Yes.
9	BY MR. WINSLOW:
10	Q. Did you open the subject matter on
11	that subject, or did the person who interviewed
12	you open it?
13	A. It was on my application.
14	I don't recall if it was brought up
15	in my interview, either with the personnel office
16	or with the supervisor. I don't think it was but
17	I'm not sure.
18	Q. Were you hired under any of the
19	special programs for hiring of the handicapped?
20	A. No.
21	Q. You expressed the opinion in your
22	affidavit before the investigator that Lari's desk
23	was located where there was the best circulation
24	available.
25	Why did you feel that way or what

basis do you have for making that statement? 1 2 Her desk was by an open door--between two doors of the office--and to me I believe that 3 is the best place of getting cross circulation 5 between the two doors in the room. Is that when Lari's desk was at the 6 Q. back of the room near the door to publications? Yes. 8 Α. 9 Is she there now? 0. 10 No. So, that would no longer be true as 11 far as you're concerned? 12 13 Right. A. Do you know why she isn't there 14 15 anymore? Because she was put on the 5520 word 16 processor and they are situated on the other side 17 of the room. 18 If you were to quit smoking--for 19 example, if smoking were banned in the typing 20 pool--and you continued to work there, are you 21 afraid that you might resume your drinking or 22 wouldn't it make any difference? 23 I could not say definitely. It's a 24 very strong possibility as far as I'm concerned.

I smoke a lot. I think it would very difficult for me to get by on a detail basis of not smoking in the office. There are times when the work does get frustrating.

The first thing I do is to light a cigarette and calm down and get my work done the best I can. At times—and I never know when—the compulsion to drink does come; and, again, if I had to deal with trying not to smoke at the same time, I think that would be extremely difficult for me. I don't know if I could handle that on a daily basis.

And, the attempts that I have tried to quit smoking since I've been in the program has proven to me that it is not so easy and, in fact, as I stated on my statement to the investigator, many people in the program who have tried who have a lot more years of sobriety than I were forced to resume smoking because of the fact the tension builds up, they were not able to cope, I guess, with the withdrawal from cigarettes and got to the point where it was becoming a threat to their sobriety because the compulsion continued to increase with every frustrating day.

So, they were strongly advised that

if it came down to a choice sobriety and smoking that they had better start smoking again.

- Q. Did you try to comply with the request of Beverly Keith to avoid going near Lari's desk with a cigarette in your hand?
 - A. Yes, I have.
- Q. Have you done anything else to try to alleviate the smoke that Lari might be subjected to in the pool?

A. Yes.

When I noticed that she is coming back, because my desk is right in front of the files for form letters and forms that we use, and I have caught myself on several occasions when she has come -- I've noticed her walking toward the back, and I was just about to light a cigarette, I will wait until she has gotten her forms and left before I'll light my cigarette.

If I already have one lit, and she comes back, I just try not to puff on it while she is there and blow smoke around.

Q. Have you noticed or heard of any or has anyone made any comments or have you made any comments o or done anything that would show animosity toward Lari because of this limitation

1	and this request to curtail or limit the smoking
2	in that area?
3	A. No, absolutely not.
4	Q. I know I sympathize with her problem
5	as well as I feel anxious of my own in having to
6	deal when what could be in fact, we have met at
7	the elevator and chatted and I have no animosity
8	toward her whatsoever.
9	And, I have not noticed any animosity
10	toward her from anyone else.
11	MR. WINSLOW: That's all.
12	EXAMINER MAGID: Cross-
13	examination, Ms. Hall?
14	CROSS-EXAMINATION
15	BY MS. HALL:
16	Q. You said that smoking was probably
17	not good for your health and your smoking would
18	create a hazard for you, do you think?
19	A. See, the problem with smoking as
20	being not good for my health, I have a serious
21	choice that I have to make in the matter because
22	of my alcoholim.
23	If it's a matter of giving in to one
24	addiction to avoid falling pray on the other, then
25	I'm forced to do that, because at this point I

1	cannot quit smoking and not being able to smoke at
2	will, because when I get the urge to smoke or when
3	I get up-tight, then I smoke to calm my nerves and
4	if I had to deal with that problem on top of my
5	alcoholism, it presents quite a problem there.
6	Q. Do you think that while smoking is
7	the lesser of two hazards for you, that it might
8	be a very great hazard to someone who might be
9	around you in a work place?
10	A. It could, yes.
11	I don't understand the nature of your
12	disability, though; so I can't say for a fact.
13	EXAMINER MAGID: You think it's
14	possible that it might be harmful?
15	THE WITNESS: I could imagine so.
16	MS. HALL: This might be
17	out of line; I don't know.
18	EXAMINER MAGID: Do you want to
19	have the witness leave the room while we talk
20	about it?
21	MS. HALL: No, I'll ask, I
22	guess.
23	BY MS. HALL:
24	Q. Are you aware of any studies linking
25	cigarette smoking to alcoholism and, in fact,

studies that indicate that smoking precedes and 1 2 encourages other addictions, alochol being one of 3 them? 4 Α. No. Do you, have any doctors' statements 5 Q. saying that your use of tobacco is helping you 6 7 physically to keep from falling pray to your 8 alcohol problem? No, only the experience of alcoholics 9 10 in the AA Program. And, other alcoholics advised you to 11 12 keep smoking? 13 A. Yes. Not a doctor? 14 Q. 15 Α. Right. Is there a doctor -- have you 16 Q. submitted any doctors' statements saying that you 17 are disabled because of the addiction that you 18 have tobacco smoke? 19 20 Α. No. 21 Have you submitted any statements from doctors saying that tobacco smoke is good 22 for you because it keeps you off of alcohol? 23 24 Α. No. Then, you haven't officially applied

1	for any sort of accommodation because of your
2	smoking disability or addiction?
3	A. No.
4	Q. At any level?
5	A. No.
6	Q. Can you tell me why you smoke during
7	virtually all six of your breaks and lunch periods
8	in the typing room?
9	A. I can only explain that by saying I'm
10	addicted to cigarettes and I smoke at will. I do
11	smoke a lot, and I smoke all day and all night
12	until I go to bed.
13	Q. Is there any reason during these
14	times when you're not allowed to work that you
15	can't leave the room to smoke?
16	A. No.
17	Q. Can you tell me why you don't?
18	A. It hadn't crossed my mind actually to
19	leave the room to smoke during breaks or during
20	those times that I could leave to smoke.
21	Q. There is a memo from the Director,
22	Exhibit Number 2.
23	EXAMINER MAGID: Do you want him
24	to see a copy of this?
25	MC UNITA Vac nleaca

1	BY MS. HALL:
2	Q. The fourth paragraph, starting with
3	the words, "I would hope," could you possibly read
4	that and comment as to whether you knew anything
5	about this, whether anybody has ever asked you to
6	comply with this and, if so, why you feel you
7	don't need to?
8	A. Well, the memorandum is dated
9	June 12, 1985.
10	I began working in October of 1985,
11	and I was not made aware of this, no. I did not
12	know. Otherwise, I would have complied.
13	EXAMINER MAGID: You would have
14	complied?
15	THE WITNESS: Yes.
16	EXAMINER MAGID: Nobody has ever
17	asked you to?
18	THE WITNESS: No, sir.
19	BY MS. HALL:
20	Q. Neither Beverly nor Ron nor anyone
21	ever mentioned to you about smoking on breaks?
22	A. No. I was totally unaware of that
23	memo.
24	MS. HALL: That's it.
25	EXAMINER MAGID: Mr. Aguirre, how

1	old were you when you started smoking?
2	THE WITNESS: I had
3	my first cigarette when I was in the fifth grade,
4	but I didn't begin smoking regularly until my
5	teens. I'm not exactly sure. I would say maybe
6	around 14 or 15.
7	EXAMINER MAGID: When do you feel
8	you became an alcoholic?
. 9	THE WITNESS: I think I have
10	been an alcoholic all my life. My first drunk was
11	as a child, after a wedding reception for my
12	brother. And, as I recall, it was all my first
13	blackout.
14	I believe I was born with this
15	disease but again as a child, that was my first
16	drunk and my first blackout.
17	EXAMINER MAGID: When do you
18	think you became addicted to alcohol?
19	THE WITNESS: The addiction
20	has always been there, but I didn't begin drinking
21	regularly until my teens when I was in high
22	school, I believe the ninth grade.
23	EXAMINER MAGID: So, your smoking
24	preceded your drinking habit; is that correct?
25	THE WITNESS: Yes.

1	EXAMINER MAGID: Now, you
2	testified that you did try to comply with requests
3	not to go near Ms. Hall's desk while you were
4	smoking.
5	How about others in the group?
6	Did they also try to comply?
7	THE WITNESS: Yes.
8	EXAMINER MAGID: Everyone?
9	THE WITNESS: To the best of
10	my knowledge, yes.
11	EXAMINER MAGID: Did you ever see
12	anyone deliberately not comply or go out of their
13	way to go near her with cigarettes?
14	THE WITNESS: No.
15	EXAMINER MAGID: If the Agency
16	banned smoking in the work area, would you quit?
17	THE WITNESS I would have to
18	see how it would affect me.
19	EXAMINER MAGID: You would first
20	try to complý?
21	THE WITNESS: Yes.
22	EXAMINER MAGID: Anything else on
23	direct, Mr. Winslow?
24	MR. WINSLOW: No, I don't
25	think so.

1	EXAMINER MAGID: Do you have
2	anything?
3	MS. HALL: No.
4	EXAMINER MAGID: All right, we
5	thank you for your testimony, Mr. Aguirre, and I
6	caution you not to discuss your testimony outside
7	the hearing room.
8	(Witness Excused)
9	EXAMINER MAGID: That concludes
10	the testimony of the approved witnesses.
11	Are there requests for rebuttal
12	witnesses?
13	MR. WINSLOW: Yes, Your Honor.
14	I would like to call Bob Rogowski.
15	EXAMINER MAGID: What testimony
16	MR. WINSLOW: To testify
17	regarding the pre-hiring interview that was
18	conducted with Ms. Hall, as well as the policy of
19	the V.A. with respect to smoking, with respect to
20	handicapped people hiring handicapped people
21	with respect to EEO questions.
22	He is the only individual that I know
23	of in personnel who would be able to testify on
24	those questions, and the only individual other
25	than Beverly Reith who would be able to testify

regarding the information provided by the

Complainant at the time of her employment

interview. I would like to call the personnel

officer who is Bob's boss.

name?

EXAMINER MAGID: What is his

MR. WINSLOW: His name is

Kenneth Ciacivch because Bob isn't familiar with

the Union contract with the V.A. and Pederal

regulations on unfair labor practice issues or

federal statutes covering those, and you've asked

a number of questions regarding unfair labor

practices and grievances. Those really fall

within the bailiwick of Ken Ciacivch.

Director of the Regional Office, George Clowney, who is the one who is actually the third alleged discriminating official, Mr. Ciacivch being another one, because there has been testimony offered by the Complainant to the effect that she discussed this matter with Mr. Clowney, and he made certain responses which I would like to question him about as well as is the testimony of Mr. D'Aoust of his conversations with him regarding possible other areas where relief could

be granted; what other means might be used to solve Laren's problem.

EXAMINER MAGID:

Is that it?

MR. WINSLOW:

That was

basically what I wanted to get out of each of those people.

EXAMINER MAGID: Ms. Hall, do you have a request for rebuttal witnesses?

MS. HALL:

No.

EXAMINER MAGID: All right, with respect to Bob Rogowski and your proposed rebuttal testimony regarding the policy regarding smoking, it is the Agency which presented the evidence regarding the Agency's policy on smoking. There is evidence in the file.

Ms. Hall did not present any evidence ::
regarding what the Agency's policy is. Therefore,
there is nothing to rebut regarding the Agency's
policy. The evidence is in the file and I'm going
to deny your request for Mr. Rodowski for the
purposes of providing testimony regarding smoking
and the Agency's policy.

Regarding your proposal for him to provide rebuttal testimony regarding the Agency's policy on the handicapped and on EEO questions,

those are requests could have been made months ago if you desired to have testimony to that effect.

. 21

Also, I'm not aware of any information that Ms. Hall gave regarding the Agency's policy on the handicapped and on EEO questions. Therefore, I'm going to deny your request for rebuttal testimony by Mr. Rodowski on those matters.

However, I will approve Mr. Rodowski for the sole purpose of providing rebuttal testimony regarding the pre-hiring interview which Ms. Hall had with him, since she did testify as to the contents of that interview. I will allow you to question him on that subject and that subject alone.

With regard Kenneth Ciacivch and your request for him to testify regarding unfair labor practices and grievances, I'm aware that there has been some testimony all of it by Agency witnesses regarding the prospect of unfair labor practices and grievances.

There has been no testimony from

Ms. Hall regarding those subjects, or the prospect

of unfair labor practices or grievances and

occurring. Therefore, I'm going to deny your

request for Kenneth Ciacivch.

б

With respect to your request for Director Clowney as a rebuttal witness, you requested that he would provide rebuttal testimony regarding conversations with Witness D'Aoust.

D'Aoust is an Agency witness, and it would be inappropriate for you to provide rebuttal testimony that would contradict testimony by one of the Agency's other witnesses regarding the conversations they may have had. I'm going to deny your request for rebuttal testimony by Clowney regarding conversations he had with D'Aoust.

Now, I would like you to tell me specifically, Mr. Winslow, the subject matter of the conversations between Clowney and Hall that you wish Mr. Clowney to rebuts?

MR. WINSLOW: First of all, she stated that Mr. Clowney had told her that the problem, if you want to call at that—I'm not sure what words she used—has been blown all out of proportion, and the were smokers were under considerable pressure, and he didn't feel that he wanted to increase the pressure on them.

Then, she expressed the opinion that

what he was saying was that he was under some kind of pressure by "society" and that he had stated that the whole issue had been overblown.

I think he is entitled to express and clarify what he meant if that is what he said and whether he was under pressure by his employees vis-a-vis the society, or whether he was talking about pressure some other society or just exactly what he meant, if that is what he said, when he made that comment.

He is one of the people that she charges with discrimination. I would also calling your attention to the fact that two of the witnesses that we initially had requested called that we be allowed to call were Mr. Clowney and and Mr. Ciacivch.

Our request in that letter was that these people would testify as to what accommodations had been made or attempted by Management as well as the conditions in the Complainant's work area. Inasmuch as they are charged with discrimination, it seems to me they ought to be given a chance to respond to those charges and to explain how they feel we have attempted to accommodate her and how they feel

working conditions have been in that area, but certainly in the case of Mr. Clowney especially, he is the, if I may say, ultimate authority.

The final decision is his and he also, I think, is in a position to indicate whether he feels that he would consider the request to Central Office for additional money to build a room around Laren that has been raised.

It seems to me also that much of the testimony that Mr. D'Aoust gave with respect to an unfair labor practice as to the procedure to be followed on a grievance and what those things are, is most confused, and I raised the objection several times that Mr. D'Aoust wasn't qualified to testify on those matters and I was overruled.

I feel that Mr. Ciacivch could clarify that for Your Honor, and I feel Mr. Clowney could clarify what he was saying to Laren's and about about which she testified.

EXAMINER MAGID: With respect to that testimony of Ms. Hall in which she gave the opinion as to when Mr. Clowney was referring to, I rule that it's not necessary to rebut that opinion testimony, since it is nothing more than that, simply her opinion, and it's not necessary to

rebut it, since it is her opinion and presumably her opinion won't change. I state this is merely her opinion and not an authoritative.

With respect to the other matters which I requested the other matters that Ms. Hall raised regarding her conversations with Director Clowney, I find that those matters are somewhat collateral to the main proceeding here.

The main purpose of this proceeding which is to determine whether the accommodations attempted to be made by the Agency were sufficient, and I find them too collateral to require rebuttal testimony.

With respect to his status as an alleged discriminating official and the right to testify, that is correct; the alleged discriminating officials do have the right to testify. However, their presence as hearing witnesses must be requested just as it must be requested for my other witnesses and the Agency failed to request him when it had the opportunity to do so.

It is true that he was requested as a witness in the Agency's letter to me of May 23 and in my response to that request, I asked the Agency

to either state why they were all necessary or to justify their appearance individually even though they were to testify to the same items.

At that time if the Agency had said,
"Despite the fact that they they will testify the same thing, they are alleged discrimination officials, and we renew the request," I would have approved the request. However, you did not do so.

You just merely selected one person from each of the two groups. You did not renew the request for Mr. Clowney. Therefore, on those bases, I'm going to deny your request for Mr. Clowney as a rebuttal witness.

I'm going to request that when we come back with Mr. Rodowski that you do provide copies of the Union agreement that was in effect at the time that of Ms. Hall's began to make her complaints about the smoking, and I will offer it for admission as an Examiner's Exhibit.

MR. WINSLOW: I have already told them to bring a copy.

EXAMINER MAGID: All right, let's take a brief recess until such time as we can call Mr. Rodowski as a witness along with the Union Agreement.

1	BXAMINER MAGID: Off the record.
2	(Whereupon, a short recess was
3	taken off the record)
4	EXAMINER MAGID: Back on the
5	record, would you state your name, please?
6	THE WITNESS: Robert Francis
7	Rodowski.
8	EXAMINER MAGID: Mr. Rodowski,
9	you have been called as a witness by the Agency to
10	offer certain testimony in the relative to
11	Complainant's discrimination complaint against the
12	Agency.
13	You're here on official duty and you
14	are assured by EEOC regulations of freedom from
15	reprisal for testimony.
16	We do require that you testify either
17	oath or affirmation. Do you have any objection to
18	taking an oath?
19	THE WITNESS: No. I don't.
20	ROBERT RODOWSKI,
21	having been first duly sworn, was
22	examined and testified as follows:
23	EXAMINER MAGID: Be seated,
24	please.
25	EXAMINER MAGID: State your full

1	name?
2	THE WITNESS: Robert Francis
3	Rodowski.
4	EXAMINER MAGID: Mr. Rodowski, do
5	you recall making an Affidavit in this case?
6	THE WITNESS: Yes, I do.
7	EXAMINER MAGID: Have you
8	reviewed that affidavit lately?
9	THE WITNESS: I reviewed it
10	yesterday evening.
11	EXAMINER MAGID: At the time you
12	gave that affidavit, which is Exhibit B-5 in the
13	complaint file, were all the facts that you stated
14	in it true and correct to the best of your
15	knowledge and belief?
16	THE WITNESS: Yes, they were.
17	EXAMINER MAGID: Reviewing it
18	yesterday after some time has passed, are all the
19	facts contained in the affidavit still true and
20	correct to the best of your knowledge and belief?
21	THE WITNESS: Yes, they are.
22	EXAMINER MAGID: Thank you very
23	much. Are you a V.A. employee?
24	THE WITNESS: Yes, I am.
25	EXAMINER MAGID: In what

1	capacity?
2	THE WITNESS: I'm a personnel
3	management specialist.
4	EXAMINER MAGID: What grade is
5	that?
6	THE WITNESS: Grade 11
7	position.
8	EXAMINER MAGID: Do you know what
9	grade Mr. D'Aoust is?
10	, THE WITNESS: He is a Grade 11
11	as well.
12	EXAMINER MAGID: All right,
13	Mr. Winslow, you may examine Mr. Rodowski along
14	the guidelines that we discussed earlier.
15	DIRECT EXAMINATION
16	BY MR. WINSLOW:
17	Q. Did you bring with you the Union
18	contract that was in effect when Laren Hall was
19	hired?
20	A. Yes.
21	This is a Master Agreement with the
22	American Federation of Government Employees.
23	EXAMINER MAGID: May I have it,
24	please?
25	THE WITNESS: And I believe

	·
1	the ratification date is August 1982, and Ms. Hall
2	was hired in 1984 and that contract had been in
3	effect continuously since that date.
4	EXAMINER MAGID: This is a copy I
5	might have?
6	THE WITNESS: Yes, it is.
7	EXAMINER MAGID: I'm going to
8	mark this Master Agreement is Post Examiners
9	Exhibit 2.
10	Mr. Winslow, any objections to its
11	admission?
12	MR. WINSLOW: No.
13	EXAMINER MAGID: Ms. Hall, any
14	objection to its admission?
15	MS. HALL: NO.
16	EXAMINER MAGID: All right,
17	Examiner's Exhibit 2 is admitted. All right, Mr.
18	Winslow.
19	(Whereupon, Examiner's Exhibit 2, having
20	been marked for identification was admitted into evidence)
21	EXAMINER MAGID: All right, Mr.
22	Winslow?
23	DIRECT EXAMINATION
24	BY MR. WINSLOW:
25	Q. Are you familiar with the contents of

that contract in detail?

EXAMINER MAGID: Excuse me, would you leave the room for one moment, Mr. Rodowski

THE WITNESS: Sure.

EXAMINER MAGID: The only purpose for which Mr. Rodowski was approved as a rebuttal witness was to provide testimony regarding the pre-hiring interview with Ms. Hall.

He was not approved for discussions about the agreement or anything within the agreement unless it pertains to the pre-hiring interview.

MR. WINSLOW: Okay.

Again, I'm going to object on this ground; that it seems to me that we have inquired into at some length the question of whether or not the Agency had any obligation to the Union, how the Union was involved in this whole question.

The contract covers that.

We have never be able up this point to introduce any evidence regarding what is in that contract, or whether it even bears on that question.

And, it seems to me that either Mr. Rodowski or Mr. Tiatizth should be allowed to

testify regarding just how the Union should be, or is, involved in this entire question; and that a simple reading of the contract is not going to be enlightening because it's my opinion—and haven't read the contract but I'm under the impression—there is nothing in there about smoking.

There may be something in there about an unfair labor practice, what constitutes an unfair labor practice, and when management is obliged to consult with the Union and I have to assume that the Examiner does not have the necessary background to deal with those questions.

Now, it may well be that you do. I'm inclined to think you're well versed in this whole matter, but inasmuch as V.A. statute--well, it's actually a federal personnel manual and V.A. personnel manual that is involved, as well as federal statutes, it seems to me that would be helpful for someone to at least get that part of the picture clarified.

I appreciate and I asked him to bring the contract down with the thought in mind that that's why you wanted it.

If, on the other hand, there is

б

nothing in the contract about smoking and if there is nothing in there grievances, which I'm sure there is, and there is nothing in there about unfair labor practices, when management has to consult with the Union, then obviously the Contract serves no purpose.

But, it seems to me it would be helpful to yourself to understand how all these rules and manual provisions in the Contract relate. That is the reason for my having them bring the Contract.

I don't feel that we can jump to the conclusion that there isn't anything in the Contract that we're not obliged to do certain things.

I explained that Mr. D'Aoust was not qualified to give that kind of testimony. I'm not sure that Bob is. That's why I want to talk to him. But, in any event, that is my reason for bringing it up.

EXAMINER MAGID: My request for the Union agreement was made some time ago at almost a first mention of the provisions of the Union contract at the time when Mr. D'Aoust first mentioned that the Union agreement was a stumbling

block to ordering a smoke free work environment.

That is when I requested the Union agreement. I want to see what is in it. It's not connected at all with Mr. D'Aoust's failure to be more knowledge; it's about the Union agreement.

Mr. D'Aoust testified that he believed that the Union contract, certain provisions in it, I can find for myself whether those provisions are there. What it said about past practice and so forth.

That is the reason that I wanted the agreement so I can read the actual language and as you point out I am capable of reading the agreement.

Perhaps I don't know all the interpretations; however, I will leave it to you, Mr. Winslow, to provide any possible favorable interpretations of the Contract as may exist concerning smoking in the work place, whether they be arbitrator's decisions stemming off the Union contract or court decisions, or whatever.

I believe you are capable of finding those and if there are there, I suspect you will provide them to me either by way of closing arguments, by way of citation or providing the

1 actual cases.

In any case, that is the reason I requested the Union agreement and the reason I approved Mr. Rodowski's presence as a rebuttal witness was for an entirely different reason.

MR. WINSLOW:

I understand.

EXAMINER MAGID: So, your objection is noted, and it will, of course, be part of the record.

And, let us proceed with Mr. Rudowski. I will call him in.

(Witness enters conference room)
BY MR. WINSLOW:

Q. All right, Mr. Rodowski, what role did you play in in the hiring of Laren Hall?

A. As I indicated before, I'm a staff member in the personnel division. And, at the time in question, roughly the fall of 1984, I had the responsibility for our staffing program which meant that I was responsible for recruiting and placement of individuals and bringing them on board.

And, I was the individual that was her initial contact. I initially reviewed her application that we received, contacted her, asked

her if she wanted to be considered for the job, invited her for an interview, initially interviewed her for the position prior to referring her to the supervisor which is an ordinary practice.

And, then, in addition, on Ms. Hall's first day on the job, I would have been the individual who also conducted the orientation interview, indicating conditions of employment, salary, benefits, going over health benefit options and routine processing matters on the first day of employment.

- Q. Did you interview her more than once prior to her employment?
- A. I talked to her briefly on the phone, asking her again if she wanted to come in for an interview, and on the day she came in for an interview, talked to her, I imagine, for fifteen or twenty minutes.
 - Q. What was discussed at that time?
- A. Typically, I follow very specific patterns of questions when I talk to anybody regarding employment matters.

Again, we have a sort of a two-step interview process in our Agency.

The individual first comes to the personnel division, and we typically discuss things like salary and benefits.

we typically review their history of employment. If there is something unusual on there, we ask the employee about it, but we don't ask a lot of background questions.

We sort of give them some background about the place that they will be referred to and then refer them to the supervisors.

Basically, most decisions in our Agency as to who to hire rests on supervisor's recommendations. So, our discussion in personnel is relatively limited.

Maybe I should back up just a little bit and talk about how I obtained Laren's application which is a little bit different than a typical application because it may have relevance here.

There are two basic ways of hiring an individual in federal employment: One is through what we call the competitive process. We get a Civil Service register, and we interview candidates off that register.

A second major category, though, is

a non-competitive appointment. There are a group of individuals that are appointed, such as handicapped employees, severely handicapped employees; for example, disabled veterans, Viet Nam air veterans, reinstatement elgibles, transfers eligibles. That is pretty much the range for people eligible for non-competitive appointment.

That means our Agency or any Federal Agency could consider their employment without having them take a Civil Service examination.

In our particular Agency, we maintain applicant supply files of people with respect to eligibility. So, we have an applicant supply file for Viet Nam vets for individuals certified as severely handicapped and that sort of thing.

At the time we had a vacancy in our centralized typing unit, and we requested the Office of Personnel Management registers which would have competitive eligibles, but we also checked our inventory of possible candidates with what we call these special status appointments.

I'm not sure when Laren would have sent her application in, but I would imagine a

couple of months or a couple of weeks prior to when this vacancy occurred.

She sent an SF-171 to our Agency and attached to the application, there was a letter from the Michigan Rehabilitation Service indicating that she was classified as severely handicapped under the law and that she was eligible for a clerk typist position and could perform this particular position without hazard to herself or other individuals.

There is a standard form that we have provided that indicates that this person has a particular disability.

Again, typically, for the affirmative action reasons, one other reason we look at other sorts of candidates in addition to the competitive registers that we have available.

In this particular case, I reviewed the application and it indicated that she was working at the Internal Revenue Service and that she was a clerk typist and she had typing skills.

So, I called her up and asked her would she like to be considered for a permanent appointment at our Agency. She was on a temporary appointment at IRS, and she indicated that she

l did.

Q. She did what?

A. Was interested in being considered for the position.

So, we set up an appointment and, again, at that particular appointment, we discussed the items that you would discuss in any interview.

Usually, the interview is somewhat structured because we want to have uniformity in terms of what we ask people and what we tell people, and again just to make sure we don't eliminate any important items.

Q. Was she considered then because she

was handicapped.

Λ. In the sense we considered her because she was a qualified clerk typist and she was eligible for a non-competitive appointment.

Q. Because of the handicap?

A. That was the basis of her non-competitive eligibility was her being classified as a severely handicapped.

Q. What was actually said by you to Laren about her handicap?

A. Again, I referenced this attachment

that comes with the 171 initially. That had no indication on it what her specific disability was.

Later on, we got some more specific information; but on this particular letter, there was no specific indication of what her particular disability was.

Typically, when we interview a disabled veteran or handicapped individual, we ask them questions about their handicap in terms of how it would affect their performance of a particular job.

So, I asked Ms. Hall if she would tell me what her disability was. She indicated she had a stomach condition and also indicated that she had some respiratory problems.

I asked her if she thought that would cause any problems in performing the duties of the job that I discussed.

I discussed again, in brief, what the job involved and told her that the supervisor would go into much more detail about the day-to-day activities, and she indicated she didn't anticipate any problems performing that work.

Q. Did you tell her the nature the area

in which she would work?

б

- A. I explained to her that we were considering her for a clerk-typist job specifically in our centralized typing unit, and she would be talking with the supervisor in that particular unit.
- Q. At the time that you had the interview with her, did you have her medical history from the Michigan Rehabilitation Services?
 - A. No, we didn't.
- Q. Did you tell her that she would be working in a room with a number of other people?
- A. I can't remember specifically mentioning that. It was sort of like an obvious fact.

For one thing, most of our spaces are open work spaces, and we don't tell people,
"You'll be in a large office." It wouldn't be an item discussed.

- Q. Did she tell you she would be obliged to worked in a smoke free work area?
 - A. No, she didn't.

EXAMINER MAGID: Did you tell her that smoking was permitted? Did you tell her what the working conditions were in general?

1 THE WITNESS: In general or do 2 you mean specific to smoking? 3 EXAMINER MAGID: In general with specific respect to whether you have to wait until 5 break before you smoke or what? 6 No, that wasn't THE WITNESS: 7 discussed. 8 You didn't go EXAMINER MAGID: 9 into that? 10 THE WITNESS: No. 11 BY MR. WINSLOW: 12 Why wasn't it discussed? Again, typically, the interviews that 13 14 I have are very structured. 15 There are certain items that I discuss and then I ask people do they have any 16 questions, for example, and, obviously, if you're 17 a candidate for a job and have a particular 13 question about an area, they want me to expand on 19 and provide specific information. 20 But, the topic of what are the 21 smoking regulations at the Veterans Administration 22 23 never came up. Have you hired any other employees or 24 Q.

do you know whether V.A. has any other employees

who suffer from respiratory problems?

. 10

A. The V.A. maintains self identification system for handicapped individuals. Our employees when they first come on board, I give them basically a form that they code.

And, there are a number of disabilities listed on there, and they code the disabilities that they have. Again, as part of the file yesterday I was reviewing it, and I noticed that we have ten other individuals that have pulmonary respiratory conditions at our Agency.

- Q. Have you been involved in the hiring of any of those people?
 - A. Not that I am aware of.
- Q. Have these people been able to successfully cope with the smoke if there is smoke in the areas where they work?
- A. There have been several situations -
 I've been in personnel for four an a half years,

 and I would say on two or three occasions I've

 been aware of individuals complaining that maybe

 someone was smoking a cigar next to his desk or

 was a heavy smoker.

And, I'm not even sure if it was

somebody specifically with a disability or someone that was just bothered by the smoke. But, there was a complaint to supervision and accommodations were made by switching desks around, or moving the person away from being right next to the person that smoked.

- Q. Did that solve the problem?
- A. As far as I know because none of those situations ever evolved beyond the complaint not being resolved by moving the desks or switching the assignments where people wouldn't be sitting next to each other.
- Q. Are you saying there was never an EEO Complaint or grievance filed on that question?
- A. Again, I have been in personnel for four and a half years and this is the only EEO complaint that I have -- we have only had two complaints, and this is the one that has ever been on the basis of handicap specifically.
- Q. Have you ever had any other employee who seemed to have the degree of disability or inability, let's put it that way, to tolerate cigarette smoke that Ms. Hall apparentlyparents has?
 - A. I would say, no.

- Q. Is that the reason you didn't ask specifically about whether she could work in a pool area where there were smokers?
- A. I believe at the time I asked

 Ms. Hall the question of whether or not -- people

 are very sensitive about their handicaps, and I

 don't typically ask probing questions about their

 condition.
 - Q. Why not?
- A. I feel that if they can perform the job and they feel confident that they can perform the job, the nature of their disability is not really relevant.

For example, if you will recall, one of Ms. Hall's conditions was a stomach condition.

I asked the question, "Is that going to cause any problems in your performing your duties?"

potentially, I guess, it could. The condition might be so severe that she may need some sort of -- she may need, for example, to leave the work site on a constant basis.

But, I asked the question, and she said, "No."

Q. You asked her what question?

A. I asked the question, "Does your disability pose any problems in performing the duties of a clerk typist's job. And, when she said, "No," I felt there was no need to ask any more questions.

б

- Q. Would one of the considerations against asking such a question be the fact that if the individual were not hired, he then would have some basis possibly for filing an EEO complaint based on the fact that the reason they weren't hired was because they have is disability or handicap?
- A. Again, we are hiring based on bona fide qualifications. If the disability doesn't affect the individual's ability to perform a particular job, it doesn't become relevant.

So, I'm not going to ask questions that are irrelevant. I ask them can they perform the job, and they give me their assurance that they can.

Again, we have a statement from the Michigan Rehab Service indicating that, yes, she could perform the duties of a clerk-typist, then I'm going to be reasonably sure she can perform those particular duties and not go into asking

1 questions in detail. 2 I wouldn't say it's necessarily 3 because we're afraid of an EEO complaint, but I 4 would say it's because we just don't feel it's 5 relevant, and it's not a bona fide occupational 6 qualification not to have any handicap. 7 So, we have no right to ask those 8 questions. We only ask questions as they relate 9 to their ability to perform the duties that will 10 be assigned to them. 11 EXAMINER MAGID: I think you have 12 been straying a bit from the proof of examination. Actually, I 13 MR. WINSLOW: don't have anything else that I want to ask 14 Mr. Rodowski. 15 EXAMINER MAGID: Ms. Hall, 16 Cross-Examination? 17 CROSS-EXAMINATION 18 19 BY MS. HALL: You said there are three or four 20 Q. others that had a similar problem with cigarette 21 22 smoke. Did you ever look into how much sick 23 time they use possibly with their lung problem due 24

to the cigarette smoke?

1 Α. No. Were they non-smokers, I would 2 Q. 3 assume? I assume that if they were 4 complaining about smoke, they were non-smokers, 5 6 but I don't know that for a fact. 7 Did any of them ever have to take early retirement or go on disability leave? 8 9 A. No. You said that you asked me about my 10 11 stomach condition; if that would be a problem, and 12 I said, "No." 13 Α. Yes. But, you didn't ask me about my lung 14 Q. condition. 15 I didn't ask specifically for each 16 Α. disability. I asked what your disabilities were 17 and if those disabilities would cause any problems 18 in performing the duties of the job? 19 Did you ask me, then, about my 20 Q. stomach condition specifically or not? 21 Well, specifically in the sense that 22 I referred to your disabilities and asked if you 23 had any problems, but I didn't refer to each 24

disability separately.

1	I believe I asked you indicated
2	what your disabilities are. Do your disabilities
3	cause any problems performing the duties as I have
4	outlined.
5	Q. Do you remember me stating that I had
6	an ileostomy?
7	MR. WINSLOW: I'm sorry, I
8	didn't hear the last
9	MS. HALL: I asked him if
10	he remembered me stating that I have an ileostomy.
11	THE WITNESS: I can't recall.
12	To the best of my recollection, it
13	was a stomach condition, but I don't remember your
14	referring to it by the medical term.
15	BY MS. HALL:
16	Q. An ileostomy is not a stomach
17	condition.
18	EXAMINER MAGID: Ms. Hall, just
19	keep asking him questions. Your time for
20	testimony is past.
21	BY MS. HALL:
22	Q. If I mentioned my stomach condition,
23	can you tell me why you think I wouldn't have
24	mentioned my lung condition?
25	A. You did mention both conditions. I'm

sorry, you did mention that you had two disabilities; one was a stomach condition and the other was a respiratory condition.

- Q. Okay, is there any reason why someone with a lung condition can't type?
 - A. None whatsoever.
- Q. Is there any job requirement in the list of job requirements saying that you must be a smoker to be a typist in the typing pool at the V.A.?

EXAMINER MAGID: Is there any allegation to that effect, Ms. Hall?

THE WITNESS: The position descriptions are absent discussion on any kind of -- they don't say anything even about seeing. We have two blind transcriptionists; so it doesn't mention smoking/non-smoking, sighted/non-sighted.

Basically, the position descriptions describe the duties of the position that are to be performed and nothing else.

- Q. Do you recall me asking you why you hired me to begin with with the obstructive lung disease in view of the smoking in the pool?
 - A. I don't remember any questions.

 The first time I remember discussing

the disability with you in any kind of specificity was I would say three or four weeks after you came on board at the V.A.—I think there was a discussion we had in the hallway outside Personnel—you indicated that you were having some problems with smoke, and I mentioned that I would talk to the supervisor, Ron D'Aoust or Beverley Keith and see what they could do to rearrange the desks, and I think perhaps getting some fans in the area.

- Q. Do you remember saying to me, "Well, it's such a big room, I didn't think there would be a problem"?
 - A. No, I don't remember that.
- Q. If you have ten people with a pulmonary respiratory problem, and three or four individuals had made complaints about this problem and you knew I had a lung condition before hiring me, can you tell me why you wouldn't mention were you aware that the potential for this problem was there?
- A. Again, three or four complaints over the period of are three or four years is one complaint a year that was resolved with just some basic informal reorganization of a particular

to try to accommodate, I believe.

EXAMINER MAGID: The question was whether you recall her stating that to you before she was hired; during the interview?

THE WITNESS: I believe during the interview, she indicated that she was bothered by the smoke, and I indicated that they again had a situation once or twice in the past and that in those particular cases, we had moved some desks around.

BY MS. HALL:

- Q. Do you typically go into how you alleviate situations with people you haven't even hired yet?
 - A. It doesn't typically come up in the

interviews that I conduct, but there are all kinds of situations that people might bring to an interview.

You know, they might say, "I need to get off work early for this reason or that reason," and I might tell them how we could handle that particular situation in our organizational structure.

I don't ever remember specifically having a conversation, though, about how we would specifically accommodate a disability with an individual.

we have hired since I've been here people without, for example, arms or they have some sort of paralysis and that sort of thing, and they might indicate that they need to get up more often.

Typically, what I tell them is that we have a policy of trying to accommodate people as much as possible and they don't anticipate that as a problem. We don't anticipate that to be a problem.

Again, we have a very large handicapped work force and, again, no problems at all ever filed at all in a formal or informal

1	capacity about non-accommodation of a handicapped;
2	very severe handicaps involved.
3	We look sometimes the other way in
4	terms of performance standards and quality of work
5	expected because we realize have people have
6	handicaps that need to be overcome.
7	MS. HALL: That's it.
8	EXAMINER MAGID: Mr. Rodowski,
9	are you the handicap coordinator?
10	THE WITNESS: No.
11	I believe that our Operation Manual
12	indicates that the personnel officer for the
13	station is specifically designated as the
14	selective placement handicap coordinator.
15	EXAMINER MAGID: Who would that
16	be?
17	THE WITNESS: Ken Ciach.
18	EXAMINER MAGID: Was he the
19	handicap coordinator at the time Ms. Hall was
20	hired?
21	THE WITNESS: Yes, he was.
22	EXAMINER MAGID: Did you have any
23	familiarity with the EEOC regulations on
24	accommodating handicapped applicants or employees?
25	THE WITNESS: Some

1	familiarity.
2	EXAMINER MAGID: What is your
3	familiarity?
4	THE WITNESS: Again, there are
5	manuals and regulations, a book that the Office of
6	Personnel Management puts out about selective
7	placement of handicapped individuals and that is a
8	policy guideline that I obviously read and am
9	familiar with and have referred to during my
10	tenure.
11	EXAMINER MAGID: You have read it
12	and you've referred to it because during the
13	course of your employment you do interview
14	handicapped applicants and deal with handicapped
15	employees; is that correct?
16	THE WITNESS: That's correct.
17	EXAMINER MAGID: Would it be
18	accurate to say that at some point in your career
19	you have read the EEOC regulations on
20	accommodations of handicapped?
21	THE WITNESS: I don't believe
22	I've ever read them.
23	EXAMINER MAGID: Okay.
24	Did you ever see the medical
25	documentation that was sent in by the Michigan

Rehabilitation Service?

1

2

3

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

THE WITNESS: Approximately I believe a week before Ms. Hall actually came on board, I prepared a letter for the personnel officer's signature to the Michigan Rehab Service asking for specific medical documentation concerning her handicap.

That is a requirement of law. The Office of Personnel Management has some guidelines about what you need in an accepted appointment folder.

Again, as I said, this was an accepted appointment outside of the regular Civil Service register, and we have to set up a special file, and part the documents in that particular file requires a statement from the Michigan Rehab Service which is a little bit more specific as to the nature of the person's disability.

Did you ever see EXAMINER MAGID: those medical documents?

Approximately a THE WITNESS: week or two weeks after Ms. Hall came on board, they responded and it was incorporated in the file.

> Her hiring, EXAMINER MAGID:

290

1	then, was not dependent on yours or anyone in the
2	Agency's reviewing those documents; is that
3	correct?
4	THE WITNESS: Her hire was
5	only dependent upon her being certified as a
6	severely handicapped individual.
7	EXAMINER MAGID: It was not
8	dependent on any limitations that was stated in
9	the response from Michigan Rehabilitation
10	Services?
11	THE WITNESS: NO.
12	EXAMINER MAGID: And, you did ask
13	in your letter for Michigan Rehabilitation
14	Services to comment on any limitations or any
15	special requirements of hers, didn't you?
16	THE WITNESS: That is one of
17	the items that we request.
18	EXAMINER MAGID: And their
19	response came in after she was hired; is that
20	correct?
21	THE WITNESS: Yes.
22	EXAMINER MAGID: At the time the
23	response came in, was Ms. Hall in a probationary
24	period?
25	THE WITNESS: I'm trying to

1 think because she was on a temporary appointment. I would have had to review it. but there different 2 3 probationary requirements for different kinds of 4 appointments. 5 I'm almost certain there is a probationary period for the handicap employment б 7 program. 8 EXAMINER MAGID: For the severely 9 handicapped? 10 THE WITNESS: Although, I'm 11 not sure because there is an temporary appointment that federal agencies can use, called the seven 12 13 hundred hour temporary appointment. Yes, I'm aware 14 EXAMINER MAGID: 15 of that. 16 THE WITNESS: Because of that particular provision, I think there might be an 17 indication that there isn't a probationary period 13 19 for the handicapped. Before you refer EXAMINER MAGID: 20 to that -- I'll ask you to refer to it if I want 21 you to -- my familiarity with other cases 22 involving the severely handicapped at other 23

agencies, leads me to believe that there is a

probationary period under the handicapped program

24

25

that might be twice as long as the probation period for regular career conditional employees.

Are you familiar with that?

THE WITNESS: I think I'm familiar with what you're talk about, but it's not a probationary period.

If I could discuss a little bit.

EXAMINER MAGID: Yes.

THE WITNESS: There is a special seven hundred hour temporary appointment for handicapped individuals under the severely handicapped program.

This allows the Agency to hire somebody seven hundred hours for approximately or four months and, basically, gives the Agency an opportunity to look to see if their handicap causes them any kind of accommodations problems.

Then, if it does, basically, the appointment runs out and it's sort of an easy way to get an individual off the rolls that that have problems accommodating those particular handicapped.

There is also an authority that allows to you to select the handicapped individual on a permanent basis, sort of side stepping this

initial period.

In Ms. Hall's case, she was on seven hundred hour at IRS at the time we contacted her and it was our impression that since she was already serving sort of a temporary appointment at IRS that there was no need to offer her a temporary employment; we would offer her a permanent position basically to her advantage because you get full benefits if she she doesn't get a temporary appointment.

There is a two-year period, once you're hired as a permanent employee where you're still considered an accepted appointee.

After two years, they convert it to what they call clear conditional status. The only real effect of that is that it gives her a greater reinstatement eligibility right at some point in the future. I think it might give her greater protection during her accepted appointee, but it's not a probationary period.

In a probationary period, you're able to separate somebody without certain due process obligations that you have once somebody completes the probationary period, and there is nothing similar to that.

1 EXAMINER MAGID: What is the 2 reason that you selected Ms. Hall rather than the 3 use of a competitive system for hiring? 4 THE WITNESS: Typically, we 5 use the systems simultaneously so that the job Ms. Hall was considered for in the typing pool at б 7 the time we might have thirty employees, lots of 8 turnover. 9 It's like a basic entry level 10 position; so we may fill 15 or 20 positions a year 11 in that particular typing pool. 12 EAMINER MAGID: So, you fill from both? 13 THE WITNESS: 14 Right -- I don't 15 recall in this particular situation -- what we do, as you are probably aware, on a Civil Service 16 17 register, there are certain limitations as to who 18 you can hire. Basically, you have to hire the top 19 three. Now, we can give our supervisors the 20 top three off the list and also invite, say, 21 22 Veterans, Viet Nam vets, disabled vets and

Pirst of all, you get more candidates

handicapped individuals. It works to our benefit

23

24

25

in a few ways.

to consider, and the more candidates, the better chance that we'll select a better candidate. And, second of all, we have certain affirmative action goals that we're aware of and by looking at these alternative recruitment sources, we can meet those EEO goals as well.

EXAMINER MAGID: Do you have affirmative action requirements with respect to hiring the handicapped?

THE WITNESS: Yes, we do.

EXAMINER MAGID: Did Ms. Hall's hiring satisfy the Agency's obligation to meet those affirmative action requirements?

THE WITNESS: We don't have any specific goals. As part of our handicapped supporting plan, we indicate where we are, for example, as compared to the Agency in the federal work force.

Currently, we're about sixteen percent handicapped identified again through the self identification system which I talked about earlier and, again, we have about four percent individuals referring to themselves as severely handicapped.

We do have a goal for severely

1 handicapped individuals. 2 EXAMINER MAGID: So, the answer 3 to my question is "no," she did not she did not go toward meeting an Agency goal for hiring. 5 THE WITNESS: Not for the б specific goal but, again, a general goal of having 7 more handicapped people on board, yes. 8 EXAMINER MAGID: Any redirect, 9 Mr. Winslow? 10 REDIRECT EXAMINATION 11 BY MR. WINSLOW: 12 When the state responded to your Q. letter, did they indicate to you that Ms. Hall 13 would require any special adaptation of the work 14 15 place in order to accommodate her handicap? 16 A. I believe it said avoid smoking 17 areas. EXAMINER MAGID: Isn't their 18 19 response in the complaint file? I don't believe THE WITNESS: 20 it's in the complaint file, but there was a file 21 that I brought earlier today, documenting her 22 23 appointment. I referenced earlier a file that we 24 have to maintain, and I believe the response is in 25

1	that particular file.
2	EXAMINER MAGID: I show you
3	Exhibit C-5 of the complaint file, Mr. Rodowski.
4	. Is that the response from Michigan
5	Rehabilitation Services that you are speaking of?
6	THE WITNESS: This is the
7	response.
8	EXAMINER MAGID: Would you look
9	through it and see if there are specific
10	limitations that are listed. Look on Page Four of
11	that exhibit under IV.
12	THE WITNESS: It says "avoid
13	dusty, smokey work setting."
14	EXAMINER MAGID: And, that was
15	the recommendation from the Michigan Agency; is
16	that correct?
17	THE WITNESS: That's correct.
18	MR. WINSLOW: What was the
19	date of that?
20	THE WITNESS: October 3, 1984,
21	letter.
22	EXAMINER MAGID: Yes, that is the
23	date the cover letter of Exhibit C-5.
24	BY MR. WINSLOW:
25	Q. Had Ms. Hall been hired at that

1	point?
2	A. Yes, Ms. Hall was hired, I believe,
3	September 24, 1984, was the date.
4	Q. Did you consider the typing pool to
5	be a dusty, smokey work setting?
6	A. Dusty, I would say, no. Smokey, I
7	guess I really didn't have any opinion as to
8	whether it was smokey.
9	My only familiarity with the typing
10	pool would be to occasionally walk a person over
11	to it for a job interview. But, typically, that
12	is done by the secretary. I really have very
13	little reason to go onto the typing pool; very
14	seldom do.
15	I have never been aware when I walked
16	in, like, there is a lot of smoke there. I never
17	had that kind of an impression.
18	Q. That is what I'm asking.
19	Did you consider the pool to be a
20	smokey area?
21	A. No.
22	EXAMINER MAGID: Do you smoke?
23	THE WITNESS: No, I don't.
24	BY MR. WINSLOW:
25	O. Does Mr. Clowney smoke?

1 A. No. Does Mr. Tiatizth smoke? 2 0. Mr. Tiatizth smoked until about six 3 Α. months ago and he took my advice and gave it up. I have nothing 5 MR. WINSLOW: 6 further. Ms. Hall, EXAMINER MAGID: 7 anything further? 8 9 RECROSS EXAMINATION BY MS. HALL: 10 Do you recall telling me that you 11 hired me as a Schedule A with a special two-year 12 probationary period? 13 I don't remember specifically 14 discussing your appointment although it probably 15 came up, and I believe -- let my take that back if 16 I may -- as part again of this orientation process 17 that I mentioned on the first day, we do discuss 18 the nature of the appointment, and I did discuss 19 with you that it was a Schedul A appointment and 20 that there would be conversion to a career 21 conditional appointment after two years. 22 Can you tell me why people coming off 23 the roster have a one-year probation and disabled 24

people have a two-year probation?

25

A. I never said that you have a two-year probation period. Again, it's called a conversion to career conditional status, which only affects your eligibility for reinstatement should you leave the federal government at that point.

But a probationary period speaks to something different and at maximum, a one-year probationary period is the maximum in any federal government position.

And I believe, although I would have to refer to something else before I could tell with any complete confidence, that the seven hundred hour temporary appointment then precludes your use of the probationary period because it basically uses the substitute for probationary period.

- Q. Do you have a copy of what Schedule A is that would state how long the probationary period is?
 - A. May refer to this?

EXAMINER MAGID: All she asked you is whether you have it?

THE WITNESS:

I believe I have
in our now office what Schedule A is and also as
part of the documentation file there is that

1	particular chapter the OPM manual. There's a
2	photocopy in there.
3	BY MS. HALL:
4	A. Could a photocopy be provided of
5	Schedule A?
6	EXAMINER MAGID: No.
7	You have had plenty of opportunity to
8	request documents such as that and you've not
9	requested it up until now.
10	MS. HALL: Okay, that's it.
11	EXAMINER MAGID: I have no other
12	questions.
13	Thank you for coming and offering
14	your testimony, Mr. Rodowski, and I will caution
15	you not to discuss your testimony outside the
16	hearing room.
17	THE WITNESS: Okay, thank you.
18	(Witness Excused)
19	EXAMINER MAGID: Is there
20	anything else before we go into closing
21	statements?
22	MS. HALL: No.
23	MR. WINSLOW: I don't think
24	so, no.
25	EXAMINER MAGID: All right, let's

1	go into closing statements.
2	Ms. Hall?
3	MS. HALL: Are there are
4	any restrictions about closing statements that I
5	should know about?
6	EXAMINER HAGID: There are very
7	few restrictions on closing statements, and if we
8	come to them, they're easily recognized,
9	and Mr. Winslow will challenge you.
10	MS. HALL: I wanted to
11	mention some cases that might be helpful.
12	EXAMINER MAGID: All right, I
13	would appreciate it. Jocobson versus Michigan
14	Mental Health Department. The number is 276 MW
15	2(d) 627.
16	The next one is <u>Gus</u> versus <u>Jack Tar</u>
17	Management Company, 407 F.(2) 9859.
18	EXAMINER MAGID: Wait a minute.
19	407 P.(2) and then what?
20	THE WITNESS: 9859.
21	EXAMINER MAGID: I think you had
22	better show me what you have because you're giving
23	me an invalid number.
24	MS. HALL: That's what I
25	have.

EXAMINER MAGID: Could it be that
that the 9 after the (2) is a (d).

7 .

MS. HALL:

Banzhaf versus

The FCC, 405 (f) (d) 1082. I think you might want
to a page 1097 on that. Austin versus Tennessee,
179 U.S. 343; and Golden versus Comtech, Number 36

ETD 35095.

I came to the V.A. simply hoping to find gainful employment. I had previously been involved in a lawsuit as you mentioned with Deaconess Hospital and anyone who has been involved in lawsuits will do just about anything to steer clear of getting into another one.

So, I specifically mentioned when I came to V.A. that I had this problem. I specifically mentioned that I had to avoid smoke.

And, I remember leaving feeling relieved that this was out the way and they hadn't just said, "Well, get out, because we can't use you."

I then came here in good faith, quitting the position that I was in and found a bunch of cigarette smoke which began physically affecting me immediately.

I made those effects known to

management on many different occasions, and their response was basically to tell me that nothing was going to change and that I should just try to move on, which I tried to do.

I took every test I could. I was told I was either too old or because I couldn't tolerate smoke that I couldn't be hired.

I tried at the V. A. Medical Center
Ann Arbor, I tried at the V. A. Medical Center in
Allen Park, I tried the Post Office; I tried every
different department within the V. A.

They offered me a position in the teletype room. They said that it was for training only. At the point where I signed up for it, I was told that they couldn't out-and-out offer me the position, and later on in testimony they're claiming that they could have offered me the position.

I don't know really know whether they could have or not, but I wasn't aware that I had to take that position. If I had, I probably would have taken it.

I was given an out by my supervisor who said up until that time she had not done anything about the smoke and that I was a good

transcriptionist and if I would stay there, she would do something.

I said, "Good because I don't want to go there. I'd rather stay here. I want to learn the 5520."

My supervisor and I discussed the fact that the teletype room was not as good a job as running the 5520.

so, I stayed in the pool, assuming that accommodation was going to be maintained. Beverly was the sort of person that if she said she was going to do something, unless she was told not to by someone, her supervisor, she would have probably been able to pull it off.

I think I worked very hard to prove that I could do that job if I just given a chance. I do just about everything twice because the smoke affects me so badly, which means I work twice as hard as everybody else. I stay late night and proofread—I used to stay late at night proofreading that stuff—because there were so many errors I would have to do things over and over again.

I worked through all my lunch breaks and regular breaks when I started there,

proofreading because that was the only time when there were enough people out the room that I could concentrate because the smoke would be a little bit less.

So, I worked very hard trying to make it on the job, and it's pretty much been to no avail because no accommodations have been made. I suspect they thought I would just away. I tried to but I couldn't. There was no place to go.

Mr. D'Aoust said he wasn't aware of anyone else having problems. There is testimony here by Beverly Keith--I would assume you got a copy of this--stating there were ten people that complained, Pat Barton and Pat Norton specifically complained about it; yet he still maintain that he is not aware that anybody in the room has a problem but me. I find that hard to believe.

Mr. D'Aoust also said that I had great promotion potential. I would like to see what he bases that on since I've tried in every department but one in the V.A. and been turned down by all of them.

If he builds me an eight thousand dollar room, there is still going to be no place I can go because nobody else will build me an eight

thousand dollar room. I will be in the typing pool just like I would have been in the closet if I would have let him put me in there for the rest of my life, if I live. It's going to be a short life, the way that smoking is going.

the rights of smokers, and none as far as I can see of the rights of non-smokers. There has been a lot of tension and anxiousness and anxiety that not smoking causes smokers, and I haven't heard anybody mention anything about the tension and anxiety and the fear I experience when I have to go down the clinic because I can't breath anymore.

When I have pleuracy attacks because of the cigarette smoke that is so severe I think they offered to send me to a hospital.

Nobody seems to be concerned about that, and I don't quite understand why when solution doesn't cost them a penny.

There is no job requirement that I be a smoker, and I obviously am a smoker from the many, many lung ailments that I keep coming down with as I work at the V.A.

I still haven't found anything saying specifically that the pool is a smoking area nor

•

have I seen anything that guarantees to a smoker the constitutional or legal right to smoke in the pool or in finance where there are about probably 20 smokers altogether or in loan guarantee or anyplace else.

I don't know quite what this statement is supposed to contain, but I can't think of anything else to say except that I hope EEOC can remedy this situation because I really need to keep this job, and I don't have a lot of other places to go.

Obviously, the many applications that I've turned in would tend to verify that, I think. That's pretty much it. I don't have anyplace to go but the typing pool. So that's it.

CHAIRMAN MAGID: Mr. Winslow?

MR. WINSLOW: Ms. Hall knew she had this condition when she came.

She did not tell anyone the severity of the condition when she was hired. She knew because she had the problem at Deaconess Hospital, and she received a substantial sum of money as a consequence of her Worker's Compensation claim and also as a consequence of her lawsuit.

she also had the same problem at the

IRS where she didn't come here ignorant of the problem. In spite of all that, she just said nothing other than, "smoke bothers me."

б

It seems to me that if the problem was that serious, that she had an obligation to explain how serious it was and to consider the conditions under which she would be working when she was given the opportunity to look at them.

She admitted she was shown the area, she was interviewed in the area, apparently spent five, ten or fifteen minutes in the area, and it seems to me that she had an ample opportunity to observe the conditions where she was going to be working.

Yet, not one word was said at least to indicate that this kind of an environment would bother her.

We have a lot of employees--ten of them--who have respiratory problems who for the most part are able to get along fine in the working areas that are provided for them and which contain smoking people.

And there was no testimony, as I understand it, that there was three or four of those people who complained. It is my

understanding from Mr. Rodowski's testimony that there were three or four complaints, but that they were various individuals not necessarily the 10 people who have the respiratory problem.

When the problem became known to the Agency, and the severity of it became known to the Agency, the same attempts were made to resolve the problems as has been made for other employees who presented with the same difficulties, but who apparently were able to tolerate the situation in the place they worked, simply by having their desks relocated.

The Agency went a step further in that and attempted to isolate those who smoked from those who did not smoke and particularly from Ms. Hall, but they have some very severe limitations, one being that that word processing equipment is located on one side of the room as far as wiring, that some employees needed more supervision than other employees, that new employees need to be where they can be given assistance by the supervisor.

And, these attempts to relocate the employees were not made without considerable difficulty. It seems to me that Ms. Hall fails to

recognize how hard it was to try to do these things for her and on her behalf, especially when she says that nobody cared, and I think the people did care.

8 .

An effort was made to try to find a place where there was no smoking. Unfortunately, the room turned out to be worse than the pool area as far as ventilation and stuffiness were concerned.

Fans were installed. There is a conflict as to whether the fans blew the smoke toward her or whether they blew the smoke away from her. It makes no sense to provide fans to blow smoke toward her, so I would assume that the smoke was blown away from her, at least insofar as the other employees would tolerate the breeze and the discomfort from the cold air blowing on them.

She was offered a job in the teletype unit. The intent was that there would be no one in that area smoking. But the other two people in that room did not smoke. The room was air conditioned and air handling was such as to provide probably one of the best smoke free, if you will, environments that could be found in the building.

 into his office on at least two occasions

according to his testimony, telling them as well
as her supervisor that Laren had a problem and
they had a need to try to cooperate by reducing
and eliminating the smoke as far as possible and
refrain from cigarette smoking when they were near
her desk.

Mr. D'Aoust had called the smokers

I don't know how she could conceive that her immediate supervisor would have more clout with the employees than the chief of the division.

Mr. D'Aoust is the chief of the division and if he asks the employees to cooperate. I find it a little bit hard to figure out why she would think Beverley Keith who is a unit supervisor a couple of steps down would be able to enforce any rules regarding smoking any more than Mr. D'Aoust had already attempted had.

I can't give you off the top of my head a Federal law on unfair labor practices, but one of the provisions is that if you change the working conditions in a work place you are obliged to consult--and I use the word "consult" because that is the word that is used in the code--with

the Union.

б

You're not obliged to get the Union's concurrence, but you are required to at least ask them what they think about the proposed change.

If you fail to do that, the Union or the employee can file an unfair labor practice charge which results in a proceeding to try to correct the problem with respect to the Union and a failure to comply with the law.

If the Agency were to unilaterally decide, or decide with the concurrence or at least after having consulted with the Union, that smoking either should be reduced or eliminated in the typing pool, it would subject the Agency to a grievance by any employee who felt that he had a right or she had a right to smoke.

You have up to, it was testified, five to eight people who smoke. The Agency has the choice of changing its policy on smoking locally and face a grievance from many of those people which again would entitle considerable expense and considerable and prolonged proceedings.

And, it was felt that it policy which had been established in 1979 had never been

changed even though the written policy, as such, had been allowed to terminate or lapse by the terms of the circular itself, but to the best of your knowledge--and I have been here almost 25 years--there has never been a policy against smoking in the Veterans Administration.

The policy in that circular and the policy that was provided to me that was offered as Exhibit 2, the memorandum from the Director, were given to me yesterday by Mr. Rodowski after we inquired about any written policy that might exist on smoking. I don't think it was well known that such a policy existed.

It was pretty apparent that one of the things that was done to try to alleviate the problem for Laren was to put out that memorandum and the Director undertook in her behalf to help resolve the problem by encouraging the employees who worked with her to cooperate.

Again, I think the concerns of top management is quite evident from that action.

The statement was made to me by the Director that when Artie Pierce, who was the President of the Union, was approached on this subject and suggested that ash stand and the sign

outside the publications unit door, that was the about the only time he ever saw Artie Pierce happy, really expressing an enthusiasm, or pleasure, about a problem that had been presented to him because he felt that he had finally found the solution to Laren's difficulty.

·//

- 4

Again, I think that illustrates that the Union president was sympathetic with her problem and that he was attempting through his office to find a solution for her problem.

As far as promotion possibilities are concerned, testimony was offered that there have been a number of people who have worked in that teletype unit in the room that was offered to Laren and those people were promoted out of that unit without any difficulty, without any feeling that they couldn't do some other job.

As a matter of fact, the secretary to the personnel office came from that unit, and she presently performs much the same functions she did when she was in the pool and also a similar job, all of which involves typing in the teletype room.

The simple answer, I suppose, to the problem that might be, "Why don't you enclose the

area that Laren occupies?"

б

I discussed that with Mr. Clowney, I discussed several other possible solutions with Mr. Clowney, and his response to that is much the same as Mr. D'Aoust has indicated; that if we do it for one, we're going to be faced with trying to do it for others, and inasmuch as there ten people with respiratory problems, and the two people that don't have any respiratory problems in the District Council's, who have also complained about smoking.

And, I might add, I don't like smoking either because I don't smoke, and I don't like to have to sit and smell somebody's smoke.

I suppose if this was the issue involved, that we would have to lot of people who would complain that they needed a private office.

I don't think that is the issue. I think the issue is did we, in fact, make a reasonable effort to accommodate this employee's handicap.

And what is reasonable under these circumstances? We have one employee in that pool who would be just as seriously and adversely

affected if smoking were banned as Laren is with smoking existed.

I don't think the issue in this case is whether smoking, per se, is discriminatory. I think that there has been no evidence offered that is of a very conclusive nature which shows that smoking is harmful to the health of individuals.

There have been many articles written, there has been a lot in the press, there have been a lot of studies done, and there are a lot of reports which have been published alleging that smoking harmful, but I would suggest that there are many that also suggest that there are many that also suggest that is not really true. And, I don't think that is the issue here.

I would strongly urge the Examiner on that point. The issue is: Did we do what we could reasonably do to accommodate Laren's disability or handicap?

She has offered nothing whatever as far as I can see to show that what was done was not, in fact, a sincere effort to deal with the problem; that all these things they were done were pretext.

I think she has the burden of showing

that what we've done is, in fact, or was, a pretext. I don't think she has proven anything on that.

б

She is offered no other reason for all the moves that were made. She has offered no other reason for them to try to stick her away in the teletype room.

And just to boil it down, Laren has a serious problem. I'm sympathetic with it; I think all the people that are charged with discrimination are sympathetic with it. We don't have any answer.

If we provide her with an answer, it may, in fact, mean that if she leaves the employment of the Agency and any money that was spent was lost.

I think that if we had known the severity of her disability and the severity of her lung problem, that there would have been some real question as to whether or not she could, in fact, do this job under these circumstances.

I think that remains of the problem.

We wrote to her doctor and asked him to tell us,

in fact, whether she could successfully work under
the conditions in that room; and we never received

a clear cut response to that letter.

She filed another on EEO complaint on that because she feared she would be fired.

Nobody is trying to fire her.

What we're trying to do is to somehow accommodate her respiratory illness. And it is not easy to do.

I don't think we have an obligation to go beyond what we have already done.

I think if there is any fault to be found in the way this whole thing has been handled, it's on Laren's, not on the Agency's shoulders.

I really don't have any cases that I can cite to the Examiner which uphold our position. There are ample cases—there are a lot of cases—they all hinge on a particular fact in a particular case, but it is well recognized in the case law that smokers have rights too, and that unless there is a policy established by an Agency of the government, such as the one established by TACOM, that you can't just arbitrarily tell employees that they can't smoke.

Your V.A. has no such policy. If we

ì

had such a policy, it would be published. As a matter of fact, the practice, all the time I've been with the V.A. has been that people who want to smoke can smoke; people that don't want to smoke don't have to smoke.

EXAMINER MAGID: Is that it, Mr. Winslow?

MR. WINSLOW: That's it.

yet ruled on my Proposed Examiners Exhibit 1, and I will sustain Mr. Winslow's objection, and I will not admit it on the grounds that he stated; that the Department of the Army is another Agency. It is not the V.A. Conditions may be different.

There is no evidence in this case at this time as to the conditions at either TACOM or any other Armyarm installation.

I will not admit Exhibit 1.

At this time, I will go off the record and make my determination as to whether this case does meet the criteria of issuance of a bench decision.

And, when we reconvene, I will inform the parties of what that decision is and if

I have decided that this case does meet the criteria for a bench decision, I will issue it at that time. We will adjourn at this time until 8:30 tomorrow morning. ---000---(Whereupon, the proceedings were adjourned at 6:00 p.m.) ---000---

CERTIFICATE

I, Norma J. Carlin, a duly qualified and practicing stenotypy court reporter, do hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and accurate transcript of proceedings taken before me in the presence of all witnesses and subsequently transcribed out of the presence of the witnesses; and that I am a neutral party in these proceedings and have no interest whatsoever in their eventual outcome.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand this 16th day of September, 1986, A.D., Cleveland, Ohio.

CARLIN ASSOCIATES

Norma J. Carlin