the Twin City area, and all the categories in question would be encompassed by this designation.

Under all the circumstances of this case, we find that the coordinators sought by the Petitioner constitute only a segment of a broader group of employees with similar skills, duties, and interests. The Board will not add such a fragmentary group to the Petitioner's existing unit,[13] nor establish it as a separate appropriate unit.[14] Accordingly, we shall dismiss the petition.[15]

[The Board dismissed the petition.]

[13] *Boeing Airplane Company*, 94 NLRB 344.
[14] *Otis Elevator Company*, 116 NLRB 262.
[15] In view of the above disposition of the case, we deem it unnecessary to resolve the other unit contentions of the parties.

---

**A. O. Smith Corporation, Granite City, Illinois, Frame Plant *and* Local 309, International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, AFL-CIO, Petitioner.** *Case No. 14-RC-2953. October 15, 1956*

## DECISION AND DIRECTION OF ELECTION

Upon a petition duly filed under Section 9 (c) of the National Labor Relations Act, a hearing was held before Joseph H. Solien, hearing officer. The hearing officer's rulings made at the hearing are free from prejudicial error and are hereby affirmed.

Upon the entire record in the case, the Board finds:

1. The Employer is engaged in commerce within the meaning of the Act.

2. The Petitioner and the Intervenor, International Brotherhood of Boilermakers, Iron Shipbuilders, Blacksmiths, Forgers and Helpers, Local 575, AFL-CIO, are labor organizations claiming to represent certain employees of the Employer.

3. A question affecting commerce exists concerning the representation of employees of the Employer within the meaning of Section 9 (c) (1) and Section 2 (6) and (7) of the Act.

4. The Petitioner seeks to sever a group of some 30 electricians from the plantwide unit currently represented by the Intervenor. In the alternative, Petitioner seeks a department or any other unit of electricians which the Board may find appropriate.[1] The Employer and the Intervenor contend that the unit sought by the Petitioner is inappropriate because the employees in question do not comprise a true

[1] As will hereinafter appear, we are not granting a department of electricians; we find no necessity for considering the Employer's objections to the establishment of such department.

craft group, within the standards laid down in the *American Potash* case.[2]

This is the second time the Petitioner is seeking to represent a group of electricians at this plant. On the previous occasion, we dismissed the petition on the ground that the record as a whole failed to establish that the employees sought to be represented constituted a skilled craft group entitled to separate representation.[3] The Employer and Intervenor moved to dismiss the instant petition on the ground that Petitioner failed to adduce evidence showing that conditions in the plant had changed to justify a reversal of our former ruling. For reasons hereinafter appearing, we deny the motion to dismiss.

The electricians, whom the Petitioner seeks to sever, are employed in the maintenance department, and work on 3 shifts consisting of some 160 men. The record shows that the maintenance men are classified as A, B, or C, and that the electricians are classified as AE, BE, or CE, the "E" standing for "electrician," and the A, B, or C for the grade in the electrician group.[4] Some 12 of the 30 electricians testified at the hearing. Their testimony shows that with the possible exception of one man, these electricians have substantial training and/or experience in all phases of electrical work and that they are now engaged exclusively or primarily in exercising the skills of the electrician's craft.[5] Their work includes maintenance of all electrical equipment, trouble shooting, work on conduits, installing wires, cables, panel boards, substations, bus ducts, automatic controls of all kinds, work on motors, bearings, air compressors, conveyors, refrigeration equipment, and all types of lighting equipment. Although the men are assigned to designated production areas where they are needed, they do not perform any production work or exchange work with production employees. The electricians use blueprints and follow the rules of the national electrical code. They use the customary tools and testing devices of the electrician's trade. In the main, their testimony shows that they work under the direction of specifically designated electrical foremen qualified to direct them.

The Intervenor and the Employer contend that conditions in the plant have not changed since the last hearing and that there is no evidence of the existence of an electrician's craft. They urge that

[2] 107 NLRB 1418.

[3] 111 NLRB 200, 202

[4] The other job classifications in the maintenance department include machine repair floor (MFR); pipefitters (P); welders, woodworkers, and painters

[5] At the close of the hearing, the Employer introduced in evidence a list of some 30 employees in the maintenance department who have electrical background, but whom the Petitioner does not seek to represent, implying that Petitioner is seeking to represent only a segment of an alleged craft. As the testimony shows, these men are not classified as electricians and as the Employer failed to adduce evidence in support of a contention that these men are engaged primarily in electrical work, we find no merit in the Employer's contention.

only a good general maintenance background is required for all maintenance men, that crafts in the maintenance department overlap, and that the men work more than one craft. There is no apprenticeship requirement or equivalent training and the Company does not require the degree of skill possessed by journeymen craftsmen. Furthermore, major electrical jobs are contracted out.

We find that the electricians, here sought to be represented by a union which traditionally represents craft electricians, constitute a craft of the type to which we customarily permit separate representation. Our finding in this respect is based on a much more extensive and complete record than was the case when we made our earlier determination. Indicative of the difference in the evidence as to craft status on the record now before us as compared with the former record is the fact that at the prior hearing only one witness, a journeyman electrician, testified as to his experience, with no showing as to the training or experience of the other electricians, whereas the present record contains the testimony of numerous electricians with respect to their craft duties and experience.

Although the Employer has no apprenticeship program, it has, in essence, an on-the-job training program by means of which an employee can become a full-fledged maintenance electrician. Moreover, the record indicates that maintenance electricians, when employed, have had substantial experience in their trade. We are satisfied that the electricians herein sought are primarily engaged in electrical work requiring the performance of typical craft tasks. In these circumstances, we find no merit in the Employer's and Intervenor's contention that the electricians sought do not meet the requirements of the *American Potash* case with respect to the exercise of true craft skills.[6]

Accordingly, we shall direct that an election be conducted in the following group of employees at the Employer's Granite City, Illinois, plant:

All maintenance and construction electricians, their apprentices and helpers, excluding office clerical employees, professional employees, guards, watchmen, all other employees, and supervisors as defined in the Act.

If a majority of the employees in the voting group vote for the Petitioner, they will be taken to have indicated their desire to be represented in a separate unit, and the Regional Director conducting the election directed herein is instructed, in that event, to issue a certification of representatives to the Petitioner for such unit, which

[6] *Harvey Aluminum, A Division of Harvey Machine Company, Inc.*, 114 NLRB 935; *Ketchikan Pulp Company*, 115 NLRB 279; *American Tobacco Company, Incorporated*, 115 NLRB 218; *Marinette Paper Company*, 114 NLRB 1452, *Mallinckrodt Chemical Works*, 115 NLRB 730.

the Board, under the circumstances, finds to be appropriate for purposes of collective bargaining. In the event a majority does not vote for the Petitioner, these employees shall remain part of the existing production and maintenance unit, and the Regional Director is instructed to issue a certification of results of election to such effect.

[Text of Direction of Election omitted from publication.]

---

**Union Aluminum Company, Inc., and/or Southern Metals Company, Inc. *and* Aluminum Workers' International Union, AFL-CIO, Petitioner.** *Case No. 10-RC-3198. October 15, 1956*

## SUPPLEMENTAL DECISION, ORDER, AND DIRECTION OF SECOND ELECTION

Pursuant to a Decision and Direction of Election issued in the above-entitled proceeding on October 14, 1955,[1] an election by secret ballot was conducted on October 28, 1955, under the direction and supervision of the Regional Director for the Tenth Region, among the employees in the unit heretofore found appropriate. At the conclusion of the election, the parties were furnished with a tally of ballots. The tally showed that of approximately 234 eligible or allegedly eligible voters, 227 ballots were cast. Of these, 92 ballots were for the Petitioner, 118 ballots were against the Petitioner, and 17 ballots were challenged.

On November 3, 1955, the Petitioner filed timely objections to conduct affecting the results of the election. After investigation, the Regional Director, on January 27, 1956, issued his report on election, objections to election. In this report, the Regional Director concluded that there was merit in the Petitioner's first objection and he recommended that the election be set aside and a new election ordered.[2] On February 6, 1956, the Employer filed exceptions to these findings and recommendations of the Regional Director.

On April 4, 1956, the Board found that substantial and material issues had been raised by the Employer's exceptions and issued an order directing hearing. On May 15, 1956, a hearing was held before Lloyd Buchanan, hearing officer. On June 4, 1956, the hearing officer issued his report and recommendations on objections to election, a copy of which is attached hereto. Like the Regional Director, the hearing officer found that the Employer had interfered with the employees' free choice of a bargaining representative and therefore recommended that the results of the election be set aside and that a new

[1] Not reported in printed volumes of Board Decisions and Orders.

[2] As no exceptions were filed to the Regional Director's finding that the Petitioner's second objection lacked merit, this finding is adopted and the objection is hereby overruled.