

STATE OF CALIFORNIA

AGRICULTURAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

POINT SAL GROWERS AND PACKERS,)	
)	
Employer,)	Case No. 78-RC-3-SM
)	
and)	
)	
INTERNATIONAL UNION OF)	4 ALRB No. 105
AGRICULTURAL WORKERS,)	
)	
Petitioner,)	
)	
and)	
)	
UNITED FARM WORKERS OF)	
AMERICA, AFL-CIO,)	
)	
Intervenor.)	
)	

DECISION AND CERTIFICATION OF REPRESENTATIVE

Pursuant to the provisions of Labor Code Section 1146, the Agricultural Labor Relations Board has delegated its authority in this proceeding to a three-member panel.

A secret ballot election was conducted on June 23, 1978, among the agricultural employees of Point Sal Growers and Packers (Employer), in the state of California following a Petition for Certification filed by the International Union of Agricultural Workers (IUAW), on June 16, 1978, and intervention by the United Farm Workers of America, AFL-CIO (UFW) on June 20, 1978. The official Tally of Ballots showed the following results:

////////////////////
////////////////////

IUAW	82
UFW	40
No Union	12
Challenged Ballots	<u>9</u>
Total	143

The challenged ballots are not sufficient in number to effect the results of the election.

On September 26, 1978, after a hearing held on August 22, 23 and 24, 1978, Investigative Hearing Examiner (IHE) Newman Strawbridge issued his Decision in which he recommended that the Intervenor's objections to the conduct of the election be dismissed and that the IUAW be certified as the collective bargaining representative of the employees of the Employer. The Intervenor filed timely exceptions to the IHE's Decision and a brief in support thereof. The Employer filed a brief in opposition to the Intervenor's exceptions.

The Board has considered the objections, the record, and the IHE's Decision in light of the exceptions and briefs and has decided to affirm the rulings, findings and conclusions of the IHE and to adopt his recommendations to dismiss the objections and to certify the IUAW.

CERTIFICATION OF REPRESENTATIVE

It is hereby certified that a majority of the valid votes have been cast for the International Union of Agricultural Workers and that pursuant to Labor Code Section 1156 the said labor organization is the exclusive representative of all agricultural employees of Point Sal Growers and Packers for purposes of

collective bargaining, as defined in Labor Code Section 1155.2(a), concerning employees' wages, working hours and other terms and conditions of employment.

Dated: December 26, 1978

RONALD L. RUIZ, Member

ROBERT B. HUTCHINSON, Member

JOHN P. McCARTHY, Member

CASE SUMMARY

Point Sal Growers and Packers

4 ALRB No. 105

Case No. 78-RC-3-SM

ALO DECISION

A secret ballot election was conducted on June 23, 1978, among the agricultural employees of Point Sal Growers and Packers (Employer), following a Petition for Certification filed by the International Union of Agricultural Workers (IUAW), on June 16, 1978, and intervention by the United Farm Workers of America, AFL-CIO (UFW) on June 20, 1978. The official Tally of Ballots showed the following results: 82 votes for the IUAW, 40 votes for the UFW, 12 for no union, and 9 challenged ballots.

The UFW timely filed three objections, alleging: (1) employer violence; (2) employer interference with a UFW agent's access; and (3) failure to comply with employee-list requirement. The IHE recommended dismissal of all three objections for insufficient proof, also recommended that election be upheld, and that certification be granted.

BOARD DECISION

The Board affirmed the rulings, findings, and conclusions of the IHE, dismissed the objections, and certified the IUAW as collective bargaining representative of the Employer's agricultural employees.

* * *

This Case Summary is for information only and is not an official statement of the case, or of the ALRB.

* * *

STATE OF CALIFORNIA

AGRICULTURAL LABOR RELATIONS BOARD

In the Matter of:)	
)	
POINT SAL GROWERS AND PACKERS,)	
)	
Employer,)	Case No. 78-RC-3-SM
)	
and)	
)	
INTERNATIONAL UNION OF)	
AGRICULTURAL WORKERS,)	
)	
Petitioner,)	
)	
and)	
)	
UNITED FARM WORKERS OF)	
AMERICA, AFL-CIO,)	
)	
Intervenor)	
)	

Mr. Cal Watkins, of Point Sal
 Growers and Packers

Mr. Arturo Castro, for the International
 Union of Agricultural Workers

Mr. Jeffrey P. Sweetland, for the
 United Farm Workers of America, AFL-CIO

DECISION

I. Statement of the Case

Newman Strawbridge, Investigative Hearing Officer: This case was heard in Santa Maria, California on August 22, 23, 24, 1978. On Friday, June 16, 1978 the International Union of Agricultural Workers (hereinafter the IUAW) filed a Petition for Certification. The United Farm Workers of America, AFL-CIO (hereinafter "UFW") intervened on June 20, 1978. A representation

election was held on Friday, June 23, 1978, of all the agricultural employees of Point Sal Growers and Packers (hereinafter "Point Sal" or employer) in California. The results were:

IUAW	82
UFW	40
No Union	12
Challenges	9
Total	143
Names on the Eligibility List	158

The UFW timely filed objections to the election, alleging that the employer engaged in misconduct which affected the election. Pursuant to his authority under 8 Cal. Admin. Code §20365 (g), the Executive Secretary set the following objections for hearings

1. That UFW organizer Mr. Peter Velasco was subjected to physical violence by a foreman of the employer in an attempt to expel him from the employer's property on June 22, 1978; and

2. That access and the organizing activity of UFW organizer Mr. Peter Velasco were unlawfully interfered with by agents of the employer; and

3. That the employer failed to comply with the employee list requirements of 8 Cal. Admin. Code §20310, thereby prejudicing the outcome of the election.

The employer, the IUAW and the UFW were represented at the hearing and were given full opportunity to participate in the hearing, including examining witnesses and presenting closing arguments. Upon the entire record, including my observation of the demeanor of the witnesses, and after consideration of the arguments made by the parties, I make the following findings

of fact and conclusion of law.

II. UFW organizer Mr. Pete Velasco was subjected to physical violence by a foreman of the employer in an attempt to expel him from the employer's property on June 22, 1978.

A. Summary of Testimony

It was the policy of Point Sal to allow access to workers at any time they were not working. Practically this meant that access could be taken during the morning compound break which generally occurred around 7:00 a.m. each day. On Thursday morning, June 22, 1978, two UFW organizers came onto the fields to speak to workers during this break. Shortly after turning onto the employer's property, they were met by a field supervisor, Mr. Pritchett, who told them they would have to leave because the break was over. The UFW organizers testified that they thought the break time had been manipulated so as to prevent access.^{1/} One of the organizers got out of the car and walked to the truck of another supervisor, Mr. Glenn Conrad, to find out why the break time had been changed and when lunch would be. The UFW organizer testified that when he spoke to the supervisor he did so in a loud voice to make sure the

1/ The UFW produced no direct evidence that the break time was manipulated. All agree that the break is usually around seven. The exact time is controlled by when the compound man decides to go in to town and get the food and coffee. There was testimony that the same man had been compound man for a long time. There was also testimony that the time of the compound was controlled by the workers with the employer having no say in it. The UFW failed to establish any agency between the compound man and the employer or the IUAW and therefore there is no basis upon which to construe that the company attempted to manipulate access agreements to frustrate organizing.

workers could hear what was happening. Mr. Velasco, the organizer, then testified that while he was talking to the supervisor who was sitting in his pick-up, Mr. Agapito Alvarado, a long time employee of Point Sal and a foreman in the lettuce crew came to the truck and pushed him. This was done in full view of the entire lettuce crew made up of 40 to 50 people, most of whom, according to Mr. Velasco, were in fact looking at him the moment he was pushed.

The employer does not disagree with any of the above stated facts except as to what Mr. Alvarado did and whether the other workers noticed it. Mr. Alvarado and Mr. Glenn Conrad, the harvest supervisor who was in the pick-up truck present at the scene, both testified for the company that Mr. Velasco, the UFW organizer, came up to the truck and began shouting. Upon seeing this take place and noticing that it was causing some unrest among the workers Mr. Alvarado walked over to the truck. He did this to show his appreciation for Mr. Velasco and to suggest that he, Mr. Velasco, might better achieve his purposes if he were more respectful of the rights and needs of workers on piece-rate production.^{2/} Mr. Alvarado's testimony is that he

2/ Transcript, Vol II, page 62, Direct examination of Mr. Alvarado:

Q. Well why did you go up to him and shake hands with him?

A. Well, because I just want to show my appreciation to him that he came over there with the crew, that's all. I am not going to argue or anything with him, or anything like that, because I know, on the purpose, but then my understanding is just to -- when they come around, that means that he is going to campaign or something. If that's his intention to do, why not talk to the boys in a very smart way, or maybe tell them that -- what his purpose of going there, instead of open up his mouth and start hollering and with his loud voice and everything.

walked up to Mr. Velasco, they shook hands, and then Mr. Alvarado patted Mr. Velasco on the shoulder.^{3/} This version of events is corroborated by Mr. Glenn Conrad.

I credit Mr. Alvarado's version of events. In making this decision I have found several factors important. One, Mr. Alvarado's version is internally consistent and reasonable under the circumstances. Two, Mr. Alvarado's demeanor was that of a honest man trying as best he could to state what happened as clear as he could. Third, Mr. Alvarado's version is corroborated by the only other person present in the immediate vicinity Mr. Glenn Conrad and who testified that he saw everything that took place. Fourth, while Mr. Velasco testified that he took a mental picture just as he was pushed and that he saw the majority of the lettuce crew looking at him, the UFW failed to call any of these witnesses to corroborate Mr. Velasco's story in spite of the fact that a version contrary to their own was corroborated by an eye witness. Fifth, Mrs. Velasco, another UFW organizer

3/ Transcript, Vol. III page 56, Direct Examination of Mr. Alvarado:

Q. Okay. As you walked up to Glenn and Mr. Velasco, what did you do?

A. I shake hand with him, right in front, and then I pat him, How are you, and said -- everything like that, we are like a friendly manner. And then he -- I shake hands with him right there in the pick-up right by the pick-up. And there pat his shoulder like that, too.

Ibid, page 68: Q. "Did you push Mr. Velasco?"

A. No, sir, I didn't push Mr. Velasco. To the best of my memory, this is the second night now that I have been thinking about it, but honestly, I didn't do anything but shake hands with him. I don't know why he tell me that, when he make that demonstration here to you, in front of the public, but I feel that -- it just kind of, I think that shocked me for I don't -- know what reason he say that, but honestly, I didn't push him, that's the truth. There is no reason why I push him.

who took access with Mr. Velasco and who testified that she was watching the incident from her car, failed to testify that she saw any assault take place. Sixth, the testimony of Mr. Fabian Ugo inferentially supports Mr. Alvarado's version in that Mr. Ugo was working in a row close to the incident and testified that he saw most of what was going on and that he neither saw any pushing nor later heard of any from the other crew members.

B. Legal Analysis and Conclusion

Physical assault will not be allowed under the ALRA. Such conduct, even if against a trespasser who knows (s)he is trespassing is considered inherently coercive to the free choice of workers. Tex-Cal Land Management Co., 3 ALRB 14, (1977) However in this case I find that no assault took place.

C. Recommendation

I recommend the Board dismiss the objection for failure to prove conduct violative of the Act.

III. The UFW objected that access and the organizing activities of UFW organizer Pete Velasco were unlawfully interfered with by agents of the employer.

A. Summary of Testimony

This objection is based on events that allegedly occurred during the regular lunch break also on Thursday, June 22, 1978. Mrs. Velasco testified that she, Mr. Velasco and two other organizers took access to the fields of Point Sal in order to distribute leaflets, present the benefits of unionization and answer questions from the workers of the lettuce crew. Mr. Velasco was the speaker and the others were to mill around, distribute leaflets and talk

individually to workers. Mr. and Mrs. Velasco testified that the foreman, Mr. Agapito Alvarado, interfered with this protected activity. Each testified that Mr. Alvarado placed himself between the workers and Mr. Velasco, and continually talked to Mr. Velasco while the latter attempted to communicate to the workers there gathered.

Mr. Alvarado testifies that he only began talking to Mr. Velasco after the workers were going back to work, at which time he told Mr. Velasco that he should leave, "because they don't seem interested in what you are talking about." (Transcript Vol.III, pages 72-73) Mr. Alvarado testified that before he began talking to Mr. Velasco he was walking around checking the lettuce. While doing this he was all around the area, at one point in front of Mr. Velasco and at another behind him and so on. He testified that he was not, during the period before the workers started back to work, very close to Mr. Velasco.

The essential difference in the testimony seems to be when Mr. Alvarado started to interfere with Mr. Velasco's attempt to communicate with the workers. Mr. and Mrs. Velasco say from the start of the break and Mr. Alvarado says only after the workers were returning to work.

Since Mr. Velasco's version of when things happened is independently corroborated and, absent any other basis to determine which version more accurately reflects what happened that day, I find that Mr. Alvarado interfered with Mr. Velasco's access in that he instructed him to leave at some point before it was clear that the break was over. The UFW offered no direct

proof that the effect of this was sufficiently coercive to have affected the outcome of the election.

Mr. and Mrs. Velasco testified that Mr. Velasco's attempt to communicate to the lettuce crew workers was further disrupted by a "cheerleading" section led by Mr. Timoteo Rabara, a worker and leader in the lettuce crew as well as a high official of the victorious union, the IUAW. Mr. Rabara is alleged to have mocked Mr. Velasco's attempts to discuss union benefits by overstating and jeering about union dues while at the same time getting other workers to do the same. Mr. Velasco testified that when this happened Mr. Rabara had already returned to his row and was beginning to work. The characterization provided by the Velascos is not directly contradicted by other evidence. Mr. Rabara, who was present during the hearing, did not take the stand. Mr. Alvarado did testify that he did not remember anyone yelling other than Mr. Velasco. He did not testify about the specific conduct of Mr. Rabara.

I find that Mr. Rabara interfered with Mr. Velasco's attempt to communicate with other lettuce workers by mocking what Mr. Velasco was saying. The UFW failed to offer any evidence of agency (neither dominance, collusion or ratification) between Mr. Rabara and the employer. Nor did the UFW prove that the conduct affected the free choice of workers, much less an effect sufficient to change the outcome of the election.

B. Legal Analysis and Conclusions of Law

Interference with access does not per se constitute misconduct affecting the results of the election. K. K. Ito Farms, 2 ALRB No. 51. Whether or not the interference once proven

is likely to have affected the outcome of the election is a separate question and must be evaluated on a case by case basis. K. K. Ito Farms, 1 ALRB No. 51. There has been no proof that the conduct described coerced the workers such that the outcome, absent the interference, would have been different than the tally.

C. Recommendation

I recommend the Board dismiss this objection for failure to prove sufficient effect to overcome the presumption in favor of certification. Perez Packing, Inc., 2 ALRB No. 13 (1976); Chula Vista Farms, Inc., 1 ALRB No. 23 (1975).

IV. The UFW objected that the employer failed to comply with the employee list requirements of 8 Cal. Admin. Code §20310 thereby prejudicing the outcome of the election.

A. Summary of Testimony ^{4/}

The employer had a duty under 8 Cal. Admin. Code §20310(d) to provide an accurate list of all eligible voters, their home addresses and their job classifications on Monday afternoon. The employer had knowledge of this duty before the Petition for Certification was filed. The employer provided a list by 12:55 on Monday. This list however was deficient. Of the 158 names on the list 27 had only post office box numbers, four out of town addresses where local addresses existed,

4/ I have reviewed the testimonial and documentary evidence presented. I find Attachment 1 to be the chronology of events upon which the following summary as well as my conclusions are based.

and fourteen (14) inaccurate addresses. The UFW intervened on Tuesday, June 20th, 1978 at 4:30 p.m. and requested the list on Wednesday June 21st, 1978 at 7:45 a.m. Three experienced UFW organizers testified that the purpose of the list was to direct them to eligible voters homes in order to carry out home visits. Each further testified that home visits were essential to an informed vote since in their experience it is in the home where the workers open up, ask questions, demand answers and develop trust. The informational importance of the list in this election is, according to these organizers, enhanced by the fact that the UFW, as an intervenor, had to compete in a labor force more familiar with the petitioning union and its perspective. I credit these opinions as those of experts and find them to be true and applicable to the election at hand. (Cal. Evid. Code §720).

The UFW first used this list to conduct home visits on Wednesday afternoon. By this time the list had been amended to include 26 home addresses previously reflected by only a post office box number. That evening at the pre-election conference the UFW complained only of several out of town addresses. At this time there were nine such addresses. Five workers from Oxnard had no local addresses since each in fact commuted from Oxnard each day. One local address was provided by the IUAW that evening and the others the next morning. Therefore on Wednesday afternoon, the first afternoon the UFW could have worked with a list provided by the employer, the list was complete except four (4) out of town addresses, one post office box number and what turned out to be 14 incorrect addresses.

The rest of the out of town addresses were provided on Thursday morning. Fourteen corrected addresses were provided by Thursday afternoon in time for home visits, if they had been on the UFW's agenda. The UFW testified that Thursday afternoon was used to remind people to vote and not for the more in-depth home visit.

B. Legal Analysis and Conclusions

The employer testified that he knew that he had a duty to provide accurate home addresses of all eligible voters. The employer did nothing to insure that he could comply with this requirement. In this regard the employer failed to exercise due diligence and I find it negligent. Yoder Brother, Inc., 2 ALRB No. 4 (1976); Valley Farms, Maple Farms and Rose J. Farms, 2 ALRB No. 42 (1976).

However, I find nothing in the record to indicate that the effect upon the workers was sufficient to set the election aside. Actually we are talking about the effect of fourteen (14) incorrect addresses, one post office box reference and four (4) out of town addresses on the home visit campaign for Wednesday afternoon alone since the UFW did not ask for the list until Wednesday morning and did not carry on the in-depth type home visit on Thursday afternoon. There were 158 names on the list. The UFW had at most nine (9) organizers. The vote spread was eighty-two (82) to forty (40). The only specific testimony of prejudice was that of Mr. Peter Cohn who testified that he went to one home that turned out to be

an incorrect address. If we were to assume none of the workers, whose addresses were deficient on Wednesday, voted for the UFW and that none of these workers were in fact seen by the UFW at their homes and further, if seen would have voted for the UFW, the result of the election would still be the same. It is my conclusion that without more evidence of prejudice the UFW has failed to overcome the presumption in favor of the election. Perez Packing, Inc., 2 ALRB No. 13 (1976); Chula Vista Farms, 1 ALRB NO. 23 (1975)

C. Recommendation

I recommend the objection be dismissed for failure to prove the election result was sufficiently affected by the deficient list.

V. Over-all Recommendation

I recommend the election be upheld and the IUAW be certified the exclusive bargaining representative for the workers at Point Sal.

DATED: September 26, 1978

Respectfully submitted,



NEWMAN STRAWBRIDGE
Investigative Hearing Examiner

Attachment 1

Chronology of Events

Friday June 16, 1978

3:30 p.m. - The ALRB received a Petition for Certification filed by the IUAW. (Point Sal #4) Mr. Lorenzo Campbell, board agent in charge of the election, phoned Mr. Kenneth Belier, the general manager of Point Sal between 3:30 and 4:00 p.m. Mr. Belier was informed that it would be necessary to supply lists of employees, names and addresses and job classification by Monday morning, June 19, 1978. (Transcript Vol II page 78) Mr. Belier, later testified that the company was aware of the address requirement long before the petition was filed. (Transcript Vol II, page 99-102)

Monday June 19, 1978

12:55 - Mr. Belier delivered the list to the ALRB.
(Transcript Vol II, page 78, UFW #1)

2:30 (Est) - Mr. Campbell of the ALRB telephoned Mr. Belier that the list was deficient. Mr. Belier was asked to provide home addresses for 27 workers whose addresses on the list were a post office box number. Mr. Belier told the ALRB that he would go right to work on it and they would have the corrected list by the next morning. Mr. Belier then took the people who

had post office box numbers and put them on a list according to crew. By the time this was done the workers had already gone home so the list was given by Mr. Belier to the crew leaders early Tuesday morning. (UFW #1, Transcript Vol. II page 80)

Tuesday June 20, 1978

7:00 a.m. - Mr. Belier gave the field superintendent the names for whom home addresses were needed.

(Transcript, Vol II page 80, Point Sal #1)

10:00 a.m. - Addresses obtained by crew leaders given to Mr. Belier. (Vol II page 81)

4:30 p.m. - The UFW intervened. (Point Sal #6)

Mr. Belier testified that he turned the addresses over to the ALRB sometime around 10:00 a.m. on Tuesday the 20th. His memory at this point is inconsistent with other evidence introduced by the employer. Point Sal #8, the trustworthiness of which has been stipulated to by both parties, indicates that the missing addresses were not provided the ALRB until 2:15 p.m. on Wednesday June 21, 1978. Throughout Mr. Belier's testimony he seemed confused about the exact dates events occurred. For these reasons I find the addresses were delivered to the ALRB on Wednesday June 21, 1978 at 2:15 p.m. (Point Sal #8)

Wednesday June 21, 1978

- 7:45 a.m. - Mrs. Velasco, an organizer for the UFW picked up the list. (Point Sal #7)
- 8:20 a.m. - Mr. Campbell called Mr. Belier to find out his progress on the list deficiencies. (Point Sal #8)
- 1:48 p.m. - A second call from the ALRB to Mr. Belier about post office box problem. Mr. Belier was in a meeting. The agent was told that Mr. Belier would call back in 15 or 20 minutes. (Point Sal #8, Point Sal #1) There were 27 workers for whom only post office boxes were shown. At this time Point Sal provided 26 home addresses. The address of one worker was left blank. (Point Sal #1)
- 2:25 p.m. - The UFW was notified that the changes had been provided. Pete Cohn of the UFW said they would call back. (Point Sal #8)
- 2:45 p.m. - Mr. David Daniels picked up the supplement to the list. (Point Sal #8)
- Late Afternoon - Early Evening - Home visits were made by the UFW
- 8:00 p.m.- The pre-election conference was held. The UFW objected to the out of town addresses on the original list. (Point Sal #10) There are (9) nine addresses that would be considered out of town. One from San Francisco, one from Watson-ville, one from Stockton, one from Los Angeles, and 5 from Oxnard. The IUAW provided one local address for the San Francisco worker at that

time. The worker was staying with Mr. Rabara, and officer of the IUAW, and a worker in the lettuce crew at Point Sal. The company promised to get the local addresses by the morning. (Point Sal #10) Mr. Belier testified that the 5 Oxnard addresses are in fact the present home addresses of the workers involved since they commuted to Point Sal from Oxnard daily. (Transcript, Vol II, page 86)

Thursday June 22, 1978

- 8:50 a.m. - Mr. Belier called in the three local addresses. (Point Sal #12, Transcript Vol II, page 87) This resolved the deficiency with reference to out of town addresses.
- 10:45 a.m. - Mr. Scott Washburn informed the ALRB that 17 names had incorrect addresses. (Point Sal #12)
- 11:10 a.m. - An agent of the ALRB called Mr. Belier and informed him of the incorrect addresses. (Point Sal #12) For an unexplained reason Mr. Belier was given only 16 names to check. (Point Sal #11; Point Sal #2). Three of these turned out to be correct as previously provided. (Transcript Vol II, page 84; compare Point Sal 1 and 2 with UFW 1).
- 11:30 a.m. - The UFW alleged and I have found the agent of the employer interfered with the access and

organizing activities of Mr. Pete Velasco
and organizer and a Vice President of the UFW.

2:00 p.m. - Mr. Belier called the ALRB and provided a list
of corrected addresses for 14 of the bad addresses reported
by Mr. Washburn. (Point Sal #11). Mr. Belier testified that
he delivered the list by 2:00 p.m. on Wednesday June 21st
1978. Again, his memory is inconsistent with documents
introduced by the employer (Point Sal 18, #11, and #12).
Also, Mr. Belier seemed confused as to dates throughout his
testimony. (Transcript Vol II, page 84, 103, 105, and 108).
For these reasons I find that Mr. Belier delivered the
corrections to the bad addresses at 2:00 p.m. on Thursday
June 22, 1978.

2:15 p.m. - Mr. David Zuniga, agent of the ALRB called
Mr. Washburn of the UFW and gave him the addresses of the
14 people. (Point Sal #11)

2:20 p.m. - Mr. Washburn called the ALRB and informed the
agent that two of the corrected addresses just provided were
incorrect. (Point Sal #11)

2:21 p.m. - Mr. Zuniga called Mr. Belier and informed him of
the two remaining incorrect addresses. (Point Sal #11) Mr.
Belier was not in and the agent was told that Mr. Belier
would call him back in 15 - 20 minutes. (Point Sal #11)

2:50 p.m. - Mr. Belier returned Mr. Zuniga's call and was given the two names. Mr. Belier stated that he would have to go into the fields to get the information. (Point Sal #11)

2:52 p.m. - Mr. Zuniga called the UFW and explained to Mr. David Daniels Mr. Belier's intention. (Point Sal #11)

3:02 p.m. - Mr. Belier called the ALRB and provided the two addresses. (Point Sal #11)

Late afternoon and or early evening - The UFW made quick "get out the vote" type house calls.

Friday June 23, 1978

The election was held.