

the personnel jacket of the employee. The evaluation is kept in the safe of my deputy administrator, whose office is across the hall from mine, separate and apart from the personnel jacket of the person who has been tested.

As I have mentioned, we do not do this on a mass production basis. Of the positions that have been filled in the last 2 years, since we instituted this program, we have tested less than 10 percent. We do not use it at all on new employees, we use it only on promotions into what I have referred to as the key jobs.

We have put out criteria to our top people who are making the employment selections, cautioning them not to go overboard on these tests, but rather to use them as one factor to be considered. We have found that they are particularly useful in further interviews and discussions with the employee. The costs of these tests have been inquired about by a letter the chairman sent to Secretary Udall. We have spent thus far approximately \$15,000 in the testing program, about half of which was spent with the Los Angeles firm called Aptitude Testing for Industry and the other half with the Pittsburgh firm called Psychological Services of Pittsburgh.

In February of this year we consolidated our testing in one firm, namely the Pittsburgh firm. And we did not renew the contract with the Los Angeles firm.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Why?

Mr. LUCE. Well, there were several reasons we didn't. First of all, the Pittsburgh firm, we found, through its representing a number of other utilities and doing work for other utilities, could bring to us a broader experience that would be more helpful to our management and to our employees, in helping to get the right people in the right job.

Secondly, we had gone through the initial phase of testing, we had tested for more than half of the key positions in the agency. We concluded we only needed one consulting firm. There was no point in hiring two to do that job which one could do.

As I say in my statement, I don't think the Bonneville Power Administration will collapse if we cease making these tests. But we do think that they have been of considerable value. We think they are of value not only to management, but to our employees, as we use them, with the safeguards we have thrown around them.

I am aware that the Civil Service Commission has in the last week changed its regulations as regards these tests. Whereas formerly the tests were neither specifically permitted or forbidden, now they are specifically forbidden, except where the agency giving the test can convince the Civil Service Commission that there is sound medical reason to do so and that the particular test being employed is a relevant test, and has been proven by experience to be——

Mr. GALLAGHER. And it will be taken in a clinical situation, between doctor-patient, and will remain there, and not in an administrator's safe or deputy administrator's safe.

Mr. LUCE. Well, the answers are destroyed in our program, we get only the evaluation, Mr. Chairman. Of course, to the extent we continue using this kind of test, we will do so only in compliance with the regulations and subject to the restrictions of the Civil Service Commission.

That is a summary of my statement. Now I am supposed to be across the street at the Capitol in about 3 minutes. I would be most happy to come back this afternoon for questions.