SENATE HEARINGS HELD ON GAS RESOURCES

Editor’s note: This report was written by Tom Lewis, a Local 1245 member employed by the Sierra Pacific Power Company, at the request of Bus. Mgr. Mitchell. Tom was Local 1245’s delegate on a committee representing gas workers and they testified before a Senate Committee hearing on natural gas resources.

HELD MARCH 22 AND 23, 1972

Senator Hollings, of North Carolina, as Chairman, heard testimony regarding S. 2467, S. 2505 and S. 2405. S. 2467 is a bill designed especially to aid in development of Natural Gas reserves.

Had an appointment and met with Senator Howard Cannon, a member of the committee, and urged him to take favorable action on the bill, to get it to the Senate floor for passage.

Also met with Senator Alan Bible, who promised to do all in his power for the bill when and if it reached the floor.

Appearing at the hearings with prepared statements supporting passage were: Representatives of the Federal Power Commission, Departments of Interior and Commerce, a committee representing gas workers from various parts of the United States, comprised of Francis Tebbs, President International Union of Gas Workers, Washington, D.C.; John Federoff, Jr., Secretary-Treasurer Gas Workers Local, Detroit, Michigan; Joseph Di Stephano, 56th District Gas Workers Local, Washington, D.C.; Lewis Johnston, President Gas Workers Local, Providence, Rhode Island; Sherman Henry, Pipe Line Workers Union, Ruston, Louisiana; and Tom Lewis, Local 1245 I.B.E.W., Reno, Nevada. Also present, John W. Morton, President Cities Service Gas Company, Chairman Board of Directors Independent Natural Gas Association; Mr. G. J. Tankersley, A.G.A.; John J. Shaw, President Southern Natural Gas Company; and Mr. Raymond N. Shibley, Counsel Panhandle Eastern Pipeline Company.

In summarizing all the pertinent points presented in all the testimony we find that: our use of natural gas has been increasing steadily over the last twelve years, but our discovery and development of new wells has failed to keep pace with this use.

If exploration began today, it would take three to four years to locate and develop enough new wells to bring production running ahead of demand again. There are approximately 60,000 natural gas reservoirs.

The absolute level of these wells is estimated because this is "proprietary information" and, due to expenditures used to get this information, will not be divulged to competitors, etc.

New York, Pennsylvania, Illinois, Massachusetts, Ohio, Maryland, Virginia, Southern California and Rhode Island, to name some of the states hardest hit, have had to cut gas deliveries to industrial, commercial and interruptible customers and generating plants.

Public service commissions have ordered no service to new customers. New York has a backlog of between three and five hundred customers waiting for gas service. One of our largest cities with an air pollution problem, New York, needs an increase of 300% in natural gas users to bring the level down to an acceptable standard.

(Continued on Page Three)
Ecology and Economy

L. L. Mitchell

(Continued from Page One)

logical side do their "thing" purely on the basis of emotion. They believe all technology is bad and anything done to improve the economy will lead to our extinction.

Both extremes overlook the hard facts of life. They believe that man, like an ecosystem, exists by reason of many interdependent and interacting factors, and that any one factor will produce a change in other factors. Ecology and economy are interrelated and both must be considered when we discuss the future of man. The basic problem in the "ecological" question is that we cannot go back to the way of life of primitive man. Unfortunately, the question is that we cannot go back in any one factor will produce a change in other factors. Ecology and economy are interrelated and both must be considered when we discuss the future of man. The basic problem in the "ecological" question is that we cannot go back to the way of life of primitive man.

We must determine what risks we can reasonably take which affect the environment and those which we cannot afford to take. We must also determine the same for the economic side of our lives. Responsible people on both sides of the argument realize there must be an equitable balance established for both ecological and economic necessities. It is not whether, but how we can provide economic growth at the same time as we restore and improve our environment.

The sad fact of the whole situation is that the "ecological crisis" we face today has been brought about by the same forces that make our lives better. The field of medicine has increased longevity and reduced mortality rates particularly in infants, to the point that we now have a population problem. Success in increasing agricultural production reduced the possibility of mass famine, but created pollution from pesticides and chemical fertilizers. Success in producing more and more families gave the opportunity for leaving city tenements, but resulted in urban sprawl and the polluting traffic jams.

There are many others which could be mentioned, but these will suffice to show that the first step to our problem has been a realization of the risks involved in making decisions on areas to be taken and the affect on other factors concerning our welfare as a people. We should face the fact that our work on the means to change our environment to produce needed electricity to fight other kinds of pollution because the power plant can itself be a pollution source? Are the risks of thermal and radiation dangers from nuclear power plants less acceptable than the air pollution from plants burning coal fuel? Can people move back to the cities and ban the automobile to reduce air pollution and traffic jams? These are not easy choices and involve both political and economic concerns.

Let no one misunderstand — we are for the restoration and protection of the environment. We do not accept the theory, however, that clean environment can be achieved by elimination or abandonment of experimentation and technology. The answer to elimination of water pollution is not caused by livestock wastes, the activities of farmers or industry — can only be solved by cooperation of the environmentalists and more advanced technology.

We should also remember that clean-up costs, if limited only to these problems of a more limited and temporary nature, are estimated to be some 100 billions of dollars. We face this problem now because for years we have bypassed the decision of who will pay the costs of restoring and maintaining the environment in the condition we desire. The expense will eventually come to the great mass of people as citizens and taxpayers....what portion will be paid by consumers in higher prices and what portion by the taxpayer in the form of higher taxes. When that issue is resolved, we face much harder decisions.

Everyone always believes the start should be in some other area than that which will affect him. Nonetheless, the greatest cost must be the need for a list of priorities. This, in the beginning, may be nothing more or less than that which is trade-off between growing more food for the world's hungry or banning the fertilizers which pollute the rivers. We must adopt and see a number of power plants to produce needed electricity to fight other kinds of pollution. Is it reasonable to say that the power plant can itself be a pollution source? Are the risks of thermal and radiation dangers from nuclear power plants less acceptable than the air pollution from plants burning coal fuel? Can people move back to the cities and ban the automobile to reduce air pollution and traffic jams? These are not easy choices and involve both political and economic concerns.
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We should also remember that clean-up costs, if limited only to these problems of a more limited and temporary nature, are estimated to be some 100 billions of dollars. We face this problem now because for years we have bypassed the decision of who will pay the costs of restoring and maintaining the environment in the condition we desire. The expense will eventually come to the great mass of people as citizens and taxpayers — what portion will be paid by consumers in higher prices and what portion by the taxpayer in the form of higher taxes. When that issue is resolved, we face much harder decisions.

Everyone always believes the start should be in some other area than that which will affect him. Nonetheless, the greatest cost must be the need for a list of priorities. This, in the beginning, may be nothing more or less than that which is the trade-off between growing more food for the world's hungry or banning the fertilizers which pollute the rivers. We must adopt and see a number of power plants to produce needed electricity to fight other kinds of pollution. Is it reasonable to say that the power plant can itself be a pollution source? Are the risks of thermal and radiation dangers from nuclear power plants less acceptable than the air pollution from plants burning coal fuel? Can people move back to the cities and ban the automobile to reduce air pollution and traffic jams? These are not easy choices and involve both political and economic concerns.

Let no one misunderstand — we are for the restoration and protection of the environment. We do not accept the theory, however, that clean environment can be achieved by elimination or abandonment of experimentation and technology. The answer to elimination of water pollution is not caused by livestock wastes, the activities of farmers or industry — can only be solved by cooperation of the environmentalists and more advanced technology.

We should also remember that clean-up costs, if limited only to these problems of a more limited and temporary nature, are estimated to be some 100 billions of dollars. We face this problem now because for years we have bypassed the decision of who will pay the costs of restoring and maintaining the environment in the condition we desire. The expense will eventually come to the great mass of people as citizens and taxpayers — what portion will be paid by consumers in higher prices and what portion by the taxpayer in the form of higher taxes. When that issue is resolved, we face much harder decisions.

Everyone always believes the start should be in some other area than that which will affect him. Nonetheless, the greatest cost must be the need for a list of priorities. This, in the beginning, may be nothing more or less than that which is the trade-off between growing more food for the world's hungry or banning the fertilizers which pollute the rivers. We must adopt and see a number of power plants to produce needed electricity to fight other kinds of pollution. Is it reasonable to say that the power plant can itself be a pollution source? Are the risks of thermal and radiation dangers from nuclear power plants less acceptable than the air pollution from plants burning coal fuel? Can people move back to the cities and ban the automobile to reduce air pollution and traffic jams? These are not easy choices and involve both political and economic concerns.

Let no one misunderstand — we are for the restoration and protection of the environment. We do not accept the theory, however, that clean environment can be achieved by elimination or abandonment of experimentation and technology. The answer to elimination of water pollution is not caused by livestock wastes, the activities of farmers or industry — can only be solved by cooperation of the environmentalists and more advanced technology.

We should also remember that clean-up costs, if limited only to these problems of a more limited and temporary nature, are estimated to be some 100 billions of dollars. We face this problem now because for years we have bypassed the decision of who will pay the costs of restoring and maintaining the environment in the condition we desire. The expense will eventually come to the great mass of people as citizens and taxpayers — what portion will be paid by consumers in higher prices and what portion by the taxpayer in the form of higher taxes. When that issue is resolved, we face much harder decisions.

Everyone always believes the start should be in some other area than that which will affect him. Nonetheless, the greatest cost must be the need for a list of priorities. This, in the beginning, may be nothing more or less than that which is the trade-off between growing more food for the world's hungry or banning the fertilizers which pollute the rivers. We must adopt and see a number of power plants to produce needed electricity to fight other kinds of pollution. Is it reasonable to say that the power plant can itself be a pollution source? Are the risks of thermal and radiation dangers from nuclear power plants less acceptable than the air pollution from plants burning coal fuel? Can people move back to the cities and ban the automobile to reduce air pollution and traffic jams? These are not easy choices and involve both political and economic concerns.

Let no one misunderstand — we are for the restoration and protection of the environment. We do not accept the theory, however, that clean environment can be achieved by elimination or abandonment of experimentation and technology. The answer to elimination of water pollution is not caused by livestock wastes, the activities of farmers or industry — can only be solved by cooperation of the environmentalists and more advanced technology.
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IN MEMORIAM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Date of Death</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Charles H. Short</td>
<td>January 16, 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James N. Reiben</td>
<td>December 31, 1971</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leonard D. Lamb</td>
<td>January 9, 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Robert Pluff</td>
<td>February 4, 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James English</td>
<td>February 1, 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roger L. Ritter</td>
<td>February 12, 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sebastian N. D’Elia</td>
<td>February 27, 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gary N. Beltranii</td>
<td>March 1, 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Beyschau</td>
<td>February 28, 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edwin T. Geise</td>
<td>March 6, 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noah C. Wiler</td>
<td>March 11, 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jack E. Moore</td>
<td>March 4, 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Morgan</td>
<td>February 24, 1972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Martin Regan</td>
<td>April 1, 1972</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tom Lewis Reports on Gas Resources Hearings

(Continued from Page One)

Gas workers, from pipeline workers to skilled servicemen, have lost or are facing loss of their jobs. In the Washington, D.C. area, approximately forty retirees will not be replaced.

Gas workers’ futures and the futures of their families are “up for grabs.”

Huge capital investments in plant and pipelines are at stake. A 900,000 mile network of pipelines, serving 150,000,000 customers, is in jeopardy.

Customers face rationing and/or changing to different fuels. Natural gas supplies one third the energy used in the United States and 28% of the energy used for electric generation. Quoting Senator Stevens, “The public thinks we are crying ‘wolf.’ They just don’t understand the seriousness of this shortage of natural gas.”

Quoting Mr. Tebb, “If something isn’t done, and done soon, we stand to lose 400 workers out of a total of 1,500, in the Washington, D.C., area alone.”

Senator Stevens: “Maybe John Q. Citizen won’t realize there’s a shortage until there’s no gas for his air conditioner on a 95° day.”

Senator Hollings: “Lack of regulation or ‘hip pocket’ regulation by the F.P.C.”

There have been too many regulatory obstacles and restrictions upon producers and pipelines; too many policies restricting development of natural gas, especially Federal leases. Underpricing of natural gas made it too popular, and increased retail sales to users.

Underpayment to producers made it unpopular to them, aggravating the shortage at both ends.

Intrastate sales of natural gas “wiped out” the increased demand for interstate sales, because they are not regulated like interstate and could get a better price in their home state.

It was not strictly the F.P.C.’s fault, when trying to make adjustments for the producers, the courts ruled it illegal. The F.P.C. approved prices and contracts, and hundreds of producer contracts were subrogated by court directed rollback in prices.

Senator Hollings: “It’s been a bonanza for the lawyers and courts. It all relates back to the Supreme Court decisions. They’re looking forward and facing backwards.”

For example, in 1960 the commission approved a field price for gas at 23.25 cents per M.C.F. Production and sales were based on this price. Then the price was cut to 21.25, then 20.625, then 20 cents, until in September of ’68 it was cut to 18.5 cents. A new commission started bringing prices up, but the damage had been done. If the 23.25 cent field price in 1960 had been increased gradually to 26 cents by 1971, a 12% increase, there would have been the financial incentive to keep search and development running ahead of demand.

A look at some sources of energy indicates increased costs plus unavoidable risks—buying liquefied natural gas from foreign sources; increased costs plus risks of having supplies cut off.

Company buying short term, non-jurisdictional gas, higher prices.

There are unlimited supplies of coal for gasification, but approximately ten years before production could meet customers’ demands.

Synthetic natural gas: for example Algonquin Pipeline Gas Company has had an application before the F.P.C. since December ’71, to build a plant manufacturing synthetic natural gas using naphtha and propane. However, the plant won’t be producing until 1973, cost $25,000,000.

Natural gas from Alaska won’t be available until certain legalities are resolved.

The causes, therefore, are economic, statutory, and governmental in nature.

They are, therefore, susceptible of solution, at the very least, substantial implementation, with governmental help.

Government leasing, off-shore drilling, would make gas available both for intra and inter-state sales, with no advantage to either.

Senate Bill 2467 won’t change existing contracts, but will provide a “Sanctuary of Contract” clause for new ones.

It also gives the F.P.C. a maximum of nine months to deny, change or approve new contracts providing greater financial stability to producers and encouraging more capital outlay necessary to bring supplies up to demand.

It provides assurances to producers that after contract approval by F.P.C. the commission cannot disturb prices, quantities to be delivered, time to be delivered, or term of contract, thus eliminating long term risks.

In my humble opinion, passage of S. 2467 should be accelerated. Time is of the essence. We can no longer “put it off until tomorrow,” because too soon and too late, we find that tomorrow has become yesterday.
Local 1245 Salutes its San Francisco

This picture of Lineman Arie Smith, left, and Line Subforeman Earl Kelly should dispel the rumor that there is no "overhead" work in San Francisco.

Shop Steward Fred Moureu, truck driver in the Transportation Dept., is shown making a delivery near the Civic Center.

This photo shows Shop Steward Frank Comelli, Relief Senior Control Operator at Hunters Point Power Plant, at the controls.

The constant flow of gas to the homes and offices is the daily task of these men. Shown above from left to right are: Rick Lutz, Fitter, Advisory Councilman Jay Burton, Lt. Crew Foreman and Barry Wilson, Equipment Operator.

If you live in San Francisco, that little grey gas meter on the side of your house probably went through the expert hands of these men in the Gas Meter Shop.

John Lavaysse, Shop Steward at the Materials Facility-Potrero Service Center, is shown filling out a materials requisition order.

The maze of wires under the streets of San Francisco are a common sight to Ron Fitzsimmons, Shop Steward-Underground.

San Francisco... The City... the Cosmopolitan... the Greatest City in the World—these used to describe the working area of many of us. "San Francisco, open your Golden Gates," a song we come and enjoy the many exciting historic sites offer. To some executives it is another place ferreled them. To some people it is just a place to live and work. To many, less fortunate, it is a place to thrive.

Speaking of a place to work, can you imagine the Oakland Bay Bridge at night with the shops and restaurants tied up with the electric buses gone dead? It's like this, and we really don't have to because employed by PG&E, are on the job making things "progress" turn.

When we drive into San Francisco or any big city, the workingman and his contribution to the driving, the road he is driving on, the traffic with the office machines and computers possible because somebody, people with families, make it all go. We are going to pay tribute to these men and women, shown a few pictures of our members.

San Francisco is a large Division and it is important that we know the portion of the people. We will pick some picture section of the Division showing some members and headquarters.
Francisco Division Members

Who said Lt. Crew Foremen don’t work? Jim Habeeb, left, is living proof as he is shown working with Tom Dudley, helper.

This photo shows Meter Repairman Jerry Riebling, left, working with a large gas meter as Shop Steward Art Bates looks on.

... the Cosmopolitan City ... the City by the World—these are some of the many terms of area of many of our Local 1245 members.

Golden Gates,” as the words to the famous to many people. To the tourist it is a call to exciting historic sites that San Francisco has is another place their company has transf is just a place to live and to others it is a many less fortunate, it is a place to exist or k, can you imagine driving in “the City” from dge at night with no lights to guide you? and restaurants in total darkness; the traffic it is gone dead? It’s hard to imagine something k have to because the members of Local 1245, the job making the wheels of the generators.

San Francisco or any big city, we rarely think about itution to the total picture. The ear he is ing on, the traffic signals, the tall buildings, id computers whirring inside, were and are people with families and feelings, is working g to pay tribute in this issue to some of these utures of our members on the job.

vision and it is impossible to show even a small ill pick some pictures which will be a cross- some members in the different departments...
Proposition No. 9 Analyzed
(Continued from Page One)

SECTION 2. Deals with the control of fuels. Prohibits sale of motor fuel: Having a Bromine number of less than 10. Having a sum of Bromine, plus value of aromatics, in excess of 48. Having a sulphur content in excess of 0.05 percent by weight. (Diesel fuel.) Lead content may not be more than 0.05 grams per gallon after January, 1975; 0.075 grams per gallon after January, 1976. After January 1, 1973 every retailer must offer at least one grade of gasoline rated at 90 octane or less, containing not more than 0.75 grams per lead gallon. In the Los Angeles Air Basin, no gasoline can be sold having a "Reid vapor pressure of more than 9 pounds per square inch" at any time. This restriction applies to the entire state between May 30 and November 1 each year.

What do these standards mean? Will more fuel be required due to less power? Will more pollution be caused than is alleviated? Are such fuels technologically possible within the time frames the voters can accept? Can California know the answers? Do the drafters of the initiative know the answers?

State Air Resources Boards, or any local or regional board, or governmental entity may adopt or prescribe more stringent standards for any motor vehicle components or fuels, than those specified by State law.

Thus, within Los Angeles County, more than 60 different sets of standards are possible. Neither a vehicle owner nor a fuel manufacturer could possibly be expected to meet all of them.

SECTION 3. Prohibits any person from operating any source capable of emitting air contaminants if he has received four or more variances in excess of the following values—or if he has received the following variances:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>contaminant</th>
<th>first stage</th>
<th>second stage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Nitrogen Oxides</td>
<td>.25 parts per million</td>
<td>3.0 parts per million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ozone</td>
<td>.5 parts per million</td>
<td>15 parts per million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carbon Monoxide</td>
<td>20 parts per million</td>
<td>60 parts per million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nitrogen Oxides</td>
<td>.25 parts per million</td>
<td>1.5 parts per million</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A "first stage pollution alert" occurs when any one of the pollutants exceeds the following values—or when declared by the district:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>contaminant</th>
<th>first stage</th>
<th>second stage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ozone</td>
<td>.5 parts per million</td>
<td>6.0 parts per million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carbon Monoxide</td>
<td>5 parts per million</td>
<td>20 parts per million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nitrogen Oxides</td>
<td>.5 parts per million</td>
<td>3 parts per million</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SECTION 4. Defines a "variance" as the discharge of a pollutant for a period of time not exceeding 30 days. A "variance" is issued only if the issuance is necessary to health, convenience or economy, even if no "protective" equipment is available.

This will require the shut-down of all installations, no matter how necessary to health, convenience or economy, even if no "protective" equipment is available.

SECTION 5. Any Air Pollution Control District may require any person who operates a source capable of emitting air contaminants to install a sealed monitoring device capable of measuring and recording contaminants from any source.

This section applies equally to heating units for homes, pool heaters, factories, power plants, and as drafted, vehicles and heavy equipment.

If such a recording device is available, it would have to simultaneously record particulate matter, ozone, sulphur oxides, nitrogen oxides, mercury, carbon monoxide, carbon dioxide, and numerous other chemical compounds.

The law, as drafted, is broad enough to cover all sources and all pollutants. Such monitoring devices as are available are limited in scope and highly expensive.

SECTION 6. This section has the greatest potential threat to constitutional guarantees and to the general health and welfare.

Any air pollution control officer in any air pollution control district is directed to immediately order the shut down of all businesses, factories, or plants operating under a variance, or any single source of air contaminants which any business, factory, or plant being operated under a variance if:

A. State air quality standards for any one pollutant are exceeded.

B. Conditions for a "First Stage Pollution Alert" exist.

A comparison of State Air Quality Standards, under the initiative, with those now pertaining to Los Angeles County for smog alerts follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>contaminant</th>
<th>Los Angeles County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ozone</td>
<td>10 parts per million for 1 hr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>for 3 successive days or for 7 days in the past 90 days,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carbon Monoxide</td>
<td>20 parts per million for 8 hours,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nitrogen Oxides</td>
<td>25 parts per million for 1 hour,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A "first stage pollution alert" occurs when any one of the pollutants exceeds the following values—or when declared by the district:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>contaminant</th>
<th>first stage</th>
<th>second stage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ozone</td>
<td>.5 parts per million</td>
<td>6.0 parts per million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carbon Monoxide</td>
<td>5 parts per million</td>
<td>20 parts per million</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nitrogen Oxides</td>
<td>.5 parts per million</td>
<td>3 parts per million</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The State Air Resources Board may provide more stringent air quality standards.

In addition to the above denial of due process, Section 6 provides that "No one has the right to be deprived of the right to determine the propriety of the issuance of a shut down order." This sets a standard for arbitrary, capricious, and capricious acts of appointed public officials.

In addition to the above denial of due process, Section 6 provides that "No one has the right to be deprived of the right to determine the propriety of the issuance of a shut down order." This sets a standard for arbitrary, capricious, and capricious acts of appointed public officials.

The above denial is entailed in substantive and procedural due process and the right to be heard. But if this initiative becomes law, the loss of income, convenience, profits, and property rights, together with the health hazards involved, must be endured. It is necessary to government to determine whether dangerous conditions exist, or that the particular business, factory, or plant is in fact contributing to the condition.

The law would leave the air pollution control officer no discretion. He must immediately shut down all industry including electrical power plants.

SECTION 7. Provides for class action suits to enjoin violations of the Health and Safety Code as amended by the initiative.

SECTION 8. Provides for fines equal to 10% of the previous year's gross non-compliance, on any person found guilty of violating any air pollution provision.

SECTION 9. Provides for public access to records of Air Pollution Control Districts.

SECTION 10. Conflict of interest. This section is so broad that any person who owns almost any share of industrial stock would be barred from serving in any capacity on an Air Pollution Control Board.

SECTION 11. Personal gain. Any person who in any way gets, or expects to get, any advantage from his position as an officer, director or owner of an industry, or who receives money, favors, advantages, or consideration from any person who owns or operates any business, factory, or plant, as a result of violation of any air pollution provisions, is guilty of a violation of this act.

SECTION 12. Prohibits future leasing, drilling or exploration for oil, or other hydrocarbons, in tidelands or submerged lands (out to 3 miles) and on shore within one mile of mean high tide. Permits a suit for injunction or restraining order.

SECTION 13. As soon as, whenever, as determined by the commission, any operation conducted under lease issued pursuant to this Chapter constitutes an ultrahazardous activity, such operation shall cease upon order of the commission and shall not commence until such time as the commission determines that the operation no longer constitutes an ultrahazardous activity.

SECTION 14. The lead-time for planning, obtaining government approval, and building any nuclear powered generating plant which is powered by atomic energy from nuclear fission during the five year period succeeding the effective date of this section shall be determined by the commission.

The United States is now in the throes of an energy crisis. Of the "fossil" fuels, which are converted into energy, coal is by far the most plentiful, and causes the most pollution. It must be extracted at the expense of stripped land and acid streams.

Oil, especially low sulphur-content oil, is in very short supply in the United States, and all known domestic reserves of natural gas could be burned within 10 years if current trends in resource development in California are continued.

The prohibition against nuclear powered generating plants is self-defeating. It has been suggested that the growth rate of electric power consumption must be curtailed. There is some indication that the rate of increase of electric power consumption, in the current rate of increase in power use in the next decade, U.S. consumption of electricity will still triple by 1990. (Emphasis added).

The above quotation is in accord with the testimony of hundreds of expert witnesses who have appeared before the Joint Committee on Atomic Energy and other Congressional Committees during the past two years. California's electrical energy needs will increase much faster—doubling every eight years.

Los Angeles County has refused to license even a relatively clean gas fired power plant because of the air pollution problem. The only hope for an adequate supply of cheap pollution-free electrical power is the nuclear plant with adequate devices to treat the warm water discharged.

The lead-time for planning, obtaining government approval, and building nuclear generating plants is now about seven years. The "Clean Environment Act" does not give even 15 years required to obtain California's needed electricity, hundreds of thousands of jobs will have evaporated, additional rapid transit will be impossible and electricity will have to be rationed for home, industrial and agricultural use.

The prohibition against nuclear powered generating plants is self-defeating. Without them, there simply will not be enough power to clean our water, to recycle wastes, or to separate and remove contaminants from the air.

SECTION 17. Provides criminal penalties for a violation of the nuclear power plant provision, and also provides that any interested person may seek a writ of mandamus or injunction.

SECTION 18. These sections deal with Persistent Chlorinated Hydrocarbons and prohibit the manufacture, possession, purchase, sale, import, transportation, use, or disposal of any chemical or chemical mixture which contains Persistent Chlorinated Hydrocarbons. It is unlawful to transport, use, or dispose of any Persistent Chlorinated Hydrocarbons, including herbicides and commercial poisons, unless a permit is issued by a State official. But no permit may be issued unless authorized by a four-fifths vote by each house of the Legislature.

(Continued on Page Eight)
Dear Fellow Members,

WOW! I would guess the economic situation among P.G.&E. employees is great. Our wage re-opener is due in July and we have averaged 4% of our Union members at our monthly unit meetings. Also it is good to know that everything is going smoothly on the job. We don’t see many of the shop stewards at our meetings either.

I wonder how many of our members would spend $10.00 a month without a care about where it goes? It seems most of you would. That is exactly what you are doing when you won’t even spend four hours a month at a Union meeting to find out what Local 1245 is doing with your money. Maybe they are buying recreation land for the Business Reps to retire on, or maybe they are financing the Frog Jump contest each year. Maybe they are trying to get a $500.00 death benefit for your spouse or possibly they are trying to procure a legal aid service for the individual member and his family.

One of our problems with attendance at our meetings may lie with some of the wives of members. How many wives complain when their husband says he is going to the Union meeting? Encourage your husband to go. Let him know what you want from Union benefits, or the most important item to your family that you feel your Union Representatives should take to the negotiating table with the Company.

So the working wives want to stay home? Should Company employees have longer vacations? Should shift employees have better hours? OR should we bring a Rep home for dinner once a month?

Brothers and Sisters, there is strength in numbers. Let your voices be heard, your votes counted and your signature on the attendance roster of your monthly unit meeting give guidance and backing to our Negotiating Committee, Review Committee and Grievance Committees.

Don’t be one that says, “It won’t make any difference if I go.” Look at what a few dedicated members have done and imagine what many can accomplish.

Fraternally,
Laurence W. Hope
5849 Soltero Dr.
San Jose, Ca. 95123

April 25, 1972
Local 1245, I.B.E.W.

Dear Fellow Members:

SENORITY RIGHTS
We Need Them

I’m a Shop Steward of IBEW Local 1245. Time and time again I am asked, “Why did Joe get that truck before I did? I’ve been here twice as long as he has.” Or, “I’ve been here 23 years and I’m still driving a heavy dump truck. Every time I got the tractor B or a backhoe I’d be dumped by someone with less time with the Company but more time on the equipment. Something’s wrong here!”

Something IS wrong here. And the Union should be doing something about it. Right now, our representatives are preparing negotiations with the Company about Lines of Progression. I am told that this will effectively ensure Seniority Rights in terms of promotions and demotions. This is good. It’s about time.

But we have to let our representatives know what we want. We need a system where men are promoted by TIME WITH THE COMPANY, not time in a classification. Promotion by Job Seniority, not Classification Seniority, which amounts to luck and favoritism. And anybody will tell you that’s the way it’s usually done now.

We must have the right to earn our promotions and advances—not just be lucky enough to get them when and if they come. Earn your seniority, don’t depend on anybody to give it to you!

Fraternally yours,
Mathew Callahan
501 Vermont St.
S.F., Calif. 94107

Bettie Charles, shown above, is a Local 1245 Shop Steward in PG&E’s General Office. Bettie is a Clerk C in the Corporate Accounting Department of the Vice President and Comptroller’s Organization. Bettie’s Shop Steward activity nor her performance as a Clerk C is the topic of this article.

Many of our members have unusual hobbies or outside activities. Bettie is no exception and her interest in acting has brought her to a starring role in a play at the On Broadway in San Francisco. She played the female lead in “No One Man Show” written by local playwright Thelma Jackson Stiles.

Bettie has since been asked to audition for a local T.V. producer and director, Sister Charles has appeared in some local theatre group presentations and directed one such presentation.

Bettie enjoys this extra-curricular activity and has a real flair for acting. I visited a dress rehearsal to take the photo shown above and to see her in action. I enjoyed it very much and must say to Bettie—“break a leg in your next play.” Editor’s note: For those of you who are not show biz buffs and think that I am wishing Bettie ill health, “break a leg” is a way of saying good luck.

Jim J. Conway

could have won $50.00 if he had noticed his Union membership card number in the March issue of the Utility Reporter. This month’s number is as well hidden as it was last month. Don’t miss out, read your Utility Reporter.
Congressman Holifield Analyzes "Clean Environment Act"

(Continued from Page Six)

This ban of the only known and effective insecticides and commercial poisons now in production applies to all of California's agriculture industry and to the home garden alike.

Forcing the largest and most productive agricultural area in the world to operate without insecticides for a single season would be catastrophic. It would mean a total catastrophe for the grower, his employees, his suppliers, and the financial institutions upon which they depend. It would mean hunger and prohibitively high prices to the millions of consumers of California's produce in California and throughout the nation.

California's agriculture products, one of the country's leading exports, could no longer compete on the world market or within the United States. In time, millions of acres of valuable farmland would return to desert and become eroded.

In time, millions of acres of valuable farmland would return to desert and become eroded.

The answer for the Northern California area would be the Shoring Safety Training Site of the American Society of Safety Engineers in Sacramento, California.

Business Manager Mitchell has enrolled his entire Staff in this school and they are in the process of attending this class. The class consists of more than just a classroom situation and demonstration. Those who are enrolled will have to learn and understand two different types of trenches and they use much of the different types of equipment available in the industry.

The emphasis is on knowledge and safety. Red Cass is the instructor at the school and he does an excellent job leaving "no stone unturned" in his presentation.

The Staff, in their assignments as Business Representatives, must answer questions on safety as well as being aware of the law on shoring. Many of our members are working in trenches and it will be beneficial to these members to have a "Rep" who is aware of the procedures and the law.

CONGRESSMAN HOLIFIELD ANALYZES "CLEAN ENVIRONMENT ACT"

The Congress has enacted the Environmental Policy Act and created the Environmental Protection Agency to enforce that Act. The Clean Air Acts of 1967 and 1970, along with Clean Water legislation which will soon be passed, are forward-looking laws which rightely take into account the technology and availability of economic support (taxes and profits) to support an anti-pollution effort. The California Legislature has, following many hours of hearings and debate, passed numerous anti-pollution laws. These laws are very strict but also take into consideration what is possible. The initiative was apparently drafted without the benefit of legal or scientific expertise. Its terms do not reflect the sober deliberation found in laws enacted under the legislative process.

If there in fact was deliberation, it appears to be aimed solely at the destruction of the industrial and agricultural base upon which 8,721,000 workers must depend for a livelihood. In 1971, more than 600,000 people were unemployed in California. More than 100,000 other persons had given up and dropped out of the labor force. The employment picture will not be much better in 1972.

The imposition of this ill-conceived law will, without doubt, drive most of California's business and industry out of the State or into bankruptcy. Already financially depressed County and City governments will also be bankrupted. No tax revenues would be available to retain the services of many of the 1,157,000 State and local government employees.

Stated simply, the imposition of this law would result in the greatest depression California has ever experienced.

Further, the initiative would not halt pollution. It is aimed at the source of only 15 percent of total air pollution, and ignores the cause of 85 percent—the automobile.

Little is known about the leadership or membership of the organization which originated the initiative. Whoever they are, it must be said that they are insensitive to the basic needs of those in our State who must live on fixed and low or moderate incomes.

Perhaps the members of that organization can afford the extremely high prices of food grown on organic farms. Perhaps their standard of living needs no improvement. But this is not the happy lot of the many people who would bear the greatest burdens—the loss of jobs and higher prices.

No one will disagree that the problems of pollution abatement must be met head on and solved. However, we have a choice of methods. We can seek solutions within the realm of the "real world" where technology and the economy permit; or we can follow the approach of the so-called "Clean Environment Act" and strike out blindly.

Every thinking voter should reject the initiative and urge their elected and appointed officials to proceed with all possible speed on the course of reason.

The class involves much physical work and for those who are not used to it, such as your editor, it means a few bruises and many sore muscles.

We suggest that those members who work in trenches contact your Shop Steward or Business Representative if you feel that your employer is violating the existing laws.

SUMMARY

The people of California are being asked to vote upon a proposition which will have a lasting and drastic effect upon their own lives and the future of the State.

They are being asked to exchange their jobs, economic well-being, convenience, and some of their Constitutional rights for the false hope that this measure will bring about a clean environment.

The people should not make this choice without fully understanding the contents of the initiative. It is doubtful that the 500,000 citizens who signed the petition to place this measure on the ballot had the slightest idea as to its real contents. And since the very long initiative will have to be explained on the ballot in very terse terms, the voters will not know of its contents on election day.

The Congress has enacted the Environmental Policy Act and created the...