Building cooperation at PG&E

The effort to build cooperation between labor and management at PG&E picked up fresh momentum last month when rank and file union members from Gas and Electric T&D conducted a series of meetings with their co-workers at yards throughout the PG&E system.

The message was essentially this: the company and the union need each other.

PG&E hopes labor-management cooperation will bring business success in a newly-competitive environment. Workers hope cooperation will increase employment security.

Those are the hopes. The heavy lifting will be done by the 20 or more labor-management committees created since April 5, when PG&E Chairman Stan Skinner and Local 1245 Business Manager Jack McNally agreed to the cooperative approach. None of those committees faces a bigger challenge than the one for Gas and Electric T&D. A top priority of that committee is to clarify the role of the division, General Construction, hiring hall, and contract workforces.

The work of the committee was a major topic of discussion during the special union presentations at PG&E yards last month. Those making the presentations were able to report several positive developments regarding job security since the cooperative approach began last April.

• PG&E now says there is enough work for all existing union crew employees in both Title 200 (division) and Title 300 (General Construction) "for the foreseeable future." If the work picture changes, the company pledges to discuss the implications of those changes in partnership with the union.

• The establishment of the hiring hall for temporary additional workers will help insulate regular Title 200 and Title 300 employees from layoffs when the current workload falls off. The union and company have agreed that temporary workers or contractors are not intended as a replacement for regular workers performing base load work. A letter agreement prohibits layoffs in either Title 200 or Title 300 when temporary workers are being used.

• This foundation of job security is intended to reduce past tensions between Division and GC employees and to encourage them to work together as equals.

Along with improved job security for bargaining unit members, cooperation is providing PG&E new flexibility in the deployment of its workforce. Where practical and where critical vacancies occur, regular GC crews can be loaned to divisions, and hiring hall employees can be hired into GC to fill in behind them.

The company and union believe that an increased sense of job security will encourage employees to share their ideas for improving their work performance. Employees are encouraged to share ideas they may have for improving safety or making further improvements in job security.

"We want to let you know there's a committee out here to listen to your opinions," said Larry Darby, a working foreman "A" in GC, who spoke about these labor-management activities at the Colma yard last month.

Presentations by union members concerning the Gas and Electric T&D labor-management committee were slated to continue throughout the month of December.
Workers here and abroad

Rolling the union on...

Escalated Action: The new leaders at the AFL-CIO announced plans to step up support for striking Detroit newspaper workers and for locked-out employees at Staley Manufacturing Co. in Decatur, Ill. The AFL-CIO plans to increase pressure on some companies to stop advertising in the Detroit newspapers, and will urge firms like PepsiCo to stop buying corn sweeteners from Staley.

Sweet Success: A month-long strike by Sugar Workers Union Local 1, an affiliate of the Seafarers International Union, ended recently when union members voted to end the walkout and ratified an extension of the previous three-year contract. The union action followed management’s withdrawal of “takeaway” demands, according to the union. About 100 members of the Longshoremen’s union honored picket lines in the walkout.

Organizing Immigrants: Union officials in Los Angeles and New York plan major organizing drives among immigrant workers. The nine-union Los Angeles Manufacturing Action Project (LAMAP) will target all employers in a specific industry at one time. In New York, the Central Labor Council will focus on the retail food industry.

Reining in Abuses: Santa Clara County, the heart of California’s “Silicon Valley”, has passed a law to rein in corporate abuse of property tax abatements. The new law requires companies seeking tax abatements to disclose how many jobs they will create and their wage and benefit levels. The law also requires the employer to pay at least $10 an hour for all newly-created jobs, to provide health insurance to permanent employees, and to re-pay tax abatements if they fail to meet their job creation, wage or benefit promises.

Raising Arizona Wages: The Arizona AFL-CIO has launched an employee rights ballot initiative. If adopted, the proposal would change the state constitution to: increase the minimum wage to $6.25 and repeal exemptions; and prohibit employers from firing workers except for “just cause.”

Idaho Petitions: The Idaho AFL-CIO is backing a petition drive to place a measure on the 1996 ballot that would raise the state’s minimum wage from $4.25 hour to $6.25 and repeal exemptions for farm workers, domestic workers, and outside sales people, Labor Notes reported. The proposal would also repeal the current law which allows a 25% tip credit toward the minimum wage.

Free Speech Victory: A federal judge issued a restraining order Oct. 4 prohibiting the city of Lafayette, Ca. from attempting to enforce an emergency ordinance outlawing virtually any picket line, march rally or other demonstration, the California AFL-CIO News reported. The city passed the ordinance at the behest of the Lafayette Park Hotel, which is seeking to thwart workers’ efforts to win a union contract at the hotel.

Strike Ended: Members of Teamsters Local 743 at Lakewood Engineering ended the nationwide AFL-CIO boycott of their company when they won a first contract with the Chicago maker of electric heaters and fans and metal Christmas-tree stands. The contract provides pay raises, improved benefits, seniority rights, job descriptions, and a job safety committee.

PERRY SWORN IN

Rich Perry (left) was sworn in by President Howard Stiefer at the November Advisory Council meeting to represent Local 1245 members at the US Bureau of Reclamation.
Members ratify pact with Foster-Wheeler

Members of Local 1245 ratified a new four-year agreement with Foster Wheeler, a cogeneration facility based in Martinez, Ca. The agreement provides general wage increases of 3.25% per year. Equity raises ranging from 2% to 5% were also negotiated.

The addition of an employer-maintained 401K plan will supplement current pension benefits.

Another new provision in the agreement will give employees out on disability the opportunity to continue receiving their full wage by utilizing sick leave to supplement the payments from State Disability Insurance.

Other provisions of the agreement included:

- The employer will pay up to $125 for prescription safety glasses and increase the boot allowance.
- Employees will receive an additional $5 an hour (over and above time-and-a-half) for call-outs.
- Current employees who are qualified will have preference for any newly-created job classifications.
- Foster-Wheeler is a gas turbine cogeneration facility that supplies steam and electricity to the Tosco refinery in Martinez, Ca.

Negotiating the agreement for the union were Clark Sheppard, power plant technician; Brian Walker, electrical technician; Business Rep. Hunter Stern; and Assistant Business Manager Perry Zimmerman.

Utility Reporter honored for deregulation coverage

Business Manager Jack McNally and Communications Director Eric Wolfe accepted two first-place awards in the 1995 Journalism Awards Contest sponsored by the International Labor Communications Association (ILCA).

A four-part series by McNally and Wolfe examining utility deregulation received first place for Best Series. The series included articles on the history of regulation in California, the affect on workers of deregulation in other industries, the consequences of natural gas deregulation, and an analysis of current efforts to deregulate the electric industry.

These articles, along with on-going monthly coverage of electric deregulation in California, helped the Utility Reporter take first place also in the Unique Performance category.

The Utility Reporter also won an Honorable Mention for Best Use of Graphics for the charts, photos and artwork accompanying the story on natural gas deregulation. That story included a cartoon by Local 1245 member Eugene Williams, a frequent contributor to the Utility Reporter.

The 1995 competition was for works produced in calendar year 1994. The Utility Reporter competed against other local union publications throughout the US and Canada. There were 1,631 entries in this year's contest, submitted by 192 member publications.

Utility restructuring & employee rights

This month the California Public Utilities Commission is scheduled to release its revised proposal for utility restructuring.

Utilities, large industrial consumers, and independent power producers have been very vocal in telling the CPUC what it should do. But none of these special interests has shown much respect for the effect utility restructuring will have on utility employees.

That's why Local 1245, along with other utility unions, organized the Coalition of California Utility Employees (CUE). Since the spring of 1994, CUE has provided expert testimony at numerous CPUC hearings. From the start, we urged the CPUC to safeguard the reliability of California's energy services, and we reminded the commissioners of the crucial role that utility employees play in maintaining a reliable system.

However, much of the debate continued to focus on the issue of "stranded assets." The big question was how to compensate shareholders for physical assets (like power plants) that are put out of service by the transition from a regulated utility industry to a more competitive one.

In August, Southern California Edison and some of the big industrial consumers got together and presented the CPUC with a new proposal for dealing with "stranded assets." The proposal said nothing about the impact on utility employees.

That's when we stepped forward and said: "Wait just a minute—people are assets, too." In October, CUE submitted written testimony to the CPUC declaring that utility employees who lose their jobs because of restructuring should be treated as "stranded human assets." We pointed out that utility employees accept a contractual obligation to provide the public with continuous service, and that dedicated employees are as valuable to ratepayers as any physical utility asset.

We testified that the CPUC to the greatest possible extent should completely avoid causing layoffs ("stranding human assets"). In detailed testimony we showed how the risk of power plant closures can be reduced.

Where reductions must occur, we contended that stranded employees who have dedicated themselves to serving ratepayers deserve transitional assistance from the ratepayers.

In cases where power plants are being "spun off" by a utility, we believe the sales agreement should contain a clause guaranteeing continued recognition of the employees' union. When plants are to be spun off or completely closed down, we argued that plant owners should be required to offer employees the right to purchase the plant.

Where workforce reductions become absolutely necessary, we urged the CPUC to require utilities to offer voluntary retirement and severance benefits to their employees.

We have shown the CPUC how to give employees the fair shake they deserve. Now the time has come for the commissioners to make their decision.

Advisory Council member Bob Irwin (left) presents an appreciation plaque to Business Rep. Landis Mattilla in recognition of the union's successful efforts to negotiate employer-paid health care benefits for union tree trimmers. Playing a key role in shaping the final agreement was Business Manager Jack McNally (center).
When must employers provide family leave?

A survey of state and federal family leave requirements

By Dick Grosboll

T

he California Fair Employment and Housing Commission recently issued regulations clarifying California's family and medical leave requirements. Previously, the U.S. Department of Labor issued lengthy regulations interpreting the federal Family and Medical Leave Act. Hopefully the following summary will give Local 1245 members a basic understanding of federal and state family and medical leave laws adopted during the past three years, as well as the recently-adopted regulations.

Please note, however, that your collective bargaining agreement governs your employment situation and may provide rights in addition to those provided by law. Moreover, this article is only a summary, and is not intended to address each provision in the laws and regulations. Notwithstanding the new regulations, many questions remain unanswered or uncertain.

In February 1993, President Clinton signed into law the Family and Medical Leave Act of 1993 (known as "FMLA"), requiring private and public employers with at least 50 employees to provide up to 12 weeks of unpaid, job-protected leave to take care of a newborn, adopted child, sick child, spouse or parent, or because of an employee's own serious health condition.

California also passed family leave legislation (the California Family Rights Act, known as "CFRA") which became effective Jan. 1, 1993, but which was different than the federal law in several respects; however, to make it easier for both employees and employers to understand their rights and obligations under both laws, California law has been amended to conform to the FMLA in most respects. California provides "broader" family medical and leave rights to some extent than the FMLA.

Eligible Employers

Federal and state leave requirements are applicable for employers with 50 or more employees. Both laws specify that an employer must have 50 or more full-time employees for each working day during each of 20 or more work weeks in the current or preceding calendar year. The workweeks do not have to be consecutive. (Moreover, the employer must employ at least 50 employees within 75 miles of the worksite of the employee requesting the leave.) California law applies to cities, counties, public utilities and other political subdivisions regardless of the number of employees.

Eligible Employees

An employer is required to provide family and medical leave only for full-time employees who have worked for at least one year for the employer. Moreover, to be eligible for such leave, an employee may be required to have worked at least 1,250 hours during the 12-month period immediately prior to the leave date. Additionally, eligibility may be provided to an employee if the employee is the father or in loco parentis (i.e., performing the role of) a child of a person standing in the relation of a lawfulparent, or a child of a person standing in the relation of a "lawful" spouse.

Allowable Leave Time

Employers must provide employees with up to 12 work weeks of unpaid family leave during a 12-month period. California's prior practice of allowing up to four months family leave in a 24 month period has been changed to conform to the FMLA. (See section on next page concerning additional leave time under California law for "pregnancy" and pregnancy related disability.)

If possible, an employee must provide at least 30 days advance notice for foreseeable events (such as the expected birth of a child or a planned medical treatment). For events which are unforeseeable, the employee may notify the employer, as least verbally, as soon as the employee learns of the need for the leave. Failure to comply with the notice requirements is grounds for, and may result in, deferral of the requested leave.

Authorized Reasons for Family Leave

Employees are entitled to leave for the following reasons:

1. Birth or Adoption. The birth or placement for adoption of a child or foster child (but the leave must be taken within 12 months of such birth, adoption or placement). The term "child" is interpreted broadly, and includes a biological, adopted or foster son or daughter, a stepchild, legal ward, or a child of a person standing in the relation of a "lawful" spouse.

2. Care for Family Members. To care for an ill spouse, parent, or child with a serious health condition. The child must be under 18 or be an adult who cannot care for himself or herself. The spouse must be a "lawful" spouse.

3. Employee's Own Serious Health Condition. The employee is unable to perform the functions of his or her job due to a serious health condition; however, California law provides greater rights when the employee's serious health condition is caused by pregnancy, childbirth or related medical conditions.

A serious health condition is an illness, injury, impairment, or physical or mental condition that incapacitates the employee for family members for more than three consecutive days and requires some treatment by a health care provider. It also includes chronic medical conditions (such as arthritis or asthma) that may flare up periodically and thus compel a need for intermittent time off, but not necessarily three consecutive days. Also covered are conditions that require regular multiple treatments, such as physical therapy or radiation. For example, an employee may take four hours of leave time off every week to take his or her child to physical therapy if the child's health care provider recommends it.
FAMILY ISSUES

doctor certifies that such treatment is medically necessary for the child's medical condition.

The California regulations provide that an employer may require that an employee provide a "certification" of his or her own serious health condition or that of a family member. The certification of a family member's serious health condition does not have to identify the serious health condition; however, an employer may require that the certification include the date on which the condition began; the probable duration of the condition; an estimate of the time which the provider believes the employee needs to care for the child, parent or spouse; and a statement that the serious health condition "warrants the participation" of the employer to provide care during a period of treatment or supervision of the child, parent or spouse. The certification for the employee's serious health condition must include similar information.

For medical leave for an employer's own serious health condition, an employer may, however, demand a second and, under limited circumstances, even a third medical opinion if the employer has reason to doubt the validity of the original certification (except for pregnancy disability leave in most instances).

Interruption Leave

Leave may be taken on an intermittent or reduced basis for the birth or adoption of a child, if the arrangement is agreed to by the employer. If, however, an employee wants to take leave because of a serious health condition of a family member or the employee, the leave may be taken intermittently or on a reduced schedule if medically necessary and without the employer's approval.

Requiring Use of Other Leave

Under the FMLA, employers may require employees to first use their paid vacation, personal or sick leave for any part of the 12-week leave period. If the employee uses paid leave, the employer is required to provide unpaid leave to total 12 weeks. Under California law, however, an employer cannot require an employee to use accrued sick leave. The employee may, however, use accrued sick leave if mutually agreed to with the employer. (The Union's bargaining agreement with the employer may include specific provisions on this subject.)

Return Rights & Benefits

1. Right to Reinstatement. There is no absolute right to reinstatement to the same job that an employee held before the leave. An employee who takes family leave is entitled to return to the same position or to a comparable position with the same terms and conditions of employment and benefits, including seniority; however, under California law, for "pregnancy disability" leave, the employer has a greater obligation to return the employee to the same position.

"Employment in a comparable position" is defined in the state regulations as employment in a position which is virtually identical to the employee's original position in terms of pay, benefits, and working conditions, including privileges, status and perquisites. It must involve the same or substantially similar duties and responsibilities, which must entail substantially equivalent skill, effort, responsibility, and authority. It must be performed at the same or geographically proximate worksite from where the employee was previously employed. It ordinarily means the same shift, the same or an equivalent work schedule.

2. An Employer May Not Have to Reinstate the Employee. An employer may not have to offer reinstatement in limited situations. An employer, for example, has no greater right to reinstate an employee to a pregnancy disability leave. The employer has the burden of proving, by a preponderance of the evidence, that an employee would not otherwise have been employed at the time reinstatement is requested.

If, however, an employee is laid off during the course of taking leave and his or her employment is terminated, the employer's responsibility to provide leave, maintain health benefits and reinstate the employee ceases at the time the employee is laid off, provided the employer has no continuing obligations under a collective bargaining agreement.

Health Benefits

Employers are required to provide for continued health coverage for employees on family leave at the same level of benefits and cost that would have been in effect had the employee continued to work, including dependent benefits. If the employer paid for all or a part of such medical coverage prior to the leave, the employer must pay the same amount for the leave period.

Denial of Family Leave

An employer can deny unpaid leave to a salaried employee who is in the highest paid 10% of the employer's employees in certain limited situations if his or her absence could cause "substantial and grievous economic injury" to the employer.

Pregnancy Leave

The major distinction between CFRA and FMLA is how pregnancy disability is addressed. Under California law, employers with five or more employees are required to grant a woman a pregnancy disability leave of up to four months, as needed, depending on her actual period of disability, with a right of return. Employers with more generous leave policies for other temporary disabilities, must also provide such leave for employees temporarily disabled by pregnancy. There is no length of service requirement for entitlement to a pregnancy disability leave.

Four months means the number of days the employee would normally work within four months. For a full-time employee who works five eight-hour days per week, "four months" means 88 working and/or paid eight-hour days of leave entitlement, based on an average of 22 working days per month for four months. For employees who work more or less than five days, the four months will be calculated on a pro rata or proportional basis.

Leave may be taken intermittently or on a reduced work schedule when medically advisable, as determined by the employee's health care provider. (An employer may, however, limit leave increments to the shortest period of time that the employer's payroll system uses to account for absences or use of leave.)

In addition, under California law a parent who was actually disabled by the pregnancy can take family care leave of up to 12 weeks to care for the newborn, as explained above.

Dick Grosboll is an attorney with Neyhart, Anderson, Reilly & Freitas. If you have questions concerning Family Leave, you may contact Dick Grosboll at (415) 495-4949.

Make Ends Meet

Lower your monthly credit payments with a low-interest personal loan.

Your union's Loan Program combines lower rates with longer terms to offer you affordable personal loans — perfect for bill consolidation. Loans start at $2,500.

UNION PRIVILEGE LOAN PROGRAM

For information call: 1-800-343-7097
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Season's Greetings from

Merry Christmas

Happy New Year
Season's Greetings from IBEW Local 1

Merry Christmas

Executive Board
(Seated, from left) Howard Sleet, president; Jack McNally, business manager; Jim McCauley, vice president. (Standing, from left) Ed Mallory, recording secretary; Kathy Tindall; Mike Davis, treasurer; Andrew Dudley; Chris Habecker; and Debbie Mazzanti. (Photo: Austin W. Lea II)

Happy Chanukah

Happy New Year

Janet Evenson
Dispatcher
Riverside Office

Art Murray
Business Representative

Gary Hughes
Business Representative

Frank Saxsenmeier
Business Representative

Karen Kiley
Confidential Secretary

Dennis Seyfe
Business Representative

Linda Knight
Bookkeeping

Sam Tamimi
Asst Business Manager

Ann Kools
Confidential Secretary

Ron Van Dyk
Business Representative

Austin Lea
Printer

Eric Wolfe
Communications Director

Pat Hove
Membership Records

Perry Zimmerman
Asst Business Manager

Karen Kiley
Confidential Secretary

Perry Zimmerman
Asst Business Manager
Dave Pittman
Irrigation Districts

Lee Thomas, Jr
Humboldt

Larry Rodriguez
Alameda/Contra Costa
Transit & East Bay
Municipal

Shirley Roberts
San Francisco Clerical
(VP & Comptroller's Office)

Ken Sorenson
Pacific Gas Transmission

Bernard Smallwood
San Francisco & General Office

Bob Vieira
Sierra Pacific Power Co.

Raymond Thomas
Chains

Arthur Torres
Sacramento Municipal Utility District

Bob Vieira
Sonoma Pacific Power Co.

Bill Wallace
Sonoma/City of Santa Clara

Happy Holidays!

Rich Cowart
East Bay & Material Control

Grover Day
Shafter & City of Lodi

Jim 'Ed' Edwards
Colgate

Jim Findley
North Bay

Bob Irwin
Tree Trimmer Companies

Michael Johnson
CATV, Operating Company

Linda Jurado
Clerical at Large

Dan Lockwood
Coast Valleys

Bob Lovett
DeSales

Jim Lynn
Pipeline Operations

Monte Nelson
Citizens Utilities Co. of California

Will Nunez
Sacramento Regional Transit

Joseph Osterlund
General Construction

Jeff Johnstone
Outside Construction

Rich Perry
US Bureau of Reclamation

Dave Pittman
Irrigation Districts

Shirley Roberts
San Francisco Clerical (FP & Comptroller's Office)

Larry Rodriguez
Alameda/Centex Trans & East Bay Municipal

Ken Sennesen
Pacific Gas Transmission

Linda Thomas, Jr.
Humboldt

No Photo Available

Raymond Thomas
Chains

Arthur Torres
Sacramento Municipal Utility District

Bob Vieira
Sonoma Pacific Power Co.

Bill Wallace
Sonoma/City of Santa Clara

8 Utility Reporter December 1995
Time to mobilize talents of Local 1245 retirees!

By Orv Owen

W e should mobilize the time and talents of our retirees. As reported by others, Americans may some day be spending more years in retirement than they did in active employment.

In 1940 Americans spent approximately 7% of their lives in retirement. In 1977, that figure had risen to 23% and by the year 2030 Americans may spend one-third of their lives in retirement because of the sharp increase in life expectancy. It has also been stated that perhaps the greatest loss that comes with retirement is the loss of our personal identification. We become tolerated and lumped together with others under terms like "re-tired," "senior citizens" and "elders." Those terms do not describe our true identity, nor do they convey the real potential we possess for continuing accomplishment.

Our true identity is in the fact that we are union men and women with skills that contributed to the growth of our great country, united together by a war and participating in building one of the most outstanding local unions in the labor movement.

In my view it would be a grave error to allow the true nature of our identification to be hidden, and our true potential to be wasted. We can and should mobilize our time and talent into building the largest and most active retirees club in the labor movement.

We have the potential to maintain the unity of strength that brought us this far. That potential needs to be embraced and enhanced.

Join with other retirees in continuing our legacy. To find out more about the Retirees Club chapter in your area or how to get one started—call Local 1245 at 510-933-6060. Keep the faith!

Medicare cuts would harm cost-effective program

What is often ignored in the current Medicare debate is that Medicare is truly a cost-effective program. Here are some of the facts that ought to receive more consideration as policy makers consider potentially harmful revisions to Medicare.

Cost-Effective

- Medicare is the most cost-effective health insurance program in the nation. It has an administrative cost of 2 to 3%, a fraction of the overhead expenses for private insurance. Medicare does not have to support huge sales and advertising budgets, or pay large salaries or shareholder profits.
- Americans over the age of 65 are the most universally insured population in the US thanks to Medicare.
- Medicare provides basic insurance, not a "Cadillac" health plan. It does not cover prescriptions, eye glasses or regular check-ups. It does not include long-term care, though there is good reason for thinking that it should.

Cuts Would Devastate Millions of Beneficiaries

- Today Medicare covers less than half of an older person's health care costs. Seniors over 75 spend an average of 17% of their income on out-of-pocket costs, and women over 85 living alone pay 42%.
- Medicare costs, reflecting the growing older population, are expected to grow 10% annually. The Congressional budget plan allows Medicare funding to increase by only 7%. The difference would be paid in part by the beneficiaries—up to $3,500 in addition to the $3,200 that most beneficiaries in California already pay annually in out-of-pocket expenses.
- Contrary to popular opinion, most older Americans have very modest incomes. About 22% of elderly households had annual incomes of less than $10,000 in 1992, over half had incomes of less than $20,000 per year.
- The proposed cuts in Medicare would be especially devastating to lower income Medicare beneficiaries. In 1995, there are approximately 228,000 older Americans in California living at or below poverty level. Low and moderate income seniors already spend one-third of their incomes on health care.
- If Congress sends the president a bill containing these unwise cuts in Medicare, the president should veto it.

Ultimate aim: "get rid of it"

Gingrich, Dole reveal true Medicare agenda

T he Republican leaders who concocted the scheme to slash $270 billion from Medicare claim the best of intentions. They say they want to save the system on which America's elderly depend for quality care.

But House Speaker Newt Gingrich (R-GA) and Senate Majority Leader Bob Dole (R-KS) recently let their guards down and showed their true intentions regarding Medicare.

Here's what Gingrich said about Medicare: "Now we don't get rid of it in round one because we don't think that's politically smart." And when does Gingrich plan to go ahead with round two and "get rid of it altogether? Don't expect him to wait too long-Gingrich has already proven he'll charge ahead with whatever he thinks is right—even if it destroys health security for millions of older Americans.

And what about Senate Majority Leader Dole?

During the course of Medicare's 30-year history, Dole has voted to keep the program going and at times even claimed he supported it. He's also said these Republican cuts in Medicare are really an effort to save the program.

But recently he showed his true colors by dusting off his vote against the original program in 1965—when he was one of only 12 House members who voted against creating Medicare.

Dole recently bragged to a conservative audience, "I was there, fighting the fight, voting against Medicare... because we knew it wouldn't work in 1965."

These comments, said Senate Minority Leader Tom Daschle (D-SD) "confirm what we've said all along... the Republicans want to obliterate Medicare."

The take-home lesson? You've got to watch them every minute.
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# Unit Meeting Schedule

**January - June 1996**

### San Joaquin

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Chairmen/Contact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1111</td>
<td>FRESNO</td>
<td>Cherry C. Barden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1112</td>
<td>BAKERSFIELD</td>
<td>E. Miranda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1120</td>
<td>SELMA</td>
<td>P. Sankovich</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1122</td>
<td>MERCEDES</td>
<td>R. Telles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1123</td>
<td>Lemoore</td>
<td>M. Massey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1129</td>
<td>AUBERRY</td>
<td>T. Moore</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Coast Valleys

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Chairmen/Contact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1211</td>
<td>SALINAS</td>
<td>S. Lucero</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1212</td>
<td>MONTEREY</td>
<td>M. Olivera</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1213</td>
<td>KING CITY</td>
<td>M. Kovak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1214</td>
<td>MOSS LANDINGS</td>
<td>J. Josephson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1215</td>
<td>SANTA MARIA</td>
<td>B. Bell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1217</td>
<td>TEMPLETON</td>
<td>F. triangle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1218</td>
<td>MPV CAPE</td>
<td>R. Shorter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1219</td>
<td>HOLLISTER</td>
<td>J. Vermillion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1220</td>
<td>DIABLO CANYON</td>
<td>D. Lockwood</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Pipeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Chairmen/Contact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1121</td>
<td>KETTLEMAN</td>
<td>S. Jameison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1311</td>
<td>HINKEY</td>
<td>P. Earl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1313</td>
<td>TOPICK</td>
<td>K. Fell</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Santa Clara

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Chairmen/Contact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1141</td>
<td>CITY OF SANTA CLARA</td>
<td>R. Wallace</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### San Jose

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Chairmen/Contact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1511</td>
<td>SAN JOSE-PHYSICAL</td>
<td>B. Bril</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1512</td>
<td>BEL MONT</td>
<td>B. Quinn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1513</td>
<td>SANTA CRUZ</td>
<td>A. Fretas</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### City of Oakland

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Chairmen/Contact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2311</td>
<td>OAKLAND GENERAL</td>
<td>I. Rodriguez</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### City of Redding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Chairmen/Contact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2311</td>
<td>CITY OF REDDING</td>
<td>J. Knopfhor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Pacific Gas Transmission

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Chairmen/Contact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2021</td>
<td>SAND POINT</td>
<td>T. Anderson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2022</td>
<td>WALLA WALLA</td>
<td>B. Seidell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2024</td>
<td>REDMOND</td>
<td>K. Sorensen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2025</td>
<td>SPOKANE</td>
<td>S. Jordan</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Humboldt

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Chairmen/Contact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3111</td>
<td>EUREKA</td>
<td>A. Koppenberg</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Shasta

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Chairmen/Contact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2312</td>
<td>REDDING</td>
<td>A. Streeman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2313</td>
<td>BUNNY</td>
<td>T. Marymes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2314</td>
<td>RED BLUFF</td>
<td>H. Inness</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### City of Redding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Chairmen/Contact</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2311</td>
<td>CITY OF REDDING</td>
<td>J. Knopfhor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The California Labor Federation has placed the following firms on its "We Don't Patronize" list. Firms are placed on this list after a written request from an affiliated union has been approved by the Federation's Executive Council.

All friends of labor are urged to avoid patronizing these firms. Remember: they are not fair to their employees!

**Hotels, Restaurants & Theme Parks**

| All Marriott Hotels in California with the specific exception of the Marriott Hotel at Fisherman's Wharf in San Francisco which is a union house. |
| All non-union Kimpton Group hotels and restaurants in California. |
| Shilo Inns at Corning, Yosemite, Delano, Mamaroneck Lakes, Diamond Bar, and Palm Springs Resort. |
| Taco Bell at Taco Bell fast food outlets in California except those located in Santa Clara and San Benito counties. |

**Contra Costa County**

- Days Inn, Richmond
- Lathayette Park Hotel, 5287 Mt. Dibble Blvd., Lafayette
- Scott's Bar & Grill, Walnut Creek

**Fresno County**

- Holiday Inn Fresno Airport Hotel, 5060 East Clinton at the airport.
- Holiday Inn Fresno Centre Plaza Arium Hotel and Convention Center, 2233 Ventura St. at Highway 99.

**Los Angeles Area**

- Beverly Prescott Hotel and Rax restaurant.
- The Sheraton Los Angeles Airport, 6101 West Century Blvd.
- University Hilton Hotel, 3540 South Figueroa St.

**Monterey Area**

- Anheuser-Busch Center Conference Pacific Grove.
- Casa Munnas, Fremont and Munras, Monterey.
- Doubletree Inn, 2 Portal Plaza, Monterey.
- Days Inn, 1400 Del Monte Blvd., Seaside.
- Monterey Plaza, 400 Cannery Row, Monterey.
- Sheraton Hotel, 350 Calpine Central, Monterey.

**San Francisco**

- Napa Valley Lodge, 3500 Del Monte Blvd., Seaside.
- University Hilton Hotel, 5755 Market Street.

**Sacramento Area**

- Capitol Theater, Century 21, 22, 23 and 25 Theaters (Syfy).

**San Diego Area**

- Anthony's Restaurant's 165 Solana Hills Dr., Solana Beach, 215 Bay Blvd., Chula Vista, 9300 Murray Dr., La Mesa, 1300 Harbor Dr., San Diego, 3355 Harbor Dr., San Diego; 1166 Avenue Abla, San Diego.
- Bali Hai Restaurant, 2232 Shelter Island Dr., San Diego.
- Hob Nob Restaurant, 2271 First Ave., San Diego.
- Holiday Inn Bayside, 4875 10th St., San Diego.
- Holiday Inn Express, 1330 10th Ave., Vacation Village.

**San Luis Obispo Area**

- Anthony's Restaurant's 165 Solana Hills Dr., Solana Beach, 215 Bay Blvd., Chula Vista, 9300 Murray Dr., La Mesa, 1300 Harbor Dr., San Diego, 3355 Harbor Dr., San Diego; 1166 Avenue Abla, San Diego.
- Bali Hai Restaurant, 2232 Shelter Island Dr., San Diego.
- Hob Nob Restaurant, 2271 First Ave., San Diego.
- Holiday Inn Bayside, 4875 10th St., San Diego.
- Holiday Inn Express, 1330 10th Ave., Vacation Village.

**San Juan Capistrano Area**

- 1737 Post St.
- Campton Place Hotel, 340 Sutter St.
- Emporio Armani.
- Ernie's, 847 Montgomery St.
- Fisherman's Grille No. 9, Fisherman's Wharf.
- Gallery Park Hotel, 191 Sutter St.
- Harbor Court and Harry Denton's Bar and Grill, 185 Sutter St.
- Jack in the Box, all locations.

**San Jose Area**

- Jalema Hotel, 590 Bush St.
- Liberte (Elsa Gillmara's Liberte.)
- The Mistaria, Ghirardelli Square.
- Mandarin Oriental Hotel, 333 Sansom St.

**San Francisco**

- Anthony's Restaurants, 2500 California St., San Francisco.
- El Cid Restaurant, 2301 California St., San Francisco.
- San Francisco Honda, 10 South Van Ness Ave., San Francisco.
- San Francisco Lodge, 1944 Union St., San Francisco.
- San Francisco Sheraton Hotel, 2222 Market St., San Francisco.
- San Francisco Victorian Hotel, 1180 Market St., San Francisco.
- San Francisco Winery & Restaurant, 1000 California St., San Francisco.
- Sixpence Inns.
- All non-union Kimpton Group specific exception of the Discovery Inn, is a union Contra Costa County Clara and San Benito counties.

**Sheraton Hotel, 2233 Ventura St., West Sacramento.**

- Sir Francis Drake Hotel, 505 Post St.
- Richelieu Hotel, Van Ness Ave.
- A. Sellevis' Fisherman's Wharf.
- H. H. Nichol, all locations.
- Col. Sauers Kentucky Fried Chicken, all locations.
- Mission Press, 24th St.
- Sir Francis Drake Hotel, Santa Cruz, Starlight and Cafe Espresso.

**Mazatlan Restaurant, 225 El Camino Ave.**

- San Jose Marriott Hotel at South Bay Center.
- San Jose Marriott Courtyards.
- All friends of labor are urged to avoid patronizing these firms.

- Marriott at Hotel, 2300 Lafayette St., West Sacramento.

**Best Western**

- Pacific Grove.
- Monterey Peninsula.
- Monterey.
- Monterey.
- Monterey.
- Monterey.
- Monterey.

**Los Angeles**

- 3500 Del Monte Blvd., Seaside.
- 400 Cannery Row, Monterey.
- 350 Calle Principal, Pacific Grove.
- 1000 California St., San Francisco.
- 400 Capitol Ave.
- 1517 Broadway.
- 3405 El Camino Ave.
- 350 Calle Principal, Monterey.
- 3500 Del Monte Blvd., Seaside.
- 400 Cannery Row, Monterey.
- 350 Calle Principal, Monterey.