Local 1245 proposes solution to electricity market crisis

By Eric Wolfe

They wailed and they moaned and they felt their constituents' pain. But at the end of the day California legislators weren't prepared to shove the electric deregulation genie back into the bottle.

In the closing hours of the 2000 legislative session, legislators faced an energy crisis that included astronomical jumps in wholesale electric prices and repeated threats of rolling blackouts.

So they passed a bill to streamline the process for building new power plants in the state. They approved an electric rate cap for the citizens of San Diego. They called upon the California Public Utilities Commission to broaden its investigation of the state's energy problems, including possible market manipulation. But these were largely symbolic measures, akin to chasing an elephant-sized genie with butterfly nets. Real solutions require a solid explanation of what went wrong in the first place.

Fortunately, that explanation is contained in written testimony filed with the California Public Utilities Commission on September 15 by IBEW Local 1245 and its union allies in the Coalition of California Utility Employees (CUE).

The problem isn't that the electric market doesn't work. The problem, says CUE, is that an electric market can't work.

"Electric generation facilities (power plants) have long lead-times to construct, they are capital-intensive, and there is virtually no way to store their output. That means that millions or billions of dollars must be routinely invested based on forecasts of future supply, demand, and price conditions in order to assure reliable future generation resources," says CUE. "The chances that those forecasts will be accurate is nil."

Union seeks hydro protections

Local 1245's campaign to protect job security for hydro employees has made recent progress on two important fronts.

Over the summer Local 1245 and PG&E agreed that "successor" language in the current labor agreement would be applicable in the event that hydro assets are transferred from PG&E's utility company to some other entity within PG&E Corporation.

Specifically, the union and company clarified that:

• All wages, classifications, and service would carry over to the new entity.

For the past decade, MID has contracted with Asplundh Tree to perform tree trimming around District power lines. The MID tree trimmers perform essentially the same work as nearby unionized tree trimming crews, but their total compensation package is about 40% lower.

"There are major inequities in the treatment of tree trimmers at MID," said Local 1245 Business Manager Jack McNally. "They have no vacation, no holidays, no medical. We think they deserve better."

The tree trimmers first met with union representatives in June at a pizza parlor near their yard. Follow-up contacts were made by IBEW Local 1245 staff members Dennis Seyfer, Junior Ornelas and Landis Marttila.

Asplundh tree trimmers performing high voltage line clearance tree trimming for the Modesto Irrigation District (MID) voted on Sept. 7 for representation by IBEW Local 1245.

The vote was 12 to 1.

The vote was 12 to 1.
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They talk about Al Gore's intellect and lack of charm. They talk about George W. Bush's charm and lack of intellect. They talk about which candidate kissed Oprah. The media will talk a lot about the presidential candidates between now and November 7. But the thing they usually overlook is the thing that matters most to working families:

The president's power of appointment.

The importance of this presidential power isn't always easy to see. But it comes into focus when you look back at our recent history.

According to long-time labor attorneys, most of the people appointed during the Reagan-Bush years to federal agencies that administer labor laws had an anti-union, anti-worker bias. Some examples:

- The Department of Labor issued new regulations that gutted major parts of the Davis-Bacon Act and the Service Contracts Act. In essence this meant that the federal government was using its enormous purchasing power to put downward pressure on the wages of construction workers.

- The Department of Labor virtually stopped enforcing the Occupational Safety and Health Act, leaving workers without protection.

- The National Labor Relations Board issued a string of anti-worker decisions. Many of these decisions reversed earlier cases that had been in effect for years.

- Theoretically you could take these agencies to court for failing to fulfill their mission, but the federal courts were stacked by Reagan and Bush with judges who sympathized with bosses, not workers. Five of the nine Supreme Court Justices were appointed by Reagan and Bush.

The Clinton-Gore years—1993 to 2000—brought a different attitude toward workers:

- The people appointed to the NLRB and the Department of Labor have been knowledgeable about labor, and have enforced worker protection laws. At the NLRB today, there is a favorable 3-2 majority, and the General Counsel of the Board is a former union lawyer.

- The Clinton Labor Department reversed the Reagan Labor Department attack on Davis-Bacon by issuing new regulations that undid the damage.

- Clinton's appointments have brought better balance to the federal courts, including the appointment of two moderates to the Supreme Court.

- Besides using the power of appointment to benefit working people, Clinton used his veto power to kill a flood of anti-labor legislation flowing out of a hostile Congress during much of his term in office.

Al Gore will continue these policies of giving working people a fair shake. He has openly discussed his desire to enact a law banning the use of permanent replacement workers during strikes. He's pledged to veto bills that harm workers. And he's made it clear that labor agencies should be staffed with people who understand and sympathize with the issues of working people.

George W. Bush is a different story.

- At the NLRB Bush could name a new General Counsel and appoint three new members to the five-member Board, giving it an immediate anti-labor majority.

- Bush would quickly transform the Department of Labor and OSHA back into the management-oriented agencies we saw in the 1980s, when labor had no voice.

- Bush would further tilt the federal courts against working people. At the Supreme Court, where as many as three vacancies could open up, Bush could be expected to appoint judges acceptable to his pro-business buddies, stacking the deck against working people for decades to come.

This is the silent issue: the power of appointment. History has shown us how critical this issue is, even if it is rarely discussed on the talk shows or featured in the candidates' television commercials.

Working people have rights, but these rights lose much of their meaning without proper enforcement of our nation's labor laws.

That's why all working families need Al Gore.
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YOU HAVE THE POWER!
## THE ISSUES

After all the paid ads and campaign slogans are gone, we'll be left with a President who must actually govern. Only by examining the issues can we get a glimpse of what that government would look like.

### SOCIAL SECURITY

The vast majority of working Americans will rely on Social Security as the foundation of their retirement security.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>George W. Bush</th>
<th>Al Gore</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>George W. Bush would consider raising the retirement age for receiving Social Security. His proposal for a trillion dollar tax cut would divert money from saving Social Security. Bush plan would take 16-24% of Social Security's payroll tax revenue and divert it to individual accounts. A study by the non-partisan Century Foundation says diverting these funds would require cutting guaranteed Social Security benefits 29% for older workers and 54% for workers under age 31.</td>
<td>Al Gore opposes raising the retirement age for receiving Social Security. Gore would leave guaranteed benefits alone and add new “Retirement Savings Plus” accounts on top of promised benefits to boost retirement security for low- and moderate-income working families. Gore proposes setting aside two-thirds of the projected budget surplus to ensure Social Security and Medicare remain strong into the future.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### FAIR WAGES

Working Americans depend on wages for a substantial portion of their income. A President can use his enormous influence for or against wage fairness, and it will be felt in the wallets of workers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>George W. Bush</th>
<th>Al Gore</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>George W. Bush, as Texas governor, on three occasions opposed increasing and extending the minimum wage. Bush opposes the Davis-Bacon Act, which protects community-wage standards in the construction industry. Bush has taken no position on equal pay for women.</td>
<td>Al Gore has supported minimum wage increases on three occasions in Congress and consistently as Vice President. Gore supports the Paycheck Fairness Act to help working women close the wage gap. In Congress and as Vice President, Gore fought anti-worker efforts to repeal the Davis-Bacon Act.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PUBLIC EDUCATION

A good system of public education is the gateway to a liveable wage for millions of Americans. Public education is the clearest expression of the American ideal that everyone ought to have an equal opportunity to succeed, no matter what their initial station in life.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>George W. Bush</th>
<th>Al Gore</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>George W. Bush's six years as governor has left Texas ranking 45th in college entrance scores, 46th in high school completion rates, 48th in literacy, and 50th in teachers' salaries plus benefits. In 1997 Bush tried to raid the teachers' pension fund to pay for a huge tax cut for the wealthy. Bush's plan for educational &quot;reform&quot; is to give people tax breaks to send their kids to private school.</td>
<td>Al Gore, with President Clinton, proposed 100,000 new teachers to reduce class sizes nationwide. Clinton-Gore established, for the first time, national educational goals for all schools and students. In Congress, Gore co-sponsored the bill to create the Department of Education. Gore, as Vice President, has promoted the building and modernizing of schools nationwide.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### WORKERS’ RIGHTS

The right to organize and the right to participate in the political process are two key elements in the strength of a democracy. Yet workers face enormous institutional barriers to organizing, including the systematic firing of workers who try to organize. Moreover, in recent years, anti-labor groups have increased their efforts to strip workers of a political voice by proposing "Paycheck Deception" or "Gag the Worker" initiatives in state referenda and in Congress.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>George W. Bush</th>
<th>Al Gore</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>George W. Bush favors &quot;Gag the Workers&quot; legislation that would virtually eliminate unions from participating in the democratic process, while proposing nothing to restrict corporate influence. Bush said on Larry King Live: &quot;There will be no true campaign funding reform unless the labor loophole is closed.&quot; He has proposed nothing to restrict corporate political participation. Bush has boasted of his state's anti-union policies and his Department of Economic Development touts Texas's low wages and anti-labor climate.</td>
<td>Al Gore vigorously opposed California's &quot;Gag the Workers&quot; Prop. 226. Gore has pledged to stiffen penalties for employer interference with the right to organize, and to ban permanent striker replacements. Gore opposed Congressional efforts to pass the TEAM Act, which would legalized phony &quot;company unions.&quot; Gore has pledged to fight any effort to weaken workplace safety laws. In Gore's own words: &quot;I was raised on this bedrock principle: the right to organize is a basic American right.... It must never be taken away. So let me tell you what I'll do as President: if a piece of anti-worker legislation ever comes near my desk, I'll reach over, ink up that veto pen, and strike it down in a heartbeat.&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
THE ISSUES

Senator Dianne Feinstein and Congressman Tom Campbell have cast many votes on issues of importance to working people. The record speaks for itself.

PATIENTS' BILL OF RIGHTS

A strong Patients' Bill of Rights would ensure that treatment decisions are made by doctors, not insurance company administrators, and to ensure the right to see specialists when needed and to get emergency room care when and where needed.

SOCIAL SECURITY/MEDICARE

The growing budget surplus provided Congress in 1999 with a major choice: use the money to strengthen Social Security and Medicare, or use it to finance huge tax cuts.

WORKERS' RIGHTS

Working Americans deserve to earn a fair wage and to have a safe work environment. They also should have the right to choose union representation without management interference.

PUBLIC EDUCATION

A century ago, unions were in the forefront of the battle for public education. Education is the great "equalizer" because it offers even the poorest families an opportunity to improve their lot in life through learning and effort. Vouchers drain tax dollars away from public schools and funnel them to private institutions.

Dianne Feinstein supports a strong Patients' Bill of Rights. In 1999, the Senate leadership introduced a managed care bill (S 1344) that excluded more than 100 million Americans and gave health plans the final say on medical treatment decisions. Feinstein voted against this phony Patients' Bill of Rights.

Dianne Feinstein supports a strong Patients' Bill of Rights. In 1999, the House considered HR 2723, a bill to ensure that treatment decisions are made by doctors, not insurance company administrators, and to ensure the right to see specialists when needed and to get emergency room care when and where needed. Campbell voted No on this genuine Patients' Bill of Rights.

Dianne Feinstein favors strengthening Social Security and Medicare rather than squandering the budget surplus on tax cuts for the rich. During consideration of the Senate's FY 2000 Budget Resolution, Feinstein supported a measure that would have saved the budget surplus to extend the solvency of the Social Security and Medicare trust funds.

Tom Campbell opposes a strong Patients' Bill of Rights. In 1999, the House considered HR 2723, a bill to ensure that treatment decisions are made by doctors, not insurance company administrators, and to ensure the right to see specialists when needed and to get emergency room care when and where needed. Campbell voted No on this genuine Patients' Bill of Rights.

Tom Campbell opposes a strong Patients' Bill of Rights. In 1999, the House considered HR 2723, a bill to ensure that treatment decisions are made by doctors, not insurance company administrators, and to ensure the right to see specialists when needed and to get emergency room care when and where needed. Campbell voted No on this genuine Patients' Bill of Rights.

Dianne Feinstein favors tax cuts for the wealthy over strengthening Social Security and Medicare. During consideration of the House FY 2000 Budget Resolution, Campbell supported an $800 billion tax cut aimed mainly at the wealthy. The resolution didn't call for a single nickel to strengthen Social Security or Medicare.

Tom Campbell favors tax cuts for the wealthy over strengthening Social Security and Medicare. During consideration of the House FY 2000 Budget Resolution, Campbell supported an $800 billion tax cut aimed mainly at the wealthy. The resolution didn't call for a single nickel to strengthen Social Security or Medicare.

Dianne Feinstein consistently supports workers' rights. Feinstein opposed S 1981, a bill to make it even harder for workers to organize unions. Feinstein voted for an increase in the minimum wage (S 625), and opposed an attempt to weaken Davis-Bacon prevailing wage standards (S 1650). Feinstein opposed "Paycheck Deception" legislation (S 1663), which tried to muzzle workers' political voice. Between 1996-1999 Feinstein supported labor on 89% of the votes.

Tom Campbell has a mixed record in Congress on workers' rights. He opposed "Paycheck Deception" (HR 2608) and also opposed a bill to make it harder for workers to organize unions (HR 3246). Campbell opposed efforts to delay implementation of ergonomic standards. Campbell supported a House bill to weaken overtime pay protections (HR 2888). Between 1996-1999 Campbell supported labor on 22% of the votes.

Dianne Feinstein supports public education and opposes school voucher programs. A Senate proposal in 1999 (Murray Amendment to S. 280) aimed to reduce class size and help local school districts recruit and train 100,000 new teachers. Feinstein supported this proposal. Feinstein in 1998 opposed a bill (HR 2646) that proposed voucher-like subsidies for private education for the rich.

Tom Campbell supports voucher programs. In 1999 he voted in favor of a proposal that would have allowed states to use $100 million in Title I funds for private school vouchers. In 1998 Campbell supported a bill (HR 2846) that proposed voucher-like subsidies for private education for the rich.

Dianne Feinstein supports public education and opposes school voucher programs. A Senate proposal in 1999 (Murray Amendment to S. 280) aimed to reduce class size and help local school districts recruit and train 100,000 new teachers. Feinstein supported this proposal. Feinstein in 1998 opposed a bill (HR 2646) that proposed voucher-like subsidies for private education for the rich.

Tom Campbell has a mixed record in Congress on workers' rights. He opposed "Paycheck Deception" (HR 2608) and also opposed a bill to make it harder for workers to organize unions (HR 3246). Campbell opposed efforts to delay implementation of ergonomic standards. Campbell supported a House bill to weaken overtime pay protections (HR 2888). Between 1996-1999 Campbell supported labor on 22% of the votes.

Dianne Feinstein consistently supports workers' rights. Feinstein opposed S 1981, a bill to make it even harder for workers to organize unions. Feinstein voted for an increase in the minimum wage (S 625), and opposed an attempt to weaken Davis-Bacon prevailing wage standards (S 1650). Feinstein opposed "Paycheck Deception" legislation (S 1663), which tried to muzzle workers' political voice. Between 1996-1999 Feinstein supported labor on 89% of the votes.

Tom Campbell opposes a strong Patients' Bill of Rights. In 1999, the House considered HR 2723, a bill to ensure that treatment decisions are made by doctors, not insurance company administrators, and to ensure the right to see specialists when needed and to get emergency room care when and where needed. Campbell voted No on this genuine Patients' Bill of Rights.

Dianne Feinstein supports public education and opposes school voucher programs. A Senate proposal in 1999 (Murray Amendment to S. 280) aimed to reduce class size and help local school districts recruit and train 100,000 new teachers. Feinstein supported this proposal. Feinstein in 1998 opposed a bill (HR 2646) that proposed voucher-like subsidies for private education for the rich.

Tom Campbell supports voucher programs. In 1999 he voted in favor of a proposal that would have allowed states to use $100 million in Title I funds for private school vouchers. In 1998 Campbell supported a bill (HR 2846) that proposed voucher-like subsidies for private education for the rich.
Issues What's At Stake for Working Families?

Restoring California's overtime pay protections

Key Vote: AB 60

In 1997, ex-Gov. Pete Wilson’s appointees to the Industrial Welfare Commission ended daily overtime protection for eight million workers, effective Jan. 1, 1998. Overtime wasn't abolished for some important public policy reason. It was abolished because ex-Gov. Pete Wilson and his corporate allies saw an opportunity to take money away from workers and transform it into corporate profits.

Very big bucks were at stake in this epic confrontation between employers and employees. Elimination of the daily overtime premium reduced California workers’ pay by an estimated $1 billion a year. Many California businesses switched to a 12-hour day.

With the election of Gov. Gray Davis in November of 1998, the battle was taken up again. For working people it was an issue of fundamental fairness. Earning the overtime premium is the only way many folks can make ends meet.

But money wasn't the only thing at stake. Daily overtime pay protects workers from extremely long shifts that are exhausting and unsafe. It helps working parents who cannot leave their children unsupervised during long shifts and commutes. It spurs job creation because employers facing increased labor costs after eight hours substitute additional hires at straight time wages for longer hours at premium pay.

For Local 1245 members and other workers covered by collective bargaining agreements, the daily overtime law provides important protection against efforts by employers to bargain away overtime premium pay. Without legislative protection, overtime premium pay would be a prime candidate for “take aways” at the bargaining table in this era of utility restructuring.

AB 60 restored premium pay at time-and-a-half after eight hours, and double-time after 12 hours in a workday. The bill also provided workers with the power to approve flexible scheduling—such as 4-10s—at their particular workplace.

But not everyone in the legislature supported this vitally important bill. Curious how your state Senator and Assembly Member voted? You can find out in the following pages.

Key Vote: SB 26

In the last five years, nearly 15,000 claims of age discrimination have been filed in California, and these claims continue to grow.

Senate Bill 26 sought to strengthen under already existing law, an employer may use one of two legal theories to prove their employer has discriminated against them. They may prove that their employer intentionally discriminated against them (“intentional discrimination”) or that their employer’s policies and/or practices disproportionately impacted a group of persons (“disparate impact discrimination”). The use of disparate impact analysis may be used to prove race and gender discrimination.

In a 1998 case, Marks v. Loral, the California Court of Appeals held that disparate impact analysis may not be used in age discrimination cases. The court held that an employer may choose to hire or retain employees with lower salaries, even though this may result in choosing younger employees. The Marks decision was binding on all trial courts statewide.

Unfortunately, the Marks case gave employers a green light to replace older, higher paid workers with younger, lower-paid workers.

SB 26 permits the use of disparate impact analysis in age discrimination cases and declares the Legislature’s intent that discrimination against older workers can be fought with the same tools and vigor as other forms of discrimination.

Where did your legislator stand on age discrimination?

Expanding sick leave rights

Many employers do not permit employees to use sick days to care for sick children or other family members.

Public schools will not care for an ill student. Very few child care providers take care of sick children. Similarly, it is very difficult to find care for the unexpected or occasional illness of a parent or spouse who requires assistance.

This creates a dilemma for many parents in the workplace when their child is ill: they can stay home with the child and risk their job, or leave the sick child at home alone if they cannot find care.

Earlier laws require unpaid leave for extended illnesses of family members, but the minimum leave period is generally two weeks. Parents who confront the more frequent occurrence of short-term illness have been left hanging out to dry.

AB 109 offers families some relief. The bill requires an employer who provides sick leave for employees to permit an employee to use the sick leave to attend to the illness of a child, parent or spouse.

The bill prohibits an employer from discriminating against an employee for using, or attempting to use, sick leave for this purpose. It would provide that an employee aggrieved by a violation is entitled to reinstatement and reimbursement for lost wages and work benefits caused by the acts of the employer.

Gov. Davis signed this long-needed piece of legislation in 1999. How did your state Senator and Assembly Member vote on Family Sick Leave?

Key Vote: AB 109
Strengthening job safety enforcement

Workplace deaths, injuries and illnesses take a tremendous, tragic and unnecessary toll in California. AB 1127, sponsored by the California Labor Federation, was an important attempt to reduce workplace risks.

Based on national estimates, Californians annually suffer approximately 780 job-related deaths from injury, 1.584 million nonfatal injuries, 7.200 deaths from occupational disease, and 104,000 occupational illnesses among the civilian workforce. The price tag is estimated at $21 billion annually in California.

For years California was widely recognized as having the best occupational safety and health program in the country. But in the early 1980s, Cal-OSHA went into decline. The program was actually terminated in the late 1980s, and jurisdiction for job safety was turned over to the Federal government. Labor fought back, and in 1988 Proposition 97 restored Cal-OSHA.

But the program still needs improvement. AB 1127 addressed a number of administrative roadblocks to effective health and safety enforcement.

Key Vote: AB 1127

The bill increased civil and criminal penalties for willful, serious, and repeat violations of occupational safety and health standards. And it provided that willful violation of such standards leading to death or permanent or prolonged injury of an employee may be prosecuted as a misdemeanor or a felony.

Too often workers health and safety are sacrificed in the name of cost-benefit analyses. AB 1127 was an important step in making employers more accountable for the safety of their employees.

Before you vote on Nov. 7, check out pages 8-24 to see how your legislators voted on worker safety.

Providing help to injured workers

The Workers' Compensation reform legislation of 1993 was expected to benefit employers, in the form of reduced Workers' Compensation expenses, and workers, in the form of benefit increases. The savings were intended to be divided equally.

But things did not work out fairly. Employers, who were expected to save $1.5 billion each year, in fact saved over $10 billion in a recent three-year period. Meanwhile, workers have experienced benefit increases less than $513 million each year.

A RAND Civil Institute for Civil Justice report, Compensating Permanent Workplace Injuries, concludes that all injured workers experience significant wage loss following a disabling injury and that the current benefits are grossly inadequate. Workers with a partial permanent disability rating under 5% end up losing 30% of their wages, but current benefits replace just 12% of their wage loss.

More than six of ten workers with permanent disability receive a partial disability rating of less than 15%, yet the 1993 reforms left benefits for these workers unchanged. The maximum weekly benefit for these workers has not changed for over 15 years.

Most states, following a Nixon administration task force recommendation, set their maximum temporary disability benefit at 100% of the state’s average weekly wage and indexed it. California’s is currently less than 75% of our average weekly wage and is not indexed.

SB 320 would have provided for:
• Significantly higher permanent disability benefits weighted toward the lower rated disabilities as called for in the recent RAND report.
• Setting maximum benefits at 100% of average weekly wages and indexing the benefit, bringing California in line with the majority of other states.
• An increase in the minimum weekly benefits paid to permanently disabled workers, protecting those workers who are least able to have other resources to call on.

Key Vote: SB 320

The positions taken by incumbents in the following pages are 100% accurate: their votes on these issues were recorded and are part of the public record.

But how about the Challengers? Their positions are based on their written responses to the Local 1245 survey, where they were asked to take a position on these various bills. Are they giving honest answers, or merely telling union members what they think union members want to hear?

Our experience in past elections has shown us that many candidates stay true to their word. But some candidates who express support for pro-worker positions in the survey end up voting against workers on these very same issues once they are elected.

We encourage you to use as many different sources as possible in evaluating the candidates for office in your area.
Locate Your State Senate District, Then Find Out Where the Candidates Stand
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District 1 California Senate</th>
<th>District 3 California Senate</th>
<th>District 5 California Senate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Thomas Romero</strong> (No Incumbent)</td>
<td><strong>Rico Oller</strong> (No Incumbent)</td>
<td><strong>Michael Machado</strong> (No Incumbent)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protect Workers Against Age Discrimination (SB 26)</td>
<td>Protect Workers Against Age Discrimination (SB 26)</td>
<td>Protect Workers Against Age Discrimination (SB 26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Romero For Working People</strong></td>
<td><strong>Oller Against Working People</strong></td>
<td><strong>Machado For Working People</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase Employer Penalties for Safety Violations (AB 1127)</td>
<td>Increase Employer Penalties for Safety Violations (AB 1127)</td>
<td>Increase Employer Penalties for Safety Violations (AB 1127)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Romero For Working People</strong></td>
<td><strong>Oller Against Working People</strong></td>
<td><strong>Machado For Working People</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restore Daily Overtime Premium (AB 60)</td>
<td>Restore Daily Overtime Premium (AB 60)</td>
<td>Restore Daily Overtime Premium (AB 60)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Romero For Working People</strong></td>
<td><strong>Oller Against Working People</strong></td>
<td><strong>Machado For Working People</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Sick Leave (AB 109)</td>
<td>Family Sick Leave (AB 109)</td>
<td>Family Sick Leave (AB 109)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Romero For Working People</strong></td>
<td><strong>Oller Against Working People</strong></td>
<td><strong>Machado For Working People</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase Workers' Compensation Benefit (SB 320)</td>
<td>Increase Workers' Compensation Benefit (SB 320)</td>
<td>Increase Workers' Compensation Benefit (SB 320)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Romero For Working People</strong></td>
<td><strong>Oller Against Working People</strong></td>
<td><strong>Machado For Working People</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Where Do the Candidates Stand?**

**Incumbent**

**John Burton**

Protect Workers Against Age Discrimination (SB 26)

**Burton For Working People**

Increase Employer Penalties for Safety Violations (AB 1127)

**Burton For Working People**

Restore Daily Overtime Premium (AB 60)

**Burton For Working People**

Family Sick Leave (AB 109)

**Burton For Working People**

Increase Workers' Compensation Benefit (SB 320)

**Burton For Working People**

**Challenger**

**Terrence Faulkner**

Protect Workers Against Age Discrimination (SB 26)

**Faulkner For Working People**

Increase Employer Penalties for Safety Violations (AB 1127)

**Faulkner For Working People**

Restore Daily Overtime Premium (AB 60)

**Faulkner For Working People**

Family Sick Leave (AB 109)

**Faulkner For Working People**

Increase Workers' Compensation Benefit (SB 320)

**Faulkner For Working People**

**Incumbent**

**Alan Nakanishi**

Protect Workers Against Age Discrimination (SB 26)

Increase Employer Penalties for Safety Violations (AB 1127)

Restore Daily Overtime Premium (AB 60)

Family Sick Leave (AB 109)

Increase Workers' Compensation Benefit (SB 320)
Where Do the Candidates Stand?

**District 7**

**Incumbent**
Dick Rainey
- Protect Workers Against Age Discrimination (SB 26)
- Rainey Against Working People
- Increase Employer Penalties for Safety Violations (AB 1127)
- Rainey For Working People
- Restore Daily Overtime Premium (AB 60)
- Rainey Against Working People
- Family Sick Leave (AB 109)
- Rainey Against Working People
- Increase Workers’ Compensation Benefit (SB 320)
- Rainey Against Working People

**Challenger**
Tom Torlakson
- Protect Workers Against Age Discrimination (SB 26)
- Torlakson For Working People
- Increase Employer Penalties for Safety Violations (AB 1127)
- Torlakson For Working People
- Restore Daily Overtime Premium (AB 60)
- Torlakson For Working People
- Family Sick Leave (AB 109)
- Torlakson For Working People
- Increase Workers’ Compensation Benefit (SB 320)
- Torlakson For Working People

**District 9**

**Incumbent**
Don Perata
- Protect Workers Against Age Discrimination (SB 26)
- Perata For Working People
- Increase Employer Penalties for Safety Violations (AB 1127)
- Perata For Working People
- Restore Daily Overtime Premium (AB 60)
- Perata Against Working People
- Family Sick Leave (AB 109)
- Perata For Working People
- Increase Workers’ Compensation Benefit (SB 320)
- Perata For Working People

**Challenger**
Linda Marshall
- Protect Workers Against Age Discrimination (SB 26)
- Increase Employer Penalties for Safety Violations (AB 1127)
- Restore Daily Overtime Premium (AB 60)
- Family Sick Leave (AB 109)
- Increase Workers’ Compensation Benefit (SB 320)

**District 11**

**Incumbent**
Byron Sher
- Protect Workers Against Age Discrimination (SB 26)
- Sher For Working People
- Increase Employer Penalties for Safety Violations (AB 1127)
- Sher For Working People
- Restore Daily Overtime Premium (AB 60)
- Sher For Working People
- Family Sick Leave (AB 109)
- Sher For Working People
- Increase Workers’ Compensation Benefit (SB 320)
- Sher For Working People

**Challenger**
Gloria Hom
- Protect Workers Against Age Discrimination (SB 26)
- Increase Employer Penalties for Safety Violations (AB 1127)
- Restore Daily Overtime Premium (AB 60)
- Family Sick Leave (AB 109)
- Increase Workers’ Compensation Benefit (SB 320)
Where Do the Candidates Stand?

**District 13 California Assembly**

**Incumbent**

John Vasconcellos  
Protect Workers Against Age Discrimination (SB 26)  
Increase Employer Penalties for Safety Violations (AB 1127)  
Restore Daily Overtime Premium (AB 60)  
Family Sick Leave (AB 109)  
Increase Workers' Compensation Benefit (SB 320)

**Challenger**

John Longwell  
Protect Workers Against Age Discrimination (SB 26)  
Increase Employer Penalties for Safety Violations (AB 1127)  
Restore Daily Overtime Premium (AB 60)  
Family Sick Leave (AB 109)  
Increase Workers' Compensation Benefit (SB 320)

**District 15 California Assembly**

**Incumbent**

Bruce McPherson  
Protect Workers Against Age Discrimination (SB 26)  
Increase Employer Penalties for Safety Violations (AB 1127)  
Restore Daily Overtime Premium (AB 60)  
Family Sick Leave (AB 109)  
Increase Workers' Compensation Benefit (SB 320)

**Challenger**

Anselmo Chavez  
Protect Workers Against Age Discrimination (SB 26)  
Increase Employer Penalties for Safety Violations (AB 1127)  
Restore Daily Overtime Premium (AB 60)  
Family Sick Leave (AB 109)  
Increase Workers' Compensation Benefit (SB 320)

**District 17 California Assembly**

**Incumbent**

Pete Knight  
Protect Workers Against Age Discrimination (SB 26)  
Increase Employer Penalties for Safety Violations (AB 1127)  
Restore Daily Overtime Premium (AB 60)  
Family Sick Leave (AB 109)  
Increase Workers' Compensation Benefit (SB 320)

**Challenger**

Richard Lott  
Protect Workers Against Age Discrimination (SB 26)  
Increase Employer Penalties for Safety Violations (AB 1127)  
Restore Daily Overtime Premium (AB 60)  
Family Sick Leave (AB 109)  
Increase Workers' Compensation Benefit (SB 320)
Locate Your State Assembly District, Then Find Out Where the Candidates Stand

Bay Area Districts

See Bay Area Map
**Issues**

**Where Do the Candidates Stand?**

**Incumbent**

**Virginia Strom-Martin**

- Protect Workers Against Age Discrimination (SB 26)
- Increase Employer Penalties for Safety Violations (AB 1127)
- Restore Daily Overtime Premium (AB 60)
- Family Sick Leave (AB 109)
- Increase Workers' Compensation Benefit (SB 320)

**Challenger**

**Mike Lampson**

- Protect Workers Against Age Discrimination (SB 26)
- Increase Employer Penalties for Safety Violations (AB 1127)
- Restore Daily Overtime Premium (AB 60)
- Family Sick Leave (AB 109)
- Increase Workers' Compensation Benefit (SB 320)

**Incumbent**

**Dick Dickerson**

- Protect Workers Against Age Discrimination (SB 26)
- Increase Employer Penalties for Safety Violations (AB 1127)
- Restore Daily Overtime Premium (AB 60)
- Family Sick Leave (AB 109)
- Increase Workers' Compensation Benefit (SB 320)

**Challenger**

**Virgil Parks**

- Protect Workers Against Age Discrimination (SB 26)
- Increase Employer Penalties for Safety Violations (AB 1127)
- Restore Daily Overtime Premium (AB 60)
- Family Sick Leave (AB 109)
- Increase Workers' Compensation Benefit (SB 320)

**Incumbent**

**Samuel Aanestad**

- Protect Workers Against Age Discrimination (SB 26)
- Increase Employer Penalties for Safety Violations (AB 1127)
- Restore Daily Overtime Premium (AB 60)
- Family Sick Leave (AB 109)
- Increase Workers' Compensation Benefit (SB 320)

**Challenger**

**Benjamin Wirtschafter**

- Protect Workers Against Age Discrimination (SB 26)
- Increase Employer Penalties for Safety Violations (AB 1127)
- Restore Daily Overtime Premium (AB 60)
- Family Sick Leave (AB 109)
- Increase Workers' Compensation Benefit (SB 320)
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Where Do the Candidates Stand?

District 4
California Assembly
Alpine, Amador, Calaveras, El Dorado, Mono, and Placer Counties (See page 12)

(No Incumbent)
Tim Leslie

| Protect Workers Against Age Discrimination (SB 26) |
| Leslie Against Working People |
| Increase Employer Penalties for Safety Violations (AB 1127) |
| Leslie Against Working People |
| Restore Daily Overtime Premium (AB 60) |
| Leslie Against Working People |
| Family Sick Leave (AB 109) |
| Leslie Against Working People |
| Increase Workers’ Compensation Benefit (SB 320) |
| Leslie Against Working People |

District 5
California Assembly
Part of Sacramento County (See page 12)

Incumbent
Dave Cox

| Protect Workers Against Age Discrimination (SB 26) |
| Cox Against Working People |
| Increase Employer Penalties for Safety Violations (AB 1127) |
| Cox Against Working People |
| Restore Daily Overtime Premium (AB 60) |
| Cox Against Working People |
| Family Sick Leave (AB 109) |
| Cox Against Working People |
| Increase Workers’ Compensation Benefit (SB 320) |
| Cox Against Working People |

Challenger
Ed Sullivan

| Protect Workers Against Age Discrimination (SB 26) |
| Sullivan For Working People |
| Increase Employer Penalties for Safety Violations (AB 1127) |
| Sullivan For Working People |
| Restore Daily Overtime Premium (AB 60) |
| Sullivan For Working People |
| Family Sick Leave (AB 109) |
| Sullivan For Working People |
| Increase Workers’ Compensation Benefit (SB 320) |
| Sullivan For Working People |

District 6
California Assembly
Marin & part of Sonoma Counties (See page 12)

(No Incumbent)
Joe Nation

| Protect Workers Against Age Discrimination (SB 26) |
| Nation For Working People |
| Increase Employer Penalties for Safety Violations (AB 1127) |
| Nation For Working People |
| Restore Daily Overtime Premium (AB 60) |
| Nation Against Working People |
| Family Sick Leave (AB 109) |
| Nation For Working People |
| Increase Workers’ Compensation Benefit (SB 320) |
| Nation For Working People |

(No Incumbent)
Stephen Macola

| Protect Workers Against Age Discrimination (SB 26) |
| Leslie Against Working People |
| Increase Employer Penalties for Safety Violations (AB 1127) |
| Leslie Against Working People |
| Restore Daily Overtime Premium (AB 60) |
| Leslie Against Working People |
| Family Sick Leave (AB 109) |
| Leslie Against Working People |
| Increase Workers’ Compensation Benefit (SB 320) |
| Leslie Against Working People |
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Incumbent

Patricia Wiggins

District 7 California Assembly

Napa & parts of Solano & Sonoma Counties (See page 12)

Wiggins For Working People

Protect Workers Against Age Discrimination (SB 26)

Increase Employer Penalties for Safety Violations (AB 1127)

Restore Daily Overtime Premium (AB 60)

Family Sick Leave (AB 109)

Steinberg For Working People

Protect Workers Against Age Discrimination (SB 26)

Increase Employer Penalties for Safety Violations (AB 1127)

Restore Daily Overtime Premium (AB 60)

Family Sick Leave (AB 109)

Steinberg For Working People

Increase Workers' Compensation Benefit (SB 320)

Wiggins For Working People

Rivera Against Working People

Protect Workers Against Age Discrimination (SB 26)

Increase Employer Penalties for Safety Violations (AB 1127)

Restore Daily Overtime Premium (AB 60)

Family Sick Leave (AB 109)

Rivera Against Working People

Increase Workers' Compensation Benefit (SB 320)

Rivera Against Working People

Incumbent

Helen Thomson

District 8 California Assembly

Parts of Sacramento, Solano & Yolo Counties (See page 12)

Thomson For Working People

Protect Workers Against Age Discrimination (SB 26)

Increase Employer Penalties for Safety Violations (AB 1127)

Restore Daily Overtime Premium (AB 60)

Family Sick Leave (AB 109)

Thomson For Working People

Increase Workers' Compensation Benefit (SB 320)

Thomson For Working People

Rivera Against Working People

Protect Workers Against Age Discrimination (SB 26)

Increase Employer Penalties for Safety Violations (AB 1127)

Restore Daily Overtime Premium (AB 60)

Family Sick Leave (AB 109)

Rivera Against Working People

Increase Workers' Compensation Benefit (SB 320)

Rivera Against Working People

Incumbent

Darrell Steinberg

District 9 California Assembly

Part of Sacramento County (See page 12)

Steinberg For Working People

Protect Workers Against Age Discrimination (SB 26)

Increase Employer Penalties for Safety Violations (AB 1127)

Restore Daily Overtime Premium (AB 60)

Family Sick Leave (AB 109)

Steinberg For Working People

Increase Workers' Compensation Benefit (SB 320)

Steinberg For Working People

Rivera Against Working People

Protect Workers Against Age Discrimination (SB 26)

Increase Employer Penalties for Safety Violations (AB 1127)

Restore Daily Overtime Premium (AB 60)

Family Sick Leave (AB 108)

Rivera Against Working People

Increase Workers' Compensation Benefit (SB 320)
Where Do the Candidates Stand?

District 10
California Assembly
Parts of Sacramento & San Joaquin Counties (See page 12)

Incumbent
Anthony Pescetti

Protect Workers Against Age Discrimination (SB 26)
Pescetti Against Working People

Increase Employer Penalties for Safety Violations (AB 1127)
Pescetti For Working People

Restore Daily Overtime Premium (AB 60)
Pescetti For Working People

Family Sick Leave (AB 109)
Pescetti Against Working People

Increase Workers' Compensation Benefit (SB 320)
Pescetti Against Working People

Challenger
Debra Gravert

Protect Workers Against Age Discrimination (SB 26)
Gravert For Working People

Increase Employer Penalties for Safety Violations (AB 1127)
Gravert For Working People

Restore Daily Overtime Premium (AB 60)
Gravert For Working People

Family Sick Leave (AB 109)
Gravert For Working People

Increase Workers' Compensation Benefit (SB 320)
Gravert For Working People

District 11
California Assembly
Part of Contra Costa County (See page 12)

No Incumbent
Joe Canciamilla

Protect Workers Against Age Discrimination (SB 26)
Canciamilla For Working People

Increase Employer Penalties for Safety Violations (AB 1127)
Canciamilla For Working People

Restore Daily Overtime Premium (AB 60)
Canciamilla For Working People

Family Sick Leave (AB 109)
Canciamilla For Working People

Increase Workers' Compensation Benefit (SB 320)
Canciamilla For Working People

Challenger
Jim Diaz

Protect Workers Against Age Discrimination (SB 26)
Diaz For Working People

Increase Employer Penalties for Safety Violations (AB 1127)
Diaz For Working People

Restore Daily Overtime Premium (AB 60)
Diaz For Working People

Family Sick Leave (AB 109)
Diaz For Working People

Increase Workers' Compensation Benefit (SB 320)
Diaz For Working People

District 12
California Assembly
Parts of San Francisco & San Mateo Counties (See page 12)

Incumbent
Kevin Shelley

Protect Workers Against Age Discrimination (SB 26)
Shelley For Working People

Increase Employer Penalties for Safety Violations (AB 1127)
Shelley For Working People

Restore Daily Overtime Premium (AB 60)
Shelley For Working People

Family Sick Leave (AB 109)
Shelley For Working People

Increase Workers' Compensation Benefit (SB 320)
Shelley For Working People

Challenger
Howard Epstein

No Photo Available

Refused to Take a Stand

Utility Reporter
## Issues

### Where Do the Candidates Stand?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District 13 California Assembly</th>
<th>Challengers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Incumbent</strong> Carole Migden</td>
<td><strong>Challenger</strong> Bob Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Protect Workers Against Age Discrimination (SB 26)</td>
<td>- Protect Workers Against Age Discrimination (SB 26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Migden For Working People</td>
<td>- Migden For Working People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Increase Employer Penalties for Safety Violations (AB 1127)</td>
<td>- Increase Employer Penalties for Safety Violations (AB 1127)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Migden For Working People</td>
<td>- Migden For Working People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Restore Daily Overtime Premium (AB 60)</td>
<td>- Restore Daily Overtime Premium (AB 60)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Migden For Working People</td>
<td>- Migden For Working People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Family Sick Leave (AB 109)</td>
<td>- Family Sick Leave (AB 109)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Migden For Working People</td>
<td>- Migden For Working People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Increase Workers' Compensation Benefit (SB 320)</td>
<td>- Increase Workers' Compensation Benefit (SB 320)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Migden For Working People</td>
<td>- Migden For Working People</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District 14 California Assembly</th>
<th>Challengers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Incumbent</strong> Dion Aroner</td>
<td><strong>Challenger</strong> Jerald Udinsky</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Protect Workers Against Age Discrimination (SB 26)</td>
<td>- Protect Workers Against Age Discrimination (SB 26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Aroner For Working People</td>
<td>- Aroner For Working People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Increase Employer Penalties for Safety Violations (AB 1127)</td>
<td>- Increase Employer Penalties for Safety Violations (AB 1127)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Aroner For Working People</td>
<td>- Aroner For Working People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Restore Daily Overtime Premium (AB 60)</td>
<td>- Restore Daily Overtime Premium (AB 60)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Aroner For Working People</td>
<td>- Aroner For Working People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Family Sick Leave (AB 109)</td>
<td>- Family Sick Leave (AB 109)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Aroner For Working People</td>
<td>- Aroner For Working People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Increase Workers' Compensation Benefit (SB 320)</td>
<td>- Increase Workers' Compensation Benefit (SB 320)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Aroner For Working People</td>
<td>- Aroner For Working People</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District 15 California Assembly</th>
<th>Challengers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Incumbent</strong> Lynne Leach</td>
<td><strong>Challenger</strong> Greg Rolen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Protect Workers Against Age Discrimination (SB 26)</td>
<td>- Protect Workers Against Age Discrimination (SB 26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Leach Against Working People</td>
<td>- Leach Against Working People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Increase Employer Penalties for Safety Violations (AB 1127)</td>
<td>- Increase Employer Penalties for Safety Violations (AB 1127)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Leach Against Working People</td>
<td>- Leach Against Working People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Restore Daily Overtime Premium (AB 60)</td>
<td>- Restore Daily Overtime Premium (AB 60)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Leach Against Working People</td>
<td>- Leach Against Working People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Family Sick Leave (AB 109)</td>
<td>- Family Sick Leave (AB 109)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Leach Against Working People</td>
<td>- Leach Against Working People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Increase Workers' Compensation Benefit (SB 320)</td>
<td>- Increase Workers' Compensation Benefit (SB 320)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Leach Against Working People</td>
<td>- Leach Against Working People</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Refused to Take a Stand

Refused to Take a Stand
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District 16</th>
<th>California Assembly</th>
<th>Incumbent</th>
<th>Challenger</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Audie Bock</td>
<td>Wilma Chan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protect Workers Against Age Discrimination (SB 26)</td>
<td>Bock For Working People</td>
<td>Chan For Working People</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase Employer Penalties for Safety Violations (AB 1127)</td>
<td>Bock For Working People</td>
<td>Chan For Working People</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restore Daily Overtime Premium (AB 60)</td>
<td>Bock For Working People</td>
<td>Chan For Working People</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Sick Leave (AB 109)</td>
<td>Bock For Working People</td>
<td>Chan For Working People</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase Workers' Compensation Benefit (SB 320)</td>
<td>Bock For Working People</td>
<td>Chan For Working People</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Note: Timothy McCormick, the other major party candidate for this seat, refused to respond to the Local 1245 Issue Survey. Bock, the incumbent, is an Independent.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District 17</th>
<th>California Assembly</th>
<th>Incumbent</th>
<th>Challenger</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Barbara Matthews</td>
<td>Greg Aghazarian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protect Workers Against Age Discrimination (SB 26)</td>
<td>Matthews For Working People</td>
<td>Matthews For Working People</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase Employer Penalties for Safety Violations (AB 1127)</td>
<td>Matthews For Working People</td>
<td>Matthews For Working People</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restore Daily Overtime Premium (AB 60)</td>
<td>Matthews For Working People</td>
<td>Matthews For Working People</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Sick Leave (AB 109)</td>
<td>Matthews For Working People</td>
<td>Matthews For Working People</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase Workers' Compensation Benefit (SB 320)</td>
<td>Matthews For Working People</td>
<td>Matthews For Working People</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District 18</th>
<th>California Assembly</th>
<th>Incumbent</th>
<th>Challenger</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Ellen Corbett</td>
<td>Syed Mahmood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protect Workers Against Age Discrimination (SB 26)</td>
<td>Corbett For Working People</td>
<td>Mahmood For Working People</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase Employer Penalties for Safety Violations (AB 1127)</td>
<td>Corbett For Working People</td>
<td>Mahmood For Working People</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restore Daily Overtime Premium (AB 60)</td>
<td>Corbett For Working People</td>
<td>Mahmood For Working People</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Sick Leave (AB 109)</td>
<td>Corbett For Working People</td>
<td>Mahmood For Working People</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase Workers' Compensation Benefit (SB 320)</td>
<td>Corbett For Working People</td>
<td>Mahmood For Working People</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District 19</td>
<td>District 20</td>
<td>District 21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Incumbent</strong></td>
<td><strong>Incumbent</strong></td>
<td><strong>Incumbent</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Lou Papan</strong></td>
<td><strong>John Dutra</strong></td>
<td><strong>Joe Simitian</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protect Workers Against Age Discrimination (SB 26)</td>
<td>Protect Workers Against Age Discrimination (SB 26)</td>
<td>Protect Workers Against Age Discrimination (SB 26)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absent for Vote</td>
<td>Dutra For Working People</td>
<td>Refused to Take a Stand</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increase Employer Penalties for Safety Violations (AB 1127)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Papan For Working People</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Restore Daily Overtime Premium (AB 60)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Papan For Working People</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Family Sick Leave (AB 109)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Papan For Working People</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increase Workers' Compensation Benefit (SB 320)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Papan Against Working People</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Challenger</strong></td>
<td><strong>Challenger</strong></td>
<td><strong>Challenger</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Steven Kassel</strong></td>
<td><strong>Lowell King</strong></td>
<td><strong>Deborah Wilder</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protect Workers Against Age Discrimination (SB 26)</td>
<td>Protect Workers Against Age Discrimination (SB 26)</td>
<td>Protect Workers Against Age Discrimination (SB 26)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increase Employer Penalties for Safety Violations (AB 1127)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Papan For Working People</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Restore Daily Overtime Premium (AB 60)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Papan For Working People</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Family Sick Leave (AB 109)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Papan For Working People</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increase Workers' Compensation Benefit (SB 320)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Refused to Take a Stand</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Issues

**Where Do the Candidates Stand?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District 22</th>
<th>California Assembly</th>
<th>Incumbent</th>
<th>Elaine Alquist</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Part of Santa Clara County (See page 12)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Protect Workers Against Age Discrimination (SB 26)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Alquist For Working People</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Increase Employer Penalties for Safety Violations (AB 1127)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Alquist For Working People</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Restore Daily Overtime Premium (AB 60)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Alquist For Working People</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Family Sick Leave (AB 109)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Alquist For Working People</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Increase Workers' Compensation Benefit (SB 320)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Alquist For Working People</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District 23</th>
<th>California Assembly</th>
<th>Challenger</th>
<th>Stan Kawczynski</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Part of Santa Clara County (See page 12)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Protect Workers Against Age Discrimination (SB 26)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Kawczynski For Working People</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Increase Employer Penalties for Safety Violations (AB 1127)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Kawczynski For Working People</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Restore Daily Overtime Premium (AB 60)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Kawczynski For Working People</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Family Sick Leave (AB 109)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Kawczynski For Working People</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Increase Workers' Compensation Benefit (SB 320)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Kawczynski For Working People</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District 24</th>
<th>California Assembly</th>
<th>Incumbent</th>
<th>Manny Diaz</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Part of Santa Clara County (See page 12)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Protect Workers Against Age Discrimination (SB 26)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Diaz For Working People</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Increase Employer Penalties for Safety Violations (AB 1127)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Diaz For Working People</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Restore Daily Overtime Premium (AB 60)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Diaz For Working People</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Family Sick Leave (AB 109)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Diaz For Working People</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Increase Workers' Compensation Benefit (SB 320)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Diaz For Working People</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District 24</th>
<th>California Assembly</th>
<th>Challenger</th>
<th>Tom Askeland</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Part of Santa Clara County (See page 12)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Protect Workers Against Age Discrimination (SB 26)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Askeland For Working People</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Increase Employer Penalties for Safety Violations (AB 1127)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Askeland For Working People</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Restore Daily Overtime Premium (AB 60)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Askeland For Working People</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Family Sick Leave (AB 109)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Askeland For Working People</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Increase Workers' Compensation Benefit (SB 320)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Askeland For Working People</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District 24</th>
<th>California Assembly</th>
<th>Challenger</th>
<th>Sue Jackson</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Part of Santa Clara County (See page 12)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Protect Workers Against Age Discrimination (SB 26)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Jackson For Working People</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Increase Employer Penalties for Safety Violations (AB 1127)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Jackson For Working People</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Restore Daily Overtime Premium (AB 60)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Jackson For Working People</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Family Sick Leave (AB 109)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Jackson For Working People</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Increase Workers' Compensation Benefit (SB 320)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Jackson For Working People</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| (No Incumbent) | | | (No Incumbent) |
|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| **District 22** | California Assembly | | **District 23** |

| (No Incumbent) | | | (No Incumbent) |
|----------------|----------------|----------------|
| **District 24** | California Assembly | | **District 22** |

**Utility Reporter**

---

Refused to Take a Stand
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District 25</th>
<th>California Assembly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Stephen Rico</strong></td>
<td><strong>Dave Cogdill</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image1.jpg" alt="Photo" /></td>
<td><img src="image2.jpg" alt="Photo" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image3.jpg" alt="Vote" /> Protect Workers Against Age Discrimination (SB 26)</td>
<td><img src="image4.jpg" alt="Vote" /> Protect Workers Against Age Discrimination (SB 26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image5.jpg" alt="Vote" /> Rico For Working People</td>
<td><img src="image6.jpg" alt="Vote" /> Rico For Working People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image7.jpg" alt="Vote" /> Increase Employer Penalties for Safety Violations (AB 1127)</td>
<td><img src="image8.jpg" alt="Vote" /> Increase Employer Penalties for Safety Violations (AB 1127)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image9.jpg" alt="Vote" /> Rico For Working People</td>
<td><img src="image10.jpg" alt="Vote" /> Rico For Working People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image11.jpg" alt="Vote" /> Restore Daily Overtime Premium (AB 60)</td>
<td><img src="image12.jpg" alt="Vote" /> Restore Daily Overtime Premium (AB 60)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image13.jpg" alt="Vote" /> Rico For Working People</td>
<td><img src="image14.jpg" alt="Vote" /> Rico For Working People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image15.jpg" alt="Vote" /> Family Sick Leave (AB 109)</td>
<td><img src="image16.jpg" alt="Vote" /> Family Sick Leave (AB 109)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image17.jpg" alt="Vote" /> Rico For Working People</td>
<td><img src="image18.jpg" alt="Vote" /> Rico For Working People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image19.jpg" alt="Vote" /> Increase Workers’ Compensation Benefit (SB 320)</td>
<td><img src="image20.jpg" alt="Vote" /> Increase Workers’ Compensation Benefit (SB 320)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image21.jpg" alt="Vote" /> Rico For Working People</td>
<td><img src="image22.jpg" alt="Vote" /> Rico For Working People</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District 26</th>
<th>California Assembly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dennis Cardoza</strong></td>
<td><strong>Marshall Sanchez</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image23.jpg" alt="Photo" /></td>
<td><img src="image24.jpg" alt="Photo" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image25.jpg" alt="Vote" /> Protect Workers Against Age Discrimination (SB 26)</td>
<td><img src="image26.jpg" alt="Vote" /> Protect Workers Against Age Discrimination (SB 26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image27.jpg" alt="Vote" /> Cardoza For Working People</td>
<td><img src="image28.jpg" alt="Vote" /> Sanchez For Working People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image29.jpg" alt="Vote" /> Increase Employer Penalties for Safety Violations (AB 1127)</td>
<td><img src="image30.jpg" alt="Vote" /> Increase Employer Penalties for Safety Violations (AB 1127)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image31.jpg" alt="Vote" /> Cardoza For Working People</td>
<td><img src="image32.jpg" alt="Vote" /> Sanchez Against Working People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image33.jpg" alt="Vote" /> Restore Daily Overtime Premium (AB 60)</td>
<td><img src="image34.jpg" alt="Vote" /> Sanchez Against Working People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image35.jpg" alt="Vote" /> Cardoza For Working People</td>
<td><img src="image36.jpg" alt="Vote" /> Sanchez Against Working People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image37.jpg" alt="Vote" /> Family Sick Leave (AB 109)</td>
<td><img src="image38.jpg" alt="Vote" /> Family Sick Leave (AB 109)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image39.jpg" alt="Vote" /> Cardoza For Working People</td>
<td><img src="image40.jpg" alt="Vote" /> Sanchez For Working People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image41.jpg" alt="Vote" /> Increase Workers’ Compensation Benefit (SB 320)</td>
<td><img src="image42.jpg" alt="Vote" /> Sanchez For Working People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image43.jpg" alt="Vote" /> Cardoza Against Working People</td>
<td><img src="image44.jpg" alt="Vote" /> Sanchez For Working People</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District 27</th>
<th>California Assembly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fred Keeley</strong></td>
<td><strong>Charles Carter</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image45.jpg" alt="Photo" /></td>
<td><img src="image46.jpg" alt="Photo" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image47.jpg" alt="Vote" /> Protect Workers Against Age Discrimination (SB 26)</td>
<td><img src="image48.jpg" alt="Vote" /> Protect Workers Against Age Discrimination (SB 26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image49.jpg" alt="Vote" /> Keeley For Working People</td>
<td><img src="image50.jpg" alt="Vote" /> Carter For Working People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image51.jpg" alt="Vote" /> Increase Employer Penalties for Safety Violations (AB 1127)</td>
<td><img src="image52.jpg" alt="Vote" /> Increase Employer Penalties for Safety Violations (AB 1127)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image53.jpg" alt="Vote" /> Keeley For Working People</td>
<td><img src="image54.jpg" alt="Vote" /> Carter For Working People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image55.jpg" alt="Vote" /> Restore Daily Overtime Premium (AB 60)</td>
<td><img src="image56.jpg" alt="Vote" /> Restore Daily Overtime Premium (AB 60)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image57.jpg" alt="Vote" /> Keeley For Working People</td>
<td><img src="image58.jpg" alt="Vote" /> No Position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image59.jpg" alt="Vote" /> Family Sick Leave (AB 109)</td>
<td><img src="image60.jpg" alt="Vote" /> Family Sick Leave (AB 109)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image61.jpg" alt="Vote" /> Keeley For Working People</td>
<td><img src="image62.jpg" alt="Vote" /> No Position</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image63.jpg" alt="Vote" /> Increase Workers’ Compensation Benefit (SB 320)</td>
<td><img src="image64.jpg" alt="Vote" /> Increase Workers’ Compensation Benefit (SB 320)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image65.jpg" alt="Vote" /> Keeley For Working People</td>
<td><img src="image66.jpg" alt="Vote" /> No Position</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

October 2000 21
Where Do the Candidates Stand?

### District 28
**California Assembly**
San Benito & parts of Monterey, Santa Clara & Santa Cruz Counties (See page 12)

#### Incumbent
**Jeff Denham**
- Protect Workers Against Age Discrimination (SB 26)
- Increase Employer Penalties for Safety Violations (AB 1127)
- Restore Daily Overtime Premium (AB 60)
- Family Sick Leave (AB 109)
- Increase Workers’ Compensation Benefit (SB 320)

#### Challenger
**Simon Salinas**
- Protect Workers Against Age Discrimination (SB 26)
- Increase Employer Penalties for Safety Violations (AB 1127)
- Restore Daily Overtime Premium (AB 60)
- Family Sick Leave (AB 109)
- Increase Workers’ Compensation Benefit (SB 320)

---

### District 29
**California Assembly**
Parts of Fresno & Tulare Counties (See page 12)

#### Incumbent
**Mike Briggs**
- Protect Workers Against Age Discrimination (SB 26)
- Increase Employer Penalties for Safety Violations (AB 1127)
- Restore Daily Overtime Premium (AB 60)
- Family Sick Leave (AB 109)
- Increase Workers’ Compensation Benefit (SB 320)

#### Challenger
**Lita Reid**
- Protect Workers Against Age Discrimination (SB 26)
- Increase Employer Penalties for Safety Violations (AB 1127)
- Restore Daily Overtime Premium (AB 60)
- Family Sick Leave (AB 109)
- Increase Workers’ Compensation Benefit (SB 320)

---

### District 30
**California Assembly**
Kings and parts of Fresno, Kern & Madera Counties (See page 12)

#### Incumbent
**Dean Florez**
- Protect Workers Against Age Discrimination (SB 26)
- Increase Employer Penalties for Safety Violations (AB 1127)
- Restore Daily Overtime Premium (AB 60)
- Family Sick Leave (AB 109)
- Increase Workers’ Compensation Benefit (SB 320)

#### Challenger
**Ken Kay**
- Protect Workers Against Age Discrimination (SB 26)
- Increase Employer Penalties for Safety Violations (AB 1127)
- Restore Daily Overtime Premium (AB 60)
- Family Sick Leave (AB 109)
- Increase Workers’ Compensation Benefit (SB 320)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Issues</th>
<th>Where Do the Candidates Stand?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Incumbent</strong></td>
<td><strong>Challenger</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sarah Reyes</strong></td>
<td><strong>Richard Cabral</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District 31 California Assembly</td>
<td>Parts of Fresno &amp; Tulare Counties (See page 12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protect Workers Against Age Discrimination (SB 26)</td>
<td>Protect Workers Against Age Discrimination (SB 26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reyes For Working People</strong></td>
<td>Cabral For Working People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase Employer Penalties for Safety Violations (AB 1127)</td>
<td>Increase Employer Penalties for Safety Violations (AB 1127)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reyes For Working People</strong></td>
<td>Cabral For Working People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restore Daily Overtime Premium (AB 60)</td>
<td>Restore Daily Overtime Premium (AB 60)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reyes For Working People</strong></td>
<td>Cabral For Working People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Sick Leave (AB 109)</td>
<td>Family Sick Leave (AB 109)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reyes For Working People</strong></td>
<td>Cabral For Working People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase Workers' Compensation Benefit (SB 320)</td>
<td>Increase Workers' Compensation Benefit (SB 320)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reyes For Working People</strong></td>
<td>Cabral For Working People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Incumbent</strong></td>
<td><strong>Challenger</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Roy Ashburn</strong></td>
<td><strong>Virginia Gurrola</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District 32 California Assembly</td>
<td>Parts of Kern &amp; Tulare Counties (See page 12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protect Workers Against Age Discrimination (SB 26)</td>
<td>Protect Workers Against Age Discrimination (SB 26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ashburn Against Working People</strong></td>
<td>Gurrola For Working People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase Employer Penalties for Safety Violations (AB 1127)</td>
<td>Increase Employer Penalties for Safety Violations (AB 1127)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ashburn Against Working People</strong></td>
<td>Gurrola For Working People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restore Daily Overtime Premium (AB 60)</td>
<td>Restore Daily Overtime Premium (AB 60)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ashburn Against Working People</strong></td>
<td>Gurrola For Working People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Sick Leave (AB 109)</td>
<td>Family Sick Leave (AB 109)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ashburn Against Working People</strong></td>
<td>Gurrola For Working People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase Workers' Compensation Benefit (SB 320)</td>
<td>Increase Workers' Compensation Benefit (SB 320)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ashburn Against Working People</strong></td>
<td>Gurrola For Working People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Incumbent</strong></td>
<td><strong>Challenger</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Abel Maldonado</strong></td>
<td><strong>Laurence Houlgate</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District 33 California Assembly</td>
<td>San Luis Obispo &amp; part of Santa Barbara Counties (See page 12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protect Workers Against Age Discrimination (SB 26)</td>
<td>Protect Workers Against Age Discrimination (SB 26)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Maldonado Against Working People</strong></td>
<td>Houlgate For Working People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase Employer Penalties for Safety Violations (AB 1127)</td>
<td>Increase Employer Penalties for Safety Violations (AB 1127)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Maldonado Against Working People</strong></td>
<td>Houlgate For Working People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restore Daily Overtime Premium (AB 60)</td>
<td>Restore Daily Overtime Premium (AB 60)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Maldonado Against Working People</strong></td>
<td>Houlgate For Working People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Sick Leave (AB 109)</td>
<td>Family Sick Leave (AB 109)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Maldonado Against Working People</strong></td>
<td>Houlgate For Working People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase Workers' Compensation Benefit (SB 320)</td>
<td>Increase Workers' Compensation Benefit (SB 320)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Maldonado Against Working People</strong></td>
<td>Houlgate For Working People</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

October 2000 23
Methodology: where the chickens come from

IBEW Local 1245 undertook the Candidate Survey to give our members an opportunity to see how candidates for the California Assembly and California Senate stand on issues important to working people. We want to provide you a way to evaluate the candidates based on objective evidence.

Such evidence is available in the form of voting records. The five issues we selected were all voted on during the current (1999-2000) session of the California Legislature. The survey shows how the incumbents actually voted on the issues. On issues where incumbents voted for working people, they were awarded a “thumbs up.” Where the incumbent voted against working people, they were given a “thumbs down.” If an incumbent abstained on any of these five votes (all bills were backed by labor), it was effectively a “no” vote, so the incumbent was given a “thumbs down.” If the incumbent was absent during the vote, he or she is listed as “Absent During Vote.”

Non-incumbent candidates (challengers and candidates in districts where there is no incumbent running) were sent a survey asking them to declare whether they were generally for or against these same selected bills. We also sent a summary of the bills’ general content. All surveyed candidates received a follow-up letter reminding them of the deadline for returning the survey. If a non-incumbent refused to respond to our survey, they were awarded a “chicken.” This seems an appropriate symbol for candidates who don’t have the courage to say where they stand. If a non-incumbent candidate responded to the survey, but chose not to take a position on a particular issue, their position on that issue was listed as “No Position.”

No surveys were sent to members of the Legislature who are now running for a seat in the other chamber. Their positions were derived from their voting record in the chamber they currently serve in.

Two years ago we found that the challengers in some races indicated a greater degree of support for working people than they actually exhibited once they got into office. We cannot attest to a candidates’ truthfulness in this survey; we can only report what they say.

We have made every effort to include in our Election Guide all major party candidates for the legislature within Local 1245’s geographical jurisdiction, as well as one independent member of the Assembly (Audie Bock). If a candidate failed to participate, it was by his or her own choice. Space did not permit us to survey candidates from minor parties.

Local 1245’s endorsements of California candidates for Assembly, Senate, and the US House of Representatives can be found on page 27. We hope these surveys are helpful in providing you with objective information to assist you in evaluating the candidates.

A Case of Truth Avoidance

How truthful were candidates for Congress when they respond to the Local 1245 survey?

I decided to check up on a few of them after the September issue of Utility Reporter was published. One case stood out as a particularly obnoxious example of truth-avoidance.

Congressional candidate Ken Payne (District 5 - Sacramento County) indicated a pro-worker position on all five issues contained in the Congressional Candidate Survey (see September issue of Utility Reporter).

I then sent Mr. Payne a personal e-mail, asking his position on two of the issues in the survey: the Ergonomics Standard and the Patient Bill of Rights. In both cases, Mr. Payne took the anti-worker position. A complete flip-flop.

Apparently Mr. Payne is not a man who can be taken at his word. That’s something for voters in the Sacramento area to bear in mind when voting for their Congressional representative on Nov. 7.

You can conduct your own credibility test on the candidates for Assembly and Senate using this issue of Utility Reporter. Some of these candidates have web sites that accept e-mail. Check out their positions in the Utility Reporter, then send them an e-mail message asking them to take a stand on some of these same issues. Be sure to reference the bill number so there is no question about what is being asked.

Let me know if you get any interesting responses. Write to me at:

Eric Wolfe, Communications Director
IBEW 1245
PO Box 4790
Walnut Creek, CA 94596
Union members make the difference. The voice of working families was heard in the March 7 Primary Election because union members stepped forward and got involved. Your local Central Labor Council can show you how to phonebank or walk precincts for labor-endorsed candidates this fall. It's easy to do, you meet great people, and you can make a difference! Sign up now.

Central Labor Council of Alameda County
510-532-4242

Butte-Glenn Counties Central Labor Council
530-343-9474

Contra Costa County Central Labor Council
925-228-0161

Five Counties Central Labor Council (Redding Area)
530-241-0319

Fresno & Madera Counties Central Labor Council
559-275-1151

Humboldt & Del Norte Counties Central Labor Council
707-443-7371

Kern, Inyo & Mono Counties Central Labor Council
661-324-6451

Marysville Central Labor Council
530-743-7321

Merced-Mariposa Central Labor Council
559-271-1288

Monterey & Santa Cruz Counties Central Labor Council
(831) 633-1869

Napa & Solano Counties Central Labor Council
707-557-5036

North Bay Counties Central Labor Council
707-545-6970

Sacramento Central Labor Council
916-927-9772

San Francisco Labor Council
415-440-8502

San Joaquin & Calaveras Counties Central Labor Council
209-948-5526

San Mateo County Central Labor Council
650-572-8848

South Bay Central Labor Council
408-266-3790

Stanislaus & Tuolumne Counties Central Labor Council
209-523-8079

Tri-Counties Central Labor Council (San Luis Obispo/Ventura areas)
805-641-3712

Will you invest three hours of your time this fall to defend your livelihood against legislative attack? It will be one of the most important investments you make this year.

Interested in looking further into volunteer opportunities?
Visit the California Labor Federation’s website at:

www.labor2000.calaborfed.org
WHY WE MUST DEFEAT PROP 38
THE "DRAPER VOUCHER INITIATIVE"

Proposition 38 on the November 7 ballot asks voters if the state should give a $4000 "voucher" to each student who attends a non-public school.

"A big detour in the wrong direction."
— California Governor Gray Davis

What's wrong with Prop 38?

☑ Abandons Neighborhood Schools
Not one penny of the billions spent on the Draper Voucher Initiative will be used to make our children's schools better.

☑ Provides No Accountability
Restricts state or local regulation of voucher schools. Allows fly-by-night operators to open voucher schools and hire teachers without any teaching credentials, training or experience educating children.

☑ Allows Discrimination
Voucher schools -- not parents -- decide whose children will be accepted. They will be able to reject students based on their gender, ability to pay, or academic and physical abilities.

☑ VOTE NO ON PROP 38... another expensive experiment our children can't afford.

No On Vouchers 2000 Committee • www.NoVouchers2000.com

Provided by your union and the California Labor Federation, AFL-CIO. Visit our website for more info: www.culaborfed.org.
IBEW Local 1245 Endorsements: State of California

**U.S. PRESIDENT**
- Al Gore

**U.S. SENATOR**
- Dianne Feinstein

**U.S. CONGRESS**

### California Assembly

**District**
1. Virginia Strom-Martín
2. Virgil Parks
3. Benjamin Wirtschafter
4. Open
5. No Endorsement
6. Joe Nation
7. Patricia Wiggins
8. Helen Thomson
9. Darrell Steinberg
10. (Dual Endorsement) Debra Gravert, Anthony Pesceetti
11. Joe Cacamialla
12. Kevin Shelley
13. Carole Migden
14. Dion Aroner
15. Greg Robin
16. (Dual Endorsement) Audie Bock, Wilma Chan
17. Barbara Matthews
18. Ellen Corbett
19. Lou Papan
20. John Dutra
21. Open
22. Elaine White Aquist
23. Manny Diaz
24. Rebecca Cohn
25. Stephen Rico
26. Dennis Cardoza
27. Fred Keeley
28. Simon Salinas
29. Lita Reid
30. Dean Florez
31. Sarah Reyes
32. Virginia Gurrola
33. (Dual Endorsement) Laurence Houlgate, Abel Macedo
34. Robert Conaway
35. Hannah-Beth Jackson
36. No Endorsement
37. Rosalind McGrath
38. Jon Altman
39. Tony Cardenas
40. Bob Hertzberg
41. Fran Pavley
42. Paul Koretz
43. Darío Frommer
44. Carol Liu
45. Jackie Goldberg
46. Gil Cedillo
47. Herb Wesson
48. Roderick Wright

### California Senate

**District**
1. Thomas Romero
2. John Burton
3. Michael Machado
4. Tom Torlakson
5. Don Perata

### California Propositions

#### Proposition 32: YES
Veteran’s Bond Act of 2000
Provides farm, home, and mobilehome purchase assistance for veterans.

#### Proposition 33: YES
Legislature: Retirement
Permits state legislators to participate in the Public Employees’ Retirement System.

#### Proposition 34: YES
Campaign Contributions & Expenditures
Repeals certain amendments made by Prop. 208 to the Political Reform Act of 1974, and reenacts provisions that impose similar, but increased dollar amount limits on campaign contributions for elective state office, candidate loans, and voluntary campaign spending.

#### Proposition 35: NO RECOMMENDATION
Public Works Projects

#### Proposition 36: NO RECOMMENDATION
Drug Treatment Diversion Program

#### Proposition 37: NO
Fees, Taxes, Voter Requirements.
Redefines as taxes certain compulsory fees enacted by state or local government.

#### Proposition 38: NO
School Vouchers. State-Funded Private and Religious Education
Authorizes annual state payments of at least $4,000 per pupil for qualified private and religious schools. Restricts regulation of private schools. Exempts private schools from designated Uniform Building Code requirements.

#### Proposition 39: YES
School Facilities
Authorizes bonds for construction, reconstruction, rehabilitation or replacement of school facilities if approved by 55% vote for projects evaluated by schools, community college districts, county education offices for safety, class size, and information technology needs.
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District
1. Tom Collins
2. No Endorsement
3. John Lee
4. Bob Beers
5. Kristen Hansen
6. Wendell Williams
7. Morse Arberry Jr.
8. Barbara Buckley
9. Chris Giunchigliani
10. David Goldwater
11. Doug Bache
12. Genie Ohrenschall
13. Byron Goynes
14. Ellen Kolvisto
15. Kathy McClain
16. John Oceguera
17. Bob Price
18. Mark Manendo
19. Jerry Claborn
20. Thomas Walsh
21. Larry Betti
22. Gene Segerblom
23. Richard Perkins
24. Vivian Freeman
25. Dawn Gibbons
26. Dave Lacerda
27. Sheila Leslie
28. Vonne Chowning
29. No Endorsement
30. Debbie Smith
31. Bernie Anderson
32. Kendall Stagg
33. No Endorsement
34. No Endorsement
35. Marci de Braga
36. Roy Neighbors
37. No Endorsement
38. Joe Dini
39. Willie Edwards
40. Bonnie Parnell
41. David Parks

Nevada Senate Districts

VOTE November 7
By Orv Owen

Our day is coming—our day to determine who will represent our views at the city, county, state and federal legislative bodies. And, frankly, it cannot come too soon for this senior citizen. The political rhetoric and the "buzz words" of the current campaigns reek with hypocrisy and insincerity, in my view. I, along with millions of other seniors, still believe that "leopards do not change their spots" and politicians cannot run or hide from their records.

I like to feel that for the past 54 years I voted for candidates who, with their voices and their actions, supported working people, their families and senior citizens. It is not rocket science to understand where the current political parties and candidates stand on the issues that affect workers and their families, their parents and grandparents.

One of the most critical issues facing today's politicians is saving Medicare, the federal health insurance program for the elderly and eligible disabled.

Medicare has provided access to quality health care for 35 years. Today, Medicare is part of the basic fabric of American society. Certainly, no one wants to return to the way things were before Medicare, when 70% of people over age 65 had no health insurance of any kind.

Since Medicare was enacted, poverty among the elderly has fallen to about 10%. Ninety-nine percent of America's seniors have health insurance coverage under Medicare, and seniors are healthier and living longer.

All of this has been accomplished while Medicare provided access to first-class health care services for all beneficiaries. Medicare has preserved our right to choose our doctors and Medicare and Social Security are not on the side of workers and their families and their parents and grandparents.

We were not born suspicious of politicians—their votes and actions made us this way! Now our day is coming. That day is Nov. 7. Let's make it count!

Keep the faith!

Key issues: Social Security & Medicare

Larry Lindsey, a key economic adviser to Republican presidential candidate George W. Bush, noted in a May 15 interview that he wouldn't play the stock market with his personal funds. As Lindsey puts it: "I hate losing money."

That same day, his boss advocated taking part of the money every working American pays into Social Security to earn guaranteed benefits and putting it into private accounts dependent upon the stock market.

Social Security isn't the only vital program that would be jeopardized by Bush's misguided policy proposals. The solvency of Medicare relies on responsible handling of the nation's current budget surpluses. Bush's proposed $1 trillion tax cut would squander this once-in-a-lifetime opportunity to strengthen the Social Security and Medicare Trust Funds.

Bush's plan to privatize Social Security and Medicare

Security would divert between 16 and 24% of Social Security's payroll tax revenue into privatized, individual accounts. Diverting funds would require cuts in guaranteed Social Security benefits—29% for older workers and 54% for workers 30 and younger—according to a study released in June by the non-partisan Century Foundation.

The study notes that even under the best market conditions, returns on the individual accounts would fall far short of making up the reduction in guaranteed benefits. In fact, "the reductions in Social Security benefits for future retirees are so substantial that they raise questions about the viability of protecting benefits for current retirees, older workers, disabled workers and survivors," the report says.

Gore, by contrast, would leave current benefits alone and add a new "Retirement Savings Plus" account on top of promised benefits to boost retirement for low and moderate income families.

Gore favors setting aside two-thirds of the projected budget surplus to ensure Social Security and Medicare remain strong for generations to come.
The candidates & working women’s issues

**Big Mary’ Septak**
In the late summer of 1897, several mines around Hazleton, Penn., were closed by strikes as the northeastern Pennsylvania anthracite region seethed with rebellion. On Sept. 10, strikers marching to mines still working were stopped by armed deputies in Lattimer. Without provocation, the deputies fired into the crowd, killing 19 miners and seriously wounding another 36.

Despite the tragic loss of life, despite the presence of the National Guard following the massacre, the strike continued. And it was the women of the immigrant mining communities who kept the struggle going. They successfully shut down mines not yet affected by the strike. They were led by “Big Mary” Septak, operator of a miners’ boardinghouse in Lattimer. Mary lost nine of her 10 children to disease; before they died, her little sons worked in the collieries picking slate. She believed in the strike.

Beginning on Sept. 15, “Big Mary” Septak led as many as 200 women in a series of raids on collieries and washeries which forced the men to stop working. Big Mary openly defied the National Guard. She told a mounted captain: “If we had guns, you’d pay the devil.” National Guard officers complained, “The women are worse to handle than the men.” The Wilkes-Barre Record described the “Polish Amazons” for their “ill-advised and unwomanly demonstrations.” But to the immigrant women, the fight for survival was more important than middle-class notions of femininity. And it paid off. The women’s militancy produced concessions from the mine owners.

George Bush, so far, has been silent on the issue of equal pay, despite the fact that women earn only about 73 cents for every dollar men make. This pay inequality results in a loss of $200 billion in family income each year.

Al Gore, as part of the 2000 budget, supported $14 million for efforts to promote pay equity for women. Al Gore supports the Paycheck Fairness Act to help working women close the pay gap.

George Bush refused to support a request for $40 million in state funds for breast cancer exams. Bush supported weak Patients’ Bill of Rights, giving HMOs final say on what is medically necessary and no right for women to choose their Ob/Gyn as their primary physician.

Al Gore fought for Medicare to cover mammograms, and supports adding prescription benefits. Gore cosponsored breast cancer legislation. Gore fought for strong Patient’s Bill of Rights that included right to sue HMOs and the right for women to choose their Ob/Gyn as their primary physician.

George Bush proposed a tax plan so risky that even House Republicans avoided voting on it. The plan would drain budget surpluses and could force cuts in Medicare, education and child nutrition programs to give tax breaks to the rich.

Al Gore helped expand the Earned Income Tax Credit. Gore proposes a tax plan that helps working families, including expanding the child care and Earned Income Tax Credits, expanding health care coverage through targeted tax credits, and giving a deduction for college tuition.

George Bush supports a plan that would cut $2.9 billion in Head Start funding and deify the program to almost 400,000 children.

Al Gore worked to increase Head Start funding by 68%, increasing enrollment by 200,000 children. Proposed a $600 million increase in funding.
Federal ergonomics standard headed for major showdown

A
ter 10 years of effort by work-
ers, the Republican leadership in Congress and President Clinton are headed for a showdown over a new ergonomics standard to protect workers on the job.

A rider to kill implementation of the new standard is attached to a House Appropriations bill for Labor and Health spending. President Clinton has promised to veto any measure with this rider.

In an effort to eliminate the nation's No. 1 workplace health hazard—musculoskeletal injuries caused by poorly designed workplaces, repetitive motions and other ergonomic hazards on the job—the AFL-CIO has launched television ads in targeted congressional districts calling on lawmakers to oppose efforts to kill the ergonomics standard.

Workers and their unions have been mobilizing to establish a workplace ergonomics standard to reduce or prevent the musculoskeletal disorders—such as carpal tunnel syndrome, tendinitis and back injuries—that hit some 1.8 million workers a year. More than 600,000 workers a year are forced to take time off from the job because of injuries related to workplace ergonomic hazards.

But during the same decade, big business groups and their allies in Congress have staged an all-out battle to prevent OSHA from developing and issuing an ergonomics standard.

While OSHA began public hearings this spring on its proposed standard, Republican congressional leaders—in mostly party-line votes on the fiscal year 2001 Labor, Health and Human Services and Education appropriations bill—were able to include a ban that prohibits OSHA from moving ahead on the much-needed worker safety measure.

President Clinton has vowed to veto the bill if it gets to his desk.

Share your experience

A
yone in the workforce knows that working safely is important. Workers represented by a union have safety rules, safety committees, and guidelines to follow in order to get our work done safely and without injury.

However, today's economy has many employers, contractors and subcontractors who have non-union workers. Many of these workers do not know anything about safety or safety rules and regulations.

On occasion, union workers like ourselves will encounter non-union workers on a jobsite. If you see anyone performing a task that looks dangerous, and you think could pose a threat to the worker or others, you should take action.

Explain the possible dangers as you see them, and what the consequences could be if the worker continues to work in an unsafe fashion or in an unsafe area.

Sometimes we may be tempted to feel that people deserve what they get. But safety is something to be small-minded or mean-spirited about. Offer fellow workers the benefit of your experience.

Sometimes we may be tempted to feel that people deserve what they get. But safety is something to be small-minded or mean-spirited about. Offer fellow workers the benefit of your experience.

Yes, we have Cal-OSHA and OSHA, but these agencies can't be everywhere at once.

So lend a hand. No one benefits when someone is injured on the job.

Born to be (safely) wild

o
e of us who ride motorcycles know the enjoyment and freedom of being on the open road.

More and more people are taking to motorcycles each year. Today's bikes offer unprecedented comfort, power and speed.

Increased speed can also bring increased risk.

Helmets, required by law in California, afford some protection to the head. But tee shirts and tank tops aren't going to help the rest of your body when you're skidding along asphalt at 60 mph.

The best protection is to drive safely. Taking a motorcycle class is a good way to learn about your bike and how to operate it safely.

The most important rule always is to watch out for the other guy. The laws of physics dictate that you're going to lose if you collide with something with four wheels.
Local 1245 proposes solution to electricity market crisis

From Page 1

In other words, matching supply to demand may be easily accomplished with many commodities, but it is fiendishly difficult with electricity—and failure to do so carries a very high price for society. The mismatch between supply and demand leads inevitably to boom and bust cycles in both price and reliability of electricity generation.

Such business cycles will occur in virtually any market. When artichokes fall into short supply, prices skyrocket—and most people will stop eating artichokes for a while.

The problem is that people are not going to stop using electricity, anymore than your body is going to stop using blood. When supplies are short, that electricity is going to be very expensive.

Market Perpetuates Problem

The Wall Street Journal and other business interests have argued that the solution is simply to let the market respond: high prices will stimulate investors to build more power plants.

But CUE, represented by attorney Marc Joseph of the firm Adams Broadwell Joseph and Cardozo, argues that leaving these decisions to the market will only perpetuate the problem, not solve it. As more power plants are built and put on line, supply will eventually exceed demand. Oversupply and the resulting low prices will then lead suppliers to shut down plants.

Capital will be foolishly wasted, plant owners will suffer financial losses, and trained, experienced workers will be sent packing.

But the biggest victim of these “boom and bust” cycles in electricity will be the public as a whole. Volatile electric prices will discourage new investment in the state by businesses that require electricity, and the displacement of skilled workers will threaten the reliability that the public expects.

The fundamental problem, CUE argues, isn’t really the independent power producer who manipulates the system to boost prices. “The fundamental problem is inherent in the market itself.”

If the market is ill-equipped to meet society’s need for reliable power at stable prices, how can reliability and stability be achieved?

Restoring What Was Abandoned

CUE argues that “some of what was abandoned by restructuring must be restored.”

■ First, demand-side management (or conservation) must be brought back into the equation. “Conservation programs before deregulation were a big success,” CUE says. These programs provided hundreds of megawatts of cost-effective conservation. Without these programs, today’s shortages would be “incalculably greater.”

■ Second, California needs to make sure that someone is driving the bus. In the current market system, no one is responsible for forecasting both overall supply and overall demand. The Independent System Operator is focused primarily on hour-by-hour reliability and “has not attempted to deal with state-wide resource supply/demand issues in any significant way.” When tackling short-term supply problems, someone needs to be responsible for evaluating how various solutions will affect reliability over the long-term.

■ Third, someone with an “obligation to serve” must be responsible for assessing generation, transmission and demand-side management in an integrated fashion so that they have the capability of fulfilling that obligation. This function used to be performed, subject to public review, by Investor-Owned Utilities like PG&E. They did it before, they could do it again.

Proof Regulation Works

The free-market diehards, of course, will howl at the suggestion that California return to this sort of regulation. Especially the free-market diehards who are making a killing in the current market.

But CUE points to the Los Angeles Department of Water and Power as vivid proof that California would be better off with a return to regulation. The LADWP has retained control of its own electric generation assets, and continues to plan on a long-term basis for its future needs, subject to public review.

As a result, LADWP has insulated itself from the wildly inflated prices now plaguing the open market. LADWP has also avoided the severe problem now plaguing PG&E and Southern California Edison, who are being squeezed between the frozen rates they charge retail customers and the wildly inflated wholesale rates they must pay independent producers.

In the long run, the sort of long-term planning recommended by CUE would benefit virtually everyone. A proper incentive structure could be used to induce utilities like PG&E to construct generation and to make cost-effective decisions when purchasing power from other generators. Likewise, structures could be put in place to assure that independent generators, whose plants we now need, would be permitted an adequate return on investment, “whether through sales on the open market or through contracts with a utility.”

But providing incentives to independent generators does not mean we have to give them carte blanche to run roughshod over California consumers in a runaway wholesale power market—the scenario that has brought so much grief to California consumers over the summer.

The genie is out of the bottle. Everyone knows that stuffing genies back in bottles isn’t easy. But it does little good to simply wring our hands or give out bandaids to those injured in the genie’s rampage.

The genie is out of the bottle. Everyone knows that stuffing genies back in bottles isn’t easy. But it does little good to simply wring our hands or give out bandaids to those injured in the genie’s rampage.
Plumas Sierra REC agreement hikes wages, extends benefits

Local 1245 members at Plumas Sierra Rural Electric Cooperative bargained a 3.5% general wage increase effective July 1, 2000 during a recent wage and benefit opener in their agreement.

The agreement also brings Satellite and Internet employees up to the same medical benefit level as physical employees, resulting in an additional $200 a month applied to medical premiums.

The agreement also provides a 3% wage increase on July 1, 2001, and provides for a wage and medical benefit opener for July 2002.

"Our main priority was to make some gains on the 2.5% increase we had in 1999, and to bring the Satellite and Internet employees into the same medical plan that the physical crews enjoy through NRECA," said Business Rep. Ray Thomas.

This negotiating committee took a one-year wage opener and used it to negotiate a two-year extension, with wage improvements. I want to commend them for this, and for their sincere concern for the level of medical benefit coverage for their union sisters and brothers in the Satellite and Internet side of the house," said Thomas.

Members of Local 1245 at the newly-organized Northern California Power Agency ratified a first agreement by a 51-6 margin.

The three-year agreement provides 3% general wage increases in each year. The agreement would be reopened for wage negotiations in the third year if the Consumer Price Index exceeds 4%.

The agreement makes improvements in shift premiums, holiday pay for shift employees, and rest periods. It also improves post-retirement health insurance.

In addition, the negotiations produced a severance package and a successor clause that protects union status in the event of a change in ownership.

The pact provides that part-time and probationary employees will be laid off before regular employees.

Northern California Power Agency pact ratified

members in shift premiums, holiday pay for shift employees, and rest periods. It also improves post-retirement health insurance.

In addition, the negotiations produced a severance package and a successor clause that protects union status in the event of a change in ownership.

The pact provides that part-time and probationary employees will be laid off before regular employees.

NCFA employees, who voted for union representation on Jan. 19, work for a consortium of municipalities with interests in hydro facilities and steam units at the Geysers.

Negotiating the contract for the union were Paul House, Ken Ling, Frank Carter, Gary Herlins, and Local 1245 Business Rep. Frank Saxsenmeier.

Union power: Changing the way California works

"W"ealthy Californians are riding the crest of the new economy into a prosperous future. But millions of California workers are battling the undertow of part-time, low-wage, no-benefit jobs—and being held underwater with brutal tactics to deny their freedom to join a union."

With those words the California Labor Federation sounded labor’s battlecry for the current election year. Union members from all over California met in Anaheim July 17-18 for the Federation’s Convention 2000, where they laid battle plans for winning more organizing drives and electing more worker-friendly politicians.

California Gov. Gray Davis, who appeared in person, and Vice President Al Gore, who appeared by video linkup, pledged their support for labor’s goals and reaffirmed their belief in the right of workers to organize unions.

Delegates to the convention re-elected Federation Executive Sec.-Treasurer Art Pulaski and President Tom Rankin. Local 1245 Business Manager Jack McNally was re-elected as District 12 vice president.
Concord, Ca.
June 2, 2000

40 Years
 McCauley, Jim

35 Years
 Addcok, William E. Aldermen, G. M. Bradley, E. H. Davis, Tommy L. Evanson, Evan E. Rector, Ronald W. Slater, John G.

30 Years

25 Years

Webb, William Whitfield, Mary Ann Yuhre, Frank

20 Years
Union seeks protections for PG&E hydro workers
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employer.

• All bargaining unit employees in all departments assigned to the transferred entity would be allowed to move to the new employer, including hydro, general construction, water and technical employees.

• The new employer would enter into duplicate agreements for United Healthcare, DDS and VSP benefits.

• Applicable HMOs would be identified based on availability and participation.

• A new pension plan would be established with provisions identical to the existing plan with no break in credited service for affected employees, and funded at the same level as the utility plan, including the same future funding and actuarial liabilities.

• All other benefits, such as life insurance and LTD, would be identical.

• Affected employees not electing to move to the new employer would be offered their rights under the existing agreement, including Title 206 rights.

The successorship clause in the Local 1245-PGE labor agreement would also afford affected employees significant protections in the event that PG&E auctioned its hydro assets to non-PG&E entities, as it originally proposed to do last year. However, the scope of the protections could be subject to interpretation. Furthermore, when the current agreement term ed out, the union could find itself defending the existing terms and conditions in negotiations with a large number of new employers who may or may not have a constructive approach to bargaining.

That's why Local 1245—as a lead player in the Coalition of California Utility Employees (CUE)—has been working on the regulatory front to achieve a transfer of the hydro assets within PG&E Corp.

A “settlement agreement,” co-authored by CUE, PG&E and others, was submitted to the California Public Utilities Commission on Aug. 9.

“PG&E had earlier submitted an application to auction off these assets. We insisted that auctioning these plants was unacceptable,” said CUE attorney Marc Joseph.

“Any settlement with us had to keep hydro at PG&E or an affiliate. Our goal in these talks was to keep the system intact,” Joseph said.

The Aug. 9 settlement proposal would preserve the employee protections already agreed to by Local 1245 and PG&E by transferring the hydro assets to a new PG&E affiliate to be called Cal-Hydro.

Consumers would also benefit from the settlement. Under a 40-year agreement with California’s Independent System Operator (ISO), Cal-Hydro would generate power for a stated rate-of-return, rather than a market rate. This would offer California’s electric consumers a measure of protection against the sky-high rates that have recently battered the state’s wholesale electric market.

“The power would be dispatchable by the ISO to supply ancillary services, to fill in the gaps so other generators can’t exercise market power,” said Joseph.

It is not yet clear what action the CPUC will take in response to the settlement proposal. In addition to CUE and PG&E, the settlement is supported by The Utility Reform Network (TURN), the Agricultural Energy Consumers Association, and water districts in Sonoma and Tuolumne Counties. The settlement is opposed by the CPUC’s Office of Ratepayer Advocates and a coalition of environmental groups.

Notice regarding agency fee payers objection plan

Any employee who is not a member of the IB EW and who pays agency fees to IB EW Local 1245 pursuant to a union security provision in Local 1245’s collective bargaining agreement has the right to object to expenditures of fees for activities which are not reasonably related to collective bargaining or undertaken to advance the employment-related interests of employees represented by the Local. The agency fees paid by a fee payer who perfects an objection will be reduced by an amount reflecting the portion of the overall expenditures of the Local Union that are used for non-chargeable activities. Objections must be made annually and will be effective for a single calendar year. Each fee payer who wishes to file an objection with Local 1245 must do so in writing, addressed to the Business Manager, Local 1245, Post Office Box 4790, Walnut Creek, California 94596, by certified mail. In registering their objections, objectors must state their name and address and that they pay fees to this Local, and provide their nonmember identification number, if known, and their social security number. Objections must be postmarked during the month of November preceding the calendar year for which the objection will be in effect, or during the first thirty days after the objection commences paying fees to the Local Union as required by a collective bargaining agreement. Objections must be renewed annually, during the month of November.

Edwards, Dwyer & Mohr on staff

Arlene Edwards has been hired as a union business representative.

Edwards, the Clerical-at-Large representative on the Advisory Council, served on the union’s bargaining committee during General Negotiations with PG&E in 1999.

Her initial assignment will be to represent PG&E employees in the Sacramento area, including those in the Sacramento Call Center.

Ed Dwyer has been brought on staff to fill in temporarily behind Business Rep. Jim Lynn, who is on special assignment.

Like Edwards, Dwyer served on the union’s negotiating committee during the last round of General Bargaining with PG&E.

Dwyer will represent members at PG&E in Central California, from Clovis to Dinuba, including General Construction and tree trimming companies. Business Rep. Debbie Mazzanti will fill in behind Lynn at the Fresno Call Center.

Joy Mohr has been hired by Local 1245 as an Accounting Associate.

Mohr, who graduated from Heald Business College with degrees in Accounting and Computer Business Administration, worked in a Sacramento accounting office before coming to Local 1245.

Arlene, Ed and Joy: we welcome you to the Local 1245 staff!
Oakland, Ca.
May 19, 2000
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Fernandez, Rolf
Fielder, Larry W.
Forseiga, Welco E.
Garber, Bonita
Gary, Charles E.
Gehring, Lockey
Goldman, George, Jr.
Gray, Steven R.
Hall, Richard
Haed, Leonard L.
Henry, Walter
Hill, Michael
Jackson, Clifton

Johnson, David F.
Johnson, Ernest
Johnson, Samuel
Kay, James W.
Lane, Frank
Lillie, Don C.
Lopez, John L.
Marcum, Mark T.
Matthews, Joe
Mazur, Herb
McClendon, Lonnie
Meadows, James W.
Middletown, Pat A.
Montalban, Michael
Noltgrass, Marion
Pacheco, Alvin A.
Palmer, Arthur C.
Petersen, Duane F.
Reid, Edwin C., Jr.
Reyes, Romeo T..
Rucker, Mary M.
Sauer, Linda F.
Sexton, Gordon D.
Smith, Joseph
Thomas, Pamela
Thomas, Pauletta
Warren, William L.
Watkins, Kenneth
Williams, Maurice J.
Wilson, Elzen E.

Valdez, Eduardo T.
Wilcox, David
Wills, Sara L.
Wong, Ella
Wong, Gene W.
Yokoyama, Harry
Yuhre, Frank

20 Years
Affleck, Brian S.
Alvira, Angel L.
Armbruster, Martha
Ashworth, Glenn
Baker, Ivy J.
Blassa, Steve S.
Boeder, Steve
Buchanan, Robert B.
Burton, Shery L.
Caires, Timothy G.
Cano, Miguel Jr.
Carey, Patricia
Carroll, Patricia
Carter, Valerie J.
Cederquist, Jerry N.
Ching, Cecilia
Clifton, Jerome C.
Contaxis, Mary B.
Craig, Melvin L.
Cravinas, Emma J.
Cronin, Dennis P.
Davis, James D.
Davis, Patricia
Dea, Galen H.
Dominguez, Cornelio
Douglas, William E.
Drinkward, Peter C.
Estes, Alfonso III
Ferrera, Tanya L.
Figueroa, Ena
Garcia, Mauricio
Garcia, Ruth E.
Gutierrez, Dolores L.
Helsedle, Janice L.
Helsel, Diane
Hemmer, Charles D.
Hinck, Wallace
Holsen, John K.
Huey, June
Jackson, Joseph
Jackson, Lawrence
Johnson, William M.
Jones, Angela
Jones, Susan F.
Jones, Tina L.
Jordan, Albert D.
Jung, William
Kahler, Charles H.
Kimbrell, Mark
Kiyomura, Glenn H.
Klein, John P.
Knowlton, Monica L.
Latigue, Rosalind
Lombardo, Mary A.
Long, Robert E.
Low, Darcy E.

Orozco, Ernest R.
Patrick, Gazzaway III
Philips, David W.
Pittman, Nadina
Polen, James M.
Reed, Cynthia L.
Rodriguez, Trinidad
Russo, Thomas J.
Ryles, Harry R.
Silva, Henry H.
Silva, Jeffrey M.
Silva, Randall R.

Smith, Loretta L.
Silva, Jeffrey M.
Stage, William Jr.
Sueur, Gilberto
Tambunting, I.
Tancoco, Randolph
Valenzuela, Alfred J.
Veneracion T.
Vera, Jaime M.
Walker, Stephen R.
Wedge, James L.
Williams, Negra E.
Wilson, Linda J.

25 Years
Adiaso, Cornelio
Alder, Robert
Babbitt, Milton M.
Blake, Anthony B.
Calingo, Patricelli
Cantilier, Gloria
Chan, Ronald B.
Cristubal, Bernardino
Drew, Steven E.
Ferndandez, Robert
Fortier, Dorothy
Galang, Cesar
Hon, Harry
Hunter, Barry
Ig, Penny
Istria, Josefine
Jacobson, Donald
Lih, Elaine
Lee, Steven
Lemos, Darry
Martinez, Adrian P.
Mayes, D.
Mata, Erma
Monroe, Edgar L.
Nicodet, Teresa
Nunes, Frank Jr.
Paakkas, Donald F.
Page, Michael S.
Piquette, Leonadro
Robles, Victor
Rodriguez, Jose, A.
Tang, Jane
Tolliver, Adelaide

20 Years
Affleck, Brian S.
Alvira, Angel L.
Armbruster, Martha
Ashworth, Glenn
Baker, Ivy J.
Blassa, Steve S.
Boeder, Steve
Buchanan, Robert B.
Burton, Shery L.
Caires, Timothy G.
Cano, Miguel Jr.
Carey, Patricia
Carroll, Patricia
Carter, Valerie J.
Cederquist, Jerry N.
Ching, Cecilia
Clifton, Jerome C.
Contaxis, Mary B.
Craig, Melvin L.
Cravinas, Emma J.
Cronin, Dennis P.
Davis, James D.
Davis, Patricia
Dea, Galen H.
Dominguez, Cornelio
Douglas, William E.
Drinkward, Peter C.
Estes, Alfonso III
Ferrera, Tanya L.
Figueroa, Ena
Garcia, Mauricio
Garcia, Ruth E.
Gutierrez, Dolores L.
Helsel, Janice L.
Helsel, Diane
Hemmer, Charles D.
Hinck, Wallace
Holsen, John K.
Huey, June
Jackson, Joseph
Jackson, Lawrence
Johnson, William M.
Jones, Angela
Jones, Susan F.
Jones, Tina L.
Jordan, Albert D.
Jung, William
Kahler, Charles H.
Kimbrell, Mark
Kiyomura, Glenn H.
Klein, John P.
Knowlton, Monica L.
Latigue, Rosalind
Lombardo, Mary A.
Long, Robert E.
Low, Darcy E.

30 Years
Asbe, Gary
Beckman, Chris A.
Bergh, Eugene D.
Bizon, George
Blackburn, Gordon
Bonje, Virginia
Brightman, Thomas
Brown, Robert L.
Burns, Larry G.
Burton, Darrell
Canepiti, Ernest
Carder, George V.
Casteleducco, Peter
Char, Valerie
Collins, Carol
Culv witty, Walter
Cooper, Roger
Covarrubias, Arnold
Darby, Larry
Diasango, Jim
Dorado, Edward
Dyson, Morgan
Duckley, John M.
Fernandez, Rolf
Fielder, Larry W.
Forseiga, Welco E.
Garber, Bonita
Gary, Charles E.
Gehring, Lockey
Goldman, George, Jr.
Gray, Steven R.
Hall, Richard
Haed, Leonard L.
Henry, Walter
Hill, Michael
Jackson, Clifton

Johnson, David F.
Johnson, Ernest
Johnson, Samuel
Kay, James W.
Lane, Frank
Lillie, Don C.
Lopez, John L.
Marcum, Mark T.
Matthews, Joe
Mazur, Herb
McClendon, Lonnie
Meadows, James W.
Middletown, Pat A.
Montalban, Michael
Noltgrass, Marion
Pacheco, Alvin A.
Palmer, Arthur C.
Petersen, Duane F.
Reid, Edwin C., Jr.
Reyes, Romeo T..
Rucker, Mary M.
Sauer, Linda F.
Sexton, Gordon D.
Smith, Joseph
Thomas, Pamela
Thomas, Pauletta
Warren, William L.
Watkins, Kenneth
Williams, Maurice J.
Wilson, Elzen E.

Valdez, Eduardo T.
Wilcox, David
Wills, Sara L.
Wong, Ella
Wong, Gene W.
Yokoyama, Harry
Yuhre, Frank

20 Years
Affleck, Brian S.
Alvira, Angel L.
Armbruster, Martha
Ashworth, Glenn
Baker, Ivy J.
Blassa, Steve S.
Boeder, Steve
Buchanan, Robert B.
Burton, Shery L.
Caires, Timothy G.
Cano, Miguel Jr.
Carey, Patricia
Carroll, Patricia
Carter, Valerie J.
Cederquist, Jerry N.
Ching, Cecilia
Clifton, Jerome C.
Contaxis, Mary B.
Craig, Melvin L.
Cravinas, Emma J.
Cronin, Dennis P.
Davis, James D.
Davis, Patricia
Dea, Galen H.
Dominguez, Cornelio
Douglas, William E.
Drinkward, Peter C.
Estes, Alfonso III
Ferrera, Tanya L.
Figueroa, Ena
Garcia, Mauricio
Garcia, Ruth E.
Gutierrez, Dolores L.
Helsel, Janice L.
Helsel, Diane
Hemmer, Charles D.
Hinck, Wallace
Holsen, John K.
Huey, June
Jackson, Joseph
Jackson, Lawrence
Johnson, William M.
Jones, Angela
Jones, Susan F.
Jones, Tina L.
Jordan, Albert D.
Jung, William
Kahler, Charles H.
Kimbrell, Mark
Kiyomura, Glenn H.
Klein, John P.
Knowlton, Monica L.
Latigue, Rosalind
Lombardo, Mary A.
Long, Robert E.
Low, Darcy E.