
In lieu of flowers, the family has asked for donations to a college fund for Jim’s children. Checks payable to “Sue Lynn” can be sent to:

Sue Lynn
c/o IBEW 1245
P.O. Box 4790
Walnut Creek, CA 94596

Jim Lynn
1951-2002

Members hold key to beating Prop. D

Drawing on lessons learned from a similar campaign last year, Local 1245 mounted a full-scale effort against Proposition D, a ballot measure that would enable San Francisco to municipalize PG&E assets within the city.

“This proposition would devastate our membership,” said Business Manager Perry Zimmerman. “If San Francisco succeeded in taking over PG&E’s assets, job displacements would sweep across the whole PG&E system, and we’re not prepared to let that happen without a fight.”

The union won an early skirmish in the battle over the wording of the ballot measure, then began the laborious task of securing the endorsements of neighborhood groups and political clubs. By the end of September, the “No on D” campaign had won the backing of such influential groups as SPUR, the San Francisco Building and Construction Trades Council, and the Coalition of San Francisco Neighborhoods, as well as major politicians like Mayor Willie Brown and Senator Dianne Feinstein.

PG&E Negotiations

 Talks enter home stretch

With an Oct. 15 deadline fast approaching, negotiators for Local 1245 and Pacific Gas and Electric prepared to begin work on the major economic issues beginning Oct. 4.

Chief among the economic issues are pension, Long-Term Disability (LTD), Medical/Dental/Vision, post-retirement medical, general wage increase, high cost of living, severance and Title 206/306/19 issues. Another significant issue to be decided is the term of the agreement. “In general, the company is seeking concessions from the union on LTD and Medical/Dental/Vision, while the union is seeking improvements in post-retirement medical and the pension,” said Assistant Business Manager Bob Choate, who leads the union’s negotiating committee.

“Because of our interest in improvements in several areas, we’re exploring every possible option with respect to LTD and Medical/Dental/Vision that will achieve savings for the company without harming our mem-

Sierra talks will open this month

Local 1245 and Sierra Pacific Power Co. plan to open general bargaining Oct. 14.

The union and company both floated proposals over the summer to limit the scope of bargaining in light of the company’s pressing financial problems.

The company had expressed interest in a one-year wages-only agreement. The union responded with a proposal to open bargaining for a two-year agreement that would address wages, successorship and job security issues.

In the absence of a counter-proposal from the company, bargaining will begin this month with no limitation on subject matter.
Jim Lynn: Exceptional rep, exceptional man

By Perry Zimmerman, Business Manager

As a Business Rep, Jim Lynn had it all. At his funeral, his children spoke of Jim as a family man, and the players from the softball team he coached spoke of Jim as a coach and team leader. Let me tell you about Jim at work, and about what made him such an exceptionally talented Business Rep for Local 1245.

Jim was a unionist; he was deeply committed to the labor movement and its goals. He believed that only through collective bargaining can workers have an effective voice. He believed in unions. Jim cared deeply about our members, and the members knew it. Everybody who comes to work for a union cares about the members, but it’s easy to get jaded—researching, negotiating. These skills seemed to come naturally to Jim. He used an awesome sense of humor to reduce tension, disarming critics, deescalating tension, and proving a point. Whether Jim had just convinced the Review Committee to take one of his cases to arbitration or had just told an employee that he had agreed to their termination, members always knew that Jim cared.

Jim studied the collective bargaining agreements that he worked with. He had strong technical skills when it came to contract interpretation, grievance resolution, and negotiating. These skills seemed to come easily to Jim, but in truth he worked hard to sharpen his skills—researching issues, tracking down past practice. He took his job as an advocate very seriously, and part of that advocacy was a firm grasp of the contract. Jim had a way with employers. As one PG&E manager who dealt with Jim extensively said after his death, Jim was “firm in conviction yet pleasant in manner.” He used his sense of humor to reduce tension, and then effectively and honestly argued his position. If the facts did not support Jim, if the contract language did not support Jim, he backed down. If the facts and the contract language supported Jim, there was no stopping him. Employers respected and liked working with Jim. Because of this, he got results.

Jim was curious. He never stopped learning. He bought and devoured books about negotiating techniques and styles. He read everything that he could get his hands on about collective bargaining and grievance handling. At lunch, on a long ride, or between meetings at the union hall he picked your brain. He had a voracious appetite for learning.

Jim liked and was liked by other staff members. He was a rep’s rep. He paid close attention to relationships on staff, always building and never burning bridges. Reps knew they could count on Jim, and Jim knew that he could count on them.

Jim thought about the future. Jim identified more participants for our “The Future is Now” training sessions for potential business reps than anybody else on staff. As he worked, he always had an eye out for those who could do the work tomorrow.

Our members in California Gas Transmission, Gas Transmission Northwest, Stockton, and Fresno who knew Jim were privileged. Jim’s family lost a great family man. Jim’s team lost a great coach. Local 1245 lost a truly great rep.
Davey pact improves wages, protects seniority

Local 1245 members at Davey Tree Surgery Co. on Aug. 30 approved a new two-and-a-half year labor agreement. The agreement, approved by 90% of those voting, calls for a 3.8% general wage increase in 2002, and future wage increases based on the most recent June Employment Cost index. Based on this index, it is already known that the wage increase for 2003 will be 3.6% for those members who trigger wage increases prior to August 2003, according to Senior Business Rep. Ray Thomas. The pension contribution made by the company to the member increases from 2% to 3% of all hours worked effective next Jan. 1.

"This pension increase is long overdue, and is an offset to the employee medical contribution," Thomas said. Another union gain was the union seniority clause for employee retention. When Davey assumes the contract area of another tree company that is signatory to a contract with Local 1245, Davey will retain this company’s employees by their Local 1245 union seniority.

"This is a big step in the right direction because in the past the tree companies could retain who they wished to retain with no consideration of union seniority," Thomas said.

Negotiating for the union were Bernardo Martinez, Gil Suarez, Rod Danyuer, and Darrell Buzzard (who has since left the company to become an apprentice Carpenter), along with Thomas and Business Rep. Junior Ornelas.

Transmission line clearance

Davey Foreman Joe Link is shown here performing line clearance operations on interior live oak trees on a 60 KV line off Henderson Road in Redding, Ca. in July.

Link and Top Climber Mike Malloy (not shown) exercised the necessary precautions as these trees were in direct contact with the 60 KV lines.

When they’re not working on 60 KV lines, Davey Transmission employees keep the 115 and 230 KV lines clear of encroaching branches and hazard trees.

The job wasn’t made any easier by the North Valley summer weather, which saw temperatures nearing 120 degrees.

A two-year apprenticeship is required to become Top Climber, with another 12 months to become a Top Foreman. In addition to the apprenticeship, Link and North Valley co-worker Robert Bodner volunteered for the week-long Davey Tree Climbing School, which offers training in climbing techniques, roping and rigging, and related arboricultural training.

PG&E bargaining enters home stretch

From Page 1

ers in the future," Choate said.

In the area of post-retirement medical, the union is exploring how to improve some of the lower cost plans for retirees to give them better options.

Intense effort has gone into looking for ways to mitigate the cap on company contributions to post-retirement medical premiums. Options being looked at include balancing the burden more fairly between retirees who are over 65 and those who are under, and creating mechanisms for offsetting the prices that retirees have to pay for prescription drugs.

"We are pleased that there has been a collaborative and creative approach to bargaining up to this point," said Senior Assistant Business Manager Tom Dalzell. "That has set a good tone for the very difficult work that still remains."

As is always the case in bargaining, it is extremely difficult to predict which proposals will survive the final hectic days of negotiations, when so much is on the table and both parties' highest priorities come to the fore.

"Talking about day-to-day progress at the bargaining table is risky, because people's expectations may get tied to the direction we're headed," said Business Manager Perry Zimmerman. "That way members will already be acquainted with some of the main ideas when the final package is completed."

The union and company remain committed to an Oct. 15 deadline for wrapping up bargaining. The package will be published in the Utility Reporter and explained in detail at November unit meetings, with a mailballot ratification being counted sometime in December.

Bargaining updates:

PG&E Intranet: wwwhr/ibew
Internet: www.ibew1245.com
Preserving union jobs in an era ofchanging technology

Technology has changed the American workplace with dizzying speed, giving rise to new work processes requiring new skills.

Unfortunately, new technologies can give employers an opportunity to steer work away from Local 1245 members by creating new job classifications not covered by our labor agreements.

On Sept. 5, Local 1245 brought together union members from several public sector employers to explore the effects of changing technology on our jobs and to map out strategies for improving job security.

Senior Assistant Business Manager Tom Dalzell outlined some of the threats:
• Management doing our work.
• Work going to outside contractors.
• Other bargaining units performing our work.
• Increased reliance on warranties and extended warranties to perform work that should belong to our members.

Convergence of technologies can also erode our jobs. Video, phone, and data, for example, have evolved from distinct technologies into overlapping systems.

“You go into a switching closet and you find three people from three different bargaining units all trying to plug their stuff in,” said Business Rep. Lynne Morel.

“We’re trying to be more proactive and be aware of the movement of technology and the work and make sure we don’t just give that work away,” explained Assistant Business Manager Dennis Seyfer.

Members supplied examples of job erosion in their own workplaces.

Jerry Heitman, a Senior Telecom Tech at the Sacramento Municipal Utility District, noted that management in some cases may not want to train unionized employees to do new work because the employer already has people on the property who can do the work. “And it just so happens they’re not represented by a union,” said Heitman.

John Hendry, a Telecom Electrician at the City of Oakland, expressed frustration with employers who don’t take full advantage of new technologies to improve service to customers. Failure to keep up with these changes, he said, can drive customers away and ultimately threaten jobs.

Members identified several strategies for dealing with the challenges posed by technological changes in the workplace:
• Follow up on grievances and arbitrations.
• Exercise the meet and confer process where these changes are taking place.
• Settle intra-union disputes.
• Utilize resources available through IBEW headquarters in Washington DC.
• Organize information technology groups into our union.
Members of Local 1245 on Sept. 12 ratified a new four-year Memorandum of Understanding with the City of Redding Electric Department, Business Rep. Jack Osburn reported.


The agreement also provides:
- 6.5% equity adjustment for the warehouse leadman.
- Pay differential increase for troubleshooters to 5% over linemen.
- Pay differential increase for working foreman to 10% over journeymen.
- Working foreman wage increased 10% when in charge of large crew.

The agreement also establishes 3.5% and 5% shift differential pay for power plant operations work.

In addition, utility arborists receive a 2% wage adjustment for obtaining an ISA Arborist Certificate.

The pact increases meal allowances. It also requires the city to pay costs to meet the DMV commercial license requirement.

Effective July 2003 the pact increases the medical individual deductible from $100 to $200 and caps individual deductibles to three per family per calendar year. It decreases city co-payments to 70% for non-use of PPO if a PPO is available, eliminates the next year carryover provision when maximum out of pocket is met in previous year, and increases vision care deductible to $25.

Under the agreement, employees now must be in paid status before and after funeral leave and jury duty to be paid. The pact provides for reduced notice of shift change for certain power plant classifications.

The agreement provides a re-opener provision for PERS retirement enhancements, and establishes a voluntary VantageCare Retiree Health Savings Plan for banking sick leave sell back and other qualified paid time to fund future retiree medical needs.


PG&E open enrollment

The 2003 Open Enrollment period for Local 1245 members at PG&E is Oct. 28 - Nov. 8, and Oct. 14-25 for retired members.

During Open Enrollment, members can make changes to their union-negotiated health plans for 2003. This is also the time to drop dependents who are no longer eligible for coverage.

Active employees can enroll online or call the HR Service Center’s automated phone system to make changes. All changes will be effective Jan. 1, 2003.

Open Enrollment packages will be mailed out a few days before Open Enrollment begins.

Notice regarding agency fee payers objection plan

Any employee who is not a member of the IBEW and who pays agency fees to IBEW 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 objector commences paying fees to the Local Union as required by a collective bargaining agreement. Objections must be renewed annually, during the month of November.
**WORKING FAMILIES**

**COMPARE THE CANDIDATES**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Gray Davis</th>
<th>Bill Simon</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>DAILY OVERTIME</strong></td>
<td>Davis signed the law that assures workers premium pay for working over 8 hours in a day. AB 60</td>
<td>Simon says he would <strong>eliminate</strong> daily overtime pay. San Francisco Chronicle, 4/18/02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PAID FAMILY LEAVE</strong></td>
<td>Davis signed first-in-the-nation law providing for paid family leave. SB 1661</td>
<td>Simon opposes paid family leave. He even opposes unpaid family leave. <a href="http://www.simonforgovernor.com">www.simonforgovernor.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE</strong></td>
<td>Davis signed the law that raised Unemployment Insurance benefits. SB 40</td>
<td>Simon says he would &quot;roll back&quot; Unemployment benefits. <a href="http://www.simonforgovernor.com">www.simonforgovernor.com</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WORKPLACE SAFETY</strong></td>
<td>Davis signed legislation to penalize anti-worker employers who cause job injuries. AB 1127</td>
<td>Simon would loosen workplace safety laws to &quot;ease the burden&quot; on employers. Speech 4/17/02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HEALTH CARE</strong></td>
<td>Davis expanded participation in the California Healthy Families Program by 800%. L.A. Times 1/27/02</td>
<td>Simon opposes expansion of the California Healthy Families Program. Speech 4/2/02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>WORKERS COMPENSATION</strong></td>
<td>Davis signed the law that increased Workers Comp. pay for injured workers. AB 749</td>
<td>Simon said he would veto our Workers Compensation bill. AB 749</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>HMO REFORM</strong></td>
<td>Davis has signed 21 health care bills to make HMOs more accountable. San Jose Mercury 8/16/00</td>
<td>Simon opposes reforms that would increase HMO accountability. Speech 4/2/02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Gov. Davis delivered for working families.**

**Don’t let Bill Simon roll back these gains.**

**Vote Gray Davis for Governor**

*Still haven’t made up your mind? Please see Page 36.*
Dear Member,

A small group of people have a very large influence on our quality of life and rights on the job. Those people are the members of the California Legislature. In the pages that follow, Local 1245 profiles the candidates for California Assembly and State Senate to provide you with objective information about the candidates.

Over the past two years, the California Legislature has taken action to improve Workers Compensation and Unemployment Insurance benefits. The Legislature has also passed bills affecting our rights in the workplace, including a bill to prevent employers from retaliating against employees who use Family Sick Leave, and a bill to prohibit secret monitoring in the workplace. Some legislators stood with us on these issues, and some legislators told us to take a hike.

Your union is not going to tell you how to vote. That's your decision to make, not ours. The following pages are designed to show you what we have found out about the candidates so that you can make an informed decision.

Exercise your rights. Register to vote in California by October 21st and vote on November 5th.

Perry Zimmerman
Business Manager
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Each year 800,000 California workers suffer a workplace injury or illness. One hundred fifty thousand injured workers file for temporary disability and 130,000 file for permanent disability under the Workers Compensation system—the sole remedy for workplace injuries.

Unlike victims of non-industrial accidents, injured workers are prohibited from suing. That's what makes it so important that the state operate a fair and just system of Workers Compensation.

According to the RAND Institute for Civil Justice report, Compensating Permanent Workplace Injuries, all injured workers experience significant wage loss.

For most permanently injured workers in California, the maximum weekly benefit has been frozen for 18 years. In fact, California's benefits rank among the lowest in the nation. Most injured workers with limited partial permanent disability ratings end up losing 30% of their wages, yet benefits replace only 12%.

Improving compensation for injured workers

Each year 800,000 California workers suffer a workplace injury or illness. One hundred fifty thousand injured workers file for temporary disability and 130,000 file for permanent disability under the Workers Compensation system—the sole remedy for workplace injuries.

Unlike victims of non-industrial accidents, injured workers are prohibited from suing. That’s what makes it so important that the state operate a fair and just system of Workers Compensation.

According to the RAND Institute for Civil Justice report, Compensating Permanent Workplace Injuries, all injured workers experience significant wage loss.

For most permanently injured workers in California, the maximum weekly benefit has been frozen for 18 years. In fact, California’s benefits rank among the lowest in the nation. Most injured workers with limited partial permanent disability ratings end up losing 30% of their wages, yet benefits replace only 12%.

Key Vote: AB 749

AB 749, signed into law by Gov. Davis this year, provides $2.4 billion in long overdue benefit increases for injured workers.

Not only does the bill specify increases for temporary disability and permanent total disability benefits, it provides for a cost of living “COLA” for temporary total disability and permanent total disability benefits.

The measure passed the Assembly on Feb. 4, 2002 by a vote of 45-29. The measure passed the Senate on Feb. 4, 2002 by a vote of 23-14.

Every worker is just an injury away from economic hardship. Check out the following pages to find out where the candidates in your Assembly and state Senate districts stand on Workers Compensation improvements.

Prohibiting secret monitoring

Personal privacy is highly valued by most people, but privacy is increasingly hard to come by in a world where government and corporations have ever-more sophisticated methods for “keeping track” of individuals.

The advent of e-mail has given employees increased opportunities for communications, but it has also given employers new ways to keep tabs on employees and their private affairs. To help safeguard employees against “electronic eavesdropping” by their employers, the Legislature enacted SB 147, which prohibits an employer from secretly monitoring the electronic mail or other computer records generated by an employee.

The bill requires an employer who intends to inspect employee electronic mail to distribute to all employees the employer’s workplace privacy and electronic monitoring policies and practices.

Californians enjoy a constitutionally-protected right to privacy. This bill helps give substance to that right by forbidding the demeaning practice of secret monitoring in the workplace. The measure passed the Assembly on Aug. 30, 2001 by a vote of 44-28. The measure passed the Senate on June 4, 2001 by a vote of 25-14.

How did your legislators vote? See the following pages to find out.

Key Vote: SB 147

Preventing employers from thwarting family sick leave

WHEN IS A BENEFIT NOT A BENEFIT?

When your employer can punish you for using it.

The sad fact is that California’s family sick leave law provides employees a benefit that some employers are intent on taking away through “absence control” policies. Sick leave days are granted for care for a child, parent, or spouse as an absence which may lead to discipline.

SB 1197 was passed by the Legislature to prevent employers from robbing employees of this legislated benefit. SB 1197 provides that “absence control” policies that thwart the state’s family sick leave law are illegal, and employers working under such an absence control policy are entitled to appropriate legal and equitable relief.

Key Vote: SB 1197
**Issues**

What's At Stake for Working Families?

**Strengthening job-loss safety net**

California’s Unemployment Insurance benefits fall behind benefits paid to workers in 45 other states.

The current system provides for a 39% wage replacement rate, not to exceed $230 per week. But the average replacement rate was just 23% in 1999, the worst in the nation.

The federal Advisory Council on Unemployment Insurance recommends that states establish a 50% replacement rate for most workers.

High earnings requirements and delays counting earnings toward eligibility hinder workers’ ability to receive benefits. Due to various reasons, only 41% of the unemployed in California receive benefits.

SB40 begins to address this serious problem by increasing maximum weekly Unemployment Insurance benefits. It requires the Employment Development Department to conduct a study regarding eligibility for unemployment insurance benefits and an alternative base period. It also qualifies specified part-time employees for benefits.

Specifically, the bill increases the maximum weekly benefit from 39% of claimant’s average weekly wage, not to exceed $230, to the following:

- For new claims filed prior to Jan. 1, 2003: 45% of claimant’s average weekly wage, not to exceed $330.
- For new claims filed on or after Jan. 1, 2003: 50% of average weekly wage, not to exceed $370.
- For new claims filed on or after Jan. 1, 2004 and before Jan. 1, 2005: 50% of average weekly wage, not to exceed $410.
- For new claims filed on or after Jan. 1, 2005: 50% of claimant’s average weekly wage, not to exceed $450.


Most workers experience a period of unemployment sometime in their lives. It could happen to you.

Do the candidates in your Assembly and Senate districts favor improved benefits for the unemployed? Find out on the following pages.

**Defending California against price gouging**

Runaway wholesale electric prices looted California in 2000-2001, robbing the state of its budget surplus and driving PG&E into bankruptcy.

This crisis made it very clear that California made a huge blunder with its deregulation scheme. By forcing regulated utilities to give up power production, the state gave up control over both the supply of electricity and its cost.

Getting a handle on the crisis proved anything but easy. However, the Legislature did move quickly to address a root cause of the crisis: lack of any meaningful public control over the state’s power supply. While Gov. Davis was rightly besieging federal regulators to step in and cap wholesale electric prices, the state legislature acted to reassert some measure of state control over power supplies by passing SB 6X, creating the California Consumer Power and Conservation Financing Authority.

The Legislature gave this new agency the authority to construct power plants on its own or in cooperation with utilities, as well as the authority to finance improvements in energy efficiency.

Whether this agency is pressed into service to build power plants depends on several other issues, including the future role of federal price caps, the resolution of PG&E’s bankruptcy case, and the extent to which the private sector builds new power plants. While the danger of blackouts appears to have abated, there are already signs that power plant construction is not keeping up with the projected growth in demand over the next few years.

If California determines that the market cannot or will not meet the state’s energy requirements, SB 6X gives state authorities the means to develop the needed resources.

Legislators who voted against SB 6X apparently felt it was OK to leave California consumers to the mercies of the marketplace. Those voting in favor of SB 6X understood that this new agency provides California with important leverage in taming a still-dangerous and unpredictable electric marketplace.

The measure passed the Assembly on April 26, 2001 by a vote of 48-28. The measure passed the Senate on May 3, 2001 by a vote of 24-14.

How did your legislator vote?

**Are candidates' answers credible?**

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—or on follow-up personal e-mail correspondence. Are they giving honest answers, or merely telling us what they think we 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.
Hold Your State Senators Accountable!

* Locate Your State Senate District.
* Find Out Where Candidates Stand.
* Vote on November 5th!
Where Do the Candidates Stand?

### District 2

**Incumbent**

**Wes Chesbro**

- Increase Workers Compensation (AB 749)
- Chesbro For Working People
- Increase Unemployment Insurance (SB 40)
- Chesbro For Working People
- California Power Authority/Fight the Gougers (SB 6X)
- Chesbro For Working People
- Family Sick Leave/No Retaliation (SB 1197)
- Chesbro For Working People
- Privacy/Employee Computer Records (SB 147)
- Chesbro For Working People

**Challenger**

**Peggy Redfearn**

- Increase Workers Compensation (AB 749)
- Redfearn Against Working People
- Increase Unemployment Insurance (SB 40)
- Redfearn Against Working People
- California Power Authority/Fight the Gougers (SB 6X)
- Redfearn Against Working People
- Family Sick Leave/No Retaliation (SB 1197)
- Redfearn For Working People
- Privacy/Employee Computer Records (SB 147)
- Redfearn Against Working People

### District 4

**Incumbent**

**Sam Aanestad**

- Increase Workers Compensation (AB 749)
- Aanestad Against Working People
- Increase Unemployment Insurance (SB 40)
- Aanestad Against Working People
- California Power Authority/Fight the Gougers (SB 6X)
- Aanestad Against Working People
- Family Sick Leave/No Retaliation (SB 1197)
- Aanestad Against Working People
- Privacy/Employee Computer Records (SB 147)
- Aanestad Against Working People

**Challenger**

**Marianne Bopp Smith**

- Increase Workers Compensation (AB 749)
- Bopp Smith For Working People
- Increase Unemployment Insurance (SB 40)
- Bopp Smith For Working People
- California Power Authority/Fight the Gougers (SB 6X)
- Bopp Smith For Working People
- Family Sick Leave/No Retaliation (SB 1197)
- Bopp Smith For Working People
- Privacy/Employee Computer Records (SB 147)
- Bopp Smith For Working People

### District 6

**Incumbent**

**Deborah Ortiz**

- Increase Workers Compensation (AB 749)
- Ortiz For Working People
- Increase Unemployment Insurance (SB 40)
- Ortiz For Working People
- California Power Authority/Fight the Gougers (SB 6X)
- Ortiz For Working People
- Family Sick Leave/No Retaliation (SB 1197)
- Ortiz For Working People
- Privacy/Employee Computer Records (SB 147)
- Ortiz For Working People

**Challenger**

**No major party opponent**

*October 2002*
Issues
Where Do the Candidates Stand?

Incumbent

District 8
California Senate
San Francisco and parts of San Mateo Counties (See page 10)

Jackie Speier
Increase Workers Compensation (AB 749)
Speier For Working People
Increase Unemployment Insurance (SB 40)
Speier For Working People
California Power Authority/Fight the Gougers (SB 6X)
Speier For Working People
Family Sick Leave/No Retaliation (SB 1197)
Speier For Working People
Privacy/Employee Computer Records (SB 147)
Speier For Working People

Challenger

Dennis Zell
Increase Workers Compensation (AB 749)
Increase Unemployment Insurance (SB 40)
California Power Authority/Fight the Gougers (SB 6X)
Family Sick Leave/No Retaliation (SB 1197)
Privacy/Employee Computer Records (SB 147)

Incumbent

District 10
California Senate
Parts of Alameda and Santa Clara Counties (See page 10)

Liz Figueroa
Increase Workers Compensation (AB 749)
Figueroa For Working People
Increase Unemployment Insurance (SB 40)
Figueroa For Working People
California Power Authority/Fight the Gougers (SB 6X)
Figueroa For Working People
Family Sick Leave/No Retaliation (SB 1197)
Figueroa For Working People
Privacy/Employee Computer Records (SB 147)
Figueroa For Working People

Challenger

James Gunther*
Increase Workers Compensation (AB 749)
Gunther Against Working People
Increase Unemployment Insurance (SB 40)
Gunther Against Working People
California Power Authority/Fight the Gougers (SB 6X)
Did Not Respond
Family Sick Leave/No Retaliation (SB 1197)
Gunther Against Working People
Privacy/Employee Computer Records (SB 147)
Gunther For Working People

(No Incumbent)

District 12
California Senate
Merced, San Benito, and parts of Madera, Monterey, Stanislaus County (See page 10)

Rusty Areias
Increase Workers Compensation (AB 749)
Areias For Working People
Increase Unemployment Insurance (SB 40)
Areias For Working People
California Power Authority/Fight the Gougers (SB 6X)
Areias For Working People
Family Sick Leave/No Retaliation (SB 1197)
Areias For Working People
Privacy/Employee Computer Records (SB 147)
Areias For Working People

(No Incumbent)

Jeff Denham
Increase Workers Compensation (AB 749)
Increase Unemployment Insurance (SB 40)
California Power Authority/Fight the Gougers (SB 6X)
Family Sick Leave/No Retaliation (SB 1197)
Privacy/Employee Computer Records (SB 147)

*Refused to Take a Stand

No Photo Available

Refused to Take a Stand
Issues Where Do the Candidates Stand?

**District 14 California Senate**
Mariposa, Tuolumne, and parts of Fresno, Madera, San Joaquin and Stanislaus Counties (See page 10)

**Incumbent**
Charles Poochigian

- Increase Workers Compensation (AB 749)  
  Poochigian Against Working People
- Increase Unemployment Insurance (SB 40)  
  Poochigian Against Working People
- California Power Authority/Fight the Gougers (SB 6X)  
  Poochigian Against Working People
- Family Sick Leave/No Retaliation (SB 1197)  
  Poochigian Against Working People
- Privacy/Employee Computer Records (SB 147)  
  Poochigian Against Working People

**Challenger**
No major party opponent

**District 16 California Senate**
Kings and parts of Fresno, Kern & Tulare Counties (See page 10)

**Incumbent**
(No Incumbent)

**Challenger**
Blair Knox

- Increase Workers Compensation (AB 749)  
  No major party opponent
- Increase Unemployment Insurance (SB 40)  
  No major party opponent
- California Power Authority/Fight the Gougers (SB 6X)  
  No major party opponent
- Family Sick Leave/No Retaliation (SB 1197)  
  No major party opponent
- Privacy/Employee Computer Records (SB 147)  
  No major party opponent

**District 18 California Senate**
Inyo and parts of Kern, San Bernardino & Tulare (See page 10)

**Incumbent**
(No Incumbent)

**Challenger**
Roy Ashburn

- Increase Workers Compensation (AB 749)  
  Ashburn Against Working People
- Increase Unemployment Insurance (SB 40)  
  Ashburn Against Working People
- California Power Authority/Fight the Gougers (SB 6X)  
  Ashburn Against Working People
- Family Sick Leave/No Retaliation (SB 1197)  
  Ashburn Against Working People
- Privacy/Employee Computer Records (SB 147)  
  Ashburn Against Working People

**Incumbent**
No major party opponent
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Hold Your Assembly Members Accountable!

★ Locate Your Assembly District.
★ Find Out Where Candidates Stand.
★ Vote on November 5th!
Issues Where Do the Candidates Stand?

**District 1 California Assembly**
Del Norte, Humboldt, Lake, Mendocino, Trinity and parts of Sonoma Counties (See page 14)

- (No Incumbent)
  - Patty Berg
  - Increase Workers Compensation (AB 749)
  - Berg For Working People
  - Increase Unemployment Insurance (SB 40)
  - Berg For Working People
  - California Power Authority/Fight the Gougers (SB 6X)
  - Berg For Working People
  - Family Sick Leave/No Retaliation (SB 1197)
  - Berg For Working People
  - Privacy/Employee Computer Records (SB 147)
  - Berg For Working People

- (No Incumbent)
  - Robert Brown
  - Increase Workers Compensation (AB 749)
  - Increase Unemployment Insurance (SB 40)
  - California Power Authority/Fight the Gougers (SB 6X)
  - Family Sick Leave/No Retaliation (SB 1197)
  - Privacy/Employee Computer Records (SB 147)

**District 2 California Assembly**
Colusa, Glenn, Modoc, Shasta, Siskiyou, Sutter, Tehama & parts of Butte & Yolo Counties (See page 14)

- (No Incumbent)
  - Doug La Malfa
  - Increase Workers Compensation (AB 749)
  - Increase Unemployment Insurance (SB 40)
  - California Power Authority/Fight the Gougers (SB 6X)
  - Family Sick Leave/No Retaliation (SB 1197)
  - Privacy/Employee Computer Records (SB 147)

- (No Incumbent)
  - Doug Kinyon
  - Increase Workers Compensation (AB 749)
  - Kinyon For Working People
  - Increase Unemployment Insurance (SB 40)
  - Kinyon For Working People
  - California Power Authority/Fight the Gougers (SB 6X)
  - Kinyon For Working People
  - Family Sick Leave/No Retaliation (SB 1197)
  - Kinyon For Working People
  - Privacy/Employee Computer Records (SB 147)
  - Kinyon For Working People

**District 3 California Assembly**
Lassen, Nevada, Plumas, Sierra, Yuba & parts of Butte and Placer Counties (See page 14)

- (No Incumbent)
  - Stuart King
  - Increase Workers Compensation (AB 749)
  - King For Working People
  - Increase Unemployment Insurance (SB 40)
  - King For Working People
  - California Power Authority/Fight the Gougers (SB 6X)
  - King For Working People
  - Family Sick Leave/No Retaliation (SB 1197)
  - King For Working People
  - Privacy/Employee Computer Records (SB 147)
  - King For Working People

- (No Incumbent)
  - Rick Keene
  - Increase Workers Compensation (AB 749)
  - Increase Unemployment Insurance (SB 40)
  - California Power Authority/Fight the Gougers (SB 6X)
  - Family Sick Leave/No Retaliation (SB 1197)
  - Privacy/Employee Computer Records (SB 147)
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Issues
Where Do the Candidates Stand?

Incumbent

Tim Leslie

- Increase Workers Compensation (AB 749)
- Leslie Against Working People
- Increase Unemployment Insurance (SB 40)
- Leslie Against Working People
- California Power Authority/Fight the Gougers (SB 6X)
- Leslie Against Working People
- Family Sick Leave/No Retaliation (SB 1197)
- Leslie Against Working People
- Privacy/Employee Computer Records (SB 147)
- Leslie Against Working People

Challenger

Scott Warren

- Increase Workers Compensation (AB 749)
- Warren For Working People
- Increase Unemployment Insurance (SB 40)
- Warren For Working People
- California Power Authority/Fight the Gougers (SB 6X)
- Warren For Working People
- Family Sick Leave/No Retaliation (SB 1197)
- Warren For Working People
- Privacy/Employee Computer Records (SB 147)
- Warren For Working People

Incumbent

Dave Cox

- Increase Workers Compensation (AB 749)
- Cox Against Working People
- Increase Unemployment Insurance (SB 40)
- Cox Against Working People
- California Power Authority/Fight the Gougers (SB 6X)
- Cox Against Working People
- Family Sick Leave/No Retaliation (SB 1197)
- Cox Against Working People
- Privacy/Employee Computer Records (SB 147)
- Cox Against Working People

Challenger

Eric Ulis

- Increase Workers Compensation (AB 749)
- Ulis For Working People
- Increase Unemployment Insurance (SB 40)
- Ulis For Working People
- California Power Authority/Fight the Gougers (SB 6X)
- Ulis For Working People
- Family Sick Leave/No Retaliation (SB 1197)
- Ulis For Working People
- Privacy/Employee Computer Records (SB 147)
- Ulis For Working People

Incumbent

Joe Nation

- Increase Workers Compensation (AB 749)
- Nation For Working People
- Increase Unemployment Insurance (SB 40)
- Nation For Working People
- California Power Authority/Fight the Gougers (SB 6X)
- Nation For Working People
- Family Sick Leave/No Retaliation (SB 1197)
- Nation For Working People
- Privacy/Employee Computer Records (SB 147)
- Nation For Working People

Challenger

Kenneth Hitt

- Increase Workers Compensation (AB 749)
- Hitt For Working People
- Increase Unemployment Insurance (SB 40)
- Hitt For Working People
- California Power Authority/Fight the Gougers (SB 6X)
- Hitt For Working People
- Family Sick Leave/No Retaliation (SB 1197)
- Hitt For Working People
- Privacy/Employee Computer Records (SB 147)
- Hitt For Working People
Issues

Where Do the Candidates Stand?

Incumbent

Patricia Wiggins

- Increase Workers Compensation (AB 749)
  Wiggins For Working People

- Increase Unemployment Insurance (SB 40)
  Wiggins For Working People

- California Power Authority/Fight the Gougers (SB 6X)
  Wiggins For Working People

- Family Sick Leave/No Retaliation (SB 1197)
  Wiggins For Working People

- Privacy/Employee Computer Records (SB 147)
  Wiggins For Working People

District 7
California Assembly

Napa and parts of Solano & Sonoma Counties (See page 14)

Challenger

No major party opponent

(No Incumbent)

Lois Wolk

- Increase Workers Compensation (AB 749)
  Wolk For Working People

- Increase Unemployment Insurance (SB 40)
  Wolk For Working People

- California Power Authority/Fight the Gougers (SB 6X)
  Wolk For Working People

- Family Sick Leave/No Retaliation (SB 1197)
  Wolk For Working People

- Privacy/Employee Computer Records (SB 147)
  Wolk For Working People

District 8
California Assembly

Parts of Solano & Yolo Counties (See page 14)

(No Incumbent)

John Munn

- Increase Workers Compensation (AB 749)

- Increase Unemployment Insurance (SB 40)

- California Power Authority/Fight the Gougers (SB 6X)

- Family Sick Leave/No Retaliation (SB 1197)

- Privacy/Employee Computer Records (SB 147)

Incumbent

Darrell Steinberg

- Increase Workers Compensation (AB 749)
  Steinberg For Working People

- Increase Unemployment Insurance (SB 40)
  Steinberg For Working People

- California Power Authority/Fight the Gougers (SB 6X)
  Steinberg For Working People

- Family Sick Leave/No Retaliation (SB 1197)
  Steinberg For Working People

- Privacy/Employee Computer Records (SB 147)
  Steinberg For Working People

District 9
California Assembly

Parts of Sacramento Counties (See page 14)

Challenger

David Pegos

- Increase Workers Compensation (AB 749)

- Increase Unemployment Insurance (SB 40)

- California Power Authority/Fight the Gougers (SB 6X)

- Family Sick Leave/No Retaliation (SB 1197)

- Privacy/Employee Computer Records (SB 147)
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### Issues

**Where Do the Candidates Stand?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District 10</th>
<th>California Assembly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>(No Incumbent)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Katherine Maestas</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Increase Workers Compensation (AB 749)</td>
<td>Maestas For Working People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Increase Unemployment Insurance (SB 40)</td>
<td>Maestas For Working People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- California Power Authority/Fight the Gougers (SB 6X)</td>
<td>Maestas For Working People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Family Sick Leave/No Retaliation (SB 1197)</td>
<td>Maestas For Working People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Privacy/Employee Computer Records (SB 147)</td>
<td>Maestas For Working People</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Alan Nakanishi** |          |
| - Increase Workers Compensation (AB 749) | |
| - Increase Unemployment Insurance (SB 40) | |
| - California Power Authority/Fight the Gougers (SB 6X) | |
| - Family Sick Leave/No Retaliation (SB 1197) | |
| - Privacy/Employee Computer Records (SB 147) | |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District 11</th>
<th>California Assembly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Incumbent</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Joe Canciamilla</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Increase Workers Compensation (AB 749)</td>
<td>Canciamilla For Working People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Increase Unemployment Insurance (SB 40)</td>
<td>Canciamilla For Working People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- California Power Authority/Fight the Gougers (SB 6X)</td>
<td>Canciamilla For Working People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Family Sick Leave/No Retaliation (SB 1197)</td>
<td>Canciamilla For Working People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Privacy/Employee Computer Records (SB 147)</td>
<td>Canciamilla For Working People</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Challenger** |          |
| **Jan Denny** |          |
| - Increase Workers Compensation (AB 749) | Denny Against Working People |
| - Increase Unemployment Insurance (SB 40) | Denny Against Working People |
| - California Power Authority/Fight the Gougers (SB 6X) | Denny Against Working People |
| - Family Sick Leave/No Retaliation (SB 1197) | Denny Against Working People |
| - Privacy/Employee Computer Records (SB 147) | Denny Against Working People |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District 12</th>
<th>California Assembly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>(No Incumbent)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Leland Yee</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Increase Workers Compensation (AB 749)</td>
<td>Yee For Working People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Increase Unemployment Insurance (SB 40)</td>
<td>Yee For Working People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- California Power Authority/Fight the Gougers (SB 6X)</td>
<td>Yee For Working People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Family Sick Leave/No Retaliation (SB 1197)</td>
<td>Yee For Working People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Privacy/Employee Computer Records (SB 147)</td>
<td>Yee For Working People</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Howard Epstein** |          |
| - Increase Workers Compensation (AB 749) | |
| - Increase Unemployment Insurance (SB 40) | |
| - California Power Authority/Fight the Gougers (SB 6X) | |
| - Family Sick Leave/No Retaliation (SB 1197) | |
| - Privacy/Employee Computer Records (SB 147) | |

Refused to Take a Stand
### Issues: Where Do the Candidates Stand?

#### District 13
- **California Assembly**
- Parts of San Francisco County (See page 14)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Issues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Mark Leno | For Working People | Increase Workers Compensation (AB 749)  
Increase Unemployment Insurance (SB 40)  
California Power Authority/Fight the Gougers (SB 6X)  
Family Sick Leave/No Retaliation (SB 1197)  
Privacy/Employee Computer Records (SB 147) |

#### District 14
- **California Assembly**
- Parts of Alameda & Contra Costa Counties (See page 14)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Issues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Gail Neira | For Working People | Increase Workers Compensation (AB 749)  
Increase Unemployment Insurance (SB 40)  
California Power Authority/Fight the Gougers (SB 6X)  
Family Sick Leave/No Retaliation (SB 1197)  
Privacy/Employee Computer Records (SB 147) |

#### District 15
- **California Assembly**
- Parts of Alameda, Contra Costa, Sacramento & San Joaquin Counties (See page 14)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Candidate</th>
<th>Position</th>
<th>Issues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Donna Gerber | For Working People | Increase Workers Compensation (AB 749)  
Increase Unemployment Insurance (SB 40)  
California Power Authority/Fight the Gougers (SB 6X)  
Family Sick Leave/No Retaliation (SB 1197)  
Privacy/Employee Computer Records (SB 147) |

#### Guy Houston
- Increase Workers Compensation (AB 749)  
Increase Unemployment Insurance (SB 40)  
California Power Authority/Fight the Gougers (SB 6X)  
Family Sick Leave/No Retaliation (SB 1197)  
Privacy/Employee Computer Records (SB 147)
Issues

Where Do the Candidates Stand?

Incumbent

Wilma Chan

District 16
California Assembly
Parts of Alameda County (See page 14)

Challenger

George Nugent

Incumbent

Barbara Mathews

District 17
California Assembly
Merced & parts of San Joaquin & Stanislaus Counties (See page 14)

Challenger

Brian McCabe

Incumbent

Ellen Corbett

District 18
California Assembly
Parts of Alameda County (See page 14)

Challenger

Jack Hovingh

Where Do the Candidates Stand?

Wilma Chan

- Increase Workers Compensation (AB 749)
- Increase Unemployment Insurance (SB 40)
- California Power Authority/Fight the Gougers (SB 6X)
- Family Sick Leave/No Retaliation (SB 1197)
- Privacy/Employee Computer Records (SB 147)

Incumbent

Barbara Mathews

- Increase Workers Compensation (AB 749)
- Increase Unemployment Insurance (SB 40)
- California Power Authority/Fight the Gougers (SB 6X)
- Family Sick Leave/No Retaliation (SB 1197)
- Privacy/Employee Computer Records (SB 147)

Incumbent

Ellen Corbett

- Increase Workers Compensation (AB 749)
- Increase Unemployment Insurance (SB 40)
- California Power Authority/Fight the Gougers (SB 6X)
- Family Sick Leave/No Retaliation (SB 1197)
- Privacy/Employee Computer Records (SB 147)

Incumbent

District 16
California Assembly
Parts of Alameda County (See page 14)

Challenger

George Nugent

- Increase Workers Compensation (AB 749)
- Increase Unemployment Insurance (SB 40)
- California Power Authority/Fight the Gougers (SB 6X)
- Family Sick Leave/No Retaliation (SB 1197)
- Privacy/Employee Computer Records (SB 147)

Incumbent

Barbara Mathews

- Increase Workers Compensation (AB 749)
- Increase Unemployment Insurance (SB 40)
- California Power Authority/Fight the Gougers (SB 6X)
- Family Sick Leave/No Retaliation (SB 1197)
- Privacy/Employee Computer Records (SB 147)

Incumbent

Ellen Corbett

- Increase Workers Compensation (AB 749)
- Increase Unemployment Insurance (SB 40)
- California Power Authority/Fight the Gougers (SB 6X)
- Family Sick Leave/No Retaliation (SB 1197)
- Privacy/Employee Computer Records (SB 147)

Incumbent

District 17
California Assembly
Merced & parts of San Joaquin & Stanislaus Counties (See page 14)

Challenger

Brian McCabe

- Increase Workers Compensation (AB 749)
- Increase Unemployment Insurance (SB 40)
- California Power Authority/Fight the Gougers (SB 6X)
- Family Sick Leave/No Retaliation (SB 1197)
- Privacy/Employee Computer Records (SB 147)

Incumbent

District 18
California Assembly
Parts of Alameda County (See page 14)

Challenger

Jack Hovingh

- Increase Workers Compensation (AB 749)
- Increase Unemployment Insurance (SB 40)
- California Power Authority/Fight the Gougers (SB 6X)
- Family Sick Leave/No Retaliation (SB 1197)
- Privacy/Employee Computer Records (SB 147)
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Refused to Take a Stand
Issues

Where Do the Candidates Stand?

(No Incumbent)

**Gene Mullin**

- Increase Workers Compensation (AB 749)
- Mullin For Working People
- Increase Unemployment Insurance (SB 40)
- Mullin For Working People
- California Power Authority/Fight the Gougers (SB 6X)
- Mullin For Working People
- Family Sick Leave/No Retaliation (SB 1197)
- Mullin For Working People
- Privacy/Employee Computer Records (SB 147)
- Mullin For Working People

(No Incumbent)

**David Kawas***

- Increase Workers Compensation (AB 749)
- Kawas Against Working People
- Increase Unemployment Insurance (SB 40)
- Kawas Against Working People
- California Power Authority/Fight the Gougers (SB 6X)
- Kawas Against Working People
- Family Sick Leave/No Retaliation (SB 1197)
- Kawas Against Working People
- Privacy/Employee Computer Records (SB 147)
- Kawas Against Working People

**Incumbent**

**John Dutra**

- Increase Workers Compensation (AB 749)
- Dutra For Working People
- Increase Unemployment Insurance (SB 40)
- Dutra For Working People
- California Power Authority/Fight the Gougers (SB 6X)
- Dutra For Working People
- Family Sick Leave/No Retaliation (SB 1197)
- Dutra For Working People
- Privacy/Employee Computer Records (SB 147)
- Dutra For Working People

**Challenger**

**Daniel Dow**

- Increase Workers Compensation (AB 749)
- Increase Unemployment Insurance (SB 40)
- California Power Authority/Fight the Gougers (SB 6X)
- Family Sick Leave/No Retaliation (SB 1197)
- Privacy/Employee Computer Records (SB 147)

**Incumbent**

**Joe Simitian**

- Increase Workers Compensation (AB 749)
- Simitian For Working People
- Increase Unemployment Insurance (SB 40)
- Simitian For Working People
- California Power Authority/Fight the Gougers (SB 6X)
- Simitian For Working People
- Family Sick Leave/No Retaliation (SB 1197)
- Simitian For Working People
- Privacy/Employee Computer Records (SB 147)
- Simitian For Working People

**Challenger**

**James Russell**

- Increase Workers Compensation (AB 749)
- Russell Against Working People
- Increase Unemployment Insurance (SB 40)
- Russell Against Working People
- California Power Authority/Fight the Gougers (SB 6X)
- Russell Against Working People
- Family Sick Leave/No Retaliation (SB 1197)
- Russell Against Working People
- Privacy/Employee Computer Records (SB 147)
- Russell Against Working People
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## Issues: Where Do the Candidates Stand?

### District 22

**Sally Lieber**
- Increase Workers Compensation (AB 749)
- Lieber For Working People
- Increase Unemployment Insurance (SB 40)
- Lieber For Working People
- California Power Authority/Fight the Gougers (SB 6X)
- Lieber For Working People
- Family Sick Leave/No Retaliation (SB 1197)
- Lieber For Working People
- Privacy/Employee Computer Records (SB 147)
- Lieber For Working People

**Stan Kawczynski**
- Increase Workers Compensation (AB 749)
- Lieber For Working People
- Increase Unemployment Insurance (SB 40)
- Lieber For Working People
- California Power Authority/Fight the Gougers (SB 6X)
- Lieber For Working People
- Family Sick Leave/No Retaliation (SB 1197)
- Lieber For Working People
- Privacy/Employee Computer Records (SB 147)
- Lieber For Working People

### District 23

**Manny Diaz**
- Increase Workers Compensation (AB 749)
- Diaz For Working People
- Increase Unemployment Insurance (SB 40)
- Diaz For Working People
- California Power Authority/Fight the Gougers (SB 6X)
- Diaz For Working People
- Family Sick Leave/No Retaliation (SB 1197)
- Diaz For Working People
- Privacy/Employee Computer Records (SB 147)
- Diaz For Working People

**Rebecca Cohn**
- Increase Workers Compensation (AB 749)
- Cohn For Working People
- Increase Unemployment Insurance (SB 40)
- Cohn For Working People
- California Power Authority/Fight the Gougers (SB 6X)
- Cohn For Working People
- Family Sick Leave/No Retaliation (SB 1197)
- Cohn For Working People
- Privacy/Employee Computer Records (SB 147)
- Cohn For Working People

### District 24

**Rebecca Cohn**
- Increase Workers Compensation (AB 749)
- Cohn For Working People
- Increase Unemployment Insurance (SB 40)
- Cohn For Working People
- California Power Authority/Fight the Gougers (SB 6X)
- Cohn For Working People
- Family Sick Leave/No Retaliation (SB 1197)
- Cohn For Working People
- Privacy/Employee Computer Records (SB 147)
- Cohn For Working People

### Incumbent
- Manny Diaz (No Incumbent)
- Rebecca Cohn (No Incumbent)

### Challenger
- Stan Kawczynski
- No major party opponent

*Utility Reporter*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District 28 California Assembly</th>
<th>District 29 California Assembly</th>
<th>District 30 California Assembly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Incumbent</strong> Simon Salinas</td>
<td><strong>Challenger</strong> Jane Howard</td>
<td><strong>Incumbent</strong> Nicole Parra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Increase Workers Compensation (AB 749)</td>
<td>- Increase Workers Compensation (AB 749)</td>
<td>- Increase Workers Compensation (AB 749)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salinas For Working People</td>
<td>Howard Against Working People</td>
<td>Parra For Working People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Increase Unemployment Insurance (SB 40)</td>
<td>- Increase Unemployment Insurance (SB 40)</td>
<td>- Increase Unemployment Insurance (SB 40)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salinas For Working People</td>
<td>Howard Against Working People</td>
<td>Parra For Working People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Power Authority/Fight the Gougers (SB 6X)</td>
<td>California Power Authority/Fight the Gougers (SB 6X)</td>
<td>California Power Authority/Fight the Gougers (SB 6X)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salinas For Working People</td>
<td>Howard Against Working People</td>
<td>Parra For Working People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Sick Leave/No Retaliation (SB 1197)</td>
<td>Family Sick Leave/No Retaliation (SB 1197)</td>
<td>Family Sick Leave/No Retaliation (SB 1197)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salinas For Working People</td>
<td>Howard Against Working People</td>
<td>Parra For Working People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Privacy/Employee Computer Records (SB 147)</td>
<td>Privacy/Employee Computer Records (SB 147)</td>
<td>Privacy/Employee Computer Records (SB 147)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salinas For Working People</td>
<td>Howard Against Working People</td>
<td>Parra For Working People</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District 28 California Assembly</th>
<th>District 29 California Assembly</th>
<th>District 30 California Assembly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Incumbent</strong> Simon Salinas</td>
<td><strong>Challenger</strong> Jane Howard</td>
<td><strong>Incumbent</strong> Nicole Parra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Increase Workers Compensation (AB 749)</td>
<td>- Increase Workers Compensation (AB 749)</td>
<td>- Increase Workers Compensation (AB 749)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salinas For Working People</td>
<td>Howard Against Working People</td>
<td>Parra For Working People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Increase Unemployment Insurance (SB 40)</td>
<td>- Increase Unemployment Insurance (SB 40)</td>
<td>- Increase Unemployment Insurance (SB 40)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salinas For Working People</td>
<td>Howard Against Working People</td>
<td>Parra For Working People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Power Authority/Fight the Gougers (SB 6X)</td>
<td>California Power Authority/Fight the Gougers (SB 6X)</td>
<td>California Power Authority/Fight the Gougers (SB 6X)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salinas For Working People</td>
<td>Howard Against Working People</td>
<td>Parra For Working People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Sick Leave/No Retaliation (SB 1197)</td>
<td>Family Sick Leave/No Retaliation (SB 1197)</td>
<td>Family Sick Leave/No Retaliation (SB 1197)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salinas For Working People</td>
<td>Howard Against Working People</td>
<td>Parra For Working People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Privacy/Employee Computer Records (SB 147)</td>
<td>Privacy/Employee Computer Records (SB 147)</td>
<td>Privacy/Employee Computer Records (SB 147)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salinas For Working People</td>
<td>Howard Against Working People</td>
<td>Parra For Working People</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District 28 California Assembly</th>
<th>District 29 California Assembly</th>
<th>District 30 California Assembly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Incumbent</strong> Simon Salinas</td>
<td><strong>Challenger</strong> Jane Howard</td>
<td><strong>Incumbent</strong> Nicole Parra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Increase Workers Compensation (AB 749)</td>
<td>- Increase Workers Compensation (AB 749)</td>
<td>- Increase Workers Compensation (AB 749)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salinas For Working People</td>
<td>Howard Against Working People</td>
<td>Parra For Working People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Increase Unemployment Insurance (SB 40)</td>
<td>- Increase Unemployment Insurance (SB 40)</td>
<td>- Increase Unemployment Insurance (SB 40)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salinas For Working People</td>
<td>Howard Against Working People</td>
<td>Parra For Working People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Power Authority/Fight the Gougers (SB 6X)</td>
<td>California Power Authority/Fight the Gougers (SB 6X)</td>
<td>California Power Authority/Fight the Gougers (SB 6X)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salinas For Working People</td>
<td>Howard Against Working People</td>
<td>Parra For Working People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Sick Leave/No Retaliation (SB 1197)</td>
<td>Family Sick Leave/No Retaliation (SB 1197)</td>
<td>Family Sick Leave/No Retaliation (SB 1197)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salinas For Working People</td>
<td>Howard Against Working People</td>
<td>Parra For Working People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Privacy/Employee Computer Records (SB 147)</td>
<td>Privacy/Employee Computer Records (SB 147)</td>
<td>Privacy/Employee Computer Records (SB 147)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salinas For Working People</td>
<td>Howard Against Working People</td>
<td>Parra For Working People</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District 28 California Assembly</th>
<th>District 29 California Assembly</th>
<th>District 30 California Assembly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Incumbent</strong> Simon Salinas</td>
<td><strong>Challenger</strong> Jane Howard</td>
<td><strong>Incumbent</strong> Nicole Parra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Increase Workers Compensation (AB 749)</td>
<td>- Increase Workers Compensation (AB 749)</td>
<td>- Increase Workers Compensation (AB 749)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salinas For Working People</td>
<td>Howard Against Working People</td>
<td>Parra For Working People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Increase Unemployment Insurance (SB 40)</td>
<td>- Increase Unemployment Insurance (SB 40)</td>
<td>- Increase Unemployment Insurance (SB 40)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salinas For Working People</td>
<td>Howard Against Working People</td>
<td>Parra For Working People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Power Authority/Fight the Gougers (SB 6X)</td>
<td>California Power Authority/Fight the Gougers (SB 6X)</td>
<td>California Power Authority/Fight the Gougers (SB 6X)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salinas For Working People</td>
<td>Howard Against Working People</td>
<td>Parra For Working People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Sick Leave/No Retaliation (SB 1197)</td>
<td>Family Sick Leave/No Retaliation (SB 1197)</td>
<td>Family Sick Leave/No Retaliation (SB 1197)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salinas For Working People</td>
<td>Howard Against Working People</td>
<td>Parra For Working People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Privacy/Employee Computer Records (SB 147)</td>
<td>Privacy/Employee Computer Records (SB 147)</td>
<td>Privacy/Employee Computer Records (SB 147)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salinas For Working People</td>
<td>Howard Against Working People</td>
<td>Parra For Working People</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District 28 California Assembly</th>
<th>District 29 California Assembly</th>
<th>District 30 California Assembly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Incumbent</strong> Simon Salinas</td>
<td><strong>Challenger</strong> Jane Howard</td>
<td><strong>Incumbent</strong> Nicole Parra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Increase Workers Compensation (AB 749)</td>
<td>- Increase Workers Compensation (AB 749)</td>
<td>- Increase Workers Compensation (AB 749)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salinas For Working People</td>
<td>Howard Against Working People</td>
<td>Parra For Working People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Increase Unemployment Insurance (SB 40)</td>
<td>- Increase Unemployment Insurance (SB 40)</td>
<td>- Increase Unemployment Insurance (SB 40)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salinas For Working People</td>
<td>Howard Against Working People</td>
<td>Parra For Working People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California Power Authority/Fight the Gougers (SB 6X)</td>
<td>California Power Authority/Fight the Gougers (SB 6X)</td>
<td>California Power Authority/Fight the Gougers (SB 6X)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salinas For Working People</td>
<td>Howard Against Working People</td>
<td>Parra For Working People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Sick Leave/No Retaliation (SB 1197)</td>
<td>Family Sick Leave/No Retaliation (SB 1197)</td>
<td>Family Sick Leave/No Retaliation (SB 1197)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salinas For Working People</td>
<td>Howard Against Working People</td>
<td>Parra For Working People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Privacy/Employee Computer Records (SB 147)</td>
<td>Privacy/Employee Computer Records (SB 147)</td>
<td>Privacy/Employee Computer Records (SB 147)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salinas For Working People</td>
<td>Howard Against Working People</td>
<td>Parra For Working People</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Issues

**Where Do the Candidates Stand?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District 25</th>
<th>District 26</th>
<th>District 27</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Incumbent</strong></td>
<td><strong>Challenger</strong></td>
<td><strong>Incumbent</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Cogdill</td>
<td>Denise Smith</td>
<td>John Laird</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Increase Workers Compensation</strong> (AB 749)</td>
<td><strong>Increase Workers Compensation</strong> (AB 749)</td>
<td><strong>Increase Workers Compensation</strong> (AB 749)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cogdill Against Working People</strong></td>
<td><strong>Cogdill Against Working People</strong></td>
<td><strong>Laird For Working People</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Increase Unemployment Insurance</strong> (SB 40)</td>
<td><strong>Increase Unemployment Insurance</strong> (SB 40)</td>
<td><strong>Laird For Working People</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cogdill Against Working People</strong></td>
<td><strong>Cogdill Against Working People</strong></td>
<td><strong>Laird For Working People</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>California Power Authority/Fight the Gougers (SB 6X)</strong></td>
<td><strong>California Power Authority/Fight the Gougers (SB 6X)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Laird For Working People</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cogdill Against Working People</strong></td>
<td><strong>Cogdill Against Working People</strong></td>
<td><strong>Laird For Working People</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Family Sick Leave/No Retaliation (SB 1197)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Family Sick Leave/No Retaliation (SB 1197)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Laird For Working People</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cogdill Against Working People</strong></td>
<td><strong>Cogdill Against Working People</strong></td>
<td><strong>Laird For Working People</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Privacy/Employee Computer Records (SB 147)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Privacy/Employee Computer Records (SB 147)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Laird For Working People</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cogdill Against Working People</strong></td>
<td><strong>Cogdill Against Working People</strong></td>
<td><strong>Laird For Working People</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Challenger</strong></th>
<th><strong>Incumbent</strong></th>
<th><strong>Challenger</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Denise Smith</td>
<td>Greg Aghazarian</td>
<td>Charles Carter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Increase Workers Compensation</strong> (AB 749)</td>
<td><strong>Increase Workers Compensation</strong> (AB 749)</td>
<td><strong>Increase Workers Compensation</strong> (AB 749)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Smith For Working People</strong></td>
<td><strong>Smith For Working People</strong></td>
<td><strong>Smith For Working People</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Increase Unemployment Insurance</strong> (SB 40)</td>
<td><strong>Increase Unemployment Insurance</strong> (SB 40)</td>
<td><strong>Increase Unemployment Insurance</strong> (SB 40)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Smith For Working People</strong></td>
<td><strong>Smith For Working People</strong></td>
<td><strong>Smith For Working People</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>California Power Authority/Fight the Gougers (SB 6X)</strong></td>
<td><strong>California Power Authority/Fight the Gougers (SB 6X)</strong></td>
<td><strong>California Power Authority/Fight the Gougers (SB 6X)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Smith For Working People</strong></td>
<td><strong>Smith For Working People</strong></td>
<td><strong>Smith For Working People</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Family Sick Leave/No Retaliation (SB 1197)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Family Sick Leave/No Retaliation (SB 1197)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Family Sick Leave/No Retaliation (SB 1197)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Smith For Working People</strong></td>
<td><strong>Smith For Working People</strong></td>
<td><strong>Smith For Working People</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Privacy/Employee Computer Records (SB 147)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Privacy/Employee Computer Records (SB 147)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Privacy/Employee Computer Records (SB 147)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Smith For Working People</strong></td>
<td><strong>Smith For Working People</strong></td>
<td><strong>Smith For Working People</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Issues:**
- Increase Workers Compensation
- Increase Unemployment Insurance
- California Power Authority/Fight the Gougers
- Family Sick Leave/No Retaliation
- Privacy/Employee Computer Records

**Districts:**
- District 25: Calaveras, Mariposa, Mono, Tuolumne and parts of Madera & Stanislaus Counties (See page 14)
- District 26: Parts of San Joaquin & Stanislaus Counties (See page 14)
- District 27: Parts of Monterey, Santa Clara & Santa Cruz Counties (See page 14)

---

October 2002
Where Do the Candidates Stand?

**District 31**

**California Assembly**

- **Challenger**
  - Sara Reyes
  - Increase Workers Compensation (AB 749)
  - Increase Unemployment Insurance (SB 40)
  - California Power Authority/Fight the Gougers (SB 6X)
  - Family Sick Leave/No Retaliation (SB 1197)
  - Privacy/Employee Computer Records (SB 147)

- **Incumbent**
  - No major party opponent

**District 32**

- **Challenger**
  - Kevin McCarthy
  - Increase Workers Compensation (AB 749)
  - Increase Unemployment Insurance (SB 40)
  - California Power Authority/Fight the Gougers (SB 6X)
  - Family Sick Leave/No Retaliation (SB 1197)
  - Privacy/Employee Computer Records (SB 147)

- **Incumbent**
  - Michael Shea III
  - Increase Workers Compensation (AB 749)
  - Increase Unemployment Insurance (SB 40)
  - California Power Authority/Fight the Gougers (SB 6X)
  - Family Sick Leave/No Retaliation (SB 1197)
  - Privacy/Employee Computer Records (SB 147)

**District 33**

- **Challenger**
  - Laurence Houlgate
  - Increase Workers Compensation (AB 749)
  - Increase Unemployment Insurance (SB 40)
  - California Power Authority/Fight the Gougers (SB 6X)
  - Family Sick Leave/No Retaliation (SB 1197)
  - Privacy/Employee Computer Records (SB 147)

- **Incumbent**
  - Abel Maldonado
  - Increase Workers Compensation (AB 749)
  - Increase Unemployment Insurance (SB 40)
  - California Power Authority/Fight the Gougers (SB 6X)
  - Family Sick Leave/No Retaliation (SB 1197)
  - Did Not Vote
  - Privacy/Employee Computer Records (SB 147)
### Issues

#### Where Do the Candidates Stand?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No Photo Available</th>
<th>District 34 California Assembly</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(No Incumbent)</td>
<td>Inyo and parts of Kern, San Bernardino &amp; Tulare Counties (See page 14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(No Incumbent)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Bill Maze***

- **Increase Workers Compensation (AB 749)**
  - Maze Against Working People
- **Increase Unemployment Insurance (SB 40)**
  - Maze Against Working People
- **California Power Authority/Fight the Gougers (SB 6X)**
  - Did Not Respond
- **Family Sick Leave/No Retaliation (SB 1197)**
  - Maze Against Working People
- **Privacy/Employee Computer Records (SB 147)**
  - Maze Against Working People

**No major party opponent**

---

### Where the chickens come from

IBEW Local 1245 created the Candidate Survey to show where candidates for the California Assembly and Senate stand on issues important to working families. We want to provide our members a way to evaluate the candidates based on facts. Facts are available in the form of voting records.

The issues we selected were all voted on during the current (2001-2002) session of the California Legislature. The survey shows how the incumbents actually voted on the issues. Where the incumbent was absent or abstained, we list them as "Did Not 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 extending the deadline for them to return the survey. Finally, candidates who didn’t respond were contacted by personal e-mail and given a final chance to state their position on these bills. Candidates who responded via personal e-mail have an asterisk (*) by their name.

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 had the courage to respond to the survey, but chose not to take a position on a particular issue, their position on that issue was listed as "Did Not Respond."

In the past we have found that 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 Candidate Survey all major party candidates for California Assembly and state Senate within Local 1245’s geographical jurisdiction. 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.

We hope these surveys are helpful in providing you with objective information to assist you in evaluating the candidates.

Local 1245’s endorsements of candidates can be found on Pages 28-29.

---

### Stinson for CalPERS

Local 1245 endorses Stephen Stinson for the CalPERS Board of Administration.

Stinson, a member of IBEW Local 1245 and IBEW Local 340, has 20 years experience as a Pension Fund Trustee for the Sacramento Area Electrical Workers Pension Trust Fund, including eight years as chairman.

In addition to his endorsement by IBEW, he is endorsed by the California Independent Public Employees Legislative Council, and the Sacramento Police Officers Association, among other groups.

---

**MAKE YOUR VOICE HEARD!**

**VOTE NOV. 5**
California Candidates for Statewide Office

Cruz Bustamante
Lt. Governor

Cruz Bustamante proved his mettle as Lt. Governor when he filed a class action taxpayer lawsuit against the unregulated power generators who put the squeeze on California's treasury and drove PG&E into bankruptcy.

Bustamante understands the importance of creating jobs and has used his office to champion the cause of rebuilding California's infrastructure, serving as co-chair of the Commission on Building for the 21st Century.

Local 1245 endorses Cruz Bustamante for re-election.

Phil Angelides
State Treasurer

As treasurer, Phil Angelides has increased state fund investment in California, creating economic growth, jobs and opportunity, including increased funding for affordable housing, pollution control, job creation and student lending.

He increased state deposits in community banks by $3 billion and invested state funds to promote home ownership and business growth.

During the energy crisis, Angelides proposed creation of the California Power Authority, an idea that was eventually adopted to protect consumers against future price-gouging.

Local 1245 endorses Phil Angelides for re-election.

Kevin Shelley
Secretary of State

Kevin Shelley has been steadfast in his support of working people, voting in the Legislature to increase Workers Comp and Unemployment benefits, restore overtime pay, and improve job safety. He's been a leader in consumer protection, protecting elders from abuse, and reforming nursing homes.

As Majority Leader in the Assembly, Shelley proved he can get things done. As Secretary of State he has pledged to bring long-needed reform to California's voting system. If anyone can get it done, Shelley's the man to do it.

Local 1245 endorses Kevin Shelley for Secretary of State.

Bill Lockyer
Attorney General

As attorney general, Bill Lockyer has been an effective advocate for the interests of ordinary Californians. He has worked to:

- Protect seniors against scam artists
- Protect women from domestic violence
- Protect consumers against price-gouging
- Protect our air and water resources
- Improve public safety
- Help victims of crime

Lockyer, formerly chair of the Assembly Labor Committee, understands and supports the interests of working people.

Local 1245 endorses Bill Lockyer for re-election.

John Garamendi
Insurance Commissioner

As the state's first Insurance Commissioner, John Garamendi earned a reputation as a protector of consumer interests, forcing insurance companies to honor their commitments.

As Deputy Secretary of the Interior, Garamendi added to his reputation as a man who gets things done, helping resolve disputes over the Headwaters redwoods and Central Valley water resources.

California needs a Commissioner who can restore integrity and vitality to this important office.

Local 1245 endorses John Garamendi for Insurance Commissioner.

Jack O'Connell
Sup't of Public Instruction

Few people can match Jack O'Connell's qualifications for the top state education post. He's a former high school social studies teacher who, as a state legislator, authored California's landmark class size reduction program and teacher salary incentives.

As chairman of the Senate's budget subcommittee on education O'Connell has worked to increase funding for special education and school-to-work programs. He can be expected to fight for improvements to education, because that's exactly what he's been doing all along.

Local 1245 endorses Jack O'Connell.

Steve Westly
State Controller

Steve Westly has pledged to use this office to improve California's business climate by standardizing tax policy and increasing transparency. He supports increased investment in California transportation, education and affordable housing, and vows to reinforce investment and R&D tax credits to promote manufacturing and technology in California.

Westly has the financial management skills to protect retirement funds and to make sure that every corporation doing business in California honors its responsibility to investors and the public.

Local 1245 endorses Steve Westly.

Local 1245 endorses Cruz Bustamante for re-election.

Local 1245 endorses Phil Angelides for re-election.

Local 1245 endorses Kevin Shelley for Secretary of State.

Local 1245 endorses Bill Lockyer for re-election.

Local 1245 endorses John Garamendi for Insurance Commissioner.

Local 1245 endorses Jack O'Connell.

Local 1245 endorses Steve Westly.
### IBEW Local 1245 Endorsements: State of California

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GOVERNOR</th>
<th>Lt. Governor</th>
<th>Secretary of State</th>
<th>Attorney General</th>
<th>State Treasurer</th>
<th>State Controller</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gray Davis</td>
<td>Cruz Bustamante</td>
<td>Kevin Shelley</td>
<td>Bill Lockyer</td>
<td>Phil Angelides</td>
<td>Steve Westly</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INSURANCE COMMISSION</th>
<th>SUP'T PUBLIC INSTRUCTION</th>
<th>BOARD OF EQUALIZATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>John Garamendi</td>
<td>Jack O'Connell</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**District**
1. Carole Migden
2. No Endorsement
3. No Endorsement
4. John Chiang

### California Senate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Wesley Chesbro</td>
<td>Marianne Bopp Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Jackie Speier</td>
<td>Liz Figuero</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Rusty Areias</td>
<td>No Endorsement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>No Endorsement</td>
<td>Richard Alarcon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Gilbert A. Cedillo</td>
<td>Gloria Romero</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Kevin Murray</td>
<td>Debra Bowen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Martha M. Escutia</td>
<td>Neil Soto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>No Endorsement</td>
<td>Joe Dunn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>No Endorsement</td>
<td>Philip G. Hanneman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Denise Moreno Duchery</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**District**
1. Mike Honda
2. Zoe Logren
3. Sam Farr
4. Dennis A. Cardoza
5. John Veen
6. No Endorsement
7. David G. Lapere
8. No Endorsement
9. Lois Capps
10. No Endorsement
11. Bob Conaway
12. Marjorie Mussel Mikels
13. Brad Sherman
14. Howard L. Berman
15. Adam B. Schiff
16. Henry A. Waxman
17. Xavier Becerra
18. Hilda L. Solis
19. Diane E. Watson
20. Lucille Roybal-Allard
21. Maxine Waters
22. Jane Harman
23. Juanita Milender-McDonald
24. Grace F. Napolitano
25. Linda T. Sanchez
26. No Endorsement
27. No Endorsement
28. No Endorsement
29. No Endorsement
30. No Endorsement
31. No Endorsement
32. No Endorsement
33. No Endorsement
34. No Endorsement
35. No Endorsement
36. No Endorsement
37. No Endorsement
38. No Endorsement
39. No Endorsement
40. No Endorsement
41. No Endorsement
42. No Endorsement
43. No Endorsement
44. No Endorsement
45. No Endorsement
46. No Endorsement
47. No Endorsement
48. No Endorsement
49. No Endorsement
50. No Endorsement
51. No Endorsement
52. No Endorsement
53. No Endorsement

### California Assembly

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Patty Berg</td>
<td>Doug Kinyon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Stuart R. King</td>
<td>Scott Warren</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Eric Ulis</td>
<td>No Endorsement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Joe Nation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Patricia Wiggins</td>
<td>Lois Wolk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Darrell Steinberg</td>
<td>Katherine E. Maestas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Joe Cenacchillo</td>
<td>Leland Yee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Mark Leno</td>
<td>Anna G. Eshoo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Loni Hancock</td>
<td>Donna Gerber</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Wilma Chan</td>
<td>Robert S. Matthews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Ellen M. Corbett</td>
<td>Gene Mullin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>John A. Dutra</td>
<td>Anna G. Eshoo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Joe Smillman</td>
<td>S. J. Lieber</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Manny Diaz</td>
<td>Rebecca Cohn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>E. Denise Smith</td>
<td>Tom Hallman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>John Laird</td>
<td>Simon Salinas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>William Martinez, Jr.</td>
<td>Anna G. Eshoo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Nicole M. Parra</td>
<td>Sarah Reyes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Carole Migden</td>
<td>No Endorsement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Debbie Stone</td>
<td>Laurence Houlgate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>Virginia Gurrol</td>
<td>Hannah-Beth Jackson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>No Endorsement</td>
<td>No Endorsement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>No Endorsement</td>
<td>No Endorsement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>Cindy Goldberg</td>
<td>Cindy Goldberg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>Fran Pavley</td>
<td>Fabian Nunez</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>Dario Frommer</td>
<td>Mark Ridley-Thomas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>No Endorsement</td>
<td>Judy Chu</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>No Endorsement</td>
<td>No Endorsement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>No Endorsement</td>
<td>No Endorsement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>No Endorsement</td>
<td>No Endorsement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>No Endorsement</td>
<td>No Endorsement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>No Endorsement</td>
<td>No Endorsement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>No Endorsement</td>
<td>No Endorsement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>No Endorsement</td>
<td>No Endorsement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36.</td>
<td>No Endorsement</td>
<td>No Endorsement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37.</td>
<td>No Endorsement</td>
<td>No Endorsement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.</td>
<td>No Endorsement</td>
<td>No Endorsement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.</td>
<td>No Endorsement</td>
<td>No Endorsement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.</td>
<td>No Endorsement</td>
<td>No Endorsement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.</td>
<td>No Endorsement</td>
<td>No Endorsement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42.</td>
<td>No Endorsement</td>
<td>No Endorsement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43.</td>
<td>No Endorsement</td>
<td>No Endorsement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.</td>
<td>No Endorsement</td>
<td>No Endorsement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.</td>
<td>No Endorsement</td>
<td>No Endorsement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46.</td>
<td>No Endorsement</td>
<td>No Endorsement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47.</td>
<td>No Endorsement</td>
<td>No Endorsement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48.</td>
<td>No Endorsement</td>
<td>No Endorsement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49.</td>
<td>No Endorsement</td>
<td>No Endorsement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50.</td>
<td>No Endorsement</td>
<td>No Endorsement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51.</td>
<td>No Endorsement</td>
<td>No Endorsement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52.</td>
<td>No Endorsement</td>
<td>No Endorsement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53.</td>
<td>No Endorsement</td>
<td>No Endorsement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### California Propositions

**PROPOSITION 48:** YES
Housing & Emergency Shelter Trust Fund Act of 2002
Bonds to finance various existing housing and code enforcement programs, applying to programs that provide assistance for multi-family housing, emergency housing, farm worker housing, home ownership for low- and very low-income households, and down-payment assistance for first-time home buyers.

**PROPOSITION 47:** YES
Education Facilities: Kindergarten-University Public Education Facilities Bond Act of 2002
Provides for issuance of state general obligation bonds to be provided to school districts, county superintendents of schools, and county boards of education, as well as funds for the Higher Education Capital Outlay Bond Fund.

**PROPOSITION 48:** YES
Court Consolidation
Deletes obsolete references to municipal courts from the California Constitution and makes conforming and related changes.

**PROPOSITION 49:** NO RECOMMENDATION
After School Programs
Provides for issuance of state general obligation bonds for before and after school programs providing tutoring, homework assistance, and educational enrichment. Provides priority for additional funding for schools with predominantly low-income students.

**PROPOSITION 50:** YES
Water Quality, Supply & Safe Drinking Water Projects.
Coastal Wetlands Purchase and Protection.
Authorizes $3.44 billion general obligation bonds for water projects.

**PROPOSITION 51:** NO RECOMMENDATION
Transportation
Authorizes $3.44 billion general obligation bonds for transportation.

**PROPOSITION 52:** YES
Election Day Voter Registration.
Allows persons who are legally eligible to vote and have valid identification to register to vote on election day at their polling place, increases criminal penalty for voter and vote registration fraud.
IBEW Local 1245 Endorsements: State of Nevada

GOVERNOR
Kenny Guinn

LT. GOVERNOR
Erin Kenny

SECRETARY OF STATE
Dean Heller

ATTORNEY GENERAL
John Hunt

STATE CONTROLLER
John Lee

SUPREME COURT JUSTICE B
Bill Maupin

U.S. CONGRESS

District
1. Shelley Berkley
2. Travis Souza
3. Dario Herrera

Nevada State Senate Districts

District Capital:
Mark Amodei
1. Maggie Carlton
2. John Hawk
3. Terry Care
4. Kristen Hansen
5. Terry Lamuraglia
6. Bob Coffin
7. Andriana Martinez

Nevada State Assembly Districts

District
1. Tom Collins
2. Garn Mabey
3. Peggy Pierce
4. Howard Wade Bycroft
5. John Ellerton
6. Wendell Williams
7. Morse Arberry, Jr.
8. Barbara Buckley
9. Chris Giunchigliani
10. David Goldwater
11. Bob McClary
12. Gene Orehenschall
13. Mike Slater
14. Ellen Kolvisto
15. Kathy McClain

October 2002 29
Union members have made the difference in many recent elections because we have turned out in larger numbers than the general voting public.

Now we have a chance to make the difference in several key races in November. Your local Central Labor Council can show you how. Sign up now.

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.

For additional campaign resources, visit the California Labor Federation website at: wwwNCCC.calaborfed.org
Davis signs four HMO reforms

Gray Davis of California signed four bills Sept. 22 aimed at strengthening HMO reforms previously enacted by his administration.

The new laws serve to:
- Ensure that health maintenance organizations will not deny drugs to patients with serious illnesses.
- Give the state Department of Managed Health Care authority to regulate HMOs' quality of care.
- Provide health coverage through a state insurance program for those with existing conditions.
- Require HMOs to accept patient grievances over the Internet.

Much of the new legislation was aimed at fine-tuning laws to restore the industry's financial stability of HMOs. Cohn's bill also requires the department to adopt regulations for timely access to care by January 2004.

The HMO industry opposed the bills signed by Davis, according to Cohn.

Another bill, sponsored by Assemblywoman Helen Thomson, a nurse, would provide insurance for about 4,000 people who could not get health insurance because of existing medical conditions.

Anti-trust scrutiny of health insurers

Federal antitrust regulators are stepping up scrutiny of health insurers, concerned that competition in the industry may have been crimped by mergers, according to Deputy Assistant Attorney General Deborah Majoras.

Health insurance companies have become an "area of primary concern" to the department's antitrust division, Majoras said at an antitrust conference.

She said that there had to be sufficient competition among providers and among the health care plans that purchase the providers' services in order for consumers to benefit from competition in health care markets.

Antitrust officials will give especially close inspection to any new mergers among health insurers, Majoras said.

In addition, they are looking for any "collective or unilateral activity" that may raise competitive concerns.

Majoras said the increasing focus on health insurers has been triggered by the spate of mergers that have reduced the number of competitors in recent years.

Between 1995 and 2000, there were more than 350 mergers involving health insurers or managed care organizations, according to American Medical Association President Donald Palmisano, who spoke at the same antitrust conference.

Having scooped up smaller rivals during the 1990s, the 10 largest national insurance companies, such as WellPoint Health Networks and Aetna, now cover more than half of the nation's insured, Palmisano said.

Keep your hard hat on!

Historians believe that the first hard hats were probably felt fedoras and baseball caps dipped in tar and dried in the sun by men working on the Hoover Dam project in the 1930s.

Since that time, hard hats have become the first line of defense for men and women working in dangerous areas. As a reminder to "keep your hat on," your Safety Committee would like to share a few anecdotes which emphasize the importance of wearing hard hats:

- A construction worker pulling forms from a wall was on his hands and knees when he was hit from behind by a small loader. The worker was driven head first into the wall. A steel fastener in the wall imbedded itself into the man's hard hat. The hat prevented his head from being impaled. Although the worker suffered a severe neck injury, his hard hat took the brunt of the impact.

So, what anecdotes can you tell about hard hats? Remember to be safe in work areas—keep your hat on!

Richard Lane

---

**SAFETY MATTERS**

By the Local 1245 Safety Committee

Current members of the Local 1245 Safety Committee: Stoney Burk, Alameda Power & Telecom.; Keith Hopp, Pacific Gas & Electric; Ralph Muraca, City of Santa Clara; Al White, Pacific Gas & Electric; David Vipond, Citizens Communications; Rich Lane, Turlock Irrigation District; Gil Suarez, Davey Tree; Art Torres, Sacramento Municipal Utility District; and Assistant Business Manager Jim McGauley.
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Proposition D: A Bad Choice for San Francisco

LOSS OF EXPERIENCED WORKERS

Proposition D opens the door to an expensive and unnecessary acquisition of PG&E’s distribution and transmission system. This would result in the lay-off or displacement of all Local 1245 members in San Francisco, forcing our members to relocate to other PG&E headquarters. Conversations with our members in San Francisco make it very clear that a majority of our members would not consider accepting a job with the City of San Francisco.

MORE FREQUENT OUTAGES

There is a direct link between a skilled workforce and service reliability. The loss of skilled, experienced, dedicated utility workers will lead directly to more frequent power outages, greater delays in restoring service, and slower responses to emergencies. The power disruptions of the recent past have shown how service interruptions harm the economy and endanger the public.

ELIMINATION OF MAINTENANCE STANDARDS

Municipalization also has the unintended consequence of removing San Francisco from state-mandated electric maintenance programs. Local 1245 worked extremely hard for the creation of service reliability standards at the state level. Municipalization under Proposition D would eliminate these important inspection and maintenance requirements, leaving San Francisco consumers with less protection against deteriorating facilities.

INADEQUATE SUPPLY

Despite the rhetoric, Proposition D does nothing to increase electric supply. Buying PG&E’s poles and wires would actually diminish the financial resources available to the City to pursue genuine solutions to the problem of inadequate power supply. The city’s ability to pursue renewable energy and conservation programs would be compromised if hundreds of millions of City dollars get tied up in a PG&E takeover attempt.

EXPOSURE TO A DANGEROUS & SUSPECT POWER MARKET

Because Proposition D does nothing to increase energy supplies, the City would be forced to buy power from the same generators and energy marketers who gouged the State of California for $9 billion. The only saving grace for San Francisco ratepayers is that these costs will be spread among ratepayers statewide. If a newly-created San Francisco municipal utility were to suffer losses in this same market, there will be no sharing of the pain—City ratepayers will be on the hook for the entire amount.

A QUESTION OF PRIORITIES

Is purchasing the City’s electric system an urgent priority? Only if your concerns are largely ideological rather than practical. As a practical matter, fixing the mismanaged Hetch Hetchy system is a far higher priority. Diverting limited City funds to a PG&E buy-out means that other, more vital projects simply don’t get funded.

A QUESTION OF ACCOUNTABILITY

Energy is a high-stakes undertaking. The Controller estimates the cost to be “in the hundreds of millions of dollars” just to get into the business of providing energy to City residents and businesses. That’s before the City actually starts to purchase electricity. Who will be accountable for this new venture? Under Proposition D, voters will no longer have the ability to approve the bond issuances a PG&E takeover will require. A newly-created commission of politicians, many of them not having expertise in energy issues, will decide how to spend billions.

A QUESTION OF WHO PAYS

It’s easy to promise rate reductions. The state legislature promised rate reductions of 20% when it voted to deregulate energy in 1996, but the reality turned out quite differently. Proponents of Proposition D also promise rate reductions, but their figures have no more basis in reality than the state legislature did six years ago. Rates will be driven by underlying costs, and under Proposition D the City’s energy costs would rise dramatically. There will be no one to pay those costs except the ratepayers and taxpayers of San Francisco.

EMPTY PROMISES

Proposition D is a collection of empty promises, promoted by feel-good rhetoric that won’t feel so good when San Franciscans get the bill:

• Proposition D fails to protect San Francisco ratepayers from future price spikes.
• Proposition D fails to provide any mechanism for hastening the closure of the older, polluting power plants.
• Proposition D fails to provide a credible plan—or proper accountability—in the siting and building of new, replacement power plants.
• Proposition D fails to provide for the future reliability of San Francisco’s utility service.
Members hold key to beating Prop. D

Local 1245 representatives joined other anti-D campaigners in meetings with editors at the San Francisco Chronicle and the San Francisco Examiner to seek anti-D endorsements.

"The endorsements of newspapers and political clubs are important for reaching the electorate. They're especially important in influencing undecided voters," said Business Rep. Hunter Stern.

The grassroots campaign to reach out directly to voters got underway Sept. 21 and 22 when two dozen PG&E volunteers—including front-line supervisors and union members—turned out for the first weekend of door-to-door leafletting. Another two dozen turned out the following weekend.

"We're getting this down to a science. You show up, you get your assignment, you hang your leaflets on people's doors, and you're headed back to the Beach Chalet for lunch by one o'clock," said Business Rep. Landis Marttila. "People end up really enjoying themselves because they know they are doing something important and they're having a direct impact on the final vote."

Last year the union beat a similar municipalization measure—Proposition F—by a razor-thin margin, with the final outcome remaining in doubt more than a week after the election. In the end, it was the massive volunteer effort by Local 1245 members that turned the tide.

"It was a close race last year and polling indicates it's going to be close again this year," said Assistant Business Manager Jim McCauley, who is coordinating the union's anti-D campaign. "But we're confident that we can beat this thing again if our members get involved."

"No on D" billboards will again feature San Francisco lineman Jose Lopez, reminding voters that skilled union members are essential to service reliability. Lopez's picture also appears on a mailing targeted to key voting populations in the city, a leaflet, and on campaign window signs.

Prop. D hurts you, the ratepayer.

♦ Takes away right of voters to approve energy revenue bonds and puts the cost of those bonds in your energy bill.
♦ Lets City politicians and their appointees issue billions in bonds to buy PG&E's pipes & wires, plus huge sums for equipment, material and new employees—all paid for by you and your neighbors.
♦ Gives City politicians—with no experience—the responsibility of operating the most complex urban utility system on the West Coast.
♦ Does nothing to speed the closure of old, inefficient power plants.
♦ Fails to place any limit on costs or utility rates.
♦ Forces you to bear all costs of system upgrades, maintenance and operation, as well as all repairs after fires, earthquakes and other disasters. These costs are currently shared statewide.

Prop. D will harm your service.

♦ Fewer experienced workers. The current skilled workforce will choose PG&E jobs elsewhere in the state rather than stay to work for a new, unproven employer.
♦ Reduced maintenance, more outages, longer waits for hookups. Your utility service will have to get in line behind the City's other budget priorities.

IBEW members have always worked hard to keep your power on. It's what we do. It's who we are.

City Hall Can't Do Our Job.

Vote No on D.

You Can Help
Defeat D.

To volunteer for leafletting, or to obtain a window sign for your home or car, contact:

Landis Marttila: 415-469-9903
or
Hunter Stern: 415-282-9042
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Women's hours and other conditions

With the right to vote won, the Women's Trade Union League campaigned for legislation regulating women’s hours and other conditions of work. The WTUL regarded such legislation as working women’s best protection against exploitation.

Protective legislation curbed abuses, but proved a double-edged sword by excluding women from certain occupations. After World War I, thousands of New York women working as streetcar operators, typesetters and telegraphers lost their jobs when the state legislature banned some kinds of night work by women.

Conflict sharpened in 1923 when the NWP proposed an Equal Rights Amendment that would have outlawed protective legislation. Said Melinda Scott of the United Textile Workers: “The National Women’s Party does not know what it is to work 10 or 12 hours a day in a factory; so they do not know what it means to lose an eight-hour day law. The working women do know, and that’s why they are unanimously opposing this amendment.”

The real answer was in union organization, but the American Federation of Labor was unwilling to take on the job of organizing the millions of unorganized workers, male and female.

Male-dominated craft unions welcomed protective legislation as a way of keeping women out of their trades. This came as no surprise to feminists like Alice Paul of the National Women’s Party, who declared, “Men are not going to make laws for the working woman. Their enactment will be by business, or, in some cases, by public pressure. The leaves were shortened from 12 weeks to six, and the expense was shifted entirely to workers. In earlier versions of the bill employers and employees were to split the costs.

Labor unions and women’s groups across the country hailed the Democratic governor’s decision to make California the first state to enact a comprehensive paid family leave program. The bill is seen by supporters as a model for the nation.

Labor unions and women’s groups across the country hailed the Democratic governor’s decision to make California the first state to enact a comprehensive paid family leave program. The bill is seen by supporters as a model for the nation.

California again proved itself a pacesetter in national political trends when Gov. Gray Davis last month signed ground-breaking legislation that allows most California workers to take paid leave after the birth or adoption of a child or to care for sick family members.

California is the first state to enact a comprehensive paid family leave program. The bill is seen by supporters as a model for the nation.

Paid family leave was a top priority for the California Labor Federation, which sponsored the bill.

Under the measure, written by Sen. Sheila Kuehl, most workers will be paid about 55% of their salary for six weeks of leave for a new child or sick relative. The program will expand the state fund providing insurance for disabled workers but will be funded entirely by employee payroll deductions, averaging about $26 a year. About 13 million of California’s 16 million workers would be eligible.

Labor unions and women’s groups across the country hailed the Democratic governor’s decision to make California the first state to enact a comprehensive paid family leave program.

Karen Nussbaum, assistant to AFL-CIO President John Sweeney in Washington, D.C., called enactment of the California bill a “huge victory.”

Business groups, which had attempted to kill the bill in the Legislature, denounced the governor’s decision.

Steven Maviglio, the governor’s press secretary, said Davis signed the bill because he believed it was important to put “families first.”

During final negotiations over the bill several compromises were made in an effort to address concerns raised by business. The leaves were shortened from 12 weeks to six, and the expense was shifted entirely to workers. In earlier versions of the bill employers and employees were to split the costs.

Only workers who pay into the state disability insurance system will be eligible for the paid family leave. State government employees are exempted from that system because California covers them under a self-insured program.

Payroll deductions for eligible workers—ranging up to $70 a year for people earning more than $72,000 a year—would begin in January 2004. Workers would be allowed to start taking paid leaves as of July 1, 2004.

The maximum payment will be $728 a week, and the payments will not be taxed.

Workers will only be allowed to take leaves to bond with a new child—whether by birth, adoption or foster care—or to take care of a sick child, spouse or domestic partner, parent or, in some cases, grandparent.

National Campaign

California marks the first victory for the AFL-CIO and its allies in a growing national campaign for paid family leave, unfolding in state legislatures nationwide. Measures similar to the California bill have been introduced in nearly 30 statehouses over the last two years, but none has been signed into law.

The United States is one of the few industrialized nations in the world that doesn’t offer workers paid leave for the birth or adoption of a child or illness of family members, despite 20 years of effort by labor and women’s groups.

“People are finally seeing the real need to do something about it,” California AFL-CIO President Tom Rankin told the Los Angeles Times. “Obviously the politicians are following the people here.”
Trends indicate that one in four Americans over the age of 25 will have at least one stay in a nursing home during their lifetime. That's a lot of Americans who are going to be in for a rude shock. Nursing home residents are among the most vulnerable people in the country. They must rely on others for assistance with daily activities as well as nursing and rehabilitative care.

And despite efforts to regulate nursing home care, America's nursing home residents remain subject to abuse and neglect.

There are 1.6 million Americans residing in 17,000 nursing homes and the numbers will grow with demographic changes, according to a new report by the Alliance for Retired Americans. The average resident requires assistance with nearly four of five essential activities of daily living (ADLs).

Staffing is Key

The key to any progress in improving the quality of nursing home care, according to the Alliance report, is staffing.

"Nursing home staff and management cannot produce a decent environment for residents until there are vast improvements in staffing ratios, staff and management training, pay rates, benefits and incentives, and safety protections," the report claims.

Serious Deficiencies

In 2001 the General Accounting Office found that one-fourth of nursing homes were cited for serious deficiencies that caused actual harm to residents or placed them at risk of death or serious injury.

The federal nursing home reform law enacted in 1987 requires states to receive complaints and provide timely review and investigation of allegations of abuse or neglect. Forty percent of abuse violations documented by state inspectors are found as a result of complaints. Yet, complaints are considered to be underreported.

Enforcement of federal and state laws and regulations has been inconsistent over the years, according to the Alliance report. The Health Care Financing Administration (HCFA) took nearly seven years before publishing enforcement rules implementing the 1987 nursing home reform law.

A Step Backwards

The Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS), the renamed HCFA, has even stepped backwards by proposing to allow nursing homes to use single-task workers to assist with feeding residents thus undermining progress toward development of a trained, well-compensated direct care nursing workforce.

Despite more than a decade of studying appropriate minimum staffing in nursing homes, CMS and the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) will not recommend a standard to Congress, stating that the staffing shortage will be resolved through market forces and more efficient use of existing nurse staffing.

"Both the federal and state governments have a responsibility to ensure quality of care in nursing homes through collaborative and rigorous enforcement actions," the Alliance report declares.

The full text of the Alliance report can be found on the Alliance's web site at:

www.retiredamericans.org

With stock slide, Social Security plan loses its luster

Support for President Bush proposal to establish personal investment accounts in Social Security has eroded substantially after the stock market's long dive, USA Today reported.

When Bush outlined the idea of individual investment accounts in May 2000--on a day the Dow Jones average closed above 10,000--two-thirds of the public supported the idea. Now, with the Dow below 8,000, a USA TODAY/CNN/Gallup Poll shows that just over half support it. Opposition has climbed to 43% from 30%.

When the market was flying high, it was easy to argue that sticking with Social Security traditional benefit is riskier that going for a higher return by investing part of payroll taxes in individual investment accounts. A June 2000 poll showed that by 51% to 42% Americans thought sticking with the current system was the riskier choice.

But now the public, by 50% to 42%, says that adding investment accounts would be riskier. The survey of 1,010 adults in late September has a margin of error of 3 percentage points.

The stock market's woes could make it harder for the White House to follow through on its strategy of promoting its Social Security plan in 2003, following November's midterm elections. If Bush does go ahead and press for change, he is likely to look for new ways to package his proposal. Some advocates already have begun referring to the Bush program as "Social Security choice" rather than "privatization.

But whatever Bush calls his program, voters are increasingly likely to think of it as the "ENRONization of Social Security."
Gray Davis backed working people in the 2001-2002 legislative session

**It's a Fact**

Governor Gray Davis during the last legislative session signed 18 labor-backed bills that:

- Help our unions organize
- Protect injured workers
- Protect laid-off workers
- Balance work and family

**Protecting Injured Workers.**
- AB 486. Workers' Compensation clean-up bill.
- AB 2837. Strengthens criminal investigation of worksite deaths, provides bilingual access to CalOSHA services, and increases employer penalties for failure to notify a death on the job.

**Protecting Laid-Off Workers.**
- SB3X 2. Extends Unemployment Insurance benefit increases to workers laid off in the aftermath of 9/11.
- AB 2957. Requires companies to give sufficient notice to workers and community support agencies in advance of mass layoffs.

**Balancing Work and Family.**
- SB 1661. Beginning July 1, 2004, workers will receive up to 6 weeks of paid leave per year to care for a new child (birth, adoption, or foster care) or seriously ill family member (parent, child, spouse, or domestic partner).
- AB 1471. Guarantees that employers' absence control policies cannot evade workers' sick leave rights.

**Helping Our Unions Organize.**
- SB 1818. California's labor laws will be vigorously enforced for all workers, regardless of immigration status. The State will not ask about immigration status during any labor law investigation.
- AB 2895. Workers are protected when they talk about their working conditions to each other or a union representative.
- AB 2412. Employers must provide a worker's payroll records within 21 days of a request by the workers or their union representative.
- AB 2509. Guarantees that higher labor standards local governments have enacted (like living wages, anti-retaliation, and worker retention policies) apply to state funds that they administer.
- SB 1156/AB 2596. Realizing the farmworkers' long held promise of the right to organize and bargain with their employers.
- SB 371. Employee status and bargaining rights for court interpreters.
- AB 1788. Card check agreements for UC service contractors.

**Vote Nov. 5th**

---

**GRAY DAVIS**

**GOVERNOR**