Local 1245, PG&E in cooperative effort

Joint conference takes on the tough issues

By Eric Wolfe

Local 1245 and PG&E grappled with critical issues of service quality at a labor-management conference held Dec. 7 and 8—just three days before massive winter storms showed the issue of electric service back into the public spotlight.

Nearly 100 management and bargaining unit employees spent long hours discussing how work should be apportioned between the General Construction (Title 300) and Division (Title 200) workforces to assure maximum efficiency. This difficult issue, in turn, sparked discussion of several related matters, including: increased utilization of hiring hall employees, the pressing need to assure maximum efficiency. This difficult issue, in turn, sparked discussion of several related matters, including: increased utilization of hiring hall employees, the pressing need for additional apprentices as the current workforce ages, and the possible creation of a new non-journeyman electric classification.

The issue of workforce size surfaced repeatedly during these discussions. Management made it clear at the outset that PG&E had enough work to keep its present workforce busy into the foreseeable future. In fact, there was general agreement at the conference that more people would be needed to put PG&E back on its feet.

But feelings were equally strong that any workforce expansion must be structured properly.

While last month's storms gave the media an opportunity to blast PG&E for previous downsizing, and to suggest that more workers are needed, expanding a workforce as skilled and diversified as PG&E's is a complex undertaking—when potential risks for the company and for employees.

PG&E General Manager for Customer Energy Services Bob Haywood reminded conferees that the company faces very real budgetary constraints as it enters a more competitive business environment. And Local 1245 Business Manager Jack McNally pointed out that adding permanent employees to perform maintenance work that is only temporary could lead to a new round of layoffs.

ASSESSING NEEDS

Assessing PG&E manpower requirements and attempting to devise a formula to apportion work between Division and General Construction employees during the labor-management conference on Dec. 7-8 are (from left): Scott Stalder, subforeman A, GC-East Bay; Al Calleros, working foreman, GC San Francisco; and John Petrovitz, gas crew foreman, San Francisco Division. (Photo: Eric Wolfe)

Stalder, subforeman A, GC-East Bay; Al Calleros, working foreman, GC San Francisco; and John Petrovitz, gas crew foreman, San Francisco Division.

People are polite—up to a point. But when their lights are out and their freezers are thawing and their heaters aren't working, people can—well, let's not mince words—people can get a little agitated.

And when they are talking to their local power company, people can—well, let's not mince words—people can get downright abusive.

The challenge to PG&E customer service representatives during the December storms was to bear the brunt of customer anger over outages that lasted up to a week. This challenge required patience, skill, and information. Unfortunately, information was sometimes in short supply as the company attempted to track up to 1.6 million customer outages. On Tuesday, Dec. 12, at the height of the storm, service representatives were unable to call up the "access information screen" for several hours—apparently because of a computer malfunction.

During that period, said San Francisco Service Representative Antonio Aguilar, "we had absolutely no information to give them."

Ouch.

Call centers in San Francisco, San Jose and Fresno invoked mandatory overtime in order to remain open from 6 a.m. to 10 p.m. during the thick of the storms. "Just three days before massive storms shoved the issue of electric service back into the public spotlight.

Reprinted with permission from the PG&E Utility Reporter.
Workers here and abroad

Rolling the union on...

No Cuts!: Public sector workers in France protested a government proposal to cut social security benefits by mounting massive strikes that paralyzed Paris. Joining the strike were transport workers, telephone workers, truck drivers and utility workers. The strike was in its fourth week as the Utility Reporter went to press.

De-Peopled: The Lansing (Michigan) Community College is offering a seminar on "Preparing Your Organization to Work Productively Without Jobs," Labor Notes reported. The seminar promises to deal with questions like: "Why organizations are de-jobbing themselves, what the de-jobbed organization looks like, how a de-jobbed organization gets its work done...and what you should do to prepare for the workplace without jobs."

Boycott Hillhaven: The Central Labor Council of Alameda County, Ca. has called for a boycott of all Hillhaven and Vencor Convalescent Hospitals in Alameda County. SEIU Local 250 has been locked in a contract battle with the chain since August of 1994. The union has been trying to draw attention to the deteriorating quality of health care as more hospitals transfer so-called sub-acute care patients into convalescent hospitals.

Poor Little Rich Boy: The Raleigh News & Observer recently asked Republican Congressman Fred Heineeman of North Carolina where his $133,000 Congressional salary put him on the economic scale. "That does not make me rich," Heineeman said. "That does not make me upper middle class. In fact, that does not make me middle class. In my opinion, that makes me lower middle class." Heineeman said salaries of $300,000 to $750,000 a year put one in the middle class.

Going Up: Overriding a veto by Gov. William Weld, the Massachusetts legislature has increased the state minimum wage by $1 an hour. Two 50-cent increases will set the minimum wage at $5.25 by Jan. 1, 1997. The California Labor Federation is trying to put a minimum wage referendum to California voters in November of 1996.

Victory Party: More than 3,000 construction workers and allies came to San Francisco's Civic Center in late November to protest Gov. Pete Wilson's directive slashing prevailing wage projections on public works projects. But the planned protest turned into a celebration after a judge ruled that Wilson had flouted state law requiring advance public notice of the impact his proposal would have upon public works projects, government and communities that order them, and workers who do the construction.

New Concept: Unions in Edmonton, Alberta have created a different Labor Day tradition in recent years. Instead of a picnic for themselves, the city's unions now hold an annual "Barbecue for the Unemployed." According to the Canadian Association of Labour Media, 4,000 unemployed people showed up this year.

Organizers Protected: The US Supreme Court ruled in late November that paid union organizers who seek or take jobs with nonunionized employers with the goal of persuading co-workers to join the union are protected by federal labor laws to the same extent as any other employees. The decision means that employers cannot retaliate against paid union organizers in their workforces and cannot refuse to hire applicants whom they suspect of seeking work for the purpose of organizing a union from inside.

Labor Festival: The 10th Annual Western Workers Labor Heritage Festival will be held Jan. 12-14 at the Louden Nelson Community Center, 301 Center St., in downtown Santa Cruz.

Union Mushrooms: Pacific Mushrooms Co. signed a contract with the United Farm Workers in December, making it the fifth regional mushroom producer to sign with the union. Two-thirds of the Central Coast mushroom industry is now covered under UFW agreements.

Danger Below: More than 11,000 miners around the world die at work each year, free Labour World reported.
Deregulation plan to be unveiled

The California Public Utilities Commission was slated to announce on Dec. 20 its revised plan for deregulation of the state’s electric utilities—too late to be covered in this issue of Utility Reporter.

The Commission failed to meet a previous deadline of Dec. 6 for its long-awaited revision. The original plan was unveiled in April of 1994. Disagreements between commissioners over the pace of deregulation could be a factor in the delay.

Local 1245 members will almost certainly be affected by any deregulation plan that is ultimately adopted. Stay tuned for developments.

Workers deserve credit for storm performance

Despite all the critical attention PG&E received in the media, PG&E employees deserve a great deal of credit for their performance during last month’s storms. The series of storms that hit California in mid-December brought unprecedented winds. The 134 mile-per-hour gusts recorded in eastern Contra Costa County were the highest wind speeds ever recorded by the Bay Area Air Quality Management District.

No electric system, no matter how well maintained, can withstand that kind of punishment without significant damage. And no utility company, no matter how skilled and dedicated its workforce, is going to be able to put that system back together overnight.

Last month’s storms knocked down over 700 power poles, some 2400 miles of line, and dozens of transmission towers. Our members at PG&E responded with an extraordinary effort, working extremely long hours under very harsh circumstances.

PG&E acted quickly to bring in workers from other utilities on an emergency basis, and our union dispatched additional workers through the union hiring hall. But with 1.6 million customers experiencing power disruptions, there is simply no way to get everyone immediately back on line.

And so the calls flooded into PG&E service representatives at the four call centers in Sacramento, San Francisco, Fresno, and San Jose. On Tuesday, the peak of the storm, the call centers were flooded with 2 million calls. PG&E mandated overtime at the call centers, and supplemented that workforce by routing calls to the Stockton credit center, and by bringing Division workers into the call centers.

This is not to say that PG&E is without problems. The call center technology is still not performing as it should. Out in the field there are many maintenance issues that need to be addressed.

But PG&E has been moving aggressively since last spring to deal with these issues. And, as you can read in this issue of the Utility Reporter (see Page One), the company has been working cooperatively with this union to identify problem areas and to work jointly toward solutions.

Customers have a right to expect high quality electric service. But they shouldn’t expect PG&E employees to do more than is humanly possible. We’ve worked hard to give Californians a gas and electric system that is the envy of the world. And we’re working hard to keep it that way.
Service representatives bear brunt of customer anger
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Week of storms. The centers took turns remaining open 24 hours a day, supplementing PG&E's 24-hour call center in Sacramento.

In addition, PG&E brought in division employees to assist with phone answering at the call centers. Calls were also routed to PG&E's credit and collection center in Stockton.

"Barrage of Frustration"

To say the work was stressful would be a considerable understatement. The hardest part, said Aguilar, "was the barrage of frustration and verbal abuse that we took over the phones for 10, 14, 24 hours at a time."

From the service representatives' point of view there were three stages to the storm, Aguilar said.

During the first couple of days, customers asked for estimates on when service would be restored. Many remembered the January and March outages and didn't expect an instant resolution of their problem.

Toward mid-week, however, customers were getting frustrated "because we were not able to give them any information as far as estimates when they were going to be back up, and our seeming lack of knowledge as to their specific situation," said Aguilar.

In the final days of the outage, customers seemed more resigned and called in mainly for updates. But "every now and then we got a few irate customers who expected service immediately regardless of anything we said."

Other customers were more sympathetic, said Aguilar.

"About every 15th call was a real nice person—people who were sympathetic and gave us their appreciation," he said.

No Contact with Outside

Aguilar said the stressful work environment was intensified by the fact that customer service representatives had virtually no contact with the outside world for a week—except phone calls from people suffering from the outages and status reports from the field. He credited management at the San Francisco Call Center with working hard to bring in food and schedule adequate breaks.

"It was a team effort—management tried to help you out," he said.

IN THE MEDIA SPOTLIGHT

PG&E Service Representatives were in the media spotlight during the storm as public attention focused on the difficulty of getting through to PG&E. Here a Channel 7 news crew zeros in on Service Representative Marsha Bishop (at left, and in inset) while taping a report for the late night news on Dec. 14. (Photos: Eric Wolfe)
Haywood told participants. If any of the conferences were expecting to catch up on a little sleep while listening to two days of speeches, they were sorely disappointed. Immediately after the opening remarks by McNally and Haywood, the conference divided into six working groups, representing six geographical areas: Redwood, San Joaquin, East Bay/Diablo, Mission Trail, Sacramento, and San Francisco/Peninsula/DeAnza.

The primary task of the groups was to figure out the criteria to be used in assigning work to General Construction or Division. As a starting point, the groups examined company projections concerning the person-hours needed to put PG&E back in good working order. The groups then tried to come up with staffing scenarios to deliver those person-hours.

Issues discussed in putting together these scenarios included the most efficient deployment of GC and Division workforces in that area, co-mingling of GC and Division workforces, resource sharing between GC and Division, and the need for apprentices to replace an aging workforce.

The groups also attempted to determine how much of the workload in each area is "baseline" work to be performed by permanent employees, and how much is short-term work that could be performed by temporary employees out of the union hiring hall. As the discussions progressed, page after page of butcher paper filled up with calculations and spread out across meeting room walls at PG&E's Learning Center in San Ramon, where the conference was held. Discussions were often vigorous, but never became uncivil. Management and bargaining unit employees alike seemed eager to move beyond traditional points of disagreement and to stay focused as much as possible on the issue of delivering the best service possible to the customer.

By early afternoon of the second day, spokespersons for the sub-groups assembled to present their findings to

The December conference was a significant step forward in fulfilling the company's pledge to work cooperatively with the union in identifying service problems and determining the workforce required to fix them. PG&E General Manager for Customer Energy Services Bob Haywood declared at the outset that recommendations by the conference would be taken seriously.
Taking on the
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the Construction "94-53" committee—one of the many labor-management committees authorized by Letter Agreement 94-53. After a couple of hours of deliberations, the "94-53" committee announced that it accepted "as guidelines" the recommendations of the six area groups regarding the definition of Title 200 and Title 300 work.

The "94-53" committee noted that several principles should guide the implementation of these guidelines, namely:

- Flexibility is essential. We will be flexible with how the work gets done.
- We will share resources and continue co-mingling;
- We will use customer needs to guide determinations about who does what work;
- We will consider the availability and location of resources when deciding who does what job;
- We will find ways to keep lines of communication open between Titles 200 and 300.

"We will find ways to keep lines of communication open between Titles 200 and 300."
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Hiring Hall

In addition, the committee said it accepted the recommendations of the six area groups concerning the addition of hiring hall positions. (A recent Letter Agreement has now authorized the use of hiring hall workers for Division as well as GC.)

The committee said it would begin to explore the questions of how many to create, where to create them, and what process to use.

The committee also said it would explore additional issues raised during the conference, namely:

- “A” rights for displaced employees to return to the Division.
- Need for a new electric non-journeyman classification.
- Hiring permanent employees to meet work load.

and ways to keep communication open between Titles 200 and 300.”
tough issues

In addition, the committee did accept the recommendations of the six area groups concerning the addition of hiring hall positions. A recent Letter Agreement is now authorized the use of hiring hall workers for Division as well as GC.

The committee said it also accepted the conferences recommendations on creating apprenticeships, and tough issues of communication open between Titles 200 and 300. tough issues

Darrel Mitchell, flanked by union and management members of the committee, reports back to the conference that its recommendations and Division work have been accepted by the "94-53" committee.
FEDERAL BUDGET

Getting real

By Eric Wolfe
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Sometimes you have to look beneath the surface to understand something. In politics, it seems you have to look beneath the surface to understand anything. Take the federal budget, for example. Since winning control of the US House and Senate last year, Republicans have insisted that the fate of the nation depends on balancing the federal budget. Republican leaders even shut down the federal government for several days in November to show how strongly they feel about balancing the budget.

We owe it to our children to balance the budget, say the Republicans (and many Democrats). We must all sacrifice today so that our children will have a better tomorrow.

Invoking these noble sentiments of self-sacrifice, House Speaker Newt Gingrich and Senate Majority Leader Bob Dole have led the effort to slash funds for a host of federal programs: Medicare, Medicaid, the Occupational Safety and Health Administration, the National Labor Relations Board, summer youth programs, assistance to dislocated workers, adult training, and college loans, to name a few. (See story, Page Nine.)

To listen to the political rhetoric, you'd think that the Republicans had targeted every bit of fat in the federal government in their crusade to balance the budget so that our children will have a better tomorrow.

But in politics, there's always more to it than what you see on the surface. While asking millions of Americans to sacrifice, the Republicans are asking no such sacrifice from corporate America. In fact, in this "time of sacrifice," the Republican budget is continuing to offer huge handouts to some of the nation's wealthiest corporations.

Some of these tax breaks and subsidies, as described in the November 27 issue of The Nation, are as follows:

Tax Breaks for Raids on Workers' Pension Funds.

Workers' pension funds are currently protected by a stiff tax (20 to 50%) on any money a business withdraws from the funds. And any money taken out can only be used to strengthen worker benefit packages. But House Ways and Means chairman Bill Archer has proposed an 18-month moratorium on this tax (retroactive to Jan. 1, 1995) and the removal of restrictions on how the money can be used. Already American businesses are lining up to take an estimated $40 billion out of the funds. After the 18-month moratorium expires, the excise tax would be established at 6.5%, leaving virtually no disincentive to keep businesses from treating employees' pensions as just another source of revenue.

Market Promotion Program.

The US Department of Agriculture currently gives about $100 million a year in tax breaks and direct subsidies to some of the most profitable companies in the world. These programs help companies like McDonald's, Kraft and Archer-Daniels-Midland sell more Big Macs and macaroni and cheese overseas. About 9% of this money—our tax dollars—goes to companies that are foreign owned. The agriculture committees in each house, led by Senator Richard Lugar (R-IN) and Rep. Pat Roberts (R-KS), decided that the agri-giants were still struggling, and have added $25 million to the program's budget for next year.

Tax Loophole for Mutual Life Insurance Companies.

Mutual insurance companies are the beneficiaries of extraordinarily generous tax breaks. Thanks to hefty lobbying clout, the highly profitable mutual companies have been able to maintain a loophole that allows them to skirt nearly $2 billion in taxes annually.

Tax Breaks for Companies in US Territories.

In theory, the $3.5 billion in annual tax breaks to companies that do business in Puerto Rico and the US Virgin Islands increase employment in the territories. But in reality the companies largely reinvest the money, which increases a company's profits but not its employment levels or its workers' salaries. Beneficiaries include pharmaceutical companies like Johnson & Johnson and Bristol-Myers Squibb, as well as soft drink makers Pepsi and Coca-Cola.

Special Deductions for Oil Companies.

The oil industry has wrangled special tax breaks that allow it to deduct fully the costs of locating and drilling for oil. During the energy crisis of the 1970s, the subsidies were expanded. But now our country has all the oil it needs—and we are even exporting our own Alaskan oil. And yet Congress continues to offer more than $1 billion annually in tax breaks to this enormously profitable industry. In the name of "our children," Congress is taking away tax incentives for alternative fuel development, but the money to Big Oil just keeps right on gushing.

On the surface, the Republican call for a balanced budget looks like an honorable attempt to persuade all Americans to sacrifice now in order to benefit our children down the road. When you scratch the surface, however, you find that average Americans are being asked to sacrifice their health care, their education, and their occupational safety so that big corporations won't have to elbow their way through so much riff-raff on their way to the public trough.
Americans are being asked to make sacrifices to help balance the budget. But it turns out that most of the sacrificing is going to be done by working Americans, while corporations continue to exploit tax loopholes.

Here are some of the things that the Republican budget sacrifices:

**Workers Health and Safety**

OSHA: There is an overall 16% cut in the federal Occupational Safety and Health Administration. The biggest reduction has been to worker safety programs. The House voted to cut OSHA federal enforcement by 30%. This would reduce workplace inspection for health and safety violations.

California could see a decrease of 14% in its Cal-OSHA budget. The reduction of regulatory and enforcement powers proposed by Congress would have the effect of changing OSHA from an enforcement agency with real powers to an agency providing counseling and technical assistance to companies.

Ergonomic Standards: These standards—badly needed to protect workers against repetitive stress injuries—were to be implemented for clerical workers, grocery clerks and others who perform repetitive tasks. In fact, Republican legislation specifically prohibits any standards in this area. This is in spite of the fact that one out of three dollars spent on workers’ compensation relates to the injuries addressed in these standards.

The total spent on compensation claims related to these injuries is about $20 billion per year nationwide.

Most experts believe that standards would lead to decreased injuries to workers and a lowering of costs to employers.

Fall Protection: The legislation would prohibit OSHA from enforcing their recently-promulgated standards covering construction workers and certain others who work above 16 feet. These standards protect workers against falls, which account for two-thirds of all construction fatalities.

Worker Training

California training and education programs would be cut by $4.3 billion over the next seven years. Specific cuts include:

**Summer Youth Program:** 102,000 kids will no longer be eligible for summer jobs. The House and Senate eliminated this program entirely.

**Year-Round Youth Program:** This program helps high-risk students stay in school. The House deleted $81 million for California, while the Senate proposal decreases funding by $32 million.

**Dislocated Workers:** Californians have benefitted greatly from this program. The program covers workers who might be dislocated because of NAFTA. Seventy-two million dollars would be cut if the House version is enacted, $55 million cut if the Senate proposal is enacted. Nearly 32,000 workers would be denied training as a result.

**Older Workers:** This program helps subsidize older Americans going back to work, using their talent and skills to help community organizations who work with, for example, abused children, the homeless and frail elderly. California would receive $6 million less in funds the first year in the House version and a decrease of $4.2 million in the Senate bill.

**Adult Training:** These programs train adults to enter the workforce with skills that will enable them to take jobs that pay a living wage. Beginning in 1996, these programs are proposed to be funded at 31% less than their 1995 level.

**School to Work:** These programs help students make the transition from high school to work. Congressional cuts halved the President’s request. California was not one of the original 28 states funded. The changes proposed could prevent California from participating in this program.

**JTPA:** Combined, all training programs covered by the Job Training Partnership Act would be cut by 40% from the 1995 funding.

**Wage and Hour Administration:** This agency enforces the laws that require employers to pay minimum wage, Davis-Bacon wage rates, and overtime after 40 hours per week. It guarantees that wages are paid by employers and generally protects low-wage workers from some of the worst excesses of the workplace. Closing sweatshops such as those that have been found to operate in the garment industry is one part of this agency’s duties. Congress proposes to cut its budget by 12.5%.

**National Labor Relations Board:** Republican proposals would reduce the budget of the NLRB by one-third, severely limiting its ability to hear cases. Legislation also repeals the Board’s injunction powers so its power to take action against employers would be limited.

**Striker Replacement:** Under an executive order signed by President Clinton, employers can no longer permanently replace strikers on federal projects when there is a labor disagreement. A rider placed in the budget bill and many other pieces of legislation would negate the president’s order and allow for the permanent replacement of strikers.

**TEAM Act:** Not part of the budget but passed by the House on Sept. 27, it would modify the National Labor Relations Act to permit management in non-union workplaces to form company unions under the complete control of management.
### City College of San Francisco Labor Studies Program

**Spring Semester, 1996**

**Classes begin January 18, 1996**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Course Name</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Instructor(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LS 1:</td>
<td>Union Organizing (3 units)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mondays, 7-10 pm</td>
<td>TBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LS 2:</td>
<td>Public Sector Labor Relations (2 units)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tuesdays, Feb. 27-May 21, 7-10 pm</td>
<td>Instructor: Karena Hart, President, ATU 1574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LS 5:</td>
<td>Bay Area Labor History (2 units)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Thursdays, Feb. 29-May 23, 7-10 pm</td>
<td>TBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LS 10:</td>
<td>Race &amp; Ethnicity in the Labor Movement (3 units)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Thursdays, 7-10 pm</td>
<td>Instructor: Sue Englander</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LS 100:</td>
<td>Peer Counseling (1 unit)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Saturdays, April 13 &amp; 20, 9 am-5 pm</td>
<td>TBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LS 110:</td>
<td>Issues in Health &amp; Safety (1 unit)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Saturdays, March 2 &amp; 9, 9 am-5 pm</td>
<td>TBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LS 111:</td>
<td>Work Health &amp; Safety (1 unit)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mondays, 9 am-3 pm</td>
<td>TBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LS 112:</td>
<td>Accident Investigation (1 unit)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Fridays, 9 am-4 pm</td>
<td>TBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LS 120:</td>
<td>Labor Law (3 units)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tuesdays, Feb. 7 - March 6, 6:30 pm-9:30 pm</td>
<td>Instructor: TBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LS 130:</td>
<td>History of Labor (3 units)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Wednesdays, April 2, 4, 5, 9 am-6 pm</td>
<td>TBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LS 131:</td>
<td>Labor Economics (3 units)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Wednesdays, April 10-20, 9 am-6 pm</td>
<td>TBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LS 132:</td>
<td>Labor History (3 units)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Mondays, April 22, 9 am-6 pm</td>
<td>TBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LS 133:</td>
<td>Labor Economics (3 units)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Wednesdays, April 24-29, 9 am-6 pm</td>
<td>TBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LS 134:</td>
<td>Labor Economics (3 units)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Thursdays, May 2-3, 9 am-6 pm</td>
<td>TBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LS 135:</td>
<td>Labor Law (3 units)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fridays, May 9-23, 9 am-6 pm</td>
<td>TBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LS 136:</td>
<td>Labor Law (3 units)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tuesdays, May 27, 9 am-6 pm</td>
<td>TBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LS 137:</td>
<td>Labor Law (3 units)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Wednesdays, June 3-4, 9 am-6 pm</td>
<td>TBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LS 138:</td>
<td>Labor Law (3 units)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Thursdays, June 9-13, 9 am-6 pm</td>
<td>TBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LS 139:</td>
<td>Labor Law (3 units)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fridays, June 14-21, 9 am-6 pm</td>
<td>TBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LS 140:</td>
<td>Labor Law (3 units)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tuesdays, June 25-27, 9 am-6 pm</td>
<td>TBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LS 141:</td>
<td>Labor Law (3 units)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Wednesdays, July 2-4, 9 am-6 pm</td>
<td>TBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LS 142:</td>
<td>Labor Law (3 units)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Thursdays, July 9-11, 9 am-6 pm</td>
<td>TBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LS 143:</td>
<td>Labor Law (3 units)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fridays, July 19-26, 9 am-6 pm</td>
<td>TBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LS 144:</td>
<td>Labor Law (3 units)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tuesdays, July 29-30, 9 am-6 pm</td>
<td>TBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LS 145:</td>
<td>Labor Law (3 units)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Wednesdays, August 1-3, 9 am-6 pm</td>
<td>TBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LS 146:</td>
<td>Labor Law (3 units)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Thursdays, August 8-10, 9 am-6 pm</td>
<td>TBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LS 147:</td>
<td>Labor Law (3 units)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fridays, August 23-29, 9 am-6 pm</td>
<td>TBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LS 148:</td>
<td>Labor Law (3 units)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tuesdays, September 2-4, 9 am-6 pm</td>
<td>TBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LS 149:</td>
<td>Labor Law (3 units)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Wednesdays, September 11-20, 9 am-6 pm</td>
<td>TBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LS 150:</td>
<td>Labor Law (3 units)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Thursdays, September 18-20, 9 am-6 pm</td>
<td>TBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LS 151:</td>
<td>Labor Law (3 units)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fridays, September 21-27, 9 am-6 pm</td>
<td>TBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LS 152:</td>
<td>Labor Law (3 units)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tuesdays, October 1-3, 9 am-6 pm</td>
<td>TBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LS 153:</td>
<td>Labor Law (3 units)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Wednesdays, October 11-14, 9 am-6 pm</td>
<td>TBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LS 154:</td>
<td>Labor Law (3 units)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Thursdays, October 18-19, 9 am-6 pm</td>
<td>TBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LS 155:</td>
<td>Labor Law (3 units)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fridays, October 25-29, 9 am-6 pm</td>
<td>TBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LS 156:</td>
<td>Labor Law (3 units)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tuesdays, November 5-6, 9 am-6 pm</td>
<td>TBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LS 157:</td>
<td>Labor Law (3 units)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Wednesdays, November 13-20, 9 am-6 pm</td>
<td>TBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LS 158:</td>
<td>Labor Law (3 units)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Thursdays, November 21-22, 9 am-6 pm</td>
<td>TBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LS 159:</td>
<td>Labor Law (3 units)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fridays, November 29-30, 9 am-6 pm</td>
<td>TBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LS 160:</td>
<td>Labor Law (3 units)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tuesdays, December 2-3, 9 am-6 pm</td>
<td>TBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LS 161:</td>
<td>Labor Law (3 units)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Wednesdays, December 9-11, 9 am-6 pm</td>
<td>TBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LS 162:</td>
<td>Labor Law (3 units)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Thursdays, December 18-19, 9 am-6 pm</td>
<td>TBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LS 163:</td>
<td>Labor Law (3 units)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Fridays, December 27-29, 9 am-6 pm</td>
<td>TBA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**San Francisco State Labor Studies**

**Spring Semester, 1996**

**Classes begin Jan. 29, 1996**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Course Name</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Instructor(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Labor 251:</td>
<td>Know Your Workrights (3 units)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tuesdays, 4:10 - 6:55 pm</td>
<td>Instructor: Al Lannon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor 300:</td>
<td>Researching Labor Issues (3 units)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Saturdays, Feb. 3, 7, 10 am-12 pm</td>
<td>Instructor: Brenda Cochrane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor 343:</td>
<td>Women and Work (3 units)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Thursdays, 7 - 9 pm</td>
<td>Instructor: TBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labor 578:</td>
<td>Urban Health Systems (3 units)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Tuesdays, 4:10 - 6:55 pm</td>
<td>Instructor: David Leeman</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**San Jose City Coll. Labor Studies**

**Spring Semester, 1996**

**Classes begin Jan. 22, 1996**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Course Name</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Instructor(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LS 906:</td>
<td>Directed Study, Level 2 (1-3 units)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Wednesdays, Feb. 7 - March 6, 6:30 pm-9:30 pm</td>
<td>TBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LS 136:</td>
<td>Labor Studies Work Experience (1-4 units)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Wednesdays, March 15-April 17, 9:30 am-9:30 pm</td>
<td>TBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LS 137:</td>
<td>Special Topics: Labor Values and Traditions (1 unit)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Wednesdays, April 24 - May 22, 6:30 pm-9:30 pm</td>
<td>TBA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Labor Studies**

All classes are at Downtown Campus, 800 Mission St. (at 4th St.), in San Francisco unless otherwise noted. Fees are $13/unit for all students, plus a $10 per student fee. Some tuition assistance is available.

---

**San Jose City Coll. Labor Studies**

**Spring Semester, 1996**

**Classes begin Jan. 22, 1996**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Course Code</th>
<th>Course Name</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Instructor(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LS 906:</td>
<td>Directed Study, Level 2 (1-3 units)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Wednesdays, Feb. 7 - March 6, 6:30 pm-9:30 pm</td>
<td>TBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LS 136:</td>
<td>Labor Studies Work Experience (1-4 units)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Wednesdays, March 15-April 17, 9:30 am-9:30 pm</td>
<td>TBA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LS 137:</td>
<td>Special Topics: Labor Values and Traditions (1 unit)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Wednesdays, April 24 - May 22, 6:30 pm-9:30 pm</td>
<td>TBA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Those still working can help mobilize retirees

By Orv Owen

A new approach to the retirement age has been witnessed in the past few years. Our Retiree Club chapters are committed to continuing our efforts in organizing, mobilizing, and expanding our Retiree Club chapters throughout Local 1245's service areas where our members reside.

We would appreciate any help and guidance we receive from active Local 1245 members in contacting retired members in their home areas to assist us in establishing a Retirees Club chapter in an accessible location to hold monthly meetings and social activities. Retired members who held unit officer positions, shop stewards, and members who served on committees know how to get the job done. It would be extremely helpful to have your assistance in establishing a Retirees Club chapter in your home area.

Active members and retired members who would like to help, please contact Local 1245's office by mail (P.O. Box 4790, Walnut Creek, CA 94598) or by telephone (510-933-6060), and ask for Julie Rodriguez.

Elections next year will be extremely important to both active and retired members. Retired members have the time and talent to participate in the election process, which could be of great assistance to our active brothers and sisters. We all have a personal interest in the programs and benefits that affect the standard of life of senior citizens.

We need each other just as much now as we did in past years. Keep the faith!

Is Social Security about to collapse? The answer is ‘No’!

Thirty years ago, when Barry Goldwater proposed making Social Security voluntary, he was dismissed as a lunatic. Now, however, the radical transformation of Social Security—essentially its privatization—is the consensus among a certain political class and the pundits who serve them.

The strategy of the privatizers is proving quite successful: Sow doubts about the future solvency of the system. Chip away its near-universal political support by taxing benefits of “affluent” retirees, periodically lowering the definition of affluence. Eventually turn the public pension system into welfare for the elderly poor—an easy target for cuts—while leaving the middle class and rich to fend for themselves.

A Time magazine cover story from March 20, 1995, headlined "The Case for Killing Social Security," opened by citing Sen. Alan Simpson (R-WY). Simpson "confronted the Social Security Commissioner with a 'poll showing that more people under the age of 35 believe in UFOs than in the prospect that Social Security will pay them benefits upon retirement.' The article went on to recite the usual statistics about the system's imminent bankruptcy, as the Baby Boomers and then the "Generation X'ers" enter their golden years. The article concluded with a menu of "options"—privatize the whole system, cut benefits, or means-test them.

Almost no one bothers to investigate the claim of Social Security's coming insolvency, which is based on projections in the annual report of the system's trustees. Anyone investigating would have discovered that the projections assume the economy will grow an average of 1.5% a year (above inflation) for the next 75 years—half the rate of the previous 75 years, and matched in only one decade from 1910-1920. Even the 1920s, the decade of the Great Depression, saw a faster growth rate.

What would happen if the economy grew at a pepper 2.2% rate? The trustees provide alternative projections based on that as well, and, gosh, the system remains solvent indefinitely. At 2.5%—still slower than the 75-year average—it runs a surplus.

The World Bank's report, Averting the Old Age Crisis, recommended a three-pillared system: 1) a mandatory system, financed out of taxes, to provide a minimal base pension; 2) a mandatory savings scheme, in which every worker is required to contribute a portion of his or her earnings to a kind of IRA, to be invested in financial markets; and 3) a supplementary system of private savings, also to be invested in the financial markets.

What's wrong with this? First, the present system is mildly redistributive, with the rich slightly subsidizing the poor in retirement. A private system would end that transfer. And second, a private system would be no better equipped to handle the bulge of boomer retirees beginning around 2010 than the present system. Right now Social Security is financed by a wage base that grows roughly in line with the overall economy; why should the stock market do significantly better?

Most people think that money invested in the stock market finds its way into real investment in buildings and machines. In fact, almost none of it does; most firms finance real investment through their profits. (Between 1901 and 1994, US non-financial corporations financed less than 5% of their capital expenditures through the stock market.) The stock market is mainly an arena for the buying and selling of existing shares and, through takeovers and spin-offs, of entire corporations. Investing in the stock market will no more create the wealth necessary to take care of elderly Boomers than Social Security taxes do.

The best commentary on the Social Security slashed was in Barron's (May 29, 1995), the weekly magazine of investors. Columnist Alan Abelson sharply characterized the strategy of privatization: "The soft spot in any entitlement is that the recipients feel entitled. If, instead, they're made to feel slightly grateful, then it's no great sweat to persuade them to accept a pittance instead of a plump. And to put them in the proper frame of mind, nothing is more effective than a whiff of destitution. Paupers...can't be choosers."

(Excerpted from an article by Doug Henwood, editor of Left Business Observer)
SCHOLARSHIP OPPORTUNITIES

Local 1245
Trade and Vocational School Grant

The purpose of these grants is to provide aid to the children of members to attain a trade or technical education.

1. The grants will be as follows: $500 per year, for up to two years for two candidates, as long as a passing grade is maintained, and a parent maintains membership in good standing in Local Union 1245.

2. In order to be a candidate in this contest, you must be a daughter or son, natural, legally adopted or a legal ward of a member of Local Union 1245. You must be a high school student who has graduated or is graduating in 1996. A copy of your diploma or a letter from your high school stating that you will graduate in 1996 must be attached to your application. Additionally, a letter of recommendation from your vocational teacher, department head, or school principal must accompany the application.

3. Applications may be secured by addressing the Recording Secretary of Local Union 1245, by calling the Union office, or by using the form printed in the Utility Reporter.

4. The grant will be made only to a candidate who intends to enroll full time in any industrial, technical or trade school, other than correspondence schools, which are accredited by the national Association of Trade and Technical Schools or the Association of Independent Colleges and Schools.

5. Applications must be mailed to IBEW, Local Union 1245, PO Box 4790, Walnut Creek, CA 94596, by registered or certified mail only, and be postmarked no later than the first Monday of April each year (April 1, 1996).

6. Two names will be drawn by the Judge of the Competitive Scholarship Contest from those submitting applications. These two will be recipients of the grants.

7. Essays should be submitted on 8-1/2" by 11" paper, on one side, preferably typed and double spaced, with applicant's written signature at the conclusion of the essay.

8. Presentation of awards will be made to recipients at the unit meeting nearest his/her residence following the drawing.

Application for the Local 1245 Trade & Vocational School Grant for Members' Children Enrolling in Technical, Industrial, or Trade Schools

Sponsored by Local Union 1245
International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers, AFL-CIO

Candidate Information

Candidate's Name ___________________________ Birthdate ___________________________
Address ___________________________ City ___________________________
State __________ Zip __________ Phone ___________________________
High School ___________________________ Graduation Date __________
Address of High School ___________________________
What school do you expect to attend? ___________________________
Where is it located? ___________________________
What trade or craft will you be studying? ___________________________
Why this particular skill? ___________________________
Candidate's signature ___________________________ Date ___________________________

Statement of Member/Parent

Name of Member/Parent ___________________________
Employer ___________________________ Location ___________________________
I certify that I am a member in good standing of IBEW Local Union 1245, that the Candidate named above, ___________________________, is my ___________________________, and that the Candidate will graduate from high school during the term ending ___________________________, 1996.
Signature of Member/Parent ___________________________
Union Card No. ___________________________

Local 1245
Al Sandoval Memorial Competitive Scholarship

The purpose of this contest is to provide a grant in aid for scholarships to colleges and junior colleges, thereby making financial assistance toward the attainment of a higher education.

1. The grant will be as follows: $500 per year, up to four (4) years, as long as a "C" (2.0) average is maintained, and a parent maintains membership in good standing in Local Union 1245.

2. In order to be a candidate in this contest, you must be a daughter or son, natural, legally adopted or a legal ward of a member of Local Union 1245. You must also be a high school student who has graduated or is graduating in 1996. A copy of your diploma or a letter from your high school stating that you will graduate in 1996 must be attached to your scholarship application.

3. The scholarship grant will be made only to that candidate who intends to enroll full time in any college certified by their State Department of Education and accredited by the local accrediting association.

4. Application may be secured by addressing the Recording Secretary of Local Union 1245, by calling the Union office, or by using the form printed in the Utility Reporter.

5. Checks will be paid directly to the college upon presentation of tuition bills to the Local Union.

6. All applications shall be accompanied by a written essay, not to exceed five hundred (500) words, on the subject designated by the Executive Board.

7. Essays should be submitted on 8-1/2" by 11" paper, on one side, preferably typed and double spaced, with applicant's written signature at the conclusion of the essay.

8. Applications and essays must be mailed to IBEW, Local Union 1245, PO Box 4790, Walnut Creek, CA 94596, by registered or certified mail only, and be postmarked no later than the first Monday in March of each year (March 4, 1996).

9. Each year the scholarship will be presented at the Advisory Council meeting in May; the judge and a guest and the recipient and parents shall be invited, at Local Union expense, to present and receive the scholarship award.

10. A suitable trophy or plaque shall be purchased by the Local Union, at a cost not to exceed $75, to be presented to the scholarship recipient.

The topic for the 1996 Al Sandoval Memorial Competitive Scholarship Essay is: "SHOULD THE EIGHT-HOUR WORK DAY BE PRESERVED?"