

CALIFORNIA ENERGY COMMISSION

REPORT OF CONVERSATION Page 1 of 1

DOCKET

11-AFC-2

DATE JAN 23 2012

RECD. JAN 27 2012



Siting, Transportation, and Environmental Protection Division

FILE: 11-AFC-2

PROJECT TITLE: Hidden Hills SEGS

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Telephone	916-654-4545/ 702-224-3000	<input type="checkbox"/> Meeting Location:	
NAME:	Lisa Worrall	DATE:	Jan. 23, 2012
WITH:	Jeff Orr, Financial Secretary, United Association Local 525, Las Vegas, NV		
SUBJECT:	Response to CEC Dec. 19, 2011 labor letter		

Jeff contacted me in response to staff's letter dated December 19, 2011 that was sent to him to solicit his feedback based upon his experience and knowledge of the labor workforce in the Pahrump and Las Vegas areas. The following notes are from our conversation.

If a labor agreement is signed, the labor unions in Las Vegas would be called if the local union (per the labor agreement) does not have enough unemployed workers to fully supply the project's workforce needs. For example, if the Bakersfield desert pipefitters union cannot provide the required amount of labor from their union, they can reach out to other unions to fill the need. As the closest labor union for pipefitters is in Las Vegas, the balance of the workers could come from that union. The Las Vegas union workers would use a travel card where they deposit it at the local union (Bakersfield) and would be dispatched out of the Bakersfield local union headquarters. Their per diem/travel pay would be based on the travel distance from the Bakersfield union to the project site. The Las Vegas union workers would commute daily to the project site, possibly carpooling. The per diem would cover gas and car maintenance costs involved with the daily commute.

If a labor agreement is not signed and a non-union contractor is used for the project construction, non-union workers can bid on the project. The workforce would come from a greater geographic area, especially those in specialized trades. As non-union workers they would not make as much as a union worker, they would seek lodging closer to the project site and may be more willing to find alternative lodging options such as leasing land in the Charleston View area to park their recreational vehicle. The closest available lodging would be first to be used (Charleston View, Tecopa, and Shoshone) then Pahrump and then Las Vegas.

Project operations labor would be mostly from Las Vegas. About 80 to 85% of the workforce would come from Clark County. Pahrump does not have a large union labor supply.

cc: Project file	Signed:
Dick Ratliff, Staff Counsel	Name: Lisa Worrall