

My name is Randy Brooks and I'm interviewing Gary Moore. Today is February 5th, 1992.

Gary, could you tell me about your background and how you began working for the Federation?

Sure, I had graduated from the University of Washington and then I went to graduate school at the University of Wisconsin in Madison. I studied public administration and labor relations and wanted to work for a Union when I was done. I became familiar with AFSCME at graduate school. Jerry Wurf was the International President of AFSCME at the time, and AFSCME was always pointed out as the most progressive Union in the American Labor Movement. AFSCME's positions in Memphis on civil rights with Dr. Martin Luther King and some other progressive stands had attracted me. It was not just a trade union pursuing narrow trade union issues, there was more of a movement in dealing with broader issues than the typical trade union issues. I said to myself at that time, AFSCME is the union that I want to work for. As I was originally from Washington State, I came back here and then conned George Masten to get a job and was hired as a temporary organizer on May 1st, 1975. I continued on from there. I started out as an organizer in May of '75 after badgering George for God knows how long, a number of months at least! It was during the Legislative session. I probably was at a disadvantage coming out of school as opposed to coming up through the ranks. He offered me a job

as a temporary organizer for 60 days. I remember coming back on the 59th night before the last day, in the evening. Elsie Schrader, who was a staff person and I were down in Ocean Shores, convening an organizing meeting with people in Developmental Disabilities, a field service operation. We were driving back, and I was talking to her in the car. I said I was going to see George the next day, because my 60th day was up. Her advice was; "Well, don't go talk to him, just keep coming in!" I said; "Well that's not a bad approach". So I didn't even go in to confirm what was going to happen after this. I just kept showing up and frankly, I tried to avoid the office like the plague, so I wouldn't run into George. This went on for about a month and a half. I remember coming back in on a Friday afternoon. I was dropping off some membership cards I had for some people to join the union. So I was dropping off the cards with the accountant to start the processing and I was coming out of her office, down the hallway in the office on Columbia or something like that. George comes out down the hallway from the other end and said he wanted to see me for a couple of minutes. I thought; "Oh, the gig's up!" I went into his office, and he said; "How long are you hired for?" I said; "60 days," and he said; "Well, it's a little past that, isn't it?" I said; "Well the paychecks are still coming!" He then asked me to do a project with the highway maintenance people; a reclass was taking place on all the people of the highway maintenance bargaining unit. I did that, comparing how people fared on the survey; the classification

survey that was conducted. In October of that year, the area representative in Spokane wanted to transfer to Seattle for a vacancy that had occurred there. So George asked me if I would be willing to move to Spokane and be an Area Representative over there. I said; "Sure, when do you want me to start over there." He said; "tomorrow," so I caught a plane that night and started in Spokane as a Field Representative. I had about 10 locals; Eastern Washington locals from Spokane up to Colville in the north, and Clarkston in the south. I worked in Spokane until May of '79 when a vacancy opened in Seattle. I told George I'd like to transfer over; my wife had an opportunity with her employer and he said; "sure." I waited around, we sold our house, she moved to Seattle, and then finally in the latter part of October of '79 the replacement for me in Spokane was hired and so then I moved over to Seattle. I was an Area Representative in the Seattle Office from the latter part of '79 till I got this position; which was November of '85.

One of the things that George had brought up was his problem of getting financial stability for the Union. I wanted to ask you, is the Union financially stable at this time?

Yes. I think that goes back to 1978, at our convention, where we changed our dues structure. We used to have a minimum dues and every time you'd have to go in and get a dues increase to provide ongoing financial stability. We switched to a percentage dues

structure which is much fairer, in a more progressive way, because you are having people pay dues in accordance with their ability to pay. That dues structure had an escalator clause, if you will, that the lid would go up in accordance with the same percentage as the general salary increase given to state employees. That has helped provide financial stability to the Union. There's been a couple of occasions where the lid has been increased, to be able to expand programs and hire additional staff, those sort of things. I think the purest, or fairest way would be no lid, everybody would pay 1.1 percent, but the lid has been increased on several occasions. Overall, the Union is stabilized financially, and I think our growth in membership has certainly helped in terms of that financial stability. Obviously when you increase your membership dramatically you have additional services you have to provide. But we've been able to keep fairly good pace with that.

Is the Union increasing in size at this time?

Oh, yes, it's continuing to grow at a very good pace! In fact, about eight months ago, we went over 20,000 members for the first time in our Union's history! So we're moving on to the next plateau.

How much lobbying do you personally do with the Legislature and the Governors staff?

More than I like! There are three of us that lobby: Mark Brown, Bev Hermanson and myself. I have been less involved this session than I have in past years because it is hard to ignore everything else in the Union and focus exclusively on the lobbying. Mark and Bev do that. This is Bev's first session, this session she got some experience under her belt in terms of lobbying. So she has been able to pick up quite a bit of that. Still you have to do quite a bit, meeting with the Governor's Office, the leadership in the House and the Senate. It goes up and down depending on the nature of the legislation and who we have in different areas and try to work. I haven't had to do as much this session as in previous sessions, but it still takes a considerable amount of time.

What is your role then when you are over there?

We share responsibilities. We will take different bills and follow them through. We testify in committees on behalf of the Union, sharing our position on given pieces of legislation. We do this before the Appropriations Committee, Appropriations in the House, Ways and Means in the Senate on salaries, medical insurance, and retirement trying to convince leadership to do something, one way or another, depending on what is in the best interests of our membership. We do lobbying individually with members, working them to try and generate support or opposition to the given bill, depending on our position on it. We are

engaged in doing the day-to-day lobbying work.

What do you perceive is the Federation's role for state employees at this time; What is your goal?

Our goal includes certain things that are always there. In terms of improving the economic conditions of the employees, that is an ongoing goal that never changes. We are always trying to enhance the economic conditions of employees, ensuring that their benefits keep pace with what they should be receiving. Health care has the right to sit in with the Governor and negotiate our economic conditions and terms and condition of employment. To be truthful, it will be very difficult with the Republicans controlling the Senate, we are going to need a Democratic Senate and Democratic House and probably a Democratic Governor. Hopefully, all of those three things will come together in this election in the fall. Then we can get collective bargaining so that employees truly do have a Democratic form of workplace democracy to achieve those goals that we hold so important.

Is the focus on common goals or specific employee troubles?

It is both. We have an overall responsibility to improve the wages, hours of work and terms / conditions of work for the membership on a broad basis. Dealing with individual agencies in terms of their policies and their programs and how employees are

treated within agencies. Also to insure that an employee's voice is heard in a meaningful way we have the not just token consideration, but meaningful input into those decisions in the labor management committee process on an agency-by-agency basis. Then also representing individual employees who have been treated unfairly, have had actions taken against them that were not proper, defending them and representing them in grievances and appeals before the Personnel Appeals Board in disciplinary actions. It is kind of a three-legged stool in terms of the Legislative Arena, the State Personnel Board, and the third one dealing with the agencies which are on a broad basis as well as an individual basis. You have to do all of those activities to fully represent the interests of the membership.

How does your staff represented in following that; in other words percentage wise how much is with common goals and how much is specific to individual employees?

It is hard to give a percentage there. There are three of us that work the Legislative Arena, there is a couple that work the Personnel Board on a full-time basis, and then we have fifteen field staff around the state that handle the labor management meetings / contract negotiations at the Local level, individual representation of grievances and appeals. I suspect that it is fair to say that with regard to the fifteen field staff, the Area Representatives, the majority of the time is probably spent in

individual representation, a good portion of it is labor / management committee meetings, and the broader issues.

In the past there was a familiar relationship between the Governor, the Legislature and the Federation. Does that now exist?

I think that has changed dramatically. It has changed over the years as well.

In closing, just for fun, can you tell me what you were doing in 1968. It seems as though that was a pivotal time for our country.

I was a student at the University of Washington, participating in anti-war activities. I was in marches and demonstrations and everything else as a student against the Vietnam War. I was working for Bobby Kennedy's campaign until he was assassinated in California, and thinking the world had come to an end at that point he was assassinated and what went on beyond that. That was a very big year, I remember that clearly.

Did it affect how you deal with things now?

I think there was a certain belief or hope that things were going to turn, and then after the assassination a great deal of

cynicism and skepticism. Then following on with the Nixon years,
I think that enhanced that feeling.

Thank You