

106.3 (Service)  
2.1 (Recognition)  
102.3 (Time Limits)

**REVIEW COMMITTEE****IBEW** **PG and E**

PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY  
245 MARKET STREET, ROOM 444  
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA 94106  
(415) 781-4211, EXTENSION 1125

D.J. BERGMAN, CHAIRMAN

- DECISION  
 LETTER DECISION  
 PRE-REVIEW REFERRAL

**CASE CLOSED  
LOGGED AND FILED**

RECEIVED JUL 22 1986

Golden Gate Region Grievance No. 2-1213-85-142  
P-RC 1070

INTERNATIONAL BROTHERHOOD OF  
ELECTRICAL WORKERS, AFL-CIO  
LOCAL UNION 1245, I.B.E.W.  
P.O. BOX 4790  
WALNUT CREEK, CALIFORNIA 94596  
(415) 933-6060  
R.W. STALCUP, SECRETARY

July 21, 1986

KENT H. ANDERSON, Company Member  
Golden Gate Region  
Local Investigating Committee

JOE VALENTINO, Union Member  
Golden Gate Region  
Local Investigating Committee

Subject of the Grievances

This grievance concerns an allegation that the employment date for employees who participated in the training program for Women in Non-traditional Jobs should be the date of their commencing the training program rather than their current date of hire into a physical classification within the Company.

Facts of the Case

In the case at hand, the grievant was hired as a Groundman on June 20, 1983. On May 2, 1983, the grievant began the training program for Women in Non-traditional Jobs, Phase II, at Kettleman. The training was conducted for seven weeks. During that period, all of the participants were placed on a temporary agency payroll (Women in Apprenticeship Programs, Inc.). The subject grievance was filed on August 20, 1985.

Discussion

The Union opined that Company is a "Co-employer" using the temporary agency merely as a conduit for payment of wages. The Company interviews, tests and selects the participants in the training program. The training is conducted at a Company facility with instruction by Company employees, and successful completion of the training is determined by the Company. Therefore, according to the Union, the training program participants are PGandE employees effective the first day of training.

The Company argued that this grievance was not timely filed as the grievant's employment date is June 20, 1983, and the grievance was not filed until August 20, 1985. The Company further argued that accepting the Union's position would place it at a disadvantage in evaluating these employees during what would be a shortened probationary period while in a beginning-level physical classification. Company also noted that the Fair Start or Women in Non-traditional Job Program has been discontinued.

Decision

The Pre-Review-Committee agreed that the grievance was not timely filed in accordance with Section 102.3 of the Agreement. The Committee does recommend that, should the training program be reinstated, the parties enter into Ad Hoc discussions on the issues raised in this grievance.

This case is closed without adjustment and should be so noted by the Local Investigating Committee.

  
DAVID J. BERGMAN, Chairman  
Review Committee

  
ROGER W. STALCUP, Secretary  
Review Committee

RRDoering(222-1408):mc