

# REVIEW COMMITTEE

306.14 - Work in question 613.1 should be assigned to Clerical Asst., not Engineers Aid.

SEP 1 9 1990

IBEV

PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY 215 MARKET STREET, ROOM 916 SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA 94106 (415) 973-1125

CASE CLOSED LOGGED AND FILED RECEIVED SEP 1 8 1990

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

. .

D.J. BERGMAN, CHAIRMAN

☐ DECISION ☐ LETTER DECISION ☐ PRE-REVIEW REFERRAL

General Construction Grievance No. 3-1975-89-80 P-RC 1395

BYRON TOMLINSON, Chairman General Construction Joint Grievance Committee

BARRY HUMPHREY, Chairman General Construction Joint Grievance Committee

## Subject of the Grievance

This case concerns the hiring of Engineer's Aides for summer employment.

#### Facts of the Case

The Committee determined that, of the five Engineer's Aides hired for the summer, three were performing work that clearly was not within the definition of a Clerical Assistant and one was clearly performing Clerical Assistant work. These four were settled locally. The one remaining position was in dispute.

That employee performed the following:

- o transfering information from PIMs and inputting it into Premise
- o routing schedule approvals
- o reviewing schedules for completeness
- development of a non-outage tracker via the computer center
- o reconciliation of the new prearranged overtime account billings and M&O
- preparation of journal entries
- o calculations
- o spread sheets on Lotus for man-hour forecasting

## Discussion

The Union argued that the duties outlined are primarily clerical in nature and, therefore, the Company had denied rehire rights to a Clerical Assistant that had been laid off when they hired the Engineer's Aide instead of filling the vacancy with a Clerical Assistant.

Company, after further review, agreed that the duties listed could have been performed by the Clerical Assistant in question.

## Decision

Based on the decision, there were two positions that could have been filled by Clerical Assistants. The first position was filled from June 19, 1989 to September 1, 1989 and should be offered to the laid off Clerical Assistant with the greatest seniority. The second position was filled from July 11, 1989 to August 11, 1989, and the second most senior laid off Clerical Assistant should be offered the position. If either employees declines, the third laid off Clerical Assistant shall be offered the position(s). The laid off Clerical Assistants 306.14 date.

Based on the foregoing, this case is closed on this basis, and such closure should be noted in the Joint Grievance Committee minutes.

DAVID J. BERGMAN, Chairman Review Committee

ROGER W. STALCUP, Secretary Review Committee

LLB(222-5451):rps