



REVIEW COMMITTEE



IBEW

RECEIVED JAN 24 1996

PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY
201 MISSION STREET, ROOM 1508
MAIL CODE P15B
P.O. BOX 770000
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA 94177
(415) 973-8510

**CASE CLOSED
FILED & LOGGED**

INTERNATIONAL BROTHERHOOD OF
ELECTRICAL WORKERS, AFL-CIO
LOCAL UNION 1245, I.B.E.W
P.O. BOX 4790
WALNUT CREEK, CALIFORNIA 94596
(510) 933-6060
R.W. STALCUP, SECRETARY

MARGARET A. SHORT, CHAIRMAN

- DECISION
- LETTER DECISION
- PRE-REVIEW REFERRAL

REVIEW COMMITTEE DECISION

Central Coast Division Grievance No. CCH-94-22
 DeAnza Division Grievance No. DEA 94-1
 DeAnza Division Grievance No. DEA 94-3
 DeAnza Division Grievance No. DEA 94-5
 DeAnza Division Grievance No. DEA 94-6
 DeAnza Division Grievance No. DEA 94-7
 DeAnza Division Grievance No. DEA 94-9
 Diablo Division Grievance No. CON-94-8
 Diablo Division Grievance No. CON 94-36
 Diablo Division Grievance No. CON 94-37
 Diablo Division Grievance No. CON 94-38
 Diablo Division Grievance No. CON 94-39
 Diablo Division Grievance No. CON 94-40
 Diablo Division Grievance No. CON 94-52
 Diablo Division Grievance No. CON 94-53
 Diablo Division Grievance No. CON 94-54
 Diablo Division Grievance No. CON 94-55
 Diablo Division Grievance No. CON 94-56
 Diablo Division Grievance No. CON 94-57
 Diablo Division Grievance No. CON-94-99
 East Bay Division Grievance No. OAK -94-28
 East Bay Division Grievance No. OAK -94-29
 East Bay Division Grievance No. OAK -94-30
 East Bay Division Grievance No. OAK -94-31
 East Bay Division Grievance No. OAK -94-33
 East Bay Division Grievance No. OAK -94-34
 East Bay Division Grievance No. OAK -94-37
 East Bay Division Grievance No. OAK -94-38
 East Bay Division Grievance No. OAK -94-32
 Los Padres Division Grievance No. SLO -94-22
 Los Padres Division Grievance No. SLO -94-18
 Mission Division Grievance No. HAY-94-29
 Mission Division Grievance No. HAY-94-37
 Mission Division Grievance No. HAY-94-10
 Mission Division Grievance No. HAY-94-11

Review Committee File No. 1775

Mission Division Grievance No. HAY-94-13
Mission Division Grievance No. HAY-94-14
Mission Division Grievance No. HAY-94-16
Mission Division Grievance No. HAY-94-18
Mission Division Grievance No. HAY-94-12
Mission Division Grievance No. HAY-94-36
Mission Division Grievance No. HAY-94-44
North Bay Division Grievance No. SNR-94-03
North Bay Division Grievance No. SNR-94-15
North Bay Division Grievance No. SNR-94-12
North Coast Division Grievance No. STR-94-16
North Coast Division Grievance No. STR-94-17
North Coast Division Grievance No. STR-94-40
North Valley Division Grievance No. CHI-94-17
North Valley Division Grievance No. CHI-94-19
North Valley Division Grievance No. CHI-94-21
North Valley Division Grievance No. CHI-94-33
North Valley Division Grievance No. CHI-94-34
North Valley Division Grievance No. CHI -94-18
North Valley Division Grievance No. CHI -94-20
Nuclear Power Division Grievance No. NPG-616-94-049
Nuclear Power Division Grievance No. NPG-618-94-051
Oakland Division Grievance No. OAK-94-35
Oakland Division Grievance No. OAK-94-36
Oakland Division Grievance No. OAK-94-37
Peninsula Division Grievance No. BEL-94-14
Peninsula Division Grievance No. BEL-94-15
Peninsula Division Grievance No. BEL-94-16
Peninsula Division Grievance No. BEL-94-17
Peninsula Division Grievance No. BEL-94-18
Peninsula Division Grievance No. BEL-94-19
Peninsula Division Grievance No. BEL-94-20
Peninsula Division Grievance No. BEL-94-22
Peninsula Division Grievance No. BEL-94-23
Peninsula Division Grievance No. BEL-94-24
Peninsula Division Grievance No. BEL-94-25
Peninsula Division Grievance No. BEL-94-26
Peninsula Division Grievance No. BEL-94-27
Peninsula Division Grievance No. BEL-94-31
Peninsula Division Grievance No. BEL-94-35
Peninsula Division Grievance No. BEL-94-50
Sacramento Division Grievance No. SAC-94-24(a)
Sacramento Division Grievance No. SAC-94-24
San Francisco Division Grievance No. SFO-94-13
San Francisco Division Grievance No. SFO-94-15
San Francisco Division Grievance No. SFO-94-18
San Francisco Division Grievance No. SFO-94-19
San Francisco Division Grievance No. SFO-94-27
San Francisco Division Grievance No. SFO-94-31
San Francisco Division Grievance No. SFO-94-34

Review Committee File No. 1775

San Francisco Division Grievance No. SFO-94-39
San Francisco Division Grievance No. SFO-94-46
San Francisco Division Grievance No. SFO-94-29
San Francisco Division Grievance No. SFO-94-32
San Francisco Division Grievance No. SFO-94-35
San Francisco Division Grievance No. SFO-94-40
San Francisco Division Grievance No. SFO-94-41
San Francisco Division Grievance No. SFO-94-44
San Francisco Division Grievance No. SFO-94-51
San Joaquin Division Grievance No. FRO-94-14
San Joaquin Division Grievance No. FRO-94-33
San Jose Division Grievance No. SJO-94-6
San Jose Division Grievance No. SJO-94-20
San Luis Obispo Division Grievance No. SLO-94-5
San Luis Obispo Division Grievance No. SLO-94-8
San Luis Obispo Division Grievance No. SLO-94-21
Sierra Division Grievance No. AUB-94-13
Sierra Division Grievance No. AUB-94-14
Sierra Division Grievance No. AUB-94-15
Sierra Division Grievance No. AUB-94-16
Sierra Division Grievance No. AUB-94-19
Sierra Division Grievance No. AUB-94-22
Sierra Division Grievance No. AUB-94-23
Sierra Division Grievance No. AUB-94-24
Sierra Division Grievance No. AUB-94-29
Sierra Division Grievance No. AUB-94-41
Sierra Division Grievance No. AUB-94-48
Sierra Division Grievance No. AUB -94-30
Sierra Division Grievance No. AUB-94-45
Stockton Division Grievance No. STKN-94-2
Yosemite Division Grievance No. MER-94-10
Yosemite Division Grievance No. MER-94-12
Yosemite Division Grievance No. MER-94-13
Yosemite Division Grievance No. MER-94-14
Corporate Services Grievance No. VPC-94-7

Review Committee File No. 1775

The above referenced grievances were referred to a Title 206/19 subcommittee for resolution. All the grievances concern disputes arising out of the Company's application of Title 206/19. The grievance issues fall into two general categories. The first involves the "compression" of displacement options. The second involves the affect a systemwide displacement has on employees' ability to be placed in a demotion area option (206.6 (a)) when more junior demotion unit (206.6(b)) or system options (206.6(c)) are available.

In Arbitration Case No. 201, it was determined that the method in which the Company administered Title 206 did not constitute a violation of the Labor Agreement. In light of that conclusion, the subcommittee examined the 206/19 assignments of the grievants in the above referenced grievances to determine if the specific assignments were appropriate. The Committee reached the following settlements:

Review Committee File No. 1775

Mission Division Grievance No. HAY-94-10

Facts of the Case

The grievant was hired by the Company on May 23, 1985 and at the time of displacement was a T&D Driver. The grievant was placed as a Utility Worker. The grievant believed the placement should have been into a higher option under the provision of Section 206.6.

The grievant was placed into his 74th option. The other options were compressed out or were assigned to employees with greater seniority.

Decision

The placement of the grievants under Title 206 did not constitute a violation of the Labor Agreement. This case is closed without adjustment.

Mission Division Grievance No. HAY-94-10

Facts of the Case

The grievant was hired by the Company on May 23, 1985 and at the time of displacement was a T&D Driver. The grievant was placed as a Utility Worker. The grievant believed the placement should have been into a higher option under the provision of Section 206.6.

The grievant was placed into his 74th option. The other options were compressed out or were assigned to employees with greater seniority.

Decision

The placement of the grievants under Title 206 did not constitute a violation of the Labor Agreement. This case is closed without adjustment.

Mission Division Grievance No. HAY-94-10

Facts of the Case

The grievant was hired by the Company on May 23, 1985 and at the time of displacement was a T&D Driver. The grievant was placed as a Utility Worker. The grievant believed the placement should have been into a higher option under the provision of Section 206.6.

Review Committee File No. 1775

On this basis, this case is considered closed.

Any questions regarding the above cases should be directed to this committee.

Doug Veeder 1/10/95
Doug Veeder Date
Company Member

Ken Ball 1-10-96
Ken Ball Date
Union Member

Bruce A. Tison 1/10/96
Bruce Tison Date
Company Member

Sam Tamimi 1/10/96
Sam Tamimi Date
Union Member