



REVIEW COMMITTEE

IBEW



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

RECEIVED AUG 12 1997

**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

**VP C&TS Grievance No. CTS-94-196^{lm}
Pre-Review Committee No. 1979**

**VP C&TS Case No. CTS-96-02
Pre-Review Committee No. 2107**

**Kris Picton
Company Member
Local Investigating Committee**

**Debbie Mazzanti
Union Member
Local Investigating Committee**

Subject of the Grievance

PRC 1979 concerns the use of a Title 300 Apprentice Telecommunications Technician at the Technology Service Center instead of a Title 200 Telecommunications Technician.

PRC 2107 concerns jurisdiction over work performed in the Telecommunications Section at the Technology Service Center, specifically whether the appropriate classification is Computer Operator III or Telecommunications Operations Analyst.

Facts of the Case

The work location is in the General Office and involves answering telephone calls from other employees throughout the Company's system who are experiencing problems with their communications equipment. The calls are routed through a menu selection from the 223-9000 number. The employee answering the phone completes a Service Request by taking basic and specific technical information from the caller, then dispatches the tag (SR) to a Telecommunications Technician either in the G.O. or the field.

There is substantial testimony in the LIC report of PRC 2107 that when the TSC was first established, the above work was performed by Telecommunications Technicians who complained that their skills were not being fully utilized in this capacity so company assigned them to troubleshooting in various field locations and the G.O. It was then that some discussion took place between the Company and Union as to what would be an appropriate classification to perform this work. No agreement was reached and Company decided to utilize the Computer Operator III classification through the employment of 7 Hiring Hall

employees. Union filed a grievance, contending the work being performed should be assigned to the Telecommunications Operations Analyst classification in the Physical bargaining unit rather than to the Computer Operator III classification in the Clerical bargaining unit.

The LIC report for PRC 1979 indicates that the Title 300 Apprentice Telecommunications Technician actually provided the training to the Title 200 Telecommunications Technicians who initially worked at the TSC. The

LIC Report states that the Title 300 Apprentice performed this training for about 7 months, although the Pre-Review Committee is of the opinion that the training necessary to perform the work in question could be completed in a week or less.

Discussion

The Pre-Review Committee reviewed the job definitions of both Computer Operator III, a Clerical bargaining-unit classification and Telecommunications Operations Analyst, a Physical bargaining-unit classification. It was agreed that CO III was clearly not the right classification. However, while the description of TOA seems appropriate for all the duties at issue, the definition provides for much more and it would seem that this classification, like the Telecommunications Technician, would also be underutilized and overpaid for the work being performed. As such, Company plans to assign other duties such as but not limited to: telephone adds, moves, changes, VMS resets, and set-ups. Currently, there are no TOA's assigned to the General Office. Company also stated that customer focus and good customer contact skills are an expectation for the TOA position.

Decision

Concerning the use of the Title 300 Apprentice, the parties have agreed in many other cases that short-term co-mingling of Title 200 and Title 300 employees is permissible. In this case, the length of time the Title 300 employee was assigned to work with the Title 200 work group was approximately seven months. Recognizing that the Title 300 Apprentice was not relieving an absent employee, the length of this assignment seems too long for the stated purpose of training journeymen to answer phones and take information. It is also of concern that the Apprentice's own training was interrupted for productive work at which he was already proficient.

The Pre-Review Committee also agrees that the work at issue should be assigned to Telecommunications Operations Analysts until the parties work out some other mutually agreed to arrangement or classification. Company will release the Hiring Hall Computer Operator III's and request Hiring Hall Telecommunications Operations Analysts until the positions can be staffed on a regular basis. As an equity settlement, those individuals who are at the top CO III rate who performed the work in question and are currently employed shall be entitled to backpay at the experienced rate of Hiring Hall Telecommunications

Operations Analyst for the time each performed the work from April 1, 1997 and continuing for as long as such work is performed.

The HH CO III's who are at the beginning step will begin receiving the top rate of HH TOA effective 8/12/97.

This case is closed on the basis of the foregoing adjustment.



Margaret A. Short, Chairman
Review Committee

8/12/97

Date



Roger W. Stalcup, Secretary
Review Committee

8/12/97

Date