



REVIEW COMMITTEE



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

RECEIVED JUL - 9 1996

MARGARET A. SHORT, CHAIRMAN

- DECISION
- LETTER DECISION
- PRE-REVIEW REFERRAL

**Nuclear Power Generation Grievance No. NPG-675-95-14
Fact Finding Committee No. 6220-95-237
Pre-Review Committee File No. 2060**

**Steam Generation Grievance No. SLO-95-28
Fact Finding Committee No. 6233-95-250
Pre-Review Committee File No. 2061**

MARGE LORENZ
Company Member
Local Investigating Committee

MIKE HAENTJENS
Union Member
Local Investigating Committee

CHER ANTHONY
Company Member
Local Investigating Committee

MIKE HAENTJENS
Union Member
Local Investigating Committee

Subject of the Grievances

These cases concern whether it is appropriate for apprentice control technicians to perform journeyman electrical production work without benefit of upgrade to the Control Technician classification.

Facts of the Cases

In early 1995, the Company vacated the Electrician and Instrument Repairman classifications at power plants. The majority of incumbents prebid to newly established Apprentice Control Technician positions. The Company's decision to vacate the Electrician and Instrument Repairman classification and have the electrical work performed by Control Technicians became the central issue in Arbitration Case No. 210. Arbitration Case No. 210 was closed by the parties as the result of Letter Agreement 95-74 which provided expanded job opportunities in the CES business unit for displaced employees.

At the Diablo Canyon and Morro Bay power plants, Apprentice Control Technicians, who formerly held the Electrician classification, continued to perform journeyman level electrical work when they were not actively engaged in academic or on-the-job training within the Apprentice Control Technician classification. It was noted by the Pre-Review Committee that at the time the LIC conducted its investigation in this case, little if any training was being provided to the former Electricians who bid to the Apprentice CT classification. Discussions were underway at the Joint Apprenticeship Committee level to update the Apprentice CT training program. The Pre-Review Committee has been advised that the Joint Apprenticeship Committee has concluded discussion on the issues related to the training program and at present Apprentice CT's are receiving the necessary training.

The grievants in this case were not upgraded to the Control Technician rate of pay, but they continued to receive the rate of pay of a journeyman Electrician. Ordinarily, employees are placed at the beginning pay step of the Apprentice Control Technician when entering an apprenticeship for the first time. However, note 4 of the Apprentice Control Technician job description in Exhibit VI-B of Title 600 provides that employees, who were previously Electricians or Instrument Repairmen, are allowed to maintain their journeyman rate of pay until such time as the apprenticeship is complete.

Discussion

The Master Apprenticeship Agreement provides that an employee in an apprenticeship classification may be assigned to work alone as part of the employee's training and experience but that such assignments shall be for the purpose of developing and demonstrating proficiency.

The issue in these cases is whether the assignment of journeyman level electrical production work (work that is not assigned for the purpose of developing or demonstrating proficiency) to Apprentice Control Technicians requires an upgrade to the Control Technician rate of pay.

In the cases at hand, the employees were assigned electrical work that was clearly within their skill and ability to perform. These employees had most recently held the Electrician classification. Additionally, they were compensated at the rate of pay of a journeyman classification, Electrician, that had previously been assigned this work, as is provided for in the job definition agreement. Lastly, in closing out Arbitration Case No. 210, the parties recognized that a certain amount of electrical production work would be performed by apprentices who had previously held the Electrician classification.

Conclusion

This case presents a very unique set of circumstances, in that via the closure of Arbitration Case No. 210 the parties acknowledged that ACT's would continue to perform the work they previously performed as journeyman Electricians. No exception was provided to deal with the seeming conflict with the Master Apprenticeship Agreement, which limits an apprentice to work alone only as part of the employee's training and experience where such is for the purpose of developing and demonstrating proficiency. Based on the unusual facts presented in this case, the Pre-Review Committee agreed that the assignment of journeyman level electrical production work to Apprentice Control Technicians, without benefit of an upgrade, was not in violation of the Agreement. On that basis, the grievances are considered closed.


Margaret A. Short, Chairman
Review Committee

7/3/96
Date


Roger W. Stalcup, Secretary
Review Committee

7/3/96
Date