



REVIEW COMMITTEE



RECEIVED SEP 04 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

**North Valley Division Case No. CHI-95-51/300
Fact Finding File No. 6211-95-228
Pre-Review Committee File No. 2067**

**JO ANN PITTMAN
Company Member
Local Investigating Committee**

**MICKEY HARRINGTON
Union Member
Local Investigating Committee**

Subject of the Grievance:

This case concerns the Title 306, Demotion and Layoff Procedure, options given an Appr. Electrician, Station Department, General Construction, headquartered at Table Mountain.

Facts of the Case:

On March 6, 1995, the grievant, an Apprentice Electrician in Station, Substation and Hydro Department, was given Title 306 demotion rights to Fieldman, Gas, G.C., San Francisco pursuant to Subsection 306.4(a), last sentence. It is agreed that the grievant had no Section 306.2 or 306.3 rights which would have kept him in the Station Department. The grievant had more than five years of service at the time of the demotion notice.

DISCUSSION:

The grievance alleges that the grievant should have been given an option to return to a former line of progression pursuant to Section 306.4(b) concurrent with the Subsection 306.4(a) option. The grievant had been a Miscellaneous Equipment Operator for more than a year within the four-year period prior to becoming an Appr. Electrician. The record does not indicate what GC Department he was in as an MEO, but even if it was Station, MEO is in a different line of progression than Appr. Electrician (Reference Line of Progression Diagram for Station, Substation Hydro Construction Department, GC.)

A careful reading of the contract says that an employee gets a Subsection 306.4(b) option only when the employee CANNOT exercise an option under Subsection 306.4(a). The grievant did not meet the criteria for a return to a former line of progression (306.4(b)) as he had an option to demote within his current line of progression (306.4(a)).

DECISION:

There was no violation of the Agreement. This case is closed without adjustment.

Margaret Short,
Margaret A. Short, Chairman *SSD*
Review Committee

9/4/96
Date

Roger Stalcup
Roger W. Stalcup, Secretary
Review Committee

9/4/96
Date