

INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS

Review Committee File No. 466  
San Francisco Division  
Grievances Nos. 2-63-8 and  
2-63-12  
Bypass of Allan Ashley to Fitter Vacancy

RECEIVED  
JUL 30 1964  
LOCAL 1245, I.B.E.W.

July 28, 1964

MR. E. E. STRAND  
Chairman, San Francisco Division  
Joint Grievance Committee

The above subject grievance was referred to the Review Committee by the Company and Union members of the local investigating committee. We have been informed by the Union that the subject grievances are withdrawn on the basis of the understanding reached at the Review Committee. We are enclosing a copy of the Union's letter of withdrawal for your information.

L. V. BROWN  
L. V. BROWN, Chairman  
Review Committee

LVB:FB  
cc VJThompson  
CLYager  
EFSibley  
AGMollart  
DGCollins, Chairman, Apprentice Committee  
LLMitchell  
HALee

Enc.

July 16, 1964

Mr. L. V. Brown, Chairman  
Review Committee  
Pacific Gas & Electric Company  
245 Market Street  
San Francisco 6, California

Dear Mr. Brown:

Review Committee File No. 466 (San Francisco Division Grievances Nos. 2-63-8 and 2-63-12) exemplifies the problem of unilateral testing by a single division of the Company and pinpoints the need for jointly agreed universally applied tests where tests are to be used.

Section 205.11 gives recognition to the Company right to use tests to determine qualifications but a question can always be raised in the mind of the individual as to the fairness and the applicability of such tests regardless of how proper they may be.

Union's Members of the Review Committee believe the test used in the San Francisco Division may not be applicable in all respects to the needs of the job for which it is being used. We do, however, feel it constitutes an effort on the part of management in San Francisco to apply some objective measure of qualifications rather than to leave the determination solely to subjective reactions of supervision. We believe such objective determination a help rather than a hindrance in making decisions on an employee's qualifications when there is no showing of bias, prejudice, discrimination or injustice.

Our examination of the facts leads us to believe that none of these factors existed in this case. The test has been consistently used since 1957; all those promoted to Fitter from bidders in San Francisco have passed the test; and the grievant was aware of the requirement. While we can question the need for the specific angle cutting test used, it is obvious that some demonstration of such ability is necessary in light of the fitting requirements of the job being sought.

Mr. L. V. Brown

-2-

July 16, 1964

We believe this grievant may not have had proper training on the cutting of angles and thus was at a disadvantage, but, if this was the case, the time to have raised this question was during his training period and not after he had reached the point of preference in bidding rights.

The grievance asks for a determination of the validity of the test now used in San Francisco and raises the question of fairness where such a test is applied only to bidders in one division of the Company.

The Union's Members of the Review Committee believe the answer to both of these questions can best be resolved by referring this problem to the Joint Apprenticeship Committee for study and recommendation to the parties. With this as an understanding of the Joint Review Committee, the Union will withdraw this case from Review and consider the grievance closed.

Very truly yours,

L. L. Mitchell, Secretary  
Review Committee

LLM:do  
cc: WFlaming  
RFields  
LNFoss

