

**PG and E**

PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY  
245 MARKET STREET, ROOM 444  
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA 94106  
(415) 781-4211, EXTENSION 1125

D.J. BERGMAN, CHAIRMAN

- DECISION  
 LETTER DECISION  
 PRE-REVIEW REFERRAL

**REVIEW COMMITTEE****CASE CLOSED** MAY 4 1983**LOGGED AND FILED****RECEIVED MAY - 4 1983**REVIEW COMMITTEE DECISION**IBEW**

INTERNATIONAL BROTHERHOOD OF  
ELECTRICAL WORKERS, AFL-CIO  
LOCAL UNION 1245, I.B.E.W.  
P.O. BOX 4790  
WALNUT CREEK, CALIFORNIA 94596  
(415) 933-6060  
R.W. STALCUP, SECRETARY

Coast Valleys Division Grievance No. 18-692-82-29  
San Jose Division Grievance No. 8-628-81-111  
Review Committee File No. 1550-83-3

Subject of the Grievance

Both grievances concern the appropriate rate of reimbursement pursuant to Section 201.5 of the Physical Agreement for an employee required to maintain a telephone in his home.

Facts of the Cases

In the San Jose case, the grievance issue is over the Company reimbursing employees at the lifeline rate in those geographical areas where lifeline is available. The Local Investigating Committee determined that the Troublemens in San Jose Division are required to have a telephone at their place of residence. The company stated that, for those Division employees who are required to have a phone who are not normally required to call out on the phone, they will be reimbursed at the lifeline rate. For those employees who normally are required to call the Company on their phone, they will be reimbursed at the "one-party" rate. The Union stated that two-party service was not available in the San Jose area. The supervisor stated in order to obtain a timely response that a one party-party was preferred over a two-party line.

The Coast Valleys case concerns the issuance of a letter dated March 26, 1982 which provided for reimbursement at the single-party rate unless the two-party service rate was available in the residence area of the employee.

The supervisor stated that he issued the letter which restated the policy regarding reimbursement to Troublemens for the maintenance of telephones in their residences. He stated that this policy had been in effect for the last nine years; and all during that time, the Company had been paying the two-party rate.

The reason a letter was issued was that because of recent changes in personnel in Troublemens positions, the Company found that not all the regulations were being followed properly. One person did not submit a bill at all and did not know he was allowed any reimbursement, and a second person was submitting his request for reimbursement at an old rate. A third employee was using the single-party rate on his request for reimbursement.

According to the supervisor, the two-party rate has been in effect throughout the Coast Valleys Division, and it has always been the practice to follow the guidelines in Standard Practice No. 724.4-1. The supervisor also stated that the Company has been paying the extra dollar per month for the cost of one basic rotary dial telephone which should be considered part of the basic rate.

Discussion

Standard Practice No. 724.4-1 was reviewed. Paragraph 5 states in part, "Reimbursement for single-party service will only be allowed when two-party service is not offered by the Telephone Company." Company had argued that the Standard Practice was written prior to the existence of the lifeline rate and that at the time the Standard Practice was issued, it was Company's intent to reimburse employees for telephone expenses at the lowest rate available. Union argued that, pursuant to Section 107.1, Company had reduced the scope of a plan beneficial to the employees inasmuch as prior to the existence of lifeline rates all employees entitled to reimbursement receive either the one-party unmeasured rate or the two-party unmeasured rate.

In discussing this case, it was noted by the Committee that there are varying practices throughout the system with respect to telephone reimbursement costs. In some locations, an additional dollar was paid for maintaining the instrument plus the various taxes associated with maintaining a telephone. In other locations, these associated expenses were not paid by the Company.

Decision

The Review Committee is in agreement that employees will be compensated at the single-party unmeasured rate except where the two-party unmeasured rate is available. Employees will also be reimbursed for the various taxes and assessments associated with maintaining a telephone. Those employees in San Jose Division who were compensated at the lifeline rate will be retroactively reimbursed in accordance with the above. The Coast Valleys case is closed without adjustment.

FOR COMPANY:

- L. C. Beanland
- F. C. Buchholz
- J. B. Stoutamore
- D. J. Bergman

By *[Signature]*

Date 5-3-83

FOR UNION:

- G. W. Abrahamson
- R. L. Choate
- P. Pelucca
- R. W. Stalcup

By *[Signature: Roger Stalcup]*

Date 4/29/83