



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



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

306.2(P)

D.J. BERGMAN, CHAIRMAN

DECISION LETTER DECISION PRE-REVIEW REFERRAL

## RECEIVED DEC 1 1 1984

General Construction Grievance No. 3-1310-84-42 P-RC 976

December 10, 1984

MR. R. S. BAIN, Chairman General Construction Joint Grievance Committee

MR. MIKE MC KINNEY, Chairman General Construction Joint Grievance Committee

Grievance Issue

Alleged improper demotion from Field Regulator Changer of Gas Construction Helper.

Facts of the Case

The grievant was promoted from Miscellaneous Equipment Operator B (MEOB) to Field Regulator Changer on March 8, 1984.

On May 14, 1984, he sent a letter to the Manager of the Gas Construction Department in which he requested to return to the MEOB classification because he allegedly was performing Street Fitter work and was not being compensated for it.

As a result of this request, the grievant was removed from the Regulator Replacement Program, but was placed as a Helper instead of MEOB, effective May 29, 1984. The grievant was then <u>temporarily upgraded</u> to MEOB on May 29, 30, 31 and June 1, and was <u>promoted</u> to MEOB on June 4, the next following workday. The net result was that the grievant was paid as if he had been placed directly as a MEOB.

## Discussion

While acknowledging that the correction asked for (demotion to MEOB instead of Helper) was, in effect, implemented, the Union maintained that the grievant should have been placed under the step-by-step demotion procedure provided for in Title 306; in other words, the Union claimed that the Company was prohibited from attempting to demote the grievant directly to Helper without first considering his rights to MEOB under Title 306. The Company held that, except where noted otherwise, Title 306 is applicable only in lack of work situations, not to voluntary demotions.



## Decision

The Committee understands that when a G.C. employee requests a demotion, the usual procedure has been to demote him to the next lower classification in his line of progression, provided he is qualified for such classification and Company is able to utilize such employee in the next lower classification. The subject of this case appears to be an exception to this practice.

The Committee does not see any valid reason to deviate from G.C.'s customary procedure with regard to voluntary demotions, and agrees that this procedure should be effected in all future such cases.

By agreeing to this decision, Company does not intend to imply that it agrees with Union's position that voluntary demotions are covered in Title 306.

Case closed on this basis.

D. J. BERGMAN, Chairman Review Committee

MAShort(1123):1db

R. W. STALCUP, Secretary Review Committee