

# **REVIEW COMMITTEE**

Exhibit A Clerical 18.1(c) job duties typist vs nontypist



PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY 215 MARKET STREET, ROOM 916 SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA 94106 (415) 973-1125

D.J. BERGMAN, CHAIRMAN

PRE-REVIEW REFERRAL

AUG 1 7 1990

CASE CLOSED LOGGED AND FILED

RECEIVED AUG - 9 1990

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

De Sabla Division Grievance Nos. SV-82-89-00020 and SV-82-89-00021 P-RC Nos. 1424 and 1425

August 8, 1990

WILLIAM C. LEVINS, Company Member De Sabla Division Local Investigating Committee

ART MURRAY, Union Member De Sabla Division Local Investigating Committee

## Subject of the Grievances

These cases concern the appropriateness of two Service Representative-Typist positions; one in Orland, one in Paradise.

### Facts of the Cases

In September 1989 much of the customer service work in the above two offices was consolidated into the larger Chico office. Employees in the affected classifications were also relocated. The Orland office retained a Service Representative, a Service Representative-Typist, which had been established in 1982, and two Meter Readers. The Paradise office after reorganization was staffed with a Sr. Service Representative I, a Service Representative, and a newly established Service Representative-Typist. Before the reorganization, there were three Utility-Clerk Typist positions.

#### Discussion

The Union asserted that the typist positions spent less than 50% of their time actually typing and it was therefore inappropriate to designate the Service Representatives as typists. Company stated there is no negotiated minimum amount of time required to establish a typist or steno combo classification and that Company has historically unilaterally established such positions based on Company's assessment of need.

The Committee noted that in 1989, the Union submitted a letter agreement proposal to the Company to establish a minimum amount of time spent for establishing a typist position. Union later withdrew the proposal based on Company's verbal rejection.

August 8, 1990

## Decision

The Pre-Review Committee is in agreement that the facts of this case demonstrated a need for typing to be done at each of the offices and inasmuch as there is only one typist in each location, there is no violation of the Agreement.

Union, however, reserves the right to challenge Company's establishment of typist positions in the future. This decision is based on the facts of this case and is not intended to limit Company's right to effect staffing decisions.

This case is closed without adjustment and such closure should be so noted by the Local Investigating Committee.

DAVID J. BERGMAN, Chairman Review Committee

MAShort(223-1123):nj

TALCUP, Secretary eview Committee