

Clerical -identifies what work related to

magnetic demand tapes s/b performed by bu empl.



REVIEW COMMITTEE

IBEW

RECEIVED GCT 2 5 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

JOE CERRUTI **Company Member**

Local Investigating Committee

Fact Finding File No. 4653-89-248 Pre-Review Committee Case No. 1772

CES Grievance No. 46-130-89-46

DEBBIE MAZZANTI Union Member Local Investigating Committee

Subject

Union alleges that bargaining unit work is being performed by a monthly exempt employee in the Financial and Accounting Services Section of Customer Accounting.

Facts of the Case

The ST-33 system is a general purpose mini-computer which was used to process magnetic demand tapes. At the time of this grievance, the ST-33 was being tested for use in retrieving load data over phone lines. Part of the testing included programming, troubleshooting and maintaining the data base. The supervisor testified that a number of alternatives were being evaluated; one alternative being that the ST-33 system may be eliminated and another is that the system would be expanded. Exempt employees were utilized to test, troubleshoot and maintain the system. Bargaining unit employees had maintained the database on the magnetic demand tape system.

Discussion

The committee agreed that given the age of this case it is likely that the work in dispute has significantly changed or may no longer exist. In general, the committee agreed that work associated with system development, system analysis or system testing would likely be exempt work and that day-to-day production or processing would likely be bargaining unit work. The committee also agreed that consistent with other settlements, work that is within the jurisdiction of the union will remain within that jurisdiction even though technology may have changed the way that work is performed.

The committee agreed to refer this case back to the local investigating committee to review the current work. using the general direction provided above, and make appropriate adjustment in work assignments. If the Local Investigating Committee is unable to resolve this grievance, it should prepare a new joint statement of facts and refer the case directly to the Pre-Review Committee.

On that basis, this grievance is considered closed.

Margaret A, Short, Chairman

Review Committee

10/24/96

Roger W Stalcup, Secretary

Review Committee

Date