



# REVIEW COMMITTEE



## IBEW

RECEIVED JAN 24 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

### REVIEW COMMITTEE DECISION

- Central Coast Division Grievance No. CCH-94-22
- DeAnza Division Grievance No. DEA 94-1
- DeAnza Division Grievance No. DEA 94-3
- DeAnza Division Grievance No. DEA 94-5
- DeAnza Division Grievance No. DEA 94-6
- DeAnza Division Grievance No. DEA 94-7
- DeAnza Division Grievance No. DEA 94-9
- Diablo Division Grievance No. CON-94-8
- Diablo Division Grievance No. CON 94-36
- Diablo Division Grievance No. CON 94-37
- Diablo Division Grievance No. CON 94-38
- Diablo Division Grievance No. CON 94-39
- Diablo Division Grievance No. CON 94-40
- Diablo Division Grievance No. CON 94-52
- Diablo Division Grievance No. CON 94-53
- Diablo Division Grievance No. CON 94-54
- Diablo Division Grievance No. CON 94-55
- Diablo Division Grievance No. CON 94-56
- Diablo Division Grievance No. CON 94-57
- Diablo Division Grievance No. CON-94-99
- East Bay Division Grievance No. OAK -94-28
- East Bay Division Grievance No. OAK -94-29
- East Bay Division Grievance No. OAK -94-30
- East Bay Division Grievance No. OAK -94-31
- East Bay Division Grievance No. OAK -94-33
- East Bay Division Grievance No. OAK -94-34
- East Bay Division Grievance No. OAK -94-37
- East Bay Division Grievance No. OAK -94-38
- East Bay Division Grievance No. OAK -94-32
- Los Padres Division Grievance No. SLO -94-22
- Los Padres Division Grievance No. SLO -94-18
- Mission Division Grievance No. HAY-94-29
- Mission Division Grievance No. HAY-94-37
- Mission Division Grievance No. HAY-94-10
- Mission Division Grievance No. HAY-94-11

Mission Division Grievance No. HAY-94-13  
Mission Division Grievance No. HAY-94-14  
Mission Division Grievance No. HAY-94-16  
Mission Division Grievance No. HAY-94-18  
Mission Division Grievance No. HAY-94-12  
Mission Division Grievance No. HAY-94-36  
Mission Division Grievance No. HAY-94-44  
North Bay Division Grievance No. SNR-94-03  
North Bay Division Grievance No. SNR-94-15  
North Bay Division Grievance No. SNR-94-12  
North Coast Division Grievance No. STR-94-16  
North Coast Division Grievance No. STR-94-17  
North Coast Division Grievance No. STR-94-40  
North Valley Division Grievance No. CHI-94-17  
North Valley Division Grievance No. CHI-94-19  
North Valley Division Grievance No. CHI-94-21  
North Valley Division Grievance No. CHI-94-33  
North Valley Division Grievance No. CHI-94-34  
North Valley Division Grievance No. CHI -94-18  
North Valley Division Grievance No. CHI -94-20  
Nuclear Power Division Grievance No. NPG-616-94-049  
Nuclear Power Division Grievance No. NPG-618-94-051  
Oakland Division Grievance No. OAK-94-35  
Oakland Division Grievance No. OAK-94-36  
Oakland Division Grievance No. OAK-94-37  
Peninsula Division Grievance No. BEL-94-14  
Peninsula Division Grievance No. BEL-94-15  
Peninsula Division Grievance No. BEL-94-16  
Peninsula Division Grievance No. BEL-94-17  
Peninsula Division Grievance No. BEL-94-18  
Peninsula Division Grievance No. BEL-94-19  
Peninsula Division Grievance No. BEL-94-20  
Peninsula Division Grievance No. BEL-94-22  
Peninsula Division Grievance No. BEL-94-23  
Peninsula Division Grievance No. BEL-94-24  
Peninsula Division Grievance No. BEL-94-25  
Peninsula Division Grievance No. BEL-94-26  
Peninsula Division Grievance No. BEL-94-27  
Peninsula Division Grievance No. BEL-94-31  
Peninsula Division Grievance No. BEL-94-35  
Peninsula Division Grievance No. BEL-94-50  
Sacramento Division Grievance No. SAC-94-24(a)  
Sacramento Division Grievance No. SAC-94-24  
San Francisco Division Grievance No. SFO-94-13  
San Francisco Division Grievance No. SFO-94-15  
San Francisco Division Grievance No. SFO-94-18  
San Francisco Division Grievance No. SFO-94-19  
San Francisco Division Grievance No. SFO-94-27  
San Francisco Division Grievance No. SFO-94-31  
San Francisco Division Grievance No. SFO-94-34

Review Committee File No. 1775

San Francisco Division Grievance No. SFO-94-39  
San Francisco Division Grievance No. SFO-94-46  
San Francisco Division Grievance No. SFO-94-29  
San Francisco Division Grievance No. SFO-94-32  
San Francisco Division Grievance No. SFO-94-35  
San Francisco Division Grievance No. SFO-94-40  
San Francisco Division Grievance No. SFO-94-41  
San Francisco Division Grievance No. SFO-94-44  
San Francisco Division Grievance No. SFO-94-51  
San Joaquin Division Grievance No. FRO-94-14  
San Joaquin Division Grievance No. FRO-94-33  
San Jose Division Grievance No. SJO-94-6  
San Jose Division Grievance No. SJO-94-20  
San Luis Obispo Division Grievance No. SLO-94-5  
San Luis Obispo Division Grievance No. SLO-94-8  
San Luis Obispo Division Grievance No. SLO-94-21  
Sierra Division Grievance No. AUB-94-13  
Sierra Division Grievance No. AUB-94-14  
Sierra Division Grievance No. AUB-94-15  
Sierra Division Grievance No. AUB-94-16  
Sierra Division Grievance No. AUB-94-19  
Sierra Division Grievance No. AUB-94-22  
Sierra Division Grievance No. AUB-94-23  
Sierra Division Grievance No. AUB-94-24  
Sierra Division Grievance No. AUB-94-29  
Sierra Division Grievance No. AUB-94-41  
Sierra Division Grievance No. AUB-94-48  
Sierra Division Grievance No. AUB -94-30  
Sierra Division Grievance No. AUB-94-45  
Stockton Division Grievance No. STKN-94-2  
Yosemite Division Grievance No. MER-94-10  
Yosemite Division Grievance No. MER-94-12  
Yosemite Division Grievance No. MER-94-13  
Yosemite Division Grievance No. MER-94-14  
Corporate Services Grievance No. VPC-94-7

Review Committee File No. 1775

The above referenced grievances were referred to a Title 206/19 subcommittee for resolution. All the grievances concern disputes arising out of the Company's application of Title 206/19. The grievance issues fall into two general categories. The first involves the "compression" of displacement options. The second involves the affect a systemwide displacement has on employees' ability to be placed in a demotion area option (206.6 (a)) when more junior demotion unit (206.6(b)) or system options (206.6(c)) are available.

In Arbitration Case No. 201, it was determined that the method in which the Company administered Title 206 did not constitute a violation of the Labor Agreement. In light of that conclusion, the subcommittee examined the 206/19 assignments of the grievants in the above referenced grievances to determine if the specific assignments were appropriate. The Committee reached the following settlements:

Oakland Division Grievance No. OAK-94-35

Facts of the Case

The grievant was hired on April 30, 1984 and at the time of displacement was a Groundman. The grievant was displaced into a Utility Worker - Gas at Richmond. The grievant believed she should have been placed into any higher prioritized option under Title 206.

The grievant was placed into her 28th option. The other options were compressed out or were assigned to more senior employees. The Committee noted that the grievant went on LTD before reporting to her assignment. As such, should the employee return to active duty, she will be provided with 206 options as they exist at that time.

Decision

The grievant's placement under Title 206 did not constitute a violation of the Labor Agreement. This case is closed without adjustment.

Administrative

The grievant was placed into her 28th option. The other options were compressed out or were assigned to more senior employees. The Committee noted that the grievant went on LTD before reporting to her assignment. As such, should the employee return to active duty, she will be provided with 206 options as they exist at that time.

The grievant was placed into her 28th option. The other options were compressed out or were assigned to more senior employees. The Committee noted that the grievant went on LTD before reporting to her assignment. As such, should the employee return to active duty, she will be provided with 206 options as they exist at that time.

Conclusion

The grievant's placement under Title 206 did not constitute a violation of the Labor Agreement. This case is closed without adjustment.

Administrative

The grievant was placed into her 28th option. The other options were compressed out or were assigned to more senior employees. The Committee noted that the grievant went on LTD before reporting to her assignment. As such, should the employee return to active duty, she will be provided with 206 options as they exist at that time.

Review Committee File No. 1775

On this basis, this case is considered closed.

Any questions regarding the above cases should be directed to this committee.

Doug Veeder 1/10/95  
Doug Veeder Date  
Company Member

Ken Ball 1-10-96  
Ken Ball Date  
Union Member

Bruce A. Tison 1/10/96  
Bruce Tison Date  
Company Member

Sam Tamimi 1/10/96  
Sam Tamimi Date  
Union Member