



REVIEW COMMITTEE

IBEW



PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY
201 MISSION STREET, ROOM 1508
MAIL CODE P15B
P.O. BOX 770000
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA 94177
(415) 973-8510

RECEIVED OCT 11 1996

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

Fresno Grievance No. FRO-93-40
Fact Finding No. No. 5672-94-121
Pre-Review Committee Case No. 1854

JAMES DRAKE
Company Member
Local Investigating Committee

RON VAN DYKE
Union Member
Local Investigating Committee

Subject of the Grievance

This case concerns co-mingling of Title 200 and Title 300 employees.

Facts of the Case

For a two-week period, Title 300 Electric Maintenance employees were used to augment a Title 200 Electric Maintenance crew performing work at the Kings River Powerhouse. The work was originally assigned to Title 200 but some of the employees were reassigned to correct unanticipated failures at Merced Falls, San Joaquin #2 and #3 Powerhouses. In addition the completion date for the Kings River Powerhouse project was moved up, necessitating the use of the Title 300 employees. The record indicates an historical practice of mixing maintenance crews.

One of the Title 300 Electricians was tagged into a temporary additional Title 200 Electrician in Hydro Generation for two months.

Discussion

The Pre-Review Committee discussed the Industrial Relations letter dated November 12, 1993 concerning the use of Title 300 employees noting Item 2, Loaning of Title 300 employees. It states:

"The Company has historically loaned Title 300 employees to help for specific projects, when a special skill is needed and to temporarily assist a Title 200 crew. It is not the Company's intent by the loaning of those employees to avoid filling vacancies via Title 205, to avoid temporary upgrades, or to avoid the use of Title 208 and 212."

Item 3 of that same letter concerns Cross Section Upgrading and it states:

"The Company agrees that it is inappropriate to upgrade Title 300 to Title 200 classifications, or to circumvent the provisions of Title 205 as well as upgrading Title 200 employees to Title 300 classifications."

While no upgrade was involved, when Title 300 employees are on loan to Title 200 work units, the Title 300 employees retain their status and continue to be covered by the provisions of Part III of the Physical Labor Agreement.

DECISION

Tagging the Title 300 Electrician into the Title 200 classification was not appropriate and is not in compliance with the November 12, 1993 letter. This case is considered closed based on the foregoing.

Margaret A. Short

Margaret A. Short, Chairman
Review Committee

10/11/96

Date

Roger Stalcup

Roger W. Stalcup, Secretary
Review Committee

10/11/96

Date