

## **REVIEW COMMITTEE**



PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY 2850 SHADELANDS DRIVE, SUITE 100 WALNUT CREEK, CALIFORNIA 94598 (510) 974-4282

\*\* MARGARET A. SHORT, CHAIRMAN

- ☐ DECISION
- ☐ LETTER DECISION
- □ PRE-REVIEW REFERRAL

RECEIVED JAN. 20, 1999

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

Hydro Generation Grievance No. FRO-96-60 Fact Finding No. 6529-97-060 Pre-Review Committee No. 2154

DON SCHMIDT
Company Member
Local Investigating Committee

GARY HUGHES
Union Member
Local Investigating Committee

## Subject:

This grievance resulted from the award of a Subforeman A position in Hydro Construction to an employee with 306.9(a) rights. The union alleged that the successful bidder should not have had 306.9(a) rights and therefore the position should have been awarded to a more senior bidder.

## Facts of the Case

In June 1995, an Electrician, was promoted to Subforeman A. In early 1996, he was demoted to Electrician due to lack of work and provided 306.9(a) rights. In September of 1996, he was promoted back to Subforeman A under Section 305.5(a).

The grievant, also an Electrician with greater seniority, alleged that the job award made in June 1995 was in error. The grievant maintains he had a temporary/permanent upgrade form on file to the position at that time and that neither he nor the Union was properly notified of the bypass as required in Letter Agreement 78 - 58.

The Local Investigating Committee could not locate either the temporary/permanent upgrade form or any indication that a bypass notice was sent to the grievant or the Union. Likewise, the grievant was apparently unable to produce his copy of the temporary/permanent upgrade form.

**Discussion** 

The Committee reviewed the career histories of each of the involved employees. In reviewing the records, it was determined that at the time of the original job award, June 1995, the grievant was headquartered in promo/demo area 1 and the successful job bidder was headquartered in promo/demo area 6. As the job vacancy was in promo/demo area 6, it appears to the committee that the job award was in accordance with the Agreement and no bypass of the grievant occurred.

**Decision** 

The Committee agreed that the job award was appropriate and no violation of the Agreement occurred. On that basis, this grievance is considered closed.

Margaret A. Short, Chairman Review Committee	Hoger Status
	Roger W. Stalcup, Secretary Review Committee
	1/12/99
Date	Date