

INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS
741.5

Review Committee Files Nos. 438, 443 and 485
Coast Valleys Division Grievances Nos. 18-222,
18-224, 18-225 and 18-63-5

June 2, 1964

MR. E. C. HERSAM, Chairman
Coast Valleys Division
Joint Grievance Committee

The Union has recently informed the Company members of the Review Committee that the above subject grievances have been withdrawn from the agenda of the Review Committee. We are enclosing a copy of the Union's statements of withdrawal for your information.

It will be in order for you to note in the minutes of your next Division Joint Grievance Committee meeting that these cases are considered closed.

L. V. BROWN

L. V. BROWN, Chairman
Review Committee

LVB:RS
Encl.

cc: VJThompson
EFSibley
CLYager
LHSmith
LLMitchell

INTERNATIONAL BROTHERHOOD OF ELECTRICAL WORKERS, AFL-CIO

1918 Grove Street

Oakland 12, California

LOCAL UNION 1245

May 18, 1964

Mr. L. V. Brown, Chairman
Review Committee
Pacific Gas & Electric Company
245 Market Street
San Francisco 6, California

Dear Mr. Brown:

The following Review Committee cases are being withdrawn by the Union for the reasons noted on the enclosed statements:

R.C.#438	- Coast Valleys Division Grievance #18-222
R.C.#443	- Coast Valleys Division Grievances #18-224 & #18-225
R.C.#485	- Coast Valleys Division Grievance #18-63-5
R.C.#486	- San Francisco Division Grievance #2-63-9
R.C.#520	- San Francisco Division Grievance #2-63-15 (L.I.C.#)
R.C.#488	- San Francisco Division Grievance #2-63-15 (G/C #)
R.C.#490	- North Bay Division Grievance #4-63-12
R.C.#544-64-37	- North Bay Division Grievance #4-64-2
R.C.#500	- San Francisco Division Grievance #2-63-13
R.C.#514	- Stockton Division Grievance #16-63-8
R.C.#515	- Stockton Division Grievance #16-63-9
R.C.#535-64-28	- Sacramento Division Grievance #6-63-3

Very truly yours,



L. L. Mitchell, Secretary
Review Committee

LLM:do
Encls.
cc: WMFleming
RWFIELDS

oeiu-29
afl-cio
51864do

Review Committee File No. 438
Coast Valleys Division Grievance No. 18-222

Union is withdrawing R. C. #438 from the file and will consider the case closed. The basis for this case is the claim that on certain jobs, a Fitter was performing work falling within the duties of a Mechanic. The problem is whether or not the work is considered a "hot tie-in".

Investigations by both parties have failed to prove conclusively that the particular job processes involved are what is considered to be work which is clearly within the scope of duties of one classification or the other. For this reason, neither party is willing to agree to the claim made by the other. We believe that this lack of clear delineation on the work involved is due in part to a variability of procedures in this Division as related to those generally used in other Divisions of the Company's operations.

We believe that future disagreements over hot tie-ins in this Division can be avoided by an understanding on the method to be employed before starting such jobs in the future.

L. L. Mitchell, Secretary
Review Committee

May 18, 1964