REVIEW COMMITTEE



RECEIVED JAN 2 4 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

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

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:

On this basis, this case is considered closed.

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

Ðoug Ve**∯**der Company Member

Company Member

Bruce Tison

Date

æ -96 Ken Ball

Union Member

Date

0<u>/96</u>

Sam Tamimi **Union Member**

Date

De Anza Division Grievance No. DEA-94-1

Facts of the Case

The grievant was hired on December 12, 1984 and at the time of displacement was a Street Light Maintenance Man. The grievant was displaced into a Utility Worker, DC. The grievant believed he should have been placed into a Garageman at the De Anza headquarters under the provision of Subsection 206.6(a).

The grievant was placed into his 20th option. The other options were compressed out or were assigned to more senior employees.

Decision

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

and the second second

The grower was need to december 10, 1986 and of the time of depleter without the Other Eight Maintenance Link. The one-was task cash of the order distribution of The greves more-was a status instruction parage of the distribution of the order of the measurements taken on status of Sectoments 108 (ve

The conventiones are a more light source of an arrange success concepted out memory scenario and the concepted areas

Center

The streaked of a sector of the 122 one of the transformed of the 12200 And the sector of the first sector sector sector.

g for the characteria data a

5

Ren y ten des deus marca a tra constructions a 10 a 988 persona constructions de la subcata en società de 12 a De 2011 - Califeren a constructiona a l'associa estas constructions de la construction de la construction de 10 Ten de la constructione de la construction de la construction de la construction de la construction de la const

•

San Jose Division Grievance No. SJO-94-6

Facts of the Case

The grievant was hired by the Company on April 12, 1985 and at the time of displacement was a Groundman. The grievant was placed as a Fieldman, Gas T&D under Section 206.5. The grievant believed he should of received a Subsection 206.6(a) option.

The grievant was placed into his 7th option. The other options were compressed out or were assigned to more senior employees.

Decision

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

and entry one one second of the second of the second of the second second second second second second second se Alter and the second Alter and the second Alter and the second Alter and the second Alter and the second Alter and the second second

Realigneerse else a laanst stradien di Rielastiche – Rice speer – Linen verke opponing daard staal ge Interneties in een op een opponing en en gee

가 옥사 또 중에는 10억에 가려서 있었다. 이번 이상에 가지 않는 것이 있는 것이 있는 것이 있는 것이 있는 것이 있는 것이 있는 것이 있다. 이번 가지 않는 것이 있는 것이 있는 것이 있는 것이 같이 있는 것이 같은 것이 있는 것이 있다.

and the second second

84 Jack Brite Control of Contro

n an anna an Aonaichtean ann an Aon An Aonaichtean ann an Aonaichtean an

De Anza Division Grievance No. DEA-94-3

Facts of the Case

The grievant was hired by the Company on January 3, 1989 and at the time of displacement was a Groundman. The grievant was placed as a Utility Worker, DC. The grievant believed he should have been placed into a Utility Worker/Electric Materials Distribution under the provision of Section 206.6.

The grievant was placed into his 11th option. The other options were compressed out or were assigned to employees with greater seniority.

Decision

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

and the second second

Stea presente unas intela con los Desargales por unaspesa i un los de las ensertes de tamellos desetuses comeras Pulantemenas. Des os exemploses desente seus Célure Minaker, QC, The gravente conferment an anama constructera question como i concentration de la construction Mejes est Destructerar unaser con constructions d'examinação P

The strakene was muren and also in a paper. The earch on that in one conversion dury on ware strated subscription was warded as subscription.

1998 de la seconda de la companya d Companya de la company

na serie de la construcción de la c

6

Review Committee File No. 1775

P-RC No. 1782

n praeniški tek na slovenski politički politički politički politički politički politički politički politički po Proslatenski politički politički politički politički politički politički politički politički politički politički

and a second second

De Anza Division Grievance No. DEA-94-6

Facts of the Case

The grievant was hired by the Company on June 21, 1976 and at the time of displacement was a Patrolman. The grievant was placed as a Utility Worker, DC. The grievant believed the placement should have been into a Utility Worker - Water under the provision of Section 206.6.

The grievant was placed into his 16th option. The other options were compressed out or were assigned to employees with greater seniority.

Decision

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

The sprevore was a sector of Constant of Constant in 1975 that is the Grand Market Chosen smart was a Proposition. The greater was more to a UBM constant, CO. The prevent basetor the compression of the constant of the CO. The material basetor from compression of the constant of the CO. The material statement of Source of the Constant of the Constant of the Constant of the Constant of Source of Constant of the Constant of the Constant of Source of Constant of the Constant of Source of Constant of the Constant of the Constant of the Constant of the Constant of Source of Constant of the Constant of

Ten grever was also no second (Encander Charlen - Charlen - Marian - Marian) An ware assigned to second a second as grad assignation

na service de la companya de la comp La companya de la comp

8

Meno provinsi provins Provinsi pro Provinsi pro

★★
A transformed state of the second state of the secon

De Anza Division Grievance No. DEA-94-7

Facts of the Case

The grievant was hired by the Company on May 13, 1991 and at the time of displacement was a Utility Worker - Gas T&D. The grievant was placed as a DC Utility Worker. The grievant believed the placement should have been into a Materialsman under the provision of Section 206.6.

The grievant was placed into his 19th option. The other options were compressed out or were assigned to employees with greater seniority.

Decision

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

Fine indevide class concellant Company of May 11, 1974, and 10, the Line G Forestament and Classifier Concella (200, The presson mountable) at a 20 Maily Worker, The measurem respond the classifier sector coner static and the Person Creating provision of Terrina, 2000

The prevent was incominate up 13th adaption. The uses in an signed only another cut prevent approach to minimize over modules as extention.

<u>Decimo</u>n

(Bellementaria) metropation ante per l'inclusione material de la companya de la companya de la companya de la Alexandre en l'interviente de la companya de la companya de la

nego presenta en per una en entre en la presidante de la seña por seña en el 1995, a seña esta deserva da serv Any en entre espectadad a definidad en la completa de la seña de la completa en la completa en la definidad de 1997 - La completa de la completa de

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.

(1) Service and service of the service of the service of the service of the service problem and the service of the service

Tyropolar worg i sow alarishili pratrica o goʻra islabiti i Stalia isti i i soci u sira i sotarif Adama davi Uroveksa alibasi Abilo rakino memola viri sada Store Comminiseri proti titi titis usuravalati nevito ngo CB sirang neogoti agas ora tagata tratagilari. Na kito ji i tra viti i titishargagina Mala Talattifica (gʻravina) ngo socio tagata tratagilari tagata silariti.

(As a specific provide state of the state

(1) H. Bowender, How H. B. Bowen, and M. M. Cheff, and S. Shakarakara, "A sub-control of anti-control of the sub-system of the second second state of the second s second seco

San Joaquin Division Grievance No. FRO-94-14

Facts of the Case

The grievant was hired by the Company on April 4, 1988 and at the time of displacement was a T&D Driver. The grievant was placed as a DC Utility Worker. The grievant believed the placement should have been into a Materialsman under the provision of Section 206.6.

The grievant was placed into his 14th option. The other options were compressed out or were assigned to employees with greater seniority.

Decision:

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

a ya 11996 ili na shi na sa wa kwa shiki she sa

(1) March (1998), a construction of the Archae mark and Area (1997) (3) on the process of the construction of the archae mark and the Area (1997), and th

^{na} Benghuk uku se Adolah bulu na usi sebelahkan s^{an} kecah sebelah pertakan pertakan pertakan pertakan sebelah Sebelah bulu mentihan sebelah pertakan pertakan pertakan

Characteristics and the second state of the

ur**en, pagi S**anta da Bandan da Bandari da Kanan da Bandari Bandari da Santa da Santa da Santa da Santa da Santa Referencia da Santa d Referencia da Santa da

14 El control de la sectión des autorisatives en la confession de la confessione de la sectión de calabatives de la confessiona de la confessione a sectión de la confession de la confessione de la confessione la confessione de la confessione de la confessione de la calabative de la confession de la confessione de

Review Committee Files No. 1763, 1764, and 1765

P-RC 1815, P-RC 1816, P-RC 1819, P-RC 1970, P-RC 1763, P-RC 1796, P-RC 1803, P-RC 1804, P-RC 1805 and P-RC 1806 / FRO-93-31, FRO-93-30, BAK-94-3, CON-94-10, CHI-93-11, SAC-94-40, SAC-94-32, SAC-94-33, SAC-94-41 and SAC-94-42)

The situation which gave rise to these grievances involve contracting sand and gravel delivery to various job sites. According to the facts of each case, the Company established a contract for the delivery which was separate from the purchase of the sand and gravel. In light of Review

Committee Case No. 1755 and 1756, the Committee agreed that this contracting was in violation of the Agreement.

P-RC 1972 (CON-93-4)

This grievance concerns the use of contractors to sawcut concrete for trenching and excavation purposes. The Committee noted that the Fieldperson's job definition includes "use of concrete saws". Therefore the Committee agreed that this is work normally performed by the Gas T&D Department employees. The company reserves the right to put forth the argument in future cases that the company is not obligated to purchase specialized equipment.

P-RC 1700, P-RC 1710, P-RC 1750 and P-RC 1754 (FRO-93-8, GG-PD-93-8, CCH-94-4 and MER-93-10)

The issue in these cases involve the reduction in the number of employees in the Gas T&D Department at these headquarters while contracting was occurring in the same department at other headquarters in the system.

P-RC 1611, P-RC 1610, P-RC 1660, P-RC 1574, P-RC 1631, P-RC 1599, P-RC 1672, P-RC 1673, P-RC 1661, P-RC 1703, P-RC 1711, P-RC 1725, P-RC 1726, P-RC 1736, P-RC 1743, P-RC 1749 and P-RC 1755 (COA-91-9, COV-52-18-91-13, COV-52-92-14, FRO-91-33, HUM-91-3, MIS-91-33, GG-PD-93-04, GG-PD-93-05, STKN-92-18, YOS-93-15, GG-PD-93-7, SJO-92-29, SJO-92-27, STKN-93-15, FRO-93-26, CCH-94-3 and MER-93-11)

The issue in these cases involve the reduction in the number of employees in the Electric T&D Department at these headquarters while contracting was occurring in the same department at other headquarters in the system.

It is clear from the Electric T&D and Gas T&D cases described above, that the company contracted out work that is normally performed by those department employees. The remaining question then concerns whether the company had met it's obligation outlined in Subsection 207.2(b), by maintaining the total size of the bargaining unit in these two departments. As evidenced by the number of grievances which originated from headquarters where the headcount in the affected departments was below the established floor number, the company had not met that obligation. Therefore the Agreement has been violated in all of these cases. However, during the discussion which led to Letter Agreement 95-54, the parties agreed that these cases would be settled without adjustment.

· • • • 4

Sacramento Division Grievance No. SAC-94-24(a)

Facts of the Case:

The grievant was hired by the Company on June 15, 1964 and at the time of displacement was a Patrolman. The grievant was placed as a Utility Worker - Electric Materials Distribution. The grievant believed the placement should have been into a higher option under the provision of Section 206.6.

The grievant was placed into his 15th option. The other options were compressed out or were assigned to employees with greater seniority.

Decision:

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

<u> Andreas ann an an an an An Anna an An An An</u>

The constant of the parameters of the constant of the second states of the constant of the

The second second of the transformer of the second to the second second second to the second to the second seco In the second second second second second second second second

nning generative of the second of the second sec In the second second

Let a construction of the second of the s

North Valley Division Grievance No. CHI-94-33

Facts of the Case

The grievant was hired by the Company on April 14, 1992 and at the time of displacement was a Routine Hydro Clerk T/A. The grievant was laid off. The grievant believed the placement should have been into one of the four options provided under the provision of Section 206.6.

The grievant was laid off. The other options were compressed out or were assigned to employees with greater seniority.

Decision

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

¹ Proposition of the state of the state

Construction of the second se second sec

The exclusion time is a set of the constraint power representation of the representation of matter and set of the constraint of the

The grouped product control of the 105 each opportunity of a second to the last of the last of Alternative of the product of the product build of the second to the second to the second to the second to the s

o entro de la contra de la construcción de la construcción de la construcción de la construcción de la constru

(1) A second state of the second state of t

n en service and finde and the service of the servi

e <u>Rentrant</u> a la companya de la comp

The granner and the second of the State State State and the second state of the second state of the second state

North Valley Division Grievance No. CHI-94-34

Facts of the Case

The grievant was hired by the Company on June 22, 1992 and at the time of displacement was a Utility Worker - Water. The grievant was placed as a Traveler Utility Worker. The grievant believed the placement should have been into one of his options under the provision of Section 206.6.

The grievant was placed into his 5th option. The other options were compressed out or were assigned to employees with greater seniority.

Decision

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

, ¹la provane seus seroles (), en clumpunte por d'entre d'Albert e service prova prova prova constructurilate vers e collà la presidence statetti d'Esta persona d'est cullet de l'Albert d'Albert platta checuer d'Esta provació () éstato des services estate contre d'Albert d'Estato d'Albert d'Albert checuer d'Esta provació () éstato d'Albert services estate () a sub estato d'Albert estato de l'Albert

Measure replaced donate a conception of Bills to position. The increase proving increases guide cases of one of In which increases to replace the construction of dealers, and dealers to

areau art an a transmuch o cho arteu regi i chili con noncerearea araareele aa Aarteu regi anto no chilo arteu regi chileatare e cuivo con artei chile chile arteu

reprint principal and a construction of the principal distribution of the second second second second second se The reprint of the second se

(An approximate space of the order of the contract of the part of the part of the order of the order of the order of the part of the pa

n Ne general term e na porta de l'Édentition d'Ample and d'Adda d'Adda de la transforma de la transforma de la tr Ne neme d'Adda de la transforma de la transf

. Ang agagawakan menangkan menangkan di kacamatan kanan menangkan menangkan kanan di kacamatan di Kacamatan kan Anggang perang ^{ang}an kanangkan di kanangkan kanang

¹¹ States and the second states of the second

Yosemite Division Grievance No. MER-94-12

Facts of the Case

The grievant was hired by the Company on September 30, 1963 and at the time of displacement was a Field Clerk. The grievant was placed as a Utility Worker - D.C. The grievant believed the placement should have been into a Assistant Foreman's Clerk under the provision of Section 206.4.

(4) A set of the A set of the set of the

The grievant was placed into his 5th option. The other options were compressed out or were assigned to employees with greater seniority.

Decision

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

n an ann an San Ann an Ann

The disensity of the construction of the construction for factor and in the construction of the construction of I can a construction of the construction of the construction factors and the construction of the construction The construction of the construction of construction of the construction of the construction of the construction The construction of the constru

^{,"你}"我们就是我们就是我们的问题,我们就是我们的人们就是我们的问题,我们就是我们的问题,我们就是我们的,我们就是我们就是我们就是我们的。" 我们就是我们就是我们就是你们的你的,你们还是你们的你们,你们们还是我们的你们的你们。"

n 1999 (prime de 2010) en la servicie de la sectedada de la composición de la composición de la deservición de Nova en la composición de la composición de la general de la composición de la composición de la composición de

n seneral seneral de la construcción La construcción de la construcción d

ા અને પ્રાયમિક્રે કે કે કે પ્રાપ્ય છે. આ પ્રાપ્ય પ્રાપ્ય પ્રાપ્ય પ્રાપ્ય છે. આ ગામમાં આવેલી પ્રાપ્ય છે. પ્રાપ્ય પ્રાપ્ય ગામમાં આવ્યું કે આ ગામમાં આવ્યું કે **104**, સ્વાપ્ય **104**, સાથ ગામમાં આ ગામમાં આ ગામમાં પ્રાપ્ય ગામ ગામમાં આવ્યું કે આ ગામમાં આવ્યું આ ગામમાં આવ્યું કે આ ગામમાં આવ્યું કે બાળવા આ ગામમાં આવ્યું છે. આ ગામમાં ગામમાં આ ગામમાં આ ગામમાં આ ગામમાં આવ્યું આ ગામમાં આવ્યું આ ગામમાં આવ્યું આ ગામમાં આવ્યું આવ્યું છે. આ ગામમાં આવ્યું આ



Yosemite Division Grievance No. MER-94-13

 $P^{2}(x) = e^{-ix} e^{-ix} e^{-ix} e^{-ix}$ (where $e^{-ix} e^{-ix} e^{-ix}$) $e^{-ix} e^{-ix} e^{-ix} e^{-ix}$

Facts of the Case

The grievant was hired by the Company on October 10, 1973 and at the time of displacement was a T&D Driver. The grievant was placed as a Utility Worker, DC. The grievant believed the placement should have been into a Garageman under the provision of Section 206.6.

The grievant was placed into the 12th option. The other options were compressed out or were assigned to employees with greater seniority.

Decision

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

105

Yosemite Division Grievance No. MER-94-14

Facts of the Case

.

The grievant was hired by the Company on October 25, 1982 and at the time of displacement was a Patrolman. The grievant elected severance after being assigned to a Utility Worker - DC. The grievant believed the placement should have been into a Utility Worker - Building Services under the provision of Section 206.6.

The grievant was assigned into his 27th option. The other options were compressed out or were assigned to employees with greater seniority.

Decision

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

a tradición de la companya de la com La companya de la comp La companya de la comp

Tinne comentation de l'anno contra companya de l'aglia serve di la 1980, en l'estante de margina. L'aglia contratere de l'anno 1990, en la contratere segmente contratere dentra assessatere conseguerse. Trasplato de l'aglia d'aglia d'Aglia de la contratere de 1990, contratere de la contratere de la construcción Tribut de l'aglia d'Aglia d'Aglia de la contratere de 1990, contratere de la contratere de la construcción de l

A new contraction en la versión de la versión de la tradición de la contraction de la elementa termente de las Revenue elemente de la contraction de la contraction de la tractación.

²⁸ Mercentz and digital and the state of the distribution of the second se

a terretaria en esta en la construcción de la construcción de la construcción de la construcción de la constru Construcción de la construcción de l Construcción de la construcción de

Districte experiences in the construction of the transformation of the experience of the transformation of the

Sierra Division Grievance No. AUB-94-41

Facts of the Case

The case concerns the change of one of the grievant's options under Title 19. The grievant was initially given a list of options which included Meter Reader - Marysville.

The Title 19 options were rescinded and when reissued, the Meter Reader - Marysville option was changed to Meter Reader/Utility Clerk - Marysville. The grievant did not believe the change should have been made.

The Committee determined that the option in question was a vacancy. Between the issuance of the two sets of options, management reclassified the vacancy. The Committee agreed to settle this case without adjustment and without prejudice.

Decision

There is no violation of the agreement. Case closed without adjustment and without prejudice.

The could concerns in elarge of case concerned are proposed as to the interval a marana akki milaka malemeta kusha ila takoni dama amindiba anta taka adalah sahra ata The follow TR publicity of the estimated and write followed in the reserve destance of the time nghigh ar **an** 49 million o chieren Brienner Control Caw Al Perturbation of the million of the second

. Na su constante constructione a transmissione de transmissione en la construction de la construcción de la comp n en fan de skrienen en en een een een een de skrienen en de skrienen en de skrienen en de skrienen en de skrie 1911 1931 Merstel de State en een een skrienen een tekster tekste skrienen en de skrienen en de skrienen een sk 1914 Merstel de State en een een de skrienen ee

98

The last opposite the presidence with the presidence of the second state of the first second second state of the

P-RC No. 1841

(2) We have a splitter of the second state of the second state of the second state of the second state property of the second state of the seco

envez Caterose é de an 1977. El

Mission Division Grievance No. HAY-94-13

Facts of the Case

The grievant was hired by the Company on November 4, 1991 and at the time of displacement was a Utility Worker - Gas T&D. The grievant was placed as a Utility Worker, DC. The grievant believed the placement should have been into a Telecom Installer under the provision of Section 206.6.

The grievant was placed into his 11th option. The other options were compressed out or were assigned to employees with greater seniority.

Decision

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

Mission Clasher Clasher Her PANALA P

and a second second

The grievent was used to be Company on Rovastoer of 1991 and at the time of deplacement was a public Worker - Gas TSB. The prevent was preced as a cliffly Norker. CC1. The gree at polluyed the diagenetics of the store theory to be restaller under the provide of Science 2036. The time of the time of the time installer under the provide of Science 2036. The time of the time

The grovani was blacen into his 14th uppers. The most listicus yers nomeneously but or ware assument at encloyees with greater semicity.

The dedicemonial first prioritable togs: TWE 2013 dealers annormatic el escapera contre 12.555 Esté America Districtions (moltiples y 2.55 el c. 1215555)

22 ·

- Men gerienzal hones a complexes zone la Angelezy (zon barene barene en 1913), ande an Angelez af - La escalezzar en 1933), en al an Metroport - Marin Marin - Propart en energia arte en artene porta (1985) - <u>La escalezzar en 1975), en al anterior en 1975 - Propart en al anterior en artene porta (1985)</u>, en artene en Review Committee File No. 1775 P-RC No. 1841

• • • • • • • •

nin ben autorial da contratorio de la casa de la ciencia de la casa de la completa de la contratorio de la comp Casiletia e espectivo de la contratorio de la contratorio de la contratorio de la contratorio de la contratorio

alah di Kepadatan Kababagi Jawa Jerd

Andreas and a sub-state of the second sec Andreas and a sub-state of the second sec Second second

المواريح المحار ومنتجا فالمحاد الرواف المعج فالمحاد المحتج ليهدأ أأتنا العجج وترج المكار والرجا

Mission Division Grievance No. HAY-94-14

Facts of the Case

The grievant was hired by the Company on November 5, 1984 and at the time of displacement was a Utility Worker. The grievant was placed as a Plant Assistant. The grievant believed the placement should have been into another position under the provision of Section 206.6.

The grievant was placed into his 6th option. The other options were compressed out or were assigned to employees with greater seniority.

Decision

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

Hasien Linteren Blievence fle HAMPALEN

The gravent was used by the Company on November 5, 1934 and at the une of displacement was a Utility Viorhon. The prevant was placed as a Plast Assimant. The prevant placed of inducement score give open one occurs constant mobilities provision of Section 200 company. A standard of the score of the section of the score of the score and the score of th

The grovent was blenge into the Bill angles. The orbit internet crose of hobbished out of Hore assumed in templotases with difeater centrolity.

<u>nder me</u>

Phie exclusion en en conjunctivation (in per Ville 200 dischord in projection) - Receive en the Like gr References: RecEmpled Brossed and exclusioned Br

<u>Mental of Blocks to town on the Medicial</u>

<u>la presenta de la construcción de</u> Esta de la construcción de la const

The gravestages and be the Commence of Soverside 5, 1996 and of the time of Careforders with the Property Society of the generatives of the careford from Society and the first of the Careford New Commence of the careford of the careford of the careford of the Commence of the careford of the care

o. 1775 <u>P-RC No. 1843</u>

n fan een weren geneer een een een een een een en namme de eenste een een de de eenste de eenste eenste eenste Eenste opgelege weren eenste met die geween op 100 werdte eens

and she

a an an tha an an an

ette on externe de la popular de president (j. j. j. j. j. en la finsk fan de la finsk fan de la president en s Gebeure en la seconda de la finsk fan de la fin Gebeure fan de la finsk fan de Reederstelle fan de la finsk fan de la finsk

Mission Division Grievance No. HAY-94-11

Facts of the Case

The grievant was hired by the Company on July 15, 1991 and at the time of displacement was a Utility Worker. The grievant was placed as a Utility Worker, DC.

The grievant believed the placement should have been into a higher option under the provision of Section 206.6.

The grievant was placed into his 20th option. The other options were compressed out or were assigned to employees with greater seniority.

Decision

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

د مراجع الله الله المراجع المراجع المراجع المراجع التي التي المراجع المراجع المراجع المراجع المراجع المراجع ال المراجع المراجع

The crievent cass miles on the (concern) on usive in the cost and the more of fisotecenterway a PAR V index (The crickent was thered as a UPPs, hindred (16)

The ground belief as the monoment stored bave open soft a subject to be and/r ins weather the Senie of Magnesian and a

inge anlægge færet och men som ble tilte grennen. Men opper menter anlænne top somernation att I menske er englandet och menske somerne somerne tilte opper menter anlænde top somerne som att i

ni plana population of the second second

21

e e la com

the second se

Review Constitute Participa (1775 - 17

Mission Division Grievance No. HAY-94-10

Facts of the Case

The grievant was hired by the Company on May 23, 1985 and at the time of displacement was a T&D Driver. The grievant was placed as a Utility Worker. The grievant believed the placement should have been into a higher option under the provision of Section 206.6.

The grievant was placed into his 74th option. The other options were compressed out or were assigned to employees with greater seniority.

Decision

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

Mesico Division Rosenation Str. HAY-94-14

<u>E stant de se</u>

The prievant was nired by the Company on play 72, 1986 and of the time of nisplacement was a T&D Crives. The mievent was maded as a UNIN Worker. The antervant baltered for the preparation acount dans death to but of notion chart for hinnayon of Sector 195 B.

The onevent even blood mo his 74th desch. The ciner actions were obstronessed out NUMBRE ASSECTION OF SHID WARD WARD SPECIES LODDAN.

<u>ിറോപാ</u>ം The applyment of the energy apply and lenger. This defined consistence is would be to be And services where the service states and the services and

Lasing Blance Revenue in the Your Lo

f man i di cui cui

20

The prever, was three by the Company on Day 27 (455 end)or the mar of department, was a 248 Diver. The delease was claring as a 126 m glower. The

P-RC No. 1845

(1) A set of the se

n en en la seconda de presentadores despréses d'Un 1928 proteín en compositor de la seconda de la seconda de l La seconda de la 1970 de la construir de la construir de la construir de las

North Bay Division Grievance No. SNR-94-15

Facts of the Case

The grievant was hired by the Company on February 2, 1979 and at the time of displacement was a Night Groundman. The grievant was placed as a Utility Worker, DC. The grievant believed the placement should have been into a higher option under the provision of Section 206.6.

The grievant was placed into his 17th option. The other options were compressed out or were assigned to employees with greater seniority.

Decision

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

(1) Some and the second second of the structure of the structure of the second s Second s Second se Second seco

n an anna an Airtean ann an Airtean ann an Airtean ann an Airtean a' Airtean ann an Airtean Airtean. An Airtean ann an Airtean an Airtean ann an Airtean ann ann ann ann an Airtean ann an Airtean Airtean Airtean Airtean ann an Airtean ann an Airtean ann ann an Airtean ann ann an Airtean ann an Airtean Airtean Airtean Airt

(a) A set of the s

n en general de la company de la company enversion de la company en la company de la company en la company de Record de la company de la company de la company de la company en la company de la company en la company de la Record de la company de la company de la company en la company en la company en la company de la company de la c

North Bay Division Grievance No. SNR-94-03

Facts of the Case

The grievants were hired by the Company between 1968 and 1990 and at the time of displacement were in various Electric Department Classifications. The grievants were place into various positions. The grievants believed the placements should have been into other classifications under the provision of Section 206.6.

The grievants were placed into the appropriate 206 option. The other options were compressed out or were assigned to employees with greater seniority.

Decision

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

<u>. 1997 - Anton Massenne de Partico II</u>

The provents where one of the Company between 1958 and 1990 and at the lime of displacement were in manous Section Decembers Destructions. The gravatim wate place but valuate transions. The gravants believed the modements chould have been menumer accession concerns and on the prevence of Practice Inc.

The interprits were braced into the appropriate 1206 lobbon. Due other includes were remonstrated of unit were accounted to employees with onseter currently.

<u>Jackson</u>

The subbased in southers where TRAP 200 the conversion of american set from the subbase There are a transmission of straight bound medication of the conversion of the straight bound the straight Straight which are to the straight of the straight

and the second sec

The elements leave one for the Constant/29ndeau 1958 and 1059 and 10 the order the trans of the based wave reliances the Elevine Discontinue Classification is to prevale theme is the ordered method. The processes Prevent of the constant rate released to the ordered method. The processes Prevent of the constant rate released to the constant of the processes of the constant of the constant rate relation.

P-RC No. 1847

e al presentar pertane en la construir de la transformation de la forma de la construir de la transforma de la La transforma de la construir de la construir de la construir de la transforma de la construir de la construir d

Sierra Division Grievance No. AUB-94-24

Facts of the Case

The grievant was hired by the Company on November 5, 1990 and at the time of displacement was a Groundman. The grievant was placed as a Utility Worker, DC. The grievant believed the placement should have been into a another option under the provision of Section 206.6.

The grievant was placed into his 13th option. The other options were compressed out or were assigned to employees with greater seniority.

Decision

.

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

n de la Angle - La Angle - La Angle - Carlo - **96**2 de la Carlo - Carlo - Carlo - Carlo - Carlo - Carlo - Carlo Carlo - Carlo -

Teness Commerse Const. 2778

Mission Division Grievance No. HAY-94-16

Facts of the Case

The grievant was hired by the Company on November 3, 1981 and at the time of displacement was a T&D Driver. The grievant was placed as a Utility Worker, DC. The

grievant believed the placement should have been into a higher option under the provision of Section 206.6.

The grievant was placed into his 9th option. The other options were compressed out or were assigned to employees with greater seniority.

Decision

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

1997 - Serie Aller and States and State

setter no these

The gasters was lead to the Company on Rovements 1961 rick of the ame of destinances and a 1945 Briver. The one can was maked by a black flower (10). The

energan tereeven "to treated ant ticked lighe cean who a light of a concerning Service for an establishing for Ref.

. The privation was bound indice, with policy in Travestation in the new commercial bud by

· · · · .

24

The prevent error from the fee classifiers an Mannader of Toll and Hold and the second 가 있는 것이 있 같이 있는 것이 같이 있는 것이 있는 것

าราการสาราช (1975) กระชาติประการสาราชการที่ได้ (1975)

De Anza Division Grievance No. DEA-94-5

Facts of the Case

:

The grievant was hired by the Company on October 24, 1978 and at the time of displacement was a Groundman. The grievant was placed as a Auxiliary Operator. The grievant believed the placement should have been into a Utility Worker - Building Services under the provision of Section 206.6.

The grievant was placed into his 58th option. The other options were compressed out or were assigned to employees with greater seniority.

Discussion and Disposition

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

<u> Maharana ingkaon</u>ana ayanta ing ing ingkaona

ار از از ۲۰۰۰ به موقع استان او سموری ژر استان از از ۲۰۰۰ به موجوع

The gravest resembled on on Campate on Catopia, 2, 1978 and et the sale of displacement was a Branconne. The gravant was been as a Adrifer Doardon. The gravant selfated the resolution of once 1 have one on a solution. Tener 1 Ballebrg Samicas under the recommend of the USLA

The grievant was evaded into its all this outral. The other operations were compressed that or were associated at exposure at with greater servicity.

Eliscension and Olice scient

long amaganét long almano sooras. Téle 1918 jili soor popolis no ol vito pago sérit o tipina. Len geolegi Misérius del 10 milliona sa capacitament.

<u> Shining an ing katao ing P</u>angka

n Alexandra (1993) - 1993 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 -1997 - North Alexandro (1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 19 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 - 1997 -



Stockton Division Grievance No. STKN-94-2

Facts of the Case

The grievants were hired by the Company between 1968 and 1992 and at the time of displacement were in various Gas and Electric classifications. The grievants were placed into various prioritized options. The grievants believed that placement should have been into higher options under the provision of Section 206.6.

The grievants were placed into the appropriate options. The other options were compressed out or were assigned to employees with greater seniority.

Decision

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

Central Coast Division Grievance No. CCH-94-22

Facts of the Case

2

The grievant was hired on March 9, 1988 and at the time of displacement was a Utility Clerk - Operator. The grievant was laid off. The grievant believed she should have been placed into any of the positions compressed off her option list.

Laid off was the grievant's 7th option. The other options were compressed out or were assigned to more senior employees.

Decision

The grievant's layoff under Title 19 did not constitute a violation of the Labor Agreement. This case is closed without adjustment.

nen millinger. Dies is diese stren die die State 1973

The groven was means to March 5, 1,20 and to be smooth courternant realing GEW. Chine - Cossistor - The prevent rest of out - The assessing hereics she thousd bave peak prevent for an electre score in compresent of the cost one.

ual dé sera por entre l'in de lora. Com ciue a succer entre administration de estare terrene en parte estar estar pressiones

yodinon

in le gelevant sint officielle. That of it is an increation is constant control allon. A<mark>grees</mark> as the That in tage of the conjugation of the Agric C

and a start of the second s

And the series of the sector sector of the sector of

4

P-RC No. 1870

Review Committee File No. 1775

and a second

Frank and from many and a long as a street

Sierra Division Grievance No. AUB-94-45

Facts of the Case

This case concerns the Title 206 placements of 4 grievants. The details are as follows:

Hire Date 5/17/65 7/28/69 6/5/70 1/2/70	<u>206 Assignment</u> System Operator - Chico System Operator - Auburn System Operator - Chico	Prioritization #2 #2 #2
1/3/79	System Operator - Chico	#1
	5/17/65 7/28/69	5/17/65System Operator - Chico7/28/69System Operator - Auburn6/5/70System Operator - Chico

The grievants believed they should have been given options to displace into Table Mountain.

The Committee reviewed the placement of each grievant and the disposition of their higher prioritized options. The Committee determined that all their options were either compressed out or were assigned to more senior employees. The Committee determined that the employees were not entitled to displace into Table Mountain.

Decision د رياميس مردر اين 349 J.C

ling to the langer - Age

C. S. Anna an

- - - - • eg

en en la companya de la comp

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

1999 - 13 reference of Longering and the state of the second

Buttern Lovenver Street 1. Sustem Lodensen Thies en

ē 11

alternation of the grant of the case of the same construction of the construction of the same of the same of the 101

REVIEW COMMITTEE



RECEIVED JAN 2 4 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 DECISIONPRE-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

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:

3

On this basis, this case is considered closed.

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

Doug Vender Company Member

Date

æ -96 Ken Ball

Union Member

Date

Bruce Tison

Company Member

0/96

Sam Tamimi **Union Member**

Date

 $\mathcal{D} = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{$

Review Committee File No. 1775

P-RC No. 1871

n general general opporten en slære for i fræftære i som en er skolfer for som slædet er er er fræ Refer for en general for er er skolf for skolfere er er frægte som er for er er fore for er fore for er er er

a gan shekara kata kana shekara ngan nagaran si sa kulayar sa kuta kanan sara sanasisi 102 sa sa sala

Review Committee File No. 1773

Mission Division Grievance No. HAY-94-18

Facts of the Case

The grievant was hired by the Company on September 3, 1980 and at the time of displacement was a T&D Driver. The grievant was placed as a Auxiliary Operator. The grievant believed the placement should have been into a higher option under the provision of Section 206.6.

The grievant was placed into his 10th option. The other options were compressed out or were assigned to employees with greater seniority.

Decision

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

Mission Division Geevance Plo. HAY-94-18

Facts of the Case

The grievant was hired by the Company on September 3, 1980 and at the time of displacement was a 78D Onver. The grievant was placed as a Auxiliary Operator. The grievant believed the placement should have been into a plener option under ma provision of Section 206.6.

The grevant was placed into his 10th option. The other options ware compressed out or were assigned to employees with greater seniority.

 \mathbb{D} ectsion and the second second

The placement of the orievents unger Title 208 old not concluse in violation of the Labor Antemport while sold is press windly accustored

Mission Division Galacance No. 1947 22-15

Pace of the June

25 The gravient was broat by the Chinipany on September 3 1959 and at the time of chapieces war area a TSD Laivers. The grevent was placed as a Auxilian Casedon The

and the second second

 $(1,10^{10},\ldots,10^{10})$

P-RC No. 1872 **Review Committee File No. 1775**

Sierra Division Grievance No. AUB-94-23

The second states to be a second state of the second states and the second states of the Case

The grievant was hired by the Company on April 3, 1978 and at the time of displacement was a T&D Driver. The grievant was placed as a Materialsman position. The grievant believed the placement should have been into a higher option under the provision of Section 206.6.

The grievant was placed into his 11th option. The other options were compressed out or were assigned to employees with greater seniority.

Decision

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

per de la companya de la companya en la companya de la **95**,294,200 m

Review Committee File No. 1775

Sierra Division Grievance No. AUB-94-22

Facts of the Case

The grievants were hired by the Company on between 1971 and 1978 and at the time of displacement were in various Electric T&D classifications. The grievants were placed into various options. The grievants believed the placement should have been into a higher option under the provision of Section 206.6.

The grievants were placed into the appropriate options. The other options were compressed out or were assigned to employees with greater seniority.

Decision:

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

¹ Construction of the state of the state of the state of the fragmentation of the state of

94

a se service de la construcción d La construcción de la construcción d

San Jose Division Grievance No. SJO-94-20

Facts of the Case

The grievant was hired on May 6, 1985 and at the time of displacement was a Utility Clerk-Typist Operating. The grievant was displaced into a Utility Clerk-Typist - Customer Services at Cupertino. The grievant believed she should have been placed into a Utility Clerk-Typist Operating at San Jose under Title 19.

(1,2)

The grievant was placed into her 5th option. The other options were compressed out or were assigned to more senior employees.

Decision

The grievant's placement under Title 19 did not constitute a violation of the Labor Agreement. This case is closed without adjustment.

Contraction of the second s

Sierra Division Grievance No. AUB-94-13

Facts of the Case

۰.

The grievant was hired by the Company on March 7, 1985 and at the time of displacement was a Utility Worker. The grievant was placed as a Gas Transmission Operator. The grievant believed the placement should have been into a higher option under the provision of Section 206.6.

The grievant was placed into his 29th option. The other options were compressed out or were assigned to employees with greater seniority.

Decision

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

Alexand Alexandres of the constraint of the constraint of the second of the second

Sierra Division Grievance No. AUB-94-16

Facts of the Case

٠,

The grievant was hired by the Company on February 8, 1980 and at the time of displacement was a Field Clerk. The grievant was placed as a Materialsman. The grievant believed the placement should have been into a higher option under the provision of Section 206.6.

The grievant was placed into her 67th option. The other options were compressed out or were assigned to employees with greater seniority.

Decision

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

New york to dealer the second strength to the second

i inalguno sere insesti neditori una l'umpanto un filippears (l'1920), and su tra teme no l'assenceminere influtioni l'inserti. The paseano vesto casono tra defontatoria. The une esti usidered intercestentemi encetto nege traego carro con concurso autori o traeneno colfino no 1936.

The good the discontration of a set fille budget of the state of a set of the set of

li<mark>ua s</mark>am**mana** katalah di amar 1999 Mangaman menangkan di dipangkan menangkan katalah pertakan di sebagai kata Pangameter di salah di angkan di angkan langkan langkan di ti

i kon lidaan in an shahara oo giboley B

92

l'il grecent aux chud ac des Comany out Bei gen a 1999 mar n' de comany out ann a Rupe com a l'obstation (1990 aux a contra composition) a stational anna.

Review Committee File No. 1775

t i de la companya de

an e page en les presentes de la companya de la caracteria de la companya de la companya de la companya de la La companya de la comp

Revenue Committee (He No. 1775

Diablo Division Grievance No. CON-94-99

Facts of the Case

The grievant was hired on September 18, 1991 and at the time of displacement was a Meter Reader. The grievant was displaced into a Meter Reader at Davis. The grievant believed he should have been placed into a Meter Reader at Concord under Title 19.

The grievant was placed into his 4th option. The other options were compressed out or were assigned to more senior employees. میکنون در میلی از میکند. با با میکنون میکنونی و میکنونی میکنونی میکنونی از این از میکنونی از میکنونی از میکنون این میکنونی در این میکنونی از میکنونی از میکنونی میکنونی میکنونی از میکنونی از میکنونی میکنونی از میکنونی از م

Decision

The grievant's placement under Title 19 did not constitute a violation of the Labor Agreement. This case is closed without adjustment. 2. 특별 2. 전 1. 1월 178 172 1999 - 1997년 1997 - 1997년 - 1997년 1

The direction has shown or Sectomer 18 1091 and at the Sector displacement was a 나는 방법과 관계는 가방에 한 것으로 가장 가장을 것을 수 있다. 이 가장 가장 가장 가장 가장 가장 가장 가장 가장 있다. 나는 물일 것 [15] 이 말 한 것이 가장 가장 가장을 가장 가장 것이 있는 것이 가장 가장 것이 있다. 이 가장 수 있는 것이 같은 같은 모일 같은 이 말 한 것이 것이 있는 것이 있는 것이 같은 것이 있는 것이 있는 것이 있는 것이 있다. 것이 있는 것이 같은 것이 있

The engine of the second second second and the country of the second second second second second second second 이 있는 것이 있다. 같은 것이 같은 것이 같은 것이 있는 것이 있는 것이 있는 것이 있는 것이 있는 것이 있는 것이 없다. 것이 같은 것이 없는 것이 없는 것이 있는 것이 있는 것이 있는 것이 있는 것이 있는 것이 있는

[1] S. M. S. M S. M. S. M S. M. S

ny manana amin'ny fisia dia mampina dia

12 the second a large of the stability first and a the first and a local second second second second second second

P-RC No. 1877

"这些人,还是我的人,你们还没有什么你的?""你你是我的人,你你们还是你说,你是我们没有不能的?" n en sin de la companya de la company La companya de la comp La companya de la comp Review Committee File No. 1775

a de la companya de la calactería de la companya d CARTER PROFESSION

医动脉的 医外侧下侧 网络加索属 建物体的

Peninsula Division Grievance No. BEL-94-50

Facts of the Case This case concerns the allegation that two vacancies were not included as displacement options for Title 19.

The committee determined that the positions in question were not authorized vacancies as of the date that displacement options were generated.

Decision

Given that the two positions in question were not authorized vacancies at the time that Title 19 was implemented, there is no violation of the agreement. This case is closed without adjustment.

The case concerns of consects" has not consected to the transmission of the transmission of the consected of the de**p**resented to be a set of the set

The committee offerty we may the publicne in sugged by were not sufficienced in tradiciou ද්ධාර්ධ එක්ෂ ක්ෂුණු දෙනා - දුන්නේ දුන්න සිති විද්දි දුන්න ප්රියාන පරිදු මුණුද්ධිය විද්ය

Even motione by individual cluescon were an automation vacancies when that ikves inde rear a calve is no vession et molecopament. This prove is ciulted 12

n felter de la companya (a) prime provide the second se Second se 62

化氨酸盐 化过程分离 化合物化物 化分子分离 化分子分离 医鼻腔 化加加盐 医内外侧 医外外 医胆管的 医口腔 化苯基苯基基 [1] A. M. Martin, J. M. Katalan, and K. K. Katalan, "A strain st strain stra

Review Committee File No. 1775

P-RC No. 1880

Review Connettee Rep Hol 1775

Sierra Division Grievance No. AUB-94-14

Facts of the Case

The grievance was hired by the Company on February 19, 1985 and at the time of displacement was a Utility Worker - Gas. The grievance was placed as a Utility Worker, DC. The grievance believed the placement should have been into a higher option under the provision of Section 206.6.

The grievance was placed into her 12th option. The other options were compressed out or were assigned to employees with greater seniority.

Decision

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

CLEME THE CONTRACTOR DOLLATE E-94-14

The growance was blied by the Company on Recruinty 19, (1983 and at the time as displatement was in With Monker - Das The growands was buden as a Utility Worker - CO., The provenum pelieved the placement of durition we been into a higher obtain worker the formation of Social 108 e

No presidente de la constante d La constante de la constante de

Sierra Division Grievance No. AUB-94-19

Facts of the Case

The grievant was hired by the Company on June 14, 1972 and at the time of displacement was a T&D Driver. The grievant was placed as a Utility Worker Building Services. The grievant believed the placement should have been into a higher option under the provision of Section 206.6.

The grievant was placed into his 21st option. The other options were compressed out or were assigned to employees with greater seniority.

Decision

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

Sierra Division Grievance No. AUB-94-15

Facts of the Case

The grievant was hired on August 17, 1971 and at the time of displacement was a Groundman. The grievant was displaced into a Utility Worker at Emeryville. The grievant believed she should have been placed into an area or unit option under Title 206.

The grievant was placed into his 21st option. The other options were compressed out or were assigned to more senior employees. Also at dispute was whether the grievant was entitled to any 206.5 options. The Committee determined that the grievants immediately previously held line of progression was General Construction. The Agreement does not provide for 206.5 rights from Title 200 to Title 300 positions. As such, the grievant was not entitled to 206.5 rights.

Decision

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

San Joaquin Division Grievance No. FRO-94-33

,

Facts of the Case

The grievant was hired on June 22, 1977 and at the time of displacement was a Transformer Repairman. The grievant was displaced into a Fieldman at Fresno. The grievant believed he should have been placed into a Telecom Installer at Fresno under Title 206. The grievant believed that he should have had a 206.5 option to an Apprentice Electrician.

The grievant was placed into his 2nd option (Fieldman under Section 206.5). The other option was compressed out. The Committee determined that the grievant was not entitled to a 206.5 option to an Apprentice Electrician as it is in the same Line of Progression as Transformer Repairman.

Decision

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

and the second second

(1) Logistical and constraints of the ML 1977 weak of the constraint apparents of the Line of the Constraint of the tensor was reasoned as the expertance of the Line of th

(2.2.4) A set of a set of the set of the

 $\begin{array}{c} \sum_{k=1}^{n} p_k \left(x_k \right) & = \sum_{k=1}^{n} p_k \left(x_k \right) &$

(2) A contract state of a contract of a contract of [1, 1980] Contract to complete the second states provide the Contract that if a contract of The coordinates are as 83% states to a contract of a contract of the contract of provide a contract of a contract of The coordinates are as a solution of a contract of the contract of the contract of the contract of the coordinates are as a solution of the contract of the contract of the contract of contract of the contract of the second contract of the second contract of the contract of the

Sierra Division Grievance No. AUB-94-48

Facts of the Case

The grievant was hired on June 18, 1984 and at the time of displacement was a Utility Clerk-Typist. The grievant was displaced into a MR/Utility Clerk at Marysville. The grievant believed she should have been placed into some other positions under Title 19.

The grievant was placed into her 3rd option. The other options were compressed out or were assigned to more senior employees.

Decision

The grievant's placement under Title 19 did not constitute a violation of the Labor Agreement. This case is closed without adjustment.

Yosemite Division Grievance No. MER-94-10

Facts of the Case

The grievant was hired by the Company on July 31, 1985 and at the time of displacement was a Utility Worker. The grievant was placed as a Chem/Rad Helper. The grievant believed the placement should have been into a Materialsman under the provision of Section 206.6.

The grievant was placed into his 35th option. The other options were compressed out or were assigned to employees with greater seniority.

Decision

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

a de la companya de la comp

(1) State and the second second states of the second se

(i) A process managements of a non-highlighting targets. The other constraints are incomputed asset out of any analysis of a non-highlighting particulation.

an a shara a

(figure and the second s second se Second se Second sec

an tan tati Dina sa sa sa sa

Terrore view of a fill of the boot of the bottom of the A month of the bottom of the bottom of the **103** merical of the bottom of the bottom of the bottom of the bottom The bottom of the

Sacramento Division Grievance No. SAC-94-24(b)

Facts of the Case

The grievant was hired by the Company in 1983 at the time of displacement was a Utility Worker. The grievant was placed into a Utility Worker - DC. The grievant believed the placement should have been into a higher option under the provision of Section 206.6.

The grievants was placed in a DC option. The other options were compressed out or were assigned to employees with greater seniority.

Decision

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

North Coast Division Grievance No. STR-94-17

Facts of the Case

The grievants were hired by the Company between 1964 and 1991 and at the time of displacement were in various Gas and Electric Classifications. The grievants were placed into various positions. The grievants believed the placement should have been into a higher options under the provision of Section 206.6.

The grievants were placed into the appropriate options. The other options were compressed out or were assigned to employees with greater seniority.

Decision

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

The construction of the second construction of t

and a second second

ma componente e como a antra Xilo (1920), como porto de trajor de los filos (2020). Semanente

33

entral elementaria per presentaria de transforma de la construcción de la construcción de la construcción de la Espectemente elementaria de la construcción de la construcción de la construcción de la construcción de la const

Facts of the Case

The grievant was hired by the Company on June 17, 1985 and at the time of displacement was a Groundman. The grievant was placed as a Utility Worker - DC. The grievant believed the placement should have been into a higher option under the provision of Section 206.6.

The grievant was placed into his 29th option. The other options were compressed out or were assigned to employees with greater seniority.

Decision

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

Facts of the Case

The grievant was hired by the Company on October 24, 1983 and at the time of displacement was a T&D Driver. The grievant was placed as a Utility Worker - DC. The grievant believed the placement should have been into a higher option under the provision of Section 206.6.

,

The grievant was placed into his 24th option. The other options were compressed out or were assigned to employees with greater seniority.

Decision

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

Facts of the Case

The grievant was hired by the Company on May 28, 1974 and at the time of displacement was a Manhole Pumpman. The grievant was placed as a Utility Worker - DC. The grievant believed the placement should have been into a higher option under the provision of Section 206.6.

The grievant was placed into his 17th option. The other options were compressed out or were assigned to employees with greater seniority.

Decision

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

[1] A set of a set of the set

and the second second

The prevent of the solution and an addition of the Solution of

¹⁹18 (1939-388 1939) o nes i<mark>nto</mark> pre 12¹6 (**1939)** – ¹⁰18 (Shar potrona resea normineration (1937) Comerce sus mentions introducede kara em exempleacede

الدولي الواهي ولها والع^{ار العا}لي الموالي الواهي ولها والعالي المواليو معاملة المالية المالية الم

[3] # Kommannelling of the control of the 20 Berlin structure of the control o

(1) Some free states of the second se Second secon second sec

line infrasti i posto la sino provinsi no penere, la solo di 1000 sento da Selara da Se Grandriantentaria a la comple Respondenti **51**4 gran alto un oltro da alconos, conserva-1000 tra prevento entre espectore publicatente trapectorio e el tras el contra constructorio di 1916 transmissione del constructione da constructiva el tras el contra constructorio di contra constructorio di

Facts of the Case

,

The grievant was hired by the Company on July 23, 1990 and at the time of displacement was a T&D Driver. The grievant was placed as a Utility Worker - DC. The grievant believed the placement should have been into a higher option under the provision of Section 206.6.

The grievant was placed into his 12th option. The other options were compressed out or were assigned to employees with greater seniority.

Decision

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

²⁰ A sprach provide a sprace of the sprace of an experimental sprace of the sprac

tan kanalar sa ka

The super second structure of the structure of the second state of the second state of the structure of the super structure of the structur

Facts of the Case

The grievant was hired by the Company on June 27, 1983 and at the time of displacement was a T&D Driver. The grievant was placed as a Utility Worker - DC. The grievant believed the placement should have been into a higher option under the provision of Section 206.6.

The grievant was placed into his 18th option. The other options were compressed out or were assigned to employees with greater seniority.

Decision

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

an an an Arrange ann an Arrange. An an Arrange ann an Arr

an Alan an Alan ang sa sa

ning serge setter in omning och den in der Alle andere och som påret och som en en andere andere andere andere Settergensen och som en en andere andere och som en andere andere andere andere andere andere andere andere and

 $(A^{A})_{ij}^{A}$, where the set of the s

(1) Some stand over the second state previous devices of the SUD state of the SUD state over the second state of the st

Facts of the Case

The grievant was hired by the Company on March 12, 1992 and at the time of displacement was a Groundman. The grievant was placed as a Utility Worker - DC. The grievant believed the placement should have been into a Shop Meterperson under the provision of Section 206.6.

The grievant was placed into her 5th option. The other options were compressed out or were assigned to employees with greater seniority.

Decision

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

ار این از میکند. این این کو میکند در میکند این کار در ا

(a) Solid (a)

n general en la gran de la constante de la cons La constante esta

a sharan

n see along the figure of the second seco In the second second

na an an ann an Air ann an Air

(1) Serie met in all of the constant of the state of t

Facts of the Case

 $\mathbf{h}_{\mathbf{a}}$

The grievant was hired by the Company on January 15, 1988 and at the time of displacement was a Groundman. The grievant was placed as a DC Utility Worker. The grievant believed the placement should have been into a Materialsman under the provision of Section 206.6.

The grievant was placed into his 18th option. The other options were compressed out or were assigned to employees with greater seniority.

Decision

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

47

Facts of the Case

The grievant was hired by the Company on June 11, 1990 and at the time of displacement was a Utility Worker Gas T&D. The grievant was placed as a Utility Worker - DC. The grievant believed the placement should have been into a higher option under the provision of Section 206.6.

The grievant was placed into his 34th option. The other options were compressed out or were assigned to employees with greater seniority.

Decision

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

Construction of the second of the second of the second second

.

g en angelen en solar en en en tradicipal de tradicipal de la solar de la solar de la solar de la solar de la s Esperante por engla companya de la solar en engla 1925 **52** ^{en d}e tradicipal de la solar de la solar de la solar Esperante por engla companya de la solar engla tradicipal de la solar de la solar de la solar de la solar de la

.

Facts of the Case

The grievant was hired by the Company on April 8, 1991 and at the time of displacement was a Utility Worker - Gas T&D. The grievant was placed as a Utility Worker - DC. The grievant believed the placement should have been into a Materialsman under the provision of Section 206.6.

The grievant was placed into his 25th option. The other options were compressed out or were assigned to employees with greater seniority.

Decision

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

53

in a second s

Facts of the Case

The grievant was hired by the Company on April 12, 1985 and at the time of displacement was a T&D Driver. The grievant was placed as a Utility Worker - DC. The grievant believed the placement should have been into a Telecom Installer under the provision of Section 206.6.

The grievant was placed into his 7th option. The other options were compressed out or were assigned to employees with greater seniority.

Decision

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

Apple a constraint of the comparison of the constraint of

Facts of the Case

The grievant was hired by the Company on December 28, 1987 and at the time of displacement was a T&D Driver. The grievant was placed as a Utility Worker - DC. The grievant believed the placement should have been into a Telecom Installer under the provision of Section 206.6.

The grievant was placed into his 11th option. The other options were compressed out or were assigned to employees with greater seniority.

Decision

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

el annan prèse de la seconda de la contra de la 2000 de seconda de la seconda de la seconda de la seconda de la

E gran a construction of the second second

The greaters was not an the Oppmany on Department's set of the first the first of the State of the State of State of the S

Th<mark>e gnavers w</mark>os secred on the 10th notion. The other scheme view in moreses, hit onwere obsidned to end in ees with mease pressiv

Dec.action

The dependence the model TEA 208 dd net goest at the state of the Cool Advants of The concentration of a spectration

<u>l voi an an an an a</u>

Tale generation of a solar fractional solarge and the second second solar to the solar of the solar degree between the solar to the contract of the second solar to the solar of the solar of the solar to the solar Tale solar solar solar terms (solar), but were contracted at the solar to the solar of the solar of the solar te the memory solar solar terms (solar).

Facts of the Case

The grievant was hired by the Company on October 11, 1982 and at the time of displacement was a T&D Driver. The grievant was placed as a Utility Worker - DC. The grievant believed the placement should have been into a Telecom Installer under the provision of Section 206.6.

The grievant was placed into his 4th option. The other options were compressed out or were assigned to employees with greater seniority.

Decision

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

22 A second states of the s

na seren ser

u la guerrant plana constant nom Collettern plantationes of the Collector of the Collector

n na service and a construction of the service of t

Facts of the Case

The grievant was hired by the Company on May 29, 1991 and at the time of displacement was a Utility Worker - Gas T&D Driver. The grievant was placed as a Utility Worker - DC. The grievant believed the placement should have been into a Telecom Installer under the provision of Section 206.6.

The grievant was placed into his 6th option. The other options were compressed out or were assigned to employees with greater seniority.

Decision

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

2 spectra se deserva de la seconda de la

1. Second Strategy and Strat

The structure of a contract of an effective variables. If Middle units is the trial of a contract of the structure of a contract of the structure of the str

. Na≢ Brienning all statistics of pression pression and monormal statistics of the pression of the statistic pre Heren productive

الحيار العراقي . المائلي المراجع المنظر

ling entergen allan. Noteen on the ^{an} 2005 curring to the source end of the b<mark>ittar</mark> Gen an official sources of the entergy and the

The sense of the second sec In 2000 Second second

Diablo Division Grievance Nos. CON-94-8, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56 & 57

Facts of the Case

•;

This case concerns the Title 206 placement of 12 grievants. The details are as follows:

Name	Hire Date	206 Assignment	Prioritization
Wade Cunningham	2/22/72	GC Utilty Worker	3
Ray Torres	8/23/71	Utility Worker- Bldg	16
-		Srvcs, San Jose	
Ernie Quinonez	10/22/68	GC Utility Wrkr	1
Lesley Green	1/2/79	Meter Reader-Concord	1
Sherry Jones	6/6/83	Meter Reader-Concord	1
Ron Bastiaans	9/19/83	Apprentice Lineman -	1
		Oakport	
Jim Kliewer	10/24/83	Gas Transmission	49/88
		Operator - Hinkley	
ja suura ana ana anna anna anna anna anna an		changed to GC Gas in	
u filman (1997). An that		Antioch	
Mike Kelly	9/18/84	GC Utility Worker -	3
		Antioch	
Anthony Kennerly	7/23/87	GC Utility Worker -	9
	and the second sec	Antioch	
Ron Spirlock	8/18/71	GC Utility Worker -	1
		Antioch	_
Dawn Curtis	3/16/92	GC Utility Worker -	3
	e sa we	Antioch	
Marco Cartagena	8/9/87	Trv. Utility Worker -	7/8
		Moss Landing	
		changed to GC Utility	
		Worker, Antioch	
and the second			

The Committee reviewed the placement of each grievant and the disposition of their higher prioritized options. Grievant Kliwer believed that he should have been given a 206.5 option to Apprentice Lineman. The Committee determined that all their other options were either compressed out or were assigned to more senior employees. Grievant Kliwer was not entitled to a 206.5 option to an Apprentice Lineman since it was in his line of progression.

Decision

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

.

.



East Bay Division Grievance No. OAK-94-28, OAK-94-29, OAK-94-30, OAK 94-31 OAK 94-33, OAK 94-34, OAK-94-38

Facts of the Case

This case concerns the Title 206 placement of 7 grievants. The details are as follows:

<u>Name</u>	Hire Date	206 Assignment	Prioritization
Brown	2/20/92	U.WDC-Richmond	#14
Mitchell	6/3/85	U.WDC-Richmond	#14
Mathis	1/11/71	Janitor-SF	#29
Bennett	5/13/91	U.WDC-Antioch	#48
Asche	9/30/83	Trav. U.W-Pittsburg	#12
Thomas	3/12/91	U.WDC-Oakland	#24
Lamperti	5/15/68	Fieldman-Richmond	#1

The Committee reviewed the placement of each grievant and the disposition of their higher prioritized options. The Committee determined that all their options were either compressed or were assigned to more senior employees, or were positions for which they were not qualified.

Decision

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

East Bay Division Grievance No. OAK -94-32

مراجع هماند. الألم من المراجع التي التي المراجع الم المراجع المراجع

Facts of the Case

The grievant was hired on September 20, 1990 and at the time of displacement was a Utility Worker. The grievant was displaced into a DC Utility Worker at Oakland. The grievant believed he should have been placed into a Garageman at Richmond under Title 206.

The grievant was placed into his 18th option. The other options were compressed out or were assigned to more senior employees, or were positions for which the grievant was not qualified.

Decision

1.4.1.1

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

کی است. مرجعه باید از در مراجع

Facts of the Case

The grievant was hired on April 16, 1991 and at the time of displacement was a Utility Worker - Gas T&D. The grievant was displaced into a DC Utility Worker - Gas at Redwood City. The grievant believed he should have been placed into another position under Title 206.

The grievant was placed into his 29th option. The other options were compressed out or were assigned to more senior employees.

Decision

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

Number of the second of the second second

Mission Division Grievance No. HAY-94-44

Facts of the Case

The grievant was hired on February 20, 1990 and at the time of displacement was a Materialsman. The grievant was displaced into a Materialsman at Fremont. The grievant believed he should have been placed into a Utility Worker at Alta under Title 206.

The grievant was placed into his 14th option. The other options were compressed out or were assigned to more senior employees.

Decision

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

Ton meeneetti olesii on noon Respectate 200 oolekte tare oo too oolekteraan entropeaa eentropeaa e Oolekteremenettii oolekteristate eene oolekteremeenistii Oolekterista oolekterista oolekterista eentropeaa oolek Oolekteremenettii oolekteristate eene oolekteremeenistii Oolekteristate eene oolekterista oolekteristate oolekt Oolekteremeentii oolekteristate oolekteristate oolekteristate

. .

28

n (men valaatii oo too oo ka shaqayaatiigi oo ka ka too (men ahaa oo (men ahaa oo too) ka toolaatii oo ka ka k Na gabalaa tiishii oo ka shaqayaatiigi daalaa ka gabalaa ka sa ka sana ahaa ka shaqayaa tiishii oo ka sa shaqay

Review Committee File No. 1775

North Coast Division Grievance No. STR-94-40

Facts of the Case

1. . .

The grievant was hired on July 16, 1979 and at the time of displacement was a Clerk Steno-D. The grievant was displaced into a Utility Clerk-Typist at Woodland. The grievant believed she should have been placed into a Utility Clerk-Typist in Demotion Area 10 under Title 19.

The grievant was placed into her 8th option. The other options were compressed out or were assigned to more senior employees.

Decision

The grievant's placement under Title 19 did not constitute a violation of the Labor Agreement. This case is closed without adjustment.

North Valley Division Grievance No. CHI-94-17

Facts of the Case

The grievant was hired on August 21, 1973 and at the time of displacement was a T&D Driver. The grievant was displaced into a DC Utility Worker - Electric at Stockton. The grievant believed he should have been placed into a Utility Worker at Burney under Title 206.

The grievant was placed into his 11th option. The other options were compressed out or were assigned to more senior employees.

Decision

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

. 35

North Valley Division Grievance No. CHI-94-19

Facts of the Case

The grievant was hired on August 20, 1984 and at the time of displacement was a Groundman. The grievant was displaced into a Meter Reader at Chico. The grievant believed he should have been placed into a position in his demotion area under Title 206.

The grievant was placed into his 24th option. The other options were compressed out or were assigned to more senior employees.

Decision

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

36

Review Committee File No. 1775

Sierra Division Grievance No. AUB-94-29

Facts of the Case

The grievant was hired by the Company on September 17, 1990 and at the time of displacement was a Utility Worker - Gas T&D. The grievant was displaced into a Utility Worker - Gas. The grievant believed he should have been placed into a Maintenance Assistant at Hinkley under Title 206.

The grievant was placed into his 18th option. The other options were compressed out or were assigned to employees with greater seniority.

Decision

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

Sierra Division Grievance No. AUB -94-30

Facts of the Case

The grievant was hired on July 23, 1979 and at the time of displacement was a Groundman. The grievant was displaced into a Meter Reader at Oroville. The grievant believed he should have been placed into a Utility Worker at Marysville under Title 206.

The grievant was placed into his 2nd option.

Decision

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

North Valley Division Grievance No. CHI-94-21

Facts of the Case

The grievant was hired on March 30, 1992 and at the time of displacement was a Utility Worker - Gas T&D. The grievant was displaced into a DC Utility Worker - Gas at Chico. The grievant believed he should have been placed into a Fieldman at Chico under Title 205. The Company did not fill Fieldman positions under Title 205, and the grievant had no right to that classification under Title 206. The parties have agreed in the past that Title 206 takes precedence over Title 205.

The grievant was placed into his 3rd option. The other options were compressed out or were assigned to more senior employees.

Decision

.

The grievant's placement under Title 206 did not constitute a violation of the Labor Agreement. The grievant had no rights to the Fieldman classification. This case is closed without adjustment.

37

.

Oakland Division Grievance No. OAK-94-36

Facts of the Case

The first grievant was hired on September 12, 1983 and at the time of displacement was an Patrolman. The grievant was displaced into a DC Utility Worker - Gas at Chico. The grievant believed he should have been placed into any of the compressed 206.6 options.

The grievant was placed into his 5th option. The other options were compressed out or were assigned to more senior employees.

The second grievant was hired on May 9, 1994 and at the time of displacement was a Groundman. The grievant was displaced into a DC Utility Worker - Gas at Richmond. The grievant believed she should have been displaced into any of the compressed 206.6 options.

The grievant was placed into her 13th option. The other options were compressed out or were assigned to more senior employees, or were positions for which the grievant was not qualified.

Decision

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

s-j₽

San Luis Obispo Division Grievance No. SLO-94-5

Facts of the Case

The grievant was hired on August 24, 1981 and at the time of displacement was a T&D Driver. The grievant was laid off as a result of the Title 206 activity. The grievant believed he should have been placed into a Utility Worker at Diablo Canyon Power Plant under Section 206.6.

The grievant's option were compressed out or were assigned to more senior employees.

Decision

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

San Luis Obispo Division Grievance No. SLO-94-8

Facts of the Case

The grievant was hired on May 2, 1973 and at the time of displacement was an Inspector. The grievant was displaced into an Apprentice Lineman at King City.

The grievant believed he should have been placed into a Telecom Installer at San Luis Obispo under Title 206.

The grievant was placed into his 2nd option. The other options were compressed out or were assigned to more senior employees.

Decision

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