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:

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 sok for er skiller for slæget er er skiller er slære for Andere er forsenset er forset er skiller er slættere er forket er statere af fær er forset for er forset for a

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 were 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 anthe sole 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 as this is item "The grevent was placed as a fundament for the time

and the second second

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

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

and a second second

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.

. 2011년 2011년 - 1월 1971년 1월 1971년 - 1971년 1월 1일 1일 1일 1일 1일 1월 1971년 - 1971년 1월 1971년 1월 1971년 1월 1971년 1월 19

per de la companya d

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. 1910), and su tra teme no l'assencem inter i filitò filitori. The guerrano vesto cosono tra defontuari se l'Una une esti usidered fino cuestantem gobelto nege treego com o costo costuto durato po travenero cofinatori. 1916

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

- **Г/75** - Карадаран - Карадарарарарарар - Арадара - Арадара - Карадарарарарарарарарарарарарарарарар

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 این این این این این این این ا این میکنون در این میکنونی این این این این این میکنونی در این میکنونی در این میکنونی در این این این این این این ا

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 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

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 test of the consected of the test of the consected of the de**p**resented to be a la companya da comp

The committee offerty we may the publicne in sugged by were not sufficienced in tradiciou ද්ධාර්ධ එක්ෂ ක්ෂුණු දෙනා - දුන්නේ පුර්දන් සම්මාර්ත්රී දුන්න ප්රිදු මුන්ත්රීම දුන් වූ

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 set of t 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 医内外间 医白垩 医小原子的 医口口 医鼻子周周炎 [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 factor of a social 100 at the placement of durition we been into a higher obtain worker the factor of a social 100 at the placement of durition we been into a higher the social factor of the province 100 at the placement of durition we been into a higher of the social factor of the placement of the social factor of the social factor

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 at a contract of the second states provide the provide a contract of a contract of The coordinates are as a solution of the second states of the contract of the second contract of the second states are as a solution of the second states of the contract of the second contract of the second states are contract on the second states of the second contract contract of the second contract of the second states are contract on the second states of the second contract of contract of the second states are contract on the second states of the second states of the second states of the contract of the second states are contract on the second states of the second states of the second states of the contract of the second states of the second states are contract on the second states of the second states of the contract of the second states of the second states

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 assets that increases on any other of a non-sector coefficients.

an a harana a

(figure and set of the set of

an tan tati Dina sa sa sa sa

Terrore versionen Tollo population de la page la page la construcción de la seconda de la construcción d

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.

(11) security a second se

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

اليون الولغي ولحار مع^{ار الر}اد . اليون الولغي ولحار معار معار . اليون ويولغان ماليان الماليون .

[3] # Kommwashi, C. C. Shino, S. Shek, C. & All Bound in Company, S. Shino, etc. Stat. Strategic procession strategics.

(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 Salaria de Salaria. Orienzamentarias a la courte a Responsion i **51**4 spessia anticipito da la collisti distribuis. I 1000 a neverto sento escato de publicamenta respecto nove el como di collisti el comencia da collisti. Interpretente di 2000 collisti.

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 first of the second second second second second structure of the second s second secon second sec

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 in den i har som en att som en att so Settergensen som i som en att som e

 $(A^{A})_{ij}^{A}$, we can also be a set of the set o

(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.

اری از میکند. میکند به میکند از میکند این از میکند. این از میکند میکند از میکند این میکند این میکند این میکند.

(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 pròsaiche anna an tarr a 1977 agus a' an

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, hut onwere obsidned to end in ees with unexpectementaly.

Dec.action

The dependence the model TEA 208 dd net goest at the state of the Cool.

<u>l waan na har</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 puesto nesto non de Colaptera do Latarea do 1000 pod ou mandra e la Cadadement vienco 7000 Dovero 70e e recentoras promos as polos consisto o do Pro guerrant boltorea, de núecement prophy couraina o consisto e estama entreter o rec Pre provect boltorea, de núecement prophy couraina o consisto e estama entreter o rec

na server a and a construction of the server of the server

О вероянии составляется боло положить составляется разробластивания составляется и составляется и справалися в начали в 1970 Состании обще давет 599 вероя с возна на полосо составляется с ССС Пава составляется работ на составляется с правде Полав са соста посу в составляется с поста со в начати на проставляется и проставляется на разволи посу с в составляется с поста на соста на пол со в начати на проставляется от 1970 на составляется на проставляется на посу в составляется на поста на на пост со в начати на проставляется на проставляется на посущи в составляется на поста на на поста на поста на поста со в начати на поста поста на поста поста на поста на посущи в соста в поста на поста на поста на поста на поста со в начати на поста поста на со в начати на поста со в начати на поста со в на поста на пост со поста на пост поста на пост поста на пост поста на пост поста на пост поста на поста на п

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 springer gehannen för som en statistikken att det som en som en statistikken ett som ett so Som ett s Som ett som

1. South and the second sec

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

. Na≢ Brien no species solition de presente presente la montra a servicio de la servicio du servicio du servicio Nerra productore

الحيار العراقي . المائلي المراجع المنظر

ling entergen allan. Sitteetti sittä 170€ 205 tun nähin ministen kuun een siisiittä. Sati en ställin kuun esitteetti ainenteetti tarta.

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 المراجع التي التي 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 بیشند از دریشنان

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 olesiili nin oon Referebbe 200 ooleefte zure oofinis ooten oorin ooleettalen entropoleefte po Ooleettimeraammetti Ton oominoopen entre ooleefte zure oorin oorin oorin oorin oorin oorin oorin oorin oorin oo Ooleettimeraammetti Tonoo oorin ooleefte zure oorin Ooleettime

. .

an an an an Anna an An

28

nije e vezeti o na posobe e tegepleto del complemente da la terme o consultante terme. Na protección terme del consultante permanente da la termente da la terme del construcción del terme del constru

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.