RECEIVED OCT 0 6 1994

REVIEW COMMITTEE

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

RICK R. DOERING, CHAIRMAN

CASE CLOSED
FILED & LOGGED

OCT 0 6 1994

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

☐ DECISION
☐ LETTER DECISION
☐ PRE-REVIEW REFERRAL

San Francisco Division Grievance Nos. SFO-91-04 & 92-04
P-RC 1577 & 1694
Steam Generation Grievance No. CCP-92-1
P-RC 1595
Diablo Canyon PP Grievance Nos. 22NPG-531-93-1 & 93-2
P-RC 1732 & 1733

DEB DRAZNIN, Company Member
San Francisco Division
Local Investigating Committee

FRANK SAXSENMEIER, Union Member
San Francisco Division
Local Investigating Committee

JANETTE MATT, Company Member
Contra Costa Power Plant
Local Investigating Committee

ED CARUSO, Union Member
Contra Costa Power Plant
Local Investigating Committee

CHER ANTHONY, Company Member
Diablo Canyon Power Plant
Local Investigating Committee

MIKE HAENTJENS, Union Member
Diablo Canyon Power Plant
Local Investigating Committee

Subject of the Grievance:

These cases concern the equal distribution of prearranged overtime.

Facts of the Case:

The Union alleges that the distribution of prearranged overtime was not equitably distributed and that the formula and remedy included in P-RC 1456 is not applicable.

Discussion:

The Committee reviewed P-RC 1456, which establishes the following formula to be used to determine if prearranged overtime has been equally distributed and what the appropriate remedy is if overtime is not equally distributed.

1. Add up the total number of overtime hours worked by a classification in the HQs.
2. Divide the total in #1 by the number of employees in the classification in the headquarters. (This represents each employee's equitable distribution of overtime.)
3. Compare the figure in #2 with each employees' actual and declined hours.
4. Where #2 exceeds #3, pay the employees the difference unless there are extenuating circumstances.

Union opined that due to the wide spread in the distribution of overtime in these cases, the above remedy is insufficient to resolve the unequal distribution of overtime. Union proposed a revised formula that would give greater consideration to actual hours worked and include additional employees in the remedy who were significantly below the average number of hours worked.

Company noted that the issue of equal distribution of prearranged overtime has been a long-standing issue between the parties, and that the Company and Union jointly established a procedure in P-RC 1456 to determine the appropriate remedy when overtime is not eqally distributed. The Company believes that the formula provides for an effective remedy when overtime is not distributed equitably.

Decision:

The Pre-Review Committee is returning these cases to the Local Investigating Committees for settlement in accordance with the provisions included in P-RC 1456. The Company and Union will review the effectiveness of the formula included in P-RC 1456 at the end of calendar year 1995 to ensure that it is an effective remedy in cases of unequal distribution of overtime.

The Pre-Review Committee recommends that supervisors review P-RC 1456 and our ongoing obligation to distribute overtime as equally as possible.

JOHN A. MOFFAT, Chairman
Review Committee

Date 10/6/94

ROGER W. STALCUP, Secretary
Review Committee

Date 10/6/94

SARayburn(583-4281):