

PERSONNEL
741.5

East Bay Division
Grievances Nos. 48,
59 and 62.

January 30, 1957

Mr. T. P. Jenkins, Chairman
East Bay Division
Joint Grievance Committee

The following listed grievances referred to the Review Committee for decision have been held pending the outcome of negotiations concerning Steam Department job definitions and lines of progression. These negotiations having been concluded, it has been agreed that the grievances referred to here will be withdrawn. Please note in your next Joint Grievance Committee minutes that such action has been taken.

The cases to which this reference is made are:

East Bay Division Grievance No. 48	(R.C. File No. 88)
" " " " " 59	(R.C. File No. 98)
" " " " " 62	(R.C. File No. 102)✓

V. J. Thompson, Chairman
Review Committee

VJT:MMC
cc: CLY
EFS
RJT
L. L. Mitchell

Effective 1/1/57

REVIEW COMMITTEE CASES AFFECTED BY AGREEMENT ON
DEMOTION REACHED IN STEAM DEPARTMENT NEGOTIATIONS

AGREEMENT ON DEMOTION

In order to provide for the uniform application of the Demotion and Layoff Procedure of the Agreement within the Steam Generation Department and at the same time to provide a full staff of trained operators in each plant, the following definitions and procedure shall apply when operating employees in the Department are to be demoted due to lack of work.

I. DEFINITIONS

- A. Operating classifications in the Steam Generation Department shall be considered as the "same classifications" as that term is used in the Agreement if they have the same maximum wage rate, except that Oiler and Condenserman shall not be considered as the same classification.
- B. The "next lower classification in the reverse order of the normal line of progression" shall be determined by reference to the appropriate "Normal Line of Progression" as shown on the attached charts.

II. PROCEDURE

- A. When an employee is to be demoted due to lack of work, other than by reason of the shut down of a plant or the discontinuance of one or more shifts in a plant, the procedure outlined in the Agreement shall be followed and the foregoing definitions shall apply.

REVIEW COMMITTEE CASES NOS. 98 and 102

Since neither case involved the shutdown of a plant nor the discontinuance of one or more shifts, the procedure to be followed is outlined in II-A. Therefore, the provisions of Title 206 are to be applied in accordance with the definition outlined in I-A and I-B.

In the case of R.C. No. 98 the aggrieved employees should have been given the opportunity, as provided in I-A, of displacing Control Operators at Pittsburg and Contra Costa Power Plants, instead of being limited to demotions to the next lower classification as defined by I-B. Other employees who were affected by this demotion, due to the elimination of the Emergency Relief classifications, should have been given similar opportunities.

In the case of R.C. No. 102 the A.C.O.s at Contra Costa Power Plant, who were eliminated and forced to displace A.O.s at Contra Costa, should have been allowed to displace A.C.O.s at Pittsburg or Turbine Tenders at Oakland Power Plant or Oleum Power Plant.

In the case of R.C. No. 88, which involves bidding, the aggrieved, under the current agreement on lines of progressions, would not be entitled to a Control Operator's vacancy since the entry point would be Assistant Control Operator for Control Operators bidding from Moss Landing Power Plant to Contra Costa Power Plant.