		<b>V</b>		
REVIEW COMMITTEE				
$\mathbf{PG} = \mathbf{E}$	CASE CLOS	ED <sup>14</sup> / <sub>3</sub>	IBEW	$\mathbf{O}^{(i)}$
PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY 245 MARKET STREET, ROOM 444 SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA 94106 (415) 781-4211, EXTENSION 1125	LUGOLD MIND	FILED %	INTERNATIONAL BROTHERHOO ELECTRICAL WORKERS, AF LOCAL UNION 1245, I. P.O. BOX	FL-CIO B.E.W.
	ARB.	145	WALNUT CREEK, CALIFORNIA (415) 933	
D.J. BERGMAN, CHAIRMAN	REVIEW	COMMITTEE DEC	CISION R.W. STALCUP, SECRE	TARY
	San Francisco	Division Grie	evance No. 2-1034-84-1	34

LETTER DECISION

89-2

10/75

San Francisco Division Grievance No. 2-1034-84-134 Review Committee File No. 1628-85-21

This case was referred to arbitration as Arbitration Case No. 145 and is being returned to the Review Committee for settlement in accordance with the following:

## Subject of the Grievance

This case concerns the appropriateness of a work assignment given to a Groundman. Specifically, the assignment was the holding of an insulated energized secondary cable to assist a journeyman Cable Splicer who was connecting the cable to a network protector.

### Facts of the Case

On August 31, 1984, a Groundman was assisting a Cable Splicer in putting secondary leads on a transformer by holding the cable to assist the journeyman, who was putting cable into a connector. The energized cable fell off the wall pins, hit the transformer and fell on the floor. The Groundman stated that the weight of the cable pulled it out of his hands.

#### Discussion

It was the position of the Union that it is beyond the Groundman's job definition to handle or be in close proximity to energized equipment or cable. Company believed that since the energized cable was insulated, the holding of it by a Groundman was proper.

The parties acknowledged that the Groundman, by reason of his previous experience and/or instruction was qualified to perform the work assignment because he was familiar with the operation and hazards involved in that assignment. The Groundman clearly was working under the direction of the journeyman, and his role was limited to supporting insulated, energized secondary cable. It is recognized that a Groundman is not a "qualified electrical worker," as defined in Title 8 California Administrative Code Section 2700. However, a Groundman can be a "qualified worker" for purposes of Section 2700 because that term is defined as:

> "A person who by reason of experience or instruction is familiar with the operation to be performed and the hazards involved."

#### Decision

The Committee agreed that Groundmen will be required to perform all

# Review Committee File . 1628



Page 2

duties set forth in the job definition of that classification contained in Exhibit VI-L of the parties' current Labor Agreement and in any future versions of that job definition agreed to by the parties. Specifically, a Groundman may be required to support and/or hold onto insulated, energized secondary cables under the direction of a journeyman (Cable Splicer). However, a Groundman will not be permitted to use hand tools to perform work on energized cables or to use a voltage tester on cables.

This case is considered closed on the basis of the foregoing.

FOR COMPANY:

Floyd C. Buchholz William J. Rowe Robert C. Taylor David J. Bergman

Date

FOR UNION:

Patrick S. Nickeson Fred H. Pedersen Arlis L. Watson Roger W. Stalcup

By Date