

REVIEW COMMITTEE

PG and E

PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY
245 MARKET STREET, ROOM 444
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA 94106
(415) 781-4211, EXTENSION 1125

IBEW



INTERNATIONAL BROTHERHOOD OF
ELECTRICAL WORKERS, AFL-CIO
LOCAL UNION 1245, I.B.E.W.
P.O. BOX 4790
WALNUT CREEK, CALIFORNIA 94596
(415) 933-6060
L.N. FOSS, SECRETARY

RECEIVED OCT 27 1978

D.J. BERGMAN, CHAIRMAN

- DECISION
 LETTER DECISION
 PRE-REVIEW REFERRAL

Shasta Division Grievance No. 13-56-78-12
P-RC 381
Alleged Denial of Upgrade, Heavy Tractor Driver

October 17, 1978

MR. A. E. HENDERSON, Chairman
Shasta Division
Joint Grievance Committee

The above-subject grievance has been discussed by the Pre-Review Committee prior to its docketing on the agenda of the Review Committee and is being returned, pursuant to Section I B(2) of the Review Committee procedure, to the Joint Grievance Committee for settlement in accordance with the following:

The issue concerns the denial of a temporary upgrade of the grievant, a Heavy Tractor Driver, to Labor Foreman, on April 4 and 5, 1978. The grievant was assigned with two Truck Drivers working in combination repairing a low spot on the Pit 5 road by hauling in tunnel spoil and repairing the road. The Joint Statement of Facts indicates that all three employees were given specific instructions by the exempt Foreman, and during the days in question, did not communicate with each other concerning the work assignment nor did the grievant provide any supervision of the Truck Drivers. The central issue then becomes a contractual question of three employees working on the same job and does that, standing by itself, entitle the senior employee to an upgrade notwithstanding the work performed.

In reviewing Title 600, Exhibit VI-L, Job Definitions and Lines of Progression, Division Electric Departments, specifically, the Labor Foreman job definition, the Pre-Review Committee is of the opinion that in order to qualify for an upgrade, an employee must be "in charge of a crew," and in this case, it is apparent that the grievant was not "in charge," and on that basis, is not entitled to the correction asked for.

This case is considered closed on the basis of the foregoing, and the closure should be so noted in the minutes of your next Joint Grievance Committee meeting.

D. J. BERGMAN, Chairman
Review Committee

L. N. FOSS, Secretary
Review Committee

DJB:rto

cc: RJLaRue
IWBonbright
LVBrown
Personnel Managers