

REVIEW COMMITTEE**PG and E****IBEW**

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

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
R.W. STALCUP, SECRETARY

CASE CLOSED
LOGGED AND FILED

JAN 21 1986

RECEIVED JAN 17 1986

D.J. BERGMAN, CHAIRMAN

San Joaquin Division Grievance No. 25-783-85-26
P-RC 1052

- ☐ DECISION
☐ LETTER DECISION
☐ PRE-REVIEW REFERRAL

January 13, 1986

TOM C. PHEBUS, Company Member
San Joaquin Division
Local Investigating Committee

FRANK HUTCHINS, Union Member
San Joaquin Division
Local Investigating 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 Step Five A(ii) of the grievance procedure, to the Local Investigating Committee for settlement in accordance with the following:

On April 16, 1985, an Operating Foreman was notified by a System Operator that she would not be able to report for the third shift due to illness. The Foreman assigned the vacant shift to a Relief System Operator. The Relief Operator told the Foreman that if it could be worked out, he would prefer to not work the shift. The Foreman told the Relief Operator that he would attempt to get someone else to work, but if he was unsuccessful, the Relief Operator would have to stand the shift. The Foreman contacted a System Operator on duty during the day shift at that time, but the Operator declined to work. The Foreman notified the Relief Operator of this, and the Relief worked the vacant shift.

The subject grievance was filed by a System Operator who was on his day off on April 16, 1985. The grievant believed that since the Foreman had contacted the System Operator working the day shift to see if he was interested in working the third shift, the Foreman should also have contacted the grievant.

Discussion

In discussion of this case, the Union argued that in accordance with Section C.3(a)(3), of the Utilization of Relief Shift Employees Clarification, the Relief System Operator had made other arrangements with his supervisor in advance and should not have worked the third shift on April 16, 1985.

The Company did not believe that other arrangements had been made, and argued that the supervisor was under no contractual obligation to contact the grievant.


Decision

Following review of the case and the Relief Clarification, the Committee agreed that the employee in the Relief classification was the appropriate employee to work the vacant shift and that the grievant was not contractually entitled to be called.

January 13, 1986

Based on the foregoing, this case is considered closed without adjustment and should be so noted by the Local Investigating Committee.


DAVID J. BERGMAN, Chairman
Review Committee


ROGER W. STALCUP, Secretary
Review Committee

RRD:ml