PG and E

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

CASE CLOSED LOGGED AND FILED

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

D.J. BERGMAN, CHAIRMAN

DECISION LETTER DECISION ☐PRE-REVIEW REFERRAL RECEIVED MAY 2 1986

EVIEW COMMITTE

San Joaquin Valley Region Grievance No. 25-779-85-22 P-RC 1060

April 30, 1986

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

WAYNE WEAVER, Union Member San Joaquin Valley Region 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:

Subject

This grievance concerns an allegation that Company improperly delayed the report date of a Lineman who was awarded a T&D Driver position in another headquarters.

Facts of the Case

On March 12, 1985, the grievant, a Lineman in Taft, accepted a T&D Driver position in Bakersfield. At that time, there were seven authorized Linemen positions in Taft. Of the seven, three were vacant and were being filled through the postbid procedure. Three of the other jobs were filled by Linemen, including the grievant, who had accepted other jobs and were waiting to report to their new headquarters. The supervisor deemed it necessary to maintain a compliment of two crews in Taft. As a result, employees were released in order of the date of the job award. The grievant was released on May 31, 1985 and reported to Bakersfield on June 3, 1985.

Discussion

The Union argued that the grievant should have been released within ten working days of the job award, and noted that for a two-week period, the grievant was loaned to Bakersfield to perform tear downs.

The Company opined that it attempts to release employees within ten days of the job award but must take into consideration operational needs.

The Committee noted that Title 205 of the Physical Agreement does not contain specific time limits for the release of employees following a job award. Time limits have been proposed in bargaining but never agreed to. The Committee agreed that employees should be released as soon as operations permit, and

Company cannot arbitrarily delay an employee's release. The reasonableness of the release date must be examined on a case-by-case basis. In the case at hand, the Committee noted that the Taft headquarters was making an effort to expeditiously fill their vacant Lineman positions in order to release the grievant, and the headquarters believed it was necessary to maintain a compliment of two crews in the meantime. The grievant was released immediately upon the filling of one of the vacant Lineman positions.

Decision

The Committee agreed that the grievant's delayed report date was not arbitrary or unreasonable and, therefore, was not a violation of the Agreement.

This case is closed without adjustment and should be so noted by the Local Investigating Committee.

DAVID J. BERGMAN, Chairman Review Committee ROGER (STALCUP, Secretary Review Committee

RRD:m1