

7.1 -Just cause for discipline
Improper response from
Service Operator to
customer re: gas leak.



REVIEW COMMITTEE

IBEW



PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY
201 MISSION STREET, 1513A
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA 94105
(415) 973-1125

D.J. BERGMAN, CHAIRMAN

- DECISION
- LETTER DECISION
- PRE-REVIEW REFERRAL

APR 21 1993
**CASE CLOSED
LOGGED AND FILED**

RECEIVED APR 19 1993

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

De Anza Division Grievance No. DEA-92-5
P-RC 1638

GREG HOLMES, Company Member
De Anza Division
Local Investigating Committee

DENNIS SEYFER, Union Member
De Anza Division
Local Investigating Committee

Subject of the Grievance:

This case concerns a Service Operator who received a Written Reminder in the work performance category of positive discipline for not properly responding to a customer call reporting a gas leak.

Facts of the Case:

The grievant had been coached and counseled on July 17, 1991 concerning his work performance, specifically his manner of speech and attitude toward a customer. On October 29, 1991 the grievant received an Oral Reminder, also in the work performance category, for refusing to respond to a customer and police agency's request for service.

At 9:00 p.m. on January 22, 1992 the grievant received a call from a customer who reported the smell of gas and a possible gas leak. The customer stated the grievant told her that a serviceman would respond immediately. The customer called back at 11:00 p.m., again reported the smell of gas, and inquired about the status of the serviceman. The customer stated that the grievant then advised her that a serviceman would not be dispatched until the following morning. The customer called a Customer Services Supervisor at 9:00 a.m. the following morning to repeat her concern about the smell of gas and the lack of the Company's response. A subsequent review of the service tag showed that the grievant had listed the work as a pilot light relight and scheduled the job for the afternoon of January 23.

The grievant stated that during the customer's initial call he questioned her on whether her pilot light was out. When he was told the pilot light was out, the grievant stated that he told the customer that a serviceman would be out the following morning. The grievant maintained that the only mistake he made was putting "p.m." on the service tag rather than "a.m."

Discussion:

The Union opined that the discipline taken against the employee was not warranted. The Union notes that Service Operators are instructed to ask customers questions to determine if a call actually requires immediate response. In the case at point, the Service Operator had reasonably determined that the smell of gas was due to an unlit pilot light.

The Company noted that this incident was the latest of three recent incidents all concerning the employee's response to customer calls. The disciplinary action was appropriate to impress upon the employee the need for quality, timely service and to get his commitment to follow established policies. Company noted that Standard Practice 850-2 clearly indicates that the Company will immediately respond to a customer complaint of a gas leak or odor of gas and that if there is doubt as to the urgency, it should be treated as immediate response. The grievant inappropriately tried to troubleshoot the customer's complaint over the phone instead of treating it as an immediate response.

Decision:

After discussing this case at length, the Pre-Review Committee determined that the Written Reminder has since been deactivated. The Committee agrees to close this case on this basis and such closure should be so noted by the Local Investigating Committee.



David J. Bergman, Chairman
Review Committee



Roger W. Stalcup, Secretary
Review Committee

Date 4-13-93

Date 4/8/93