



REVIEW COMMITTEE



IBEW

RECEIVED FEB 19 1997

PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY
201 MISSION STREET, ROOM 1508
MAIL CODE P15B
P.O. BOX 770000
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA 94177
(415) 973-8510

**CASE CLOSED
FILED & LOGGED**

INTERNATIONAL BROTHERHOOD OF
ELECTRICAL WORKERS, AFL-CIO
LOCAL UNION 1245, I.B.E.W
P.O. BOX 4790
WALNUT CREEK, CALIFORNIA 94596
(510) 933-6060
R.W. STALCUP, SECRETARY

MARGARET A. SHORT, CHAIRMAN

**Diablo Division Grievance No. CON-94-71
Fact Finding File No. 5841
Pre-Review Committee Case No. 1885**

- DECISION
- LETTER DECISION
- PRE-REVIEW REFERRAL

KAREN SAVELICH
Company Member
Local Investigating Committee

FRANK SAXSENMEIER
Union Member
Local Investigating Committee

Subject of the Grievance

On March 19, 1994, an explosion occurred at Contra Costa Substation. In addition to Title 200 Substation Maintenance employees, General Construction employees were called out on overtime to assist with repairs. Employees from the Title 200 Transmission Department grieved, claiming they should have been called out to assist Substation Maintenance employees in repairing the damaged facilities rather than calling out GC employees.

Facts of the Case

At approximately 5:00 am on Saturday, March 19, 1994, an explosion occurred at Contra Costa Substation. Two regulators and one transformer bank were substantially damaged. Additionally, there was damage to the substation substructure and there was a considerable amount of large diameter conductor down (2300 mcm aluminum bundled conductor). Approximately 18,500 customers were out of power. Load was transferred to other circuits and the customers were restored to service by 9:30 am. However, there was concern about being able to meet normal load demand if the transferred load was not returned to Contra Costa Sub by Monday morning.

All available Antioch Substation Maintenance employees were called out and began the process of testing equipment to determine the extent of damage. A General Construction Line Department crew was called out to assist with repairs to the downed wire. As work progressed, it was determined that one of two damaged regulator banks was not repairable and a decision was made to bring in a mobile sub in order to put Contra Costa Substation back in service. Installation of the mobile sub was scheduled

for Sunday, March 20, 1994. Many of the Antioch Substation Maintenance employees returned on Sunday, as did Title 200 Electricians from Concord and Technicians from Oakland. The GC Line Department crew also returned to assist on Sunday.

On Sunday, the mobile sub was put in place. The GC Line crew installed new 2300 mcm aluminum conductor to connect the mobile sub to the incoming 21 KV circuit at the deadened structure and to the buss structure. With the exception of the 2300 mcm aluminum conductor, the GC Line crew had all the necessary materials to complete this work. The conductor was picked up at the Division Transmission yard at Meadow Lane in Concord. The GC crew used a Division truck during this job.

Transmission Department employees from the Meadow Lane headquarters in Concord grieved, claiming the work done on Saturday and Sunday by GC Line should have been assigned to them. Transmission crew members who testified to the LIC opined they were capable of completing this work and should have been utilized rather than assigning the work to GC Line.


Discussion

The principle issue in this case is one of jurisdiction. Division Transmission Department employees believe they could do the work and should have been called out utilizing the provisions of Title 212 of the Physical Agreement.


The Pre-Review Committee is of the opinion that the work performed on Saturday and Sunday was entirely within the confines of Contra Costa Substation and as such, the jurisdiction for work performed lies with the Division Substation Department. In the case at hand, all available Substation Maintenance employees were utilized but more help was required. Substation Department elected to call on GC Line for assistance, rather than Division Transmission Department. However, the work in question is not the jurisdiction of either GC Line Department or Division Transmission Department. The Committee is of the opinion that both GC Line and Division Transmission employees are capable and qualified to perform the work in question, but where additional assistance is required by the department with jurisdiction over the work, it is their call to determine which group they will go to in an effort to secure the needed assistance.

DECISION

There was no violation of the Agreement. This case is closed without adjustment.



Margaret A. Short, Chairman
Review Committee



Roger W. Stalcup, Secretary
Review Committee

2/19/97

Date

2/19/97

Date