

# **REVIEW COMMITTEE**



PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY 2850 SHADELANDS DRIVE, SUITE 100 WALNUT CREEK, CALIFORNIA 94598 (925) 974-4123

MARGARET A. SHORT, CHAIRMAN

DECISION LETTER DECISION PRE-REVIEW REFERRAL RECEIVED by LU 1245 SEPT. 3, 2002

**CASE CLOSED**FILED & LOGGED

-----

INTERNATIONAL BROTHERHOOD OF ELECTRICAL WORKERS, AFL-CIO LOCAL UNION 1245, I.B.E.W. P.O. BOX 4790 VVALNUT CREEK, CALIFORNIA 94596 (925) 933-6060 SALIM A. TAMIMI, SECRETARY

**Pre-Review Committee No. 12160** 

Hydro Generation - Auberry

Krista Gregory
Company Member
Local Investigating Committee

Jim Lynn
Union Member
Local Investigating Committee

#### Subject of the Grievance

This grievance concerns whether work assigned a System Operator from Helms was appropriate or if an Electrical Technician should have been utilized.

### Facts of the Case

An Electrical Technician from Auberry was in charge of a crew assigned to Haas Powerhouse to perform extensive rewiring on several control panels. The work was performed between October 16 and 26, 2000.

On October 16, a System Operator from Helms worked with the maintenance crew for four hours on straight time. During this period he changed out three relay cases. This work involves:

- Reading and interpreting prints
- Disconnecting the old wiring from the old relay cases
- Installing new cases
- Point-to-point wiring between the empty relay case and the terminal block

The System Operator did not test the relays; an Electrical Technician performed the testing. The System Operator was previously an Electrician and had performed this work in the past. The Operator completed the assigned tasks without incident.

From October 23 to 26, an Electrical Machinist performed the above duties.

The grievant is an Electrical Technician from Auberry who was not available to perform this work on the dates in question.

# Discussion

The System Operator job definition states in relevant part:

"Makes minor repairs to equipment, performs routine tests on automatic equipment..."

Roving Operator is next lower to System Operator. Its job definition states in relevant part: "Shall perform such duties as routine electrical, mechanical and building maintenance as assigned and for which an employee has been properly trained in hydro plants, ....May be assigned to maintenance or water systems repair crews."

Company opined that the System Operator was working down in his normal line of progression as a Roving Operator, and as such was appropriately assigned to work with a maintenance crew. Once assigned to a maintenance crew, the work to be performed by an Operator is dependent on the individual employee's skill set. In this instant case, the Operator was qualified by virtue of his prior classification of Electrician to change out the relay cases. However, this assignment would not have been given to a Roving Operator who progressed through the OIT program – given the wiring that needed to be done – as the required skill set would have been lacking.

Union opined that changing the relay cases is not "routine" and exceeds the intent of the Roving Operator job definition. Union further argued that when employee's change lines of progression, that it is not appropriate for Company to continue to make work assignments that draw upon that prior knowledge. For example a Gas Service Rep that bids to Apprentice Lineman should not be utilized to relight pilots or change gas meters just because he knows how. Aside from the contractual concern, there are the issues of changing work procedures that the employee may not be aware of and the safety implications.

It was agreed that having the Machinist change relay cases was within that job definition.

It appears to the PRC that utilizing the System Operator was an expedient assignment because of the employee's prior experience as an Electrician; that the work only took four hours; no overtime was worked; and the grievant was not available to perform the work.

### <u>Decision</u>

This case is closed without adjustment.

Margarer Short.	Salin A. Launa
Margaret A. Short, Chairman Review Committee	Sam Tamimi, Secretary Review Committee
9/3/02	9-3-02
Date	Date