



REVIEW COMMITTEE



PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY
LABOR RELATIONS DEPARTMENT
MAIL CODE N2Z
P.O. BOX 770000
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94177
(415) 973-6725

INTERNATIONAL BROTHERHOOD OF
ELECTRICAL WORKERS, AFL-CIO
LOCAL UNION 1245, I.B.E.W.
P.O. BOX 2547
VACAVILLE, CALIFORNIA 94696
(707) 452-2700

JOHN MOFFAT, CHAIRMAN

DECISION
LETTER DECISION
PRE-REVIEW REFERRAL

RECEIVED by LU 1245
February 19, 2010

**CASE CLOSED
FILED & LOGGED**

BOB CHOATE, SECRETARY

Pre-Review Committee No. 18959 Energy Delivery – Electric T&D – Red Bluff

Robin Wix
Company Member
Local Investigating Committee

Kit Stice
Union Member
Local Investigating Committee

Subject of the Grievance

Written Reminder issued to a Lineman for a work procedure violation, specifically working without proper grounding.

Facts of the Case:

The Grievant has been a Lineman for two years and has a total of six years of Company service. The Grievant was issued a Written Reminder for not following proper grounding procedures. He had no other discipline on the record at the time the Written Reminder was issued.

The crew was comprised of two journeyman Linemen, a second step Apprentice Lineman and a Crew Foreman with 30 years of service. The crew was assembled from three different yards. A tailboard was held and the Rubber Glove mode was going to be used. The appropriate procedures were followed with the exception of 7.5 of the grounding manual which indicates that when conductors are on the ground the bracket grounding procedure is the only work procedure. Additionally at no time will the Rubber Glove work procedures be substituted for protective grounding procedures. The Grievant stated that based on the situation when the crew arrived they did not identify that grounding was required. He further stated that he would not make that same mistake again.

There was a safety stand down the morning of this particular incident and the Grievant was present at that meeting. The communication at that meeting was on grounding procedures that were to be followed without exception based on the standards. The Grievant had also been part of safety tailboards prior to this date regarding protective grounding.

The Crew Foreman had received a Written Reminder for this incident, as he is ultimately responsible for the crew and their actions.

Discussion:

The facts in the case are not in dispute, the issue was the degree of discipline for the Grievant .

The Union argued that since the Crew Foreman received a Written Reminder then the Lineman should have received an Oral Reminders several PRC and Review Committee cases put the Crew Foreman at a higher level of discipline as in cases that have policy or work procedure violations.

Company argued that the discipline should not be reduced just because the Crew Foreman received the same level of discipline.

The PRC notes that based recent serious accidents dealing with Grounding Procedures there is a no tolerance element on safety violations and in this case the discipline was equitable.

Decision

Based on the facts in this case the discipline was for just cause. This case is closed without adjustment.



John A. Moffat, Chairman
Review Committee

2/11/2010

Date



Bob Choate, Secretary
Review Committee

2/11/2010

Date