

REVIEW COMMITTEE



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

JOHN MOFFAT, CHAIRMAN

DECISION LETTER DECISION PRE-REVIEW REFERRAL RECEIVED by LU 1245 February 19, 2010

CASE CLOSED FILED & LOGGED

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

BOB CHOATE, SECRETARY

Pre-Review Committee No. 19067 Energy Delivery – Support Services – Santa Rosa

Jeff Neeley
Company Member
Local Investigating Committee

Darryl Norris
Union Member
Local Investigating Committee

Subject of the Grievance:

The Grievant, an Operating Clerk was issued a Written Reminder for falsely reporting a gas leak at her home in order to get a GSR dispatched.

Facts of the Case:

The Grievant is an Operating Clerk – Typist with 29 years of service with no active discipline on file at the time of this incident.

The Grievant was issued a Written Reminder in conduct for violating USP on Employee conduct. The Grievant used her knowledge of the Company procedures for personal gain.

On a Sunday the Grievant called the Company's Customer Service department stating that her furnace was not working and subsequently that she smelled gas and requested that PG&E come out to investigate. She had spoken with a Customer Service Representative told the Representative that her heater was not working and if a GSR could be dispatched. The CSR said Sunday was for emergencies only that it be five to schedule a pilot relight according to the Grievant. The Grievant knew that there were two GSR working that Sunday. The Grievant also knew if she told the CSR that she smelled gas that a GSR would respond.

The GSR responded checked the heater and replaced the batteries in the thermostat. The GSR did not find any gas leak or do a gas leak investigation. When the GSR arrived at the home the Grievant did not mention that there was a gas odor or there was a gas leak. The Grievant continued to claim she smelled gas.

Discussion:

The Company believes that the Grievant violated the Company Standard Practice on Employee Conduct and was dishonest on her claim that she smelled a gas odor in her garage in order to get a immediate response for a Sunday relight. and the Company maintaining the position that use of Company knowledge for personal gain is a very serious offense. Other customers with serious problems may have been harmed as result of this type of behavior. The Company's practices and procedures are clear and "gaming" the system is a serious violation and deserves this type of discipline.

The Union argues that the reason that the GSR was sent out on the same day was that the Grievant claimed that she had a gas leak. The GSR never did a leak investigation to determine if a gas leak existed and was not disciplined. If a gas leak investigation was done and no gas leak was detected, then the Company's assertion that the Grievant used her knowledge of Company procedures and protocol for her own gain would have some merit.

The parties discussed this case at great length and based on the Grievants statement "that you are forcing me to do this" to the Service Center Clerk, there is a presumption that the Grievant gave false information. Further to date the Grievant has not complained of a gas odor at her residence.

Decision:

Based on the fact that there was no leak investigation done at the Grievant's residence at the time of the service call and that some element of the Grievant's knowledge of Company practices and procedures exist for her own gain the PRC agrees to close this case with the deactivation without prejudice of the Written Reminder on date of the parties signature

Based on the aforementioned this case is close.

John A. Moffat, Chairman

Review Committee

Date

Bob Choate, Secretary Review Committee

Datá