



## REVIEW COMMITTEE



PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY  
LABOR RELATIONS DEPARTMENT  
MAIL CODE N2Z  
P.O. BOX 770000  
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94177  
(650) 598-7567

RECEIVED by LU 1245  
December 2, 2011

---

**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

DOUG VEADER, CHAIRMAN  
 DECISION  
 LETTER DECISION  
 PRE-REVIEW REFERRAL

F.E. (ED) DWYER Jr, SECRETARY

### Pre-Review Committee Numbers 20768 & 20800 Electric Operations – System Operations – Various

Chris Diamond  
Vanessa Camacho-Parker  
Company Members  
Local Investigating Committee

Mike Grill  
Darryl Norris  
Union Members  
Local Investigating Committee

#### Subject of the Grievance

These cases concern the proper pay rate for Relief System Operators.

#### Facts of the Case

The grievants in this case are Relief System Operators with less than 30 months in their classification. The grievances argue that when these employees relieve other System Operators, they should be paid at the top (30 month) step. The basis for this contention is the language in Exhibit X regarding the rate of pay for Relief System Operators which states:

“The rate of the System Operator at the highest schedule substation, hydro plant, or power plant at which he is qualified to relieve, and at which he stands shift, plus \$5.00 per week plus 8 times the hourly Sunday premium.”

The grievance contends that the wording “at the highest schedule” was intended to mean at the top of the rate; thereby entitling the Operators who are performing relief to be paid at the top of the wage rate, even though they may be at a lower step in the wage progression.

#### Discussion

The Company argued that at the time the Relief System Operator pay rate language was negotiated, System Operators were on different pay scales depending upon the complexity of the assigned substations. Substations were assigned a designated “schedule” with a different pay rate for each schedule. Relief System Operators assigned to perform at different substations would have their pay rate determined by the pay rate at the highest schedule substation which they would relieve. The word “schedule” was a reference to the substation designation, not a wage step.

The Company further opined that the determination of a proper wage step is governed by Section 204.2 of Physical Labor Agreement, which provides for progression through wage steps based on accumulating sufficient time at each step. Letter Agreement 95-161, which is referenced in the grievance, also addresses the wage placement of System Operators. Section I (2) provides for placement at (a) the starting rate of the System Operator classification to which assigned, or (b) the wage step determined by the time previously spent at the designated station.

The Union believes the language "at the highest schedule" was intended to mean at the top of the rate; thereby entitling the Operators who are performing relief to be paid at the top of the wage rate, even though they may be at a lower step in the wage progression. The Union believes this language in Exhibit X has been paid the same for many negotiations and the past practice is clear.

**Decision**

The Pre-Review Committee was made aware that the parties have agreed to discuss this wage rate issue as part of broader Electric Operations ad hoc negotiations. The Committee agrees to close these grievances with the expectation that the issue will be resolved through the ad hoc negotiations. Should the ad hoc not resolve this issue to the Union's satisfaction, the Union reserves the right to again challenge this issue through the grievance procedure.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Doug Veader, Chairman  
Review Committee

12/1/11  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
F.E. (Ed) Dwyer Jr, Secretary  
Review Committee

12/1/2011  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Date