



REVIEW COMMITTEE

IBEW



PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY
LABOR RELATIONS DEPARTMENT
375 N. WIGET LANE, SUITE 130
WALNUT CREEK, CA 94598
(530) 246-6430

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

ROBIN WIX, CHAIRMAN
 DECISION
 LETTER DECISION
 PRE-REVIEW REFERRAL

F.E. (ED) DWYER Jr, SECRETARY

Pre-Review Committee Number 22240 Electric Operations – Maintenance & Construction – Templeton

Yvonne Bradley
Company Member
Local Investigating Committee

Patrick Duffy
Union Member
Local Investigating Committee

Subject of the Grievance

This case concerns an alleged Title 212 bypass for an emergency call-out at the Templeton headquarters.

Facts of the Case

On Saturday, August 24, 2013, a 5 person Templeton crew was working a POT assignment. The scheduled assignment was from 5:00 am to 3:30 pm.

At 12:35 pm the on-call supervisor received a call from the D.O. involving flickering lights due to a secondary connection. A Tman had previously been dispatched to check the flickering lights and was unable to find any problems. The location was in Paso Robles, close to where the crew on POT was working.

The on-call supervisor contacted the Crew Foreman to inquire about the crew's status. The Crew Foreman relayed they would be wrapped up within 30 to 60 minutes. Based on the estimation provided by the Crew Foreman, the on-call supervisor assigned them the job. The crew arrived at the new jobsite at 2:45 pm.

The original job took 30 minutes longer than originally estimated, following which the crew cleaned up the jobsite and then traveled to the assigned job.

Discussion

The Union argued that the assigned crew didn't arrive at the jobsite for approximately 2 hours following the supervisor's initial call, in which time a crew from the 212 list could have been assembled and onsite, making it more practical to assemble a crew from the 212 list. The Union further opined that the supervisor and/or crew should have continued to monitor the situation in regard to responding in a timely manner.

The Company argued based on the Crew Foreman's estimation of when the job would be completed, and their proximity to the assigned job, the on-call supervisor believed it would be faster to assign the job to the crew already in the field. The Company must be able to rely on the information available at the time the work is assigned. With this in mind, the on-call supervisor assigned the work with practicality in mind.

The Committee reviewed PRC cases 193, 226 and 779. In each of the aforementioned cases the discussion was a 'practicality' issue. PRC case 779 states, 1) "Practicality" is based primarily on the speed with which service can be restored by using one particular crew in lieu of another, and 2) "Practicality" is not determined or based solely on economic considerations. In the current case the Committee has the task of determining whether the supervisor believed at the time that it would have been faster to use the crew in the field versus a 212 call-out crew. Further the Committee discussed that monitoring the situation may have resulted in the use of a 212 call-out crew in lieu of the crew that was already working.

Decision

Following much discussion regarding practicality, the Committee concluded in this case that the on-call supervisor assigned the work as practicably as possible based on the information he had from the crew that was already working. This case is considered closed without adjustment.



Robin Wix, Chairman 6/18/14
Review Committee Date



F.E. (Ed) Dwyer Jr, Secretary 6/18/14
Review Committee Date