

REVIEW COMMITTEE DECISION

Review Committee File No. 1175
San Joaquin Division Grievance No. D.Gr/C 25-72-4

Statement of Facts

This case concerns the installation of 86 street lights which included the framing and setting of approximately 60-35' poles and stringing of street light duplex secondary conductors to serve the 86 lights and transformer connection. There may have been one or two instances where wire pulling involved more than two spans.

The job was initially assigned to a three-man crew. Shortly after that, however, the Subforeman was injured and the work proceeded with two-man work units. In one instance, two two-man units were combined to connect the transformer. No one was upgraded for that "hot" work to Subforeman. This job lasted for one and one-half hours.

Discussion

This grievance calls for an application of the "Notes on Lineman Definition." There are two aspects of the events involved here which are questionable. The first aspect is incapable of resolution by the Review Committee. This was the use of a two-man unit pulling more than two spans. There is the possibility that this conflicted with Item No. 6 of the "Notes", but the facts are too vague on this point for the Review Committee to determine with certainty whether there has been a violation.

The second questionable aspect was the combination of two-man units to perform "hot" work. This clearly conflicts with the intent of the "Notes on Lineman Definition" as stated in the introductory paragraph. The Review Committee is of the opinion that the appropriate remedy is to provide Subforeman pay for the senior line employee for the time spent performing "hot" work with combined units. It should be noted that this is not a normal upgrade situation in that it is made necessary by negotiated language in the Lineman definition "Notes" and, additionally, applicable where two two-man line units are combined to jointly perform work on an energized line. In this limited situation, the normal two (2) hours minimum time at the upgraded classification will not apply. In this way, the events here will be brought into compliance with the "Notes". Even then had an exempt Electric T&D Supervisor been present, there would have been no necessity to have upgraded the senior Lineman.

Decision

Under these facts and since no exempt Supervisor was present, the senior Lineman will be paid at Subforeman rate for the one and one-half hours spent performing "hot" work with combined two-man units. No further correction will be granted.

FOR UNION:

W. H. Burr
E. R. Sheldon
L. N. Foss

By 

Date 1-3-74

FOR COMPANY:

J. A. Fairchild
H. J. Stefanetti
L. V. Brown

By 

Date 1-3-74