## REVIEW COMMITTEE

## PGandE

Case Closed PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY LOGGED AND FILED 245 MARKET STREET, ROOM 444 SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA 94106 (415) 781-4211, EXTENSION 1125

INTERNATIONAL BROTHERHOOD OF **ELECTRICAL WORKERS, AFL-CIO** LOCAL UNION 1245, I.B.E.W.

P.O. BOX 4790 WALNUT CREEK, CALIFORNIA 94596 (415) 933-6060

KEUEIVED JUL 2 3 1980

M.A. MEDEROS, SECRETARY

☐ DECISION LETTER DECISION

DPRE-REVIEW REFERRAL

D.J. BERGMAN, CHAIRMAN

Review Committee File No. 1487-80-13 East Bay Division Grievance No. 1-706-79-62

July 10, 1980

MR. M. HEAD, Chairman East Bay Division Joint Grievance Committee

The Review Committee has discussed the above case and is returning it to the Joint Grievance Committee for settlement in accordance with the following:

The grievance concerns the propriety of a Fieldman, in the Gas T&D Department being required as part of a crew to fuse plastic pipe. is not new to the Review Committee; and in 1975, the Pre-Review Committee resolved the issue (Pre-Review Committee Case No. 137 attached). The essence of that decision was that Fieldmen would be trained in and as a part of a crew, perform plastic pipe fusion using those methods and techniques described and understood by the parties as "plastic fusion" in practice at the time of the 1974 contract settlement. However, there are other issues in the present case; and the Review Committee will address itself to those issues, notwithstanding the fact that the Joint Statement of Facts is incomplete and the referral is questionable in terms of the negotiated Time Limits that are provided for in Title 102 of the Agreement.

As to the issue of the Fieldmen performing plastic fusion while the Light Crew Foremen is not in the immediate vicinity when such fusion activity was taking place, the Review Committee requests that the Joint Grievance Committee determine the length of time that the Light Crew Foremen was not present at the job site. If the amount of time is two hours or more then an upgrade for the senior qualified crew member pursuant to Section 204.3 of the Agreement, to the Light Crew Foremen classification would be in order. The issue of having Equipment Operators, who were formerly qualified Fieldmen, perform the plastic fusion work is not in violation of the agreement, although it should be understood that the Equipment Operator's job definition does not mandate an employee to be qualified in plastic fusion as a requirement of that classification.

When the Joint Grievance Committee has concluded its investigation, the case should be settled on the basis of the above. The issue of Section 204.3 entitlement shall be settled without prejudice to either position of the Company and The closure should be so noted in the Minutes of your next Joint Grievance Committee meeting and the Review Committee sent a copy of your settlement.

D. J. BERGMAN

For the Company

For the Union

DJB:ml Attachment 32:8 (9E/. 3-70)

## PGWI

## FOR INTRA-COMPANY USES

DIVISION OR DEPARTMENT

INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS

FILE NO.

741.5

RE LETTER OF

SUBJECT

San Joaquin Division Grievance Nos. D.Gr/C 25-74-13 & 14 [PRC |37]

Duties of Fieldman Classification - Fresno and Merced

March 17, 1975

MR. A. O. CLARK, Chairman San Joaquin Division Joint Grievance Committee

The above-subject grievances have been discussed by the Pre-Review Committee prior to their docketing on the agenda of the Review Committee. It was determined that the Joint Statements of Facts provides an inadequate basis for settlement of the cases and are being returned to the Division for further investigation.

Before the grievances can be accepted by the Review Committee, the issues submitted for settlement must be grieveable subjects as outlined in Section 102.6 of the Physical Agreement. In order for the Review Committee to make these determinations, the Joint Statements of Facts must contain all relevant information surrounding the grievances, including those facts or factors that can be agreed to as actual happenings and other information or matters that are relevant to the issues in dispute that underline the Joint Grievance Committee's inability to resolve the grievances.

The grievances are of similar nature and concern the intent of the negotiating parties during the 1974 contract negotiations, specifically the revisions to various job definitions in the Gas Transmission and Distribution Department, Exhibit VI, Job Definitions and Lines of Progression, Division Gas Department. As the basis for settlement, it is the Pre-Review Committee's opinion that the negotiated changes provide that Fieldmen would be trained in and as a part of a crew perform plastic pipe fusion (those methods and fusion techniques described and understood by the parties as "plastic fusion" in practice at the time of the 1974 contract settlement).

After the Joint Statements of Facts are completed, the Joint Grievance Committee should again attempt to reach a settlement in these cases using as a basis the criteria set forth above. If not settled, then the cases should be returned to the Review Committee accompanied by a complete report of your joint findings and explanation of why the cases could not be resolved.

L. V. BROWN, Chairman Review Committee

DJBergman:rto

cc: EEFoley
IWBonbright
DSSolberg
LNFoss, IBEW