

REVIEW COMMITTEE**PG and E****IBEW**

PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY
 245 MARKET STREET, ROOM 444
 SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA 94108
 (415) 781-4211, EXTENSION 1125

APR 10 1986

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
 R.W. STALCUP, SECRETARY

**CASE CLOSED
 LOGGED AND FILED**

RECEIVED MAR 28 1986

D.J. BERGMAN, CHAIRMAN

- DECISION
 LETTER DECISION
 PRE-REVIEW REFERRAL

Nuclear Plant Operations Grievance No. 22-33-83-33
 Review Committee File No. 1580-84-15

Subject of the Grievance

This grievance concerns a jurisdictional dispute between the Chemical and Radiation Protection Technicians and the Control Technicians at Diablo Canyon Power Plant.

Facts of the Case

The liquid radiation waste overboard radiation monitor has a source check mechanism attached to the side of it. The purpose of this radioactive source is to test the radiation monitor prior to each time a liquid radiation waste tank is discharged.

Prior to May 1983, the source was permanently installed in the monitor but for security reasons, subsequent to May 1983, a new procedure was developed. It involves:

1. The Operations Department calls the Chemistry and Radiation Protection (C&RP) Technician on shift and informs the Technician of the need to check the radiation monitor due to an impending discharge.
2. The C&RP Technician checks out the source check mechanism from the Chemistry and Radiation Protection Department and takes it to the detector.
3. The Technician attaches the source check mechanism to the side of the detector. This procedure involves the use of four screws for securing the source check mechanism to the monitor. The Technician then plugs in the mechanism to the monitor.
4. The Technician then calls the Control Room to inform Operations that the mechanism is in place and Operations initiates the source check remotely.
5. After the test, the Technician removes the source check mechanism and returns it to the Radiation Protection area.

Discussion

The source of the dispute concerns No. 3 above. Company's position is that the installation of the source is de minimus in that it involves less

than 20 minutes of work once a month, does not involve any electrical adjustments, rewiring, troubleshooting, or component changing. The main reason a Chemistry and Radiation Protection Technician is required is to transport the radioactive source from the Chemistry Department to the location of the monitor and back.

Union pointed to the Control Technician job definition which states in part:

"...and may install all power plant control, monitoring, computer, alarm and indicating systems, and their individual components..."

as the reason the work should properly be assigned to Control Technicians; in addition, the Control Technicians had also performed this work in the past.

Decision

As of January, 1985, full security measures were re-established for Unit 1, and the procedure that gave rise to this grievance is no longer in effect. At the same time, the Instrument and Control Department took over this function. In consideration of the foregoing, the parties agreed to close this grievance on the basis that it is moot without prejudice to the position of the parties.

This case is closed.

FOR COMPANY:

Norman L. Bryan
Floyd C. Buchholz
Robert C. Taylor
David J. Bergman

By *David J. Bergman*

Date 3-27-86

FOR UNION:

Patrick S. Nickeson
Fred H. Pedersen
Arlis Watson
Roger W. Stalcup

By *Roger Stalcup*

Date 3/27/86