

REVIEW COMMITTEE

PG and E

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

IBEW



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

MAR 24 1987

**CASE CLOSED
LOGGED AND FILED**

RECEIVED MAR 24 1987
REVIEW COMMITTEE DECISION

D.J. BERGMAN, CHAIRMAN

- DECISION
- LETTER DECISION
- PRE-REVIEW REFERRAL

East Bay Division Grievance No. 1-2051-84-6
Review Committee File No. 1616-85-9

The above-subject grievance was referred to arbitration as Arbitration Case No. 141 and is being referred back to the Review Committee for settlement in accordance with the following:

Subject of the Grievance

This case concerns the issue of Company's failure to upgrade a Lineman to Electric Crew Foreman while in charge of a three-man crew.

Fact of the Case

On December 27, 28 and 29, 1983, the grievant, a Lineman, and two Groundmen were sealing ducts for smoke in underground vaults. The three employees worked as a team with one Groundman above the hole as an observer and materials handler, and the Lineman and the other Groundman in the hole. The work performed did not involve the electrical distribution system.

Discussion

The Union argued that contractually there is a defined distinction between "crews" and "units," and any time a Lineman is on a crew with two Groundmen, he must be upgraded to Electric Crew Foreman, regardless of the work performed by the crew.

Company opined that the Lineman was functioning in the capacity of a Working Foreman, an Electric T&D classification with a wage rate equal to that of Lineman, maintaining manholes. Pursuant to Section 204.3, when an employee is temporarily assigned to work in a higher classification, he shall be upgraded. Had the job involved electrical work, an upgrade to Electric Crew Foreman would have been warranted.


Decision

The Committee agreed to settle this case on the basis that in the future for similar work assignments, Company will first consider prebidders to the Working Foreman classification for temporary upgrades as provided for in Section 205.3. In the case at hand, there were no prebidders to Working Foreman in the headquarters.

On the basis of the above, this case is considered closed.

FOR COMPANY:


Floyd C. Buchholz
William J. Rowe
Robert C. Taylor
David J. Bergman

By 

Date 3-20-87

FOR UNION:

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

By 

Date 3/19/87