

612.6  
204.4

**Stalcup, Roger**

**From:** Stalcup, Roger  
**Sent:** Monday, January 03, 2000 4:59 PM  
**To:** Rayburn, Stephen  
**Subject:** RE: Thoughts-Various Issues

1-3-00

**Sensitivity:** Confidential

Steve:

Regarding LA 99-76 - Respirator Program - specifically as it relates to the Oakport/Richmond headquarters and the number of employees who may be required to wear a respirator, it was our understanding when the parties met and reached the bargaining table agreement that Oakport/Richmond was being treated as a single headquarters for purposes of this proposal. At no point did Company communicate otherwise. When the Union agreed to recommend this proposal to the Business Manager for signature, we did so believing the agreement was that the minimum number of emergency responders for Oakport/Richmond, two GFC's and four Fitter/Fieldmen. Had we thought otherwise, we would have asked for more information regarding the number of employees in the Gas T&D Department at each of the headquarters (Oakport and Richmond), and would have presented arguments on minimums based on the actual number at each headquarters as opposed to what we did - which was to present arguments on the minimums based on the actual number of employees at the grouped headquarters (note that the grouping of these headquarters was something done in the Company proposal).

When we, the Union negotiators reached the table agreement, we took this same view as it applies to the Concord/Antioch headquarters, the Fresno/Clovis headquarters and the Redding/Red Bluff headquarters. Thus, we are of the opinion that the "minimum number of DCS employees that may be required to wear a respirator" at the combined Oakport/Richmond headquarters is 6; that the number at Concord/Antioch is 6; that the number at Fresno/Clovis is 6; and that the number at Redding/Red Bluff is 3.

By the way, I spoke with Darrel Mitchell today about the status of this proposal, and was advised that it will be moved on into Jack McNally's office for his consideration later this week.

Regarding the question of assigning an Unassigned System Operator who has been designated critical, your are correct - the union is of the opinion that Company cannot force an Unassigned Operator into a vacancy when they are in a critical position.

Regarding the appointment of a T300 Elec Tech for the Appr. Elect Tech traing program, I left a phone message on the cell phone/voice mail machine of Steve Imhof today. Assuming he is around this week and that he responds, I should have an answer on his interest shortly. If he is not interested, I will contact Bruce Tarbill.

To date, I have taken no action to respond to Company's request for nomination of four bargaining unit employees from the Building Services Department to a system-wide Safety Committee. I will forward your request to Art Murray, and will communicate to him that Company's request has been in my hands for some time, and ask that he attempt to respond in a more timely manner.

If you have questions or comments, give me a call.

Roger

-----Original Message-----

**From:** Rayburn, Stephen [mailto:SAR5@pge.com]  
**Sent:** Monday, January 03, 2000 4:15 PM ✓  
**To:** Stalcup, Roger  
**Subject:** FW: Thoughts-Various Issues  
**Sensitivity:** Confidential

Roger-

Any thoughts on these issues? Also, should I be talking to Art about the Safety Reps for the Building Department?

Steve

-----  
**From:** Rayburn, Stephen  
**Sent:** Thursday, December 16, 1999 4:45 PM  
**To:** Stalcup, Roger  
**Subject:** Thoughts-Various Issues  
**Sensitivity:** Confidential

Roger-

Would like your thoughts on the following...

1. LA 99-76 - Respirator Program. LA submitted to Union on December 14. John Parks has called regarding the numbers of emergency responders for Oakport/Richmond. The table attached to the LA is gray on the number of required emergency responders at both HQs. It could be interpreted as a total of 2 crews (2 ECF and 4 Fitters/Fieldman) for both headquarters or 2 crews for each HQs. John has asked that we clarify the requirement as 2 crews at each HQs to be consistent w/ similar size yards (Hayward, Fremont, Livermore). A similar clarification should be made for Concord/Antioch.

In looking at the number of employees/crews in the yard, this does make sense.

HQS	#GCF at HQs	#GCF Req'd	#Fitter/Fieldmen at HQs	#Fitter/Fieldman Req'd
Hayward	4	2	12	4
Fremont	7	2	8	4
Livermore	3	2	12	4
Concord/ Antioch	13	2	30	4
Oakland/ Richmond	16	2	31	4

May we have your concurrence via email to be placed in the LA file?

2. LA 99-69 - Unassigned System Operators

The Company currently has no qualified bidders for a Transmission System Operator position at Newark Sub. The junior Unassigned Operator in the bidding unit is David Montoya, a Distribution Un System Operator in Hayward. He is on critical status. Para 5 of the Critical Classification LA states that the critical classification may be lifted by mutual agreement. We would interpret that as meaning that we cannot force an Unassigned Operator into a vacancy when they are in a critical position.

May we have your concurrence on that point?

3. Electrical Tech Training Program

Joe Speck called me today. He is still looking for a T300 Elec Tech for the Joint Apprentice Elec Tech Training Program. Joe had suggested Steve Imhof and Bruce Tarbill, both from Fresno.

Thanks...

Steve