REVIEW COMMITTEE

PG and E

IBEW (O

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

CASE CLOSED DEC LOGGED AND FILED

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

D.J. BERGMAN, CHAIRMAN

☐DECISION
☐LETTER DECISION
☐PRE-REVIEW REFERRAL

Stockton Division Grievance No. 16-118-80-6 Pre-Review Case No. 566 Denial of Upgrade to Light Crew Foreman

December 3, 1980

MR. DARREL COLLINS, Company Member Stockton Division Local Investigating Committee

MR. MICKEY HARRINGTON, Union Member Stockton Division Local Investigating Committee

The above-subject grievance has been discussed by the Pre-Review Committee prior to its docketing on the agenda of the Review Committee and is being returned, pursuant to Step Five A(ii) of the Review Committee procedure to the Local Investigating Committee for settlement in accordance with the following:

The case concerns the use of a 2-man unit (Fitter and Fieldman) to install a full-circle leak clamp on a 4-inch cast iron low-pressure gas main. The Fitter is requesting an upgrade to Light Crew Foreman. The job definitions of Light Crew Foreman and Fitter both provide for a 2-man unit to repair minor leaks by means of a leak clamp, and in the determination of whether a 2-man unit is appropriate as opposed to a crew, a review of note 2(b) of the Fitter job definition is necessary.

2(b) repair of minor leaks by means of a leak clamp, fusion or welding. Large leaks, patching of pipes or emergency conditions shall be handled by crews.

The key factors in determining the need for a crew (2-5 men exclusive of the Light Crew Foreman) are contained in the Notes A(1), (2), (3), 3(a), 3(b), and B applicable to the job definitions of 0640-0641 Light Crew Foreman (Welder) and Light Crew Foreman and Notes A(1), (2), 2(a), 2(b), 2(c), 2(d), 2(e), and 3 of the job definition of (0560) Fitter. This determination, as the Review Committee has indicated in prior grievances, is initially left up to the employee in charge. If necessary, he will request additional manpower which in the case of a Fitter-Fieldman, would result in an upgrade to Light Crew Foreman. In the instant case, the Fitter alleges that he should be compensated at the Light Crew Foreman rate of pay even though the job was safely completed by a 2-man unit. The need for a Crew did not exist. Therefore, the Pre-Review Committee is of the opinion that a contractual violation did not occur and the correction asked for is denied.

This case is considered closed on the basis of the foregoing, and the closure should be so noted by the Local Investigating Committee.

D. J. BERGMAN, Chairman Review Committee R. W. STALCUP, Secretary Review Committee

RWS:rlm

cc: CRMartin

MEBadella LCBeanland IWBonbright

LVBrown FCBuchholz RHCunningham

NRFarley CAMiller

JBStoutamore

WKSnyder CPTaylor

Division Personnel Managers