

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
1982 WALNUT CREEK, CALIFORNIA 94596
(415) 933-6060
R.W. STALCUP, SECRETARY

CASE CLOSED APR 1 1982
LOGGED AND FILED

D.J. BERGMAN, CHAIRMAN

☐ DECISION
☐ LETTER DECISION
☐ PRE-REVIEW REFERRAL

Shasta Division Grievance No. 13-144-81-5
P-RC 728

March 30, 1982

MR. E. M. CONWAY, Company Member
Shasta Division
Local Investigating Committee

MR. R. M. HAFNER, Union Member
Shasta 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 grievance procedure, to the Local Investigating Committee for settlement in accordance with the following:

On March 30, 1981, a Relief System Operator worked the 7:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m. shift with an Electrician, performing maintenance at Cottonwood Substation. At 3:00 p.m., he was replaced by a System Operator who was working the 10:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. shift that day. The Union filed a grievance stating that the System Operator was working out of his classification, and the relief should have been held over the 1½ hour worked by the System Operator.


A review of the job definition for Relief System Operator shows that such employee may be required to perform electrical, mechanical and building maintenance in the Substation/Hydro Plants and other related facilities. The same terminology does not appear in the job definition for System Operator. Therefore, the Committee concludes at the outset, that the use of the System Operator to perform this work was inappropriate.


As to the grievant's claim for overtime compensation for the work involved, the Pre-Review Committee notes the Substation supervisor's testimony that had he realized the use of the System Operator was improper, in this case, he would have waited until other maintenance people returned to the yard before continuing with the job since it was not critical to perform the work. The Pre-Review Committee has faced this particular issue in previous grievance settlements; that is, the right of employees to perform "common task" work on overtime when other classifications which may also be assigned this work would be assigned at the straight rate of pay. In those cases, the Committee concluded that the use of an employee who was otherwise properly classified to perform work at the straight rate of pay may be used in place of working another employee on overtime. Such is the issue in this case, as between the use of the Relief Operator or Helper to perform the maintenance work.

March 30, 1982

After careful consideration, the Committee concludes that there was no violation of the Agreement with respect to the Relief System Operator since he was not contractually guaranteed this work on a straight time or overtime basis.

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

PEPettigrew(1123):ML/CLW:rlm

cc: RJLaRue, Jr.
LCBeanland
IWBonbright
FCBuchholz
GCampbell
RHCunningham
NRFarley
DAOkabayashi
TCPhebus
WKSnyder
JBStoutamore
CPTaylor
CEWelte
Division Personnel Managers