



PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY 245 MARKET STREET, ROOM 444 SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA 94106 (415) 781-4211, EXTENSION 1125 INTERNATIONAL BROTHERHOOD OF CASE CLOSED NOV 1 6 1882 ELECTRICAL WORKERS, AFL-CIO LOCAL UNION 1245, I.B.E.W. P.O. BOX 4790 WALNUT CREEK, CALIFORNIA 94596 (415) 933-6060 RECEIVED NOV 1 6 1982 R.W. STALCUP, SECRETARY

D.J. BERGMAN, CHAIRMAN

norman David ad an Ordenance No. 25 45

DECISION LETTER DECISION PRE-REVIEW REFERRAL

San Joaquin Division Grievance No. 25-480-81-70 P-RC 774

October 29, 1982

MR. D. S. SOLBERG, Company Member San Joaquin Division Local Investigating Committee MR. W. WEAVER, Union Member San Joaquin 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:

This case involves disciplinary action taken against a line crew, San Joaquin Division, for violating a Company rule regarding coffee stops. The Line Subforeman in this case was given a two-day disciplinary layoff, and a Lineman and Apprentice Lineman on the crew were each given one day off without pay.

In an effort to resolve this case, the Committee attempted to determine if similar situations had occurred in the Division and review the disciplinary action taken in such cases. In addition, the Committee reviewed Review Committee Decision No. 1349 for guidance. The Committee was unable to identify precisely similar situations; however, it was clear that, on the basis of the cases reviewed, the discipline for employees violating the coffee stop policy generally resulted in time off without pay. Further, the parties have clearly agreed that a crew supervisor bears a heavier responsibility than do members of the crew for rule violations which involve the crew. In Review Committee Case No. 1349, the parties agreed to reduce the discipline of the crew members since they had all received equal time off for their infraction. This was done to differentiate the levels of responsibility for the employees involved. In fact, quoting from the decision, the parties said that the Line Subforeman's "...culpability here demonstrates a lack of supervisory ability on his part, for which something more than a day's layoff may have been appropriate."

In this case, the disciplinary action involved two days for the Subforeman and a day off for each crew member which was the Division's recognition of the responsibility of the crew leader. On that basis, therefore, and in conformance with the previous discussion, the Committee agrees that the disciplinary action taken was for just and sufficient cause.



7.1 P



P-RC 774

-2-

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

BERGMAN, Chairman D. J.

Review Committee

R. Rev Committee

PEPettigrew(1123):ml