

REVIEW COMMITTEE**PG and E****IBEW** 

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

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

CASE CLOSED
LOGGED AND FILED

JAN 8 1987

D.J. BERGMAN, CHAIRMAN

RECEIVED JAN 7 1987

San Francisco Division Grievance No. 2-1335-86-72
P-RC 1144

- DECISION
 LETTER DECISION
 PRE-REVIEW REFERRAL

January 5, 1987

KENT H. ANDERSON, Company Member
San Francisco Division
Local Investigating Committee

JOE VALENTINO, Union Member
San Francisco 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(v) of the grievance procedure, to the Local Investigating Committee for settlement in accordance with the following:

Facts of the Case

On April 3, 1986, a Groundman was assigned cleaning duties in an underground vault. One of the Cable Splicers in the vault had installed one phase of cable and marked it for cutting. The cable was energized and laying on the rubbered up protector prior to cutting and replacing it in the connector in the transformer. As the Cable Splicer was about to climb down and cut the cable, the Groundman took it upon himself to cut the cable, inadvertently pushed it forward during the cutting effort and contacted an exposed hinge on the protector and went to the ground. The grievant received first degree burns.

Discussion

It was the Union's position that Groundmen are not to be utilized for any work on energized conductors or apparatus. Company argued that the grievant was not instructed to cut the cable, and that it is not a violation of the job definition to have Groundmen in proximity to energized cable.

Decision

This issue was discussed by the parties in conjunction with Arbitration Case No. 145. The Compromise Agreement and General Release entered into in that case provided, in part, that "a Groundman will not be required to use hand tools to perform work in energized cables or to use a voltage tester on cables."

In settlement of this case, the parties agree that the work performed by the Groundman; i.e., cutting an energized cable, was outside the Groundman job definition and was, therefore, improper.

On this basis, this case is considered to be closed and should be so

January 5, 1987

noted by the Local Investigating Committee.



DAVID J. BERGMAN, Chairman
Review Committee



ROGER W. STALCUP, Secretary
Review Committee

RRDoering(222-1408):mc