



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

D.J. BERGMAN, CHAIRMAN

DECISION LETTER DECISION PRE-REVIEW REFERRAL CASE CLOSED ~~ % LOGGED AND FILED

EVIEW COMMITTE

305.4 613.1, G.C. Equipment Operator Rate of Pay Book



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

## RECEIVED AUG 3 1 1987

General Construction Grievance 3-1627-86-135 P-RC 1195

August 28, 1987

PHIL G. DAMASK, Chairman General Construction Local Investigating Committee BARRY J. HUMPHREY, Chairman General Construction Local Investigating Committee

Grievance Issue

This case involves the alleged inappropriate assignment of the Line Truck Driver classification to operate a hydraulic straight boom truck mounted crane rated at 17 tons.

## Facts of the Case

In April 1986, the Company rented a hydraulic straight boom truck mounted crane rated at 17 tons. However, the Company had the truck rigged with only a two-part cable with a 7.5 tons lifting capacity.

The truck was used to haul material to the job site and with an attached personnel bucket to lift men and material while working on 230 KV tower lines in the Stockton area.

Union filed a grievance on December 8, 1986 indicating that the Company should be assigning Crane Operators to operate this piece of equipment based on the Crane Operator's definition in Exhibit X.

## Discussion

Company member opined that the truck was rigged to lift only 7.5 tons and that the complexity to operate the boom was comparable to the requirements and job duties of a Line Truck Driver or Special Driver.

Union members opined that the skill level to operate and job definitions were the governing factors in this case to determine the appropriate classification. Whether or not the equipment is used or rigged to lift 5, 7.5, or 17 tons at any given time, when a crane rated capacity is above 10 tons, the Crane Operator classification is appropriate. Further, the Union opined that this truck was similar to the Grove 12-ton crane. P-RC 1195

## Settlement

The Committee discussed the case at length and reviewed the job descriptions in Exhibit X in addition to the equipment specifications included in the Local Investigating Committee report.

Based on the facts of this case, the Committee agreed that the Company should have utilized the Crane Operator classification when assigning these duties to qualified employees.

Therefore, Committee agreed to settle this case on the basis that beginning 30 days prior to the date the grievance was filed until the present, that Company pay the Crane Operator rate to those employee(s) only on those days and for the period of time during which this equipment was operated consistent with the provisions of Section 304.2. This decision is referred back to the Local Investigating Committee to determine affected employee(s) and settlement. Based on the foregoing, this case is closed and such closure should be so noted on the Joint Grievance Committee minutes.

DAVID J. BERGMAN, Chairman Review Committee

MAShort(2-1123):mlp

ROGER W. STALCUP, Secretary Review Committee