



# REVIEW COMMITTEE

613.1 & 305.5: Bypass of  
Lineman for temp upgrade  
when regular Subfmm  
absent from job site.

## IBEW



PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY  
215 MARKET STREET, ROOM 916  
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA 94106  
(415) 973-1125

JAN 25 1990

**CASE CLOSED  
LOGGED AND FILED**

RECEIVED JAN 23 1990

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

General Construction Grievance No. 3-1947-89-52  
P-RC 1386

January 18, 1990

BYRON TOMLINSON, Chairman  
General Construction  
Joint Grievance Committee

BARRY HUMPHREY, Chairman  
General Construction  
Joint Grievance Committee

### Subject of the Grievance

This case concerns appropriate temporary upgrades of Linemen to Subforeman "A".

### Facts of the Case

Over a two-month period of time, Line Construction was performing a job that consisted of large pole replacement. The crew involved on this job consisted of seven employees: two Linemen, one Driver and a Groundman assigned to one line truck and two Linemen and a Driver to the second line truck. A Subforeman "A" was in charge of the entire job.

The two trucks usually worked in different locations with the Subforeman "A" either at the job site or within radio contact.

The work performed was generally of a routine nature but did include setting new poles, sometimes in hot lines, and installing line cut-outs when jumpers were open. The Subforeman "A" was present for most of the opening of jumpers. Tailboards were presented at the Victor headquarters yard. The Subforeman told the crew what material was needed for the day's work and generally laid out the plan for the day.

### Discussion

Company argued that every job is different and that visual contact is not always necessary. The Subforeman was providing supervision at the jobsite or by radio contact.

Union argued that because the crew was separated into two work groups, working independently of each other and, therefore, they must be considered two crews and have separate Foremen.

January 18, 1990

Settlement

The Committee reviewed Review Committee Decision Nos. 1616, 364 and 388 and agreed that when a job involves electrical work and the Subforeman is not present, an upgrade is warranted to provide proper supervision. The Committee agrees, therefore, that in the instant case, the grievants should be temporarily upgraded to Subforeman "A" when the Foreman is not present for more than two hours.

The Committee directs this case back to the Local Investigating Committee to determine those times when an upgrade was, in fact, warranted.

Based on the foregoing, this case is closed and such closure should be noted in the minutes of the Joint Grievance Committee.



DAVID J. BERGMAN, Chairman  
Review Committee



ROGER W. STALCUP, Secretary  
Review Committee

RLBolf(223-5665):mc