



# REVIEW COMMITTEE

**IBEW**



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

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

D.J. BERGMAN, CHAIRMAN

- DECISION
- LETTER DECISION
- PRE-REVIEW REFERRAL

Steam Generation Grievance No. SF-24-545-89-51  
Fact Finding Committee No. 4593-89-188  
P-RC 1435

July 9, 1990

BRETT KNIGHT, Company  
Fact Finder

DOROTHY FORTIER, Union  
Fact Finder

The above-referenced grievance has been discussed by the Pre-Review Screening Committee and is being returned to Fact Finding to determine the amount and complexity of instrument fabrication that would have been required to perform the contracted job and interpret the results of the tests. In other words, what would it have taken for PG&E to have done the work?

DAVID J. BERGMAN, Chairman  
Review Committee

ROGER W. STALCUP, Secretary  
Review Committee

RRDoering(223-1124):nj

cc: Kris Cummings

To: ROGER STALCUP / P-RC CMTE  
From: Ed Caruso  
Subject: ANSWERS TO Q's RE: F.F. # 4593 / STM GEN GRIEV.# 89-51  
Date: November 19, 1990

P-RC 1435

=====

Do to the change of H.R. Rep's in S.F. Stm Plts, it was not possible to meet as a cmte to answer your questions. Therefore, the Company has submitted its answers and these are the Union's.

#1. Yes, some of the equipment used could have been fabricated in the I.R. shop. ENCOR used P.G. and E. equipment, set up by shop employees, on straight time, and they provided a few pieces of their own equipment.

#2. It is unknown at this time how long it would have taken. The piece of plastic tube, with holes in it, would not have taken much time, with ENCOR's guidance.

#3. We feel that the \$500.00, the company cited is too high, even including the cost of manpower.

#4. We feel that the I.R. dept. employees could have. Given the length of advanced notice the Plant had to prepare for this overhaul, what the Engineering Dept. wanted to find out, and the experience that P.G. and E's Steam Engineers in the system have.

#5. Yes. (As answered in #4.)

#6. Due to the local Plant Engineering Dept. wasting time for unknown reasons, it would have been close. However, as stated in # 4, there was plenty of advanced notice in this situation to have done almost all of the fabricating/testing by Steam Generation employees. Please keep in mind, the information that ENCOR provided, was of no use to the Plant in determining specifically where the problem was.

The question that needs to be answered is, Why the I.R. employees were not allowed to work with ENCOR on the weekend? ENCOR utilized shop materials and test equipment to augment their "special" equipment. In the past I.R. Dept. employees always set up and ran the tests for the Engineering Dept..

#7. Yes, working with ENCOR we did. Again, this was not a "hard money" contract. ENCOR used a lot of P.G. and E.'s equipment, set up by the I.R. Dept., and we worked with them most of the time.

#8. To some extent, yes. We believe it is within the Job Definition of the Control Tech. to work with Engineers to evaluate test results.

We hope that these answers help clear up the Companies snow job. If you should have any further question, please do not hesitate to contact me and I will attempt to obtain answers to them.

Fraternally,



Ed Caruso

PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY  
STEAM/SAN FRANCISCO GRIEVANCE NO. SF24-545-89-51  
FACT FINDING COMMITTEE NO. 4593-89-188  
PRE-REVIEW CASE NO. 1435

MEMORANDUM OF DISPOSITION

MAR 13 1991  
CASE CLOSED  
LOGGED AND FILED

GRIEVANCE ISSUE:

MAR 12 1991

This grievance concerns whether the Company was in violation of the agreement and Letter Agreement 88-104 for contracting out condenser testing work.

DISCUSSION:

Union contended the Company improperly denied bargaining unit employees classified as Instrument Repairmen the opportunity to work overtime prior to assigning work normally performed by Instrument Repairmen to ENCOR contract employees.

The Company stated that it utilized the I&R group appropriately in conjunction with the work in question. The Plant had exhausted all efforts to utilize the Instrument Repairmen to perform normal tests with plant equipment, but wanted further specific tests to verify the problems identified by the Instrument Repairmen. ENCOR was utilized to perform additional tests with specially fabricated and more technical testing equipment. The ENCOR test results provided confirmation of the accuracy of the previous tests performed by the Instrument Repairmen.

DECISION:

After much discussion, the Committee agreed that there was no violation of LA 88-104 as this was further verification of Instrument Repairmen's previous tests. Based on the above, this case is considered closed without adjustment and without prejudice to either party.

*Ken Ball Jr*  
KEN BALL, JR., For the Union

Concur/Dissent 3-12-91  
Date

*Ed Caruso*  
ED CARUSO, For the Union

Concur/Dissent 3-12-91  
Date

*Brett Knight*  
BRETT KNIGHT, For the Company

Concur/Dissent 2/25/90  
Date

*Lorraine Noss*  
LORRAINE NOSS, For the Company

Concur/Dissent 3/6/91  
Date