



# REVIEW COMMITTEE

RECEIVED FEB 20 1998

**IBEW**



PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY  
201 MISSION STREET, ROOM 1508  
MAIL CODE P15B  
P.O. BOX 770000  
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA 94177  
(415) 973-8510

**CASE CLOSED  
FILED & LOGGED**

INTERNATIONAL BROTHERHOOD OF  
ELECTRICAL WORKERS, AFL-CIO  
LOCAL UNION 1245, I.B.E.W  
P.O. BOX 4790  
WALNUT CREEK, CALIFORNIA 94596  
(510) 933-6060  
R.W. STALCUP, SECRETARY

MARGARET A. SHORT, CHAIRMAN

- DECISION
- LETTER DECISION
- PRE-REVIEW REFERRAL

**North Bay Division Grievance No. SNR-97-04  
Fact Finding File No. 6568-97-99  
Pre-Review Committee No. 2127**

**CAROL QUINNEY**  
Company Member  
Local Investigating Committee

**LARRY PIERCE**  
Union Member  
Local Investigating Committee

**Subject**

This case concerns a work jurisdiction dispute between the Physical and Clerical bargaining units over the computer inputting of Electric Maintenance Tags.

**Facts**

In May of 1995, the Facility Assessment Condition Tracking System (FACTS) was created to track FACTS tags. FACTS tags, which are completed by field personnel (such as Troublemens, Inspectors, Electric Crew Foremen), are reports of conditions of the electric system needing maintenance. Once the tags are received from the field, they are inputted into the system.

Prior to 1995, there was no formal system for tracking maintenance tags. According to the Local Investigating Committee Report, the supervisor would keep the tags in his desk and assign the work to crews.

**Discussion**

Initially, the Company argued that the work could appropriately be assigned to the Clerical Bargaining Unit. Data input is clerical in nature and is reflected as a benchmark duty statement in the Clerical Evaluation Process. Additionally, this work did not exist prior to 1995, therefor no work has been removed from the Physical Bargaining Unit.


The Union maintained that the work clearly falls within the jurisdiction of the Foreman's Clerk and/or Assistant Foreman's Clerk classifications. The job definitions for these classifications detail working in the Electric General Foreman's office and "...performing clerical work and assisting in administrative work of such office". The job definitions further describe record keeping and work associated with assigning jobs to crews.

Jurisdictional disputes between Foreman's Clerks and Operating Clerical positions are certainly not new to the grievance procedure. Such issues have been addressed in P-RCs 1280, 1290, 1311, 1317, 1361, 1362, 1472, 1457 and RC 1672. The consistent finding in all these cases was best summed up in P-RC 1472 which clarified that "...work generated out of the General Foreman's office in the Electric T&D Department is appropriately assigned to the Foreman's Clerk or Assistant Foreman's Clerk".

Given that the work in dispute is generated out of the office of the supervisor responsible for Electric T&D, the P-RC agrees that the work is appropriately assigned to the Foreman's Clerk or Assistant Foreman's Clerk. The Pre-Review Committee recognizes there may be locations where no Foreman's Clerk or Assistant Foreman's Clerk is established to perform the work. In those situations if the Company does not choose to establish a Foreman's Clerk or Assistant Foreman's Clerk or to assign the work to a Foreman's Clerk or Assistant Foreman's Clerk at another location, it is the recommendation of the Pre-Review Committee that Company propose a letter of agreement to the Union to assign work that is the jurisdiction of the Physical Bargaining Unit to an existing Clerical Bargaining Unit classification.

Decision


This grievance is closed with the above understandings.



Margaret A. Short, Chairman  
Review Committee

2/20/98

Date



Roger W. Stalcup, Secretary  
Review Committee

2/20/98

Date