

INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS

741.5

Review Committee File No. 623
North Bay Division Grievance No. 4-64-20

November 24, 1965

MR. D. K. STUART
North Bay Division
Joint Grievance Committee

The Union has recently informed the Company members of the Review Committee that the above subject grievance has been withdrawn from the agenda of the Review Committee. We are attaching a copy of the Union's letter of withdrawal for your information.

It will be in order for you to note in the minutes of your next Division Joint Grievance Committee meeting that this case is considered closed.

L. V. BROWN
L. V. BROWN, Chairman
Review Committee

LVB:KM
Attach.

cc: VJThompson
EFSibley
CLYager
AGMollart
ESDay
✓LLMitchell, I.B.E.W.

#623

November 18, 1965

Mr. L. V. Brown, Chairman
Review Committee
Pacific Gas & Electric Company
245 Market Street
San Francisco, California

Dear Mr. Brown:

Reference is made to Review Committee File No. 623 (North Bay Division Grievance No. 4-64-20).

The matter complained of in this grievance is one which raises a question of breach of faith with the employee who had fulfilled his promise to be available for call to handle incidents such as the one which occurred. We as an organization have been taken to task in the past because certain of our members have refused to volunteer for on call duty. We have provided schedules for employees who volunteered to be available for duty in cases of emergency. We have been called upon to agree that persons in certain classifications will not be arbitrary in connection with removal from these schedules. The acceptance of these obligations by the Union was predicated on a fulfillment by the Company of its obligation to use those persons who had volunteered.

R. C. #623 is a case which seems, to the Union's members of the Review Committee, to be one which can only be resolved by a change in attitude by the local management. While we recognize cooperation is a two-way street, the situation in this case cannot be remedied by the Union. Neither can it be remedied by arbitration regardless of the decision rendered, for it is a human relations problem.

Second guessing a weather condition and not utilizing the on call man, who has voluntarily curtailed his leisure time activity in order to advance the Company's interest by being available for emergency calls, is not conducive to harmony and is certainly a doubtful means of providing efficiency.

Justifying the action with the excuse that the off call man is closer to the scene of trouble and that the on call man might be

Mr. L. V. Brown

-2-

November 18, 1965

needed for a second call (if one should occur) belies the Company claim that stand-by people are needed.

Following this procedure, in calling men for second, third, or further calls, could be justified on the same basis with the net result that the man who was giving up his free time to provide the on call service would wait in vain unless no one else could be located - hardly the situation intended when the provision for developing stand-by lists was negotiated.

While we recognize mistakes can be made in an effort to speed the return of service, it does not make it right to break faith with those who have voluntarily restricted their activity in order to assure that someone will be available without undue delay. We hope this incident was a mistake and not a matter of basic policy. With this thought in mind, we are withdrawing R. C. #623 from the active file without prejudice to further processing of a similar case and will consider this case closed.

Very truly yours,

L. L. Mitchell, Secretary
Review Committee

LLM:do
cc: WMFleming
RWFIELDS

