

PG and E

FOR INTRA - COMPANY USES

DIVISION OR DEPARTMENT INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS
FILE NO. 741.5
RE LETTER OF
SUBJECT Review Committee File No. 1385-75-14
 Shasta Division Grievance No. 13-75-8
 Non-Bargaining Unit Service Representative
 Performing Troubleman Duties

November 7, 1975

MR. A. E. HENDERSON, Chairman
Shasta Division
Joint Grievance Committee

The above-subject grievance has been discussed by the Review Committee and is being returned to the Division for settlement in accordance with the following:

The record indicates that the Joint Grievance Committee's principal disagreement concerns the propriety of the non-bargaining unit Service Representative performing Troubleman duties. Additionally, the ancillary issue of whether a Troubleman/Service Representative can combine with T&D employees as the third member of a crew to perform emergency work.

As to the principal issue in the case, the Service Representative's classification was excluded from the unit by agreement of the parties at the time of the certification of the IBEW physical bargaining unit in 1950. It was recognized, at that time, that this classification would perform job duties of the Troubleman classification, among other things. The Company, at a later date, agreed that the number of Service Representatives would not expand beyond the original number of Service Representatives at the time of the certification. As of this date, there are 17 Service Representatives in the system, which is less than the original number of Service Representatives in 1950. Therefore, the Review Committee agrees that the assignment of Troubleman duties to the Service Representative in this case was not in violation of the Labor Agreement.

The record, although somewhat inconclusive, indicates that the Service Representative was the first employee at the job site, and it was necessary for him to deenergize the line and stand by for security reasons until a crew arrived. After permanent repairs were completed, the Service Representative then energized the line, and the job was completed. The facts reveal that a Troubleman or Service Representative was needed at the outset of the job primarily to troubleshoot the problem. However, once the decision was made to make permanent repairs, the Service Representative was only needed up until the time the crew reported to the job site. Once the repairs were made, the crew could have energized the line without the assistance of the Service Representative.

2/17

November 7, 1975

In view of the circumstances surrounding this case, it is the opinion of the Review Committee that one other T&D employee should have been called at the time the other two members of the crew were called inasmuch as supervision had advance notice that permanent repairs were necessary, and the Service Representative was only needed up until the time the crew arrived at the job site. Finally, this decision should not be construed to disturb the practice of adding the Troublemaker to the crew as an extra hand when the situation warrants or the combining of a Troublemaker with other Line employees to make up a crew in situations where there is insufficient response to an emergency call-out.

To settle this case, the Joint Grievance Committee should determine who would have been assigned as the third member of the crew and make the necessary wage adjustments in accordance with Subsection 212.11(b) of the Agreement.

When a settlement is reached by the Joint Grievance Committee, the Review Committee should be sent a copy of the final disposition.



L. V. BROWN, Chairman
Review Committee

DJBergman:rto

cc: FCMarks
IWBonbright
JAFairchild
PMatthew
Personnel Managers
LNFoss, IBEW

PG and E
FOR INTRA - COMPANY USES

INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS

JUN 26 1975

DIVISION OR DEPARTMENT COLGATE-Personnel
FILE No. 741.5
RE LETTER OF
SUBJECT Colgate Division Grievance No. 12-75-2
Local Investigating Committee No. 12-75-1
Division Grievance Committee No. 12-75-2
Upgrade of Lineman to Troublemán

IWB
KHA
DJB

LVB
MMC
PMH

PNL
RTO
RLS

June 24, 1975

RECEIVED

JUN 27 1975

L.U. 1245 I.B.E.W.

MR. L. V. BROWN:
CHAIRMAN OF THE REVIEW COMMITTEE

The above subject grievance is being returned to the Review Committee for settlement.

It was the opinion of the Pre-Review Committee that the interpretation being used by the Division was proper. (Copy of Pre-Review letter attached.)

The Division offered to settle this grievance on the basis of the Pre-Review Committee's opinion during the Joint Grievance Committee meeting of June 17. The Union rejected this settlement, stating they did not agree with the Pre-Review opinion. They requested it be referred to the Review Committee again.

D. N. STRUNK
D. N. STRUNK
CHAIRMAN, COLGATE DIVISION
JOINT GRIEVANCE COMMITTEE

JLMacDonald:lm

cc: GNRadford
TMorgado
Company Joint Grievance Committee Members
Union Joint Grievance Committee Members

Attach.

DIVISION OR
DEPARTMENT
FILE No.
RE LETTER OF
SUBJECT

INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS
741.5

~~JLM~~ MAY 30 1975 LRM

Colgate Division Grievance No. D.Gr/C 12-75-2
Upgrade of Lineman to Troublemaker

May 27, 1975

MR. D. N. STRUNK, Chairman
Colgate Division
Joint Grievance Committee

The above-subject grievance has been discussed by the Pre-Review Committee prior to its docketing on the agenda of the Review Committee and is being returned to the Division for settlement in accordance with the following:

In reviewing the records submitted to the Review Committee, it appears that this situation has occurred in Colgate Division in the past, and the Division has followed the procedure as outlined in A. G. Mollart's letter, dated February 28, 1968. If this is the case and the Division has been consistent in their application, the Pre-Review Committee is of the opinion that the interpretation, as described by Mr. Mollart in his February 28, 1968 letter, is proper. Additionally, the Pre-Review Committee agrees that the assignment of the Lineman was not an emergency overtime situation, and the provisions of Title 212 are not applicable.

When a settlement is reached by the Joint Grievance Committee, the Review Committee should be sent a copy of the final disposition.

L. V. Brown

L. V. BROWN, Chairman
Review Committee

DJBergman:rto

cc: GNRadford
IWBonbright
JLMacDonald
LNFoss, IBEW