

REVIEW COMMITTEE



PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY LABOR RELATIONS DEPARTMENT MAIL CODE N2Z P.O. BOX 770000 SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94177 (415) 973-6725

JOHN MOFFAT, CHAIRMAN

DECISION LETTER DECISION PRE-REVIEW REFERRAL RECEIVED by LU 1245
August 13, 2010

CASE CLOSED
FILED & LOGGED

INTERNATIONAL BROTHERHOOD OF ELECTRICAL WORKERS, AFL-CIO LOCAL UNION 1245, I.B.E.W. P.O. BOX 2547 VACAVILLE, CALIFORNIA 94696 (707) 452-2700

BOB CHOATE, SECRETARY

Review Committee No. 19168

Customer Care – Gas Service – San Rafael

Carol Quinney
Company Member
Local investigating Committee

Joe Osterlund Union Member Local Investigating Committee

Grievance Issue:

The termination of a short service Gas Service Representative (GSR) for failing to inspect a customer's wall heaters and falsifying FAS entries.

Facts of the Case:

The grievant was hired as a Meter Reader on January 27, 2003 and became a GSR on July 4, 2005.

He was terminated on May 5, 2009.

A customer called to reconnect their range after the grievant disconnected it due to double adaptor and a leak in the flex line. The GSR making the repair asked the customer if the previous GSR, grievant, had checked the wall furnace and she said "no". The GSR explained the policy on wall furnaces and she allowed him to check them. The first wall first wall furnace was inoperable due to the safety not holding. The GSR cleaned the pilot on the first wall furnace and placed the unit into operation. The second wall furnace had a spill switch that was bypassed which is a bypassed safety switch which could allow products of incomplete combustion to enter the home, and an incorrect wall furnace cover which blocked the side of the draft diverter opening. The second wall furnace was disconnected and a hazard notice was issued to the customer and advised that repairs were needed.

The tag issued for the original leak and completed by the grievant indicated that he inspected both wall furnaces in operation and that he shut the pilots off (seasonal).

Discussion:

Union argued that the action taken was too severe. The reason he did not check the wall heaters was because the customer asked him to leave and not to light the heaters because she feared that there was residual gas in the house. In addition the Union argued that the requirement to check wall heaters is not reinforced in the field and is only emphasized when the GSR goes through training. The grievant made a mistake in completing the form. Further, the grievant felt pressured to hurry through jobs as jobs are score carded which affects his efficiency rating.

Company argued that the grievant left a hazard and entered into FAS that he in fact inspected both wall furnaces in operation, when the work was not performed. On the form the grievant deliberately indicated that he inspected both wall furnaces in operation and he manually had to enter that information into FAS.

He also entered that he shut the pilots off which he did not do. The Company felt fortunate that the hazard was discovered by another GSR.

The Committee reviewed the information entered by the grievant and it was a clear falsification of the FAS records. A hazardous condition was left and the customer was put at risk. It is clear that both wall furnaces needed to be inspected by Company policy. It is emphasized in the GSR school as well as the training binder and has not changed for years. It is a well known policy.

Decision

The discharge was for just cause and this case is closed without adjustment

For the Company:

John Moffat Gayle Hamilton **Dave Morris** Mike Savage

For the Union:

Bob Choate William R. Bouzek Louis Mennel Karen Russel

By: Sort Charles

Date: 8/11/2010