



**REVIEW COMMITTEE**  
Arbitration No. 352



PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY  
LABOR RELATIONS DEPARTMENT  
375 N. WIGET LANE, SUITE 130  
WALNUT CREEK, CA 94598  
(415) 973-8599

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

KATHY LEDBETTER, CHAIRPERSON

LLOYD CARGO, SECRETARY

**Review Committee Number 23948**  
**Gas Pipeline Operations & Maintenance – San Carlos**

Brenda Legge  
Company Member  
Local Investigating Committee

Roberto Balistreri  
Union Member  
Local Investigating Committee

Subject of the Grievance

This case concerns whether the Grievant, a San Carlos Gas Control Technician, is entitled to an upgrade to a Lead Gas Control Technician while training a Provisional Gas Control Technician.

Facts of the Case

The Union contends that the grievant provided on the job (in the field) training to a provisional Gas Control Tech. The Company contends the Grievant provided job shadowing or “on the job training” to a provisional Gas Control Tech. The training the grievant provided assisted in the development of the provisional employee’s skills and abilities as it relates to his job duties to become a fully qualified Gas Control Tech.

The Company creates a training plan for provisional employees which must be approved by the Joint Apprenticeship Training Committee (JATC) and completed within 12 months (with the ability to extend 6 months with JATC approval) from placement into a provisional journeyman classification. Failure to complete the required training within the allotted timeframe results in the employee’s removal from the position. The provisional Gas Control Tech in this case had an identified training plan, approved by the JATC, which was scheduled to be completed within 12 months from his placement into the provisional position.

The Lead Gas Control Tech’s job description includes “providing field training as required.” The Gas Control Tech’s job description includes the following: “Employee may be required to act in a lead capacity, supervising the work of other employees in lower classifications engaged in this work.”

It is a common practice across the system that experienced journeymen provide job shadowing or “on the job training” to other employees entering a new position or service area. Some training is specific to equipment or tasks performed at the specific headquarters or service area, which may differ from other work locations; and other training is to develop the employee’s knowledge/skills/abilities of assigned work tasks that may be the same systemwide.

#### Discussion

The Company maintained that in this case, the two journeymen were working alongside one another. It has been a long standing practice that the demonstration of a specific task or function between journeymen does not meet the threshold of formal training. The Grievant was not responsible for the provisional training plan of the other CGT provisional journeyman and therefore no upgrade was required in this case as the training that took place was on the job training of another journeyman.

The Union opined that in this case, the two journeymen (provisional and incumbent) were not working alongside each other. A provisional journeyman is deemed so because of an absence of knowledge or skills that require training in order for the provisional journeyman to maintain his/her current “journeyman” position. If the provisional journeyman is unsuccessful in completing his/her training, he/she is removed from the position under the JATC training plan. Therefore, the Lead Gas Control Tech is responsible for providing field training. This is specifically stated in the Lead’s job description. Conversely, providing required training is not listed in the Gas Control Tech job description. Since the Grievant is not responsible for the provisional training plan of the other journeyman, he/she should be upgraded to Lead Control Tech when asked to perform this required provisional training in the field.

The Review Committee discussed the intent of the parties during negotiations of LA 14-40 with respect to the Lead Gas Control Tech’s job description. During negotiations, the parties recognized that “field training” would be required given the anticipated number of “provisional” job awards and approved training plans following implementation of the agreement. As such, the Union opined that the intent of the newly created Lead Gas Control Technician classification included the requirement to provide “field training” for these employees.

The Company agreed that field training would be required, but the intent of adding this specific job duty to the Lead Gas Control Tech’s job description was in combination with the expectation that the Lead Gas Control Tech would provide team training on items such as the roll-out of new safety related topics, compliance or other job related training, and not focused on directly training an individual on required Operator Qualifications (OQ’s). The Lead classification would maintain oversight in making sure the employees below them have and maintain their required qualifications. The peer to peer training that occurs in the field on a daily basis has been established as a responsibility of a journey classification, and not specifically, or only, by that of a Lead journeyman.

The Lead Gas Control Tech language, as with most other Lead classifications, is that the Lead makes sure the OQ’s are maintained. It does not state they are responsible for providing the training on OQ’s.

#### Decision

The Review Committee has discussed this case at length and agreed to an equity settlement specific to the Grievant and a second employee identified in the LIC report. The Committee

remands this decision back to the Local Investigating Committee to review the time records for both employees and to pay any applicable temporary upgrade pay.


Furthermore, the committee agreed that upgrade pay will only apply when a Gas Control Technician is providing on the job training for a Gas Control Technician in a provisional training plan. Specifically, when the training provided assists in the development of the provisional employee's skills and abilities as it relates to the employee's training plan to become a fully qualified Gas Control Technician.

This agreement does not apply to any other journey classification in a provisional plan outside of the Gas Control Technician Line of Progression. The committee acknowledges that an upgrade is not appropriate simply because a Gas Control Technician is in the field with a Gas Control Technician on a provisional training plan. Furthermore, a temporary upgrade to the Lead Gas Control Technician is not required when a Gas Control Technician is assigned to provide training in the field to another employee to perform Gas Control Technician job duties.

The Committee further agrees that no employee other than the two employees noted above shall be entitled to upgrade compensation for work performed prior to the date of this settlement. Any other disputes arising as a result of this agreement shall not be considered timely and will be addressed on a going forward basis.

Based on the above, the grievance is settled and closed.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Kathy Ledbetter, Chairperson      Date  
Review Committee

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Lloyd Cargo, Secretary      Date  
Review Committee