



REVIEW COMMITTEE



PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY
LABOR RELATIONS DEPARTMENT
375 N. WIGET LANE, SUITE 130
WALNUT CREEK, CA 94598
(408) 282-7464

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 24780 Gas Operations – Gas T&D – Vacaville

Brenda Legge
Company Member
Local Investigating Committee

Keith Hopp
Union Member
Local Investigating Committee

Subject of the Grievance

At issue with this grievance is whether it was appropriate to assign a two person crew to a gas leak repair located on a street in accordance with Letter Agreement No. 14-35.

Facts of the Case

In September 2018, the Grievant, a Gas Crew Leader-Arc and an Equipment Operator were sent to a Grade 1 leak in Woodland during the workday. They called for Traffic Control as the location was 5 feet into the street and at a corner. The supervisor was also present at the job site. Shortly after the end of the regular workday, the Grievant requested the supervisor call out a 3rd person due to the amount of work to be performed. The supervisor responded that they would “see what they had going and we can get further assistance if needed.” The supervisor did unsuccessfully attempt to get a third person at some point during the evening.

The supervisor remained on the job site with the crew until about 2:00 a.m. During that time, he performed some tasks such as handing the crew a tool and watching for safety. At approximately 2:30 a.m., the Grievant contacted another Equipment Operator to assist. The second Equipment Operator worked with the crew until the work was completed at 4:00 a.m.

Discussion

The Company maintained that in this specific case, there was no requirement under LA 14-35 to utilize a 3rd Person on the crew. In addition, neither the utilization of Traffic Control nor the supervisor observing the job site do not require the additional staffing.

The Union stated that the excavation of the street, the work performed by the supervisor, and the language of LA 14-35 required the company to call out an additional crew member.


Decision

The parties could not reach agreement as to whether a 3rd person is required or not under the provisions of LA 14-35 (which has been updated by LA 19-16). However, the parties agreed that given the supervisors initial call for assistance and performance of de minimus work and the Grievant ultimately reaching out for a third crew member due to the amount of work performed, a third person was required for this specific assignment.

It was not clear to the Review Committee if the weekly 212 list was exhausted and/or if there may have been a bypass as no overtime records were provided by the Local Investigating Committee. Therefore, this case is remanded back to the Local Investigating Committee to review the weekly call out records and to determine if any bypass payment was appropriate.


This case should be considered closed based on the above and considered without prejudice and non-transferable toward any other cases related to LA 19-16 and crew size.

For the Company:

 08/12/2020

Kathy Ledbetter, Chairperson Date
Review Committee

For the Union:

 08/12/2020

Lloyd Cargo, Secretary Date
Review Committee