



REVIEW COMMITTEE



PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY
LABOR RELATIONS DEPARTMENT
375 N. WIGET LANE, SUITE 130
WALNUT CREEK, CA 94598
(530) 246-6430

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

ROBIN WIX, CHAIRMAN

- ☐ DECISION
- ☐ LETTER DECISION
- ☐ PRE-REVIEW REFERRAL

KIT STICE, SECRETARY

Pre-Review Committee Number 22959 Electric Operations – Hydro – Auburn

Julia Alburquerque-Kurtz
Company Member
Local Investigating Committee

Dave Sankey
Union Member
Local Investigating Committee

Subject of the Grievance

This case concerns the issuance of a Decision Making Leave (DML) to a Telecommunications Technician for defacing the personal property of a third party.

Facts of the Case

The grievant is a Hydro Telecommunications Technician with 12 years of service. The grievant had no active discipline at the time of the incident.

On November 23, 2014, the Company received a customer complaint claiming that a PG&E employee wrote on her car windshield and later drove by and told her to not park in that area, repeating his direction after she apologized for parking there.

The grievant observed an unattended third party vehicle parked close to a PG&E gate where a sign was posted "Caution – Keep Clear". The grievant proceeded to write backwards on the outside of the front windshield "Do not park in front of the gate or you will be towed" in black marker. The grievant returned to the area later in the day and observed the customer walking toward her vehicle and told her "You can't park there." The customer apologized to the grievant and he repeated "You can't park there."

Discussion

The Union argued that, per the grievant's statements at the LIC, he was trying to be helpful by advising the customer to not park near the gate. He wanted her to understand that doing so may result in her vehicle being towed. The grievant also stated that writing on the window in black marker that was easily washed off was his attempt to be witty. When he saw her later in the day returning to her vehicle with her dog, he verbally told her not to park there in a non-threatening manner. The Union argued a DML was excessive for a 12 year employee with no active discipline.

The Company argued that the grievant's actions were disrespectful and reflected negatively on the Company. He intentionally defaced a customer's personal property by writing on her window with a black marker, and then confronted the customer by verbally telling her not to park there twice, once following her apology for parking near the gate. Furthermore, the grievant's statement that he was only trying to be witty and helpful is not believable and demonstrates that he has no regard for other's personal property or maintaining a positive public image for the Company.

Decision

Following much discussion regarding the grievant's actions, the Committee agreed in this specific case the DML was issued for just cause. This case is closed without adjustment.

Robin Wix 7/7/15
Robin Wix, Chairman Date
Review Committee

Kit Stice 7/7/2015
Kit Stice, Secretary Date
Review Committee