

REVIEW COMMITTEE DECISION

Review Committee File Number 286  
East Bay Division Grievance Number 185

Subject of Grievance

A Senior Control Operator at Pittsburg Power Plant continued to work until 8:00 p.m. following his regular shift which ended at 4:00 p.m. At the end of the four hour overtime period, he was released from work after which he ate at a local restaurant. The employee submitted a receipt of \$2.24, requesting reimbursement for the cost of the meal. Plant supervision refused payment and informed the grievant that he would be paid \$1.50 which he was entitled to under Section 104.12 of the Agreement.

Discussion

Section 104.12 reads "The provisions of this Title shall apply to shift employees, except that where it is not practicable for Company to provide meals on the job for such employees as herein provided, they shall provide their own meals and Company shall reimburse them for the cost thereof not to exceed one dollar and fifty cents (\$1.50) for each meal".

In Arbitration Case No. 10 involving an interpretation of the same Section and a factual situation not too different from that in this grievance, the Arbiter ruled among other things that the employee was entitled to reimbursement for the full cost of a meal he had purchased from a local restaurant. While the Decision in such case was limited to Kern Power Plant, there is no reason why as an alternative to reimbursing an employee for \$1.50 when he eats on the job it can not be applied to other locations under similar circumstances involving overtime work for Operators of between 1½ and 4 hours beyond regular work hours.

Decision

The employee should be reimbursed for the cost of the meal purchased by him (\$2.24) but is not entitled to be paid for time to eat it.

FOR UNION:

Kenneth Stevenson  
W. M. Fleming  
L. L. Mitchell

By L. L. Mitchell

Date Feb, 15, 1962

FOR COMPANY:

E. F. Sibley  
C. L. Yager  
V. J. Thompson

By V. J. Thompson

Date February 13, 1962

International Brotherhood of  
Electrical Workers  
Local 1245

and

Pacific Gas & Electric Company

Review Case #175

San Joaquin Grievance #137

' Arbitration Case #10

' Issue: As applied to the facts  
' of this case and within the  
' meaning of Sections 104.1, 104.4,  
' 104.10 and 104.12 of the Agree-  
' ment dated September 1, 1952, as  
' amended, was the Company re-  
' quired to provide a meal for  
' Leland Massie when, on August 26,  
' 1958, he worked four hours be-  
' yond his regular quitting time?

' Date of Opinion: May 5, 1960

Facts of the Case: On August 26, 1958, Leland Massie, a shift employee at the Kern Power Plant, whose regular shift is from 8:00 AM to 4:00 PM, was advised that he would have to work an additional four hours. He asked the Shift Foreman if the Company was going to furnish him with a meal and when the Company refused, the Union Shop Steward obtained a meal from Ray's Steak House at a cost of \$1.94. The Company would only reimburse him \$1.50 for the meal, contending that this discharged their obligation in full with respect to the meal in question.

The issue in this case is whether the Company is required to provide a meal for shift employees in such situations.

Prior to August, 1958, the practice with respect to meals for shift employees working four hours' overtime varied. About half the employees kept food in their lockers, and provided their own meals with the help of hot plates furnished by the Company, for which they were reimbursed \$1.50 per meal. The others customarily waited until their shift was finished, and then dropped in to Ray's Steak House, which was about three and one-half miles from the plant, for a hot meal. Here they merely signed the check, and the Company reimbursed the restaurant directly.

This situation came to an end on August 6, 1958, when the superintendent of the Kern Plant posted the following notice on the Plant bulletin board:

"In order to clear up misunderstanding relative to shift workers on overtime, your attention is directed to Titles 104.1 and 104.3 of the Contract. They specifically state the employee is to furnish his own meal and is to be paid one dollar fifty cents (\$1.50) for each meal and that he shall not be allowed additional time there at Company's expense. Hot plates and a refrigerator are provided and each shift man has his own locker. Please conform to the provisions of these Titles."

It was against the background of this notice, which presumably barred further visits to Ray's Steak House at Company expense, that the demand which gave rise to the present grievance was raised.

Arbitration Case #10

The Union contends that it was eminently practicable for the Company to supply a meal under the circumstances at issue in this case: that this could have been done by having catering services in the area bring in food, or by sending someone in the plant to obtain it. Quite clearly, it would have been practicable for the Company to provide this man with a meal. As a matter of fact, he provided a meal for himself and since he provided a meal for himself by sending someone to the restaurant, it seems to us pretty unreasonable for the Company to say that it was impracticable within the meaning of 104.12 for them to have provided it.

The Company maintains that what is at issue is: "(1) whether the Company must go into the restaurant business, or (2) whether the Company may continue to follow the long standing custom and practice of reimbursing shift employees for meals obtained from their lockers." It argues that the overwhelming custom and practice throughout the PG&E system, not only at the Kern Plant, is for the shift employees to feed themselves from their lockers and accept reimbursement of \$1.50.

### Opinion

The interpretation of Section 104.12 has given rise to controversy for more than a decade, and this grievance was pursued by the Union as a test case in order to secure a general rule for the future guidance of the parties. It should be noted at the outset, however, that the submission agreement limits determination of the issue "as applied to the facts of this case". It would be beyond the competence of the Board of Arbitration to attempt to lay down a general rule in the face of so clear a mandate from the parties. Moreover, such a determination would involve the ascertainment of facts far beyond what was attempted in this case. It would be necessary, for example, to examine the location of all Company plants, their proximity to catering services, the cost of food delivery at different times of the day or night, and the manner in which the contract clause has been interpreted generally.

Limiting ourselves to the Kern Power Plant, it appears that over the years, local management and employees had worked out a reasonable system of provisions. Those employees who wanted to do so kept food in their lockers and heated it on Company-supplied hot plates. Occasionally, if there was enough notice, employees who were coming in on their regular shifts were called and asked to bring sandwiches or other food. And in some cases, the employees preferred to wait until their four hour extra shifts were over and stop in at a local restaurant for a meal at Company expense.

This modus vivendi was terminated by the Company notice of August 6, 1958, which sought to limit employees to reimbursement of \$1.50 for food which they provided themselves. The question before us is whether this was an appropriate exercise of the Company's discretionary power pursuant to the provisions of Section 104.12.

Under the specific circumstances of this case, we do not believe that it was. The Company sought to show by testimony that there are very few circumstances, if any, in which it is "practicable" to furnish meals on the job to shift employees, either because of expense or limiting physical conditions. In its view, Section 104.12 should be read as though the first half were deleted, with shift employees virtually limited to reimbursement for meals which they provided themselves.

We cannot agree with this interpretation. The meal system in operation at Kern was obviously practicable, as evidenced by the fact that it was in effect for a number of years. Provision of a meal on the job came to include, by custom and usage, the employee's privilege of stopping for a reasonably priced meal at a local restaurant at the conclusion of the shift.

On the other hand, we do not regard as a reasonable interpretation of the contract the Union's insistence that a meal should have been brought in to Mr. Massie. We are impressed with the absence of large scale commercial catering in the Kern area; with the irregularity of the service which would be required; with the general unavailability of personnel to go out and bring food in; and with the cost that might be involved. We doubt that either party intended that the Union Shop Steward, or any other employee, should be converted into a regular food messenger. Mr. Massie was entitled only to continue his previous practice of stopping at a local restaurant, with which the Company had made suitable arrangements, to eat his meal at the conclusion of the overtime shift.

The Union is not claiming reimbursement for the costs incidental to procuring the meal, but only for the meal itself, just as though Mr. Massie had actually eaten it at the restaurant. Under the circumstances, he is entitled to reimbursement for the full cost of the meal.

#### Award

1. The Company was under a contractual obligation to provide a meal for Leland Massie when, on August 26, 1958, he worked four hours beyond his regular quitting time.
2. This obligation could have been discharged by permitting Mr. Massie to take his meal, in the customary manner, at a local restaurant after finishing his shift.
3. Section 104.12 did not require the Company to bring a meal for Mr. Massie into the plant during his extra shift.
4. Under the peculiar circumstances of this case, Mr. Massie is entitled to reimbursement for the full cost of the meal delivered to him on August 26, 1958.

/s/ Walter Galenson  
Walter Galenson, Chairman

For the Company:

/s/ Vern Thompson

/s/ N. E. Rhodes

For the Union:

/s/ Mark Cook - Dissent

/s/ Jack E. Wilson - Dissent

oeiu-29  
afi-cio  
72160do

Review Case #175  
Arbitration Case #10