

REVIEW COMMITTEE DECISION

Review Committee File No. 264
Shasta Division Grievance No. 66

Subject of the Grievance

The grievance concerns two Apprentice Machinists who are assigned to the hydro maintenance crew headquartered at the Pit No. 1 Powerhouse. On August 22, 1960, they began to work at the Pit No. 4 Powerhouse on an annual overhaul. They were assigned to work outside of their regular work hours from 4:30 p.m. to 1:00 a.m. and were paid overtime for the first four days of the situation in accord with the provisions of Section 202.17. During the period that they worked at Pit No. 4 they were headquartered at the Pit No. 1 Powerhouse, leaving from and returning there each day. Upon completion of the work at Pit No. 4 on September 2, the crew moved into Pit No. 1 to perform annual overhaul work there, starting September 6, during which time they remained on the 4:30 p.m. to 1:00 a.m. work period.

It is the contention of the grievants that the assignment to the Pit No. 1 constituted the start of a second four-day situation, and that they are entitled to overtime as provided for in Section 202.17 for the first four days of the second assignment.

Discussion

To settle this grievance, the provisions of the recently agreed-to Clarification will be applied retroactively. Section M, Item 1, SCHEDULED OVERHAUL WORK IN MORE THAN ONE PLANT, provides "A single situation under Section 202.17 is deemed to exist where programmed overhauls in more than one plant are to be performed one after the other without a break in programmed work and without a change in the employee's regularly established headquarters or temporary headquarters to which he has been instructed to report under the provisions of Section 202.22.

"In such cases, the plants in which work is to be performed should be announced in advance of the start of the first work day of the situation and the work carried on from one plant to the other consecutively. The program need not provide for completion dates of the various overhauls and changes in the program may be made as long as the work in each plant is scheduled consecutively and not scheduled concurrently."

The facts presented in this case indicate that the scheduled overhauls were contemplated in more than one powerhouse. Further, as the work at Pit No. 1 commenced immediately upon completion of the work at Pit No. 4, it is assumed the overhauls were programmed to be performed one after the other without a break.

Decision

In view of the foregoing, the situation presented by this grievance is deemed to be a single situation under Section 202.17. The change of the work site from the Pit No. 4 to Pit No. 1 does not constitute a new four-day situation. The employees concerned in the grievance are not entitled to overtime compensation for work performed outside of the regular work hours in the second situation.

FOR UNION:

R. W. Fields
W. M. Fleming
L. L. Mitchell

By L. L. Mitchell

Date July 15, 1963

FOR COMPANY:

E. F. Sibley
C. L. Yager
L. V. Brown

By L. V. Brown

Date April 2, 1963