

REVIEW COMMITTEE DECISION

Review Committee File No. 311
San Francisco Division Grievance No. 140

Subject of the Grievance

The grievance concerns certain maintenance employees who were assigned to perform maintenance work at the Hunters Point Power Plant. The crew of seven employees was assigned to an additional work period extending from 4:30 p.m. to 1:00 a.m., allowing one-half hour for a meal. The employees performed work on the No. 4 and No. 2 Units at the Hunters Point Power Plant for a period of approximately four weeks when they were rotated back to their regular schedule of work hours. Subsequently, four weeks later, the crew was again rotated back to the additional work period where they continued to perform the repair work started on the No. 3 Unit at the power plant. They continued the repairs until they were completed on June 2, 1961.

It is the contention of the grievants that the reassignment to the additional work schedule and the performance of work on a new unit constituted the beginning of a new four-day period.

Discussion

It has been agreed that this grievance will be settled in accordance with the recently agreed-to Clarification of Section 202.17. It is provided in the Clarification that in the rotation of the assignment of employees, as provided for in Section 202.17, an employee is entitled to overtime compensation outside of regular work hours for only one first four-work day period in any one situation. Additionally, where emergency work is being performed in one plant under Section 202.17 and the revised schedule of work hours is continued to include other work created under emergency conditions in the same plant to which 202.17 is applicable, a single situation is deemed to exist; if notice has been given at least five work days before such work is commenced. Otherwise a new emergency situation will be deemed to exist, starting on the day such other work is commenced and another first four-work day period will be involved.

In this case, it is noted that the repairs to the No. 4 and No. 2 Units were continuous; that apparently following the completion of the repairs to these units, the additional work periods were continued uninterrupted to perform repairs to the No. 3 Unit. Although formal notice was not a requirement at the time the work was performed, as the work was scheduled in advance it is assumed that the employees were aware of the continuation of the work and that advance notice could have been given.

Decision

Under the facts stated above, it is the decision of the Review Committee that a new emergency situation did not exist and the employees are not entitled to a second first four-work day period.

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