

REVIEW COMMITTEE DECISION

Review Committee Files Nos. 1064, 1087, and 1088
San Francisco Division Grievances Nos. D.Gr/C 2-71-6,
D.Gr/C 2-71-12, and D.Gr/C 2-71-13

Statement of Facts

In the first case, Review Committee File No. 1064, the grievants had been prearranged to work overtime on Saturday, February 13, 1971, starting at 11:00 AM. Early on that morning the grievants were called by their supervisors and were instructed to report for work as soon as possible. The facts evidence that they reported for work at 8:00 AM.

In the second and third cases, Review Committee Files Nos. 1087 and 1088, the grievants had been prearranged to work overtime on Saturday, May 8, 1971, starting at midnight. During the afternoon of Saturday, May 8, the grievants were contacted and instructed not to report for work at midnight, but rather to report for work at 8:00 AM on Sunday, May 9, 1971.

The question in each of the cases is whether the change of work hours affected the prearranged status of the jobs.

Discussion

At the outset, it is the Review Committee's conclusion that in the latter two cases, the new work period which was substituted for the prearranged work period must be considered as emergency overtime, whereas in the first case the time for reporting was merely accelerated and the prearranged overtime continued as it had been scheduled.

Turning to Review Committee File No. 1064 first, even though we have concluded that the prearranged work was not cancelled, the facts indicate that there may still be a question with regard to the grievants' entitlement to a noon meal. Thus, although it is not a part of the record before the Review Committee, it can be anticipated that the employees did not have an opportunity to prepare the noon meal requested in this grievance. If this is the case, they are entitled to a Company-furnished meal and the time in which to eat it.

Decision

Review Committee File No. 1064 is referred back to the Joint Grievance Committee to determine if the acceleration of the reporting period prevented the employees from preparing a lunch before reporting for work. If so, the employees are entitled to the cost of such meal, if they purchased one, and for payment of the time in which to eat the meal.

Review Committee Files Nos. 1087 and 1088 are to be settled in accordance with the foregoing and the employees concerned were entitled to a Company-furnished meal and time in which to eat it.

FOR UNION:


W. H. Burr
E. R. Sheldon
L. N. Foss

By 

Date November 9, 1971

FOR COMPANY:

J. A. Fairchild
H. J. Stefanetti
L. V. Brown

By 

Date November 9, 1971