

Albanese Development Corporation d/b/a Holiday Inn Alton and Hotel Employees Restaurant Employees, Southern Illinois Local 15, AFL-CIO, affiliated with International Union of Hotel Employees Restaurant Employees. Case 14-RC-9775

26 June 1984

DECISION ON REVIEW

BY CHAIRMAN DOTSON AND MEMBERS
ZIMMERMAN AND DENNIS

By telegraphic order dated 29 September 1983, the National Labor Relations Board granted the Employer's request for review. The board has delegated its authority in this case to a three-member panel, which has consider the entire record with respect to the issues under review, and makes following findings.

The Employer operates a hotel and restaurant facility which contains 139 guestrooms, banquet facilities, a lounge/bar, a game room, a restaurant, and a large recreation area called the Holidome. Approximately 79 employees work in the facility under the overall supervision on the general manager. All employees are eligible for the same employment benefits and are subject to the same centralized policies concerning grievance procedures, transfers, probations, and rules of conduct.

On 2 September 1983 the Regional Director for Region 14 issued his Decision and Direction of Election in the above-entitled proceeding, in which he found appropriate for the purposes of collective bargaining the petitioned-for unit composed of all full-time and regular part-time housekeeping employees, including maids, laundry employees, and housekeeping housemen at the Employer's Alton, Illinois facility, excluding office clerical and professional employees, guards, and supervisors as defined in the National Labor Relations Act, and all other employees. Thereafter, in accordance with Section 102.67 of the National Labor Relations Board Rules and Regulations, the Employer filed a request for review, contending that the Regional Director had departed from officially reported Board precedent and made clearly erroneous factual findings in directing an election in an allegedly inappropriate unit.

By telegraphic order dated 29 September 1983, the National Labor Relations Board granted the Employer's request for review. The Board has delegated its authority in this case to a three-member panel, which has considered the entire record with respect to the issues under review, and makes the following findings.

The Employer operates a hotel and restaurant facility which contains 139 guestrooms, banquet facilities, a lounge/bar, a game room, a restaurant, and a large recreation area called the Holidome. Approximately 79 employees work in the facility under the overall supervision of the general manager. All employees are eligible for the same employment benefits and are subject to the same centralized policies concerning grievance procedures, transfers, probations, and rules of conduct. All employees punch in and out of work at one of two timeclocks.

The question presented here is whether a bargaining unit limited to those employees in the petitioned-for unit is appropriate. The Employer contends that it is not and that an appropriate unit should include all full-time and regular part-time employees or at least the front desk clerks, banquet housemen, and bellmen in addition to those employees in the petitioned-for unit. The Petitioner has disclaimed interest in proceeding to an election for any unit other than the one found appropriate by the Regional Director.

There are 24 housekeeping and laundry employees in the petitioned-for unit: 17 maids, 4 laundry employees, and 3 housekeeping housemen. The maids clean the guestrooms and furnish them with linens and other staples. The housekeeping housemen pick up soiled linen and trash from the maids' carts, keep the carts stocked, deliver cribs and rollaways to the guestrooms, set up and clean the two conference rooms located in the guestroom area, and vacuum and mop the lounge, game room, and public restrooms. The laundry employees wash, fold, and shelve the soiled laundry, all of which is deposited by other employees at the hotel laundry room.

The housekeeping department employees work only on 8 a.m. to 4:30 p.m. shift. They are separately supervised by the executive housekeeper and the assistant executive housekeeper. They receive the same hourly wage. There have been no employee transfers in or out of the department.

The front desk is maintained by seven desk clerks and four bellmen who are supervised by the front desk manager. The front desk clerks are in charge of reservations, registration, and the billing of hotel, lounge, and restaurant guests. The desk clerks direct guests' requests to bellmen and housekeeping employees and keep a supply of towels at the desk for the guests' convenience. If there are no clean guestrooms available for arrivals after the housekeeping employees have left for the day, the desk clerks will clean and make ready the guestrooms that are needed. The bellmen carry luggage, make room service deliveries, help answer the

front desk telephone, set up conference rooms, help in the restaurant, and make runs to and from the airport in the hotel automobile. In addition, when housemen are not at work, the bellmen clean the main lounge and public areas, and deliver cribs and rollaways to the guestrooms. Approximately 50 percent of the bellmen's time is spent in the guestroom area.

The three banquet housemen are supervised by the food and beverage manager and the lounge manager and the lounge manager/assistant food and beverage manager. They set up meeting and banquet functions in designated rooms in the hotel and are responsible for vacuuming and keeping these rooms clean. They regularly arrange functions in the conference rooms located in the guestroom area, where they are assisted by the bellmen and housekeeping housemen.

The Regional Director found that the petitioned-for unit of housekeeping employees constituted a distinct department: that they are separately supervised; that they perform work different from the other employees; and that their only contact with the other employees occurs while these employees are performing their separate functions. Based on these findings the Regional Director determined that the unit housekeeping employees sought by the Petitioner is appropriate. We do not agree.

In *Ramada Inns*, 221 NLRB 689 (1975), the Petitioner sought a unit of housekeeping and laundry employees, excluding, inter alia, the bellmen. The Board broadened the unit to include bellmen, based on its findings that during the evening and early mornings the bellmen performed duties normally performed by maids during the day. During the

maids' and housekeeping housemen's off hours, the bellmen cleaned and made ready guestrooms for late or unexpected arrivals, they delivered rollaway beds and cribs to the guestrooms, answered calls from guests for towels, soap, and clean linens, and cleaned the main lounge and lounge restrooms.

Like the bellmen in *Ramada Inns*, the desk clerks, bellmen, and banquet housemen in this case have similar responsibilities and perform many of the same duties as the housekeeping employees. When the maids are not present the desk clerks clean and prepare guestrooms. Similarly, the bellmen clean the main lounge and the lounge restrooms when the housekeeping housemen are not present. They also deliver rollaways, cribs, and linens to the guestrooms during the housekeeping housemen's off hours. The banquet housemen have the same responsibilities with respect to maintaining and servicing the banquet and meetings rooms as do the maids and housekeeping housemen in the guestroom area. In short, our review of the record demonstrates that despite separate immediate supervision, the desk clerks, bellmen, and banquet housemen regularly and frequently interchange duties with the housekeeping employees. In light of this functional integration and other common terms and conditions of employment, we find that the petitioned-for unit of housekeeping employees is inappropriate and must be broadened to include at least the additional employee classifications described above. We do not, however, find it necessary to determine which unit or units would be appropriate because the Petitioner is unwilling to proceed to an election in an expanded unit.

Accordingly, the petition is dismissed.