

**Holiday Inns, Inc., d/b/a Holiday Inn—Troy and Hotel, Motel, Restaurant Employees, Cooks and Bartenders Union, Local 24, of the Hotel and Restaurant Employees and Bartenders International Union, AFL-CIO, Petitioner.** Case 7-RC-14813

September 29, 1978

DECISION ON REVIEW AND DIRECTION OF ELECTION

BY CHAIRMAN FANNING AND MEMBERS PENELLO AND TRUESDALE

On May 4, 1978, the Regional Director for Region 7 issued his Decision and Order dismissing the petition in the above-entitled proceeding. He found inappropriate Petitioner's request for a unit of housekeeping employees employed at the Employer's motel and restaurant facility. Thereafter, in accordance with Section 102.67 of the National Labor Relations Board Rules and Regulations, Series 8, as amended, the Petitioner filed a request for review of this finding, and the Employer filed a brief in opposition. The Petitioner's request for review was granted by telegraphic order dated August 14, 1978.

Pursuant to the provisions of Section 3(b) of the National Labor Relations Act, as amended, the National Labor Relations Board has delegated its authority in this proceeding to a three-member panel.

The Board has considered the entire record in this case with respect to the issue under review and makes the following findings:

The Employer operates a motel, restaurant, lounge, and banquet room in a single facility. There are 3 departments: *housekeeping* with approximately 24 maids, 1 houseman, 3 laundry workers, and 1 maintenance employee; *front office* with approximately 8 front desk clerks and 2 porters; and *food and beverage* with approximately 3 cooks, 3 dishwashers, 7 waitresses, 5 cashier-hostesses, 2 bartenders, 2 cocktail waitresses, and 4 busboys.

While there is evidence supporting the Regional Director's implied view that a facilitywide unit is appropriate, there is also evidence in the record that the housekeeping department employees have a separate and distinct community of interest which entitles them to representation apart from the other employees.

Housekeeping employees perform manual work and constitute a separate department in the Employer's facility. They are separately supervised by the executive housekeeper who interviews prospective housekeeping employees, makes effective recommendations about hiring, directs daily work, and enforces

discipline. There have been no transfers into or out of the housekeeping department.

Moreover, the housekeeping employees have minimal contact with other employees. Generally, the maids use the building's side entrance, report directly to the housekeeping room, and take their breaks in that room. The maids usually give requests for maintenance service by guests, and keys and other articles left in the rooms, to the executive housekeeper. Only one maid goes to the restaurant to submit the lunch order. Porters rather than maids normally return empty guest trays to the kitchen. In addition, laundry workers are largely confined to the housekeeping room in the performance of their duties. Their contact with restaurant employees is limited to those occasions when restaurant employees deposit and collect linens and uniforms.<sup>1</sup>

Finally, we find, contrary to the Regional Director, that functional interchange among the employees is insignificant. It appears that sometime in April the innkeeper sought volunteers for a cross-training program which would provide interchanging job functions for employees. This program supplemented incidental interchange of duties which occurred during emergencies or when those employees primarily responsible for a task were unavailable. However, only three housekeeping employees are involved and the time they spend outside the housekeeping department is limited to 1 day a week. Conversely, two other employees spend only limited time in the housekeeping department.

On the basis of the record as a whole, especially the facts that housekeeping constitute a distinct department, perform manual tasks under separate supervision, and have minimal contact and interchange with front office and restaurant employees, we find that a unit of housekeeping department employees<sup>2</sup> constitutes an appropriate unit.<sup>3</sup>

Accordingly, we find, contrary to the Regional Director, that the following employees constitute a unit appropriate for the purposes of collective bargaining within the meaning of Section 9(b) of the Act:

All full-time and regular part-time maids, laundry workers, maintenance employees and housemen employed by the Employer at its motel and restaurant facility located at 2537 Rochester

<sup>1</sup> The record indicates that the one houseman may have more than minimal contact with other employees because he is responsible for cleaning the lobby area which is adjacent to the front desk. However, the weight of evidence indicates that the houseman shares community of interest with the housekeeping employees in all other respects.

<sup>2</sup> While the Petitioner did not include the maintenance employee in its proposed housekeeping unit, we shall include him as he is in the housekeeping department, and he would otherwise be the only unrepresented employee in that department. See *The Private Medical Group of New Rochelle*, 218 NLRB 1315, 1316 (1975).

<sup>3</sup> See *Lane Avenue Property, Ltd., d/b/a Ramada Inn West*, 225 NLRB 1279 (1976); *Ramada Inns, Inc.*, 221 NLRB 689 (1975).

Court, Troy, Michigan; but excluding office clericals, front desk clerks, porters, cooks, dishwashers, bartenders, cocktail waitresses and busboys, guards and supervisors<sup>4</sup> as defined in the Act.

[Direction of Election and *Excelsior* footnote omitted from publication.]

---

<sup>4</sup>The parties stipulated that the following individuals are supervisors within the meaning of the Act: Thomas Kirchner (innkeeper), Marion Roger (executive housekeeper), Emily Wurm (front desk manager), and Michael McQuarter (food and beverage director.)