NATIONAL RAILROAD ADJUSTMENT BOARD

THIRD DIVISION

Award Number 19756 Docket Number NW-19589

Benjamin Rubenstein, Referee

(Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employes

PARTIES TO DISPUTE: (

(Southern Pacific Transportation Company (Pacific Lines)

STATEMENT OF **CLAIM**: Claim of the System **Committee** of the Brotherhood that:

- (1) The Agreement was violated when W. E. Lindner and L. E. Poole were not allowed holiday pay for Decoration Day, 1970 and when G. L. Haro was not allowed holiday pay for Fourth of July, 1970 (System Files MofW 162-73; MofW 162-75; MofW 162-76).
 - (2) Eight (8) hours' pay at straight time rate be allowed as follows:

NAME

PATE

- L. E. Poole.....Lead Carpenter
- G. L. Haro......Track Walker

OPINION OF BOARD: Claimants, W. E. Linder and L. E. Poole, request holiday pay at straight time for Decoration Day, 1970 and claimant, G. L. Haro, claims holiday pay for July 4, 1970 at straight time pay.

Section I, Article **III-Holiday-, as** unended **May** 1, 1968, reads, in part:

"...each hourly and daily rated employe shall receive eight hours pay at the pro rats hourly pay for each of the following enumerated holidays."

Among the holidays listed **are** Decoration Day and July Fourth.

Holiday compensation for monthly rated employees is **computed** by prorating straight time compensation and multiplying it by 56, that is, the seven holidays provided for, at right hours each, and then dividing the total by twelve, **and** adding the **amount** arrived at to the monthly rate, regardless of whether a holiday actually occurs within **a** given month. This equals to four and **two-thirds** hour each month, or about one hour each week.

The three claimants were, regularly assigned, hourly employees.

Shortly before the respective holidays in issue, the employees were temporarily assigned to monthly rated jobs **and** were paid the wages applicable to monthly rated employees inclusive of the holiday **allowances**.

The carrier rejected the claims of the three employees on the ground that by having received the monthly rated salaries of their jobs, which included holiday **allowances**, they were not entitled to, also receive. holiday **pay**, as hourly rated employees.

There is no factual issue here in dispute. The parties agree that hsd the employees remained in their hourly rated jobs, they would **have** been entitled to receive the holiday pay, as provided for in this agreement. **Nor** is there **any** dispute of the fact, that the employees involved were temporarily transferred to the monthly payrolls at the request **and** for the convenience of the carrier. not at the request of the employees.

Award No. 15685 (**Dorsey** presented a similar situation. There, we held that an extra employee is not a monthly rated employee. He is subject to assignments to monthly, hourly and daily sated positions. We adhere to that holding and apply it to the instant **case** involving assigned hourly rated employees. Temporary assignment of hourly rated employees to monthly rated jobs, by carrier for its convenience, does not change the status of hourly rated employees to monthly employees.

Holiday pay is incorporated in labor relations **agreements** to protect employees from loss of wages **as** a result of not working on certain holidays.

Their pay for the holiday is computed on the basis of their pro-rstr hourly pay, multiplied by eight hours. If their **pay** is larger, their holiday **pay** is greater; if their **pay** is smaller, their holiday remuneration is comparatively smaller.

Our opinion herein is not to be construed **as** allowing an employee double **pay** for the **same** day. However, in view of the difference in methods of holiday payments to employees in monthly rated positions from those in hourly rated jobs, situations **may**, and do, arise, where depending on the length of transfer to the monthly rated position, an employee has been compensated for a full day's holiday pay. In such event, he should not also receive another day's **pay** for his hourly rated position. If, however, the added hourly **pay** in the monthly rated position, is less than eight hours. the employee is entitled to receive **payment for** the hours not paid for at his hourly rated wages. (11972)

This, in the opinion of the Board, was and is the intent of the parties in determining holiday pay under the various provisions of the agreements.

The parties shall compute the exact number of hours, each claimant was paid for, as holiday pay, under the formula of monthly rated provisions. while employed in monthly rated jobs, deduct that number of hours from eight and pay each employee the difference in hours at their hourly rated pay.

Award Number 19756 Docket Number MW-19589

Page 3

<u>FINDINGS</u>: The Third Division of the Adjustment Board, upon the whole record and all the evidence, finds and holds:

That the parties waived oral hearing;

That the Carrier and the Employes involved in this dispute are respectively Carrier and Employes within the meaning of the Railway Labor Act, as approved June 21, 1934;

 $\label{thm:continuous} That \ this \ Division \ of \ the \ Adjustment \ \textbf{Board} \ has \ jurisdiction \ over \\ the \ dispute \ involved \ herein: \ and$

The claim is modified accordingly.

A U-A R D

Claim sustained as modified.

NATIONAL RAILROAD ADJUSTMENT BOARD Ey Order of Third Division

ATTEST: E.U. Kellun

Dated at Chicago, Illinois, this 11th day of May 1973.