## NATIONAL RAILROAD ADJUSTMENT BOARD

## THIRD DIVISION

Award Number 22492 Docket Number MW-22401

Joseph A. Sickles, Referee

(Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employes

PARTIES TO DISPUTE: (

(Chicago, Bock Island and Pacific Railroad Company

( (William M. Gibbons, Trustee)

STATEMENT OF CLAIM: "Claim of the System Committee of the Brotherhood

that:

- (1) The Agreement was violated when Machine Operators R. Thompson, C. O. Scott, D. Brown, M. Hawkinson, I. M. Harper, A. Anderson, R. Smith, H. W. Barch, M. Humphrey, O. S. Whitt, D. W. Banks, R. A. Leeper and D. Dickson were compensated at their respective straight-time rates instead of at their respective time and one-half rates for the 9th and 10th hours each worked on certain dates during October and November, 1976 System Files 11-P-544/L-126-1583 and 11-P-547/L-126-1581/.
- (2) Each of the above-named claimants now be allowed the difference between what they should have been paid at their respective time and one-half rates and what they were paid at their respective straight-time rates for the overtime service each rendered during the above-mentioned claim period."

opinion of BOARD: Item 7 of a February 19, 1976 Agreement prwides for twenty (20) straight eight (8) hour work days at the pro rata rate, thus accumulating 8 days off to afford the members of the gangs an opportunity to visit their families.

In October ad November, 1976, the **employes involved** agreed to **work** sixteen (16) straight days of **ten** (10) hours each, **followed** by eight (8) days off. This **arrangement** - **which was contrary** to **the** agreement - was not agreed to by **the** Organization.

In reply to Carrier's assertion that the **employes** desired to work **the** longer days, **the** Organization reminds us **that the employes** cannot abrogate or change an agreement, and **that** we lack powers of "equity and justice." See **Award** 20844.

The claim seeks time and one-half for **the** two hours worked **each day over** and above the **normal 8** hours per day. The **employes** received straight time for the two hours par day and **thus**, seek one-half pay per hour for the 9th and 10th hour.

Carrier did not question **the** timeliness of the claim while **the** matter was under consideration on **the** property and **thus**, its attempt to rely on **that** defense in its Submission to **this** Board **is** not appropriate.

There seems to be no question that the **employes** agreed to **the** altered schedule **and** thus, we can readily understand Carrier's contention that **the employes** waived their **complaint and** that additional **payment amounts** to "unjusterrichment." Indeed, it does give us pause to honor these **claims on** behalf of the employes who voluntarily agreed to the violation. But, for us to **invoke** the concepts espoused by the Carrier would require us to apply equitable considerations (which is clearly beyond our authority) and ignore the well established principles which dictate that individual **agreements** do not replace **collectively** bargained agreements. See Award 21048.

There is a contractual basis for premium pay for time worked in excess of eight hours per day.

<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:

That **this Division** of **the** Adjustment Board has **jurisdiction** wet the dispute involved herein; and

That the agreement was violated.

## <u>AWARD</u>

Claimsustained.

NATIONAL RAILROAD ADJUSTMENT BOARD
By Order of Third Division

ATTEST: U.W. Pauler
Executive Secretary

Dated at Chicago, Illinois, this 24th day of August 1979.