

NATIONAL RAILROAD ADJUSTMENT BOARD

THIRD DIVISION

Award Number 23468  
Docket Number SG-23424

Martin F. Scheinman, Referee

PARTIES TO DISPUTE: (Brotherhood of Railroad **Signalmen**  
(**St. Louis-San** Francisco Railway Company

STATEMENT OF CLAIM: "Claim of the General **Committee** of the Brotherhood of Railroad **Signalmen** on the St. Louis-San Francisco Railway Company:

On behalf of Brother **D. L. Miller**, Traveling Signal Maintainer, for eight hours' overtime pay for Saturday, March **17, 1979**, under Rule **46**, account working with rail detector car." (Carrier file: **D-9872**)

OPINION OF BOARD: Claimant, **D. L. Miller**, Traveling Signal **Maintainer**, was called on March **17, 1979**, at **7:00** a.m., the sixth day of his work week, to assist a Sperry Rail Test Car. On the course of this **assignment**, Claimant bonded two defective rails and subsequently filed for eight **(8)** hours overtime.

The Organization contends that Carrier violated the Agreement between the parties by denying this overtime. The primary rule cited by the Organization is Rule **#46**. It states:

**"Rule 46.**

(a) A traveling signal maintainer will be assigned an individual territory and may be paid on either a **monthly** or hourly basis **as shown in** Appendix Item 1. If he is paid on a monthly basis, such rate shall cover all service performed during the calendar month except:

(1) He **will** be assigned one regular rest day per week. Sunday if possible. Rules applicable to **hourly** rated employees shall apply to service on such **assigned** rest day. Ordinary **maintenance** of construction work not heretofore required on Sunday will not be required on holidays or the **sixth** day of the workweek. If such work, however, is performed, rules applicable to hourly rated employees shall apply.

(2) **When** required to perform **work** outside the limits of his assigned territory on a holiday, on the sixth day of his workweek, or outside of his regular **eight-**hour assignment on any other day, he will be additionally compensated for such work in accordance with rules applicable to hourly rated employees.

(3) Such ~~time~~ as he lays off of his own accord shall be deducted."

The Organization argues that the work performed by Claimant was ordinary maintenance or construction work which took place on the sixth day of his work week. It contends that when such work is performed, rules for hourly rated employees apply.

Carrier, on the other hand, contends that the work performed was not ordinary maintenance or construction work because the Sperry Rail Test Car is not operated regularly and therefore, is not service routinely performed as ordinary maintenance. Further, it contends that the claim payment is excessive even if the work performed on the claim date had been ordinary maintenance or construction work.

In this dispute, from the evidence presented, it is clear that the operation of the rail test car, which is used to detect faulty places in rails, occurs regularly about once a year. It is also apparent that the resultant bonding of faulty rails is routine signalman work.

The record does not establish that the performance of the work was unusual. We are not convinced that its performance was extraordinary. As such, we are compelled to reject Carrier's contention that the work performed by Claimant was not ordinary maintenance or construction work.

Here, a signalman performed the ordinary maintenance or construction work on the sixth day of his work week. Therefore, Claimant must be compensated consistent with the terms of Rule 46(a).

As to the amount of overtime due Claimant, it should be noted that there is a discrepancy about how long it actually took to perform the disputed work. In any event, we are convinced that the eight (8) hours overtime claimed is excessive. Therefore, we find that Claimant should be compensated at the overtime rate for a minimum call of two (2) hours and forty (40) minutes as per the call provision in the Agreement.

**FINDINGS:** 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 Employees involved in this dispute are respectively Carrier and Employees within the meaning of the Railway Labor Act, as approved June 21, 1934;

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

Award Number 23468  
Docket Number SG-23424

Page 3

That the Agreement was violated.

A W A R D

Claim sustained in accordance with **the** Opinion.

NATIONAL RAILROAD ADJUSTMENT BOARD  
By Order of Third Division

Attest: *A. W. Paulsen*  
Executive Secretary

Doted **at Chicago**, Illinois, this **8th** day of **December 1981**.