

Form 1

**NATIONAL RAILROAD ADJUSTMENT BOARD
THIRD DIVISION**

**Award No. 40604
Docket No. SG-40609
10-3-NRAB-00003-080457**

The Third Division consisted of the regular members and in addition Referee Margo R. Newman when award was rendered.

PARTIES TO DISPUTE: (Brotherhood of Railroad Signalmen
(
(Union Pacific Railroad Company

STATEMENT OF CLAIM:

“Claim on behalf of the General Committee of the Brotherhood of Railroad Signalmen on the Union Pacific Railroad:

Claim on behalf of E. Chavez, for 18 hours at his time and one-half rate of pay, account Carrier violated the current Signalmen’s Agreement, particularly Rules 5, 7, 8, 13 and 15, when it required the Claimant to perform service outside his regular assigned hours on March 1 and 2, 2007 then failed to compensate him as required by the Agreement. Carrier’s File No. 1472768. General Chairman’s File No. N 15 673. BRS File Case No. 13984-UP.”

FINDINGS:

The Third Division of the Adjustment Board, upon the whole record and all the evidence, finds that:

The carrier or carriers and the employee or employees involved in this dispute are respectively carrier and employee within the meaning of the Railway Labor Act, as approved June 21, 1934.

This Division of the Adjustment Board has jurisdiction over the dispute involved herein.

Parties to said dispute were given due notice of hearing thereon.

The Claimant is assigned to the Signal Department working a 2:30 P.M. to 10:30 P.M. shift. This claim protests the failure of the Carrier to compensate the Claimant at the time and one-half rate of pay for his attendance at a required Rules training class outside

of his assigned work hours on March 1 and 2, 2007. On those dates, the Claimant began training at 8:00 A.M. and then began his regular work shift at 2:30 P.M., ending at 6:30 P.M. The Organization relies on Rules 5 (40-Hour Work Week) 7 (Shifts) 8 (Change of Shift) 13 (Overtime) and 15 (Calls) of the Agreement in support of the Claimant's entitlement to the overtime pay rate. It involves the same type of training that was given by the Carrier's Safety Supervisors as part of the annual start-up dealt with by the Board in Third Division Award 40599, as well as identical arguments of the Organization and the Carrier set forth therein.

A careful review of the record convinces the Board that this claim is governed by the holding and rationale of Award 40599 as well as the principle of stare decisis confirming the application of the mutuality of benefit exception to the "work or service" rule to classes on Operating or Safety Rules that occurred in this case. See Public Law Board No. 6459, Awards 12, 13, 26 and 35 and Third Division Awards 36628 and 39360. Thus, no violation of Rules 5, 13 or 15 has been established. Similarly, the finding that the Organization failed to sustain its burden of proving that the Claimant's shift times were changed in order for him to attend his training class, a prerequisite to a finding of entitlement to time and one-half pay under Rules 7 and 8, is equally applicable herein. Because there is no contention that the Claimant was not paid his straight time rate of pay for his attendance at the training classes, as well as for the work he performed on the claim dates, the claim for additional compensation must be denied.

AWARD

Claim denied.

ORDER

This Board, after consideration of the dispute identified above, hereby orders that an Award favorable to the Claimant(s) not be made.

**NATIONAL RAILROAD ADJUSTMENT BOARD
By Order of Third Division**

Dated at Chicago, Illinois, this 27th day of August 2010.