

**Award No. 3795**  
**Docket No. 3711**  
**2-CRI&P-EW-'61**

**NATIONAL RAILROAD ADJUSTMENT BOARD**

**SECOND DIVISION**

**The Second Division consisted of the regular members and in addition Referee Mortimer Stone when award was rendered.**

**PARTIES TO DISPUTE:**

**SYSTEM FEDERATION NO. 6, RAILWAY EMPLOYEES'  
DEPARTMENT, A. F. of L.-C. I. O. (Electrical Workers)**

**CHICAGO, ROCK ISLAND & PACIFIC RAILROAD COMPANY**

**DISPUTE: CLAIM OF EMPLOYES:** "1. That under the current agreement the Carrier improperly contracted out the rewinding of 19 traction motor armatures during the period of Dec. 1 to 26, 1958, to be performed by employees of contractors not subject to the current agreement.

2. That, accordingly, the Carrier be ordered to compensate the following named claimants at penalty rate, for the number of hours required to perform the above mentioned work according to electric shop records:

Dunahugh, Vern	Graham, Jess D.	Smith, Wallace L.
Smith, Melville C. Sr.	Hanneman, Glenn R.	Holloway, Averill H.
Barnhart, Claude M.	Meyers, Byron	Thompson, Geo. R.
Rusland, Claude A.	Merreighn, Francis E.	Anderson, Robt. E.
Poehls, Edward E.	Birlew, Charles G. Jr.	Hobbs, Jack N.
Castor, Harry	Bell, Robert L.	Bowden, Orren B.
Valentine, Ervin R.	Keopple, Donald B.	LePera, Dominick
Shaw, Thomas L.	Orr, Everett L.	Lewis, Herbert C.
Smith, Melville C. Jr.	Larson, John	Martin, Alvin W. Jr.
Lear, Lowell G.	Buck, Merlyn V.	Herlehy, John L.
Papish, Martin J.	Frary, Robt. C.	Bennett, Joel H.
Loding, William J.	Spurr, Edwin E.	Kulhavy, Gerald W.
Cord, LaRue K.	Koehler, Paul W.	Akins, Johnie R.
Randall, Harry L.	Ickes, Howard A.	Boney, James R.
Naab, Joseph P.	Coram, Edward A.	Marner, Arthur W.
Addison, Pete	Virnig, Louis J.	Brown, David C.
Carson, Donald F.	Ayers, Vernon L.	Claeys, Herbert
Poehls, Earl G.	Hardi, John	Leedham, Howard
Corder, Carl	Alexander, William P.	Barns, Dale H.
Brokaw, Harvey L.	Sherwood, Ismael S.	Miller, Fred R.
Brock, Ralph K.	Roemer, Jas. A.	Hall, Emmett M.
Carruthers, Paul P.	Vollert, Harry	Krantz, Raymond E."
Ziegler, Harold A.	Borden, Roy A.	

carrier. If such method chosen is one ordinarily pursued by management in the industry, it should be considered as a proper exercise of managerial judgment. In the instant case, it was the carrier's judgment that the proper and sensible thing to do was to take advantage of the unit exchange service offered by the manufacturer and secure from them complete, modernized, upgraded, and warranted armatures rather than attempt to repair or rebuild worn and antiquated ones in kind which would not give us the advantage of remanufactured, modernized, converted and warranted armatures.

As previously stated, the receipt of the remanufactured, modernized, improved, upgraded and warranted armatures received on unit exchange orders for older armatures bears more resemblance to the purchase of new ones than to the maintenance and rebuilding of old armatures.

We submit without relinquishing our position as above, that, even if claim had merit, which we deny, there is no showing of loss or damage to any individual. It is also our position, as upheld by this and other Divisions of the Adjustment Board, that there can be no penalty, much less at time and one-half rates, for work not performed.

The employees' organization in this case are in agreement with the carrier's statement that these armatures were sent to above companies on a unit exchange basis, as per third paragraph of the general chairman's letter of November 14, 1959, reading:

"We do agree with you that these armatures were sent to these companies on the unit exchange basis for rewound armatures."

The carrier and employes, therefore, are in agreement that these armatures were handled on a unit exchange basis, and, therefore, this same question and same type of case from this property has been before your Board on previous occasions for hearing in Awards 3228, 3229, 3230, 3231, 3232 and 3233 (Referee Ferguson) and 3269 (Referee Hornbeck), all of which were rendered in favor of this carrier. Further, Awards 2377, 2922, 3158, 3184 and 3185 have also upheld carriers in similar cases.

On basis of the facts and circumstances recited in the foregoing, we contend there was no violation of the employes' agreement.

We respectfully request your Board to deny this Claim.

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

The carrier or carriers and the employe or employes involved in this dispute are respectively carrier and employe 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 waived right of appearance at hearing thereon.

This claim is between the same parties and involves the same agreement and similar facts as considered in Award 3788, so like award should follow.

AWARD

Claim returned to the property for further showing as required in Award 3788.

NATIONAL RAILROAD ADJUSTMENT BOARD  
By Order of SECOND DIVISION

ATTEST: Harry J. Sassaman  
Executive Secretary

Dated at Chicago, Illinois, this 23rd day of June 1961.