365

NATIONAL RAILROAD ADJUSTMENT BOARD THIRD DIVISION

David Dolnick, Referee

PARTIES TO DISPUTE:

AMERICAN TRAIN DISPATCHERS ASSOCIATION ST. LOUIS-SAN FRANCISCO RAILWAY COMPANY

STATEMENT OF CLAIM: Claim of the American Train Dispatchers Association that:

- (a) The St. Louis-San Francisco Railway Company (hereinafter "the Carrier") violated the effective Agreement between the parties, Article 1 thereof in particular, when on June 10, 1969, it required and/or permitted other than those covered thereby, to perform work covered by said Agreement.
- (b) Carrier shall now compensate Train Dispatcher J. B. Carson one day's compensation at time and one-half the daily rate applicable to Assistant Chief Dispatcher for said violation on the rest day of Claimant.

EMPLOYES' STATEMENT OF FACTS: There is an Agreement in effect between the parties, copy of which is on file with this Board, and the same is incorporated into this Ex Parte Submission as though fully set out herein.

Article I — Scope is identical in the Agreement effective September 1, 1949, revised as of January 1, 1953 and again revised effective October 1, 1965, insofar as the rules material to this dispute are concerned.

For the Board's ready reference, Article I, Scope, of the Agreement is here quoted in full text:

"ARTICLE I

(a) SCOPE

This agreement shall govern the hours of service and working conditions of train dispatchers. The term 'train dispatcher' as hereinafter used, shall include night chief, assistant chief, trick, relief and extra train dispatchers. It is agreed that one chief dispatcher in each dispatching office shall be excepted from the scope and provisions of this agreement.

Note (1): Positions of excepted chief dispatcher will be filled by employes holding seniority under this agreement. No. 31 did as instructed.

The various reasons given for the declination of this claim are set forth in the Carrier's letter November 19, 1969, copy attached as Carrier's Exhibit No. 38. The trainmaster who is alleged to have committed the violations in Claims 37 and 38 is one of the division officers who, as such, has responsible control over the operation of a division, or a terminal, or of a major activity within an operating division, and when acting in the discharge of his duties and responsibilities, it is not mandatory that a division trainmaster exercise such responsible control only through employes of the train dispatchers' class, nor do the Rules of the Train Dispatchers' Agreement place such a hindrance or limitation upon him.

(Exhibits not reproduced.)

OPINION OF BOARD: Employes allege that on June 10, 1969 the Trainmaster at Quanah, Texas issued the following message to the Operator at Quanah, Texas:

"Call No. 36 for 8:00 A. M., for No. 32 for 9:00 A. M. Extra East for about Noon."

In Award No. 18458 we saird:

"Trainmasters have every right to issue instructions when trains should be called. That is an essential part of his customary and regular duties. These are not duties which belong exclusively to Dispatchers under the Scope Rule."

Similar conclusions were reached in Awards Nos. 18565, 18592, 18688 and in Award No. 3 of Public Law Board No. 588 on this property.

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 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 over the dispute involved herein; and

That the Agreement was not violated.

AWARD

Claim denied.

NATIONAL RAILROAD ADJUSTMENT BOARD By Order of THIRD DIVISION

ATTEST: E. A. Killeen Executive Secretary

Dated at Chicago, Illinois, this 14th day of January 1972.

Keenan Printing Co., Chicago, Ill.

Printed in U.S.A.

18939