

NATIONAL RAILROAD ADJUSTMENT BOARD

THIRD DIVISION

Award Number 20382
Docket Number CL-19772

John H. Dorsey, Referee

PARTIES TO DISPUTE: (Brotherhood of Railway, Airline and Steamship
(Clerks, Freight Handlers, Express and
(Station Employees
(
(The Central Railroad Company of New Jersey
((R. D. Timpany, Trustee)

STATEMENT OF CLAIM: Claim of the System Committee of the Brotherhood
(m-7097) that:

(A) Carrier violated the provisions of the Agreement, effective December 15, 1952, also Supplements to the Agreement, particular reference to Rule No. 1(g) and No. g(a)(h)(b), when position of Chief Clerk, Job No. D-57, incumbent G. Wetzel, Jr. Freight Office, Wilkes Barre, Pennsylvania was improperly abolished, effective with the end of tour of duty, Thursday, May 13, 1971, work items presently covered by Job No. D-57 assigned to the Agent at Wilkes Barre, Pennsylvania, effective with his start of tour of duty on Friday, May 14, 1971.

(B) Carrier now be required to properly compensate Mr. G. Wetzel, Jr. a day's pay, rate \$32.0039 per day, commencing May 17, 1971, claim to continue for a day's pay until the violation has been properly corrected, due to the improper abolishment of Mr. Wetzel's position.

(C) Carrier be further required to properly compensate Mr. Myron Dubee a day's pay at the rate of \$34.42 per day, commencing May 17, 1971, claim to continue for a day's pay until the violation has been properly corrected, due to Mr. Dubee being improperly displaced on account of Mr. Wetzel's position being improperly abolished.

(D) Carrier be further required to properly compensate Mr. Thomas James a day's pay at the rates of \$34.42 and \$33.17 per day, assigned to a Cycle Position in the Ashley area, commencing May 17, 1971, claim to continue for a day's pay until the violation has been properly corrected, due to Mr. James being improperly displaced, on account of Mr. Wetzel's position being improperly abolished.

(E) Carrier be further required to properly compensate Mr. Edward Hojanowski a day's pay at the rate of \$33.17 per day, commencing May 17, 1971, claim to continue for a day's pay until the violation has been properly corrected, due to Mr. Trojanowski being Improperly displaced, on account of Mr. Wetzel's position being improperly abolished.

(F) Carrier also be required to properly compensate Mr. J. **Bulkley**, Jr. a day's pay at the rate of \$33.17, per day, commencing ~~May~~ 17, 1971, claim to continue for a day's pay until the violation ~~has~~ been properly corrected, the reason; Mr. **Bulkley** being improperly displaced on account of Mr. **Wetzel's** position as Chief Clerk, Wilkes **Barre**, Pennsylvania being improperly abolished.

OPINION OF BOARD: Under date of May 3, 1971, Carrier's Director Operation Services wrote:

Hr. W. Czapp, District **Chairman**
Brotherhood of Railway, **Airline** and Steamship Clerks
c/o Superintendant's office
Allentown, Pa.

Dear **Sir:**

In accordance **with** the provisions of the Agreement, notice is hereby given of our intention to make the following changes.

Effective with the end of tour of duty on **Thursday**, May 13, 1971, Job **#D57**, Chief Clerk at Wilkes Barre, Pa. **will** be abolished.

Exhibit "**D**" copy attached, has been issued to Chief Clerk **G. Wetzel** Jr. incumbent of job **#D57**.

The work items presently covered by job **#D57 will** be accomplished by the Agent at Wilkes Barre, Pa. effective with his start of tour of duty on **Friday, May 14, 1971**.

Reduction is being made account **decline** in business,

(**NOTE:** Chief Clark G. Wetzel, Jr. will be **referred** to herein as "**Claimant.**" Petitioner will **be** referred to as "**Clerks.**" Respondent will be **referred** to as "**Carrier.**" All emphasis herein will be supplied unless otherwise indicated.)

On May 6, 1971, the District **chairman**, by letter, replied to Director Operations. Said letter in material part reads:

I do not **agree** and **will** not concur to the contents as outlined in your letter of **May 3, 1971** in regards to these changes at the **Wilkes Barre Freight Station, Wilkes Barre, Penna.**

Therefore, I **am** now requesting that you recall this letter of **May 3, 1971**, addressed to the undersigned and enter into a Joint Check on the position of Chief Clerk, Job No. D-57, Wilkes Barre, **Penna.**, **advising** the undersigned time and date that Joint Check **will** be accomplished.

This in accordance with **Rule No. 9**, Paragraph **(a)4(b)**, amended as of December 1, **1968** between the Central **Railroad Co. of New Jersey** and the **Brotherhood of Railway and Airline Clerks**.

A joint check was arranged by telephone on **May 12, 1971**, and accomplished on that date by a designee of Carrier; and, a designee of Clerks. The designees signed a joint detailed report in which it was concluded that the work performed by Claimant consumed four **(4)** hours and thirty-four **(34)** minutes per day. **Notwithstanding** the joint findings of the designees Carrier abolished the Chief **Clerk** position, Job No. D-57, at the end of the tour of duty on **May 13, 1971**.

The chief officer of the **Carrier** designated to handle such disputes (Vice **President-Employee** Relations), in a letter dated December 6, **1971**, addressed to Clerks' General Chairman gave as reasons for denial:

Mr. **Horchler's** denial of July 20, to District Chairman Czapp, pointed out that a joint check made on **May 12** of the position subsequently abolished, revealed that Mr. Wetzel consumed four hours, thirty minutes performing duties of the position, **including fifty minutes on the telephone.**

It **is** our contention, as previously expressed, that while Rule g(a) h(b) of the **BRAC** agreement limits re-assignment of duties **in** abolishment of positions to those involving four hours work, the Dorsey **Award** on this property **in 1970** established the principle that such an abolishment **is** proper when **elimination** of a clerical position results in the Agent being the last employee **remaining** at a particular station. Additionally; **It is our contention that telephone work, per se, is not exclusively the province of any single craft or class of employees. Relating** this again to the Dorsey Award, under the ebb and flow principle, since the Agent was the **first employee** at the station, telephone duties were

initially the agent's work and **return** of it to the Agent **is** not **in** itself a violation of the Clerks' agreement.

PERTINENT PROVISIONS OF AGREEMENT

Rule No. 1 - SCOPE contains the following provision:

(g) Positions or work within the scope of this Agreement belong to the Employees covered **herein** as provided for in these **rules** and nothing in this Agreement shall be construed to permit **assigning** this work to other than Employees covered by and as provided for **in** these rules or prevent the application of these **rules** to such positions or work except as provided for **in** Rule g(a)(4)(b) or by mutual **agreement** between the Management **and** the General Chairman.

Rule No. 9 - **REDUCING FORCES** mandates, **in** relevant part:

(4) **When** a position covered by this agreement is abolished, the work previously assigned to such position which remains to be performed **will** be assigned in accordance with the following:

- (a) To **another** position or other positions covered by **this agreement** when such position or other positions remain in existence at the location where the work of the abolished position is to be performed.
- (b) **In the event** no such position under this Agreement exists at the location where the work of the abolished position or positions is to be performed, then it may be **performed by an Agent, Yardmaster, Foreman or other supervisory employee, provided that less than four (4) hours work per day of the abolished position or positions remains to be performed; and further** provided, that such work is incident to the duties of an Agent, **Yardmaster, Foreman or other supervisory employee; and further provided that prior to the abolishment of such position, upon request by either party, the Employing Officer and District Chairman, or their duly authorized representatives, will make a joint check to determine if less than the four (4) hours of clerical work remains on the position to be abolished.**

These provisions must be read together in our adjudication of the dispute.

CARRIER'S POSITION

It is Carrier's contentions that: (1) the use of the telephone is not the exclusive work of **Clerks** or **any** other **craft** or class of employees - It cites T.C.U. v. Union Pacific R. Co., 385 U.S. 157 (1966) in support; and (2) the joint check of **May 12** shows that **fifty** (50) minutes of Claimant's daily work as Chief Clerk was devoted to use of the telephone and this amount of time **must** be subtracted from the total daily time of four (4) hours **and** thirty-four (34) minutes of daily work as detailed **in** the **joint** check; consequently, reducing Claimant's working time on work exclusively reserved to **Clerks** to less **than** four (4) hours; **and**, (3) Carrier's position (2) **being** true, Carrier had no contractual restraints to enjoin it from abolishing the Chief Clerk's Position and, to applying the "ebb **and** flow" doctrine **in** assigning the remaining work of the Chief Clerk's Position to the Agent who remained at the location-- in support Carrier cites what it **refers** to as the "Dorsey Award" in the matter of arbitration between T.C.U. and BRAC which was issued on July 14, 1970.

RESOLUTION

It is firmly established that: (1) the use of the telephone is not exclusively reserved to Clerks.

The joint check of **May 12** stands undisputed in the record.

The Union Pacific case involved the question of due process when **more** than one Organization laid claim to the same work, a situation not existent in the Instant dispute.

The **so-called "Dorsey case"** decided a dispute between T.C.U. and RRAC involving interpretation and application of a Merger **Agreement entered into between** the two labor organizations on February **21, 1969**. The Merger **Agreement was a private contract; not a collective bargaining agreement.**

The Opinion states:

We agree with Clerks that the Merger Agreement **"did not change any Agreements or rules between" Clerks and Carrier.** To this we add the Agreement did not change any **Agreements** or rules between Telegraphers and Carrier. See, Sections 2.9 **and** 2.10,

Carrier (nor **any** other carrier) is not a party to the Merger Agreement and is in no way bound by its terms.

Existing collective bargaining agreements between Carrier and Clerks or Carrier end Telegraphers can only be changed by the respective parties to each individual agreement in conformity with the procedures prescribed in the Railway Labor Act.

We now come to interpretation of the Rules Agreements existing between the parties herein.

The words "Positions or work within the scope of this Agreement belong to the Employees covered herein" have been interpreted **by** the case law of this Board to **mean** that work not exclusively reserved to Clerks but assigned to a Clerk's position becomes the work of the **position** and is subject to the Rules of Clerk's Agreement. This being established the telephone work performed **by** Claimant as part of the duties of Position No. D-57 was included in the scope of Clerk's Agreement. Therefore, under Rule 9 (4)(b) the joint check of **May 12, 1971**, proves that more than four (4) hours work per day of the abolished position and subject to the Clerk's Rules--Position No. **D-57--remained** to be performed. Ergo, Carrier violated the Agreement. We will sustain paragraphs (A) and (B) of the Claim; and we will dismiss paragraphs (C), (D), (E) and (F) of the Claim for lack of proof.

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

Carrier violated paragraphs (A) and (B) of the Claim.

Paragraphs (C), (D), (E) and (F) of the **Claim** fail for lack of proof.

Award Number 20382
Docket Number CL-19772

Page 7

A W A R D

- I. Paragraphs (A) **and (B)** of the Claim are sustained,
II. Paragraphs (C), (D), (E) and (F) of the Claim are
dismissed for lack of proof.

NATIONAL RAILROAD ADJUSTMENT BOARD
By Order of Third Division

ATTEST: A. W. Paulson
Executive Secretary

Dated at Chicago, Illinois, this **6th** day of September 1974.

CARRIER MEMBERS DISSENT **TO** AWARD 20382, **DOCKET** CL-19772

(Referee Dorsey)

We dissent. The matters of record which clearly establish this claim is invalid are discussed in the memorandum submitted by the Carrier Members. That memorandum is retained in the Master File and by reference is incorporated in this dissent.

J. J. Naylor

Arm P. Baidwood

W. B. Jones

P. C. Carter

G. M. Youder


LABOR MEMBER'S ANSWER TO CARRIER MEMBERS' DISSENT
TO AWARD 20382 (CL-19772)
(Referee Dorsey)

In normal circumstances, the brief, self-serving comments of Carrier Members' dissent would not require answer, inasmuch as disputes submitted to this Board are adjudicated on a consideration of the facts and evidence in the official record as detailed and explained by the parties to the dispute in their submissions and rebuttals and are not decided upon Carrier Members' Memoranda. However, in this case, we will make an exception and answer the "Dissent" because of certain interesting statements contained in the Memorandum referred to by the dissenters, The penultimate paragraph of that Memorandum states:

"We believe the parties are fortunate in having this case assigned to the sane Referee Dorsey who rendered the award which Carrier has cited as a second defense to the claim. The Dorsey award itself is fully reproduced in the file at pages 32 to 50, and the Referee is in a better position than anyone else to say what the effect of that award should be in the instant case."

Referee Dorsey stated what the effect of his Award was, and now the Carrier Members are unhappy about it.

The dissent is frivolous.


J. C. Fletcher
9-27-74