## NATIONAL RAILROAD ADJUSTMENT BOARD

## THIRD DIVISION

Award Number 20621
Docket Number MW-20660

Joseph A. Sickles, Referee

(Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employes

PARTIES TO DISPUTE: (

(The Baltimore and Ohio Railroad Company

STATEMENT OF CLAIM: Claim of the System Committee of the Brotherhood that:

- (1) The Agreement was violated when Class A Machine Operator Randy Powell, Jr. and Class B. Machine Operator C. R. **Corbin** were allowed only four hours' pay on December 8 and 15, 1972 and on January 19 and February 1, 1973.
- (2) The Agreement was violated when Class A. Machine Operator R. T. Sparks and Class B. Machine Operator Hubert Morrison were allowed only four hours of pay on December 8 and 15, 1972 and on January 19, 1973.
- (3) **The** Agreement was violated when Class B Operator Kenneth Fetters was allowed only four hours of pay on December 15, 1972 and on January 19 and February 1, 1973.
- (4) Each of the claimants identified in Parts (1), (2), and (3) above now be allowed twelve (12) hours' pay at their respective **straight-time** rates. (Carrier's File 2-w-421).

OPINION OF BOARD: On the dates in question, Claimants failed to complete eight (8) hours of work. They (Machine Operators) assert that they were precluded from completing their tours due to inclement weather. On the other hand, Carrier alleges that there was work available for Claimants on the days in question, but that they "requested" to be returned to Camp Headquarters.

On the property, Claimants relied upon Rule 16 (a):

"(a) Regularly established daily working hours will not be reduced below **eight**.(8) for five (5) days per week to **avoid** making force reductions, except by mutual agreement, but this number of days may be reduced in a week in which holidays occur **within** the five (5) days constituting the work week by the **number** of such holidays."

The Board feels that this dispute must be resolved on the basis of burden of proof as developed on the property.

The initial claim contended that the Agreement fails to provide for suspension of time for inclement weather. In reply, Carrier stated that:

". ..the employees were not laid off on account of inclement weather. The men present were offered a complete days work, but refused and requested to be taken back to camp headquarters on each of the days mentioned in your letter. It was for the convenience of the **employess** that less than eight hours were worked...."

Although Claimants responded to the above-cited letter, and discussed the applicability of  ${\bf Rule}$  16(b), they did not contradict that recitation.

Again, in the final denial letter, Carrier repeated that Claimants requested to be returned to Camp Headquarters even though there was work to be performed.

Claimants never replied to the final denial letter until the matter was submitted to this Board.

This Board has consistently determined that it may only consider matters which have been raised on the property. Moreover, the party asserting the violation must prove the essential **elements** of the claim. When Carrier made the assertion (on two (2) occasions) that the Claimants refused full days of work, it was incumbent upon Claimants to submit probative evidence to the contrary. See Award 18863.

The Organization, **in** its Ex Parte and Rebuttal Submissions, presents argument which contains a certain degree of appeal. It questions the identity of the work which was allegedly refused, inasmuch as all employees appeared to be employed on the **same** project, etc. However, these matters should have been submitted **on** the property, rather than directly to this Board.

We will dismiss the claim for failure 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 **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

Award **Number** 20621 Docket **Number** MW-20660 Page 3

That the claim be dismissed.

A W A R D

Claim dismissed.

NATIONAL RAILROAD ADJUSTMENT BOARD

By Order of Third Division

TTEST:

Dated at Chicago, Illinois, this 21st day of February 1975.

