

NATIONAL ~~RAILROAD~~ ADJUSTMENT BOARD

THIRD DIVISION

Award Number 21349
Docket Number MW-21500

John H. Dorsey, Referee

(Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way **Employees**
PARTIES TO DISPUTE: (
(Burlington Northern Inc.

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

(1) The Carrier violated the Agreement when, prior to notice to and discussion with General Chairman Funk, and without agreement with **General** Chairman Funk, it contracted repairs to Crawler Tractor **BNX** 71-0602 to outside forces (System File **P-P-205C/MW-84(c) 11/15/74**)

(2) Traveling **Equipment Maintainers** C. Lassiter and Jack Wieneck each be allowed eight (8) hours' pay at their respective straight-time rates because of the aforesaid violation.

OPINION OF BOARD: Under date of June 19, 1974, Carrier gave notice to the Organization's General **Chairman** that:

Crawler Tractor **BNX** 71-0602 at **Vancouver** Roadway Equipment Repair Shop for repair.

The roller frame on this tractor is twisted and cracked. To repair this **roller frame** it will be necessary to line the frame before it is welded. **The** Vancouver Shop is not equipped to handle that type of work and it will be necessary to have this repair made by contract.

The General **Chairman** admits that he received the notice on June 20, 1974; and, on the same date he informed Carrier: "We desire conference on this matter."

The tractor had been taken out of service on **June** 18, 1974,

In letter dated July 2, 1974, addressed to Organization's Vice General **Chairman**, Carrier stated:

This will refer to conference held July 2, 1974, at which time your representative Mr. R. Richardson discussed with Mr. R. W. Madsen of my staff Carrier's notice of June 19, 1974 of intent to contract repairs to Crawler Tractor **BNX** 71-0602.

At this conference Carrier advised as this machine was **needed** for **fireguard** work and as the Carrier was not equipped to **line** the twisted frame, it was necessary that this work be **immediately performed** by contract.

The tractor was ~~taken to an~~ outside contractor on July 1, 1974, for repair.

The specific provision of the Agreement relative to Carrier's contracting to have work **performed** by an outside contractor reads:

NOTE to Rule.55: The following is agreed to with respect to the contracting of construction, maintenance ~~or~~ repair work, or dismantling work customarily **performed by employees** in the Maintenance of Way and Structures Department:

Employees included within the scope of this Agreement • in the Maintenance of Way and Structures Department, ~~including~~ employees in former GN and SP&S Roadway Equipment Repair Shops and welding **employees** - perform work in connection with the construction and maintenance or **repairs** of and in connection with the dismantling of tracks, structures or facilities located on the right of way and used in the operation of the Company in the **performance of common carrier service, and** work performed by employees of named Repair Shops.

By agreement between the Company and the General Chairman, work as described in the preceding paragraph which is customarily **performed by employees** described herein, may be let to contractors and be performed by contractors' forces. However, such work may only be contracted provided that special skills not possessed by the Company's employees, special equipment not owned by the Company, or special material available only when applied or installed through supplier, are required; or when work is such that the Company is not adequately equipped to handle the work, or when emergency time requirements exist which present undertakings-not contemplated by the Agreement and beyond the capacity of the Company's forces.. In the event the Company plans to contract out work because of one of the criteria described herein, it shall notify the General Chairman of the Organization in writing as far in advance of the date of the contracting transaction as is practicable and in any event not less than fifteen (15) days prior thereto, except in "emergency time requirements" cases. If the General Chairman, or his representative, requests a meeting to discuss matters relating to the said contracting transaction, the designated representative of the Company shall promptly meet with him for that purpose. Said Company

and Organization representative shall make a good faith attempt to reach an understanding concerning said **contracting**, but if no understanding is reached the Company **may** nevertheless proceed with said contracting, and the Organization may file and progress claims in connection therewith. (**Emphasis** supplied)

The ultimate issue in this dispute and the respective positions of the parties are framed by the parties in the exchange of the following correspondence: (1) In a letter from the General Chairman to Carrier dated July **17, 1974**, he, states:

The repair of this roller carriage, is not something that has not been **performed** within the shop at Vancouver, Washington. No special **equipment** is needed that is not **possessed** by the Railway Company. nor are there skills involved that **employees** working as traveling maintainers do not possess. Therefore, we cannot agree that this work should be contracted out.

and (2) Carrier's reply to that letter dated July 31, 1974, in which it is stated:

Your contention that the Vancouver repair shops were equipped to make the necessary repairs to this tractor is not correct. In repairing the roller frame it is necessary to line the frame before it is welded and the Vancouver shop does not **possess** the necessary lining equipment.

Carrier raised no issue as to Claimants having the skills to perform the work. Therefore, the sole issue is whether Carrier owned the equipment required to repair the tractor.

The record **made** on the property does not contain substantial evidence of probative value that Carrier owned the required equipment to repair the tractor -- Organization's **mere** assertions that it did are not of such character as to satisfy the burden 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

That **the Claim** must be denied for lack of proof.

A W A R D

Claim denied.

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

ATTEST:

A. W. Pauls
Executive Secretary

Dated at Chicago, Illinois, this 16th day of December 1976.

