

NATIONAL RAILROAD ADJUSTMENT BOARD

THIRD DIVISION

Award Number 22779

Docket Number MW-22694

George S. Roukis, Referee

PARTIES TO DISPUTE: (Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way **Employees**  
(Norfolk and Western Railway Company (Lake Region)

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

(1) The Agreement was violated when, on and subsequent to January 24, 1977, eight (8) machine operators were used to perform laborer's work in connection with the construction of new track to serve the Delco Plant at Muncie, Indiana, during which time Extra Gang Laborers L. C. **Melson**, L. P. **Piercy**, T. D. **King**, A. D. Randolph, R. F. Snyder, G. J. **Reichert**, W. E. McClellan and Utah **Dockery** were furloughed and available and willing to perform such laborer's work (System File MW-MUN-77-33).

(2) Each of the employees identified in (1) above be reimbursed for the wage loss suffered as a consequence of said violation."

OPINION OF BOARD: Before proceeding to a substantive assessment of the dispute's merits, this Board must dispose of the procedural objections raised in petitioner's rebuttal submission. Based on the **accumulated** documentary record, we do not **find** any specific unequivocal evidence that Carrier advanced exclusivity arguments on the property.

Careful reading of Carrier's written correspondence dated April 11, 1977, June 7, 1977 **and September 29, 1977** reveals that Carrier considered the work of machine operators distinguishable from that of laborers and that petitioners failed to demonstrate that the machine operators **performed** laborers' work. An exclusivity argument would assert that the contested work was traditionally **performed** by both position classifications and would require a showing by the **initiating** party that the work by **custom** and practice accrued to that category of **employees**. This is not the case here and thus we must exclude this argument **from** our consideration pursuant to the **requirements** of Circular 1. The same is true regarding the seniority displacements articulated in Carrier's submission. They were not raised on the property and, as such, are inadmissible before this Board.



Award Number 22779'  
Docket Number W-22694

Page 2

On the other hand, we believe that petitioner adequately met its required proof burden by specifically delineating the type of work performed by extra gang laborers. It noted that this work included laying tie, rail, putting on angle bars, laying switches, spiking and gauging, etc. and further showed that the machine operators were not using assigned machines, since they were being repaired at Frankfort, Indiana, some eighty (80) miles away from the work **situs**. Moreover, notwithstanding Carrier's lack of denial of the aforesaid specifications, the Organization adduced three letters dated June 9, 1978 which were **written** by three machine operators employed in the contested work project, attesting that they did not operate any machinery, but instead performed laborer's work on the construction of the new line that was being built to the Delco Plant at Muncie, Indiana. The letters were **served** on the Carrier before the August 28, 1978 **ex parte** submission and were permissible evidence under our rules. The record, as developed on the property, competently affirms petitioners' position and we are compelled by the mandate of our appellate responsibility to **affirm** the **claim**.

We will, however, direct that the wage restitution be allowed to only those furloughed **employees** who actually suffered wage losses as a result of unemployment during the time period the **machine** operators performed the disputed work.

**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 Agreement was violated.

A W A R D

Claim sustained to the extent expressed in the Opinion.

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

ATTEST:

  
Executive Secretary

Dated at Chicago, Illinois, this 14th day of March 1980.