## NATIONAL RATIROAD ADJUSTMENT BOARD

THIRD DIVISION

Award Number 22951 Docket Number SG-22871

Joseph A. Sickles, Referee

(Brotherhood of Railroad Signalmen

PARTIES TO DISPUTE: (

(Southern Pacific Transportation Company

( (Pacific Lines)

STATEMENT OF CLAIM:

"Claim of the General **Committee** of the Brotherhood of

Railroad Signalmen on the Southern Pacific Transporta-

tion Company:

(a) The Southern Pacific Transportation Company (Pacific Lines) violated the agreement, effective September 1, 1949 (including revisions to May 16, 1951) between the Company **and** the employes of the former Pacific Electric **Railway** Company represented by the Brotherhood of Railroad Signalmen **and** particularly the Scope Rule.

(b) Signalmen F. Suddarth, C. R. Moon, A. R. Powley and D. R. Rasmussen be allowed payment at their respective straight time rates of pay for eight (8) hours for December 15, 1977, when crossing protection at Congress Avenue was relocated by employes of the Southern Pacific Transportation Company." /Carrier file: SIG 152-3737

OPINION OF BOARD: The Organization points out that the former Pacific Electric Railway and the Southern Pacific Company merged several years ago, and are now part of the Southern Pacific Transportation Company. Further, it asserts that when the dispute arose, agreements covering signal employes of the mentioned railways had not been consolidated.

In December of 1977, signal forces in the employ **of** the f-r Southern Pacific and covered by that agreement relocated **certain** crossing protection devices at designated locations. The crossing protection devices had been installed by Pacific Electric signal employes **and** had always been maintained by those employes.

The Organization asserts that Carrier violated the Pacific Electric Scope Clause when it required employes covered by the Southern Pacific Signalmen's Agreement to relocate the crossing protection devices, **and** it cites the Pacific Electric clause:

"This Agreement covers the rates of pay, hours of service, and working conditions of all employes, classified in Article 1, engaged in the supervision, construction, installation, repair, reconditioning, inspecting, testing and maintenance, either in the shop or in the field, of any and all signal and telephone systems and/or interlocking systems, including all apparatus and devices in connection therewith, and such other work as is generally recognized as signal work."

The Carrier asserts that there were certain parallel tracks at the location; one of which was designated as Southern Pacific track, and the other was designated as Pacific Electric track. Wig-wag signals located **on** each side of the crossing were activated by **trains** approaching on either one of the two **tracks.** When the Pacific Electric trackage was abandoned, the signal related to those tracks was disconnected and removed by Pacific Electric signal employes.

In mid-December, 1977, it was necessary to move **the** wig-wag signal on one side of the grade crossing so that it would be nearer to the remaining Southern Pacific track, and Southern Pacific signal employes performed the relocation.

We have considered not only the facts which gave rise to the claim, but also the basic understandings of the parties and certain cited Awards. We are unable to find a basis for the claim.

As the moving party, the Organization has the obligation of identifying and establishing its claim by a preponderance of the evidence, however, we are unable to find anything in the record which suggests to us that the Carrier operated in violation of its contractual obligation concerning the signal equipment in guestion.

<u>FINDINGS</u>: 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;

Award Number 22951 Docket Number SG-22871 Page 3

That this Division of the Adjustment Board has jurisdiction over the dispute involved herein; and

That the Agreement was not violated.

A W A R D

Claim denied.

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

ATTEST: LUV. VA

Executive Secretary

Dated at Chicago, Illinois, this 15th day of August 1980.