

NATIONAL RAILROAD ADJUSTMENT BOARD

THIRD DIVISION

Award Number 23560
Dock&Number MW-23811

Rodney E. Dennis, Referee

PARTIES TO DISPUTE: (Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees
(Louisiana and Arkansas Railway Company

STATEMENT OF CLAIM: "Claim of the System Committee of the Brotherhood th.t:

(1) The Carrier violated the Agreement when it assigned outside forces to spray bridges with fire retardant between Baton Rouge and New Orleans, Louisiana from May 22 to June 5, 1979 (Carrier's File 013.31-211).

(2) The Carrier also violated Article IV of the May 17, 1968 National Agreement when it did not give the General Chairman advance written notice of its intention to contract said work.

(3) As a consequence of the aforesaid violation, B&B Foreman H. H. Hoose, B&B Mechanics H. Williams and E. Jackson, B&B Helpers M. Cryer and C. Love and B&B Laborers G. Adams and J. Wells each be allowed pay at their respective rates for an equal proportionate share of the man-hours expended by outside forces."

OPINION OF BOARD: Carrier subcontracted the spraying with fire retardant of its wood trestle bridges between Baton Rouge and New Orleans. The work was performed between May 22 and June 5, 1979.

The Organization argues that Carrier violated Rule 1 (Scope), Rule 2 (Seniority), and Article IV of the May 17, 1968, National Agreement. Carrier argues that the Scope Rule contained in the Agreement is general in nature and that it does not exclusively reserve the work in question (spraying of fire proofing) to the Organization. Since the work does not belong exclusively to the Organization, Carrier believes that it does not have to notify the General Chairman of its intention to subcontract.

This Board has been called on many times to review claims wherein covered work is subcontracted and Carrier has failed to notify the General Chairman that subcontracts are to be entered into. In each of these cases, this Board has expressed its displeasure at the failure of Carrier to notify the General Chairman when such subcontracts are entered into. We are again faced with the same situation.

Article IV of the May 17, 1968, Agreement requires that Carrier notify the General Chairman when it plans to contract out work within the scope of the applicable Schedule Agreement. In the instant case, the work in question was the spraying of fire proof chemicals on timber bridge trestles.

Carrier admits that BXR Gang 696 did apply the fire proofing under the supervision of the distributor of the chemical, on one previous occasion. It must be concluded that the work in question has been done by **Carrier employees** and is work covered by the Agreement.

Article IV requires that **Carrier** notify the General **Chairman** when such work is contracted out. **Carrier's** position that it must notify the General **Chairman** of subcontracting only when the work in question is exclusively reserved to the **Organization** by contract is not appropriate. That is not what Article IV says.

It is the opinion of this **Board** that **Carrier** has violated Article IV of the May 17, 1968, National Agreement by failing to notify the General Chairman in writing of its intention to contract out the fire proofing of the wooden bridges between Baton Rouge and New Orleans, Louisiana. For **Carrier** to ignore this requirement because it thinks the work is not exclusively reserved to the **Union** or because it claims that it does not have the equipment to do the job is unacceptable. The language of Article IV was written to give the General **Chairman** an opportunity to discuss these aspects of the situation with **Carrier**. Proper notification under Article IV is a prerequisite to subcontracting of covered work. **Carrier** failed to meet that requirement in this instance and consequently has violated Article IV of the May 17, 1968, National Agreement.

Since **Carrier** has violated Article IV, it remains for this Board to address the **Organization's** claim for compensation. The **Board** has reviewed many requests for compensation for Article IV violations and has generally held that where Claimants are fully employed and no loss of earnings were demonstrated, no monetary damages are awarded. We so find in this case (see Award No. 21646, Referee **Ables**; and Award 23354, Referee **Dennis**).

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 in accordance with the Opinion.

Award Number 23560
Docket Number MW-23811

Page 3

NATIONAL RAILROAD ADJUSTMENT BOARD
By Order of Third Division

ATTEST: Acting Executive Secretary
National Railroad Adjustment Board

By  _____
Rosemarie Brasch - Administrative Assistant

Dated at Chicago, Illinois, this 10th day of March 1982.