

CH
S.O.A.
SM
20x
TAC

NATIONAL RAILROAD ADJUSTMENT BOARD

THIRD DIVISION

Award Number 2442
Docket Number CL-24238

Ida Klaus, Referee

PARTIES TO DISPUTE:

{ Brotherhood of Railway, Airline and Steamship Clerks,
Freight Handlers, Express and Station **Employees**
(Chicago, Milwaukee, St. Paul and Pacific Railroad Company

STATEMENT OF CLAIM: Claim of the System Committee of the Brotherhood (GL-9475)
that:

1) Carrier violated the Clerks' Rules Agreement in Seniority District No. 4 when it arbitrarily reduced forces by abolishing positions starting at 11:59 p.m., February 29, 1980 and continuing to April 18, 1980 without giving the employees affected thereby "not less than five (5) working days advance notice" nor did it issue a standard permanent abolishment notice until April 18, 1980.

2) Carrier shall now be required to compensate all employees affected by the temporary suspension of their positions an additional eight (8) hours pay at the rate of their assigned position which was abolished, or at their protected rate, whichever is greater, starting either on March 1, 1980 or on the date their respective positions were temporarily abolished, and for each workday until their positions were permanently abolished as of 11:59 p.m. April 18, 1980.

NOTE: Some of the claimants and positions held are listed in Attachment A.

Where positions are not listed and/or where the occupants of positions are not listed in Attachment A, same to be determined by joint check of Carrier's records.

3) Carrier shall be required to **compensate** all those **employees** who were displaced by employees whose positions were temporarily abolished as shown in Attachment A, an additional eight (8) hours pay at the rate of their assigned positions, or their protected rate whichever is greater, starting either on March 1, 1980 or on the date they were affected, and for each workday until April 19, 1980.

NOTE: The employees and monetary wage due those employees **displaced** by employees whose positions were abolished to be determined by joint check of **payroll** and other necessary records.

OPINION OF BOARD: In this claim the Organization asserts that the Carrier violated the Agreement by failing to give five working days advance notice to employees in Seniority District No. 4 of the abolishment of their positions starting on February 29, 1980. The Carrier responds that it was not required to give advance notice.

The positions were abolished under a court-ordered embargo issued on February **25, 1980** (Order No. 290-A). The background and **provisions** of the Order are described in detail **in** the Board's **opinion** in **Award No. 24440 relating to** employees in Seniority District No. 1 represented by the Organization.

The attachment to the claim shows the **following** facts as ascertained by the **Organization: Most** of the positions were abolished on Feb-y **29, 1980**, by a Carrier designated "emergency" force-reduction notice dated February **26, 1980**. Six others appear to have been abolished on March **7, 1980**, but no notice date as to them is indicated in the record.

The claim letter was dated April **28, 1980**; was sent by certified mail and received on April **29, 1980**.

This claim is identical in basic respects with that made in Award **No. 24440**. It alleges a violation of Rule K(a) of the Clerks' Agreement by an asserted failure to give "**not less than five (5) working days advance notice**" to affected employees of the abolishment of their positions by the "emergency" force-reduction **notices**. It seeks compensation, until the issuance of standard permanent abolishment notices, for all those affected and appends a list of **some** of the positions and of the **names of some incumbents** (Item No. 2). It seeks similar compensation for those who were displaced by employees whose positions were abolished (Item No. **3**). It also requests a joint check of Carrier records to identify unnamed employees under Items No. 2 and No. **3**.

The Carrier's response as submitted challenges the claim on these jurisdictional-procedural **grounds**: (1) It is invalid as to unnamed and unidentified employees. (2) It improperly seeks a joint check of the Carrier's records. (3) It makes an improper request for compensation **in** the nature **of** a "penalty".

As to the merits, the Carrier defends its action on the ground that **it** was relieved of the advance notice obligation because the court-ordered embargo created "emergency conditions" within the meaning of the exception to Rule **12(a)**.

All contentions made by the Carrier as to this claim were made by it in the claim submitted to **this Board** in Award **No. 24440**. consideration there to these contentions.

Upon a thorough analysis of the record before it in this claim, and for the reasons fully stated in Award **No. 24440**, the Board **finds as follows**:

1. **Unnamed** employees have been adequately identified as occupants of the positions listed in the attachment to the claim. They are deemed included in Item No. 2 and are entitled to be appropriately compensated for any monetary loss they may have suffered by reason of any violation of the Rule **12(a)** notice requirement as to them. It is reasonable to allow a joint check of the Carrier's records to ascertain their identity.

2. **Unnamed** occupants of positions not listed (Item No. 2) and individuals who **assertedly** may have been displaced by employees whose positions were abolished (Item No. **3**) **are** not adequately identified and are not **deemed** to be included in

the claim. They are not entitled to any **compensatory** award, and a joint check of the Carrier's records to **find and** identify them is unwarranted. **The claim** as to them must be dismissed.

3. The exception to Rule 12(a) does not apply to the facts presented, as **no** emergency under the exception has been shown to **exist**. Accordingly, the Carrier violated Rule 12(a) by failing to give **employees** properly encompassed **within** the claim no less than five **working** days notice of the abolishment of their positions. Item No. 1 should be sustained.

With respect to the remedy appropriate to the violation **found**, for the reasons fully stated in **Award No. 24440**, the Board concludes as follows:

1. Each **employee** deemed **in** finding numbered 1, above, to be included in the claim **who** received less than five working days advance notice of the abolishment of his or her position is entitled to be compensated for each working day, up to five days, for which he/she was not given such notice, at the **rate** of his/her assigned position or at his/her protected rate, whichever is greater.

2. There is no **rational basis for compensating employees** whose positions were abolished **for each workday until the Issuance of a standard permanent abolishment notice**.

3. Employees referred to in finding numbered 3, above, are not **entitled** to any remedy.

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 disposed of in accordance with the Opinion.

Award Number **24442**
Docket Number **CL-24238**

Page **4**

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 29th day of June, 1983.

