#### Form 1

# NATIONAL RAILROAD ADJUSTMENT BOARD THIRD DIVISION

Award No. 32801 Docket No. SG-33531 98-3-96-3-1114

The Third Division consisted of the regular members and in addition Referee James E. Yost when award was rendered.

(Brotherhood of Railroad Signalmen

PARTIES TO DISPUTE: (

(CSX Transportation, Inc. (former Chesapeake &

( Ohio Railway Company)

## **STATEMENT OF CLAIM:**

"Claims on behalf of the General Committee of the Brotherhood of Railroad Signalmen on the CSX Transportation Company (C&O):

- A. Claim on behalf of T.P. Brady for payment of six hours at the straight time rate, account Carrier violated the current Signalmen's Agreement, particularly the Scope Rule and Agreement S-069-87, when it used other than covered employees to perform wiring work for a case installed as part of the signal system at Worthville, Kentucky, and deprived the Claimant of the opportunity to perform this work. Carrier's File No. 15 (95-277). General Chairman's File No. 95-339-C&O. BRS File Case No. 10172-C&O.
- B. Claim on behalf of J.B. McDonie for payment of 12 hours at the straight time rate and five hours at the time and one-half rate, account Carrier violated the current Signalmen's Agreement, particularly the Scope Rule and Agreement S-069-87, when it used other than covered employees to perform wiring work for a case installed as part of the signal system at Worthville, Kentucky, and deprived the Claimant of the opportunity to perform this work. Carrier's File No. 15 (95-279). General Chairman's File No. 95-340-C&O. BRS File Case No. 10173-C&O.
- C. Claim on behalf of G.W. Peterson for payment of four hours at the time and one-half rate, account Carrier violated the current Signalmen's Agreement, particularly the Scope Rule and Agreement S-

069-87, when it used other than covered employees to perform wiring work for a case installed as part of the signal system at Brookwood, Alabama, and deprived the Claimant of the opportunity to perform that work. Carrier's File No. 15 (96-47). General Chairman's File No. 95-367-C&O. BRS File Case No. 10174-C&O.

- D. Claim on behalf of G.W. Peterson for payment of two hours at the time and one-half rate, account Carrier violated the current Signalmen's Agreement, particularly the Scope Rule and Agreement S-069-87, when it used other than covered employees to perform wiring work for a case installed as part of the signal system at Brookwood, Alabama, and deprived the Claimant of the opportunity to perform that work. Carrier's File No. 15 (96-48). General Chairman's File No. 95-371-C&O. BRS File Case No. 10175-C&O.
- E. Claim on behalf of G.W. Peterson for payment of 12 hours at the time and one-half rate, account Carrier violated the current Signalmen's Agreement, particularly the Scope Rule and Agreement S-069-87, when it used other than covered employees to perform wiring work for a case installed as part of the signal system at Palmetto, Georgia, and deprived the Claimant of the opportunity to perform that work. Carrier's File No. 15 (96-49). General Chairman's File No. 95-381-C&O. BRS File Case No. 10176-C&O.
- F. Claim on behalf of J.B. McDonie for payment of 20 hours at the time and one-half rate, account Carrier violated the current Signalmen's Agreement, particularly the Scope Rule and Agreement S-069-87, when it used other than covered employees to perform wiring work for a case installed as part of the signal system at Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, and deprived the Claimant of the opportunity to perform this work. Carrier's File No. 15 (96-50). General Chairman's File No. 96-07-SS. BRS File Case No. 10177-C&O.
- G. Claim on behalf of G.W. Peterson for payment of 20 hours at the time and one-half rate, account Carrier violated the current Signalmen's Agreement, particularly the Scope Rule and Agreement S-069-87, when it used other than covered employees to perform wiring work for a case

installed as part of the signal system at Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, and deprived the Claimant of the opportunity to perform this work. Carrier's File No. 15 (96-51). General Chairman's File No. 96-10-SS. BRS File Case No. 10178-C&O."

#### **FINDINGS**:

The Third Division of the Adjustment Board, upon the whole record and all the evidence, finds that:

The carrier or carriers and the employee or employees involved in this dispute are respectively carrier and employee within the meaning of the Railway Labor Act, as approved June 21, 1934.

This Division of the Adjustment Board has jurisdiction over the dispute involved herein.

Parties to said dispute were given due notice of hearing thereon.

This dispute contests Carrier's right to purchase from a manufacturer pre-wired Harmon VHLC racks used in equipment cases being fitted up by Signal Shop employees for installation in the signal system.

The Organization contends that the wiring of the racks should have been performed by Signal Department personnel.

Carrier denies that its purchase of pre-wired Harmon VHLC racks violated the Agreement, and points out that there is no Rule prohibiting the purchase of pre-wired racks for installation in equipment cases. Upon delivery to Carrier's property, Signal Department employees installed the racks in equipment cases.

The Organization, as the moving party, had the burden of proving that the purchase violated its Agreement. It failed to carry that burden as it presented no Rule to support its contention.

On the other hand, Carrier presented numerous Awards of this Board holding that the purchase of pre-fabricated equipment does not violate the Scope Rule or any

Award No. 32801 Docket No. SG-33531 98-3-96-3-1114

other Rules of Agreement account Agreement rights to the work do not attach to the work until the equipment is delivered and Carrier takes possession thereof. See Third Division Awards 32402, 32290, 32092, 32091, 32058, 32057, 28276, 21232, 20936, 20414; Public Law Board No. 2044, Award 4; Public Law Board No. 1719; and Public Law Board No. 1499, Award 1.

The claims have no Agreement support and must be denied.

### **AWARD**

Claim denied.

### **ORDER**

This Board, after consideration of the dispute identified above, hereby orders that an award favorable to the Claimant(s) not be made.

NATIONAL RAILROAD ADJUSTMENT BOARD By Order of Third Division

Dated at Chicago, Illinois, this 23rd day of September 1998.