

Form 1

**NATIONAL RAILROAD ADJUSTMENT BOARD
THIRD DIVISION**

**Award No. 37935
Docket No. CL-37057
06-3-02-3-21**

The Third Division consisted of the regular members and in addition Referee Edwin H. Benn when award was rendered.

**(CSX Transportation, Inc. (former Seaboard Coast Line
Railroad Company)**
PARTIES TO DISPUTE: (
(Transportation Communications International Union

STATEMENT OF CLAIM:

“Claim of the System Committee of the Union that:

**(Carrier File 6(01-0373)
(TCU File 1.2639(18)SCL)**

- 1. Carrier violated the terms of the Clerks' General Agreement, Rule No. 1 and the Customer Service Center Agreement on December 9, 2000, when it allowed Yardmaster Evette Mitchell, located at Ashland, Illinois, to issue the work order on Train Q59709 that was set to leave Chicago, Illinois. This was allowed in lieu of allowing Clerk R. E. Hunter to perform this work in compliance with CSXT Labor Agreement.**
- 2. Carrier shall now be required to compensate Clerk Hunter eight (8) hours at time and one-half at his current rate of \$147.14 for the above violation.”**

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.

As Third Party in Interest, the United Transportation Union - Yardmasters Department (UTU) was advised of the pendency of this dispute and chose to file a Submission with the Board.

In this claim, the Organization alleges that the Carrier assigned a Yardmaster at Ashland, Illinois, to issue work orders rather than assigning that work to a Customer Service Representative ("CSR") at the Customer Service Center ("CSC") in Jacksonville, Florida.

The background for this claim is set forth in Third Division Awards 37227 and 37760.

As more fully set forth in Third Division Award 37760, the Board has jurisdiction to resolve this claim.

In order to prevail in this case and under the three-part test set forth in Third Division Award 37227, the Organization must demonstrate that the disputed work: (1) was performed by someone other than a CSR at the CSC; (2) was performed by a Clerk at Ashland, Illinois, prior to the 1991 Implementing Agreement; and (3) was performed by a CSR at the CSC after the 1991 Implementing Agreement took effect. There is no evidence in this record to support that needed showing to meet the three-part test. The evidence submitted by the Organization focused upon work performed at Chicago, Illinois. The Organization had to show that the work was performed at Ashland, Illinois, as asserted in the claim. The claim will therefore be denied.

Form 1
Page 3

Award No. 37935
Docket No. CL-37057
06-3-02-3-21

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 19th day of September 2006.

**CARRIER MEMBERS' DISSENT
TO**

**THIRD DIVISION AWARDS 37929, 37930, 37931, 37932, 37933
37934, 37935, 37936, 37937, 37938, 38939, 37940, 37941, 37942**

**DOCKETS CL-37037, CL-37039, CL-37044, CL-37049, CL-37051
CL-37056, CL-37057, CL-37061, CL-37064, CL-37071, CL-37072, CL-37077,
CL-37090, CL-37094**

(Referee Edwin H. Benn)

**These Awards involve the performance of various computer functions, including
adjusting yard inventory, at field locations by Clerks and/or Yardmasters.**

**Awards 37932, 37935, 37938 and 37941 denied the claims presented therein. The
claims that culminated in Awards 37929, 37930, 37931, 37933, 37934, 37936, 37937,
37939, 37940, and 37942 were sustained in accordance with the Findings. Although four
of the 14 Awards decided the involved claims in favor of the Carrier, we nevertheless
dissent on the ground that the Board lacks the subject matter jurisdiction to decide any
of these claims. For the sake of brevity, our Dissent to Third Division Awards 37760
through 37765 is incorporated herein by reference.**

Michael C. Lesnik

Michael C. Lesnik

Martin W. Fingerhut

Martin W. Fingerhut

Bjarne R. Henderson

Bjarne R. Henderson

John P. Lange

John P. Lange

September 19, 2006