

Award No. 13147

Docket No. SG-13429

**NATIONAL RAILROAD ADJUSTMENT BOARD**

**THIRD DIVISION**

**(Supplemental)**

**John J. McGovern, Referee**

**PARTIES TO DISPUTE:**

**BROTHERHOOD OF RAILROAD SIGNALMEN**

**SOUTHERN PACIFIC COMPANY  
(Pacific Lines)**

**STATEMENT OF CLAIM:** Claim of the General Committee of the Brotherhood of Railroad Signalmen on the Southern Pacific Company that:

(a) The Southern Pacific Company violated the current Signalmen's Agreement effective April 1, 1947 (reprinted April 1, 1958, including revisions), particularly the Scope Rule and Rules 16 and 70.

(b) Mr. L. G. Hamilton be paid four and one-half (4½) hours at his overtime rate of pay for each of the following dates: February 27, 28, March 1, 2, 3, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 13, 14, 15, 16 and 17, 1961.

(c) Mr. L. S. Bailey, Assistant Signalman, be paid the difference between his Assistant Signalman rate of pay and that of Signalman for each of the following days for eight (8) hours each: February 27, 28, March 1, 2, 3, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 13, 14, 15, 16 and 17, 1961, and four and one-half (4½) hours at the Signalman overtime rate on March 3, 6, 7 and 8, 1961.

(d) Mr. T. W. Eaves be paid the difference between his Assistant Signalman rate of pay and that of Signalman for eight (8) hours on each of the following dates: March 3, 6, 7 and 8, 1961.

(e) Mr. R. J. Rogers, furloughed Assistant Signalman, be paid eight (8) hours at his rate of pay for each of the following dates: February 27, 28, March 1, 2, 3, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 13, 14, 15, 16 and 17, 1961.

(f) Mr. J. Jordan, furloughed Assistant Signalman, be paid eight (8) hours at his rate of pay for each of the following dates: March 3, 6, 7 and 8, 1961. [Carrier's File: SIG 152-93; S-97-21-105]

**EMPLOYEES' STATEMENT OF FACTS:** This dispute is a result of the Carrier's action of assigning track forces instead of signal forces to provide flag protection at highway-railroad grade crossings at which automatic highway crossing protection devices had been installed. Highway cross-

In view of the above, no doubt whatever should exist as to the propriety of using Maintenance of Way employes for flagging crossings whenever in the judgment of Carrier's supervisory personnel it is the better way to get the job done.

This claim is obviously an attempt on the part of Petitioner to secure for Signal Department employes through an Award of this Division an exclusive right to perform any and all crossings flagging at any crossing where there is an automatic crossing protection device if for any reason manual flagging of said crossing is required. Conclusive evidence thereof is the fact that within the last year, Petitioner has appealed to this Division from this property a series of 5 claims, including that in this Docket, having as their basis that very issue. The other four claims appealed to this Division carry the following organization file numbers: NRAB-1058 — Southern Pacific, NRAB-1156 — Southern Pacific, NRAB-1157 — Southern Pacific, and NRAB-1201 — Southern Pacific.

Both Signal Department and Maintenance of Way employes have always been used for crossing flagging on this property, and there have never been firmly defined lines agreed upon with respect to when one or the other of those crafts will be used. The determination as to by whom crossing flagging will be performed on this property has always been a prerogative of management which has been exercised harmoniously for many, many years.

In the above situation the principle enunciated in Award 8755, denying that claim, applies here. The following excerpt from this "Board's Opinion" in that case clearly reflects the analogy:

"Thus it appears that the work in question, not being exclusively allocated to the claimant in the scope section of the contract, and of a type performed by others in the past, is work which in the discretion of the Carrier, may be awarded to either class. The discretion to be exercised in the public interest."

Insofar as the claim for overtime rate is concerned, if there is any basis for claim submitted, which Carrier denies, nevertheless, the contractual right to perform work is not the equivalent of work performed. That principle is well established by a long line of awards of this Division, some of the latest being 6019, 6562, 6750, 6854, 6875, 6974, 6978, 6998, 7030, 7094, 7100, 7105, 7110, 7138, 7222, 7239, 7242, 7288, 7293, 7316, 8114, 8115, 8531, 8533, 8534, 8568, 8766, 8771, 8776, 9748 and 9749. In addition, the claim for 8 hours' pay for four of the claimants on dates of March 3, 6, 7 and 8, 1961, is erroneous, as only three grade crossings are involved, and there is no contention that more than one Maintenance of Way employe provided flagging protection at any one of those crossings at one time on those dates.

### CONCLUSION

The claim in this docket is entirely lacking in merit or agreement support, and carrier requests that it be denied.

(Exhibits not reproduced.)

**OPINION OF BOARD:** We find that this claim involves the same parties and question as that involved in Award No. 13143. Following our decision in that case, this claim will be denied.

**FINDINGS:** The Third Division of the Adjustment Board, after giving the parties to this dispute due notice of hearing thereon, and upon the whole record and all the evidence, finds and holds:

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 not violated.

**AWARD**

Claim denied.

NATIONAL RAILROAD ADJUSTMENT BOARD  
By Order of THIRD DIVISION

ATTEST: S. H. Schulty  
Executive Secretary

Dated at Chicago, Illinois, this 11th day of December 1964.