NATIONAL RAILROAD ADJUSTMENT BOARD THIRD DIVISION

David Dolnick, Referee

PARTIES TO DISPUTE:

365

AMERICAN TRAIN DISPATCHERS ASSOCIATION ST. LOUIS-SAN FRANCISCO RAILWAY COMPANY

STATEMENT OF CLAIM: Claim of the American Train Disptachers Association that:

- (a) The St. Louis-San Francisco Railway Company (hereinafter "the Carrier") violated the effective Agreement between the parties, Article 1 thereof in particular, when on June 9, 1969 it required and/or permitted other than those covered thereby, to perform work covered by said Agreement.
- (b) Carrier shall now compensate Train Dispatcher D. L. Ables one day's compensation at pro rata rate unless it was his sixth or seventh day, then at time and one-half the daily rate applicable to Assistant Chief Dispatcher for said violation.

EMPLOYES' STATEMENT OF FACTS: There is an Agreement in effect between the parties, copy of which is on file with this Board, and the same is incorporated into this Ex Parte Submission as though fully set out herein.

Article I — Scope is identical in the Agreement effective September 1, 1949, revised as of January 1, 1953 and again revised effective October 1, 1965, insofar as the rules material to this dispute are concerned.

For the Board's ready reference, Article I, Scope, of the Agreement is here quoted in full text:

"ARTICLE I

(a) SCOPE

This agreement shall govern the hours of service and working conditions of train dispatchers. The term 'train dispatcher' as hereinafter used shall include night chief, assistant chief, trick, relief and extra train dispatchers. It is agreed that one chief dispatcher in each dispatching office shall be excepted from the scope and provisions of this agreement.

Note (1): Positions of excepted chief dispatcher will be filled by employes holding seniority under this agreement. At 10:35 A.M., June 17, 1969, Mr. C. E. Hurt, Trainmaster, Quanah, Texas, instructed No. 31 to set out two (2) cars at Olustee and do some spotting of the elevator.

No. 31 did as was instructed.

The various reasons given for declination of this claim are set forth in the Carrier's declination letter November 19, 1969, copy attached as Carrier's Exhibit No. 37.

CLAIM 38

This claim was presented upon the following reported Statement of Facts:

At 9:10 A.M., June 17, 1969, Mr. C. E. Hurt, Trainmaster, Quanah, Texas, instructed train No. 31 at Snyder, Oklahoma to bring what he has handy to Quanah. If possible bring 10 mty covered hoppers and 2 mty box.

No. 31 did as instructed.

The various reasons given for the declination of this claim are set forth in the Carrier's letter November 19, 1969, copy attached as Carrier's Exhibit No. 38. The trainmaster who is alleged to have committed the violations in Claims 37 and 38 is one of the division officers who, as such, has responsible control over the operation of a division, or a terminal, or of a major activity within an operating division, and when acting in the discharge of his duties and responsibilities, it is not mandatory that a division trainmaster exercise such responsible control only through employes of the train dispatchers' class, nor do the Rules of the Train Dispatchers' Agreement place such a hindrance or limitation upon him.

(Exhibits not reproduced.)

OPINION OF BOARD: On June 9, 1969 the Trainmaster at Enid, Oklahoma issued the following message:

"Enid 11:45 A.M. 6/9/69

C&E Snyder-Davidson Switcher-Snyder At close of shift Snyder-Davidson Switcher job abolished. Crew released deadhead to Enid."

This message is not a train order nor is tantamount to a train order. Abolishing positions is an integral part of a Trainmaster's duties and responsibilities. He also has every right to issue work instructions as long as they are not train orders or the "distribution of power and equipment" incident to the handling of trains. None of these are involved in this claim.

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 Employes involved in this dispute are respectively Carrier and Employes within the meaning of the Railway Labor Act, as approved June 21, 1934;

18940 16

That this Division of the Adjustment Board has jurisdiction over the dispute involved herein; and

That the Carrier did not violate the Agreement.

AWARD

Claim denied.

NATIONAL RAILROAD ADJUSTMENT BOARD By Order of THIRD DIVISION

ATTEST: E. A. Killeen Executive Secretary

Dated at Chicago, Illinois, this 7th day of January 1972.