## NATIONAL RAILROAD ADJUSTMENT BOARD

THIRD DIVISION

Award Number 26209 Docket Number MW-26117

John E. Cloney, Referee

(Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employes

PARTIES TO DISPUTE:

(Seaboard System Railroad

STATEMENT OF CLAIM: "Claim of the System Committee of the Brotherhood that:

- 1. The Carrier violated the Agreement when it used Mechanical Department forces instead of Bridge and Building Department forces to construct concrete runways at Uceta Yard, Tampa, Florida, beginning on or about March 17, 1980 [System File C-4(36)-Tampa Div.-7].
- 2. Because of the aforesaid violation, each Group A B&B employe holding an assignment on the Jacksonville and Tampa Divisions during the claim period be allowed pay at their respective straight-time rates for an equal proportionate share of the total number of man-hours expended by Mechanical Department forces in performing the work referred to in Part (1) hereof."

OPINION OF BOARD: The work involved in this Claim consisted of the pouring of aprons, runways and walkways at a new car repair facility at Carrier's Uceta Yard, Tampa, Florida. The work was done by Mechanical Department Employees. The Organization contends employees covered by its Agreement with Carrier were entitled to the work. During the handling of the Claim on the property Carrier contended Mechanical Department employees had done this work for almost forty years. The Organization denied this was done with its knowledge or concurrence although the Carrier furnished statements from more than twenty employees in which they attested to having worked on "forming, pouring and finishing of concrete walks, roads, foundations in and around the shop area in the past . . "

As third party in interest, the Brotherhood Railway Carmen of the United States and Canada was advised of the pendency of this case, but chose not to file a Submission with the Division.

Rule 1, the Scope Rule of the Agreement between the Organization and the Carrier provides:

"These Rules cover the hours of service, wages and working conditions for all employees of the Maintenance of Way and Structures Department as listed by Subdepartments in Rule 5 - Seniority Groups and Ranks, and other employees who may subsequently be employed in said Department, represented by Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees."

Carrier insists the Claim does not properly identify specific Claimants and is procedurally defective as well as lacking in merit.

We do not agree the Claim is defective for lack of specificity.

This Claim arises among a series of Claims involving the same parties over recent years in which the assignment of work is disputed. In these cases we have repeatedly found the Scope Rule to be general in nature. (Third Division Awards 25090, 24028, 23852).

As we stated in Third Division Award 25090:

"This Board has carefully reviewed the record of this case and the many citations submitted by both sides in support of their respective positions. The results of that review reveals that Carrier is correct that both B & B Department personnel and Mechanic Department personnel have performed the disputed work at various times and various locations on the property. It also reveals that the Scope Rule involved here is general in nature and does not specify that the disputed work belongs only to B & B Department employees."

This Claim must be denied for the same reason.

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;

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:

Nancy J. Dever - Executive Secretary

Dated at Chicago, Illinois, this 15th day of January 1987.