# Form 1 NATIONAL RAILROAD ADJUSTMENT BOARD THIRD DIVISION

Award No. 39491 Docket No. SG-38863 09-3-NRAB-00003-050298 (05-3-298)

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

(Brotherhood of Railroad Signalmen

PARTIES TO DISPUTE: (

(Northeast Illinois Regional Commuter Rail

( Corporation (Metra)

## **STATEMENT OF CLAIM:**

"Claim on behalf of the Brotherhood of Railroad Signalmen on the Northeast Illinois Regional Commuter Rail Corp.:

Claim on behalf of J. W. Price, for 36 hours pay at the overtime rate, account Carrier violated the current Signalmen's Agreement, particularly Rule 15 and Side Letter No. 10 (SET letter dated October 24, 1989) when on January 4, 5, and 12, 2003, Carrier allowed employees junior to the Claimant on the NIRCRC Seniority Roster of Signal Department Employees to work on signal cut-overs and did not allow the Claimant to work even though he customarily performs the maintenance, installation and repair on the equipment during assigned hours and outside of assigned hours. Carrier's actions denied the Claimant of this work opportunity. Carrier's File No. 11-28-400. General Chairman's File No. 2-M-03. BRS File Case No. 12990-NIRC."

## FINDINGS:

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

Form 1 Page 2 Award No. 39491 Docket No. SG-38863 09-3-NRAB-00003-050298 (05-3-298)

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.

At the time this dispute arose, the Claimant was a Signal Electronic Technician (SET) on the Milwaukee District. He worked a Monday through Friday schedule, with Saturday and Sunday as rest days.

On January 4 (Saturday) January 5 (Sunday) and January 12 (Sunday) 2003, the Carrier assigned overtime to employees who were junior to the Claimant on the seniority roster. The overtime involved work on a cutover working with electronic equipment (GCP's, SEAR units, SSCC, codeline, AFTAC) and general signal circuits on the Milwaukee District. This claim followed, with the Organization relying upon Side Letter No. 10 and Rule 15 for support of its position.

Side Letter No. 10 addresses the establishment of the SET position. However, Side Letter No. 10 does not obligate the Carrier to assign the Claimant the disputed overtime work merely because he held an SET position. On the contrary, Side Letter No. 10 specifically states that "[t]his rule shall <u>not</u> be construed as prohibiting Signal Maintainers or other qualified Signalmen from making test, inspections and repairs as necessary." [Emphasis added]. The Claimant gains no assignment rights from Side Letter 10 for the disputed work.

Rule 15 also does not help the Claimant's asserted entitlement to the work. In pertinent part, Rule 15 states that "[w]hen overtime is required of a part of a group of employees who customarily work together, the senior qualified available employees of the class involved shall have preference to such overtime if they so desire." In its July 3, 2003 letter at Note 2, the Carrier asserts that the "... [C]laimant is not a member of a group of employees who customarily work

Form 1 Page 3 Award No. 39491 Docket No. SG-38863 09-3-NRAB-00003-050298 (05-3-298)

together." That assertion was not refuted on the property. Rule 15 therefore does not give the Claimant assignment rights for the disputed overtime work.

Throughout, the Carrier asserted that it deemed the workforce selected was sufficient and qualified to perform the work. The Organization failed to prove that determination violated any specific Rule of the Agreement. But in order to prevail, that is what the Organization must prove. The claim must therefore 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 2nd day of February 2009.