

NATIONAL RAILROAD ADJUSTMENT BOARD  
THIRD DIVISION

Award No. 45631  
Docket No. MW-48382  
26-3-NRAB-00003-240087

The Third Division consisted of the regular members and in addition Referee Michael Capone when award was rendered.

(Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employes Division –  
(IBT Rail Conference

**PARTIES TO DISPUTE:** (

(Soo Line Railroad Company (former Chicago, Milwaukee,  
(St. Paul and Pacific Company)

**STATEMENT OF CLAIM:**

“Claim of the System Committee of the Brotherhood that:

- (1) The Agreement was violated when the Carrier assigned outside forces (Dahlman Construction Co.) to perform routine Maintenance of Way and Structures Department work [including, but not limited to, removal and replacement of two (2) garage doors and garage door frames] at the Carrier’s Bridge and Building (B&B) Garage in Muskego Yard on the Watertown Subdivision on June 16 and 17, 2022 (System File C-59-22-080-23/2022-0029973 CMP).
- (2) The Agreement was further violated when the Carrier failed to furnish the General Chairperson with proper advance written notice of its intent to contract out the work and failed to enter good-faith discussions to reduce the use of contractors and increase the use of Maintenance of Way forces as required by Rule 1 and Appendix I.
- (3) As a consequence of the violations referred to in Parts (1) and/or (2) above, Claimants P. Forsythe and M. Ruether shall be compensated ‘... a proportionate share each of thirty-two (32) hours at their applicable straight-time and/or overtime rates of pay for all time, benefits, and work opportunities lost and to which they were entitled by virtue of their seniority rights and regular assignments – but which they were denied on June 16, 2022, and on June 17, 2022.’”

**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.

The Organization brings this claim asserting that the Carrier violated the Agreement when on June 16 and 17, 2022, it assigned a third-party contractor to perform routine work customarily and historically provided by employees in the Maintenance of Way and Structures Department, as described in paragraph (1) of the Statement of Claim. It maintains that the work performed by the non-agreement contractor employees is reserved to the Carrier's employees as provided for in Rule 1 - Scope, Rule 4 - Department Limits, Rule 5 - Seniority Limits, Rule 46 - Classification and Appendix I (Letter of Agreement, December 11, 1981).

The Organization claims the Carrier committed a procedural error as described in paragraph (2) of the Statement of Claim when it did not provide proper notice to the Organization of the contracting out of work as required by the "Note" to Rule 1, which it asserts is identical to Article IV of the May 17, 1968 National Agreement. It also argues that the Carrier did not produce a copy of a warranty which it claimed would be voided if the contractor did not perform the work.

The Carrier claims it provided the notice and held a conference as required by Rule 1 - Scope. It avers that the Claimants did not have the experience and skill to perform the work, and they were "gainfully employed" and therefore suffered no loss.

The Board first addresses the Organization's allegation that the Carrier committed a fatal procedural error when it failed to provide proper notice of its intention to subcontract work to a third party. We find that the Organization has

met its burden of proof that proper notice was not provided in violation of the Agreement.

A review of the record confirms that a notice to subcontract work was not provided to the Organization during the on-property handling of the dispute. Appendix I and the “Note” to Rule 1 specifically requires that “the Carrier shall notify the General Chairman in writing” to subcontract work. Without a record of notice there is no support for the Carrier’s assertion that its employees lacked the skills necessary to remove and replace two garage doors and door frames. Moreover, the record does not contain a copy of the warranty which the Carrier alleged obligated it to have the contractor perform the work. As such, we find the Carrier violated the Agreement, as alleged in paragraph (2) of the Statement of Claim and therefore, we do not reach the merits of the dispute

We move to a review of the remedy requested and find it to be unacceptable. The proper remedy shall be determined as follows:

1. The parties shall perform a joint review of the record to determine the total amount of hours worked by contractor’s employees on June 16 and 17, 2022, at the location identified in paragraph (1) of the Statement of Claim.
2. The Claimants shall be compensated a proportionate share of the total hours worked at the applicable straight time rate of pay irrespective of their work assignment on those days. The claim for overtime pay is denied except where there is evidence that a Claimant would have earned overtime if assigned to work on June 16 and 17, 2022, at the location described in paragraph (1) of the Statement of Claim.

**AWARD**

**Claim sustained.**

**ORDER**

**This Board, after consideration of the dispute identified above, hereby orders that an award favorable to the Claimant(s) be made. The Carrier is ordered to make the Award effective on or before 30 days following the postmark date the Award is transmitted to the parties.**

**NATIONAL RAILROAD ADJUSTMENT BOARD  
By Order of Third Division**

**Dated at Chicago, Illinois, this 20th day of March 2026.**