

SPECIAL BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT NO. 285

BROTHERHOOD OF MAINTENANCE OF WAY EMPLOYEES

vs  
READING COMPANY

Award No. 17

Case No. 17

STATEMENT OF CLAIM:

1. The Carrier violated the effective Agreement by failing to call Laborer Wm. Jenkins assigned to Crane No. 811 for overtime work with Crane No. 811 on Saturday, November 14, 1959.
2. Laborer Jenkins be now reimbursed for the amount of overtime work lost due to this violation of the Agreement, namely 4 hours at the time and one half rate.

OPINION OF BOARD:

On Saturday, November 14, 1959, it was necessary to use Crane No. 811 to assist in handling a broken switch point at Callowhill Street Junction in Philadelphia. The regular operator of this crane was E. Parziale. His helper was Claimant Jenkins. The Track Supervisor telephoned Parziale but received no answer. According to the Carrier, the Supervisor then attempted to call Jenkins, using a phone number which was on file for the claimant in the Supervisor's office, but was told by the telephone operator that the telephone was disconnected. The Supervisor then called Crane Operator Bravo and instructed him to operate Crane No. 811 that day, along with Bravo's helper.

Claimant Jenkins contends he was improperly deprived of this Saturday overtime work, since he was available and the Track Supervisor should have been able to reach him. Jenkins states that more than a year prior to the subject incident the telephone company changed the exchange and prefix number of the telephone which was listed for him at the Supervisor's office, but that in accordance with past practice he had given the revised phone number both of Crane Operator Parziale and also to Crane Operator Bravo. The Union also points out that Jenkins' corrected number is listed in the Philadelphia Telephone Directory and that if the Supervisor was unable to contact the claimant in the first instance the proper phone number could have been obtained from the telephone book.

It is the employee's responsibility to keep the Carrier currently advised concerning his correct telephone number. We do not think a helper properly discharges his responsibility in this respect simply by giving his corrected phone number to the crane operator with whom he regularly works. The operator may fail to transmit the helper's corrected number to supervision. Moreover, if the helper's number is known only to the operator and the Carrier is unable to contact the operator for overtime work, it has no prompt means of contacting the helper. We do not think that a supervisor is obligated to search the public telephone directory in order to find an employee's telephone number. The requirements of the service often necessitate immediate action in contacting employees for unassigned work. It would be an undue burden upon supervision to require it to search a public telephone directory in order to contact employees for such work. In this connection, we note that the

Philadelphia phone book contains over 350 listings of "Jenkins" and 16 listings of "Wm. Jenkins".

In view of what has been said above, there is no reason to consider Rule 28(j) as applied to the facts of this case. We therefore make no comment upon the parties' contentions with respect to the interpretation of this rule.

AWARD:

Claim denied.

(s) Lloyd H. Bailer  
Lloyd H. Bailer, Chairman

(s) A. J. Cunningham  
A. J. Cunningham, Employee Member

(s) H. F. Wyatt, Jr.  
H. F. Wyatt, Jr., Carrier Member

Philadelphia, Pa.  
March 17, 1961.