## SPECIAL BOARD OF ADJUSTIENT NO. 396

## THE BROTHERHOOD OF PAILROAD TRAINIEN VS.

THE NEW YORK, NEW HAVEN AND HARTFORD RAILROAD COMPANY

## STATE ENT OF CLAIM:

Claim of Worcester Yard Brakemen Passarelli and Rankin for one day, February 3 and 4, 1958 in Worcester Yard.

## OPINION OF BCARD:

5

On the dates of the claim surveyors employed by the State of Massachusetts were surveying on the Carrier's property, on or near the right of way. On each day they were on the property somewhat less than one hour. The Carrier states that surveyors checked with the operator at liope Avenue who advised that there were no trains due and no need for flag protection.

The theory of the instant claim is that the <u>above-named claiminta</u> should have been used on the subject dates to perform flag protection for the s\_\_\_\_\_\_ The Carrier contends that it is the sole indre of whether flag protection is needed and such protection was not needed on the occasions here involved.

The contract provision cited in behalf of this claim (Rule 69A of the Mediation Agreement & ted December 19, 1956) states: "If a flagman is <u>called by the Company...</u>" This provision does not declare that Management must call a flagman under specified circumstances. Moreover, numerous previous decisions on the property have held that it is for the Carrier to determine whether nag protection is required.

-1-

500 ND. 396 AWD ND. 90 AWARD:

N . . . . .

. . . .

(...

~

Claim denied. yd H. Bailer Railer, Neutral Member J. J. Duffy, Carrier Member Employe Hember ( George J. Capill .

2

-2-

.

ь

584 ND. 396 AWD ND. 90

New Haven. Connecticut April 29, 1964