

NATIONAL MEDIATION BOARD  
SPECIAL BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT NO. 925

```
*****
                                     *
BURLINGTON NORTHERN RAILROAD COMPANY *
                                     *
and                                     *
                                     *
BROTHERHOOD OF MAINTENANCE           *
OF WAY EMPLOYES                       *
                                     *
*****
```

On May 13, 1983 the Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees (hereinafter the "Carrier") and the Burlington Northern Railroad Company (hereinafter the "Carrier") entered into an Agreement establishing a Special Board of Adjustment in accordance with the provisions of the Railway Labor Act. The Agreement was docketed by the National Mediation Board as Special Board of Adjustment No. 925 (hereinafter the "Board").

This Agreement contains certain relatively unique provisions concerning the processing of claims and grievances under Section 3 of the Railway Labor Act. The Board's jurisdiction was limited to disciplinary disputes involving employees dismissed from service. On September 28, 1987 the parties expanded the jurisdiction of the Board to cover employees who claimed that they had been improperly suspended from service or censured by the Carrier.

Although the Board consists of three (3) members, a Carrier Member, an Organization Member and a Neutral Referee, awards of the Board only contain the signature of the Referee and they are final and binding in accordance with the provisions of Section 3 of the Railway Labor Act.

Employees in the Maintenance of Way craft or class, who have been dismissed or suspended from the Carrier's service or who have been censured, may chose to appeal their claims to this Board. The employee has a sixty (60) day period from the effective date of the discipline to elect to handle his/her appeal through the usual channels (Schedule Rule 40) or to submit the appeal directly to this Board in anticipation of receiving an expedited decision. An employee who is dismissed, suspended or censured may elect either option. However, upon such election that employee waives any rights to the other appeal procedures.

The Agreement further establishes that within thirty (30) days after a disciplined employee notifies the Carrier Member of the Board, in writing, of his/her desire for expedited handling of his/her appeal, the Carrier Member shall arrange to transmit one copy of the notice of investigation, the transcript of investigation, the notice of discipline and the disciplined employee's service record to the Referee. These documents constitute the record of proceedings and are to be reviewed by the Referee.

In the instant case, this Board has carefully reviewed each of the above-described documents prior to reaching findings of fact and conclusions. Under the terms of the Agreement the Referee, prior to rendering a final and binding decision, has the option to request the parties to furnish additional data; including argument, evidence, and awards.

The Agreement further provides that the Referee, in deciding whether the discipline assessed should be upheld, modified or set aside, will determine whether there was compliance with the applicable provisions of Schedule Rule 40; whether substantial evidence was adduced at the investigation to prove the charges made; and, whether the discipline assessed was arbitrary and/or excessive, if it is determined that the Carrier has met its burden of proof in terms of guilt.

#### Background Facts

Mr. Michael E. Long, hereinafter the Claimant, entered the Carrier's service as a Section Laborer on July 21, 1975. The Claimant was subsequently promoted to the position of Machine Operator and he was occupying the position of Section Laborer when he was suspended by the Carrier for approximately 45 days on October 19, 1990 which suspension became effective December 5, 1990.

The Claimant was suspended as a result of an investigation which was held on September 27, 1990 in the Carrier's depot in Alliance, Nebraska. At the investigation the Claimant was represented by the Organization. The Carrier suspended the Claimant based upon its findings that he had absented himself from duty without proper authority at Bridgeport, Nebraska on Monday, September 17, 1990 while assigned as a Laborer on Maintenance Gang 978.

#### Findings of the Board

The instant case is, essentially, a "companion" case to this Board's decision in Case/Award No. 91 decided this same date. In Case No. 91 the Board found that the Carrier had just and sufficient cause to suspend the Claimant for approximately 30 days as the result of his violation of Rule 570 occasioned

by his failure to report for duty or call himself off for the dates of September 10 through 14, 1990.

The only difference between this case and Case No. 91 is the fact that the Carrier instituted additional disciplinary processes as the result of the Claimant's continued unexcused absence on September 17, 1990.

The Claimant's actions and the defenses raised in his behalf by the Organization are materially identical. It is clear that the Claimant understood his responsibilities to report for duty or to properly call himself off; and it is equally clear that in spite of the opportunity to do so, he failed in those responsibilities.

Accordingly, the Board again finds that the Carrier had just cause to discipline the Claimant, and that the measure of discipline was appropriate given the Claimant's poor prior Personal Record regarding his non-compliance with Rule 570.

Award: The claim is denied. This Award was signed this 5th day of February 1994.

*Richard R. Kasher*

Richard R. Kasher  
Chairman and Neutral Member  
Special Board of Adjustment No. 925