NATIONAL RAILROAD ADJUSTMENT KOARD

THIRD DIVISION

Award Number 23517 Docket Number MW-2348

George S. Roukis, Referee

PARFIES TO DISPUTE:

(Brotherhood of Maintenance of Wey Employes

(The **Chesapeake** and Ohio Railway Company ((Northern Region)

STATEMENT OF CLAIM: "Claim of the System Committee of the Brotherhood that:

(1) The Carrier violated the Agreement when it failed to recall furloughed employe David Hensley to fill a temporary vacancy as laborer at Rougemere, Michigan January 22, 1979 through February 20, 1979, both dates inclusive (System File C-TC-766/MG-2512).

(2) Because of the aforesaid violation, David Hensley shall be allowed one hundred thirty-six (136) hours of pay at the laborer's straight time rate and sixteen (16) hours of pay at the laborer's time and one-half rate."

OPINION OF BOARD: Claimant contend6 **that Carrier** violated the controlling **Agreement**, particularly Rules 5(c) and **13(a)** when it failed to recall him to fill a **temporary's laborers vacancy at Rougemere**, Michigan and instead called a junior employe to perform this work on various dates between January 22, 1979 and February 20, **1979**.

Carrier contends that it complied with the Agreement since the 'Track Supervisor, who telephoned **his** house on January 22, **1979** to ascertain **his** availability **for** temporary **snow** removal work **was advised** by either Claimant's wife or mother that he was **working** at the time and would return only to a full time position. It **argues** that he **was** properly contacted to perform temporary work, consistent with past notification practices, but Claimant did not want such work.

In our review Of this **case**, we concur With **Claimant's position**. Rule 5(c) which relates to the **recall** of furloughed **employes**, does not provide a separate recall procedure for temporary work assignments. It requires that when forces are increased, vacancies occur or new positions are created that **trackmen** in furloughed or cut off status, will be **recalled** in seniority order and then in accordance with a formalized time structured notification procedure. **Furloughed** employee will be notified by mail or **telegram** at their last known address. There **is** no alternative notification provision for temporary positions, **Though** it **might** be convenient, practical and expedient for Carrier to telephone contact furloughed employes for temporary work, Rile 5(c) does not provide for Award Number 23517 Docket Number MW-23487

Page 2

this mode of notification. Moreover, it is not validated by the assertion of pest practice.

In Third Division Award 23130 (Referee Scearce) which we find conceptually relevant herein, we stated in pertinent part that:

> "In contrast, the Carrier asserts a longstanding practice of contacting furloughed employees by tele= phone relative to returning to duty. It is well estab= lished that even where a past practice is proven it cannot offset clear and unambiguous language drafted by the parties to the controry. In this case, while it may have been the Carrier's practice to contact furloughed employees by telephone - and obviously it is more convenient, this does not relieve the Carrier or its contractual responsibility to do so formally. Such approach as espoused by the Carrier also leaves unanswered the question of the extent of its obligation if a furloughed employee has no telephone."

Carrier was obligated to recall Claimant in accordance with the Agreement's unambiguous procedure6 and Rule 5(c) does not provide an alternate notification process for temporary work assignments. The Agreement was violated and we will sustain the claim.

FINDINGS: The Third **Division** of the Adjustment **Board**, upon the whole record and all the evidence, find:. and holds:

That the parties waived oral hearing;

That the Carrier and the Engloyes involved in this dispute are respectively Carrier and Employ-es with in the meaning of the Railway Labor Act, as approved June 21, 1934;

That this Division of the Adjustment Board has jurisdiction over the dispute involved herein; and

That the Agreement was violated.

AWARD

Claim sustained.

W. Paulos ATTEST:

ExecutiveSecretary

Dated at Chicago, Illinois, this 29th day of January 1982.

NATIONAL RAILROAD ADDITIONAL IN MIRAN By Order of Third Division