NATIONAL RAILROAD ADJUSTMENT BOARD FIRST DIVISION

Award No. 25465 Docket No. 44944 03-1-00-1-U-2156

The First Division consisted of the regular members and in addition Referee Ann S. Kenis when award was rendered.

(Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers

PARTIES TO DISPUTE:

(Union Pacific Railroad Company

STATEMENT OF CLAIM:

"1170409	1170410	1170411	1170412	1170413	1170414
1170415	1170416	1170417	1170418	1170419	1170420
1170421	1170422	1170423	1170424	1170425	1170426
1170427	1170428	1170429	1170430	1170431	1170432
1170433	1170466	1170467	1170468	1170469	1170470
1170471	1170472	1170473	1170474	1170475	1170476
1170477	1170478	1170479	1170480	1170481	1170483
1170482	1170484	1170485	1171414	1171417	1171418
1171419	1171547	1171548	1171549	1171550	1175551
1171575	1171576	1171577	1171578	1171746	1171762
1171763	1171764	1171765	1171766	1171767	1171768
1171769	1171770	1171771	1171772	1172286	1172287
1172288	1172289	1172290	1172291	1172292	1172293
1172294	1172295	1172296	1172297	1172298	1174876
1174877	1174878	1174879	1174880	1174881	1174882
1174883	1174884	1174885	1174886	1174887	1174888
1174889	1174890	1174891	1174985	1174907	1174908
1174909	1174910	1174921	1174922	1174923	1174924
1174876	1174877	1174878	1174879	1174880	1174881
1174882	1174883	1174884	1174885	1174886	1174887
1174888	1174889	1174890	1174891	1174895	1175070
1178282	1178283	1178284	1178285	1178286	1178287
1178288	1178289	1178290	1178291	1161863	1161864
1161866	1161867	1161868	1161869	1161870	1161871
1161872	1161873	1161874	1161875	1161876	1161877
1161878	1161879	1161880	1161881	1161882	1161883
1161884	1161885	1161886	1161887	1161888	1161889
1161890	1161891	1161892	1161893	1161894	1161492
1161858	1161859	1161860	1161861	1161862	1161895
1161896	1161397	1151898	1161899	1161900	1161901

1161902	1161903	1161904	1161905	1161906	1161907
1161908	1161909	1161910	1161911	1161912	1161913
1161914	1161915	1161916	1161917	1161918	1161919
1161920	1161921	1161922	1161923	1161924	1161925
1161926	1161927	1161928	1161929	1161930	1161931
1161932	1161933	1161934	1161935	1161936	1161937
1161938	1161939	1161940	1161941	1161942	1161943
1161944	1161945	1161946	1161947	1161948	1161949
1161950	1161951	1161952	1161953	1161954	1161955
1161956	1161962	1161963	1161964	1161965	1161966
1161967	1161968	1161969	1161970	1161971	1161972
1161973	1161974	1161977	1161978	1161979	1161980
1161981	1161982	1161983	1161984	1163886	1163887
1163888	1163889	1163890	1163891	1163892	1163893
1163894	1163895	1163942	1163943	1163944	1163945
1163946	1163947	1163948	1163949	1163950	1163951
1163952	1163953	1163954	1163955	1163956	1163957
1163958	1163959	1163960	1163961	1163962	1163963
1163964	1163965	1163966	1163967	1163968	1163969
1163970	1163971	1163972	1163973	1163974	1163975
1163976	1163977	1163978	1163979	1163980	1163982
1163983	1163984	1163985	1163986	1163987	1163988
1163989	1163990	1163991	1163992	1163993	1163994
1163995	1163996	1163997	1163998	1164290	1164606
1164891	1168229	1168349	1168350	1168351	1168352
1168353	1168354	1168355	1168356	1168357	1168358
1168359	1168360	1169914	1169915	1170327	1170328
1170329	1170330	1170331	1170332	1170333	1170334
1170335	1170336	1170337	1170338	1170339	1170340
1170341	1170342	1170345	1170346	1170347	1170348
1170349	1170350	1170351	1170352	1170353	1170354
1170355	1170356	1170357	1170358	1170359	1170360
1170361	1170362	1170363	1170364	1170365	1170366
1170367	1170368	1170369	1170370	1170371	1170372
1170373	1170374	1170375	1170376	1170377	1170378
1170379	1170380	1170381	1170382	1170383	1170384
1170385	1170386	1170387	1170388	1170389	1170390
1170391	1170392	1170393	1170394	1170395	1170396
1170397	1170398	1170399	1170460	1170401	1170402
1170403	1170404	1170405	1170406	1170407	1170408

Claim of various engineers, various dates, for a basic day penalty, each date claimed by each engineer, account the Carrier failed to provide a copy of the MPUL Scheduled Agreement Book to each affected engineer in the St. Louis Hub, prior to the implementation of the St. Hub Merger Implementing Agreement (November 01, 1998), in violation of Article VI and Side Letters No. 3 and No. 9 of St. Louis Hub Merger Implementing Agreement of the Union Pacific/Southern Pacific Merger. All claims listed herein are valid as presented pursuant to Item No. 8 of System Agreement - Claims Handling Process dated March 21, 1996 account Carrier violation Item No. 6 of System Agreement -Claims Handling Process dated March 21, 1996. Any claim listed herein that has not been conferenced by the Carrier in accordance with the provisions of Item No. 5 of System Agreement - Claims Handling Process dated March 21, 1996, as set forth in the Agreed to Questions and Answers to the On-Property portion of the 1996 BLE National Agreement, are valid as presented pursuant to Item No. 8 of System Agreement - Claims Handling Process dated March 21, 1996. (Carrier Labor Relations File Numbers identified above)."

FINDINGS:

The First 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 numerous claims listed in this case allege that the Claimants were not provided a copy of the Collective Bargaining Agreement by November 1, 1998, the implementation date of the St. Louis Hub, as agreed in Side Letter 3 of the St. Louis Hub Merger Agreement. The Organization seeks "various amounts of days pay and/or mileage" for the alleged violations.

The Carrier takes issue at the outset with the fact that the Organization has joined these individually handled claims before the Board without the Agreement of the Carrier. While we believe that the better course of action would be to have the parties address these multiple claims as a group on the property, rather than to have one party proceed

unilaterally to combine claims at this level, we nevertheless take cognizance of the fact that, with the exceptions discussed below, the claims present the same facts and issues. In the interest of economy and efficiency, we find that they are properly joined in this proceeding.

The Carrier has also argued, without refutation by the Organization, that the following claims were not conferenced and are therefore not properly before the Board:

1174921 1174922 1174923 117492	1174921	1174922	1174923	1174924
--------------------------------	---------	---------	---------	---------

In addition, the following claims were listed twice:

1174876	1174877	1174878	1174879
1174880	1174881	1174882	1174883
1174884	1174885	1174886	1174887
1174888	1174889	1174890	1174891

Moreover, the following claims were not filed by the Organization on the property:

1175551 1174985 1164891

And, case 1161951 has already been docketed to the First Division in Case 00-1-U-2142.

The Organization does not refute these procedural irregularities. We find, therefore, that the foregoing claims are not properly before the Board and, accordingly, they are dismissed.

We turn to the remaining claims. In First Division Award 25459, the Board had occasion to consider many of the issues now raised by the parties herein. In that case, the claimant was a local chairman whose time claim asserted that his rights under the contract had been violated when he did not receive a copy of the Collective Bargaining Agreement before November 1, 1998, the agreed upon date under Side Letter No. 3 of the St. Louis Hub Agreement. Concluding that there was a breach of the Agreement, the Board examined the relevant factors in determining the appropriateness of a penalty. The claim for four basic days was reduced on the basis that no intentional violation was proved. However, the claimant's status as a local chairman was determined to be a significant factor in awarding two basic days.

To the extent that the parties have raised some the same procedural issues in the instant matter as were fully considered by the Board in that award, our findings should be incorporated herein as if fully rewritten.

Award No. 25465 Docket No. 44944 03-1-00-1-U-2156

On the merits, we find that there is a somewhat different balance of factors which must be taken into account in determining whether to sustain the claims in this case. We remain unconvinced, based on the record in its entirety, that bad faith has been proven or that the Carrier intentionally denied the Claimants copies of the contract. Equally important in this decisional matrix, the Claimants have a more attenuated claim to a monetary remedy than a local chairman. There is no evidence that they suffered any injury or were prejudiced by not timely receiving a copy of the Agreement. Proof of calculable loss is nonexistent. To award damages under these circumstances would amount to a punitive remedy not provided for in the Agreement.

Under these circumstances, it is the Board's finding that the Agreement was violated but the requested remedy is denied.

AWARD

Claim sustained in accordance with the Findings.

<u>ORDER</u>

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 First Division

Dated at Chicago, Illinois, this 20th day of August 2003.