

**NATIONAL RAILROAD ADJUSTMENT BOARD  
THIRD DIVISION**

**Award No. 32765  
Docket No. CL-33676  
98-3-97-3-148**

**The Third Division consisted of the regular members and in addition Referee John C. Fletcher when award was rendered.**

**(Transportation Communications International Union  
PARTIES TO DISPUTE: (  
(Houston Belt & Terminal Railway Company**

**STATEMENT OF CLAIM:**

**“Claim of the System Committee of the Organization (GL-11706) that:**

- 1. The Houston Belt & Terminal Railway Company violated the Rules Agreement effective April 15, 1972, as amended, when it allows and/or permits employes of another Carrier not coming under the Scope of the TCU Agreement to perform work (duties and responsibilities relevant to officer's payroll) which have historically and by agreement been assigned to the clerical employes on the Houston Belt & Terminal Railway.**
- 2. Carrier shall now be required to compensate clerical employee Freda R. Edwards for eight (8) hours pay at the straight time rate of \$129.28 per day, subject to general increases and COLA, commencing January 1, 1996, and continuing until such time as claim is settled and the work in question returned.”**

**FINDINGS:**

**The Third 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.**

**For many years certain of Carrier's payroll functions were supported on site through a software contract with, first, the Data Processing Department of the Missouri Pacific Railroad Company ("MP"), next, the Union Pacific Railroad ("UP"), and then Union Pacific Technology ("UPT"). Effective January 1, 1996, Carrier changed vendors, it contracted with Automated Data Processing ("ADP") to do its payroll accounting, and its contract with UPT was terminated. ADP uses state-of-the-art software that streamlined and eliminated several incidental tasks that had been assigned to Carrier's Clerical employees. One of the functions that was eliminated was the manual preparation of the Company Officers payroll - 13 paychecks twice a month. The Organization contends that having the work associated with this task now performed by employees not subject to its Agreement is a violation of its "Positions or Work" Scope Rule.**

**This Board is mindful of the line of Awards that hold that under a Positions or Work Scope Rule, Carrier is proscribed from having work subject to the Agreement transferred to outsiders, strangers not subject to the Agreement. The facts in this case, though, do not support a showing that any work previously performed by Clerks is now being performed by individuals not subject to the Agreement. Instead, what is apparent is that certain functions have been eliminated through the use of sophisticated software. The elimination of work by computer technology is not a transfer of work to strangers to the Agreement.**

**The claim is without merit. It will be denied.**

**AWARD**

**Claim denied.**

**ORDER**

**This Board, after consideration of the dispute identified above, hereby orders that an award favorable to the Claimant(s) not be made.**

**NATIONAL RAILROAD ADJUSTMENT BOARD  
By Order of Third Division**

**Dated at Chicago, Illinois, this 23rd day of September 1998.**