

UNITED STEELWORKERS OF
AMERICA, C.I.O.

-vs-

INLAND STEEL COMPANY

GRIEVANCE NO. 16-C-153

ARBITRATION NO. 52

Hearing was held in the Labor Relations Meeting Room, Plant 1 Clockhouse of the Indiana Harbor Works Plant of the Inland Steel Company, East Chicago, Indiana, on Thursday, November 29, 1951.

Decision rendered by arbitrator on December 31, 1951.

The issue before the arbitrator as stated by the Union and the Company may be summarized as follows: Whether or not the incentive rate (File No. 77-2028) installed May 16, 1949 and made retroactive to June 28, 1948 by the Company for the Hallden Shear Recorders in the Cold Strip Mill is equitable in relation to the terms and provisions of Article V, Section 5, of the current Collective Bargaining Agreement between the Company and the Union.

As a consequence of an expansion and modernization program, and the resulting changes in conditions, the Company determined and installed new incentive rates. The incentive rate which is the basis for the grievance in this case is being applied to a new job Hallden Shear Recorder, that came into existence as a result of the changes in operating methods. Job descriptions of the Weighmaster (Index No. 77-0128) and the Hallden Shear Recorder (Index No. 77-2043) were presented as exhibits in the case during the hearing. Both jobs were classified in Job Class 7. The base rate for this job class is \$1.580 according to Exhibit C of the Company and Exhibit A of the Union.

These exhibits show that the ratio of total earnings to the base rate for the Recorder for #48 and #54 Hallden Shear is 1.18; for #66 and #74 Hallden Shear this ratio is 1.23. These are average figures for the period of January 1, 1951 to September 1, 1951.

In its prepared statement, the Union charges that the earnings realized under the incentive rate established by the Company for the Hallden Shear Recorders in the Cold Strip Mill are not equitable in relation to other incentive earnings and that the Recorder job requirements are such that the job is a part of the Shear Unit and not auxiliary in nature.

In its prepared statement, the Company says that it denied the request of the grievance (#16-C-153) that the Union filed on June 27, 1949 because it contends that the incentive rate (File No. 77-2028) does provide for incentive earnings that are equitable in relation to other incentive earnings in the department or like departments involved and previous job requirements and incentive earnings.

During the hearing, by questioning both the Union and the Company representatives, the arbitrator sought to clarify these two points: (1) What definitions exist for auxiliary and member or unit jobs? (2) To what degree are such jobs as Recorders, Truckers, etc. expected to participate in the bonus earnings? From the testimony, it appears that no clear cut definitions exist and that reference can only be made to past practice to which both parties do not subscribe on equal terms.

Also, during the hearing, the arbitrator attempted to determine whether or not any practices of the past could be used to establish the proper relationship

of the Recorders on the Hallden Shears to the other occupations in the Hallden Shear Division.

These attempts were made because the arbitrator is mindful of the harm that can be done by rulings which introduce practices foreign to the history of a particular situation. Unfortunately, the discussions during the hearing did not provide clear-guides; and the ruling is based on an evaluation of the jobs in the Hallden Shear Unit as indicated, in part, below.

The arbitrator considers the relative importance of the different jobs in the following order:

1. Operator
2. 1st Class Inspector
3. Piler & Inspector
4. Feeder
- A. Tractor Operator
- B. Recorder
- C. Lift Bracer

With this order of importance established, the average total earnings per hour and ratio of total earnings to the base rate were carefully examined and a crude ratio was established for guidance in this ruling. (The ruling on Grievance No. 16-C-152 was taken into consideration here.)

Referring to Company Exhibit C Hallden Shears #66 and #74, the Recorder data appears as follows:

<u>OCCUPATION</u>	<u>EVALUATED BASE RATE</u>	<u>AVG. TOT. EARNINGS PER HOUR</u>	<u>RATIO TOTAL EARNINGS TO BASE RATE</u>	<u>TURNS</u>
Recorder	\$1.580	\$1.940	1.23	507

The established ratio changes the Recorder figures as shown below:

<u>OCCUPATION</u>	<u>EVALUATED BASE RATE</u>	<u>AVG. TOT. EARNINGS PER HOUR</u>	<u>RATIO TOTAL EARNINGS TO BASE RATE</u>	<u>MAN TURNS</u>
Recorder	\$1.580	\$2.070	1.31	507

This, then, is the basis of the award. The Company's Industrial Engineering Department is requested to calculate a new incentive rate to reflect this change all through the range of output and for the Hallden Shears #48 and #54. The figure, 1.18, which is the ratio of total earnings to the base rate of the Recorder for the Hallden Shears #48 and #54 cannot be changed by the arbitrator because he is not informed about the calculations used by the Company to establish the incentive rate.

Respectfully submitted,

E. A. Cyrol, Arbitrator