

B E F O R E  
R. O. B O D E N  
I M P A R T I A L   A R B I T R A T O R

INLAND STEEL COMPANY

and

UNITED STEELWORKERS OF AMERICA  
LOCAL UNION 1010

)  
)  
)  
)  
)  
)

ARBITRATION NO. 117

GRIEVANCE NO. 7-D-23

ARBITRATOR'S AWARD

The Question To Be Decided

Whether or not the Company was in violation of Article V, Section 6, of the Collective Bargaining Agreement when it denied Grievance No. 7-D-23, filed December 4, 1953, which alleged that the job content (requirements of the job as to training, skill, responsibility, effort, or working conditions) of the Manipulator occupation (61-0323) in the No. 2 Blooming Mill had changed so as to require a further revision in the classification of such job under the Standard Base Rate Wage Scale.

Decision of the Arbitrator

The Company was not in violation of the Company-Union Agreement when it refused the request for a reclassification of the No. 2 Blooming Mill Manipulator occupation (61-0323).

/Respectfully submitted,

\_\_\_\_\_  
R. O. Boden, Impartial Arbitrator

OPINION

Summary of Facts of the Case

The Inland Steel Company and the United Steelworkers of America evaluated the subject job as a part of their Wage Rate Inequity Program, which was consummated in their Wage Rate Inequity Agreement of June 30, 1947.

Through these Steps, the Company and the Union agreed that the subject job was properly evaluated in relation to the other jobs in the bargaining unit and that it was properly paid as of that time.

In the fall of 1953, the Company undertook a program of expansion and modernization at the No. 2 Blooming Mill. The most significant change was that it was converted from a 40" to a 46" Blooming Mill with side guards or fingers on both sides of the mill. Also, the procedure for changing rolls has changed; instead of using the crane, and electrically operated "buggy" and carriage was substituted.

The installation of new equipment, as related to the modernization of the mill, made it necessary to consider and evaluate the effects of the program upon the existing descriptions and classifications for all occupations in the No. 2 Blooming Mill. As a result, two new occupations were created, described, and classified.

Considering the number of roll changes, it was determined from recent production records in the Production Control Department that rolls are changed approximately two to three times for a period of forty-two operating turns. On the basis of a three-turn operation on a seven-day week, roll changes occur two to three times in a two-week period. This is substantially the same as previously. The procedure for changing rolls is somewhat different--the old method involved taking the rolls out through the plates by means of a counterbalancing roll (a spool attached to the roll in the mill and removed by crane and swung around and the new roll entered); the new method makes use of an electrically operated buggy which facilitates the entering of the new roll and removal of the old and the hydraulic elevators within the mill.

In the June 30, 1947, Wage Rate Inequity Agreement between the parties, Section 3 - Job Classifications reads:

"It is agreed that all jobs within the bargaining unit shall be classified in accordance with a comparison of specific job content using methods approved by the parties hereto, which involve consideration of the training, skill, responsibility, effort and working conditions required by each job with the intent to:

1. Group jobs having substantially equivalent content regardless of department or location within the plant.
2. Reduce job classifications to the smallest practical number consistent with recognition of significant differences in job content.
3. Provide the basis for determining equitable Base Rate relationships as between jobs.
4. Provide an appropriate point of reference from which to measure such changes in job content as may occur from time to time.

It is further agreed that the evaluation of the various job classifications shall serve only as the basis for assigning the jobs to properly related job classes, and that when, and if, from time to time the Company establishes

a new job, or changes the content of an existing job so as to change the classification of such job under the Standard Base Rate Wage Scale set forth in Appendix 3 hereto, such new or changed job shall be evaluated and assigned to a properly related job class."

Also, from the general Agreement dated July 30, 1952, between the parties, Article V, Section 6 - Description and Classification of New or Changed Jobs:

"The job description and classification for each job as agreed upon under the provisions of the Wage Rate Inequity Agreement of June 30, 1947, and the Supplemental Agreement relating to Mechanical and Maintenance Occupations, dated August 4, 1949, shall continue in effect unless (1) the Company changes the job content (requirements of the job as to training, skill, responsibility, effort or working conditions) so as to change the classification of such job under the Standard Base Rate Wage Scale or (2) the description and classification is changed by mutual agreement between the Company and the Union.

When and if, from time to time, the Company at its discretion establishes a new job or changes the job content of an existing job (requirements of the job as to training, skill, responsibility, effort, or working conditions) so as to change the classification of such job under the Standard Base Rate Wage Scale, a new job description and classification for the new or changed job shall be established in accordance with the following procedure:"

(The procedure for description and classification of new or changed jobs follows.)

#### The Union's Position

The Union contends that the job content of the No. 2 Blooming Mill Manipulator occupation (61-0323) has changed sufficiently to warrant a revision in the existing classification. They list three factors which are affected:

Equipment  
Avoidance of Shutdown  
Experience

There are additional duties and responsibilities in that there is a new finger control level during mill operation and three hydraulic controls during roll changes. The new lever during operation is to control the side guards on the out-going side of the mill; the three hydraulic controls during roll changes manipulate the removal of one roll and the insertion of the other. Three additional electrical levers are necessary to operate the "buggy" and carriage.

The products rolled include four different shapes on structural and four different sections on piling bar, in addition to slabs and billets.

The mill has been revamped to a point where the Manipulator operator should be given credit for forty-eight months of experience because of variations in the product rolled and the differences. There is a difference recognized between No. 1 and No. 3 Blooming Mills.

### The Company's Position

As a result of a comprehensive industrial engineering study, it was determined that the occupation of Manipulator was one among the majority of the occupations at the No. 2 Blooming Mill that were not significantly affected so as to require an increase in job class.

Although the Company agreed to raise the coding of the Equipment factor from 3-B-5 to 4-B-7, it did not result in an increase in the total point value of the classification that would result in an increase in the assigned job class.

The Company contends:

1. That the revised job description and classification for the Manipulator occupation are correct and in a proper relationship with substantially equivalent occupations within the general wage structure.
2. That the addition of new equipment in the No. 2 Blooming Mill did not bring about any change in the requirements of the job as to training, skill, responsibility, effort, or working conditions which would require further revision in the existing description and classification.
3. That additional revisions in the point value code assigned to each of the following factors are not required:

Equipment  
Avoidance of Shutdowns  
Experience

### Opinion of the Arbitrator

The case is arbitrable under Article V, Section 6, of the July 30, 1952, Agreement:

The modernization and expansion program in the No. 2 Blooming Mill created some changes in the Manipulator's job.

The three factors in question (Experience, Equipment, and Avoidance of Shutdown) are closely related on all three Blooming Mills. Despite minor variations in the work procedures, each of the Manipulator occupations has substantially equivalent and comparable job content.

Inasmuch as the product mix consists of slabs, billets, and shapes for rolling "I" beams (of which slabs constitute 72 per cent of the production) almost unchanged from the mix prior to the above changes and the fact that the Manipulator does primarily the same job as the No. 1 and No. 3 Blooming Mill Manipulators, there seems no justifiable reason for a [REDACTED] point value rating in the Experience factor than that previously agreed to between the parties.

In the matter of roll changes, the Manipulator operator does have additional controls to operate, but none of these controls is operated entirely and solely at his discretion--they are made at the direction of the Roller, who directs roll changes. Considering the amount of time utilized in changing rolls two or three times in a normal two-week schedule, it is a minor part of the Manipulator's job requiring no additional consideration in point value rating.

In the Equipment factor, the No. 2 Blooming Mill is a 2-Hi, 46" electric driven reversing Mill which is, in the main, the same as the No. 3 Blooming Mill. The auxiliary rolling equipment (fingers and manipulators) at the No. 3 Blooming Mill are the same as those now in operation on the No. 2 Blooming Mill. The revised coding of 4-B-7 in this factor for the No. 2 Blooming Mill, which makes it the same as the No. 3 Blooming Mill, adequately covers the job content after the change.

The point value code assigned each of the three Blooming Mills for Avoidance of Shutdowns is the same--4-B-7. This coding seems fair and equitable in comparison with similar occupations having substantially equivalent job content.

The Arbitrator is, therefore, of the opinion that the Company was not in violation of the Agreement in denying the subject Grievance No. 7-D-23. Maintaining the same job class for the Manipulator operators on Nos. 1, 2, and 3 Blooming Mills is justified because these occupations have substantially equivalent and comparable job content.

July 6, 1954.