

INLAND STEEL COMPANY  
Indiana Harbor Works

and

UNITED STEELWORKERS OF AMERICA  
Local Union 1010

Grievance No. 12-E-75  
Docket No. IH-12-12-5/3/56  
Arbitration No. 175

Opinion and Award

Appearances:

For the Company:

William F. Price, Esq., Attorney  
William L. Ryan, Assistant Superintendent, Labor Relations  
Department  
J. I. Herlihy, Superintendent, Industrial Engineering Department

For the Union:

Cecil Clifton, International Representative  
Fred Gardner, Chairman, Grievance Committee  
Joseph Wolanin, Secretary, Grievance Committee

The tractor operators in the Galvanize Department grieve that Wage Incentive Plan No. 55-2033 does not provide equitable incentive earnings in relation to other incentives in the department and the previous job requirements and the previous incentive earnings. They request "a more equitable incentive in relation to their previous job requirements and previous incentive earnings." In the Third Step written statement of the Union it was contended that the work load has increased 50 per cent in a three line operation as compared with a former two line operation; that the incentive pay is the same as when the tractor operators were on a two line operation; and that their incentive should be increased an additional 15 cents by reason of the additional duties and work involved in servicing the No. 3 line.

The grievants were originally under Wage Incentive Plan No. 55-2029 covering Tractor Operator, Stocker and Stocker Craneman. The plan was of the Equipment Utilization type. When 3 line operation was introduced, Stocking Craneman and Stocker were placed under another incentive plan and Plan No. 55-2033 was formulated for Tractor Operator. This new plan was the same as Plan No. 55-2029 excepting that it averaged the percent of operating time over 3 rather than over 2 galvanizing lines.

The Job description of Tractor Operator remains substantially the same as it was under 2 line operation.

There is a basic conflict in the approach of the Company and the Union to the problem presented by this case. The Union points to the fact that an additional line has been added; that additional tonnage is being

produced and handled; and

" where there is additional tonnage handled in this same manner and with the same equipment \* \* \* it is only reasonable to assume that the increased production results in an increased work load."

The Union also claims that some of the duties performed by tractor operators, by reason of the introduction of the third line, or otherwise, require more time and effort than they required heretofore.

The Company approach on the other hand, considers the question of weights and tonnage as immaterial, particularly as the allegedly larger coils currently processed involving greater tonnage may also involve less incentive effort. It bases its case on a comparison of work loads in a manner similar to its arguments in previous incentive cases. It urges that its computations show a reduction of work load for the average tractor operator from 41.16 per cent to 32.02 per cent. The periods compared are August 14, 1955 to November 13, 1955 (under 2 line operation immediately preceding the 3 line operation) and December 2, 1956 to February 23, 1957 (under 3 line operation). The Company also represents that the justified incentive margin for these two periods was reduced only from 14.41 per cent to 11.21 per cent. (It should be observed here that these are revised figures presented after the hearing; at the hearing the Union challenged the Company's computations on the ground that Tractor Operator Learner experience was included and that there was no such increase in Tractor Operator hours worked as was claimed by the Company. The figures above are represented now to exclude Learner hours.)

The hourly incentive earnings in the pay periods ending August 28, 1955 to November 13, 1955 (2 line operation) averaged \$.297 and the man-hours worked in those pay periods averaged 474.0; for the period November 20, 1955 through February 23, 1957 (the wage increase of August 5, 1956 excluded) the average of hourly earnings was \$.305 (practically the same as in the previous period) and the average of man-hours worked by Tractor Operators was 494.5. The Union alleges that at the time of the filing of the grievance there was no substantial increase in the number of tractor operator hours, but the only data presented at the hearing indicate that there has been a significant increase in tractor operator hours to deal with the increased work-load presented by the installation of the No. 3 line. The Union seemed to emphasize the fact that the increase in tractor operator hours was not referred to by the Company until the Third Step; but even assuming the accuracy of that observation, it cannot affect my finding on the record as it is presented to me.

In dealing with additional job requirements, the Union refers to changes in job duties having to do with the handling of nearly double the amount of spelter as that handled before the inauguration of the No. 3 line and the requirement that tractor operators mix solutions of acid and sodium silicate for all three lines. The testimony in support of these arguments was impressionistic rather than factual and affords one little opportunity to arrive at an informed judgment of just what did take place. With respect to the mixing of acids and sodium silicate, a Company witness referred

to new equipment consisting of a central mixing tank which no longer requires Tractor Operators to transport the sodium silicate to each of the lines. This was put forward as representing a savings in time and effort. This is rather difficult to understand, since the Company's work load time studies of the 2 line and 3 line operation dealing with Sodim Silicate handling show no reduction of work load for those items, but, rather an increase in the number of units per operating turn and standard allowed minutes per turn. This does not affect the overall picture (an increase from 253.49 standard allowed minutes per turn for 2 line operation to 278.96 for 3 line) but points up a perplexing inconsistency in the internal logic of the Company's case not resolved in the transcript or record.

A somewhat similar situation exists with regard to "Service Pots - Supply Spelter". Regardless of the amount of spelter handled, in gross, Company Exhibit D shows that the standard allowed minutes per unit was 6.02 under both two and three line operation; but the Company computed 6 units per operating turn on the 2 line and allowed 10.08 units on the 3 line operation; similarly, the 2 line operation was computed for 36.12 standard allowed minutes per turn and the 3 line operation 65.02. This increase may not be as much as is contended for by the Union but shows some recognition of and allowance for the substance of the Union's claim. It is the best evidence on the subject before me.

There was also a claim that the tractor operators were required to traverse a greater distance in the servicing of coiling. Consideration of the routes taken by tractor operators from the end of the line to the scale to storage does not disclose any changes which are material for the resolution of this issue. Furthermore, Company Exhibit D, again, makes some allowance in the Union's direction on this matter.

The Company's presentation, briefly stated is based on the following: a) an increase in tractor hours to make up for the increase in production since the introduction of the 3rd line from 474 for a pay period to 594.5; b) a study of two line operation during January, March and August applied to the three months prior to the installation of the No. 3 line, which studies were projected to indicate work load for the period December 1, 1956 through February 23, 1957 and which show an increase from 253.49 standard allowed minutes per turn to 278.96; c) a decrease of allowed minutes per turn for the average tractor operator from 197.61 (2 line) to 153.73 (3 line); d) a decrease in the per cent work load for the average tractor operator from 41.16 per cent (2 line) to 32.02 per cent. The justified incentive margin has decreased as indicated above, from 14.4. per cent to 11.21 per cent.

Although the Union has demonstrated some weaknesses in the Company's original position and argument, which the Company has corrected with supplementary data, it has not presented any affirmative and persuasive data of its own nor has it successfully challenged the fundamental basics of the Company's case.

The quality and significance of the data presented to me require the conclusion that a showing of the required inequitability of the plan has not been made.

AWARD

The grievance is denied.

---

Peter Seitz,  
Assistant Permanent Arbitrator

Dated: July 19, 1957