

INLAND STEEL COMPANY )

and )

UNITED STEELWORKERS OF AMERICA )  
Local Union 1010 )

Grievance No. 2-F-7

Docket No. IH 113-113-1/17/57

Arbitration No. 209

Opinion and Award

Appearances:

For the Company:

L. E. Davidson, Assistant Superintendent, Labor Relations  
Robert Smith, Superintendent, Wage and Salary  
Jack Stanton, Divisional Supervisor, Labor Relations  
David Gott, Job Analyst, Wage and Salary  
George Applegate, Job Analyst, Wage and Salary  
E. Underwood, Assistant Superintendent, Coke Plant

For the Union:

Cecil Clifton, International Staff Representative  
Joseph Wolanin, Secretary, Grievance Committee  
Buster Logan, Vice Chairman, Grievance Committee  
Hollis Gearing, Grievance Committeeman

The issue raised in this grievance is whether the Coke Hoist Operators in the Screening Station Sequence of the No. 2 Coke Plant are not entitled, by virtue of new and changed conditions, to have their occupation re-described and re-classified in accordance with the Wage Rate Inequity Agreement.

Article V, Section 6 is the contract provision relied on. Marginal Paragraphs 60 and 66 are the pertinent parts, and read as follows:

"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 Wage Rate Inequity Agreement of June 30, 1947, as amended and supplemented, a new job description and classification for the new or changed job shall be established in accordance with the following procedure:

.....

"In the event the Company does not develop a new description and classification, the employee or employees affected may process a grievance under the grievance procedure set forth in Article VIII of this Agreement requesting that a job description and classification be developed and installed in accordance with the applicable provisions of the

aforesaid Wage Rate Inequity Agreement and if processed to arbitration the decision of the arbitrator shall be effective as of the date the new description and classification should have been put into effect but in no event more than thirty (30) days prior to the filing of the written grievance."

As indicated in the quoted provisions, the dispute is largely governed by the Wage Rate Inequity Agreement of June 30, 1947. That Agreement has been carried into the Job Classification Manual of the Company, particularly with respect to the considerations which determine the appropriateness of a given classification. The plan of job classification is declared to be to determine the relative values of jobs from concise statements of job content for the purposes of: (1) placing the jobs in their proper value relationship; (2) reducing the job classifications to the smallest practical number by grouping those which have substantially equivalent content; (3) establishing base rate differentials between jobs which are appropriate to the basic differences in value between the jobs in the wage scale. The method used is a blend of point rating and job comparison. Classification is based on 18 factors, which cover all significant conditions that influence job value.

The job of Coke Hoist Operator was placed by the Company in Job Class 8 during the wage rate inequity program. The job description and classification were presented to the Union in 1946. The Union was critical of the assigned classification, and this occupation was one of the 60 submitted to Arbitrator Merle D. Schmid for review. The Union questioned the points allotted by Management for five factors. The arbitrator raised the factor of accident exposure from 2-B-2 to 3-B-4, thus raising the total point value of the occupation from 54 to 56 points and placing it in Job Class 9 instead of Job Class 8. Four other disputed factors, -- quickness of comprehension, mental stability, equipment, and avoidance of shutdown -- were left undisturbed.

In 1955 and 1956 certain changes were made in the coke handling equipment. The Union thereupon filed this grievance in November, 1956 alleging that the Coke Hoist Operator occupation is improperly classified. The Union seeks a new job description and a higher classification. In the third step the Union listed the changes which it claimed affected seven of the factors, and it proposed increases in point ratings from the present 56 to 71. This would have resulted in putting this job in Job Class 13 in place of Job Class 9. The Company's Industrial Engineering Department investigated the matter and recommended slight upward revisions of one point each in the factors of physical strength and muscular coordination. The total resulting points would be 58, and this would still leave the occupation in Job Class 9. At the hearing the Union agreed that the two proposed point changes were proper; it also conceded that its earlier requests with respect to health exposure and avoidance of shutdowns were insupportable; but it still maintained that the three factors or elements, judgment, mental stability, and physical exertion, should be revalued. The following shows the respective current positions as to the five factors or elements the Union insists should be raised.

	<u>Present Coding</u>	<u>Union Request</u>	<u>Company Position</u>
Physical strength	1-A-0	1-B-1	1-B-1
Muscular coordination	2-A-0	2-B-1	2-B-1
Judgment	5-C-2	5-D-3	5-C-2
Mental Stability	6-B-1	6-D-3	6-B-1
Physical exertion	2-D-4	3-D-8	2-D-4

The remaining difference between the parties is seven evaluation points. If the Union were to prevail, there would be a total increase of nine points, and the occupation would move up into Job Class 11. Of the disputed points, one would be in the factor of judgment, two in mental stability, and four in physical exertion.

The equipment changes resulting in this Union request are not seriously disputed. As listed by the Company, they are:

- (1) Two movable grizzly units (size-grading machines) were added as spares to be operated alternately with the two existing grizzlies;
- (2) The shaker (or vibrating) screen was changed from single to double-deck;
- (3) The conveyor belt running from the screening station to the blast furnaces was widened from 42" to 48"; this increased the quantity of coke and resulted in speeding up the boom conveyor and the #4 crossover conveyor;
- (4) Conveyors #1 and #2 were each converted into two-belt conveyors;
- (5) Ten control buttons were added, making a total of 23;
- (6) Air hoses were installed to clean the vibrating screens; the former method was to strike the screens with a wooden mallet;
- (7) A door was cut into the side of #7 conveyor incline for use in inspecting the conveyor and shaker screens;
- (8) Three pilot lights were installed in the control room to inform the operator at all times if any conveyor stops running.

As the Union views it, the work of the grievants has been altered by these changes in several respects meriting higher evaluation of the five factors mentioned. The Coke Hoist Operator must now check the

double deck domestic and braize shaker, instead of the former single deck. He must remove the chute at the discharge end of the shaker, and must clean the screens. He has three additional conveyor belts to handle, and at least two conveyors have been speeded up. The two additional grizzlies have added work for the Operator because when they must be by-passed, as when there is mechanical trouble, he must move a heavy lever. The Operator has ten new control buttons to manipulate, and he must direct the Screen House Helpers and the Wharfmen.

The question for consideration is whether, and how, these changes have affected the factors which determine the classification of the job. For example, the last item mentioned above represents no change whatever. Directing the designated workers has always been done by the Coke Hoist Operator and is specifically called for in the job description. The job description and classification of this occupation, as formerly constituted, were with the help of an arbitrator, agreed upon, stabilized and in force for many years. It is only with regard to changed features that we can now be concerned.

Checking the double deck shakers must be done every two hours, and the task of checking the former single deck shakers was performed at similar time intervals. There is an insufficient change in this to merit additional factor points. The same is true of the handling of the additional conveyors and of the increased speed of two conveyors. Normally, this would represent a greater workload, but it has been offset by the installation of a new inspection door in the side of the #7 conveyor, thus appreciably reducing the amount of necessary walking and simplifying the inspection procedure. As described, the ten new control buttons are of a simple kind, merely starting or stopping parts of the equipment, and call for little special training or knowledge. They are of the same nature as the 13 buttons formerly in use. Their addition to the workload or to any of the several factors is at most nominal and would hardly warrant reclassification of the job. Cleaning the screens with air, as described, is not substantially more difficult or burdensome than the old hand-manipulated mallet method of cleaning the screens.

What is said above must not be misconstrued. It is entirely possible that the Company may add so many new duties as to warrant re-valuation, even if the duties are of the kind previously performed. The problem is one of degree. Here, on balance, it is simply being held that no new skills are called for and that the amount of added work is still within the permissible limits of the job as described and classified, with respect to the items discussed in the preceding paragraph.

On the other hand, two items have directly contributed toward a heavier job. These are the periodic removal of the chute at the discharge end, and the task of moving the heavy lever when the grizzlies are to be by-passed. It is because of these features that Management has agreed to raise by one point each the factors of physical strength and muscular co-ordination, with which adjustments the Union is now in accord.

The Union, however, believes a substantial revision is called for in three other factors: physical exertion (four points), mental stability (two points), and judgment (one point). These present the critical problem for determination in this case.

The most substantial change proposed by the Union is in the factor of physical exertion. This factor must be distinguished from two factors or elements which by their titles would seem to be closely related,-- physical strength and muscular coordination. In the Wage Rate Inequity Agreement, which the 1956 Agreement in Article V, Section 6, makes the controlling standard in these cases, these three terms are defined as follows:

"Physical strength

This element is a measure of the maximum lift or equivalent force required by usual conditions of the job. Infrequent conditions that require additional strength are not to be considered if it is possible for the worker to obtain help at those times;"

"Muscular coordination

This element is a measure of the control of the physical senses required by usual conditions of the job;"

"Physical exertion

This factor is intended to establish quantitatively the significance of physical exertion required by the job being classified, as this factor may affect the willingness of a worker to qualify for the job."

As stated, the parties have agreed on an upward revision in the evaluation of the first two elements, but are apart on physical exertion. It seems that the basic distinction between physical strength and physical exertion lies in the difference between a unit of measurement and the total quantity or use of these units. Formerly, physical strength was evaluated at 1-A-0 ("No particular strength required by the job"), and now it is to be 1-B-1 ("Must be able to lift weights up to 50# or equivalent work. Handle heavy manual controls"). Physical strength is one of the native physical requirements which affect the ability of the worker to qualify for the job, as it is put in the Wage Rate Inequity Agreement. The worker must be able to perform the physical tasks which from time to time he meets on this job. How frequently he must employ this physical capacity, what percentage of his working time, or the pace at which he works at or close to the physical capacity he must possess, determines the evaluation of the factor, physical exertion. This factor is a measure of over-all fatigue.

We note that the Wage Rate Inequity Agreement stipulates that the degree to be assigned depends on what is called "time significance:" "A" up to 1/4 of total time, "B" up to 1/2 of total time, "C" up to 3/4 of total time, and "D" exceeding 3/4 of the total time. The degree, in turn, seems to be related to the level assigned to the job. The

Inequity Agreement states that: "When the LEVEL of physical exertion varies regularly throughout the work period, appraise the intervals separately and add the points derived for each interval to obtain the total points for the factor."

This factor has been evaluated 2-D-4, meaning Level 2, Degree D, 4 points. D is the highest possible degree, and the Union of course does not question this. But the level is 2, which applies to "Below normal exertion; i.e. operate light controls, walk, handle light weight material at intervals." This level has apparently been assigned because over three-quarters of the time the Operator performs work falling within this description. The Union is requesting 3-D-8 for this factor. Level 3 calls for "Normal exertion, i.e. operate heavy controls, work with light tools, handle light weight material." For this job to have Level 3 and Degree D, it would be necessary that both conditions apply. The main features of Level 2, as compared with Level 3, are the operation of light, rather than heavy controls, and walking. Level 3 does not mention walking, and it refers to the operation of heavy controls and working with light tools. As described, this job involves a great deal of walking, the manipulation of control buttons (very light controls), visual inspection, a cleaning job which is not physically difficult, and the infrequent operation of heavy levers and a limited number of times each day the removal of a heavy chute. For the latter two tasks the Operator may have assistance from the Helper. Other features of the job, like directing certain subordinate employees, have already been mentioned, and are not pertinent to the matter of physical exertion.

If Level 3 were used, considering the essential characteristics of that level, as defined, then Degree D would be too high. It is only when Level 2 is used that Degree D is appropriate, according to the directions in the Inequity Agreement. If this factor were placed at 3-A or 3-B, the point value would be less than or only equal to the present point value.

If this job were being initially evaluated, perhaps 3-A or 3-B would be worthy of consideration. But it has had 2-D for many years, and it cannot be found that, even with the recent changes, this is not a fair or accurate evaluation of the factor of physical exertion.

The other two elements in dispute are judgment and mental stability. The Union would have the highest available evaluation given to these elements. The judgment element is a measure of the discretion or discernment necessary to make decisions as required by conditions of the job. To move up to the Union's request, it would have to meet this test: "Required to plan and lay out work for self or others exercising large discretion as to details." The bench mark jobs which have the 5-D-3 evaluation advocated by the Union are Patternmaker (Standard) - Pattern Shop, Rougher - Hot Strip Mill, and First Helper - Open Hearth. Two occupations which have D-3 are Heater in the Coke Plant and Stillman in the Benzol Plant. The Coke Hoist Operator's job simply does not meet the standards of the definition, nor can it possibly be found to be comparable with regard to the element of judgment with the bench mark or other jobs listed.

The same is true of mental stability, defined as a measure of the degree of self-control and capacity for calm or deliberate action required by conditions of the job. This element is now 6-B-1, which calls for "Self-control and patience under trying circumstances as in making delicate adjustments in difficult machine set ups." The Union requests 6-D-3, which would apply if this description were appropriate: "Dependability in extreme emergencies in action without specific instructions either individually or in directing action of others." The Heater and the Stillman mentioned above have D-3, and one can readily understand how they qualify. The three bench mark jobs are also of a substantially different order from Coke Hoist Operator when one applies the criteria or definitions included in the Wage Rate Inequity Agreement under the heading of mental stability. It is true that hazardous jobs are given special credit under the factors of accident exposure or health exposure, but it cannot be denied that when extreme emergencies may be met the occupation is also entitled to a high rating for the element of mental stability, as it is set forth in the Wage Rate Inequity Agreement.

AWARD

The revisions proposed by the Company in the evaluation of the elements of physical strength and muscular coordination are approved; the Union's request for revisions of the ratings of other factors or elements is denied; a revised job description to meet the job of Coke Hoist Operator as now constituted shall be issued by the Company.

Dated: October 4, 1957

---

David L. Cole  
Permanent Arbitrator