

INLAND STEEL COMPANY

and

UNITED STEELWORKERS OF AMERICA  
Local Union 1010

Grievance No. 7-F-9  
Docket No. IH-147-147-2/19/57  
Arbitration No. 213

Opinion and Award

Appearances:

For the Company:

L. E. Davidson, Assistant Superintendent, Labor Relations  
D. L. Gott, Job Analyst, Wage and Salary  
E. J. Gaston, Job Analyst, Wage and Salary  
E. J. Cooney, Assistant Superintendent, Plant No. 2 Mills  
R. J. Stanton, Divisional Supervisor, Labor Relations

For the Union:

Cecil Clifton, International Staff Representative  
Joseph Wolanin, Acting Chairman, Grievance Committee  
C. Kriviekas, Grievance Committee

This is the third in a series of base rate cases arising out of the modernization and expansion of the No. 2 Blooming Mill in 1956. The other two are those in which the immediately preceding awards were made.

The Slab Transfer Operator classification was formerly known as Table and Kick-off Operator. That job was in Job Class 9 (59 points), having been so classified prior to November 26, 1949 and having remained so without objection over the intervening years. Because of changes in equipment and methods a new job description was issued and the occupation, under its new title, was put in Job Class 8 (53 points). This led to this grievance, in which improper description and classification were alleged and in which it was requested that because of "greater demand on job requirement, job conditions and job responsibilities an upward revision in the classification be made."

In the second step the Union protested the coding of five factors, requesting an increase of a total of eight points. In the third step it complained of seven factor codings, adding Material and Judgment, and it requested an increase of 11 points. At the hearing the Union withdrew its complaints as to three factors, Material, Muscular Coordination, and Environment, its total claim for the remaining four factors being seven additional points. If the Union were to prevail, this job would have 60 points and be in Job Class 10.

Formerly the Table and Kick-off Operator operated two run-out tables and a slab pusher to move materials off the mill to the transfer. New or improved equipment was installed to handle blooms and slabs at the transfer. The Operator now operates the slab transfer and occasionally the mill furnace tables.

In this case, as in the two preceding cases, there is a dispute as to the right of the Company, under Article V, Section 6 E, to withdraw the interim rate it set up before it completed its analysis of the revised job. The reasoning and ruling with respect to this issue contained in the award as to Grievance No. 7-F-11 are equally applicable here and need not be repeated.

The factors in dispute and the respective positions are indicated in this table:

<u>Factor</u>	<u>Coding</u>	
	<u>Present</u>	<u>Requested</u>
Judgment	B-1	C-2
Experience	2-B-4	2-C-6
Physical Exertion	2-D-4	4-A ) 2-C-6)
Accident Exposure	2-B-2	2-C-4

Judgment was formerly coded B-1, and is still so coded. The Union's request for a higher value is based on the fact that the Operator must spot the steel for the Stamper and must regulate the speed of the chain. In the obsolete operation the positioning of slabs at the hi-line required more judgment than is now required, since the slab stop now automatically stops and positions the slabs and the Stamper and the Slab Transfer Operator are in the same pulpit only a few feet removed from the slab. The speed of the chains is set by a rheostat which rarely requires adjustment by the Operator. By comparing the work as now constituted with that formerly done, it is clear that the Judgment factor is not entitled to a higher coding. It is evident that there are features of work which distinguish this job from that of the Table Transfer Operator in the No. 3 Blooming Mill which the Union suggests as a proper benchmark.

Experience was formerly coded 2-C-6 and is now 2-B-4. The Union requests a higher value because the Operator must operate six controllers and a rheostat as compared with three controllers, must transfer slabs and billets whereas formerly only slabs, must spot the steel for the Stamper on the piler table, and must know which steel to discard. As a benchmark the Union refers to the job with the same title in the No. 3 Blooming Mill, which, like the obsolete job, has Experience valued as 2-C-6. It appears, however, that the job in the No. 3 Mill requires the Operator not only to position material for piling, stamping, and hot connections, but he must also operate a pusher for the 76" Mill hi-line, another for crop ends during shearing emergencies, and furnace delivery tables, so that the jobs are distinguishable and not comparable in terms of experience needed. On the other hand, the Company's reasons for lowering the point value of this factor of Experience from 2-C-6 to 2-B-4 are not very persuasive. In essence, the Company maintains that the job as now constituted requires no more experience than the discontinued occupation of Transfer Operator, which was assigned 2-B-4, and that three other jobs which have comparable demands

are also coded 2-B-4 (Roller Leveler, 100" Plate Mill; Roller Line Operator, 14" Mill; and Billet Shear Operator, 10" Mill). As discussed in earlier awards, the most satisfactory comparison in a changed job is with the job as it was formerly performed. One feature of this present job, that relating to the instructions under which the grievants decide as to discards, was acknowledged at the hearing to be similar in both the No. 2 and No. 3 Mills. The most that the Company proved, with respect to Experience, is that the requirements are no greater than they were on the obsolete job. This the evidence supports. But it does not support the view that the Experience factor should be lowered. The job requirements as bearing on Experience are similar in substance, and the coding long used on this job should not be disturbed.

Physical Exertion is coded 2-D-4 and the Union urges it should be 4-A, 2-C-6, which is the value assigned this factor when the job was called Table and Kick-off Operator. The Union's reasons are that the grievants must help in shear knife and roll changes and now operate six controllers and a rheostat whereas previously there were only three controllers to operate. The Union suggests as benchmarks the Gaugeman in the No. 2 Mill and the Shear Helper in the No. 1 Mill. The former six point value was assigned because "up to and including one-quarter" of the time the Operator was assigned to pry crop ends and change shear knives and for the remaining three-quarters of his time he operated light controls. Management insists that the removal of pile-ups and the cropping of ends has become a much less important part of the job due to the improvements in equipment and methods. In fact, it was asserted that it is no longer a part of his duties. This was controverted, however, by one of the Operators who testified that he has not been instructed not to remove pile-ups or crop ends and that he actually does do so, in the same manner he formerly did. He was not convincing in his first statement that he does so as frequently or more frequently than he formerly did, indicating on reflection that the frequency of such tasks has declined. These Operators do, however, still assist in changing rolls and shear knives. Management's position on these heavier duties is that their occurrences are not sufficiently frequent to be entitled to any consideration. The difficulty is that the total percentage of the Operator's time devoted to these tasks was not indicated. Lacking such information, I do not believe it proper to disregard them entirely, as suggested by Management, when there is in the manual a reference to Degree A which covers duties of a described character up to and including one-quarter of the time, and no mention of what portion of the time may be disregarded. As stated in Grievance 7-F-10, it is possible to have so little as to have it considered a de minimis amount, or an amount of no practical value. But such a showing has not been made in this instance. Hence, the former coding of Physical Exertion should be continued.

The remaining disputed factor is Accident Exposure. It is coded 2-B-2, and the Union requests 2-C-4, which was the coding of this factor in the obsolete job. The Union relies mainly on the hazards faced in shear knife and roll changes, pointing out that the Gaugeman in the same Mill is coded 2-C-4 for this factor and that the Slab Transfer Operator is in a more dangerous position when such changes are being made. The fact is, however, that the Gaugeman was given this value because of his exposure to accident when prying crop ends. For the exposure during roll or

knife changes, the Manipulator in No. 2 Blooming Mill, as well as the similar occupation in the No. 1 Mill and the Shearman in the No. 1 Mill, all of whom also assist in roll and knife changes, have been coded 2-B-2 for Accident Exposure. The decline in the frequency of crop prying tasks, which was implicitly admitted by one of the Operators, has resulted in a reduction in the amount of exposure to accidents on that score, and it seems, therefore, that the Company was justified in changing the coding of this factor from 2-C-4 to 2-B-2.

AWARD

1. The coding of the factor, Experience, shall be 2-C-6, and of the factor Physical Exertion 4-A, 2-C-6;
2. The coding of all other disputed factors shall remain unchanged;
3. The Company did not violate Article V, Section 6 E when on September 17, 1956 it discontinued the interim rate;
4. The changes in classification indicated above shall be made and put into effect in accordance with Article V, Section 6 D.

Dated: December 4, 1957

---

David L. Cole  
Permanent Arbitrator