

INLAND STEEL COMPANY)
)
 - and -)
)
 UNITED STEELWORKERS OF AMERICA)
 Local Union No. 1010)
) Grievance No. 8-E-54
) Docket No. IH-185-180-5/17/57
) Arbitration No. 241.
)
) Opinion and Award

Appearances:

For the Company:

L. E. Davidson, Assistant Superintendent,
Labor Relations
R. J. Stanton, Divisional Supervisor, Labor Relations
R. L. Smith, Superintendent, Labor Relations
E. J. Gaston, Job Analyst, Wage Administration
D. L. Gott, Job Analyst, Wage Administration
G. Fiegle, General Foreman 28" Finishing Department

For the Union:

Cecil Clifton, International Representative
J. Wolanin, Acting Chairman, Grievance Committee
William Young, Grievance Committeeman

On May 10, 1956 the following grievance was filed:

"The Union contends the new occupation of
Scrapman Cold Saw in the #2 Finishing End
is improperly classified and described."

It was requested that

"the Company develop a new description and
higher classification for this occupation."

This case is a companion to that decided in Arbitration No. 229 and its history in the steps of the grievance procedure is similar. At the hearing, as in the case of the hearing in Arbitration No. 229, the Company complained of Union requests for excessive adjournments and extensions of time which were granted by the Company and inadequate information respecting the factual bases for the grievance. Suffice to say that the remarks in Arbitration No. 229 relative to procedure are equally applicable to this case.

At the third step meeting the Union stated that it sought the same base rate as that enjoyed by the Scrapman at the older No. 1 Finishing End of the 28" Warehouse and Hot Bed Department, the same department as that in which the grievants are located. The Scrapmen at the No. 2 Finishing End (hereinafter referred to as the grievants) and those at the No. 1 Finishing End have the same classification rating and coding excepting for the factor of Physical Exertion. The grievants' classification sheet for this factor is as follows:

Straighten heavy crop ends, etc.	4 A
Straighten medium crop ends, pull crop ends into box when necessary, hook up boxes, observe, etc.	2 C 6

Thus, for up to one quarter of their time, grievants are said to exercise "above normal exertion" as defined in the Wage Rate Inequity Agreement and Manual; and for up to three quarters of their time they are said to exercise "below normal exertion as defined".

The Scrapman in the No. 1 Finishing End, on the other hand is classified for the same factor as follows:

Normal exertion to lift crop end; shovel saw burrs	3 D 8
---	-------

In this case, exceeding three quarters of his total time, the Scrapman in the No. 1 End is said to be exercising "normal exertion" as defined.

The Union requests the 3 D 8 coding for physical exertion for the grievants.

The testimony presented at the hearing by each of the parties as to the nature of the work performed by Scrapmen at the two finishing ends, insofar as it bears on physical exertion was directly contradictory and irreconcilable. Accordingly, I observed each of the jobs as they were performed in the 28" Warehouse.

In each instance the Scrapman stands in the vicinity of the saw which cuts sections into the required lengths. Although there is some diversity in the weight and character of the materials and sections processed, this is not a material factor in the operation of the Scrapman. When the section has been cut it is his responsibility to see to it that crop ends are removed from the roller table in order that it be in condition to accommodate the next section awaiting sawing. The crop ends are placed in scrap boxes located nearby.

In the case of the grievants, the normal situation and procedure is as follows: after the section is cut to length and is directed along the roller table, the crop end rests at the location where it had been cut until the next section comes along on the roller for positioning and cutting. That following section pushes the crop end into an opening or hole in the middle of the table which leads to a chute and to the recessed scrap box. The duty of the grievants is to stand nearby and observe in order to make certain that the crop end is in fact pushed into the hole and chute by the following section. If it is not, or if there are small pieces of metal on the table which might interfere with the operation of the equipment, he dislodges them with a long hook and poker-like tool and pushes them down the chute. Occasionally, it is said, the following section will overlap the awaiting short crop end and the grievants will then have to pull the crop end a foot or two until it topples into the hole. This condition did not arise, however, and, therefore was not observed during the visit to the mill. There is an additional duty of straightening the crop ends in the scrap box. This is done by crossing over to the box and with the aid of a long hook poking and moving the ends so as to get them in such position that a maximum number might be accommodated in the box. The Scrapman does not actually lift the crop ends. The uncontradicted testimony of the foreman at the hearing was that 85 to 90 per cent of his time he does not touch the crop ends; but whether or not this percentage is set at too high a figure, I am satisfied that during the period of my inspection, by far the largest part of his time and the performance of his duties were devoted to observation and another considerable portion of his time and duties to poking and pushing small pieces of material into the hole -- a job that appeared to involve below normal exertion as defined.

In the case of the Scrapman at the older No. 1 Finishing End, after the section is cut to length and moved up by rollers to the gag press, the remaining crop end is not, as at the No. 2 Finishing End, pushed by the following section into a hole and chute. There is no hole in this table. Before the next section is moved up the Scrapman lifts the crop end with tongs, and manually carries it several yards over a low barrier and deposits it in the scrap box. Thus, unlike the grievants, he has an operation to perform on each cutting, and this operation involves lifting. The crop ends observed at the time of inspection were approximately a foot long. It is stated that when the crop end is too long (or heavy) for lifting it is moved by rollers along the table and then "kicked" or propelled off by mechanical means.

The Job Classification Manual provides that when selecting the "level" of physical exertion "the fatiguing influence of the pace and continuity of physical exertion and the conditions including working position under which muscular effort is expended" should be considered.

In conferring the "above normal exertion" level for up to one quarter of the time and the "below normal exertion" level for up to one half of the time, I find that the present classification of the grievants follows this guiding principle. It credits the grievants with the occasional and unusual above normal exertion required for pushing and pulling the overlapped crop ends into the hole and, perhaps, the occasional straightening of relatively heavier ends in the scrap box so that the box will be well packed. The rest of the grievants' activities, as observed, were as testified to by Company witnesses; and no basis exists, either in the record or as a result of my observations to conclude that the occupation was not correctly evaluated in conformance with Article V Section 6 of the 1954 Agreement or the Wage Inequity Agreement. Clearly the work procedures of the other Scrapman on the No. 1 Finishing End, particularly those requiring the lifting of crop ends with tongs involve physical exertion different in quality, degree and frequency than that required of or exercised by the grievants. Accordingly, the classification and coding of that factor for the Scrapman at the No. 1 Finishing End is not a proper reference or comparison standard for the classification of the grievants.

In conclusion, I am not unmindful of the fact that Scrapmen at the No. 1 Finishing End are "spelled". This may or may not be due to the fact that the overall job at that end is more fatiguing than that at the No. 2 Finishing End. The record sheds no light on this; but whatever the answer, the Union has not shown why this should affect the conclusion stated above.

AWARD

The grievance is denied.

Peter Seitz,
Assistant Permanent Arbitrator

Approved:

David L. Cole,
Permanent Arbitrator

Dated: February 5, 1958