

IN THE MATTER OF ARBITRATION

between

INLAND STEEL COMPANY

and

UNITED STEELWORKERS OF AMERICA
Local Union 1010

ARBITRATION AWARD No. 344

Appeal No. 19
Grievance No. 1-F-45

PETER M. KELLIHER
Arbitrator

APPEARANCES:

FOR THE COMPANY:

H. S. ONODA, Labor Relations Representative
WILLIAM A. DILLON, Assistant Superintendent
R. J. STANTON, Assistant Superintendent
W. A. BISHOP, Superintendent, Blast Furnace Dept.
R. POWEL, General Foreman, Blast Furnace Dept.
E. O'CONNELL, Industrial Engineer
D. ANDERSON, Industrial Engineer
T. F. PETERS, Divisional Supervisor

FOR THE UNION:

CECIL CLIFTON, International Representative
FRED GARDNER, Chairman, Grievance Committee
JOSEPH WOLANIN, Secretary, Grievance Committee
J. WABBINGTON, Grievance Committeeman
J. WILSON, Grievance Committeeman
J. GOTHELF, Assistant Grievance Committeeman

THE ISSUE

The grievance reads as follows:

"The Pitmen allege that they are required to perform duties that are not described in their job Description and Classification.

The Pitmen request that they be required to perform duties only that are incorporated in their job Description and job Classification."

At the Third Step hearing, the Union requested an amendment to the grievance to cover a claim of an alleged violation of Article VI, Section 8.

DISCUSSION AND DECISION

Certainly, the job description for Pitman, a classification still in existence, clearly specifies the cleaning up of "material spillage" as the primary function. No limitation is made as to the furnaces where this work is to be performed. The evidence does not warrant a finding that Pitmen have been or will be requested to regularly perform pit cleaning duties involving the usual minor type spillages on the furnaces which have semi-automatic coke charging equipment.

The unrefuted Company testimony is that now that the "bugs are about out" of the No. 4 furnace, the Pitmen have not been called to assist in a period of "four or five weeks". (Tr 69) The need to call Pitmen is also becoming more infrequent for the same reason on the No. 5 furnace. (Tr. 70) The Union did not offer specific testimony as to the number of times that Pitmen were called in

in the period prior to the grievance. Suffice it to say, however, that it is conceded that the Pitmen are only called in major spillages usually caused by an equipment failure. If the equipment is operated as normally expected, they are not called. It is not the usual industrial practice for any plant to schedule its forces on the basis of having a full regular crew always available to handle an occasional emergency maximum work load. Where the work has been heavy, management has assigned laborers to assist.

The Union did not present evidence that would warrant a finding that any employee is being unduly burdened by the work arrangements existing at the time of the filing of this grievance. Considering the crew consist before and after in relation to the number of furnaces being served as well as the time studies presented in evidence, the Arbitrator must find that the force is adequate.

AWARD

The grievance is denied.

(signed) Peter M. Kelliher
PETER M. KELLIHER

Dated at Chicago, Illinois
this 9th day of July, 1960.