

INLAND STEEL COMPANY

and

UNITED STEELWORKERS OF
AMERICA, C.I.O.
Local Union 1010

ARBITRATION AWARD No. 364

Appeal No. 55
Grievance No. 18-F-18

PETER M. KELLIHER
Arbitrator

APPEARANCES: FOR THE COMPANY:

R. J. STANTON, Assistant Superintendent, Labor Relations
W. E. DILLON, Assistant Superintendent, Labor Relations
B. G. HAWLEY, Superintendent, Yard Department
T. R. TIKALSKY, Division Supervisor, Labor Relations
R. L. SMITH, Superintendent, Wage and Salary
D. GOTT, Job Analyst
G. APPLGATE, JR., Job Analyst
A. T. ANDERSON, Division Supervisor, Labor Relations

FOR THE UNION:

CECIL CLIFTON, International Staff Representative
J. WOLANIN, Acting Secretary, Grievance Committee
C. BULLOCK, Grievance Committeeman

THE ISSUE

The grievance reads:

"The job classification - Tractor Payloader-Boat-Index No. 42-0416, is unacceptable because this classification already appears in its proper sequence in the Yard Department.

Relief Sought: That the Company abide by established sequences."

DISCUSSION AND DECISION

The basic issue is whether a "new" job was created. The evidence is that the Payloader Mobile Equipment Operator has never performed the work that constitutes the primary function of the Tractor Payloader Boat occupation, i.e. "assists in unloading boats and barges and general dock clean up."

The testimony is that 90 per cent of the time is spent inside the boat or barge. This inside work of regrouping the material was previously done manually by the employees. The work of cleaning the spillage in connection with unloading was not performed by the Mobile Payloaders although they did perform general clean up work in the area particularly in connection with certain remodeling work. The equipment now used is only about one-third of the size and weight of the equipment used by the Mobile Payloader Operators.

The important consideration however, is not whether equipment may be somewhat similar but the use to which it is put. This is illustrated by the fact that on the No. 1 Open Hearth Floor Payloaders use fork type tractors and yet one occupation is in

Job Class 8 and the other is in Job Class 11. In the Tin Mill Department, there are tractor operators in different sequences on jobs with separate descriptions.

The Arbitrator cannot conclude that the work is already described and classified under the Mobile Payloader Equipment occupation. The primary function and use is different and all factors are not coded alike in the two job classifications.

The evidence does not permit a finding that in 1956 the Company agreed that all future jobs involving the handling of mobile equipment would be placed in the Mobile Equipment sequence. It is apparent that when the Mobil Equipment sequence was first created that other Mobile Equipment jobs were not included.

Under Article VII, Section 3, "Where * * * new jobs are installed", the sequence diagram and lists are to be revised under certain stipulated principles. The record shows that the "principles" set forth in the first paragraph of Section 3 have been applied in this particular case. Paraphrasing the language of Arbitration No. 186, the "criteria" are satisfied and fulfilled to a greater measure by including this new job in the "Barge and Ship Loader Sequence."

AWARD

The grievance is denied.

(signed) Peter M. Kelliher

PETER M. KELLIHER

Dated at Chicago, Illinois
this 30th day of July, 1960.