

In the Matter of Arbitration Between:

THE INLAND STEEL COMPANY

ARBITRATION AWARD NO. 385

- and -

Grievance No. 5-F-58

UNITED STEELWORKERS OF AMERICA,
Local Union 1010

Appeal No. 125

PETER M. KELLIHER
Impartial Arbitrator

APPEARANCES:

For the Company:

H. Cummins, Supervisor, Industrial Engineering Dept.
D. L. Arnold, Attorney
W. F. Price, Attorney
J. I. Herlihy, Superintendent, Industrial Engineering Dept.
L. T. Lee, Industrial Engineer, Industrial Engineering Dept.
H. Kahl, Asst. Superintendent, No. 2 Open Hearth Dept.

For the Union:

Cecil Clifton, International Staff Representative
Leo Hernadez, Grievance Committeeman
George Buzea, Witness
Al Garza, Secretary, Grievance Committee
Peter Calacci, Local Union President

STATEMENT

A hearing was held in Gary, Indiana on November 15, 1960.

THE ISSUE

The grievance reads:

"Aggrieved contend that Wage Incentive Plan, File No. 60-0528, covering Loading Crane Operator has become inappropriate because of changed conditions.

Request the Company develop a new and higher incentive plan reflecting these changed conditions."

DISCUSSION AND DECISION

The No. 4 Slabbing Mill was placed in operation on October 25, 1958. It is the Union's position that the addition of this new facility constituted a change under Article V, Section 5 and that the present incentive plan installed March 2, 1953, is now inappropriate. The Union concedes that the manner in which the Loading Crane Operator in the No. 2 Open Hearth performs his work is exactly the same. (Tr. 23) The incentive earnings here are based upon the rate of production or the tons per hour rolled by the No. 3 Blooming Mill. (Tr. 49) The incentive earnings of the aggrieved were based upon the rate of production of the No. 3 Blooming Mill in order to constitute an inducement to keep the greatest amount of residual heat in the ingots to save reheating time.

In reviewing the evidence in this case it is apparent that even where there was a greater number of heats per pay period, that the average margin earned has at times been less than where a fewer number of heats were loaded in a pay period. During the period from November 15, 1958 (shortly after the No. 4 Slabbing Mill was placed in operation) to September 17, 1960, there was only a difference of one heat average between the number of heats to the No. 3 Bloomer from the No. 3 Open Hearth. The evidence does show that the aggrieved employees actually now control a larger percentage of the ingots going to the No. 3 Blooming Mill and that,

therefore, if anything, the incentive plan is now more appropriate than at the time of its installation in March of 1953.

AWARD

The grievance is denied.


Peter M. Kelliher

Dated at Chicago, Illinois

this 21 day of March 1961.