

In the Matter of Arbitration Between:

INLAND STEEL COMPANY  
- and -  
UNITED STEELWORKERS OF AMERICA,  
Local 1010

ARBITRATION AWARD NO. 450

Grievance No. 5-G-24  
Appeal No. 357

PETER M. KELLIHER  
Impartial Arbitrator

APPEARANCES:

For the Company:

W. A. Dillon, Assistant Superintendent, Labor Relations  
R. J. Stanton, Assistant Superintendent, Labor Relations  
R. H. Ayres, Assistant Superintendent, Labor Relations  
L. R. Mitchell, Divisional Supervisor, Labor Relations  
H. S. Onoda, Labor Relations Representative, Labor Relations  
L. T. Lee, Industrial Engineer, Industrial Engineering Dept.  
M. Dottlich, General Foreman, #2 Open Hearth  
M. J. Kark, Foreman, #2 Open Hearth

For the Union:

Cecil Clifton, International Representative  
Al Garza, Secretary, Grievance Committee  
Leo Hernandez, Griever  
John Winarski, Witness  
Peter Fulayter, Witness  
John Flaz, Witness  
John Vojadick, Witness  
Roberto O. Berrios, Witness

STATEMENT

Pursuant to notice a hearing was held in Gary, Indiana, on September 21, 1961.

THE ISSUE

The grievance reads:

"Aggrieved, Pit Crews, contend that the action taken by the Company on assigning one 2nd Ladleman to each turn is unjustified. The assigning of 2nd Ladleman to each turn is not an adequate force. The Company is in violation of Article VI, Section 8.

Request the Company assign two 2nd Ladlemen, one for the North end of the Pit, and one for the South end.

### DISCUSSION AND DECISION

The record shows that during the first four months of 1960 operations were on a twenty-three furnace level. Beginning the week of May 15, 1960, the schedule of regular furnace operations commenced to decline and on June 5, 1960, operations were on a fifteen furnace level. At that time the Company assigned two First Ladlemen, but scheduled only one Second Ladleman.

The Union contends that there is an inadequate work force and that because of this proper safety standards are not being observed. The Union also charges that the Company has used a Pit Hooker to assist in pouring heats.

The record does show that in 1958 when there was likewise a lower level of scheduled furnace operations and only fifteen furnaces were in use that the Company then took off one Second Ladleman. It is the Union's testimony that in a much earlier period when only fifteen furnaces were operating that two Second Ladlemen were used. The General Pit Foreman testified that when he worked in the Pits in this early period on fifteen furnace operation, there was only one First Ladleman. (Tr. 91). The evidence does show that although the average number of heats poured by the First Ladleman increased from .85 heats per turn to 3.2 heats per turn, the ladle preparation decreased from 16.6 ladles to 10.2 ladles per turn. The testimony of certain Union witnesses is that the job of preparing ladles is harder work than pouring. It is noted also that with a lower level of operations, more spare ladles are available and that, therefore, less ladles have to be prepared. (Tr. 28). This resulted overall in a decrease in the occupied time of the First Ladleman from an average of 48.8% to 41.2%. This would mean a 16% net reduction in work required.

The testimony of Mr. Fulayter, a Second Ladleman, is that when operations are on a twenty-two furnace level with two Second Ladlemen, he then pours two more heats than he averages now under a fifteen furnace level. (Tr. 51). The Company presented evidence that although there had been a 39% decrease, i.e., heats poured and ladles prepared, there had been only a 25% reduction in the size of the crew as it related to First and Second Ladlemen. Evidence was also presented that with the reduced levels of operations and the reduction in crew size, there were 5.8% more crew man hours available per heat than during full operating periods.

The principal complaint stated at the hearing with relation to safety as it effects the reduction in the number of Second

Ladlemen is that the Second Ladleman is now required to walk from the north end to the south end and must go through a cluttered Pit area. The Company presented the testimony of the General Foreman that the Pits were never intended to be walking areas and that employees do use Crane catwalks and the mold yard which are cleared areas. The General Pit Foreman denied that the Crane catwalks are considered out of bounds. (Tr. 91).

The testimony is that whether or not Pit Hookers are performing work on the platform that their work in no manner relates to work that would be performed by the Second Ladleman and would not show that the Second Ladleman force was inadequate.

Based upon all the evidence in this record, the Arbitrator is unable to find that the Union has sustained the burden of proof placed upon it under Award No. 183. It cannot be found that the complement of the crew with only one Second Ladleman imposed an "undue burden".

AWARD

The grievance is denied.

  
Peter M. Kelliher

Dated at Chicago, Illinois  
this 23rd day of February 1962.