

In the Matter of Arbitration Between:

ARBITRATION AWARD NO. 473

INLAND STEEL COMPANY

- and the -

Grievance No. 21-G-1

UNITED STEELWORKERS OF AMERICA,

Appeal No. 459

Local Union No. 1010

PETER M. KELLIHER
Impartial Arbitrator

APPEARANCES:

For the Company:

W. A. Dillon, Assistant Superintendent, Labor Relations Department
D. L. Gott, Staff Analyst, Wage & Salary Department
A. Smith, Supervisor, Inspection, Metallurgical Department
R. H. Ayres, Assistant Superintendent, Labor Relations Department
L. R. Mitchell, Divisional Supervisor, Labor Relations Department
R. J. Brozovich, Job Analyst, Wage & Salary Department
H. S. Onoda, Labor Relations Representative, Labor Relations Dept.

For the Union:

Cecil Clifton, International Representative
Al Garza, Secretary, Grievance Committee
Norman Cusic, Witness
Proffitt Johnson, Witness
John Wiseman, Griever

STATEMENT

Pursuant to notice, a hearing was held in Gary, Indiana, on January 10, 1962.

THE ISSUE

The grievance reads:

"Aggrieved employees, Final Inspectors, Index No. 47-0841, 42, and 43, allege that their job is improperly described and classified due to changes made in job content.

Aggrieved request a new and higher classification for this job due to job content changes."

DISCUSSION AND DECISION

With reference to the factor of ENVIRONMENT--NOISE AND EYE STRAIN, the Union requests a 2-D-2 coding. This coding is given to the Straightener--Gag Press and the Cold Saw Transfer Operator based upon the "extreme noise from the saw". When the wide flanges were first being run in the No. 1 area in the south end of the warehouse building, the work was being performed in an area of relatively light concentration of equipment. It was not until November of 1959 when the No. 3 equipment was placed "back-to-back" with the No. 2 equipment with the sawing and gagging operations being more closely concentrated that the working conditions as to noise underwent a decisive change. It is noted that the size of the wide flanges have constantly increased. The Supervisor in this area testified that it was only two years ago, i.e., approximately late 1959 or early 1960, that the present largest size 24" by 12" came into the area.

The job description that was written in July of 1959 was not placed into effect until after the strike terminated. The effective date is shown as December 7, 1959. The Arbitrator cannot find under the circumstances that this grievance is untimely. There was here a gradual change in the size of the wide flanges and a decisive change with a new description being placed into effect late in 1959 when the No. 3 area was activated. With the Finishing Inspector working between transfer tables in this highly concentrated area there is no question that there has been a change in equipment that has brought about a change in working conditions. This Arbitrator had an opportunity to judge the amount of noise in the Shanties and Pulpits where the Cold Saw Transfer Operator and the Straightener--Gag Press Operator work. There is no question that the noise in this area immediately around the Pulpit and the Shanties on the outside is almost twice as loud as the noise inside the enclosed areas. The cutting noise is increased when the larger material is being cut. The noise, however, does not consist merely in the cutting operation, but also in the moving and sliding of the beams. The No. 2 and No. 3 areas are generally noisy. The Company testimony appears to indicate that where the noise is less acute, for example in the Final Inspector job in the 14" Merchant Mill, that they receive, nevertheless, a higher coding than the Finishing Inspector. The very sharp increase in the acuteness of the noise on leaving a pulpit would make it apparent that it is more difficult for an employee to work outside of an enclosed area for a short period of time as compared to being in the Pulpit for eight hours a day. Clearly a personal inspection of this area does not permit a finding that these are "unexceptional working conditions in comparsion with other occupations for which the usual applicants might as readily qualify". The Arbitrator must find that the coding should be changed from 2-B-1 for this Factor to 2-D-2.

With reference to the factor of RESPONSIBILITY FOR MAINTENANCE OF OPERATING PACE, it must first be noted that the equipment changes did not bring about any change in this factor. With reference to the Plate Mill Inspector in the 100" Plate Mill having a coding of 4-B-7, it must be observed that he has had this coding since the introduction of the Inequity Program while the employees performing this Finishing Inspection function in the 28" Mill have had a 3-B-4 coding. This has been the agreed upon relationship. The General Supervising Inspector testified that in his thirty-six years of experience it was never necessary to shut the Mill down because a Finishing Inspector was slow and was not keeping up the pace. There are several storage areas available where the material can be piled. This represents a "float situation". The Finishing Inspectors usually have a backlog of work. The Arbitrator must find that the Union failed to present any testimony that these storage areas have ever become full. During the observation it was evident that the Mill may be down and the Finishing Inspector can continue to work. The reason that the Section Inspector has this higher 4-B-7 coding is because he can shut down the Mill, while the pace that is involved in the case of the Finishing Inspector relates only to the Finishing Area and not to a Rolling Mill. Under all of the evidence, particularly the consideration that the Union has not objected to the B degree and because all other related jobs in the area have the 3 level, the Arbitrator must find that the coding of 3-B-4 is proper.

AWARD

The coding for ENVIRONMENT--NOISE AND EYE STRAIN should be raised from 2-B-1 to 2-D-2. The factor of MAINTENANCE OF OPERATING PACE is correctly coded at 3-B-4.



Peter M. Kelliher

Dated at Chicago, Illinois

this 20th day of March 1962.