INLAND STEEL COMPANY
)
Grievance No. 16-G-204
and
)
Appeal No. 855
Arbitration No. 540
UNITED STEELWORKERS OF AMERICA
Local Union No. 1010
)
Opinion and Award

Appearances

For the Company:

W. A. Dillon, Superintendent, Labor Relations

R. J. Stanton, Assistant Superintendent, Labor Relations

W. M. Weichsel, Coil Pickler, General Foreman, No. 1 and No. 2 Cold Strip

J. Borbely, Divisional Supervisor, Labor Relations

For the Union:

Cecil Clifton, International Representative Al Garza, Chairman, Grievance Committee Ted Rogus, Griever

Grievant, a Welder Operator since 1946, was working on the No. 1 Pickle Line on May 23, 1961. He allowed two and one-half coils of 21 inch \times .085 steel to collect in the looper pit. The steel twisted, causing a good deal of scrap and a delay of five hours and 29 minutes. He was given a disciplinary letter and a one-day suspension. This grievance was filed in protest.

The position of the grievant through the three grievance steps prior to arbitration was that the side wings in the looper pit were not functioning properly, and that this, and not the fact that he permitted two and one-half coils to be in the pit, caused the trouble. This was the Union's position at the arbitration hearing as well. Grievant himself, however, testified that he knew the Company had a rule that only one coil should be in the looper pit, and that the reason why more was in the pit was that the exit end had been stopped without his knowledge.

The Union contended that the wings were defective, that grievant had mentioned this to his foreman, and that they were subsequently repaired. The evidence disclosed that the Union was in error, that no such repairs were made, and that on the very day in question some 680000 pounds of steel of various widths and weights were processed on the No. 1 Pickle Line without any trouble. A light, however, was subsequently installed to warn the Operator that the flow of steel at the front or exit end has been stopped.

The Company representatives acknowledged that there are various causes of strip twisting in this operation, and that if grievant had observed the work rule, even if such twisting had occurred, he would not have been subject to discipline. Here he claimed he knew the wings were causing difficulty, particularly on narrow coils, and yet he permitted two and one-half coils of 21 inch steel to be in the pit, contrary to his supervisor's directions.

The principles governing a dispute of this kind are set forth in Arbitration No. 230. Grievant's record for many years has been excellent. He

CANAL STATE OF THE STATE OF THE

knew of the rule in force, and he is a fully qualified Welder Operator. Knowing that there might be difficulty with narrow steel he should have exercised his good judgment and avoided the situation giving rise to this, his first case of discipline.

On the facts of this case, it must be held that the Company's disciplinary action was for good cause.

in a construction of the c

AWARD

This grievance is denied.

Dated: April 17, 1963

/s/ David L. Cole
Permanent Arbitrator