

1-20-1966

# Implementation of the Award in Cases USC-1708 et al

Sylvester Garrett

Follow this and additional works at: [http://knowledge.library.iup.edu/garrett\\_series](http://knowledge.library.iup.edu/garrett_series)

---

## Recommended Citation

Garrett, Sylvester, "Implementation of the Award in Cases USC-1708 et al" (1966). *Arbitration Cases*. 115.  
[http://knowledge.library.iup.edu/garrett\\_series/115](http://knowledge.library.iup.edu/garrett_series/115)

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Sylvester Garrett Labor Arbitration Collection at Knowledge Repository @ IUP. It has been accepted for inclusion in Arbitration Cases by an authorized administrator of Knowledge Repository @ IUP. For more information, please contact [cclouser@iup.edu](mailto:cclouser@iup.edu), [sara.parme@iup.edu](mailto:sara.parme@iup.edu).

# BOARD OF ARBITRATION

UNITED STATES STEEL CORPORATION  
AND  
UNITED STEELWORKERS OF AMERICA, C.I.O.

2412 GRANT BUILDING  
PITTSBURGH 19, PA.

TELEPHONE:  
GRANT 1-1558

SYLVESTER GARRETT  
CHAIRMAN

January 20, 1966

Mr. C. V. Masterson, Jr., General Manager  
Labor Relations Arbitration Policy and  
Planning

United States Steel Corporation  
525 William Penn Place  
Pittsburgh, Pa. 15230

Mr. E. J. Zitarelli, Representative  
United Steelworkers of America  
334 Suburban Station Building  
Philadelphia, Pa. 19103

Re: Implementation of the Award  
in Cases USC-1708 et al

Gentlemen:

In a letter dated October 19, 1965 the Union questioned the Company's implementation of the Award in the above case insofar as it affected the Gantry Crane Operators. Mr. Zitarelli requested a meeting of the parties' representatives, with me, to resolve the issue. Such a meeting took place in the Board offices on January 17, 1966.

At the meeting it was clear that no question existed concerning implementation of the March 30, 1965 Award as to the Scarfers. For the Scarfers, the Company factored the standards under Revision 6 by 1.2 so as to achieve a 20% increase in Scarfer incentive earnings. As to the Gantry Cranemen, the Company held that the adjustment in Scarfer standards was reflected in earnings of the Gantry Cranemen in a sufficient amount to comply with the Award, bearing in mind the manner in which the Gantry Cranemen incentive earnings are calculated.

Mr. Masterson - 2  
Mr. Zitarelli

January 20, 1966

The formula for calculation of the Gantry Cranemen I.M.P. is as follows:

$$\text{Gantry IMP} = \frac{\text{Scarfer ESH} + \text{Gantry EHS}}{\text{Scarfer Actual Hours} + \text{Gantry Actual Hours}}$$

By increasing the earned standard hours of the Scarfers by the 1.2 factor, the Company thereby substantially increased the earnings of the Gantry Cranemen as calculated under the above formula. About 70% of the I.M.P. for the Gantry Cranemen is derived from the earned standard hours of the Scarfers under normal conditions. The remaining earned standard hours of the Gantry Cranemen are attributable to work which they perform under other standards applicable specifically to such work, but there has been no persuasive showing by the Union at any stage in this case that such other standards actually required revision because of changed conditions.

Company evidence indicates that from December 24, 1961 through September 1, 1962, the Scarfer I.M.P. averaged 195%, while the Gantry Craneman I.M.P. averaged 171%. Thus, the ratio of Gantry Craneman I.M.P. to Scarfer I.M.P. over this period was .878. During the period from February 2, 1964 through July 17, 1965, the I.M.P. for Scarfers (calculated on the basis of the March 30, 1965 Award) averaged 178%, while the Gantry Cranemen I.M.P. for the same period averaged 159%. During this period the ratio of Gantry Craneman I.M.P. to Scarfer I.M.P. thus ran at .893.

The Union now suggests that all of the standards for the Gantry Cranemen should be increased by the 1.2 factor. Under its method of calculation, earnings of the Gantry Cranemen then would be increased to a point where the ratio of the Gantry Cranemen I.M.P. to Scarfers I.M.P. would be .944. The Union suggests that such result may be required by Section 9-C-4, but provides no elaboration as to why this might be so.

Mr. Masterson -- 3  
Mr. Zitarelli

January 20, 1966

After due consideration of the evidence and arguments presented at the January 17 meeting, it is my conclusion that the Company did not err in its implementation of the March 30, 1965 Award as to the Gantry Cranemen. The Company thus appears to be in full compliance with the March 30, 1965 Award.

Sincerely,

Sylvester Garrett