

11-23-1965

# United States Steel Corporation Sheet and Tin Operations Fairless Works and United Steelworkers of America Local Union 4889

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, "United States Steel Corporation Sheet and Tin Operations Fairless Works and United Steelworkers of America Local Union 4889" (1965). *Arbitration Cases*. 151.  
[http://knowledge.library.iup.edu/garrett\\_series/151](http://knowledge.library.iup.edu/garrett_series/151)

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

Case USS-4988-S

November 23, 1965

ARBITRATION AWARD

UNITED STATES STEEL CORPORATION  
Sheet and Tin Operations  
Fairless Works

and

Grievance No. A-63-226

UNITED STEELWORKERS OF AMERICA  
Local Union No. 4889

Subject: Work Assignment; Scope of Trade and Craft  
Job; Seniority.

Statement of the Grievance: "We, of the Masonry Dept., request  
Management return to us the work on Blowpipes and  
Tuyere Stocks which is a trade and craft job; and  
pay for all monies lost by us while this job is  
being done by Blast Fce. people."

This grievance was filed in the  
Second Step of the grievance procedure November 29, 1963.

Contract Provisions Involved: Sections 2-B-3 and 9-D of the  
April 6, 1962 Agreement.

Statement of the Award: The grievance is denied.

BACKGROUND

Case USS-4988-S

This grievance from the Masonry Department of Fairless Works protests that work relining Blast Furnace blow pipes and tuyere stocks was assigned to Blast Furnace Tuyaeremen and Helpers in September of 1963 rather than to trade and craft Bricklayers and Helpers.

When Fairless Blast Furnace operations commenced in 1953 tuyere stocks were lined by Bricklayers and Helpers from the Masonry Department, using a wooden core around which a castable material was packed by hand. This method of lining tuyere stocks continued until September of 1963, when preformed liners were purchased and put into use. The Bricklayers no longer were used to grout the liners into the stocks; instead pressure equipment was used for this purpose and the work was assigned to the Tuyaeremen and Tuyaeremen Helpers in the Blast Furnace Department.

Until the late 1950's, the Fairless Blast Furnace blow pipes were not lined. As hot blast temperatures increased, however, the blow pipes were changed from cast iron to stainless steel in the mid-50's. By 1960 a castable material was applied manually inside the blow pipes, using an expanded metal liner fastened to the inside. Then late in 1960 another technique was tried, using a cardboard tube around which the castable material was hand packed by Masonry crews. Late in 1961, experimentation began with the use of a precast short length 6" refractory sleeve held in position by a cardboard liner, which also involved hand grouting of the castable material by the Masonry crews. This was done in the Brick Shed about one-half mile from the Blast Furnaces. Early in 1963 continued experimentation led to use of a full length preformed refractory lining. By this time, however, the hand grouting of the lining was deemed inadequate; voids in the hand grouted material caused hot spots to develop on the blow pipes. It seemed obvious to Management that pressure grouting was the solution.

Pressure grouting equipment long had been used by Tuyeremen and Helpers in the Blast Furnaces for other pressure grouting work. Pressure grouting thus was tried in lining the blow pipes and proved to be successful. This eliminated the hot spot problem, assured longer life for the stocks and blow pipes, and could be performed at the Blast Furnace location. 4

At this time it was found that the same method of pressure grouting could be used for lining of stocks, also to avoid hot spots. Ultimately it became possible to pressure-grout stocks without removing them from the furnace proper, and fittings were made a part of the stock assembly for this purpose. 5

Under principles laid down in Case USC-419, the Union believes that performance of the disputed work must be recognized as an integral part of the trade and craft Bricklayer job at Fairless Works. If this view is correct, the work cannot be assigned to the position-rated jobs in the Blast Furnace. Even if the principles of USC-419 are not applicable, the Union believes that an established seniority practice recognizes the right of Masonry Department employees to perform this work to the exclusion of Blast Furnace Department employees. The Union stresses that the Masonry Department has pressure guns which can perform the same work as the equipment used by the Blast Furnace employees. It also stresses that 12 stocks were brought over to the Bricklayers in the Brick Shed to be grouted in September of 1965, and that there are Pressure Gun crews in the Brick Mason Department composed of a Gun Operator (Class 8), a Gun Operator Helper (Class 5), and a Laborer (Class 3). 6

The Company notes that operation of pressure grouting equipment never has been part of the Bricklayer job as such. Bricklayers have performed hand grouting; pressure grouting traditionally has been performed by position-rated jobs, such 7

as the Tuyere man and Tuyere man Helper in the Blast Furnace Department, and the position-rated jobs in special Pressure Gun crews of the Masonry Department. The Company also stresses that it is within Management's discretion as to what materials will be used to perform a given kind of job, what equipment will be used, and the method by which the job will be performed. Blast Furnace Management was entitled to make these decisions in the present case, and, having made such decisions, it was natural for the work to be assigned to the Tuyere man and Tuyere man Helper since akin to other work long performed by these jobs. The Company notes, moreover, that Bricklayers at Fairless cannot claim that pressure grouting has been done exclusively by them; position-rated jobs to perform this function have existed at Fairless since 1953. As to seniority, the Company notes that the same sort of work, as now in issue, has been performed by Blast Furnace personnel since 1953. Finally, the Company points out that the amount of work involved is extremely small when compared with the 5,000 to 6,000 hours per pay period typically worked by the Bricklayers.

#### FINDINGS

The situation here differs substantially from that in Case USC-419. There the disputed work always had been performed by Gary Sheet and Tin Bricklayers and was covered in terms by the Bricklayers' Description and Classification. Over the years it had not been performed by employees in other jobs. 8

In the present case the disputed work is pressure grouting, not hand grouting. Pressure grouting has been performed by Blast Furnace employees at Fairless since 1953. It has not been recognized in practice as work of Bricklayers at 9

Fairless Works. A special Pressure Gun crew in the Masonry Department actually operates this kind of equipment, when needed by the Masonry Department, and this is composed of employees on position-rated jobs. On these different facts, Case USC-419 cannot be said to apply to the present case.

Likewise, the seniority claim of the Union cannot be sustained. Operation of pressure grouting equipment always has been done by Blast Furnace Department employees. All that is involved here is a Management decision to assign additional work of this kind on a particular piece of equipment, to Blast Furnace employees rather than to Masonry Department employees. In view of the small amount of work involved, there is no reason to believe that this decision poses any serious threat to the long-range job security of Masonry Department employees. In such circumstances, the grievance properly should be denied.

10

AWARD

The grievance is denied.

11

BOARD OF ARBITRATION

  
Sylvester Garrett, Chairman