

6-16-1965

# United States Steel Corporation Irvin Works and United Steelworkers of America Local Union 2227

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 Irvin Works and United Steelworkers of America Local Union 2227" (1965).  
*Arbitration Cases*. 297.  
[http://knowledge.library.iup.edu/garrett\\_series/297](http://knowledge.library.iup.edu/garrett_series/297)

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-5014-S

June 16, 1965

UNITED STATES STEEL CORPORATION  
Irvin Works

and

Grievance No. SI-64-96

UNITED STEELWORKERS OF AMERICA  
Local Union No. 2227

Subject: Incentive Administration.

Statement of the Grievance: "The incentive for the Slab Yard Scarfers, Markers, Gantry Cranemen and Scarfer Helpers does not provide equitable incentive compensation.

"The incentive was installed June 7, 1964. The Scarfing Crews cannot realize their former earnings.

"The incentive for the Scarfing Crews be readjusted to realize their former earnings with group pool or one incentive for the crews."

This grievance was filed in the First Step of the grievance procedure July 13, 1964.

Contract Provisions Involved: Section 9-C-4 of the April 6, 1962 Agreement as amended June 29, 1963.

Statement of the Award: The grievance is denied.

BACKGROUND

Case USS-5014-S

This grievance from the Slab Yard of Irvin Works protests that the earnings opportunity under an incentive installed for Scarfers on June 7, 1964 is too low. 1

Originally, the grievance also involved other employees, such as Markers (Inspectors), Gantry Cranemen, and Scarfer Helpers, not actually working under the Scarfer incentive, but affected by it. This problem will not be treated here, however, since pending in other grievances. 2

Scarfer Incentive Application No. 702 first was installed November 13, 1960 by mutual agreement, with an expected performance level of 127%. In addition to earnings generated directly by the standards, it also provided a "new incentive" differential of 30.8¢ per hour per Scarfer. In January, 1964, Management began to experiment with larger scarfing torches because of the need for increasing surface removal to meet customer requirements. Initial experimentation was with a C-59 torch, using a No. 62 nozzle, this torch being larger than the C-51 torch previously used. Shortly thereafter, the C-59 torch was supplanted by a C-65 torch with a No. 62 nozzle. This type torch thereafter was used through an experimentation period, and then provided the basis for Revision No. 1 to Incentive Application No. 702 on June 7, 1964. 3

When the experimentation period began, Grievance Committeeman Frank was given a letter dated January 29, 1964, reading: 4

"A change has been made in the scarfing torch and nozzle utilized in the Slab Yard. The new torch and nozzle are identified as a C-59 torch with a No. 62 nozzle, whereas the former torch and nozzle are identified in the Slab Conditioning Crew Incentive Application No. 702 as a C-51 torch with No. 38 nozzle.

"When sufficient experience has been gained with the use of this new equipment, Management will determine, in accordance with the applicable provisions of the Labor Agreement the effect, if any, this new equipment will have on the incentive application involved.

"I will keep you advised of the experience achieved with this new equipment."

A wider average cut is attainable with the C-65 torch, compared with the old C-51 torch (2½ inches against 1½ inches), and this change warranted revision of the standards in the incentive. Because of increased heat generated by the C-65 torch, increased delays, increased physical effort, and other factors affecting the work of the Scarfers, the standards were tightened only by an approximate 18%, with the thought that such change would permit the Scarfers to maintain their incentive earnings at past levels without difficulty.

Over a 4-year period the Index of Measured Performance of the Scarfers averaged as follows:

1960	-	115
1961	-	138
1962	-	154
1963	-	145

Against this earnings background, the following pay period by pay period earnings data (Index of Measured Performance) is particularly relevant:

7

Prior to experimentation (C-51 torch only)

<u>Pay Period</u> <u>Ending</u>	<u>IMP</u>
11- 9-63	132
11-23-63	127
12- 7-63	124
12-21-63	116
1- 4-64	117
1-18-64	106

During experimental period (C-51, C-59 and C-65 torches)

2- 1-64	121
2-15-64	123
2-29-64	128
3-14-64	131
3-28-64	142
4-11-64	134
4-25-64	137
5- 9-64	129
5-23-64	126
6- 6-64	137

After experimental period (C-65 torch only)

<u>Pay Period</u> <u>Ending</u>	<u>IMP</u>
6-20-64	125
7- 4-64	126
7-18-64	129
8- 1-64	117
8-15-64	137
8-29-64	130
9-12-64	143
9-26-64	145
10-10-64	145
10-24-64	133
11- 7-64	148
11-21-64	140
12- 5-64	127
12-19-64	132
1- 2-65	133
1-16-65	141
1-30-65	145
2-13-65	150
2-27-65	142
3-13-65	146
3-27-65	151

The Union argues that the new torches do not perform as well as they were supposed to, that they are much heavier and more awkward, and that the intense heat burns the tips of the torches. It also asserts that the greater heat generated by the new torch makes the work considerably more difficult for

the Scarfers, wears out their protective clothing faster, and subjects them to increased smoke and fumes. The Union does not believe that the new standards truly provide adequate earnings opportunity for the Scarfers in light of these circumstances.

#### FINDINGS

From the pay period ending June 20, 1964 through the pay period ending March 27, 1965, the Scarfers' Index of Measured Performance averaged about 137%. In addition, the Scarfers received an hourly "new incentive" differential of 30.8 cents. These figures provide no support for the claim that this incentive does not provide equitable incentive earnings. The remaining question is whether the replacement incentive provides the same earnings opportunity as the incentive which was replaced, as required by Section 9-C-4. For 9-C-4 purposes, the Company suggests a reference period ending on January 18, 1964, immediately prior to the experimentation period, with an average IMP of about 120%. A reference period consisting of the six pay periods immediately prior to installation of the new standards would show an average IMP in the vicinity of 134%. The result in this case would not be affected, no matter which of the two possible reference periods were selected, since it is clear that the average IMP since the new standards were installed exceeds the IMP in both of the arguably applicable reference periods. Bearing in mind that the Scarfers continue to receive the 30.8 cents per hour "new incentive" differential, it seems clear that the earnings protection requirements of Section 9-C-4 have been met.

6.

USS-5014-S

AWARD

The grievance is denied.

10

BOARD OF ARBITRATION

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Sylvester Garrett, Chairman