

9-17-1965

United States Steel Corporation Fairless Works and United Steelworkers of America Local Union 4889

Sylvester Garrett
Chairman

Follow this and additional works at: http://knowledge.library.iup.edu/garrett_series

Recommended Citation

Garrett, Sylvester, "United States Steel Corporation Fairless Works and United Steelworkers of America Local Union 4889" (1965).
Arbitration Cases. 330.
http://knowledge.library.iup.edu/garrett_series/330

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, sara.parme@iup.edu.

BOARD OF ARBITRATION

Case USS-5096-S

September 17, 1965

ARBITRATION AWARD

UNITED STATES STEEL CORPORATION
Fairless Works

and

Grievance No. SFL-64-167

UNITED STEELWORKERS OF AMERICA
Local Union No. 4889

Subject: Incentive Administration.

Statement of the Grievance: "Request 336 hours per pay period be calculated as unmeasured work incentive appl. 4060-90. We further request the standard time values of the Soaking Pits for incentive appl. 4060-90 be adjusted to reflect the change."

This grievance was filed in the Second Step of the grievance procedure August 6, 1964.

Contract Provisions Involved: Section 9-C-2 of the April 6, 1962 Agreement as amended June 29, 1963.

Statement of the Award: The grievance is denied.

BACKGROUND

Case USS-5096-S

This grievance from the Rolling Division of Fairless Works protests inclusion of certain Motor Inspector hours in calculating incentive earnings under an indirect incentive which covers almost 300 employees on about 20 mechanical and electrical assigned maintenance jobs in the Hot Strip and Slab Mills.

The grievance specifically requests that 336 hours per pay period be treated as unmeasured work between June 28 and August 8, 1964, and also that the incentive standards be adjusted for the long run.

Standard Time Values under the disputed incentive are established in terms of earned hours and actual hours on unmeasured work under four direct incentives (Ingot Stripper Crew, Soaking Pit Operating Crew, 45" Universal Slab Mill Operating Crew, and 80" Hot Strip Mill Operating Crew). New No. 2 Soaking Pits were installed at Fairless Works in 1960 and soon gave considerable trouble with control equipment and motors on the pit covers. Commencing as early as about August of 1960, it was necessary occasionally to upgrade a Motor Inspector Helper to Motor Inspector on given turns, and assign him responsibility to operate otherwise inoperative Soaking Pit covers, usually by closing the circuit relays manually. The resultant vacancy in the Motor Inspector Helper position normally was filled by stepping up a Laborer on such occasions.

During a period of about 6 weeks commencing around June 20, 1964 and running to August 8, there was an unusual amount of difficulty in operation of the cover control equipment. Management decided that the time had come to seek a long-range solution to the problem, and stepped up Motor Inspector Helpers much more frequently than had been true up to

that time in order to keep the covers operating while an effort was made to eliminate as many of the causes of the problem as was possible. A manufacturer's representative was called in for consultation, and ultimately the traverse and hoist motors for the pit covers were switched and more satisfactory results were obtained as a result. Meanwhile, the situation produced the present grievance on August 6, 1964.

In support of the grievance, the Union alleged that a Motor Inspector Helper was being stepped up every turn, and that a total of 336 man hours per pay period thus was used to manually close the circuit relays and otherwise assure that the Soaking Pit covers operated. In its judgment, all such hours should have been treated as unmeasured work during the six-week period in mid-1964, and in recognition of the possibility of future recurrence, the standards should be adjusted appropriately. Several Union witnesses testified that they had been stepped up to Motor Inspector on numerous turns in 1964 and were given lists of pits for which they were to be responsible at the beginning of such turns. These men denied that during these turns they performed any significant other assigned maintenance, although the Company holds that they performed such other maintenance even though their prime responsibility on these turns was to assure operation of the Soaking Pit covers.

The Company notes that the definition of unmeasured work in the incentive brochure clearly does not cover the work in question. Instead, says the Company, pit cover control work has been a regular part of assigned maintenance for some years and fully covered by the application.

The Company also stresses that the earnings history over representative periods under the disputed incentive does not indicate any significant depression of earnings during the June 20 to August 8 period in 1964, as follows:

3.

USS-5096-S

<u>Pay Period Ending</u>	<u>I.M.P.</u>
1- 4-64	116%*
1-18-64	116*
2- 1-64	116*
2-15-64	116*
2-29-64	125
3-14-64	126
3-28-64	126
4-11-64	126
4-25-64	122
5- 9-64	120
5-23-64	122
6- 6-64	115
6-20-64	106
7- 4-64	113
7-18-64	117
8- 1-64	123
8-15-64	123
8-29-64	117
9-12-64	124
9-26-64	118
10-10-64	114
10-24-64	103
11- 7-64	116
11-21-64	116
12- 5-64	117
12-19-64	118
1- 2-65	122
1-16-65	118
1-30-65	104
2-13-65	101
2-27-65	112

<u>Pay Period Ending</u>	<u>I.M.P.</u>
3-13-65	126
3-27-65	119
4-10-65	98**
4-24-65	125
5- 8-65	123
5-22-65	121

* Special interim allowances were in effect at the 116% level from August 18, 1963, to February 16, 1964, during which period Application 4060-90 had been cancelled. Revision No. 1 was installed effective February 16, 1964.

** P.P.E. 4-10-65 involved an extensive breakdown on the 45" Slab Mill.

Basically the Union regards the work of the upgraded Motor Inspector Helpers on the disputed turns as of an operating or production nature rather than assigned maintenance. It believes that the real function of the Motor Inspectors assigned to operation of the pit covers was to see that such covers functioned promptly and that there was no other significant responsibility imposed upon such employees.

FINDINGS

Relevant provisions in the incentive brochure read as follows:

9

"Section III-2:

"Actual Hours to be Included:

"Actual hours worked to be used in calculating the performance under this incentive application shall be the total of:

"A. All departmental indirect crew hours worked on the job titles and code numbers listed in Section I of this incentive as obtained from the normal position payroll.

"B. Hours from the following cost centers for work performed for the Hot Strip and Slab Mill Department charged against the 4000 cost centers as accumulated from the balanced distribution of these (Central Shops) man hours

.

"Section III-8:

"Unmeasured Work Hours:

"Hours actually worked, if any, by the departmental indirect crew listed in Section I, charged against Appropriations and Corporation

Research and Development projects shall be identified as unmeasured work hours. Hours actually worked, if any, by the departmental indirect crew listed in Section II, on plant facilities converted from capital portion of appropriation accounts shall be considered as unmeasured work until such time that the standard time values can be revised, if necessary, to reflect the work required by the plant facility. The time spent on such unmeasured work, if any, shall be recorded, approved by the Turn Foreman and added to the total earned standard hours and added to the total actual hours on measured work in the calculation of pay performance. All other hours on the job shall constitute hours on measured work."

There is no question that the pit cover control work here in issue is the same as had been performed ever since installation of the No. 2 Soaking Pits in 1960. From the very beginning, trouble was experienced with the control equipment on the Soaking Pit covers, and it was necessary to upgrade a Motor Inspector Helper from time to time to Motor Inspector with the responsibility to operate the otherwise inoperative covers by manually closing the circuit relays. The need to upgrade a Motor Inspector Helper to Motor Inspector for this purpose continued through 1960, 1961, 1962, and 1963 on an occasional basis. In August of 1963, the incentive covering the departmental indirect crew-operating maintenance (Hot Strip

and Slab Mills) was cancelled by agreement, and an interim period installed, during which incumbents of the numerous jobs covered by the incentive were compensated by payment of 116% special hourly interim allowances under Section 9-C-2-(c). A new incentive was not installed until the pay period ending February 29, 1964. The Company evidence is conclusive that the standards which were made effective at this time were based upon the performance by Motor Inspectors (upgraded Motor Inspector Helpers) of work of the sort here in issue.

Thus, the real problem in this case is whether the greater volume of such work during the period from June 20 to August 8, 1964 was such as to require some adjustment of the standards, despite the fact that the work was of a kind contemplated by the standards installed earlier that year. There is no question that, after August 8, 1964, the conditions which necessitated such substantial use of Motor Inspectors for this purpose were largely corrected; subsequently the amount of such work required was no greater than it had been over the years between 1960 and June 20, 1964. Thus, the present problem really involves only a temporary condition which persisted for about six weeks, and there is no occasion here to express any opinion as to whether a long-range change of the sort which persisted for only six weeks might warrant an adjustment in the standards. This decision will deal only with the specific problem presented.

11

Maintenance requirements of various types obviously fluctuate from day to day, week to week, or month to month. It is notable in the present case that there was no demonstrable adverse impact of the protested condition upon the incentive earnings. The interim hourly differential which prevailed until mid-February, 1964 was 116%. Over the four pay periods

12

between June 20, 1964 and August 15, 1964, the average Index of Measured Performance under the incentive ran about 119%. During the six full pay periods immediately preceding June 20, 1964, the Average Index of Measured Performance was about 118%. During the six pay periods immediately following August 15, 1964, the Average Index of Measured Performance was about 115.3%.

The lack of any demonstrable adverse impact may stem in part from the fact that the disputed incentive covers about 300 employees under 18 to 20 job titles, with approximately 21,000 or more employee hours worked under the incentive during a typical 1964 pay period. Since 1959 the Average Index of Measured Performance has run as follows:

13

<u>Year</u>	<u>Average I.M.P.</u>
1959	113
1960	114
1961	121
1962	113
1963	111
1964	118

AWARD

The grievance is denied.

14

BOARD OF ARBITRATION


Sylvester Garrett, Chairman