

6-29-1964

United States Steel Corporation American Steel and Wire Division Waukegan Works and United Steelworkers of America Local Union 1115

Sylvester Garrett

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

Recommended Citation

Garrett, Sylvester, "United States Steel Corporation American Steel and Wire Division Waukegan Works and United Steelworkers of America Local Union 1115" (1964). *Arbitration Cases*. 448.
http://knowledge.library.iup.edu/garrett_series/448

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 No. A-1022

June 29, 1964

ARBITRATION AWARD

UNITED STATES STEEL CORPORATION
AMERICAN STEEL AND WIRE DIVISION
Waukegan Works

and

Grievance No. WK-1-J

UNITED STEELWORKERS OF AMERICA
Local Union 1115

Subject: Job Classification

Stipulation: Job in Dispute : Mobile Craneman

Stipulation Dated: November 1, 1962

Contract Provision Involved: Section 9-D of the April 6, 1962
Agreement.

Statement of the Award: The grievance is denied with respect to the Union's request for Factors 2, 3, 5, 6, and 8 and is sustained with respect to Factor 11, which is increased to C .8. Thus the job of Mobile Craneman (PC 20-11) is raised to 9.7, Job Class 10.

BACKGROUND

Case A-1022

This job classification grievance from the Rod Storage Department, Waukegan Works, seeks to raise the classification of the Mobile Craneman (PC 20-11) from Job Class 9 to Job Class 12.

The function of the Mobile Craneman is to operate a 10,000 pound capacity Pettibone-Milliken Speed Swing Crane powered by diesel engine and possessing a hook capacity of 5,000 pounds. The Company began utilizing the job in September, 1962. Discussions were held regarding a suitable job description and classification and agreement was reached regarding the description. The classification as proposed by the Company - 9.3 for Job Class 9 - was not acceptable to the Union, which is convinced that 11.6, for Class 12, is appropriate.

Classification details appear in the following table:

<u>Factor</u>	<u>Company Classi- fication</u>	<u>Union Classi- fication</u>
1	.3	.3
*2	C .8	D 1.2
*3	C 1.6	D 22.2
4	1.0	1.0
*5	C .5	C .7
*6	CM .7	CH 1.0
7	1.0	1.0
*8	C .8	D 1.2
9	1.0	1.0
10	.8	.8
*11	B .4	C .8
12	.4	.4
	<hr/> 9.3	<hr/> 11.6

*Factors in dispute.

Installation of the new crane job was prompted by a felt need for moving coils of rods from storage in the Rod Yard, or in the Rod Storage Building, more quickly to the mill to fill short-term delivery commitments. The mobile crane was

intended to supplement, but not replace, existing overhead cranes and locomotive cranes in transferring rods from storage to the transfer point.

The Union conceives 1.2 to be correct for Factor 2 since the operator performs functions similar to those of Specimen 842 - Locomotive Craneman, for which 13-18 months of training and experience have been deemed proper, resulting in the assignment of 1.2 for Factor 2 of the Locomotive Craneman job. The Mobile Craneman must be familiar with numerous foot pedals and hand levers and must possess thorough knowledge of the yard locations where rods of varying sizes must be recognized by heat numbers and stock specifications, and he must also know the locations to which rod trucks are transferred. The Company, however, views Factor 2 as requiring no more than 7-12 months of training and experience and does not recognize similarity between the mobile crane and locomotive cranes in this respect.

5

Factor 3 - The Union sees correlation between Specimens 842, 850, and WK 70-29, all Locomotive Cranemen jobs, and the Mobile Craneman job justifying the Union's request for Code D level and a point value of 2.2, since the latter operator also exerts mental skill in operating a complex crane and in applying various rod sizes to appropriate quarters for delivery to precise transfer points and departments, functions not differing in required degrees of skill from the Locomotive Cranemen jobs. The Company counters that operation of the mobile crane is considered "semi-routine work." The highest skill required is for the operation of the equipment itself, without problem solving and identification of materials.

6

Factor 5 - The Union considers that C .7 is warranted since such is assigned to this Factor for the Locomotive Cranemen jobs, 75-05 - Tractor Craneman, and, significantly, to the Track Service Craneman operating a Pettibone-Milliken Speed Swing Loader at T. C. I. Factor 5 at C .7 was uncontested when the classification of that job was heard by the Board in Case T-679. Respecting Factor 5, the Company distinguishes the instant case from the Track Service Craneman at T. C. I. in that the parties there recognized C .7 as being appropriate on the grounds that the operator manipulated and operated a number of attachments in

7

accomplishing markedly different assignments, while the operator at Waukegan engages only in in-process handling of a single product - rods.

Factor 6 - The Union asserts that assignment of C 1.0 is logical and proper since the crane is valuable and, more particularly, since the massive and expensive tires are subject to puncture by protruding rods. The Company, however, refers to its Exhibit J, which lists 13 jobs, none of which is rated higher than C .7 except Locomotive Cranemen.

8

Factor 8 - The Union views D 1.2 as appropriate since, however infrequently, the mobile crane does enter the Rod Storage Building, thereby incurring an additional safety risk and responsibility. The Company assigns C .8 since it maintains that the area is not congested; that there is a wide road; that there are no obstructions; that no accidents have occurred; that there are few, if any, pedestrians; that there is no particular hazard to others; and that the Specimen 850 - Locomotive Craneman job which received 1.2 has two Helpers who may represent or create safety problems.

9

Factor 11 - The Union conceives its proposal to be correct since the surroundings in which the mobile crane operates are congested; it is necessary for the operator to get out of the cab to inspect each and every coil of rods and the tags attached thereto; all manner of weather conditions are encountered; congestion is in the form of a continuous parade of semi-trailer trucks, the automobiles of outside contractors and Waukegan office workers, and pedestrians. The Company again relies on the 13 jobs listed in its Exhibit J as indicating that .4 is appropriate and also cites Case A-986. In the instant case the operator, per Company testimony, is inside an enclosed, heated cab 80% of his working time.

10

FINDINGS

In Case T-679 the Board had occasion to consider Factors 2, 3, 6, 8, and 10 in classifying a similar Pettibone-Milliken Speed Swing Loader which differed from the mobile

11

crane in the instant case only in the fact that it possessed numerous and more versatile accessories. For present purposes, it is noted that Factors 2, 3, and 6 were there held to have been properly classified by the Company at, respectively, .8, 1.6, and .7. The record before the Board is devoid of evidence warranting an increase as suggested by the Union for these three Factors since it contains no evidence that training and experience, mental skill, and responsibility for equipment are to any degree greater at Waukegan Works than at the T.C.I. Rail Transportation Works.

Factor 5 is now rated at C .5 and the Union seeks C .7. It has not been demonstrated how damage to materials could exceed \$50. The assertion is made that "the operator could apply wrong rods from storage to the orders to be filled" since the operator controls the tags at each bundle of rods and could mix them up. But apparently this has never occurred in fact, nor is there evidence of the monetary loss that would result from such a mix-up.

12

Factor 8 is now at C .8 and the Union requests D 1.2. Although the T.C.I. operator received a rating of C .8, this has little value for present purposes since the Waukegan Mobile Craneman operates under specific conditions in a specific Waukegan area. It is more significant that all other cited jobs bear a rating of C .8 with the exception of Specimen 841 - Truck Driver and Specimen 850 - Locomotive Craneman. Union testimony largely emphasized that its proposal was correct because the Mobile Craneman occasionally enters the Rod Storage Building, thereby incurring an additional safety risk in a congested area subject to continual traffic of various kinds. The preponderance of the evidence, however, is that the operator rarely entered the Storage Building at any time and has not done so for many months preceding the hearing of this case. Moreover, the Board cannot find that the operating area is congested to the extent of justifying D 1.2 when C .8 has been applied to Specimen 842 - Locomotive Craneman and 70-29 - Locomotive Craneman, on which jobs the operators are responsible for the safety of Helpers. The actual language of Factor 8 for the Mobile Craneman job is - "Operates power-driven mobile equipment where probability of accident is low." Other jobs which have also received a classification of .8 employ such language as the following - "Considerable attention

13

and care required to prevent injuries to others when operating tractor-crane in mill." "Considerable care and attention when operating crane." "Operates tractor where others are exposed but probability of injury is low." "Operates crane where crew is exposed." It appears that the disputed job is more properly aligned with those Specimens which bear a .8 classification than it is with those with a higher rating.

Factor 11 - The Company proposes B .4 and the Union C .8. The evidence is that the mobile crane operator must work outside his enclosed, heated cab from 20% to 40% of the time, the Company estimating 20% and the Union 40%. It appears from the Company's assignment of .8 for Factor 10 that muscular exertion is required in positioning rod trucks and it also appears that the operator must attach load tags to buggies. Neither of these functions can be performed from inside the cab. It follows that a substantial part of an operator's time is spent outside of his cab in surroundings and weather conditions which cover the spectrum from good to quite bad. There is closer correlation with the language of the Waukegan job 20-07 - Tractor Operator (Rod Storage) - "All weather conditions where weather is extreme" - than there is with other Specimen jobs assigned ratings of less than C .8. Thus the Union's request for .8 appears correct.

14

AWARD

The grievance is denied with respect to the Union's request for Factors 2, 3, 5, 6, and 8 and is sustained with respect to Factor 11, which is increased to C .8. Thus the job of Mobile Craneman (PC 20-11) is raised to 9.7, Job Class 10.

15

Findings and Award recommended pursuant to Section 7-J of the Agreement, by



David C. Altrock
Assistant to the Chairman

Approved by the Board of Arbitration



Sylvester Garrett, Chairman