

2-19-1971

# United States Steel Corporation Western Steel Operations Gary Works and United Steelworkers of Americ Local Union 2695

Sylvester Garrett  
*Chairman*

Clare B. McDermott  
*Assistant Chairman*

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



Part of the [Dispute Resolution and Arbitration Commons](#)

---

## Recommended Citation

Garrett, Sylvester and McDermott, Clare B., "United States Steel Corporation Western Steel Operations Gary Works and United Steelworkers of Americ Local Union 2695" (1971). *Arbitration Cases*. 9.  
[http://knowledge.library.iup.edu/garrett\\_series/9](http://knowledge.library.iup.edu/garrett_series/9)

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 No. USS-7209-S

February 19, 1971

ARBITRATION AWARD

UNITED STATES STEEL CORPORATION  
WESTERN STEEL OPERATIONS  
Gary Works

and

Grievance No. HG-67-S-56-C

UNITED STEELWORKERS OF AMERICA  
Local Union No. 2695

Subject: Job Classification.

Statement of the Grievance:

Job Title: Production Record Clerk  
(46" Inventory)

Job Code : 9122-9679

Date : August 18, 1967

Contract Provision Involved:  
Salaried Agreement.

Section 9-C of the September 1, 1965

Grievance Data:

Date

Stipulation Dated:	August 18, 1967
Step 2 Meeting:	Not Applicable
Appealed to Step 3:	August 18, 1967
Step 3 Meeting:	November 14, 1967
Appealed to Step 4:	November 16, 1967
Step 4 Meeting:	March 15, 1968
Appealed to Arbitration:	August 11, 1969
Case Heard:	December 10, 1969
Transcript Received:	December 22, 1969

Statement of the Award: The grievance is sustained, and the rating of Factors 2, 3, and 4 will be raised to .9, 2.2, and 2.0, respectively, for a total rating of 6.2, for Job Class 6, and appropriate employees will be compensated accordingly retroactive to November 22, 1965.

This grievance from the Central Mills Accounting Department of Gary Works seeks to change the description and to raise the classification of the new Production Record Clerk (46" Inventory) from Job Class 4 to 6 under Section 9-C-1 of the September 1, 1965 Salaried Agreement and the December 6, 1948 Salaried Manual.

1

In past years there had been a job of Production Record Clerk in Job Class 4, which had a number of incumbents, some of whom performed varying functions. On November 22, 1965, a grievance was filed, contending that content of that job had been changed to the extent that a new description and classification were required under 9-C-1.

2

That grievance ultimately was granted, at least to the extent that a new job of Production Record Clerk (46" Inventory) was established, effective June 11, 1967 in Job Class 4. That is the new job now in dispute. Its description reads as follows:

3

"Primary Function

Prepare reports and make corrections, as necessary to control 46" Mill inventory.

Machines or Equipment Used

Key punch, verifier, adding machine, calculator, etc.

Source of Supervision

Supervisor

Direction Exercised

None

"Working Procedure

1. Posts data from various records such as slab production, 210" Plate Mill consumption, inventory code retab, rejection, single slab out list, Sheet and Tin Mill shipments, etc. to daily processing control report with various control headings such as production, corrections, consumption, etc. by turn for pieces and weights and totals same. Reconciles pieces and weights on daily processing control report with actual production listings and makes necessary corrections to report.
2. Refers to 46" Mill-yields by inventory code report and actual inventory code file listing to compare ending inventory, and makes necessary corrections to 46" Mill-yield by inventory code report.
3. Keypunches and verifies data as required to correct erroneous data.
4. Receives by phone weekly, total ton inventory from various producing units and extends tons by pre-set percentages to determine total weight of material in inventory by material use, such as oven conversions, trade, other works, etc."

The present stipulation then was entered on August 18, 1967, with the Union insisting that the new description should be expanded by addition of Items 5 and 6, as follows:

- "5. Prepares Weekly Pittsburgh Inventory Report and phones same to Pittsburgh.
6. Investigate reconciles discrepancies between book and physical inventory to balance inventory records."

The Union urges also that the present reason for classification should be changed. It now reads as follows:

5

"...prepare reports and make corrections, as necessary, to control 46" Mill inventory where sources of data are indicated by procedures or instructions and data to be included are clearly identified by codes, labels, headings, or routines. Requires recognition of completion of assignment."

The following should be substituted, in the Union's judgment:

6

"Prepare reports and make corrections to control 46" Inventory, which requires knowledge of operations and interpretation of instructions to recognize variations and completeness of reports."

The Union suggests also that the job is improperly titled, in that it should be called Inventory Control Clerk and not Production Record Clerk.

7

The Company feels that the present description and blurb are accurate. It says that the Union's suggested addition of a new Item 5 is unnecessary since the duty of preparing reports is expressly covered in the Primary Function. The Company denies that the job requires a "knowledge of operations," or is required to "interpret instructions" because according to the Company, the data are specifically identified in the source record used and in the final form of the records and reports. Thus, the Company says that the job needs only a knowledge of source records, product nomenclature, and facility involved in order to follow specific instructions.

8

The Union cited Benchmark 247, Inventory Clerk, and a Gary plant job (Inventory Clerk /Mills/) and claims that the job in dispute is engaged in comprehensive closing in final form, which allegedly amounts to intermediate compiling.

9

The Company relied on Benchmarks 150, Tabulating Machine Operator; 249, Inventory Posting Clerk; 375, Product Clerk; 378 and 381, both Production Clerks; and 388, Product Clerk.

The classification details are in the table:

<u>Factor</u>	<u>Company</u>	<u>Union</u>
1	1.1	1.1
*2	.6	.9
*3	1.1	2.2
*4	1.0	2.0
5	Base	Base
6	Base	Base
7	<u>Base</u>	<u>Base</u>
	3.8	6.2

\*Factors in dispute

#### FINDINGS

At the hearing, testimony was confined almost entirely to the job's responsibility for seeing that totals for pieces and weights by turns and by the day for slabs rolled, shipped, rejected, transferred, and reclassified on the report called Turn Activities for the Day, prepared by computer, are in balance with control sheets written out by the job. The "spread sheet" was said by the Union witness to be the main part of the job. It shows slab production, shipments, transfers, reclassifications, and rejections, by month to date as of the end of each day.

The witness explained that the job had to check that report in order to discover whether there were errors in it and, if there were, the job then had to find out where and how they had occurred in order to correct them. An error might arise from a Tab Operator's mistake, which he then tried to rerun without the aid of a Programmer. Such a situation once

resulted in the computer's printing out for the following day all production run on the previous day. That duplication resulted in an overstatement of 5,000 tons of production. The two reports thus did not balance, and the incumbent of the job in dispute discovered the source of the error by comparing a budgeted inventory sheet with an actual inventory sheet and noticing that several code "40's" (indicating current production) with a production date of "21st" continued to appear in inventory on the 22nd, which should not have happened. Correcting that required an item-by-item matching to isolate and subtract entries for those slabs which had been duplicated. Mechanically, the correction then was made by punching a card for each item so that the corrected run would not include the duplicated items.

The Company explains that the new, computerized system for recording activity of the 46" Slab Mill provides a record for every slab rolled, shipped, reclassified, rejected, or transferred. All this is fed to the computer on a turn basis, and the computer totals all that by the day for three turns, for a "daily list," which is a composite of all three turns' activity, by heat, ingot, and cut number. The turn listings are headed, for example, "Production, Turn 1," or "Rejection, Turn 1," with a listing of every individual slab produced or rejected.

At the end of the day, the turn lists are sent to the job in dispute, which up to that time has had nothing to do with the computerized listings. This job then copies totals from the various turn listings onto a control sheet, by pounds. It then adds all the "inflow" items (production) and subtracts all "outflow" items (rejections, shipments, or transfers) and thus arrives at a new, ending-inventory total to date.

The computer makes also a summary sheet, called a "spread sheet," showing all transactions by month to date. It shows beginning inventory and what has been rolled, rejected, transferred, or shipped to date, and thus forces an ending-inventory balance in pounds by inventory code.

14

15

16

17  
The job in dispute then compares the computer's ending inventory to date with the new ending inventory it derived by adding all "inflow" items and subtracting all "outflow" items, from the computer's turn listings. If that comparison is out of balance, the job then makes a painstaking search back through the listings to try to discover why there is an imbalance. Possible explanations include a running of production twice, as the Union witness detailed, or a tab listing might be missing entirely because it had been omitted inadvertently. The source of some of these errors are found only by an item-by-item comparison of yesterday's inventory with today's inventory, which might take a full turn for two people, one reading heat numbers from one inventory listing and the other crossing off those numbers on the other inventory listing until the duplication or omission is isolated.

18  
The Company witness agreed that functions of the job in dispute include balancing the 46" Mill inventory records by correcting both complex and simple errors, by means of matching numbers on different listings, which may be quite time consuming. Sometimes, if the imbalance were only a relatively few tons (i.e., ten out of 250,000), Supervision would direct that it be ignored because the time consumed in finding and eliminating it would amount to a greater loss than would continuing the system with a known, but small, error. If a particular kind of imbalance condition were to continue to recur, however, it would be tracked down and eliminated even if small, because it would indicate that something was wrong with the program itself.

19  
The Company feels that no other installation in the Corporation uses this kind of accounting for each individual slab, with a closing inventory every day. This system gives identity by piece and in pounds, with detailed proof listings showing what has been done to each piece, with a summary by type of transaction.

20  
All this, however, is said by the Company to be no more than a mechanical method of doing what the old job always did do,

i.e., maintain accurate inventory records by comparing various listings, some of which then were made by hand, and reconciling and balancing those listings. It stresses that the old job was rated as the new one is now.

The Union feels, however, that the new job investigates and reconciles discrepancies in order to balance inventory records, and it says that that requires a rating of .9, 2.2, and 2.0 in Factors 2, 3, and 4, in line with those factors of the allegedly similar Gary job of Inventory Clerk (Mills). 21

Treating the description question first, there is no solid basis for requiring inclusion of the language sought by the Union's suggested Item 5 of Working Procedure, because the present Primary Function expressly refers to preparation of reports, and no evidence was introduced which would show that the Weekly Pittsburgh Inventory Report was not covered by that language or was so extraordinary as to require individual mention. As to the Union's suggested Item 6, the evidence simply is not sufficiently clear as to whether this job has anything to do with physical inventory-taking to allow the Board to decide that matter now. The parties must settle that. The Union charge that the job did handle this duty was made initially in Step 4, allegedly based on a change said to have been made in October of 1967. 22

Factors 2, 3, and 4 now are rated at .6, 1.1, and 1.0, and the Union seeks .9, 2.2, and 2.0. 23

At the hearing, there was some argument about whether the job "controlled" 46" Mill inventory, the Union suggesting that it did and the Company insisting that it did not. The Company formula was that only Management "controls" inventory, while the job in dispute merely "balances" turn listings to the daily tabulated summary. It is less than certain what classification consequences should follow from acceptance of either of those views, but if any should result, it is necessary to point out that the Company's present statement of the Reasons for Classification says, "...prepare reports and make corrections, 24

as necessary, to control 46" Mill inventory...." (Emphasis added.) That would appear to indicate that the job does not just "balance" figures and then rest; it "balances" by checking, comparing, and correcting, and then by reporting what was wrong, submitting a listing of production which represents an accurate or much more nearly accurate figure of total production. That is close enough to "controls" 46" Mill inventory to support the accuracy of the initial statement of the Company's blurring, rather than its hearing position. Finally, there is no evidence that any other job at this location has greater responsibility than the job in dispute, or even equal responsibility, for accuracy of inventory control at this mill.

The three Benchmarks which seem on the surface to contain the most nearly comparable duties are 227 and 247, Inventory Clerks, and 249, Inventory Posting Clerk. Closer investigation reveals, however, that Benchmark 227, in addition to its inventory work, is engaged in substantial coding, which might justify its rating independent of inventory duties or at least make it different from the job in question.

Thus, the competing Benchmark references appear to be 247, Inventory Clerk, cited by the Union, and 249, Inventory Posting Clerk, cited by the Company. It is no easy matter to say with confidence that one or the other of those Benchmarks clearly governs. Each has some similar duties and some dissimilar ones. That is, 247 deals with some matters unrelated to inventory, and 249 seems to be engaged more in compiling and posting and may be distinguishable also on the ground that it is a part of the Production Planning Department and not the Accounting Department, although this may be insignificant.

Two additional elements of some uncertain importance are that this job appears to be the sole one responsible for comparing, reporting, and correcting data to control inventory figures at this mill and that the system now in use to do that at the 46" Mill is, according to Company testimony, new and unique in the Corporation. Thus, comparison with General Manual language and Benchmarks may not be as reliable as in ordinary circumstances.

The Company argues that, whatever the current job does with aid of the computer's centralization of data, was done by the former job by hand. That is less than certain, however, because many incumbents of the old job worked balances by the turn, whereas the job in dispute appears to be the only one responsible for balancing and controlling 46" Mill inventory by day and to date by comparing totals, detecting existence of, isolating, and correcting errors. On the whole and although the point is not free from doubt, that seems to justify the DDD coding of Factors 2, 3, and 4, of this new job.

28

Accordingly, the grievance will be sustained, and the appropriate employees will be compensated retroactively to November 22, 1965. Retroactivity goes back to that date in the present circumstances because that was the date of the original grievance which first questioned the description and classification of this job, and the parties have viewed the present grievance simply as a formal continuation of that original grievance.

29

AWARD

The grievance is sustained, and the rating of Factors 2, 3, and 4 will be raised to .9, 2.2, and 2.0, respectively, for a total rating of 6.2, for Job Class 6, and appropriate employees will be compensated accordingly retroactive to November 22, 1965.

30

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

*Clare B. McDermott*

Clare B. McDermott  
Assistant Chairman

Approved by the Board of Arbitration

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