

11-22-1965

United States Steel Corporation Sheet and Tin Operations Irvin Works and United Steelworkers of America Local Union No. 2227

Sylvester Garrett

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

Recommended Citation

Garrett, Sylvester, "United States Steel Corporation Sheet and Tin Operations Irvin Works and United Steelworkers of America Local Union No. 2227" (1965). *Arbitration Cases*. 207.
http://knowledge.library.iup.edu/garrett_series/207

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. USS-5255-S

November 22, 1965

ARBITRATION AWARD

UNITED STATES STEEL CORPORATION
SHEET AND TIN OPERATIONS
Irvin Works

and

Grievance No. SI-64-137

UNITED STEELWORKERS OF AMERICA
Local Union No. 2227

Subject: Incentive Administration

Statement of the Grievance: "The Union protest the Hot Strip
Finish Indirect Crew Incentive Application is not
equitable."

This grievance was filed in the
First Step of the grievance procedure October 21, 1964.

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

Statement of the Award: The grievance is denied.

BACKGROUND

Case USS-5255-S

Employees in the Sheet Finishing Department of Irvin Works grieve failure to adjust Incentive Application No. 651 under Section 9-C-2-a of the April 6, 1962 Agreement, as amended June 29, 1963, in recognition of alleged changed conditions which resulted in indices of measured performance of 111% and 112% for the pay periods ending October 10, 1964 and October 24, 1964. 1

Incentive Application No. 5250-651, often referred to as a "work done rate," covers the work of the Hot Strip Finishing Crew performed while servicing about a dozen individual production units in Hot Strip Finishing. The work of the crew is to locate and identify product to be processed, transport coils and lifts to assure proper operations of temper rolling, shearing, recoiling, normalizing, pickling, assorting, leveling and warehousing. The amount of work performed by the crew is reflected by the number of coils charged, the number of lifts charged, the number of racks processed, the number of coils warehoused, the number of lifts warehoused, the number of coils and lifts delivered to other departments, the number of various type coils discharged from the Shear and Temper Lines, the number of roll changes, and the number of Hot Rolled Coils prepared for shipment by Burning Operation. The work time values are established in terms of standard hours for these items of work. The items of work performed during each pay period will be reported. These items will be multiplied by the work time values to permit the determination of the earned standard hours of work performed during the pay period. 2

Since its installation the incentive has been adjusted 16 times under Section 9-C-2-a to preserve its integrity. The incentive has shown the following earnings record: 3

1958	114%
1959	118
1960	120
1961	117
1962	115
1963	116
1964	117
1965	118 through pay period ending 5/8/65

The incentive has been scrutinized by the parties in connection with Grievances A-57-57, A-58-66, A-62-155, A-63-73, and A-63-94, all of which were withdrawn from the grievance procedure. 4

The low performances of 111% and 112% in the pay periods ending October 10, 1964 and October 24, 1964 were attributed by the Company to low performances of operating units when operating schedules were increased, and additional crews needed a short shakedown period to achieve an efficient operating level. 5

It was pointed out by the Company in the Fourth Step Meeting that the index of measured performance in the pay period ending October 10, 1964 would have increased from 111% to 115% had the operating units performed normally and from 112% to 118% in the pay period ending October 24, 1964. 6

The Union, initially, attributed low performance in these pay periods to the discrepancy between scheduled hours and actual hours worked. (It was not claimed, however, that the number of employees working on any given turn exceeded the maximum number specified in the incentive brochure.) 7

After the Fourth Step hearing the Union submitted a list, including 13 additional alleged changes, which, in its opinion, call for an adjustment of the incentive under Section 9-C-2-a. The list was examined by the Company and answered in detail. 8

FINDINGS

The earnings record of the disputed incentive application shows no measurable decline in 1964 or 1965. The Company has given a credible explanation for the particularly low incentive earnings for the payroll periods ending October 10, 1964 and October 24, 1964 which was not effectively challenged by the Union. There is no need to discuss the contentions of the parties on each one of the 14 points advanced by the Union as demanding Section 9-C-2-a adjustments. The record does not indicate that any one of these items caused the decline of earnings in the two specific pay periods, or else affected earnings in any other pay period.

9

AWARD

The grievance is denied.

10

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



Peter Florey
Assistant to the Chairman

Approved by the Board of Arbitration



Sylvester Garrett, Chairman