

9-10-1965

# United States Steel Corporation Tubular Operations Lorain Works and United Steelworkers of America Local Union 1104

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 Tubular Operations Lorain Works and United Steelworkers of America Local Union 1104" (1965). *Arbitration Cases*. 312.  
[http://knowledge.library.iup.edu/garrett\\_series/312](http://knowledge.library.iup.edu/garrett_series/312)

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-5056-T

September 10, 1965

ARBITRATION AWARD

UNITED STATES STEEL CORPORATION  
Tubular Operations  
Lorain Works

and

Grievance No. N-L62-514

UNITED STEELWORKERS OF AMERICA  
Local Union No. 1104

Subject: Work Assignments

Statement of the Grievance: "The company is having us do work that is not in our job description, namely complex rigging.

"Facts: They make us use hoists and snatch blocks, and operate machines we are not familiar with.

"Remedy Requested: The company cease and desist from the above practice."

This grievance was filed in the First Step of the grievance procedure April 9, 1964.

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

Statement of the Award: The grievance is denied.

BACKGROUND

Case USS-5056-T

Several Pipefitters in the Lorain Works Pipe Shop grieve that Management violated Section 2-B-3, Section 9-A, -B, and -D, Section 13, and the Job Description and Classification Manual when they were required to perform complex rigging work, beginning with the week of April 5, 1964, in connection with the installation of a steam-heating system in the Pipe Mill Warehouse.

1

The Union has made a detailed comparison of the job descriptions of Riggers and Pipefitters and concludes that Management, for whatever reason, suddenly commenced requiring Pipefitters to use rigging equipment such as chain falls, block and tackle, snatch blocks, come-alongs, and air hoists. (As the hearing progressed it developed that the air hoist was the piece of equipment most objectionable to Pipefitter grievants.) One witness testified that he has never used an air hoist in 22 years of pipefitting. During the occasion in question this witness was not instructed in the use of an air hoist and experienced great difficulty in operating it to raise, lower, and "drag" pipe. This resulted in an unsafe operation although there were no accidents or untoward incidents.

2

The Union is certain that even simple rigging is beyond the jurisdiction of the Pipefitter job, but the work involved in this case was markedly complex rigging since Pipefitters were working in a warehouse 1/4 mile long and executed three hoists at one time, raising expansion loops and 8-inch pipe; materials were lifted 60 feet into the air; pipe was then attached to brackets in a semi-dark area; the operation was guided by walkie-talkies on which other people persistently broke in; some of the pipe installed was up to 40 feet long, and not necessarily in straight lengths. The Union notes that the most important man in a rigging group is the air hoist man and this circumstance confirms the Union in its opinion that Pipefitters were called upon to execute complicated assignments.

3

The Union refers to tools and equipment recognized in the Pipefitter job description for Pipefitter use and considers that air hoists fall into none of the categories.

4

Certainly an air hoist is not a "portable power tool." The Union also notes that safety Factor 8 of the Rigger job classification provides D 1.2 while Factor 8 in the Pipefitter description is B 0.4, thereby indicating that the parties originally considered complex rigging by Riggers as warranting a higher level.

It is a primary concern of the Union to protect delineated craft functions and this cannot be done if the Company is permitted to assign Class 13 Pipefitters to Class 14 Rigger work.

The Company states that the rigging performed by Pipefitters was a matter of placing pipe onto brackets above the catwalk, and hastens to assert that the 8-inch pipe to be so positioned was already placed on the catwalk before the Riggers left the job site to perform higher priority work at a blast furnace. Riggers' part of the job had been completed--i.e., they had placed the platform in position. At this point air hoists were left in the custody of Pipefitters. These hoists were built to different specifications--one was 18" long with a drum 12" in diameter and another was 30" overall and equipped with a 20" drum. Both are simple to operate, possessing a 90-pound airline, one speed, and a brake. Pipefitters were instructed in operating procedures. Hoists have been used by Pipefitters since 1937, although the Company concedes that these particular grievants may not have used hoists. Also, the work performed was the same as in the past when work has been at various heights on jobs equally "substantial." In fact 12-inch pipe has been raised and positioned at 35-40 foot heights. Assignment of the air hoist work to Pipefitters substantially reduced the manual labor they would otherwise have had to perform. The correctness of Pipefitters operating the air hoists, says the Company, is beyond challenge since such hoists are used by numerous craft and non-craft jobs such as Electricians, Millwrights, and Laborers in the Open Hearth. Furthermore, since all the Riggers did was to raise the pipe to the catwalk, and since the positioning of pipe is most assuredly a Pipefitter duty, no violation of the Basic Agreement or the Job Description and Classification Manual is seen.

With reference to lighting conditions, the Company states that the Pipe Mill Warehouse has no windows. Pipefitters worked above the level of building lights but there were higher temporary lights and a signal system to enable Pipefitters to know precisely what they were doing.

7

The Company introduced its Exhibit D to establish that Pipefitters have performed the job of hoisting pipes before finally positioning it and here notes that Board-established standards require that there be a showing that a craft has exclusively performed certain work, such as hoisting by Riggers.

8

#### FINDINGS

The preponderance of the evidence in this record, including Company Exhibit D as commented on in writing by the Union on June 29 and the Company on July 9, 1965, establishes beyond peradventure of a doubt that Pipefitters have used various pieces of tackle as tools or aids in performing their function of installing pipe. Items 6 through 8, inclusive, of Company Exhibit D, as expanded upon by testimony and letters, indicate that Pipefitters worked on these occasions without the assistance of Riggers and that they did so above ground level, although the Union contends and the Company agrees that the level was considerably less than 60 feet. Other items indicate that Pipefitters and Riggers, using tackle, work together as a team on some occasions and separately on others. Thus, Pipefitters have used the equipment and tools now said to be exclusively within the jurisdiction of the Rigger job, including air hoists. There would seem to be no impropriety in this since an air hoist may well be considered to be a "portable power tool," within the contemplation of the Pipefitter job description. Certainly the hoists are portable since they are frequently moved from job site to job site and they are power tools, the power being air pressure.

9

The "rub" in this case would seem to be that the Pipefitters here grieving never previously personally used air hoists and, secondly, considered instruction, if any,

10

to be inadequate. The first concern, seemingly, carries little weight if the use of tackle, including air hoists, is a Pipefitter duty per past practice and the Pipefitter job description. The latter complaint loses momentum in light of the simplicity of air hoist operation and the fact that Pipefitters mastered such operation to the extent that the job was completed without incident.

Since air hoists have not been restricted to the Rigger craft in the past but have been shared with Pipefitters, this grievance must be denied.

A final note: - there is no inkling in the record that Pipefitters are precluded from operating air hoists to lift and move pipe above a certain established footage level.

AWARD

The grievance is denied.

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