

# C

## **Standing Committee Meeting Minutes**

**June 7, 2017 3:00 to 4:15pm**

Administration Board Room

Present: Dan Wilson, Andrew Generous, Brooke Backlund, Glen Barker, Ben Ruether

Follow up:

### **1. Kiln gas fitting – regulations for certification.**

Unifor – Have we come to a decision on this?

CPP – Pipefitters will do the piping and quick disconnects.

Unifor – Okay. Anything with a union or screw fitting will be left with pipefitters. Are they qualified?

CPP – Some pipefitters have a B ticket, but not all of them. It depends on whether theirs is expired as they get it through their trades schooling. They would need an A ticket to work on larger stuff like the kiln burner.

Unifor – As well as any new installation. Okay.

### **2. Indigenous employment.**

Unifor – We were going to try to meet about this but that didn't happen.

CPP – We responded to you after our last meeting.

Unifor – The policy you gave us doesn't do a lot to encourage people.

CPP – If you have any specific ideas, let us know and we will listen.

Unifor – We should reach out to them, and I am not going to tell you how to do it. The local Friendship Center could be an idea. Schools may have career days. We will think about this more.

CPP – You can email Brooke if you have ideas outside of this meeting.

### **3. Workboot replacement.**

Unifor – The Company says we need lace up workboots unless there is medical information for an employee saying otherwise. We asked if the company will provide lace up rubber boots, and you say you will continue current practice. This means you are saying no, unless they use the personal reimbursement program, correct?

CPP – Yes.

Unifor – You release a policy that lace up boots are mandatory for an employee, and then you supply something that doesn't comply. It is hard for some people to wrap their heads around that.

CPP – The rubber boots we supply aren't used all the time. If an employee does have a job that requires them to be used all the time, they should use the boot reimbursement program.

Unifor – I think some people do use them all the time.

### **4. Steam plant third class ticket progress update.**

Unifor – Is this list still current?

CPP – We will provide you the updates separate from the minutes.

Unifor – Who is telling these employees about their timelines?

CPP – Dan has a six month chat with them as a courtesy. We want them to succeed and ensure they know their requirements.

Unifor – It is not necessary for you to do that, but good that you do. Not notifying the employee about these timelines was a miss when negotiating this language, as it just says in the contract that you need to tell us. It was really good we talked about this at the last meeting because some people had no idea about these timelines.

CPP – They all know the consequences of not getting their tickets. Dan personally explained it to every person when they first got on the program. They may not have known when we notify the Union that they haven't met their timelines, though.

Unifor – They know that they could end up back in the labour pool. We think not having you tell employees about timelines, and only telling us, may be a shortfall.

CPP – We tell you because you will probably want to talk to them as well. You are aware of the consequences of them not meeting this, and should talk to your members.

Unifor – Christian Lebel will talk to them. We think it should come from both you and us, just in case. We wouldn't know about these timelines if you didn't tell us the dates. How do you know what paper they are on?

CPP – They tell Dan, and he makes a note.

Unifor – When they get their third or fourth class ticket, are you aware of it?

CPP – They earn a bump in pay, so they do let us know.

New items:

#### **5. Grievance 17-06 and 17-07 – Dave Logie call in.**

Unifor – We will talk about these grievances together because the main issue is the same. Stein rejected Logie from coming into the mill on two occasions on the same day because Dave said to Stein that he had beer prior. There are stories of situations here where people have consumed alcohol and reported for work. I can't verify them. I've never heard of the Company defining how much consumption would be acceptable or not, or time limits for when you are available for work after drinking. I recognize there is liability with reporting unfit for service. I don't think I ever recall someone being rejected before because they had just had a glass of wine or a bottle of beer. This is new for us and we need to understand it.

CPP – If someone says they have been drinking, they will and have been told they can't report to work. If that isn't the case, we need to know about it. We have a 0 tolerance policy.

Unifor – We need to know time limits. If I go out tonight and drink at a birthday party until 2am, we know by tomorrow morning that it's not all out of my system.

CPP – Impairment depends on a lot of factors. In this situation, Dave said “I’ve had three beers” on the second call. On the first call, he said he had “a beer”. He had been drinking and continued drinking.

Unifor – I think the beers were with lunch. He says that he felt fit for duty. Normally people wouldn’t tell the supervisor they were drinking, they would just report for work, and now we are dealing with this. Dave feels like he is being treated unfairly. We feel your policy is different from current practice.

CPP – Did Dave tell Stein he was not impaired?

Unifor – Not on the first call. The conversation didn’t progress like that. He indicated he was fit to work on the second call, as I understand.

CPP – Any supervisor should tell an employee that has been drinking that they cannot report for work, and if that doesn’t happen the Company needs to know. It’s a 0 tolerance policy and it is not new. Dave did sign off on our substance abuse policy in DATS and I’m sure you did as well.

Unifor – That hasn’t been the practice on the floor. Dave said he had a beer and will finish it and come in. Stein said, “If you’re drinking, I can’t let you”. Dave finishes lunch, and gets a call later, and it has been quite a period of time since his last beer. He is not impaired.

CPP – We cannot judge that. We don’t have to prove impairment.

Unifor – He judges himself as not impaired. He is not hiding anything. Are the supervisors in a position where, as soon as an employee has had a glass of wine, for the rest of the night, they are unavailable? Any alcohol to their lips?

CPP – Yes. You are then unavailable to work.

Unifor – That is very difficult. I think there are general guidelines around impairment and how many drinks it takes. If we are really 0 tolerance, our members need to know that so they can comply. You will have a tough time calling people in as we do respond to calls after consumption. One beer is not much at all.

CPP – If Dave came in and then got hurt, you would argue the other way, and wonder why we let him report to work.

Unifor – You have to trust the judgment of the employee. If you are okay to drive, what is the problem? We all have to be responsible.

CPP – We have our policy here and encourage you to review it.

Unifor – Policy is different from practice. If you're going to hold this strictly, you should really think about that. Tell us if you have any more information on impairment timelines.

## **6. Grievance 17-08 – Dave Spitzer call in list.**

Unifor – This call in came out of the steam plant, and somehow the foreman grabbed an outdated list.

CPP – It wasn't outdated, the number on the list was incorrect.

Unifor – We went through great pains to try to get people on board to respond to calls. Dave was one of those guys that has been very good with responding, and taking all jobs. He is proud that he is willing to come in and do work that is required, and here he was excluded because of a clerical mistake. All he is asking for is makeup time to make him whole. The answer has been no and we are asking for the Company to reconsider.

CPP – The answer is still no. Do you have other examples where people have had make up time given for a scenario like this? The Ralph Nelson consent award says that unless it's a regular shift, we aren't required to make it up. This was a four hour call. We feel that we don't need to make it up. I understand and appreciate that Dave does come all the time. There was no intent to pass him over, and they did call the wrong phone number. I don't want to set a new precedent here to provide make up time against the consent award.

Unifor – Guys don't always pursue missed opportunities because it isn't always an issue. I know there are instances when certain supervisors have offered make up time and I don't know if it's brought to your attention. When it gets to the political arena of this meeting, I agree it is harder for you to show leniency. It is a shame that him and his supervisor could not manage a resolution.

CPP – We must be consistent and fair. We don't want someone to feel we didn't do it for them but do it for someone else. I am asking the question to ensure we are consistent.

Unifor – I can't give you any more information. Situations like this don't come up a lot. You could cover yourself by saying it's on a without prejudice or precedence basis. We understand that award is there and

that it's a technicality. If you could give it to him, though, we would appreciate it.

## **7. Grievance 17-09 – George Klingbell call time.**

Unifor – Is there a dispute over whether Maurry asked George to start his work day before 8am, or not? I understand it was before 8am.

CPP – There was no intention for George to start earlier than 8am. Maurry believed it was 8am. It is hard to argue anything to the minute, whether it is was 8am or 7:59am or 8:01am.

Unifor – The supervisors typically have their meeting at 8am to assign duties. If there was no intent to have him get to work before the meeting, why would you talk to him and send him to work before the morning meeting and the safety talk?

CPP – If we need to get going, why would you hold him back? Maurry thought, "It's 8am, I'll get him started."

Unifor – George says it was about four minutes to 8am. If the supervisor comes to me before our 8am meeting, it is because he needs it right away. I would put in call time for that. If it was two minutes to 8am, why couldn't you wait until the meeting?

CPP – If I had something I needed done at five minutes to 8am, I would wait until 8am to tell the guy. That is what Maurry says he did. Does that morning meeting always start at 8am sharp?

Unifor – Maurry says he has a schedule where he walks down to the meeting. His meeting could start few minutes after.

CPP – That is our point.

Unifor – George says Maurry asked him four minutes to 8am and the collective agreement is clear that your day starts at 8am. All we are asking for is two hours call time and 15 minutes of pay, or whatever the minimum amount is in the payroll system. George was really upset about this. The lesson is that George should have said, "You are asking me to work before 8am, are you paying call time?" As well, Maurry could have said, "Don't start your day earlier". I think there is enough information here that Maurry asked George before 8am, as Maurry told us that could have been the case. It's unfortunate they couldn't talk it through. Please pay George his time and let's get this behind us so the guys can heal their relationship and work together again.

## **8. Grievance 17-10 – Brady Daniels unjust discipline.**

Unifor – Brady tells me that he was asked to cover an overtime shift, and he responded, “I will see”. He never came to work. The Company took his response as a commitment to work and he never got back to you when you were counting on him.

CPP – We understand things a little differently. It was Garrick Powell who called Brady. Brady said he had something going on and would like to come in, but isn't sure if he could for sure. He told Garrick to go down the call list. Garrick did and no one could make it. He called Brady back and Brady said he would come in. Garrick said that if he can't come in for some reason, call himself or Jarod (who was on that night). There was no phone call from Brady. Garrick was absolutely positive that Brady was to come to work after their conversation. He didn't come in. They talked about it on their next shift, and Brady told Garrick at first that he thought he would call *if* he could make it in. Garrick said no, he said to call in if Brady couldn't make it in. Brady comes back later and says he remembers now that he actually did phone in. We checked and there was a call from his phone at 8:47pm the day of that overtime shift. He didn't leave a message because he said the phone just clicked and he didn't make another attempt. It was only a two second long call. It was also well after his shift was supposed to have started. Garrick was very clear in recalling the conversation that Brady needs to phone in if he can't make it for the shift, and then we never heard from him.

Unifor – Was that the shift supervisor's phone? Sometimes that phone doesn't work.

CPP – Yes, but regardless you still need to continue to try. Brady denied even phoning at first.

Unifor – We will move this on to the next step. We need to talk to Brady more.

## **9. Grievance 17-11 – Doug Carey unjust discipline.**

Unifor – We haven't given you the grievance for this yet. Do you want it now?

CPP – We did not do first step yet. You can give it to Jarod.

Unifor – This is his first offense and I don't think it is clear to the members why this was such a serious incident. This isn't to say that it is not worthy of discipline, but a three day suspension is a lot.

CPP – We believe this is very serious.

#### **10. Summer student termination dates.**

Unifor – As per the collective agreement, we want to make sure that all of the students have predetermined dates which are respected.

CPP – Their termination date is August 25<sup>th</sup>.

Unifor – For all of them?

CPP – Yes.

#### **11. Updated camera list.**

Unifor – Where is the recorded data stored for the process and security monitors?

CPP – Why would you like to know?

Unifor – Some arbitrations have made it clear that how that data is stored and how we ensure confidentiality is important. I think the Union and the members have to right to know that it is being respected. We also want to know who has access to this information. We feel that is within the rights of the employees on site.

CPP – Some staff have access to the monitors when it is applicable for their roles.

Unifor – We need to know more. Arbitrations say that access to this data needs to be guarded carefully, and someone shouldn't be able to call it up at any time.

CPP – We keep it secure. We don't let everyone have access to it. I'm not sure what you are asking for.

Unifor – How is the information restricted? It is logged?

CPP – Not all staff have access to the system. The software may log access. It is password protected.

Unifor – Is there audio?

CPP – There is no audio feed.

Unifor – We need a list of what staff have access.

CPP – We don't think we need to provide that.

Unifor - It has to be reasonable, who has access.

CPP – Would you be satisfied if we said we confirmed and we are confident that the people who have it need it for their position?

Unifor – We would want to know specifics. We are concerned about names and positions of those people.

CPP – We aren't prepared to share names and positions of people who have access to the cameras.

Unifor – That is what we want and we think the request is reasonable.

**12. Carry over hours.**

CPP – We have granted carry over requests for Chris Fenton, Jami Dillabough Cruz, and Rick Mallett. These carry over hours should be taken before any new hours and expire six months after their return to work.

Signature on File

---

Ben Ruether  
Union Representative

Signature on File

---

Brooke Backlund  
Company Representative