



Standing Committee Meeting Minutes

October 13, 2015 3:00 to 3:45pm Administration Board Room

Present: Ben Ruether, Glen Barker, Cameron Leeson, Doug Carey, Dan Wilson, Andrew Generous, Brooke Backlund

Follow up:

1. Car wash compensation.

Unifor – We want to follow up on this.

CPP – We have reviewed the collective agreement and feel we are meeting our obligation of maintaining the car wash facilities. The car wash broke down and we made efforts to fix it. When it went down again we realized it needed more extensive work and we fixed that. Our intention all along was to have it working again as soon as possible.

Unifor – How long was it out of service?

CPP – We aren't sure off-hand. We had to dig it up and find where it was leaking. We ended up having to replace the whole line.

Unifor – That might be accurate. There was two months in the spring with intermittent service and problems with controls. The valve in there wasn't working properly, and we think it was probably sized wrong. When you look at the whole summer, our members feel they didn't get what they deserved. That's what we are asking for, more of a commitment to get it up to a better standard for next year. The valve itself still hasn't been corrected. Ben corrected it as best as he could, and told Shayne we need a valve which has been sized properly. We don't want to see another year of this kind of service. The other thing is the sensing device is problematic at best. The problem is that it's not mounted well and is very sensitive. The company needs to do something to get better service.

CPP – Andrew will talk to Shayne and see where he's at with that valve.

2. Hole in lime silo.

Unifor – Dan was going to look into this. There was a temporary repair made which didn't last. That is not how we thought things should be handled.

CPP – The repair wasn't temporary, it was a real repair. The leak was discovered as a truck was finishing unloading. The supervisor called in a pipefitter and made the repair before the next truck had started to unload.

Unifor – I was told there was a duct tape repair that didn't last very long. The point is that we hope those incidents are taken very seriously because they can damage property.

3. Light duty program.

Unifor – We want to talk about commitment to this program. We had an understanding with H.R. that if the employee and supervisor can work through it, no one else gets involved. When H.R. gets involved, the union wants to be involved to the same extent to make sure things stay fair.

CPP – We feel we are meeting our obligation in the collective agreement. Our intention has been to involve and communicate with union representation. We feel this process is working well and we value the input we have been getting from the union safety representative.

Unifor – Tell me how this works, because maybe I am missing it. Firstly, someone comes back asking for light duty. Next we get a list of their restrictions. We have no involvement in deciding their work. Doesn't the program say we work together? Isn't there mention of a formal meeting, a discussion with a supervisor and employee, and a discussion of tasks? That is where we are stumbling a little. We want to make sure this program stays with what is laid out in the collective agreement.

CPP – The collective agreement says we will notify as soon as possible about employees working on light duty, which we are doing by email.

Unifor – It says the work assignments will be provided, which is what Cameron Leeson is getting. Cameron gets sent the person's restrictions, and some detail on what the person will be doing for work. The most recent cases have had more detail. We have to make sure the field is level, and that is why we ask for involvement. An email isn't a discussion.

CPP – It mentions a light duty meeting, but it doesn't say who is involved at it. It says a union executive member or steward must be contacted if assignments out of the department are considered.

Unifor – In cases outside the department, you move away from the OH&S member and shop steward level because of the politics involved. I guess what we are saying is that this was a joint program intended to provide meaningful work more beneficial than weekly indemnity. We want to live up to this and involve the union.

CPP – We feel we are doing this.

Unifor – We believe you are not. Cameron should be at the table to say, “Hey, what about this, why isn’t it available for this person.” He should be there for the good and the bad, not just when no work is available.

4. Ed Sankey compensation.

Unifor – As a result of the arbitration, his discipline was turned down from eight shifts to four. At standing committee, we said he lost the opportunity for overtime. We ask for him to be made whole.

CPP – The arbitrator has ordered us to repay four days of suspension, and he did not include potentially lost overtime shifts in his decision.

5. Seniority list follow up.

Unifor – To date, the union has not received an updated seniority list. We have gotten a bad one. We’ve been asking for a correct one for quite a while.

CPP – I’ll look into that again. We’ve been working with IT actively to get that fixed.

6. Contracting out.

Unifor – We are working on a settlement together. We will be taking it to the members tonight. Can we leave that to the side?

CPP – Yes.

New items and grievances:

7. Grievance 15-43 - Ski-Hi.

Unifor – 2015-06-0553. This is outside the settlement. Ski-Hi is signing out scaffolds without allowing the bargaining unit an opportunity to do the work. We are asking for make-up time.

CPP – We have this in the list of grievances to be resolved with the settlement.

Unifor – I guess we are looking for both, the \$500 settlement because the notification wasn't given, also the make-up time given to the carpenters who would have done that work. I just want to be clear, the reason it is treated different is because there was no attempt to contact the bargaining unit.

8. Grievances 15-44 and 15-48.

Unifor – 15-44 and 15-48 are in the list to be resolved.

9. 15-46 Wayne Moorhouse unjust discipline.

Unifor – The supervisor asked Wayne to do a job that Wayne felt required his full attention. Wayne said he had no issues with doing the work, instead the issue was with how the supervisor wanted him to do the work. He didn't think it was fair to cater to the radio calls. Wayne was sent home, which is unfortunate because the problem was more a lack of the ability to communicate than wanting to be insubordinate.

CPP – Wayne was given the opportunity to change his mind and he chose not to do so, therefore there was no other option than insubordination. He was refusing to do what he was told to do, which was take the radio while doing the task he was told to do.

10. 15-47 Marty Sportak unjust discipline.

Unifor – This concerns pushing chips over the wall. Dan, you've been looking after this job for a while. You know it's not totally uncommon to push over, and some people do miss it more than others.

CPP – It depends who you ask.

Unifor – I don't know because I don't monitor it. From the meeting notes, I get the idea that Marty wasn't even sure if he did push over the wall. Our position is that it seems a little harsh for him to give him a two day suspension for something that happens out there. Cameras were supposed to get a picture of the pile (for inside the cab of the equipment), but that hasn't been set up yet, and some of the guys are frustrated about that. That is kind of a side issue, but is the company going to follow through with giving that tool?

CPP – Absolutely, that is in progress. We are aware that some guys want the camera, some don't, and then we had to find the right mounting bracket and tablet to do the display.

Unifor – So that is the plan; that is great. Anyways Marty pushes over, and that seems excessive, even considering his record. I don't know what really happened that night.

CPP – It wasn't even a minor push over, it was pretty massive actually. Also he does have a record, as you mentioned.

Unifor – When I read through my notes, it sounded like he didn't know about pushing over. Could Marty see the footage?

CPP – Why did you want to see it?

Unifor – You are saying that it was him, and that is a little different from him seeing it himself. We have to believe you, so we just want to see it.

CPP – Marty canvassed guys to clean it up after him. I can't imagine Marty didn't realize he pushed it over the wall.

Unifor – I'm just going by my notes here. We should still see it. We want to be sure, and this is important when going to other steps. How did they know the chips were his?

CPP – The supervisor drove by and saw the chips going over the wall.

Unifor – I see, that's good- but not good. How does a guy know he pushed over?

CPP – They have a look. They know where they are in terms of the wall. Sometimes they ask for feedback from the other operators. There are many tools they have available.

Unifor – Is there a procedure for when it's foggy, like a guy watching them?

CPP – You have to be cautious. There's a work instruction I believe. Also you can switch piles, to one less steaming. There are definitely ways to manage this.

Unifor – Do they use a spotter sometimes?

CPP – Not usually, but they can. That's been the suggestion to get the utility to keep an eye out for it if you're in a situation like that.

Unifor – What is the downside to chip going over the wall?

CPP – It covers conveyor galley ways and damages the integrity of the building's roof. Then during clean up, damage can occur. Plus it takes up resources to clean it. Minimizing spillage is much better.

Unifor – Can you just show us the footage?

CPP – Would you drop the grievance if we can show he absolutely did it?

Unifor – Maybe, we can only go with what we know. We are listening. We still may make the argument that it's excessive. At the end of the day, with discipline, you want Marty to be smarter and better.

CPP – This was progressive, and he has a number of things leading up to this that are all similar. He is not paying attention and we need him to work safer.

Unifor – If we do have the footage, beyond a doubt, it puts us in a better position to put the message across. We want a little more knowledge on what happened that night.

CPP – We will get back to you on that.

Unifor – Why is that so hard?

CPP – Regardless of the video we would have reached the same conclusion. It wasn't like we needed the video.

Unifor – So the supervisor sees the action happening, does he correct it right away on the spot? Or did he pull up the footage, and then talk to him?

CPP – That supervisor did not discipline him.

Unifor – That makes it harder for us to agree with you.

CPP – Marty's denied the whole thing yet he canvassed co-workers to help him clean it up. Ask him about that.

Unifor – I want to make sure we have as much information as we can arm ourselves with. I only have pieces of the story. That is why we are making this request to see the footage.

CPP – Marty was doing the clean-up, and he asked guys for a hand because it is a mess. Not many people clean it up beforehand, typically they wait until the end of the pile and then get assigned that duty. That tells me Marty knew he did something wrong, and yet he still said to his

supervisor that it wasn't him. The shop steward said that the chips were already there when they came in.

Unifor – Your cameras would show that too, wouldn't they?

CPP – Yes. Therefore the shop steward was giving misinformation as well.

Unifor – I'm just asking for the footage.

CPP – Can you go back to Marty and talk about this, and then come to Dan to talk about it again?

Unifor – Okay.

11. Rescheduling dayworkers from E-F crew and issues with planned time off.

Unifor – Some guys wanted us to approach the company to talk about being mindful of vacation schedules and booked time off when making crew changes. Some members find that disruptive. They try to book far ahead, and maybe they shouldn't, and then they get a crew change which throws a wrench in their plans. This is a request to be aware of that.

CPP – I understand. We look at that, but it doesn't always work out for everybody.

12. Family Responsibility Leave form.

Unifor – We got your email about the new form, and we have some concerns around it. Firstly, if you're looking at the form, the top heading says it's an application. You don't really apply for it because it's your right to take it. We ask that the wording on that be changed to "Family Responsibility Leave Form". The second thing is using the word "request", because you aren't requesting the leave. It should say "within your household whom the leave is for", so the word request is removed. After that section, you have the bullets listing qualifying people. Under the legislation, a child under 19 is broken apart from the others because it allows the employee to take leave for educational purposes. Therefore that should be a line all by itself. You should have child listed twice, one for educational purposes, and one with no age restriction for it. This is misleading to the people using the guide.

CPP – I appreciate your feedback on that.

Signature on File

Ben Ruether
Union Representative

Signature on File

Brooke Backlund
Company Representative