



Standing Committee Meeting Minutes

June 24 2010 2:45 to 4:15pm Administration Board Room

Present:

D McRae, T Christy, J Bourguignon, D Needham, C Esplen

D Carey, D Nelson, D Laird, B Ruether, G Barker, R Meisner

1. Students in LOP Grievance

Union: The union stated that students should not be on shift or be paid a higher rate than full time employees at any time. Steve Bird arranged for the students to move on to shift to save money. The Company must respect seniority and move these full time employees on shift first. The union asks that the full time employees be paid the difference as if they had gone on shift.

Company: Two of the students went on shift as they were trained for shift work for the past 2 years. The new summer students assigned to the chip screen area were new and need the full time employees to train them on this work. This was the safe and prudent option.

2. Harassment Grievance

Union: The Company and Union have had several meetings on this issue. The union feels that this was a definite case of employee harassment. The union stated:

- a. The local will be adhering to the 30 day time lines and if one of the step meetings does not take place in a timely manner the grievance will move automatically to the next step.
- b. That should this grievance go through all 4 steps we will proceed with a section 104 of the Labour Code (expedited arbitration)
- c. The union will continue to observe and record any incidents until this grievance is settled.

The Supervisor has harassed employees in the past. There seems to be a double standard (between staff and hourly) in the mill.

Company: The Company does not believe this grievance is a case of harassment. There is no provision under our agreement to go to expedited arbitration unless there is a termination.

3. Steam Plant Entry Policy

Union: The Company is in violation of the agreement as it is trying to accomplish something through arbitration it could not do in negotiations. The Company issued a plan and the union has made a response to that plan with reasonable suggestions. The Company has not trained up two employees to their full potential that are in the line right now.

Company: There are currently 16 3rd class tickets in the department. The Company has informed the union that there are 16 required in the plan. We were not totally successful with the permits issued and need to protect the integrity of the LOP. The unions suggestions were not going to achieve the LOP integrity. The employees have been given training and have for one reason or the other not completed this work in a timely manner.

4. Code of Ethics Grievance Hog Moving

Union: The Company should be paying the COE in this case as the contractor was just moving hog.

Company: The Company did not pay COE as this is not maintenance or repair work of a nature we normally perform. The contractor also used a belly dump truck and we do not have such equipment.

5. Code of Ethics Grievance Mobile Hearing Contractor

Union: The union requested that the Company pay COE for this contractor. He is doing work that our employees normally perform.

Company: This contractor was on site to do hearing testing for the construction union not Cariboo. This is not maintenance and repair work and no COE is payable as we do not arrange or pay for these hearing tests.

6. Code of Ethics Grievance Steam Boilers

Union: The union requested that the Company pay COE for this contractor as this is CPP work. The steam plant provides hot water all the time.

Company: This again is not maintenance and repair work of a nature performed at Cariboo.

7. Code of Ethics Grievance Babcon

Union: The union requested that the Company pay COE for this contractor as this is CPP work. CPP personnel have removed these manholes several times over the years. There was a decision several years ago regarding electrical work at the Barkerville landfill that clarified this issue.

Company: The payment of COE is dependent on the language in COE and that is the contractor must be coming on site. The manholes that were opened were not on our site. No COE is payable. We will research the Barkerville issue.

8. Spark and Tank Watch Power Boiler April 16 2010

Union: The Company contracted this work without notification to the union. The notice stated that this was discussed with a contracting member. An e mail of a discussion is not acceptable. There needs to be some discussion on how to provide this manning to reduce contracting. There should be a discussion on call in of trades outside of their designation.

Company: This was an emergency and the mill forces could not provide manning so the contractor used there own spark and tank watch. The Company is willing to discuss this issue outside of standing committee to see if something can be done for flex call ins (maintenance).

9. Pre Booking of Arbitrators

Union: The union suggests that if we pre book arbitrators it would expedite the timing for arbitrations. This is done with other employers and unions.

Company: The Company is not interested in pre booking of arbitrators.

10. Shutdown Parking Permits

Union: The union had employees question why the employees name were on the shutdown parking permit. There is a personal security concern.

Company: Will put the names on the back.

Ben Ruether
Union Representative

Jason Bourguignon
Company Representative