

Standing Committee Meeting #451
Administration Board Room
June 16, 2011

Present: D McRae, J Bourguignon, D Needham, C Esplen, D Carey, J Grant,
D Laird, B Ruether

1. Steam Plant Accommodations

Union: The union stated they would like a committee of 3 from the union to discuss the applications for accommodation from this department. The committee would work with the Company members with each individual application.

Company: The Company thought this should be fairly straight forward. Each employee would need to supply the committee with the specific restrictions that are medically documented. The Company would decide with the union on whether an accommodation is possible or warranted.

2. Grievance 11-13 T Lynes

Union: The union is concerned that this employee had been denied a job posting. The employee did enter this department in the past but left prior to the completion of the 30 day period. Two years is not an unreasonable amount of time to re-evaluation one's career. The Company has allowed this practice in the past.

Company: The Company stated that the employee left the department in the past voluntarily and he stated that this was not where he wanted to work. He stated he did not want to get a 3rd class ticket and was adamant that this was not the department for him. The Company is not granting the employee another chance to try this out. This is not efficient in running the mill.

3. Grievance 11-14 R Meisner

Union: Reg was assigned to the afternoon shift during the most recent shutdown as a painters helper in violation of the flex letter. Reg could have been used in his core trade to inspect scaffolds etc. There were issues with the scaffolds during the shut that could have been avoided.

Company: Reg was assigned to nightshift as a tradesman and was paid as such through the shut. He was given the same assignment in the 2010 shutdown. There is no violation of the flex letter or contracting in this situation. It was determined that it would not be practical to have a CPP

employee inspecting over 300 scaffolds that two contracting firms built.

4. Grievance 11-16 S Aaslie

Union: The union stated that the employee was not given the chance to carryover his deferred statutory holiday time. This should be done retroactively. The Union believes Item 53 (Local Agreements) speaks to this situation.

Company: The Union is asking the Company to carryover deferred statutory holiday time. The article on deferred time does not allow this carryover.

5. Grievance 11-17 J Grant

Union: The Company scheduled an overtime job for a Saturday and did not follow the overtime equalization procedure. A millwright and a painter were scheduled for the changing out of 2 aerators. The 2nd millwright for this work should have come from the OT list and not the area trades.

The union is asking the Company for make up time and to stop using this method of scheduling overtime.

Company: The supervisor followed what he thought was the procedure in this case. This work has been done by other than two millwrights in the past. The Company will review this matter with the department.

6. Equalization of overtime and Flexibility

Union: The Company is not being consistent in all areas on how this work is assigned on a daily basis. There is no need to try and baffle anyone. What list is used once you run out of the core trades?

Company: The goal is to be consistent across the board and more discussion is required.

Signatures on file

Ben Ruether
Union Representative

Signatures on file

Jason Bourguignon
Company Representative