

Standing Committee
April 16, 2008

USC: Larry Reandau, Vince Leonard, Mike Bouse, George Brajcich, Ken Enneberg, Paul Burgher

MSC: Fred Ceruti, Ross Procter, Ian Dieter, Chad Davis, Frank Walsh

JSC: Both

Grievances:

08-01, 08-08, 08-10, 08-15, 08-22, 08-23, 08-24, 08-25, 08-26, 08-27, 08-28, 08-33 - 08-40, 08-41, 08-42, 08-43, 08-44, 08-45 - 08-48

Other Items:

April 1 \$.05 pay adjustment

Probation Extension

Safety:

USC: Vince Leonard met with James Jordan to discuss the trip to Toledo plant and the role of SAC Committee. We would like to have the SAC Committee helping guide the direction safety goes in the mill and how to get people more involved in safety. SAC will be asking for Brent Thorud to take 3 months on special assignment for the incident investigations and Focus Program. We also discussed the new safety sign that will be operated from computer.

MSC: We appreciate the participation and felt that the trip to Toledo was very helpful. We think **Safety** would be a good topic to cover every meeting as a way to start the meeting.

JSC Minutes:

USC: Where are we at with getting Standing Committee minutes posted on the intranet?

MSC: They have been sent to IT to have it posted.

USC: When we sign off jointly on the minutes, can we also have a printed copy of the minutes for the union hall, and for members of the Standing Committee to have copies made. We are concerned that people reading the minutes, will expect the minutes from the prior meeting, signed and posted by the next meeting.

MSC: We will make sure to get a copy to you as soon as we have a signed copy. We will also make sure you have signed copies from prior months. It will take more time posting them on the web than it did in the past due to the new processes in place.

USC: We would like to make sure that the April 2nd meeting is noted that it was the March 2008 Standing Committee meeting, even though the meeting took place **in April**.

MSC: We will be able to do this. We are also concerned about the meeting minutes being distributed mill wide, most people know who the minutes are discussing. Maybe instead of posting it, we could just distribute to the union hall.

USC: We have discussed this in the past. We think it will help all for researching issues to have them posted.

Standing Committee
April 16, 2008

USC: We also wanted to notify you that we will be breaking for lunch as we did not get approval to help share the costs of the lunches for these meetings. We will be breaking from 11:30 to 12:30 to have lunch.

Grievances:

08-01 & 08-22 - Incorrect Call-In

MSC: The Company views these grievances as one and the same as both stem from a past agreement with the Converting Shop Stewards. This practice has been in place for approximately 10 years and was done with the consent of the Converting Shop Stewards. Since the onset of these grievances, we have stopped scheduling crew shortages this way. We ask that since we have corrected the issue that grievances 08-01 and 08-22 be resolved with no penalty to the Company.

USC: Last meeting we discussed that shop stewards do not set policy. In our records there was no mention of spreading the overtime. Once we became aware of it, we have to go back to department guidelines and the contract guidelines.

MSC: Because we have been doing this in the past, those people have been getting more days off that they would have. As soon as we heard about the grievance we stopped the practice.

USC: Whenever there were errors in the schedule in the past, it would be corrected without a grievance. The union will recognize the past practice of scheduling in converting, and that this will be corrected. We withdraw both grievances.

MSC: To insure that employees get consecutive days off in the event of a crew shortage, would the Union like us to revert back to the past agreement with Converting Shop Stewards?

USC: No, we ask that they follow Department Scheduling guidelines which allows the employee to decide to give away the overtime and takes the pressure off of Kay.

MSC: As this has been in place for ten years, can we go back and discuss with shop stewards, and then bring that information back to next meeting?

USC: If that committee thinks that this is appropriate for the area and **it brings it back to the JSC for approval**, then department policy could be changed.

08-08 – Contracting Out

MSC: This door was installed as part of the occupancy permit which was required by the county. This was part of the project and was overlooked while the project work was being done. Once they realized that it hadn't been done, they used the contractors working on #14 to get the door installed.

USC: The location does not sound appropriate for the county to require it. If it had been on the south wall, that would make sense. Can we have a copy of the requirement of occupancy permit?

Standing Committee
April 16, 2008

MSC: We will have Scott Beckstrom provide a copy of that. We feel that we have done a good job of notifications for contract work.

USC: This work was not part of the review.

MSC: Scott says that this was provided.

USC: During lunch break perhaps we could get a copy of that and be able to resolve this grievance.

08-10 – Lead Additives Job

USC: The employee has been out sick and we haven't had a chance to discuss this with him.

MSC: This is a Monday through Friday day job with 40 hours of work. We also understand the employee's situation, but if there is a solution that might work we would be happy to look at it.

USC: The nature of the complaint is that his job has been re-designed to something that he wasn't doing before. We don't disagree that the job needs to be done 5 days a week but to change the job to that extent, it has to be renegotiated.

MSC: Talk to the employee. If you have a proposal we can take a look at it.

USC: Is this work that has to be done during days? Would the four on four off schedule work?

MSC: Someone has to do this work and there is only 40 hours of work there. They want coverage when other people are there. The four day break in the four on four off schedule would be too long to be off. If we did a job analysis on the job it would most likely lower his rate.

USC: It probably would. It would become a utility type position.

MSC: We have the right to change it contractually. We would be happy to look at a proposal that the Union and the employee come up with.

USC: We will talk with the employee. We originally asked that he be wage rate retained, go back to 12 hour shifts with bump rights.

MSC: Someone will need to do the work.

USC: Hold timely until we have a chance to talk with the employee.

08-22 – Incorrect Call-in

JSC: Hold timely and it will go to SAC.

08-28 - FMLA

Standing Committee

April 16, 2008

USC: The answer that Kim gave us was that based on the research, he only had a couple hours of credit, and he only had a few hours of time, and that she met with him to discuss this. Based on this information, we accept that this issue has been resolved.

08-24 – Changing Starting Time

MSC: Hold timely until we can find out more information. If we find out something prior to the next meeting, we will share with you.

USC: We do not understand the long delay. Can this be checked into at lunch break?

MSC: We will check into it.

08-41 - Disqualified

MSC: This was discussed this with the Shop Steward and discussed with the supervisor. We asked that this be discussed as a group to move the grievance back to first step.

USC: There is a review process in place. We would like to see how that process took place.

MSC: The supervisor told him in a meeting that he was disqualified. We can go back and meet with the shop steward, the employee and the supervisor to confirm that these meetings took place.

USC: You had several meetings with the employee to give feedback. If you can show documentation that this occurred we will drop this grievance.

JSC: Hold timely until documentation can be provided.

08-42 – Contracting Out

USC: A Contractor came in and did work on line #10 and we are requesting a copy of the Purchase Order. This work was contracted out without review.

MSC: We can provide you with a copy of the Purchase Order. We just want to tell you that this individual did not do work but simply gave advice. He talked to an operator who did the work based on the advice given by the contractor.

USC: We need to discuss with the grievant to see if there was anyone else other than the operator doing the work. If we find that there is truth to this we will drop the grievance. If this is not true, we will take this to the next step.

USC: On further investigation Target was there when the contractor was brought over to give advice that changed the scope of work.

MSC: Target was not there. Notification was there for the contractor being present on the mill site.

Standing Committee

April 16, 2008

USC: The scope of work was changed when you brought the contractor over. There should have been some sort of notification for this change. If we are bringing in someone, the Mechanic's Committee should be notified. If he needs to do another job while there, the Mechanic's Committee needs to be notified of this additional job.

MSC: If we bring in a contractor to do operations work, not maintenance work, do we still need to notify? Even if no workers are being displaced? We bring in vendors to work with operations workers to train them all the time.

USC: There are no provisions for operations work in the contract. Section one of the contract states that Labor in the mill belongs to Local 1097. The notification still needs to be done. No matter what this vendor comes in to do, this section applies to it because they are an independent contractor.

MSC: Training from outside contractors has to be part of the notification process? The company should be allowed to bring in contractors to do hands on training with our workers. This does not displace 1097 workers, it trains the operations employees and we should not have to notify that they are there.

USC: If the vendor with special skills is in training our workers without displacing a worker you still need to notify us.

MSC: Management disagrees with the Union's position on contractor notification. We would like to work out the procedures about notifying and when it applies.

USC: We agree that this needs to be discussed. We have so much history surrounding the notifications that we need to be able to answer to the union. We need to develop some sort of indicator that would allow the union members know when it changes from operations to maintenance work. We offer Paul Burgher and Ken Enneberg to be part of a special interest group to work this out. Hold Timely until this can be done.

JSC: Hold Timely

08-43 – Contracting Out

USC: The Mechanic's Committee member was told that there was no documentation on the phone system, and that this work was originally done by MIS department. He was led to believe that as this documentation was not here, they would send an instrument technician to work with him, but that a contractor was necessary. Discovered in the course of the job that more work had been done that had not been reviewed. The work that was reviewed was not the work done while the contractor was here.

MSC: What about our answer to the grievance was not acceptable?

USC: That this was proof that the work being done has not gone through the review process. We are requesting copies of any work done on the phone system.

Standing Committee
April 16, 2008

MSC: During the May 30, 2007 meeting we came to a mutual agreement to work through these grievances. We need to find some way of working through these disagreements. Union is not keeping with the spirit of the mutual agreement signed earlier this year regarding contracting out.

USC: Contract reviews need to be done. We understand if it is done one time, but when it is done time and time again then this is a problem. The responsibility is to review the contract work before it happens on the mill site. Ever since the MIS department was disbanded, several groups of people have done that work. Our frustration is that the area manager is not following the process. We are asking for documentation to show that the work has been reviewed or not.

MSC: Hold timely until we can provide that documentation.

08-44 – Bid/Transfer

MSC: We have worked on contacting both these employees and have not been able to get a hold of them to see what they have to say.

USC: The employee was denied this on work performance. If you look at his file, you will see there were no work performance issues.

MSC: What were the qualifications?

USC: He was denied during the interview but was denied because of work performance.

MSC: The Company determined that those two individuals do not meet the qualifications.

USC: During the interview process it resulted in the senior employees being eligible. Then they were notified that they were disqualified due to poor work performance review by supervisors. This was not part of the criteria that was brought to the standing committee.

MSC: How were they notified?

USC: During the process we were told that he disqualified due to poor work performance.

MSC: We spoke with the employee who had the grievance filed on his behalf. Per our discussion with him, he does not care about the matter. Will we hold timely until the supervisor returns, or would you like to drop the grievance?

USC: There is still the issue with the other employee listed on the grievance. He was disqualified because he did not do the canned presentation, but was not notified that he needed to do so.

MSC: Was he disqualified because he didn't do the canned presentation or that they didn't like the presentation that was done. We will hold timely until both parties can do more follow up.

Standing Committee
April 16, 2008

Mediations:

A07-146 – Converting Break Time

MSC: In preparing the settlement offer, we only looked at those employees who worked in converting and had a change in break structure.

USC: You are not recognizing the employees who gave up their breaks to do the work. This impacted all converting employees

MSC: Why would we look at progression ladders that were not affected by this issue?

USC: We are prepared to stick to the agreement we had with the mediator, which included the 380 people who were affected.

MSC: We do not think that all those positions were affected, why would we pay them? We would still be paying 260 employees.

USC: We told you that day to go back to 90 minutes until the break times could be negotiated. This settlement is not negotiating the break times.

MSC: If we came back with the settlement including all converting employees would that meet your needs?

USC: No matter what the settlement is we still need to negotiate the break times. We are willing to negotiate to help meet the business needs of the Company. We agreed to leave it at 60 minutes so we did not have to move it twice.

MSC: So you want to negotiate every area or just converting?

USC: Converting is the only one with those break times. The converting plant since it started always had break times and the same amount of time allotted for breaks.

MSC: We were under the impression that we would stay at 60 minutes and backed out the people we did not think were affected. If all 380 people got paid would the break times being proposed be acceptable?

USC: The idea of putting a monetary value on it was to get it resolved as soon as possible. We took this to mediation which ruled in our favor and agreed that 380 people were involved. We agreed to stay at 60 minutes without penalty until last standing committee meeting until an agreement could be reached. We agreed that we would see the offer on today's meeting.

MSC: This is the first offer. The impression is that if we could work on the money side of the grievance, that the break times would be acceptable.

USC: We have not had the opportunity to discuss this.

Standing Committee

April 16, 2008

MSC: If we can come up with an agreement for the break times and determine a money amount, we would like to do it at the same time.

USC: We are concerned that converting has a lot of soft tissue injuries. The company may want to look at break times to allow body rest time. We are still willing to talk about the amount of time. Regardless of the amounts of money that are out there, we are not prepared to sit here and give you 60 minutes of break time today. We feel that we should be allowed to negotiate this.

MSC: We are not willing to pay the grievance first not knowing what the break times will be.

USC: We agree that we can negotiate this at the same time.

MSC: How do we proceed with this?

USC: The union offered last meeting for the company to go back to 90 minutes and to set up an amount of time for the standing committee to negotiate the break times. We do not want the money part to be a big issue. If we agree to lock the penalties as of this date, and we return to 90 minutes break time, we are willing to negotiate.

MSC: In order to get there, the workers who are doing 60 minutes would go back to 90 minutes and the penalty stops accruing before we can begin to negotiate?

USC: If you remember we are not asking for time off we are asking for floating holiday hours that can be cashed in at any time.

MSC: We would have to look at the 90 minutes and look at the numbers to see if it would work. By having the shorter breaks it allowed some positions to be eliminated from the progression ladder.

USC: If it is not able to be done in ABT you can stay at 60 minutes but continue to accrue penalty.

MSC: You are saying that if we agree to the 60 minutes that the union would not accept the money settlement?

USC: We are willing to negotiate the break time. In this area you are not allowed to eat on the fly. If you include everyone that works in converting, we will take the break time down to 70 minutes.

MSC: We will go back and include all job codes in the settlement offer which is calculated through March 30th. We should be able to put the settlement together by the end of this week.

USC: We will agree to sign it if it is what we agreed to in this meeting.

Standing Committee

April 16, 2008

08-26 – Vacation Sign-ups

MSC: We understand the Union's position that vacations need to be by seniority. Based on this new proposal, everyone is able to utilize their vacations. We also heard the Union's concern that the date of May 23rd was too soon, which we changed to June 20th. Management believes that 5/23 is the last day to sign up for vacations for the rest of the vacation calendar year. We are also not giving up the right to allow area supervisors to grant vacation requests if it does not affect business needs. What we cannot agree on are how many allotments will be allowed to go at any time. In our first vacation leveling proposal, a senior back tender would not have been able to take a week of vacation when a machine tender was on vacation. We changed it to strictly be by seniority.

USC: We have always had the belief that floaters are not affected by vacations. You are coming up with guidelines for each department that you are asking us to agree on. This agreement takes into account times that have historically been taken as floaters, sick leave, etc, reducing the amount of vacations that can be done during peak vacation times and rounding down the number of vacations in a week. You have made all our department vacation scheduling guidelines null and void.

MSC: We took a calculation and applied it mill wide. In the first round we did not take away the allotments.

USC: You rounded down the allotments

MSC: We did round down due to Day at a Time Vacations. We listened to the complaints and have revised the vacation leveling to include those.

USC: We not only had problems with the allotments we did not agree to June 30th date.

MSC: If we move the cut off date to something past June what else do you have issue with?

USC: These are drastic changes being proposed. We would have to look at each allotment department by department.

Other Items

April 1 \$.05 adjustment

USC: The employees on wage-rate retention have not received their \$.05 raise.

MSC: Employees on wage rate retention will be paid the nickel increase.

Probation Extension

MSC: We are asking for an extension for three weeks to try and give an employee who is moving too slow to be able to move to another position.

USC: We agree if we are part of the review process.

Standing Committee
April 16, 2008

Next Standing Committee meeting: May 21, 2008

Larry Resendeau
for the Union

[Signature]
for the Company

05/08/08
Date

05/08/08
Date