PLAINTIFF'S EXHIBIT
MON-3095

MONSANTO COMPANY

PLANT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE AND PLANT UNION COMMITTEE

Texas City, Texas
September 19, 1968

The Plant Management Committee and Plant Union Committee held its regular meeting on September 19, 1968. The meeting was called to order by E. H. Jones. Present were:

UNION COMMITTEE	MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE
W. M. Recknor, Chairman	E. H. Jones, Chairman
D. E. Bozeman	E. R. Albritton
G. H. Bryan, Jr.	E. N. Brasfield
J. C. Goodson	R. E. Daly
Y. M. Goodwin	W. C. Fuller
R. F. Hawkins	J. J. Hickey
D. L. Knape	Gerald Osterman
D. L. Long	N. J. Ruiz
W. B. Mitchell	G. T. Ryan
W. R. Pickett	Leonard Schwab
S. T. Tatum	N. F. Wood

Absent from the Union Committee were: Carl Beard, Tom Choate, H. D. Utley, and Mitchell Williams.

Guests were: S. E. Hebert, Byron Johnson, Rex McDonnell, Jr., Don Rogers, C. H. Smith, Alden Wilson, and W. J. Waits.

OLD MINUTES

SHIFT ASSIGNMENTS

UNION said they were in disagreement with the Company's statement on page 4 of the July 18, 1968, minutes regarding uneven staffing during recent shutdown.

OLD BUSINESS

CBY 3104019

STAFFING

UNION asked if the Company had any further information on staffing in the pilot plant.

W. M. R.

COMPANY said the pilot plant workload has subsided somewhat, and this plus the end of the peak vacation period should permit a reasonable control of the operator overtime load.

X-RAYS

UNION asked if the Company had checked out the procedure used by an employee to obtain an X-ray during his physical.

COMPANY said they were in the process of formulating a new procedure and hoped to have the procedure ready by the next meeting.

NEW BUSINESS

GRIEVANCE #68-6-19 - OVERTIME - WAITS - DEPT. 41

COMPANY read grievance as follows:

Statement of Grievance

"The Company disregard of the personal rights to establish their overtime procedure on unit basis where it does not cost the Company money, the overtime is covered and has the approval of the men."

Remedy Requested

Abide by minutes of this meeting of August 16, 1962, and allow department 41 to change the overtime agreement.

UNION said the employees in the department had voted and a majority are in favor of equalizing the overtime worked by the operators and chief operators. This could be accomplished by keeping a single overtime list for both groups with no additional cost to the Company, and yet supervision has refused to institute this change to the existing overtime procedure. Further stated their primary concern was the future overtime distribution and not what the present figures were.

COMPANY said although there has been some dissatisfaction in the operator group as a result of overtime distribution, the proposed change

W.M.R.

CBY 3104020

to the procedure would cause the chief operators to become dissatisfied. Further pointed out that the overtime spread had dropped from approximately 13 hours per month to some 5.7 hours per month since June, 1968, and it is the Company's opinion that with the return of a chief, who had been on long-term illness, this figure should become smaller. An answer to this grievance will be given to the Union.

GRIEVANCE #68-8-25 - OVERTIME - PRAESEL - DEPT. 41

COMPANY read grievance as follows:

Statement of Grievance

"Shift supervisor, Tom Kennedy, sent me home on the 11:30 to 7:30 shift July 28th and upgraded an operator to chief when there was no extra man on shift."

Remedy Requested

Pay for time lost on overtime.

UNION said this employee brought to the attention of his supervisor the fact that he should have been held over to work due to the fact that a chief operator vacancy existed. The supervisor elected to send the chief home and follow the erroneous schedule calling for an operator to be held over. For these reasons the grievant should be paid for the time he was deprived of working.

COMPANY said they were in agreement that a mistake had been made when the initial schedule was made out, and this was compounded by the fact that another employee was late reporting on the shift in question. This occurrence may have been precluded had it been brought to the attention of supervision earlier. The schedule had been posted since Friday afternoon and the original mistake involved overtime coverage on the graveyard shift Sunday night. The supervisor involved has been instructed how to handle this situation should it occur in the future. An answer to this grievance will be given to the Union.

CBY 3104021

GRIEVANCE #68-7-21 - SHIFT CHANGE - McGEHEE - MONOMERS LAB

COMPANY read grievance as follows:

W.M.R.

Statement of Grievance

"Company failed to notify me of shift change with proper notice."

Remedy Requested

Time and one-half rate apply to first eight (8) hours worked under new schedule.

UNION stated they did not feel it was proper for the Company to give a shift change notice to anyone other than the employee involved. In this case an employee is being deprived of premium pay because of poor planning on the part of the Company.

COMPANY said it is their policy that Article 3, Section 1, paragraph (d) is complied with, if a responsible member of the employee's household is notified of the shift change one week in advance of when it is to take place. In this case the grievant's wife took the message, and said she would relay it. An answer to this grievance will be given the Union.

GRIEVANCE #68-7-22 - SHIFT ASSIGNMENT - RAWLS - DEPT. 17-18-24

COMPANY read grievance as follows:

Statement of Grievance

"Straight day job 18C. In the past the straight day man had been picked with the most seniority, who has not had the job before. I feel supervision had discriminated against past practice rule."

Remedy Requested

(None requested.)

UNION said it was their understanding that over the years the straight day job in this department had been rotated to the senior man interested in the job, who had not had it in the longest time. In this case a man was selected who had it before, and no explanation was given those not selected. They said they realized that this is not a formal procedure, but since it had been followed for a number of years, supervision should at least inform their people why they were bypassed.

CBY 3104022

COMPANY said the procedure for selection of a straight day operator varied throughout the plant and no formal procedure had been established in the unit in question. When the senior man interested has been selected it is because he is best qualified, and in the case of the employee selected this time he had held the straight day job once in the past for only a short time but was unable to complete his year due to illness. If the grievant wishes further explanation he should arrange to see his supervisor. An answer to this grievance will be given the Union.

GRIEVANCE #68-8-24 - LEADMEN - CHOATE - PIPEFITTER

COMPANY read grievance as follows:

Statement of Grievance

"I was notified at 0930, first of August by Mr. Hickey I would be reclassified to journeyman on the 19th of August, 1968, if I was still the pipefitter steward. This would be a 22¢ an hour decrease in pay."

Remedy Requested

According to Article 12, the Union may designate a shop steward. I was designated by the Union. I wish to remain steward without loss of pay and without further harrassment.

UNION said they felt it was their right to select whomever they wished to represent them as steward and those selected should suffer no penalty as a result of this. To their knowledge there has been chief operators and leadmen on the credit committee, the fire department and other extracurricular functions in the past, and they saw no reasons why a steward should be treated any differently. In fact, they said they knew of chiefs and leadmen who had been stewards in the past. The Company's action was a direct violation of Article 12 of the contract.

COMPANY said they felt that being the steward of a major craft was a very time-consuming duty, and would definitely interfere with the duties of a leadman. They recognized the Union's right to select their representatives and had every intention of recognizing the grievant as the steward for the pipefitters. At the same time it is the Company who appoints the leadman and his duties and responsibilities as a leadman are such as to preclude

CBY 3104023

his serving concurrently as a leadman and the craft steward. They further stated that to their knowledge no leadman had served as a steward with the exception of a few cases where there was some delay in electing a replacement. As for chief operators acting as stewards, this is no problem, because a chief is only responsible for one area as a steward. An answer to this grievance will be given the Union.

GRIEVANCE #68-8-26 - JURISDICTION - UTLEY - INSULATORS

UNION requested this grievance be postponed until next meeting.

COMPANY agreed.

STAFFING

UNION said there were still instances of truck drivers being used on overtime without helpers, and often a helper is needed.

COMPANY restated their position that helpers would be scheduled for overtime on an as-needed basis.

VENDING MACHINES

UNION said coke machines throughout the plant were being left empty quite often.

COMPANY said they would check this out. Also stated employees should call office services, extension 2201, when a machine is empty or out of order.

CAFETERIA

UNION said salaried employees beginning to cause congestion in the line at Noon.

COMPANY said they would check this out.

gb
10-7-68

CBY 3104024

LAM023717

MAP 03986