



## CANADIAN UNION OF PUBLIC EMPLOYEES

Local 2011

District of Saanich

#104 – 3301 Douglas Street, Victoria, BC, V8Z 3L2

Tel: 250-727-2215 Fax: 250-727-2216

---

August 15, 2022

Dear CUPE 2011 Members;

On November 5, 2021, before bargaining began, the employer notified your union that, at the completion of negotiations of the new Collective Agreement, they would begin scheduling the following departments on a “continuous basis”.

- Community Services Division
- Water Division
- Sewer Division
- Parks Division
- Information Technology Division
- Traffic and Road Network Division
- Legislative Services Division
- Facilities Division
- Parking Enforcement

On the last day of bargaining, after the union was again clear that we could not agree to this proposed change, the employer deleted all other improvements, and came back with essentially a rollover contract. We have one avenue to improve the language in our Collective Agreement - Collective Bargaining. We need your support to show the Employer that they need to consider the many unaddressed issues that were ignored in their roll over proposal on August 4, 2022.

The union was made aware of an email sent on behalf of Brent Reems by the Acting CAO, Suzanne Samborski. The timing and content of the email is not unexpected. This employer is trying to control the narrative, to sway voter turnout or results. The email asserts the employer’s perspective on how bargaining has progressed thus far. The union’s response to the employer’s claims is in green below.

### **The email claims that the employer offered:**

#### **1) increases to the percentage ‘in lieu’ for casual status employees**

The union proposed language that would raise the in-lieu percentage from 13% to 18% (later we lowered to 17%) to accurately reflect the amount the employer saves by not using permanent staff. Here is the breakdown of why 18% is an appropriate amount.

- Vacation = 6%
- Stat days = 5.16%
- Benefit plans = 4+%

- Sick days = 2.8% (the diff between the newly legislated 5 days and the CA language that affords a permanent employee 12 days in their first year)

The employer briefly counter-proposed to increase this benefit to an arbitrary 14%

**The employer removed this proposal from their roll-over package on Aug 4.**

- 2) **improvements to extended health benefits, including increasing the maximum payment toward the purchase of eyeglasses, hearing aides, paramedical services, and eliminating the six-month waiting period for benefits for new employee;**

Benefit amounts for chiropractors, physiotherapy, eyeglasses, etc, have not been increased in several years and have fallen behind significantly. The employer briefly proposed increases to the benefit package, however, the increases came with concessions such as a lifetime limit on prescription medication.

**The employer removed this proposal from their roll-over package on Aug 4.**

- 3) **improvements to dental benefits by way of increasing the maximum payment toward bridges and orthodontics;**

Once again, the union recognizes that the language has not been improved in several years and has fallen behind. The employer did counter-propose an “increase” for bridges (from 50% to 55%) as well as a reasonable increase to orthodontics.

**The employer removed this proposal from their roll-over package on Aug 4.**

- 4) **increased lifetime maximums for life insurance;**

This is not a significant issue for the bargaining committee and costs to the employer are negligible.

**The employer removed this proposal from their roll-over package on Aug 4.**

- 5) **increases in premium pay, tool allowances, first aid allowances and boot allowances;**

Some of these premium amounts have not been increased in decades. The employer’s proposed amounts were not in line with what the union is seeking, and in some cases, were less than the amounts provided today.

**The employer removed this proposal from their roll-over package on Aug 4.**

**6) expanding the hours of inside staff from 8:30 a.m. to 4:30 p.m. Monday to Friday to 7:30 a.m. to 5 p.m. Monday to Friday while having employees continue to work a seven-hour day within those hours. This is to help employees meet their family obligations without going through the variation in work time administrative process;**

The union was willing to agree to a reasonable expansion to the hours of work for inside workers. The hours outlined above, by the employer, were actually the **union's** proposed attempt to negotiate with the employer while ensuring employees are not scheduled 24/7.

Don't be fooled! The employer is not looking to help employees meet family obligations, and has not proposed any language that allows employees to have control of their schedule. The letter of "estoppel notice" provided to the union by this employer is attached as proof of their intention.

The current process for an employee requesting a variation of working times, is laid out in Article 16:03. The Union, in recent history, has NEVER opposed a request from any employee or the employer.

**The employer removed this proposal from their roll-over package on Aug 4.**

**7) expanding the hours of outside staff from 8 a.m. to 4:30 p.m. Monday to Friday to 7 a.m. to 5 p.m. Monday to Friday while having employees continue to work an eight-hour day to help employees meet their family obligations and to support earlier start times during the summer without going through the variation in work time administrative process;**

The union was willing to agree to a reasonable expansion to the hours of work for outside workers. The hours outlined above, by the employer, were actually the **union's** proposed attempt to negotiate with the employer while ensuring employees are not scheduled 24/7.

Don't be fooled! The employer is not looking to help employees meet family obligations, and has not proposed any language that allows employees to have control of their schedule. The letter of "estoppel notice" provided to the union by this employer is attached as proof of their intention.

The current process for an employee requesting a variation of working times, is laid out in Article 16:03. The Union, in recent history, has NEVER opposed a request from any employee or the employer.

**The employer removed this proposal from their roll-over package on Aug 4.**

**8) a three-year agreement with wage increases in line with other public sector employers.**

There have been few, if any, comparable public sector unions that have settled recently. The district tabled 3% for 3 years. The union sought a raise of \$1 plus 2.5% for each year. This roll-over proposal from the employer removed all of the union's important concerns that were tabled over the past nine months.

The union maintains that the employer has not come to the table to negotiate. We have removed language, softened our stance where we could, and yet the employer has proposed a roll-over of our Collective Agreement.

**Your Bargaining Committee is unanimously calling on all members to vote YES to the strike vote scheduled tomorrow.**

We have attached the following documents for your review:

1. Employer's November 5, 2021 – Notice of Estoppel
2. Employer's August 4, 2022 – Roll Over Proposal

In solidarity,

**CUPE 2011 Bargaining Committee**

Ryan Graham, CUPE 2011 President

Deborah Clarke, Recreation Division Representative

John Garnett, Public Works

Dale Smith, Municipal Hall Representative

Reuben Hubbard, Public Works

Sean Walmsley, Recreation