UNION MEETING MINUTES, 6/22/2017

1. **Contract Ratification**.  Negotiators for NTEU and CBP have come to tentative agreement on a new term contract.  Per the NTEU National Contract and Bylaws, a ratification meeting must be held in each chapter to vote on accepting or rejecting the new contract.  A modified ballot box, secret ballot type of election will be held on this topic.  A copy of the contract, and a summary, will be sent to each NTEU member who has provided their home e-mail address to NTEU.  Alternatively, the contract can be seen on NTEU.org, if you are a member and have established an account on NTEU.org.  Summaries will also be placed on the union bulletin boards.  Currently, the contract can’t be viewed on CBP computers.

Per NTEU legal counsel, proxies will not be allowed on this vote.  We are already stretching the NTEU National Constitution and Bylaws by allowing a ballot box type of vote be held open for 6 hours.  I understand that disallowing proxies on this particular vote is not what everyone wants, but legal counsel was queried, and they are insistent that proxies can’t be allowed for the contract ratification vote.  The formal legal justification can be viewed upon request.

*The chapter voted NO on the new contract, 32-21. Results of the vote were reported to NTEU National, per the requirements of the NTEU National Constitution and Bylaws.*

1. **Flex Team or not.** The new contract allows for the parties locally (CBP and NTEU) to come to agreement on the creation or continuation of Flex Teams.  Is this something we want to continue?  Do we want to first get a numerical limit from management?

*The discussions between the afternoon session, and the evening session, could not have been more different. And that is the inherent problem with having more than one session. The afternoon session voted 20 – 0 to postpone a vote on having a Flex Unit until we know if the new contract will be ratified, and if management will provide a percentage or number of employees that will be assigned to a Flex team. By contrast, the evening session voted 40 – 11 to accept a Flex Team.*

*(Note: a procedural objection has been raised by some members because the exact issues being voted on changed between the afternoon session and the evening session, and certain proxies were not exercised at the afternoon session because there was unanimous agreement among those present that a vote on accepting the Flex Team should be postponed.)*

1. **Force-outs from last-minute requests for ad hoc leave**.  Per CBP management, they are interested in reducing the number of OT force-outs.  One of the ways they have proposed to reduce last-minute force-outs is to disallow ad hoc leave requests, for leave periods less than 72 hours in advance, when granting the request will result in a force-out.  Blaine APD Williams granted my request to first put this to a union vote, as this would be a big change.

*On this issue there was less divergence between the afternoon and evening sessions. The vote was unanimous, at both sessions, not to accept APD Williams’ overture. To accept this proposal would be seen as losing yet another leave slot. But both sessions agreed that reforms are needed in the way last-minute ad hoc requests are granted. Most notable is the practice of an* *employee using 15 minutes of leave, through the ad hoc process, to escape a force-out. The chapter will put together a panel to study possible reforms, then put those proposed reforms to a vote at a subsequent chapter meeting.*

1. **Change to chapter bylaws**.  At our last general meeting in February, we voted unanimously to make certain modifications to the chapter bylaws.  Unfortunately, NTEU counsel has identified a problem in that the chapter did not give 15 days- notice on the meeting to vote on the changes.  Such a requirement is not mentioned in the national bylaws, but is apparently required by DOL processes - something known only to the lawyers.  Accordingly, a re-vote must be held.  This time, there is a full 15 days-notice.

*Unanimous vote to accept the changes presented at the 2/26/2016 meeting. Chief Steward Chapin will compile the changes into a finished document for the signatures of the Chapter Executive Board, and for submission to the NTEU Denver Field Office.*

1. **Possible changes to the Leave Draw.** Some have suggested a change to the order of picks.

*In the afternoon session discussion was held on the history of the Leave Draw in Blaine, and on several possible changes to the Leave Draw, including returning the process to the union (as was the practice before 2012), rounding up when confronted with fractional amounts (can’t have a portion of a person on leave and a portion not), possible changes in the order of picks, and the problem of light duty people taking up a spot on a work unit’s Leave Draw. The vote in the afternoon session was unanimous to postpone a vote on substantive changes to the Leave Draw until the Chapter President can have a conversation with APD Williams regarding management’s openness to changes, as all changes have to be negotiated with management. No vote was taken, as this decision was unanimous amongst the members present.*

*The evening session went a very different direction. A much more abbreviated discussion was held, and the members present (including proxies) voted 28 – 4 to change the order of picks to seniority/reverse seniority/seniority/reverse seniority. The evening session went on to ask the Chapter President to speak to APD Williams regarding the issue of light duty, and holding a “live” Leave Draw similar to last year’s live Bid and Rotation process.*

*(Note: a procedural objection has been raised by some members because the exact issues being voted on changed between the afternoon session and the evening session, and certain proxies were not exercised at the afternoon session because there was unanimous agreement among those present that a vote on any substantive changes to the Leave Draw should be postponed until the Chapter President could meet with APD Williams.)*

1. **Possible changes to filling mid-year vacancies in work units.** The upcoming contract will allow the union and management to come to terms on a way to fill mid-year vacancies other than through the method currently employed.  Suggestions are sought.

*A lengthy discussion was held at the afternoon session. At first, no consensus could be reached. But eventually a consensus was found that the following protocol should be followed regarding filling vacancies mid-year:*

* + - 1. *Large Work Units: a solicitation will be held. The most senior employee already assigned to that work unit, and who seeks to fill the vacated slot, will be granted the slot.*
      2. *Small Work Units: A solicitation will be held. The most senior employee wishing to fill the slot, from any work unit, will be granted the vacancy.*
      3. *For resulting vacancies created by this protocol, management will follow the same protocol, provided they wish to fill the vacated slot.*

*Both the afternoon session and the evening session were in unanimous support of this proposal. Management will be approached.*

1. CBP and Daycare

*In the afternoon session, several members brought up the topic of CBP providing or arranging for daycare for the children of employees. It was suggested that the union approach management and inquire about the possibilities of management signing a contract with a local childcare provider (the daughter of a former Blaine supervisor), whereby the children of CBP employees would be given priority consideration for placement. The vote was unanimous for the chapter to make this inquiry of management. The evening session did not discuss this topic*.

1. Food Trucks on site.

*A member suggested that the union approach local management regarding the topic of allowing food vendor trucks on-site. The vote was unanimous. The evening session did not discuss this topic.*