

Report to the UNDE National Executive (NE)

on Real Property Operations (RP Ops) for the Spring 2017

Of note is the changes within this UNDE membership dominated organization.

The Assistant Deputy Minister Infrastructure and Environment (ADM IE)-Jamie Pitfield retired and has been replaced by an actor – Susan Chambers.

The Chief of Staff (CoS)- Major General (MGen) Karl McQuillan also retired and was replaced by MGen Sylvain Sirous.

The RP Ops Commanding Officer (CO) has been replaced. Colonel (Col) Kevin Horgan has been moved early to Special Assistant to the Vice Chief of Defence Staff (SA VCDS) and was replaced by Col Marc Rancourt in advance of Col Martin Gros-Jean this Annual Posting Season (APS).

Prior to attending the Ontario regional conference I met with the new CoS and the outgoing CO to address a few regional concerns which I have added at the bottom of this report. The meeting went well and the new MGen has previous experience with UNDE through his dealings with Brother Turcq.

I have invited the new CO to attend our NE meeting on Wednesday May 17 at 10:00 for an informal grip and grin. This is merely to be able to put a face to the name on both sides.

I had the opportunity to speak with Gilles Moreau the Human Resources (HR) Director General Workplace Management (DGWM) concerning issues raised in Kingston at a town hall I attended with the Ontario (Ont) Deputy Vice President (DVP) Carolyn Handley. The concern was delays in staffing caused by HRs freezing of classifications due to outdated reviews. The DGWM denies this as happening and wants specific examples from not only Kingston but from across the country. Please send these to me for furtherance on to him.

We had the inaugural Union Management Consultation Committee (UMCC) which was reported out earlier and while we are awaiting the next one, the suggested Terms of Reference are out for our review and I have included them in this report.

The following is an excerpt from my speaking notes used at the Ont regional conference and used by Brother MacLennan at the Council of Locals conference.

I met Thursday April 06th with Col Horgan the Real Property Operations Commanding Officer (RP Ops CO) and Brigadier General (BGen) Sylvain Sirois the Chief of Staff (CoS) to the Assistant Deputy Minister for Infrastructure and Environment (ADM IE).

We are at the start of a new Fiscal Year (FY), which we hope will have new moneys for us, however, we don't know what final amount is coming to us. Currently we have 85% of our notional request, it is hoped that by end April we will have the rest of the \$150 million identified as needed. Of note is the fact that of \$1.8 B for IE, RP Ops gets \$1.1 B. Near the end of last FY, RP Ops had to turn off the money to the various regions, as for the first time in recent memory, the other L 1 organizations did a lot better job of spending their monies meaning that there was very little left over to pass on to RP Ops to spend at year end. The days of "March Madness" appear to be over. So yes, spending stopped, contracts were cancelled and penalties paid, and a "WTF" attitude spread through our Bases and Wings. An audit also identified that RP Ops had expended all of its allotted travel cap of \$2.1 M, so they had to halt travel and meals prior to the end of the FY. This also resulted in more than a few "WTF" moments – especially in Quebec.

The Task Analysis is still incomplete. 3 of the 5 major regions are in with the West and Pacific still outstanding. The expectation is that there will be distributed a regional construct down to but not necessarily including the shops. These details will be developed by the regions themselves taking into account the market realities of the immediate area. The possible movement of vacant positions within sections, regions and the country all remain in play. The overall position count will not go down, a shop may "lose" but another may "gain" either in the unit, region or country. It is recognized that the outflow is greater than the intake, this is due to the age of our membership and the glacial pace of Human Resources (HR). I was assured by the CoS that there are daily pressures brought to bear on the ADM HR Civilian (Civ) to bring the required resources to the problem. The direction from Col Horgan is to continue with all staffing. It was mentioned again

that our Full Time Equivalent (FTE) count is not an issue as we have more vacancies than we do Salary Wage Envelope (SWE), that said the FTE count departmentally is screwing us as the 25k cap needs to be adjusted upwards drastically. As the government moves the military to the “pointy end of the stick” the support roles still need to be done, and done by civilians. The hope is that the Defence Policy Review will address this short coming. This will become more important as RP Ops begins to shuffle around the 400 military positions in the organizations, and the role that they used to do becomes a civilian one. As for the SWE and what could be our new contract if ratified, I was informed that the wage increases for previous years must be found internally which is manageable, and the market adjustments are funded centrally.

There is no plan to increase contracting out. Change things yes, reorganize how contracts are utilized yes. Centralize our Members in core areas and have the outliers contracted yes. At the end of the day, the assurance was given again that they will not reduce our numbers, they have not yet, nor do they plan to. They went to great length to voice support for the civilian workforce. I brought up an example of these Facility Maintenance (FM) contracts from Wainwright Alberta where the contractor is hiring “skilled handymen” in place of our Red Seal Tradespeople. This downgrading of the work requirements is an insult to our fellow Members there and is detrimental to the very infrastructure that is being maintained, and will likely be returned to us in a horrible state when the contract is up. Col Horgan committed to get back to me on this as he was unawares.

Defence Construction Canada (DCC) is more prevalent as the Public Services Procurement Centre (PSPC) has removed itself from the work, meaning that DCC has been engaged to fill the void. Funding DCC gets from RP Ops has been cut from \$250M to \$150M, so I was assured that cuts to the DCC workforce are coming.

Brothers Turcq and Kiley join me at the UMCC there along with a representative of the Professional Institute of the Public Service (PIPSC). Interestingly enough, from the last UMCC, there has been a change in the safety footwear. The direction was recently sent out making Casuals and Students eligible for the same

footwear allowance that we enjoy as per the Canadian Labour Code (CLC) Part 2. I have attached the draft direction concerning this.

I also attached the e-mail traffic concerning a plot by management to have Military folks take over in part our Heating Plant positions. While it appears to be just a trial balloon that never got going, it is a huge cause for alarm as it shows managements mind set towards our work.

Funding for this fiscal year continues to be a topic of conversation as RPOps deals with its budget.

Respectfully submitted by T. Mark Miller VP/BC

ANNEX A - FOOT PROTECTION REQUIREMENTS AND HAZARD ASSESSMENT FORM

PART A – EMPLOYEE INFORMATION

Full Name (For multiple workers, fully identify the group covered by this assessment)

Job Position and brief description

PART B – HAZARD ASSESSMENT


State if there is a risk of the following from occurring: (YES/NO)







RISK OF:

#	HAZARD	PROB	TYPE OF HAZARD
1	Object falling/striking foot		
2	Object rolling onto employees foot		
3	Sharp object which may cut the top of foot		
4	Object puncturing the bottom of shoe		
5	Exposure to chemicals		
6	Exposure to explosive chemicals. (Risk of static buildup causing explosion)		
7	Damage to electrical components due to static discharge		
8	Contact with energized conductors (220V or less) (Electric Shock)		
9	Injury due to uneven surfaces/rough terrain		
10	Injury due to extreme heat or cold		
11	Slips/falls due to slippery conditions		
12	Rotating/abrasive equipment near foot (e.g. chainsaws)		
13	Slipping on ice (while performing work duties)		
14	Other		

PART C – PROTECTIVE REQUIREMENTS

Indicate the protective items required based on the hazard assessment by checking the box to the right. The criteria are based on the serial numbers listed in part 2 (Hazard Assessment). Where number listed more than once, choose the most appropriate.

NAME/ LABEL	USE WITH	DO NOT USE WITH	TYPICAL USEAGES/ OTHER INFORMATION	<input type="checkbox"/>
 GRADE 1	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 10		Required for heavy industrial environments with puncture hazards. .g. construction sites, autosshops, carpentry shops, fabrication shops, warehouses where forklifts present)	<input type="checkbox"/>

 GRADE 2	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 10		Required for light industrial environments with puncture hazards. E.g. Warehouses, QM shops, areas where
 ELECTRICAL SHOCK RESISTANT	8	6, 7	For any industry where accidental contact with live electrical conductors can occur
 STATIC DISSIPATIVE	7	6, 8	Environments where a static discharge can create a hazard for workers or equipment.
 SUPER STATIC DISSIPATIVE	7	6, 8	Environments where a static discharge can create a hazard for workers or equipment.
 CONDUCTIVE	6	8	For any industry where low-power electrical charges can create a hazard for workers or equipment
 CHAINSAW RESISTANT	12		For forestry workers and others exposed to hand-held chain saws or other cutting tools.
<NO LABEL> SLIP RESISTANT	5, 11, 13		To determine slip resistance. Look for a table (either on shoe or label) with 6 “coefficients of friction”) – <i>The lower the numbers, the better</i>
<NO LABEL> ANKLE SUPPORT	9,3		Visually verify that boot extends well past ankle (at least 3 inches)
Other			

Note that when selecting footwear, the footwear must have all of the requirements that are checked off.

Hazard Assessment and Protective Requirement Approved by Supervisor

Name of Supervisor

Signature

Date

PART D – PAYMENT INFORMATION

Name & Initials	PRI #	UNIT	SECTION

The following employee is eligible to receive reimbursement in the amount of:

- \$125 in a calendar year for non-slip safety footwear (no other protective features)²
- \$150 in a calendar year for non-slip safety footwear and grade 2 cap²
- \$300 in a calendar year for any other protective safety footwear²

TYPE ¹	TOTAL COST ²	# OF PAIRS THIS YEAR	TOTAL COST THIS YEAR

I hereby verify that the employee is eligible for reimbursement as per the conditions listed below:

1. Original receipt for purchase must be attached.
2. Reimbursement amount above does not exceed the maximum.
3. Footwear was damaged during the course of duty.
4. Casual employees: footwear was damaged during the course of their employment.

MANAGER/SUPERVISOR	SIGNATURE	DATE	LOCAL

¹ Types of protective footwear (and their definitions) are listed in Part 1.1 of Z195.1-16, Guideline on Selection, Care and Use of Protective Footwear. This list includes:

- Protective Toe Cap (PT)
- Protective Sole (PS)
- Metatarsal Protection (MP)
- Electrical shock-resistant sole (ES)
- Static dissipative footwear (SD)
- Super-static –dissipative protective footwear (SD+)
- Conductive footwear (C)
- Chainsaw protective footwear (CP)
- Slip resistance footwear (SR)
- Over-the-shoe toe protectors (OS)

² The amount for reimbursement is to be determined by the Det/Sect OC in consultation with the appropriate health and safety committee.

1. Supervisor

a. PRIOR TO PURCHASE

- (1) The supervisor will complete parts A-C for the workplace and provide the entire form to the employee, confirming that they understand the type of footwear to purchase and any local cost limits.

b. AFTER PURCHASE

- (1) The supervisor must sign part D only when the employee has attached their receipt for the purchase of the footwear to the form.
- (2) Prior to signing, the supervisor must verify that the safety footwear purchased meet the requirements determined in part C.
- (3) Ensure footwear to be disposed of is appropriately marked (punching a hole in the tongue of the boot) to indicate that it has been disposed of and accounted for IAW this policy.

2. Workplace Health and Safety Committee

a. ANNUALLY

- (1) Approving the Hazard Assessment (Part B) of the form and adding any additional requirements to Part C.
- (2) Review special purpose protective footwear requirements to address trade specific health and safety hazards such as fire boots for fire fighters or pole climbing boots for linemen. The committee should explicitly list these in Part C of this form.
- (3) Depending on the degree of specialization required, this may not be suitable nor adequately cover the average cost of these specialist boots. In this instance it is the responsibility of the committee to develop a suitable alternative process for procurement of the necessary footwear.
- (4) Determine whether or not insulated winter versions are needed as well as summer versions.
- (5) Set reasonable reimbursement limits based on the generally accepted average price for the product in the workplace geographic area. The Committee should review and endorse any proposed purchases above this limit on a case-by-case basis to the appropriate Manager.

3. Employee

a. PRIOR TO PURCHASE

- (1) Obtain a copy of the form with parts A-C completed and ensure that they are aware of any reimbursement limits established by the Unit based on local market conditions.

b. DURING PURCHASE

- (1) Ensure that the safety footwear purchased meets all the criteria in part C.
- (2) When requesting a footwear upgrade above the criteria established by the WHSC, seek approval through their supervisor to the WHSC.

c. AFTER PURCHASE

- (1) Provide a legible receipt for the purchase or replacement of approved protective footwear and submit it with a copy of the form to their supervisor.
- (2) Dispose of their protective footwear when it is worn out by punching a hole in the tongue of the boot, or otherwise marking it in a manner that clearly indicates that it has been disposed of and accounted for IAW this policy.

Distribution List

Original: RP Ops Sect/Det OPI (Administration Officer or Claims Clerk) for Payment

Copy: Employee

Copy: Manager/Supervisor File

Date of Issue: March 2017

Last Updated: March 2017

OPI: RP Ops Gp HQ J9-2

PROVISION OF PROTECTIVE FOOTWEAR

- References: A. General Safety Program, General Safety Standards (C-02-040-009/AG-001) Chapter 14, Annex B
B. Canada Labour Code Part II, Section 125(1)(l)
C. Canada Occupational Health and Safety Regulations, Part XII, Section 12.1
D. National Joint Council, Occupational Health and Safety Directive, Part XIII
E. CSA Z195-14, Protective Footwear
F. CSA Z195.1-16 Guidelines on Selection, Care and Use of Protective Footwear

INTRODUCTION

1. Treasury Board has adopted, in conjunction with the National Joint Council, a policy of funding the cost of protective footwear. This is reflected at ref A, regarding the provision of protective footwear to public service employees. DND policy addresses a reasonable reimbursement for Public Servants who require protective footwear in the course of their duties. It also emphasizes the need for greater participation by the local Workplace Health and Safety Committee (WHSC) when identifying the need for and selection of protective footwear.

AIM

2. The aim of this policy is to provide direction to Canadian Forces Real Property Operations Group (CF RP Ops Gp) on the subject of employee reimbursement for the procurement and repair of protective footwear by providing guidance to COs, OCs, branch heads, supervisors and WHSCs.

APPLICABILITY

3. This policy applies to all civilian employees working within CF RP Ops Gp.

ELIGIBILITY

4. It is understood that reimbursable protective footwear is intended for exclusive use within the workplace. This footwear will be provided at public expense to civilian employees, regardless of their term of employment. Contractors are not eligible for reimbursement.

5. The reimbursement for the replacement or repair of protective footwear purchases shall be considered only after:

- a. Meeting the criteria established by the local WHSC.
- b. Receiving supervisor approval in writing.
- c. Providing a receipt for the purchase or repair of protective footwear.

GENERAL

6. This policy will require the cooperative efforts of several parties. Both the local WHSC and the supervisor must determine the criteria to be used when selecting suitable protective footwear for the job. In addition to the WHSC being obliged to participate in this program through references A & B, the committee and immediate supervisor are the best source of determining the minimum foot protection

UNCONTROLLED COPY WHEN PRINTED

needed for the job, consistent with the minimum requirements expressed in references E and F. To assist in this regard, Annex A has been provided as a suggested template.

RESPONSIBILITIES

7. Employer. As representatives of DND and therefore deemed the employer, management is charged with the responsibility of providing adequate protective footwear free of charge to its Public Service employees while working within the confines of a DND facility.
8. Managers. CF RP Ops Det/Sect OC and other delegated financial managers are responsible to ensure that administrative procedures are established for providing adequate protective footwear to its civilian Public Service employees. Each CF RP Ops Det/Sect is responsible for:
 - a. Establishing a suitable price range appropriate to the type of protective footwear required. This is to be done in consultation with the appropriate health and safety committee.
 - b. Establishing frequency of replacement. This shall be governed by the nature of the work. Replacements may occur more often than once per year. The department shall pay for cost-effective repairs to safety footwear
 - c. The reimbursement of reasonable costs incurred for the purchase, replacement or repair of protective footwear.
 - d. Ensuring that the responsibilities listed below for their supervisors, safety committee and employees are met.
9. Supervisors. It is the supervisor's responsibility to approve in writing, the purchase or replacement of safety footwear and submit original copies to the designated RP Ops Det/Sect OPI (Administration Officer or Claims Clerk) for processing. Supervisors must ensure they confirm the hazards that the employee will potentially be exposed to and indicate the type of protective footwear required prior to replacement footwear being purchased.
10. Workplace Health and Safety Committees. It is the responsibility of the WHSC (or the Unit Safety Committee if the local RP Ops Det/Sect does not have a WHSC) to approve the Hazard Assessment process used for determining the type of footwear required for employees. The WHSC should also review hazard assessment information on an annual basis for each work area and confirm the requirements for any special purpose footwear to address trade specific health and safety hazards such as fire boots for fire fighters or pole climbing boots for linemen.
11. Employee. The employee is expected to take reasonable care of protective footwear supplied by the employer. This includes using the provided footwear for its intended purpose only. It is the responsibility of the employee to follow the administrative processes established by the local Manager for reimbursement and ensure the footwear purchased meets the criteria specified by their supervisor.

FUNDING

12. The reimbursement of Protective Safety Footwear will be done through the civilian pay system using the appropriate allowance entitlement code, provided by the RP Ops Det/Sect using their own allocations.

CONCLUSION

13. The intent of this policy is to provide local guidance for the procurement or repair of civilian protective footwear. The RP Ops Unit/Section/Detachment General Safety Officer will be expected to become familiar with this policy in order to resolve interpretation issues regarding this policy at the lowest possible level.

Annex A: Foot Protection Requirement and Hazard Assessment Form.

Date of Issue: March 2017

Last Updated: MAR 2017

OPI: RP Ops Gp HQ J9-2

Sandra Montpetit

From: Mark.Miller2@forces.gc.ca
Sent: April-25-17 5:23 PM
To: tmarkmiller@shaw.ca
Subject: FW: Meeting

From: Horgan Col KG@ADM(IE) CF RP Ops Gp@Ottawa-Hull
Sent: April-25-17 1:51 PM
To: Miller TM@RP Ops U (Pacific)@Esquimalt <Mark.Miller2@forces.gc.ca>
Cc: Rancourt Col MWJ@ADM(IE) CF RP Ops Gp@Ottawa-Hull <MARC.RANCOURT@forces.gc.ca>; Sirois MGen JS@ADM(IE) COS(IE)@Ottawa-Hull <SYLVAIN.SIROIS@forces.gc.ca>
Subject: FW: Meeting

Mark,

Some of the answers to the questions you received recently. The replies for the ON gathering are from RPOU(O). At one level it is clear that there remains two sides to the story and that is unlikely to change. The key is that we continue to attempt to communicate at all levels and that is my direction to the units but if people do not like the answers they receive they may continue to ask the same question hoping to get a different answer. As you are aware I will be out of this position as of Friday and you can forward concerns to Col Rancourt. I know we cheer for opposing NHL clubs (both using their clubs at the moment vice sticks) and that at times we too have been on two sides of the same story but I have enjoyed our interaction and wish you continued success in our shared goal to look after the interest of RP Ops members.

Kevin

Col / col Kevin Horgan, P.Eng

Commander, CF Real Property Operations Group
Canadian Armed Forces
kevin.horgan@forces.gc.ca / Tel: 613-943-7980 / CSN: 943-7980 **Enabling Operational Success**

Commandant, Groupe des opérations immobilières FC
Forces Armées Canadiennes
kevin.horgan@forces.gc.ca / Tél. : 613 943-7980 / RCCC : 943-7980 **Favoriser la réussite opérationnelle**

From: Mark Miller [<mailto:tmarkmiller@shaw.ca>]
Sent: April-12-17 12:27 PM
To: Horgan Col KG@ADM(IE) CF RP Ops Gp@Ottawa-Hull <Kevin.Horgan@forces.gc.ca>
Cc: T Mark Miller <tmarkmiller@shaw.ca>
Subject: meeting

Morning Kevin. As a set up for tomorrows 10:00 talk, I thought I'd give you a heads up of what I am looking for. As you know, I met with all the Ont Locals and had a town hall with Kingston. During both of those events I shared the updates from the talk with yourself and Sylvain. I also communicated out to Que on their issues.

Que has asked for a copy of your message out pertaining to the boot allowance. And they are hoping it will contain a \$ amount within it for a consistent application. The policy will state that the rate will be set by the local safety committee.

I shared with Alberta & the North, your reply concerning the "skilled handyman", as yet I have nothing back. I cannot say that monitoring contractors to ensure compliance over intent is something we feel good about. Noted.

The e-mail chain concerning HPs was troubling, in that it was never discussed with the Union. That type of discussion is what consultation is all about. Lack of transparency once discovered, breeds distrust. The issue surfaced on a Friday and there was concern that we would need to close the plant on Monday due to a lack of personnel. We explored options and now that the concern has reduced we will keep the military option only as a last resort.

Ont Reg Conf

A question was raised pertaining to the "Downsview Hospital". Can the clinic be moved there to alleviate the issue of Drs floating between offices of which there are not enough?

I am not sure what this pertains to, since the MIR is located within the Denison Armoury and I am not aware of any offsite clinics being operated. Any amplification that could be provided so that we could address this concern would be appreciated.

Petawawa has improved its in house service model by raising the LPOs from 15-25k. they suggest that this practice should spread.

That is common practice as DCC is only awarding SOA up to \$25K and this has been in effect since approximately 2012. The increase locally in Pet was in response to improved oversight of their procurement processes.

North Bay is suffering due to its low manning levels, especially in the Carpentry Shop.

Ack. This is tied to no free FTE transferred to the Det at transformation, plus very few military members being posted to the Det.

The Trenton DCC built Fire Hall has had 2 fires during its construction which leads people to believe that the building is faulty elsewhere.

There are several concerns with the facility overall and these issues are being addressed.

Kingston Town hall

The Membership feels that Kingston is being used as a "test case" and they don't like it.

There are no specific "test cases" on-going in Kingston. In fact Borden has been the test case for most items over the past two years including IOC, IEBM and the task analysis.

Communication is all but non-existent at Kingston.

LMCC were held monthly, but were not attended by Union representatives since the departure of the Union VP. As a result, the OC is reducing the frequency of the LMCC to quarterly. There are also regular gatherings/townhalls.

There is a huge level of fear/angst and uncertainty amongst the plumbers. They are in the midst of being downgraded from a PIP 10 to a PIP 09, and they are not having the process and their rights clearly explained to them. Why are they being downgraded and what does "salary protection" mean to them? There are 3 Members who have completed their

Apprenticeships yet they have not been placed Indeterminately as yet. Why? We are told that the classification is "frozen".

Correct. This is a result of the TB decision that PIP-10 require three licenses. The decision has not been officially released from Classification, which not only prevents the PIP from submitting a Classification grievance, the positions are frozen and therefore no staffing, including appointing the apprentices, can occur. This has been communicated to them numerous times, in some cases by myself personally, including meeting with them following Town Halls. We are continuing to work to move this issue through HR.

The painters have historically (but not recently) been ridiculed and disrespected in their trade. This has them wondering of their future.

There are no plans to replace the painter positions within the Det, especially in light of the frustration/pains routinely experienced in Pet that lost all its painters during WFA before the creation of RP Ops.

The task analysis was done in isolation of the union creating all kinds of angst on what the end result will be, and what it will mean for the shops. They have asked for an org chart (the same as other Locals and Regions).

The Union was invited to all meetings to discuss the task analysis; no one showed up. As well, they were provided a copy of the draft report to which no feedback was received.

Near the end of the last FY, the plumbing shop was told to eliminate its existing WOs, supposedly for the standup of IEBM. Following that, the small WOs were packaged and sent off to DCC for implementation. These are things like re-caulking a tub and swapping out shower heads, work best left to the shops. In fact, some of this work was completed and still ended up going to DCC. What was managements intent with doing this? I have a partial list of this for you.

This pertains to the current inability to staff the positions due to them being frozen. Low risk activities are being sent to contract, while the shop continues to be engaged on the more intensive/urgent work until we can resolving the staffing issue.

Money continues to be tightly controlled in Kingston. At the end of the FY, the brakes were put on – which I tried to explain as per our discussion. However, the controls continue for another 2 months. Why?

This is directly related to the uncertainty with respect to the current FY. The OC has opted to implement a "slow start." Moreover, within the CA, the spending freeze continues due to shortages of L101.

Kingston is/has been utilizing its own "apprenticeship" program which is outside of the AODP and does not include increments. Why?

The apprentices followed both AODP and, due to a shortage of AODP billets, invested in developing their own apprentices, fully funding their training.

When it comes time for new buildings to be turned over to us, the inspections that we do are being ignored. Why?

This pertains to the current DND-DCC relationship wrt exercising Technical Authority. A WG led by DCPD will be standing up to address this issue.

Why does DCC not enforce the use of holdbacks on its contracts to ensure that the taxpayer gets what it is paying for?

They do as per industry standard. As per other federal government contracts our success rate at enforcing these holdbacks is limited by a number of factors beyond the control of DCC.

Do the shops have the right of first refusal for the work that comes in?

To a certain extent, but we are not a bottom up organization. Work is screened initially to vet out low priority, duplicate, or superfluous requirements. Thereafter, decisions are made whether the work can be executed internally or externally. The Shop Supervisor, upon receiving the work orders, have the discretion of recommending other means of implementation if they feel the Shop lacks the intrinsic capability of performing the requested work.

I think that the highlights. See you tomorrow. tmm

Sandra Montpetit

From: Kevin.Horgan@forces.gc.ca
Sent: April-07-17 5:39 PM
To: tmarkmiller@shaw.ca
Cc: President
Subject: Re: Retention Recruiting HP

Mark,

Interesting as I was the one who started this possible temp solution. At the start of the heating season it appeared we would not have enough HPs to run the plant in Petawawa (someone came back from sick leave and the problem went away). However, almost every year we go through this and yes we try to hire more pers and yes we try to get HR (Civ) to understand the situation but we are often walking a thin line. As you know in the past we had a military HP trade and they were part of the manning in the plants. The question I asked was could we use the new trade Plumber/Gas fitter for this task for a short period because if we did not have the pers and could not hire anyone we did not want to be forced to contract out an operation.

In the end there was no consensus on using military pers in this role but for me if we were in the situation of making it work using mil pers vs contracting out, I was going to use the mil pers. So it may not have been seen in a positive light but it was for the right reasons (at least in my view). We will see what the HP pay raise does on the ability to hire.

Have a great weekend.

Col K.G. Horgan

Comd, CF RP Ops Gp
DND / Government of Canada
kevin.horgan@forces.gc.ca / Tel: 613-943-7980 / BB: 613-614-5683 Enabling Operational Success

Cmdt, Gp Ops Imm FC
MDN / Gouvernement du Canada
kevin.horgan@forces.gc.ca / Tél. : 613-943-7980 / BB : 613-614-5683 Favoriser la réussite opérationnelle

Original Message

From: Mark Miller
Sent: Friday, April 7, 2017 11:02 AM
To: Horgan Col KG@ADM(IE) CF RP Ops Gp@Ottawa-Hull
Cc: 'President'
Subject: FW: Retention Recruiting HP

Kevin, this is what I was alluding to earlier. As you can see this has gone up the chain due to the disturbing nature of the discussions concerning Union work. I have been suggested as the OPI for the Union side should the dept want to be proactive. Either way, a timely response would be appreciated concerning the chain attached. tmm

-----Original Message-----

From: vp.bc [mailto:vp.bc@unde.org]
Sent: Friday, April 7, 2017 7:46 AM
To: T Mark Miller
Subject: Fw: Retention Recruiting HP

Sent from my BlackBerry 10 smartphone.

Original Message

From: President <president@unde.org>

Sent: Friday, April 7, 2017 10:43 AM

To: Gilles.Moreau@forces.gc.ca

Cc: JOHN. FORSTER; KIN.CHOI@forces.gc.ca; vp.bc

Subject: Retention Recruiting HP

Gilles

The attached is disturbing and also supporting what I have been saying regarding the HP community.

Military managers senior NCO's are having sincere conversations in isolation of UNDE discussing the way ahead on how to deal with the recruitment and retention issues for HPs and this is one of many trades.

I am purposing at this time as a proactive approach for the HP community that we form a working joint Union management committee to deal with problem that will only grow as people retire.

For the departments consideration.