

Union Meeting minutes for general chapter meeting of 2/16/15.

Union legal counsel was in attendance, as were Chapter President Albright, Chapter VP Pettaway, and Chapter Secretary Carman.

1. Movement between various work units for those assigned to the Flex group. How should it proceed?

*A discussion followed regarding the methods by which Scheduling moves Flex unit employees between work units. A member of the Scheduling Office who was present for the meeting confirmed that the current method was a "fairness wheel." Discussion proceeded on whether the movement model should be based on a "fairness" model, or on a seniority model. The concept of sufficient training to be able to work in multiple work units was also discussed. A vote was called for: Those who wanted to continue to use a "fairness wheel": 6*

*Those who want to do reassignments by seniority: 17*

*The union will approach management with the idea of changing the reassignment of Flex employees to a seniority model.*

2. Assignment of work locations for those assigned to Flex group. How should it be done?

*Somewhat related to topic #1, a discussion was held regarding how employees assigned to the Flex unit should initially be assigned. I.E., should they have a default assignment location, from amongst the 5 locations that currently comprise the Flex work unit? A discussion ensued, and a vote was called for: Should employees in the Flex work unit be allowed to express a preference to be assigned to a default location, by seniority? Aye: 19*

*Nay: 0*

*The union will approach management with the concept of allowing employees assigned to the Flex unit to be assigned to default location by seniority.*

3. Filling vacancies in work schedules. How should it be done? Previously, CBP and NTEU came to an understanding that mid-year vacancies in work schedules would be filled by the most senior person to have bid on that schedule at the time of the Bid and Rotation, but was not senior enough to get that schedule at the time of initial placements. A proposal has been made to do it strictly by seniority, regardless of what employees originally bid for. Intention is to take an advisory vote on the matter.

*Discussion ensued. A call for a vote was made. Should we continue to fill mid-year vacancies in schedules through the previously negotiated method, or through a straight seniority method, regardless of what people's bids were at the start of the bid year?*

*Those in favor of filling such vacancies by pure seniority: 6*

*Those in favor of filling such vacancies in accordance with the previously negotiated method: 19*

4. AWS for mids in Blaine, in both Passengers and Cargo. Is there sufficient interest to pursue?

*Several members expressed interest. No one objected. The difficulties of mid-year implementations of AWS were also discussed, and was at least part of the reason that AWS for mids was not a go for last year, in addition to the fact that management demanded a flexibility clause that was contrary to contract and law. The union will try again, and time it for the start of the next Bid year in order to avoid some of the downfalls with doing mid-year implementations.*

5. Explanation of Goldstein (national Bid and Rotation grievance) pay out process will be provided.

*The agreement of NTEU national and CBP HQ to demand local CBP managers to produce necessary documents (which they had previously refused to provide) caused the pay-out timeline to be reset. A team of NTEU members continue to work on the numbers for Blaine and Point Roberts. Lynden numbers are also being re-run. Sumas numbers will be examined as well. It was also explained that there remains many unknowns in this process, and that in the end, NTEU might have to take CBP to federal court. The chapter will attempt to inform all members of what NTEU believes their proper pay-outs should be, so that employees can make an informed decision on whether they want to appeal the figures offered by CBP. The union will also inform the membership about other aspects of the case.*

6. Expansion of AWS for Point Roberts. Is there sufficient interest?

*Yes. Point Roberts Steward Deon Talbott will be preparing a new proposal. We have recently been informed that CBP wishes to modify the current AWS Agreement to better fit the expanded Nexus lane hours in the Summer. Negotiations are on-going.*

7. It has come to the union's attention that CBP Blaine is not always following Article 35, Section 1, D (6) concerning the proper release order for employees on overtime. Options to be discussed

*Chapter President Albright read from the contract, and explained the situation. In essence, CBP has been violating the OT release order to avoid paying callback/commutes. The release order does not contemplate the avoidance of callback/commutes. Possible responses were discussed. A vote was called to determine if the chapter should pursue action to force CBP to follow the contract, in spite of whatever possible negative consequences might follow.*

*All those in favor of enforcing the contractual language: 24*

*All those opposed: 1*

*The union will look to enforce the contract.*

8. Any other topics of interest concerning labor-management relations and issues

*One member complained about CBP management not allowing him to enforce the law regarding penalizing travelers who fail to declare prohibited agricultural products. The membership expressed its general sympathy and understanding, but union leadership explained how there really wasn't much the union could do about it. The member was encouraged to contact IA, and his Congressmen, if he felt strongly about it.*

Meeting adjourned at about 1900.