

In attendance:

CPC

Louise Chayer-Ayers

Sanjay Paliwal

John Polak

Advisors

David Shane

CUPW

Serge Champoux

Louise Jarret

Jean Claude Girard absent

Guests

Chris Eady

Pascale DeRycke

Jamie Steen

Rob Lefler

–Jim Crowell CUPW

MLOCR Incident Update – David Shane

CPC explained it was advised that at the new Winnipeg plant an employee was sweeping the MLOCR and a letter came out of the top row of the stacker. This employee was working on removing the letters from the bottom row of the stacker and was leaning over; the letter struck her just below the eye. A joint investigation was done with LJHSC and an I/A log was created. The employee was offered assistance and first aid but declined and said she was OK and continued to work. Safety glasses were also offered and accepted. CPC indicated that a cause for this incident following the investigation was not identified. The most likely cause is that the paddle was up.

CUPW inquired if stacker paddle design could be at fault. CUPW also feels that the length of the stacker paddle may be the issue and showed photos of the previous generation MLOCR paddles which are longer than the new MLOCR paddles. Furthermore, CUPW also believes that the bottom level stacker is too low. This in combination with the height of the top stacker position creates a situation that if a letter did come out it could strike an employee in the face while sweeping the lower stacker.

CPC inquired as to why CUPW felt the paddle length may be a problem. CPC will table the paddle size concern with CPC engineers and Toshiba and look at the paddle design and transport system to ascertain under what conditions a letter could be ejected from the stacker. CPC also explained that it would be premature to consider design change to the paddle without doing a complete investigation.

CUPW stated that they are concerned with how they were informed nationally about the incident; that they were advised by the local and not Canada Post. CPC indicated that the standard protocols for notifying and involving the union in investigations was followed, but

National Joint Health & Safety Committee Meeting Minutes – PT Component

April 21, 2010

agreed that for future incidents related to new equipment they will notify the PT NJHSC directly.

Action:

1. CPC to provide a copy of the SAIR report regarding the incident.
2. CPC to follow-up with Toshiba on possible causes of ejected mail from the stacker including a review of the paddle design

Delivery Update – Jamie Steen

CPC distributed and reviewed its presentation regarding CPC's response to various CUPW health and safety concerns related to Delivery as a follow up from the February 10 NJHSC meeting. The presentation included CPC's description of related work methods and accompanying hazard assessment relevant to the issues raised by the CUPW.

In summary

Slide 3 – Handling Householders in the depot

Canada Post does not believe that any safety issues have been identified based on the information provided by CUPW.

Slide 4-5-6 – Safe access to the bottom of Depot Cart (DC)

CPC explained that no one will be required to remove items from the bottom shelf of the depot cart if there is anything on the top shelf. CUPW inquired if there will be notices placed on the cart stating this. CPC stated that it will be part of the training.

CUPW stated that they have concerns at the "horse shoe" where parcels will be on the top shelf and LFTs with MECH mail will be on the bottom. CPC explained that the parcels are loaded on the top of the cart and containers can be placed on the bottom at the front edge of the cart and then slid/pushed to the back. CPC indicated that employees can safety squat and push the containers by hand to the back of the cart or an employee while standing and holding onto the cart ensuring three-points of contact can gently slide the containers to the back of the cart using their foot. CUPW disagrees with the method of pushing the containers to the back with the foot, and that this work method has not been discussed at NJHSC and that pushing a container with the foot is not a safe work method. CPC stated that an employee is not standing on one foot per se and that a stable posture is being maintained by having three point contact. The posture is similar to applying the brake on the cart with the foot, or assuming safety postures when getting in and out of vehicles. CUPW feels that there are issue with the 2 methods. CUPW stated that they are unclear of the way the cart is being loaded, and believes this process is to be implemented to save time. CPC replied that this

National Joint Health & Safety Committee Meeting Minutes – PT Component

April 21, 2010

process is not measured by MOST standards and is a stop watched activity and is deemed safe. CPC re-iterated that this is a very low frequency task.

Canada Posts does not believe that there were any specific safety issues identified based on the information provided by CUPW.

Slide 7 – Access to bottom of DC while loading the vehicle

CUPW stated that the training needs to be made clear that the top is to be unloaded prior to accessing the bottom of the Depot Cart.

Canada Post does not believe that there were any safety issues identified based on the information provided by CUPW.

Slide 8 - Mail in the front of the delivery vehicle – securing

CPC stated that for the Ford Transit Connect it is the intension to have a VTS (vehicle tray system) installed pending the outcome of the RFP process. CUPW inquired if there is a plan to convert older vehicles. CPC stated that there are no intentions to convert older vehicles as it will happen through attrition.

CUPW inquired how CPC is dealing with the Labour code for older vehicles that will be used with new PT process. CPC stated that this is a current practice and PT is not changing current methods.

CUPW inquired if it is the intention of CPC to have VTS by September prior to implementation? And when will it be brought to the committee? CPC explained that it has gone to RFP and once a design has been chosen it will be brought to the NJHSC.

Slide 9 – Mail in the front of the delivery vehicle – employee safety

CUPW does not agree with mail being more visible in a vehicle. They believe that the CMS states that mail should not be in the front of a vehicle for any reason, and has asked what Security's position is. CPC indicated that this is current practice and the CMS is being updated and stated that Security is involved in the approval process. CPC has not identified an increased risk to the employees; a LC getting mail from a relay is believed to be at a comparable low risk. CUPW stated that they disagree with the proposed process.

Canada Post does not believe that there were any safety issues identified based on the information provided by CUPW.

Slide 10 - Two bundle delivery – Arm fatigue

CPC explained that the main risk factors related to static postures are the degree to which the posture is static, the level of force required, and the duration that the static posture is maintained. CPC stated that the posture is not static because of hand/arm/shoulder motion while walking and performing related delivery activities. There is considerable movement and task variation throughout a letter carriers day along with the weight of the bundle (load) being decreased at each point of call that the letter carrier delivers. CPC also noted that the agreed to two-bundle weight is the same as the single bundle method weight (3.5 lbs) and because a portion of the mail is held on the arm, the force about the elbow and wrist are actually less than the single bundle method.

CUPW stated that they are not convinced that the posture variation is large enough to eliminate concerns regarding static postures.

CPC noted that because the weight of the mail used in the two-bundle method has not increased vs. the single bundle method that this addresses the points made in the memo written by CUPW Ergonomist, Jennifer Marshall, which was provided to 3rd party engineer Bishop in Dec 2009. CUPW stated that they are continuing with another ergonomic study and that Canada Post had been notified accordingly.

Slide 11 - Householders and simultaneous tasks

CUPW stated that it is unsafe to:

- Read while walking
- Retrieve the scanner while walking

CPC indicated that the methods presented and the accompanying hazard assessment did not reveal any unacceptable risks or unsafe practices.

Slide 12 – MPoCs – Use of Satchel at Multiple PoCs.

CPC indicated that a satchel can be used where required. CUPW will review.

Slide 13, 14, 15 – use of handrails

CPC indicated that employees can maintain a free hand to hold a handrail whether going up or down stairs regardless of what side of the stair case the handrail is located. CUPW will review.

Slide 16 – Packets at Multi POC

CUPW stated they have concerns that when putting mail in the double flap slot it will be more difficult because your arms are occupied.

CPC indicated that there is no difference with current safe practice. CPC asked if this was a time value issue or a Health and Safety problem. CUPW responded health and safety.

CUPW will come back to CPC with clarification on what the additional safety problem is with the flipping flap at the door.

Slide 17 – Parcels at Multi POC

Canada Post does not believe that there were any safety issues identified based on the information by CUPW.

Slide 18 – Apartment Keys

Canada Post does not believe that there are any concerns over vehicle keys, just Crown keys. CUPW will review.

Action:

1. CPC to review and respond if there are any compliance issues with the CLC.
2. CUPW to review re: Use of satchel at multiple PoCs
3. CUPW to review re: right hand required for handrails
4. CUPW to review re: left hand required for handrails
5. CUPW to review re: packets at multi POCs.
6. CUPW to review re: flipping flap at door.
7. CUPW to review re: apartment keys.

Dog Warning Cards in A62 Cases

CUPW stated that were advised of an apparent new process that is being implemented at an undisclosed depot in Winnipeg. The route measurement officers apparently notified the supervisors and superintendents to inform the letter carriers that they would henceforth have to file a formal complaint to their supervisors about the presence of a dog at an address and that it would be the supervisor who would investigate to determine whether the dog might be considered dangerous. Then, about the sorting cases, the supervisors apparently notified the letter carriers that the notice card would no longer be installed in the case to signal the presence of a dog at an address. Only the “sticker with the image of a dog” would be stuck to the sorting case. CPC is not aware of this and will have to follow up and get back to CUPW.

Action:

1. CPC to follow up and get back to CUPW regarding Dog Warning Cards.

Terrebonne Pilot

CUPW stated their concern with the results of the depot cart pilot in Terrebonne were not presented in March, and that they were sent the training draft and the deadline for feedback on the document was April 22. CPC explained that this review was scheduled for the last meeting, but because CUPW requested a re-scheduling of the meeting the item was not tabled earlier because the Canada Post representative was not available for the April 21 meeting and it will now be discussed at the next meeting. CPC also stated that they would look into having the training deadline moved. CPC indicated that CUPW can respond with a proviso that comments may change depending on the parties review and discussion of the pilot results.

Action:

1. CPC to check if an extension can be given for the training deadline.

Training Material Update

CUPW asked to receive the final versions of all training related to the Modern Post that had been revised to this point. CPC stated that the entire Health and Safety (H&S) modules that were reviewed by the parties will be incorporated into the training documents. In addition, at National consultations the entire training package will now be provided to CUPW. In addition, all employees will receive the complete H&S section as a handout at the training sessions. These documents will be sent to CUPW.

VES Chair Update

CPC re-affirmed it's commitment to perform additional chair testing, but explained that Toronto, Montreal and Hamilton will receive the Siemens chairs for the time being. However, once testing has been completed and depending on the final selection made, CPC can consider replacing the Sieman's chairs in Toronto, Montreal and Hamilton. CPC also explained that testing could be done in the next few weeks with 2 new chairs and the one from Siemens, so 3 chairs in total will be tested.

Action:

1. CPC to provide specs on the new chairs and timing of testing.

VES Tag Reader

CUPW asked for further clarification on the use by Canada Post of a new reader-scanner used for the mail redirection service and stated that discussion is required at NJHSC as it is the first time they have seen this. CPC explained that it is already done today, except it is now in a box as opposed to holding a scanner. CUPW requested more information

Action:

1. CPC to follow up on VES Tag Reader.

Winnipeg Office

Canada Post is conducting follow-up on four points, with regard to the new Winnipeg Office:

1. CPC is still studying the issue of wearing earphones
2. CPC will report back to the union on the issue of the compulsory wearing of safety shoes everywhere that mail is processed
3. If the LJHSC will be involved in developing the emergency measures and evacuation drills
4. CPC will report back to CUPW about the installation of the anti-fatigue mats along the MLOCs

NJHSC minutes

CUPW does not believe that the minutes of the NJHSC-PT are explicit enough. It gave the example of the 31 March minutes and the point about the modification to the AFSM output module. CPC said that CUPW has a copy of the PowerPoint presentation on this. CUPW replied that the minutes must reflect what is said in the meeting, that these documents are legal and can be used in arbitration or hearings before judges. Canada Post agreed to review the issue and report back to CUPW.

Action log

Given the lack of time, the parties agreed to review this document at the next meeting.

Note:

The meeting was adjourned. The next NJHSC (PT Component) is scheduled for May 5, 2010, **1:00pm to 4:00pm.**