

09.29.2017

WSP LMCC – CVEO/CVOs

Attendees:

- Steve S. – WPEA Union Rep, Jeremy M. – CVEO 3 (WPEA member)
- Dave J. – Teamsters Union Rep, Kevin V. – CVEO 4 (Teamsters member)
- Alexis Y. – Local 17 Union Rep, Russell H. – CVEO 1 (Local 17 member), Patrick J. – CVEO 2 (Local 17 member)
- Karl Nagel – WSP Management, Mike Dahl – WSP management & 2 from HR; Mike Foster. couldn't attend because he was moving from Prosser to Olympia (he isn't going anywhere!)

Pre-LMCC caucus notes

- Issues:
 1. Why is the department providing part A training and certification to FOBs? Never happened before, why now? If in the name of safety, what has changed?
 - Where does this stop? Part B coming down the pipeline?
 - Temporary solution to not meeting inspections numbers?
 - Request inspection numbers for last 5 years performed by certified officers and non-certified officers.
 2. Historically, there were at least up to 8 CVEOs per supervisor. These days it is more like 3-4. Why the discrepancy? Where did those other positions go? How many vacant, funded CVEO positions? If you want more numbers to qualify for a [better] grant, then why not maintain those positions rather than paying a higher rate to FOB officers to perform inspections? How is this a good use of FOB resources?
 - Request organization charts for last 15 years.

Meeting notes:

MD: Weren't supposed to upload level 3s into federal system, b/c not trained. Troopers were getting in contact with trucks all the time. Can't envision a time when troopers will take over CVE. Getting them to be more educated/knowledgeable. Expanding their knowledge base. No thought whatsoever that they are going to take away work from CVEOs. A lot more trucks running around out there. Right now there is no intent to do part B training for troopers. Compares the situation to DREs. CVEOs will be around for as long as the guys in blue shirts are around. Troopers have full authority, CVEOs have partial authority.

Authorization to fill 7-8 FOB troopers and the same for CVD → Project positions to fill a 3, 2 and 5 1s.

KV: Backs AY up.

RH: emphasizes short-staff issue

PJ: addresses King County numbers/bus distinction; uses as an example

RH: brings up transfer and backfill issue

MD: trying to leverage technology so that when we are down in staffing we can still do the work; haven't slowed down on hiring.

PJ: addresses appearance that this gives re authority; give something to troopers, CVEOs get nothing in return

KN: no change in authority the troopers have.

PJ: distinguishes DREs from this situation; what's to stop the department from getting rid of CVEOs?

- MD: Didn't do it before (?)

KV: gives history lesson and questions where this is going; what will next captain do? What does the historical pattern tell us?

- MD: all of that history happened and we are here (?); we created a bureau

PJ: more troopers to get part A certified?

- MD: potentially; not trooper cadets

KV: FOB is short and we are short. If FOB is short, why are they taking on more and not us? Why is their union not saying WTF and not asking for specialty pay? Vicious circle. Politics at this level.

RH: Paying more to troopers to do CVEO work; provides example of 09.28.17 night stop

AY: asks about qualifying for grants

- MD: didn't look at it from a grant perspective; not applying for grant money based on troopers performing inspections

- RH: if grant money is cut, how does that effect CVEOs?

- MD: doesn't foresee a cut; sees an increase, likely 2%

We have not eliminated positions. *Confirm this with org charts.*

AY: more transparency to avoid this problem in the future

- KN: more LMCCs!!!; not required to provide notice to Unions b/c this training is within the FOB's authority

- Notice not required, but open to discussion when similar concern arises

SS: would a familiarization vs. certification make more sense?

- MD: training/cert was designed for troopers to be able to do something with violations

JM: points out contradicting messages from KN and MD

- MD: if this training doesn't make sense, we will get rid of it

PJ: why not develop an advanced truck enforcement for troopers – like a crash course

- MD: but without certification cannot enforce the law

We understand that you are doing this in the name of safety.

Caucus

- New strategy: put the ball in management's court

11:06 AM return to LMCC

KV: proposes LMCCs three x/yr; agency intends to meet on a regular basis to open communication

RH: “in the name of safety”, proposes greater authority to CVEOs → rules of the road

MD: understands what we are proposing and is willing to entertain the idea and to start talking about it

He needs to talk to his chain of command

JM: emphasizes that CVEOs cannot stop trucks for any of the top 7 collision causes

KV: emphasizes that we are the experts in commercial trucks

MD: is it about numbers? Absolutely, 100% it's about numbers.

MD: part A certification allows FOBs to do something with stops now

They have always had that authority; not the same for CVEOs

JM: If we certify all FOB troopers how can they maintain their certification (32 level 3s/yr)

Trucks will get stopped up and down the road

JM: what do I tell Lts about FOB troops getting part B?

- MD: will look into it with Capt. Foster

DJ: hints on potential public disclosure request

RH: brings up cell phone law restriction

Adjourn [with agreement to schedule quarterly LMCCs]