

Cleaning Services – A Report in Response to the Employee and Labour Relations Committee Motions of October 27, 2008

Date:	December 8, 2008
To:	Employee and Labour Relations Committee
From:	City Librarian

SUMMARY

The purpose of this report is to respond to the Employee and Labour Relations Committee request of staff to develop a financially feasible proposal of Union Costing Option #2 that addresses three issues: cleaning services on Saturday and Sunday, adequate relief staff to cover for absences and management and supervision.

FINANCIAL IMPACT

This information report has no financial impact. There is no provision in the 2009 operating budget for the incremental costs resulting from contracting in of cleaning services.

The Director, Finance & Treasurer has reviewed this Financial Impact Statement and is in agreement with it.

DECISION HISTORY

At the October 27, 2008 meeting of the Employee and Labour Relations Committee, the following motion was carried:

That the Employee and Labour Relations Committee:

1. Directs staff to develop a financially feasible proposal that resolves the three outstanding issues that currently make Union Costing Option No. 2 not viable in their assessment:
 - Cleaning services on Saturdays and Sundays;
 - Adequate relief staff to cover for absences;
 - Management and supervision; and
2. Directs staff to report back to the Employee and Labour Relations Committee in December 2008 with a viable and affordable version of Union Costing Option No. 2.

This report responds to the motions.

ISSUE BACKGROUND

At the October 27, 2008 meeting, Library staff presented a report that included an analysis of Option #2 of the Union's proposal. Library staff made the assessment that the proposal was not viable without addressing the need for cleaning services on Saturdays and Sundays, adequate relief staff to cover absences and management and supervision.

COMMENTS

Library staff have prepared a version ("Revised Union Proposal") of the Union Costing Option #2 that addresses the three issues: cleaning services on Saturdays and Sundays, adequate relief staff to cover for absences, management and supervision.

The revision is based on the model in the Union proposal: one full-time custodian at each of the 18 district and large libraries; two full-time custodians at Fairview and Northern District and six full-time custodians at the research and reference libraries; 35 full-time custodians serving the neighbourhood libraries and library service buildings. Full-time custodian positions were calculated at 63 FTEs. The model was based on staff working a five day work week, seven hours per day.

Saturday and Sunday coverage has been assigned to part-time custodians. Within the neighbourhood libraries, there are a number of libraries closed on Mondays and not open on Sundays, which means that there is not a need for added part-time staff to cover the Saturdays. With the exception of Fairview, with its theatre operation, Saturday and Sunday shifts were assigned at 3.5 hours. The total number of custodians required is nine FTEs (full-time equivalents).

Relief staff requirements were calculated based on current experience in the Facilities department. For 72 FTEs the relief staff required is 13.4 FTEs.

The management and supervision requirements include three exempt staff (manager and two supervisors) and two bargaining unit staff (lead hands). The supervisors and lead hands would be expected to work the same hours as the custodians and to be on site at all library locations on a regular basis, in order to provide effective supervision, training and response to cleaning needs identified by library staff.

The use of part-time staff for Saturdays, Sundays and relief staff provides the greatest benefit in terms of covering the weekends and flexibility to cover absences due to vacation and illness. As well, the use of part-time staff creates a viable and more affordable option.

The staffing component and costs for the Revised Union Proposal are summarized as follows:

Staff required	Full-time	Part-time (FTEs)
District, large, research & reference libraries (custodians)	28.0	4.6
Neighbourhood libraries (custodians)	35.0	4.4
Relief for absences (custodians)		13.4
Lead hands	2.0	
Management (exempt)	3.0	
Total FTEs	68.0	22.4
Total FTES	90.4	

Costs	Full-time	Part-time
District, large, research & reference libraries (custodians)	\$1,325,509	\$47,340
Neighbourhood libraries (custodians)	\$1,656,886	\$208,294
Relief for absences (custodians)		\$635,807
Lead hands	\$155,299	
Management (exempt)	\$315,751	
Total	\$3,453,445	\$891,441
Total staffing cost	\$4,344,886	

The following table compares this revised proposal to the Union's original proposal (Option #2) and the Option #3 in the September 8 report for annual operating costs.

Annual Operating Costs			
	Revised Union Proposal	Union Proposal Option #2	September 8 Option #3
Staff cost	\$4,344,886	\$3,604,024	\$5,316,324
Annual replacement equipment	\$23,500	\$23,500	\$23,500
Annual vehicle maintenance	\$115,500	\$115,500	\$198,240
TOTAL	\$4,483,886	\$3,743,024	\$5,538,064
Incremental Operating Costs			
Offset from 2009 contracted services	\$1,471,231	\$1,471,231	\$1,471,231
Total Incremental costs	\$3,012,655	\$2,271,793	\$4,066,830

The total incremental costs for any of the proposals are not funded and are not included in the 2009 operating budget submission.

There are two significant differences between the Revised Union Proposal and the proposal in September 8 Option #3 that account for the reduced number of custodians and reduced costs. First, the Union proposal and the Revised Union Proposal reduces the number of custodians by increasing the number of branches visited each night by the

travelling cleaning crews. As a result, each crew spends more time travelling and less time in the branch cleaning.

Second, the Union proposal and the Revised Union Proposal do not provide for two custodians working after the branches are closed in the district and large libraries. The September 8 Option #3 proposed a staffing model that never had custodians working alone. The Committee should consider the viability of a model that does not address the safety issues that arise from staff working alone and exiting library facilities late at night.

CONTACT

Ron Dyck; Director, Information Technology & Facilities; Tel: 416-393-7104;
E-mail: rdyck@torontopubliclibrary.ca

SIGNATURE

Jane Pyper
City Librarian