

CPC	CUPW
Daniel Gilbert	Sylvain Sicotte
Virginie Tremblay	Alvaro De la Cruz
Danny Goddu	Enrika Beaujour
	Terry MacDonald

Advisor	Audrey Labout
---------	---------------

Location: The consultation took place via virtual conference

Start Time: 11:05am EST

End Time: 11:55am EST

CPC introduced the “Two-people in vehicle accommodation option” pilot initiative, for which information was emailed to the CUPW NJHSC on October 2, 2026. Starting on October 5, 2026 at selected sites in Collection & Delivery, the pilot will continue until the end of the first quarter of 2027. It aims to formalize and expand an accommodation practice already in used in many locations in order to ensure a more uniform and standardized approach.

CUPW indicated that they should have been consulted with and involved in this initiative. This is not a process that CPC should do unilaterally. While CUPW is open to supporting the offer of this accommodation option, they emphasized the importance of prior consultation to identify potential issues before implementation.

CPC explained that the pilot is meant to standardize existing practices, starts small in order to gather feedback, evaluate results and learn from them. The assignment of two people to a vehicle is not a new practice at Canada Post, already used in peer training and driver training.

When asked by CUPW which employee will be accommodated under this pilot project, CPC stated that it is expected to generally be the driver, since most of the restrictions are related to lifting, walking or standing. The other employee will make the deliveries. Depending on their restrictions, the accommodated employee may perform other tasks; otherwise, they will be limited to driving.

CUPW raised the risk of distraction from having a second person in the vehicle. CPC indicated that the limited scope of the project will allow for the evaluation of various scenarios and lessons learned. Operations teams, who are familiar with their staff, will develop appropriate matches for their locations. They shall ensure that the driver holds a driving license, has received the required training and is fit to drive.

CUPW asked where the project will be implemented first. CPC answered that five sites per region, with two-seat vehicles, were selected. The sites shared on October 2 are as follows:

Atlantic / Atlantique

- Halifax 1
- Dartmouth
- St-John's
- St-John
- Dieppe

Quebec / Québec

- Chabanel
- Bridge
- Aéroport
- Pt-Aux Trembles
- Hymus

Ontario

- Lancaster
- Barrie
- Thunder Bay
- Hamilton East
- London LCD 1

GTA

- Transportation
- 340 Matheson
- Hale Brampton)
- 66 Ray
- Portlands

Prairies

- East Delivery Calgary
- Northwest Del. Calgary
- ~~Church~~ - removed and replaced by Muray (Winnipeg) on October 9
- Red Deer (Alberta)
- E.D.D.D. (Edmonton)

Pacific / Pacifique

- Surrey A
- Surrey 2
- Victoria 4
- Glanford 3&9
- Saanich

CUPW asked if LJHSCs would be involved in the pilot. CPC replied that they would be informed and that Operations had also been instructed to consult with local union representatives. CUPW reiterated its support for such initiative, while expressing reservations about some aspects of the launch process and protocols. They plan to raise the issue at the national consultation on October 20.

CUPW noted that these topics had previously been discussed in the National DM Committee and asked if the Corporation would discontinue this committee. CPC acknowledged that the selection of the appropriate forum—National Consultation, NJHSC or DM Committee—had been confusing in the past. CPC indicated that the DM committee has been on hold for some time now, and is expected to resume its activities, but there are no timelines known at this time.

CUPW asked if a survey would be conducted during the pilot project. CPC indicated that no survey was planned at this time. They noted that accommodating employees is part of the employer's responsibilities and that this initiative considers the growth of motorized delivery activities and new delivery operations.

CUPW asked how the routes would be selected and how an employee's refusal to be accompanied by a person with accommodation would be handled.

CPC clarified that they would not impose any route selection method. The local Operations team leaders will determine the route based on local dynamics and accommodation needs. The initiative could also provide opportunities for coaching by a peer trainer or LJHSC member.

CUPW asked if an employee who refused to be matched could face disciplinary action. CPC confirmed that this was not the intent of the initiative and requested to be notified immediately of any such situation.

The union indicated that this type of accommodation had already been refused in some sites when it was proposed by local union representatives to local management. CPC recognized this, which is why the pilot aims to provide a more consistent and standardized approach.

CUPW asked whether driver training addresses having two employees in the same vehicle; CPC will verify. They specified that the designated driver will be responsible for the pre-trip inspection of the vehicle. CUPW asked that this responsibility be clearly communicated to employees.

CUPW asked what medical questionnaire would be required for this accommodation.

CPC indicated that when such accommodation is considered, the standard form, including a list of accommodation options, is forwarded to the practitioner who may specify the driving duties in the "other" section.

CUPW noted that the form can be difficult to understand for practitioners but also for employees and suggested clarifying it in pilot sites. CPC agreed to consider this suggestion but stated that no changes to the standardized national form were planned at this time.

CUPW emphasized the need to clearly define the tasks allowed for accommodated employees, consult with local unions in accordance with Article 54 and take into account the delays in obtaining the medical form.

CPC replied that, indeed, the tasks must be approved by a practitioner in order to proceed with accommodation. They also asked the team leaders to discuss with the two employees and clarify each person's responsibilities and tasks before departure.

CUPW pointed out that the match of two employees must not create a way to complete the route faster or be used to target an employee working overtime.

CUPW mentioned that if the project could start with employees having already validated medical restrictions to expedite. CPC indicated that this possibility was not excluded, but that no accommodation at a driving position should be implemented without medical validation by the practitioner.

CUPW stated that this type of accommodation should not be offered to employees other than Group 2, such as PO4s, who have previously performed Group 2 duties and may have driven CPC vehicles. CPC confirmed that no transfers between groups would be made and that employees would remain in their regular duties.

The union indicated that local consultations had already begun and that a Q&A document mentioning a tracking tool used by team leaders had been sent to them. They requested to receive this tracking tool.

CPC explained that it is a summary digital form indicating the count of people accommodated and the count of people accommodated using the two-person option in a vehicle. CPC will forward the intake form to CUPW for visibility. CPC also committed to present the results of the pilot project to the NJHSC at the February 2027 meeting.

CUPW asked how routes and tasks would be assigned locally, as well as what happens if the accommodated employee's participation in deliveries resulted in an early end of day.

CPC reiterated that no national criteria had been established and that Local Operations would determine the terms based on their knowledge of staff. According to CUPW, CPC should establish national guidelines to prevent workplace conflict. CPC responded that they will evaluate the implementation after a few weeks and provide further guidance as needed.

CUPW required that an employee's refusal to be accompanied by a person accommodated be respected. CPC has noted the point and will forward it to Operations. CUPW also cautioned that it doesn't want this pilot to be used as an opportunity for CPC to say that an employee refused accommodation. CPC said that is not the intent of this pilot.

Finally, CUPW asked if there is a list of all LJHSC co-chairs in My CareConnect and how they can access it. CPC indicated that they currently perform an extraction of management LJHSCs co-chairs to issue the quarterly communication to their corporate email address. They will forward the current list to CUPW and discuss its update at the next NJHSC meeting in November.

Meeting ended.

Action points:

- CPC to share the pilot tracking tool for team leaders.
- CPC to share the list of LJHSC co-chairs.