

**In the Matter of an Interest Arbitration
Under the *Fire Protection and Prevention Act, 1997***

BETWEEN:

THE MUNICIPALITY OF CHATHAM-KENT

(the "Municipality")

AND

CHATHAM-KENT PROFESSIONAL FIRE FIGHTERS ASSOCIATION

(the "Association")

BEFORE: Eli A. Gedalof, Sole Arbitrator

APPEARANCES

For the Municipality

Mark Mason, Counsel, Hicks Morley LLP
Jamie Burns, Counsel, Hicks Morley LLP
Georgina Feys, Manager, Labour Relations
Chris Case, Fire Chief
John Praill, Assistant Chief of Operations
Adam Walters, Assistant Chief of Logistics
Ken Labonte, Assistant Chief of Prevention & Community Safety
Sean McRoberts, Assistant Chief of Training & Safety

For the Association

Mr. Jeffrey Sack K.C., Counsel, Jeffrey Sack Law
Mr. Wassim Garzouzi, Counsel, RavenLaw LLP
Mr. Kevin Meyers IAFF Advocate
Mr. Kyle Sleightholm President/Bargaining Committee Chair
Ms. Allison Griffis VP/Bargaining Committee
Ms. Whitney Burk Secretary/Bargaining Committee
Mr. Bobby Wooldridge Treasurer/Bargaining Committee
Mr. Ryan King Steward/Bargaining Committee
Mr. Devon Taylor Executive Board Member

AWARD

INTRODUCTION

1. This is an interest arbitration, duly referred to me under the *Fire Prevention and Protection Act, 1997* (the “Act”), to settle the terms of renewal for the parties’ collective agreement that expired on December 31, 2020. The Municipality of Chatham-Kent is located in Southwestern Ontario between London and Windsor, with a population of approximately 104,316 people. The Association represents a bargaining unit of approximately 72 full-time career firefighters across three stations. Fire services in the Municipality are provided by a composite fire department that also includes approximately 357 volunteer firefighters.

2. The matter proceeded as a mediation-arbitration in accordance with ss.50.2(2) of the *Act*. Approximately five years have passed since the expiry of the parties’ last collective agreement. The parties exchanged initial proposals in March of 2021 and began bargaining in August of 2021. When the parties were not able to reach an agreement, the matter was referred to interest arbitration before a different arbitrator on November 18, 2021. The parties then engaged in ongoing mediation-arbitration before that arbitrator until August of 2024, when that arbitrator recused himself. Further delay was occasioned through the process of my appointment, a second hearing with updated materials, and further and ongoing mediated discussions with this arbitrator.

3. In light of the delay in concluding this matter, on December 4, 2024 I issued an interim award providing for wage increases based on the Municipality’s proposal. The following across the board increases have already been implemented, without prejudice to either party’s position as to whether any further wage increases are warranted:

January 1, 2021—2.0%

January 1, 2022—2.5%

January 1, 2023—2.5%

January 1, 2024—2.5%

4. I note that notwithstanding that the collective agreement arising from this award will have a four-year term, that agreement has already expired.

ISSUES AND ANALYSIS

5. Despite the length of the process leading up to this award, the parties have not resolved many issues in dispute, although a small number of proposals were withdrawn. I also summarize below the parties' positions with respect to ten Letters of Understanding (LOUs), some of which are agreed. Among the most contentious issues, in addition to wages, the Association seeks to incorporate the 24-hour shift schedule into the collective agreement, in conjunction with reducing the Resource Float Pool from 5 firefighters to 1. The Resource Float Pool was implemented in conjunction with and in order to overcome operational concerns/challenges identified in implementation of the 24-hour shift pattern, and the City strongly objects to incorporating one without the other.

6. The remaining Association proposals include wage increases and increases to the differentials for senior captains, captains, training officers and fire prevention officers. They also include a variety of benefit improvements and changes to the benefit provisions, including but not limited to changes with respect to the retiree health care spending account ("HCSA") and line of duty death benefits. The Association also seeks an additional statutory holiday, improved WSIB top up, introduction of a points system for uniforms and provision of leather structural boots, and reimbursement for the DZ license medical exam.

7. In addition to its own wage proposal, the Municipality proposes numerous changes to Article 5, ranging from housekeeping to substantial changes affecting examinations, probationary periods, training/promotions, seniority and transfers out of the bargaining unit. It also seeks amendments to: Article 7 to clarify that employees promoted while on extended sick leave will only receive the promotional increase upon return to work, Article 10 to confirm that employees electing to receive 61 weeks of parental benefits receive a supplemental unemployment benefit equal to the 35 week benefit, but distributed over the longer period, Article 12 to delete insulated vests from the uniform provision and Article 14 technological change to limit and clarify the scope of the provision.

8. There are 10 LOUs between parties and I summarize their positions as follows:

#	Subject	Assoc. Position	Mun. Position
1	O.H.I.P. Coverage	Entrench in CA	Delete
2	Use of Volunteers	Renew Schedule "A"	Renew Schedule "A"
3	Fire Ops. Committee	Delete	Delete
4	Dispatchers	Entrench in CA	Entrench in CA
5	Fire Prevention Vehicles	Delete	Delete
6	Ontario Fire College	Renew	Delete
7	Ass. Attendance OPFFA/IAFF	Revise to reflect 24-hour shifts and entrench in CA	Delete
8	Hrs. of Work-Training Officers	Entrench in CA	Entrench in CA
9	24-Hour Shifts	Revise vacation, resource float pool and training provisions and entrench in CA	Remove redundant or out-of-date language and renew
10	Fire Investigations	Amend to remove reference to benchmarks and Entrench in CA	Amend to remove redundant or out-of-date language and entrench in CA

9. In assessing the parties' proposals, I have considered the following criteria, stipulated at s.50.5(2) of the *Act*:

In making a decision, the arbitrator shall take into consideration all factors the arbitrator considers relevant, including the following criteria:

1. A comparison, as between the employees and other employees in the public and private sectors, of the terms and conditions of employment.
2. A comparison of collective bargaining settlements reached in the same municipality and in comparable municipalities, including those reached by employees in bargaining units to which the *Labour Relations Act, 1995* applies, having regard to the relative economic health of the municipalities.
3. The economic health of Ontario and the municipality, including, but not limited to, changes to labour market characteristics, property tax characteristics and socio-economic characteristics.
4. The employer's ability to attract and retain qualified firefighters.
5. The interest and welfare of the community served by the fire department.
6. Any local factors affecting the community.

10. I have also applied the established principles of interest arbitration, including the principles of demonstrated need, total compensation,

incrementalism and, first and foremost, the principle of replication. The overarching goal in interest arbitration is to replicate the collective agreement that these parties would most likely have reached had they been able to settle in free collective bargaining. In seeking to replicate free collective bargaining, interest arbitrators look to comparable outcomes, as is also reflected in s.50.5(2)1 and 2 of the Act.

11. As is often the case, the parties join issue over which bargaining relationships provide the strongest comparators. The Municipality highlights a group of 10 municipalities with composite fire departments and populations between 42,840 and 256,885 people, including several in the Northern and Eastern parts of the Province. First and foremost, however, the Municipality submits that wages ought to mirror local police, as these parties have a long and unbroken history of matching police and fire wages. The Association proposes its own list of 7 comparators, all of which employ professional firefighters with IAFF affiliated locals. It also references the Chatham-Kent police agreement, although it submits that it ought to be given less weight at this time given how circumstances have changed since the police agreement for the years in issue was reached on October 28, 2021.

12. In this case, there can be no doubt that historically the local police comparator has had a powerful influence over collective bargaining between these parties. Indeed, it has generally been determinative. There is a long history of precisely matching wages, and these parties have agreed to “me too” agreements in the past. The challenge in this case is that the local police agreement for the years 2021-2025 was reached in October of 2021. The initial hearing in this matter before this arbitrator took place near the end of 2024, and mediated discussions have continued through 2025 and into 2026. Much has changed over the intervening period.

13. As I discussed in *The Corporation of the Town of Caledon and The Caledon Professional Fire Fighters’ Association*, 2025 CanLII 95174 (ON LA) (“*Caledon*”) at paras. 7-10, the collective bargaining landscape in the fire sector (and the police sector for that matter) has changed dramatically since the outset of the term of the Collective Agreement in issue here. Inflation, which spiked in 2022 and has only recently returned closer to targeted norms, has had an outsized impact on settlements. This has resulted in significant differences in outcome based in part on the timing of settlement, including

where this has resulted in diverging from otherwise well-established comparators. As I also held in *Caledon*, however, this does not mean that local or similarly situated municipal comparators are not important. Indeed, s.55.5(2)2 of the *Act* requires that interest arbitrators compare collective bargaining settlements reached in the same municipality and in comparable municipalities. But these outcomes must be balanced against changing economic circumstances and emerging bargaining patterns in seeking to replicate a freely bargained outcome.

14. Interest arbitrators in the fire sector have repeatedly addressed the relationship between police and fire comparators, and the significance of established police comparators in light of changing circumstances. In broad terms, arbitrators have recognized that established local police comparators are highly influential and ought not to be lightly set aside. This is particularly true in the instant case, where police/fire parity has been so consistent for so long. But it is equally well-established that police rates should not be considered to the complete exclusion of other relevant fire sector comparators. The history of these awards is well-summarized by Arbitrator Hayes in *The Corporation of the City of Guelph and The Guelph Professional Firefighters Association Local 467, International Association of Firefighters*, 2017 CanLII 7602 (ON LA) ("*City of Guelph*"). In that case, as here in respect of the local police agreement, more recent fire settlements in the province, including freely bargained outcomes, had run "appreciably ahead of police wage rates" (para. 5). Arbitrator Hayes summarized the relevant prior awards as follows (at paras. 15-20):

15. Arbitrators have also made clear that the salaries paid to other fire comparators should be considered whether or not there is a local police/local fire salary relationship that has been established for a lengthy period. Arbitrator Burkett, as he did in *City of Toronto*, made the point this way:

Finally, while the local police comparator is used in fire service interest arbitration to assess the merits of a demand for a salary increase, so also the salaries paid to comparator fire services are to be taken into account. Both terms of reference are relevant, not for the purpose of allowing one side or the other to cherry-pick either the highest or the lowest, but rather to ensure that in any given round the fire service salaries are fairly adjusted.

City of Kingston, November 23, 2011, at pp. 3-4

16. Arbitrators have been prepared to deviate from a settled local fire/local police pattern and, where appropriate, have awarded fire salaries *above* those obtained by local police. Arbitrator Burkett did so in *City of Kingston* on the basis that fire comparisons dictated such a result, on the facts before him, notwithstanding prior local fire/police parity:

...we have looked at the average of the fire service comparators from 2005 through to the available salary data for 2011 and at the police salaries from 2005 through 2011. It is to be noted that for the period 2005-2008 inclusive, immediately prior to the term with which we are concerned, there existed a dollar-for-dollar parity relationship between Kingston police and Kingston fire salaries. Given all of the foregoing, we have decided to award salaries for a term that extends through 2011 that provide for annual end rates that are above the police annual end rates and thereby are closer to the historical average fire service comparator annual end rates.

City of Kingston, November 23, 2011 at p. 4

17. Arbitrator Swan in *City of Thunder Bay* did likewise. Mr. Swan awarded a fire premium over police salaries recognizing that, even with this premium, fire wages would slip behind those obtained by traditional fire comparators. He sought to achieve a balance:

We have considered the evidence presented to us very carefully, and we observe that the police-fire comparison, which has held so closely for so long, ought not lightly to be disturbed...

(at p. 5)

This increase still involves some slippage between the firefighters and their traditional comparators in other fire departments, but keeps that slippage to a minimum. At the same time it maintains a premium over parity with the police force...

(at p. 7)

City of Thunder Bay, November 23, 1993

18. Arbitrators have also departed from local fire/police parity and awarded fire salaries *below* those obtained by police. Arbitrator Teplitsky explained:

On the other hand, earlier this year, in an award between the Sudbury Firefighters and the Corporation of the City of Sudbury, I distinguished the Windsor Police award because the evidence disclosed a significant moderation of wage demands by a large segment of the Sudbury community. That evidence was sufficient to persuade me in the exercise of

my discretion to rupture the parity with police which the firefighters had recently achieved through a voluntary Collective Agreement.
City of Windsor, September 17, 1982 at p. 6

19. There have also been previous examples where a practice has developed of *blending* comparator fire and police rates for the purpose of setting fire salaries. See, for example, *City of Mississauga* where Arbitrator Swan observed:

These parties have had a long standing agreement that the appropriate salary level at the First Class Fire Fighter level should be the average of the equivalent rates for the Toronto Fire and the First Class Constable rate for Peel Regional Police. We understand this to have been in effect for at least a decade, and we see no reason to change the relationship in this award.
City of Mississauga, October 30, 2014, at p. 2

20. Arbitrator McLaren concluded similarly in *Town of Markham* where he awarded salaries based upon a mix of fire comparators with the York Regional Police:

There is no direct comparability established by the data. There is a close approximation or reasonably close comparison, between the Markham Fire Fighters and those of the nearby municipalities and the regional police. The Board has determined its wage increases by examining the close approximation in order to maintain reasonably close and comparable end rates. The general approach has been to take the mid point of the average of the three fire fighter municipalities and that of the Regional Police.

Town of Markham, May 13, 1998, at p. 4

15. Arbitrator Hayes then summarized his own approach, with which I agree, as follows (paras. 22-25):

22. Evidence concerning non-fire/non-police bargaining units will be of marginal utility given the very different duties and responsibilities discharged by police and firefighters. We do not see that this case provides reason to revisit this issue and, in any event, see no cause to do so.

23. Evidence concerning firefighter comparators will always be highly relevant. The 'nuts and bolts' of fire interest arbitration invariably require close consideration of firefighter comparators, issue by issue.

24. Relevant police agreements also serve as persuasive points of comparison particularly on the question of wages. However, any conclusion that fire should always follow police is not supportable. If that were true, collective bargaining in the fire sector would be effectively eliminated. The FPPA guarantees a role for principals in the sector. That role is protected by access to unfettered interest arbitration subject only to legislated principles.

25. Interest arbitrators should respect an established pattern accepted by the parties themselves, including one of local police parity. But, while respect for previous practice should be anticipated, arbitrators “are not required to give the same weight to a particular comparable that another arbitrator gave in another round of bargaining” (Participating Nursing Homes, at para. 20). An arbitrator must be prepared to modify a prior practice should some adjustment be required to respond to a significant presenting factor, a factor that might include reference to comparable fire collective agreement(s) freely negotiated elsewhere. [emphasis added]

16. I have applied this approach in assessing the comparators before me. In doing so, I recognize, as the Municipality argues, that Section 50.5(2) of the *Act* requires that the interest arbitrator look beyond only fire sector comparators. But in this case, fire sector comparators overwhelmingly support the need to diverge from the local police comparator in this round of bargaining. This is the case even if one restricted one’s view to the comparators identified by the Municipality. For example, the Municipality identifies Belleville, with a population of just over half the size of Chatham-Kent, as a relevant comparator. In 2020, the final year of the expired collective agreement in issue here, the annual salary for a first class firefighter in Belleville was \$1,635 ahead of Chatham-Kent. From 2021 to 2023 the gap between the Belleville fire and Chatham-Kent police rates closed to within \$352.¹ The more recently bargained 2024 rate for Belleville, however, is \$112,840 as compared to \$109,993 for the Chatham-Kent Police in that year. To follow the police comparator established in 2021 now would result in a

¹ The Belleville fire wage rates for the period January 1, 2018 to December 31, 2023 were awarded in *Belleville (City) v Belleville Professional Fire Fighters’ Association*, 2022 CanLII 101360 (ON LA)(Mitchnick).

substantially larger delta of \$2,847 as between Chatham-Kent and Belleville firefighters.

17. By further example, the Association identifies Sault St. Marie, which has a similarly sized fire service, as an important comparator. Chatham-Kent has more typically trailed Sault St. Marie and the delta has varied over time, but in 2020 the wage rates were identical. The 2024 rate in Sault St. Marie is \$113,500, or \$3,507 more than the Chatham-Kent police for that year. A delta of that magnitude would be unprecedented within the data set provided by the parties.

18. This same pattern is repeated across all of both the Municipality's and the Association's comparators, except where settlements were reached much earlier in the bargaining cycle. More recent settlements reflect an upward trend in wages. In short, to follow the local police comparator now would place Chatham-Kent firefighters out of step with their closest fire sector comparators to an unprecedented degree. As Arbitrator Stout held in *City of Thunder Bay and Thunder Bay Professional Firefighters' Association, Local 193 of the International Fire Fighters' Association*, 2025 CanLII 13074 (ON LA), facing somewhat similar circumstances, a fair and equitable wage award should reflect the historical relationship with the local police comparator, but "as modified by the provincial fire landscape". The award below aims to strike that balance.

19. The other key issue over which the parties join issue is the status of the resource float pool. The resource float pool is unique to Chatham-Kent. It is composed of five firefighters. These firefighters are not assigned to a specific platoon and do not have a fixed schedule. While it is true that they can often predict when they will be required to work based on posted schedules, scheduling demands can and do change. Subject to scheduled vacation and 10 additional "grace days", float pool firefighters must be available to be called in to provide coverage where needed. The resource float pool was implemented as a *quid pro quo* to trialling the 24-hour shift provisions and was intended to address the Municipality's concerns about coverage.

20. The Association seeks to entrench the 24-hour shift provisions in the collective agreement, in conjunction with reducing the number of firefighters in the resource float pool to 1 and capping the number of 24-hour shifts in a

28-day cycle. In the Association's submission, the resource float pool is unnecessary, unprecedented, undermines training opportunities for junior firefighters, and is being operated in a manner that violates the hours of work and overtime provisions of the collective agreement, the *Act* and the interest award that gave rise to its initial trial. The Municipality submits that the creation of the float pool was a key element in what was effectively an agreement to implement the 24-hour shift provisions. It would not be proper, it submits, to enshrine the benefit of the 24-hour shift provisions into the collective agreement without also including this critical *quid pro quo*. It also disputes that working as part of the pool negatively impacts training and crew effectiveness. It submits that for every negative issue identified by the Association the float pool scheduling model offers an opposing benefit in maintaining it.

21. But for the resource float pool issue, the Association makes a compelling case for entrenching the 24-hour shift schedule into the collective agreement. The 24-hour schedule is the norm amongst comparator fire services. The parties have now had years of experience operating under this schedule and they are well beyond the trial stage. However, I am not satisfied on the basis of the materials before me that the Association has made a case for dramatically reducing the float pool to a single firefighter, at least at this time.

22. Where parties have bargained (or been awarded) a *quid pro quo* in conjunction with a major change in their bargain, as occurred here, an interest arbitrator should be cautious in altering that balance without a compelling reason or some comparable offset. The Association's position has evolved over the lengthy period of mediation arbitration. In its most recent submission, it has alleged that the manner in which the resource float pool is being operated raises "blatant illegalities" and is in breach of the Collective Agreement, the *Fire Protection and Prevention Act* and Arbitrator Etherington's award implementing the 24-hour shift schedule and the resource float pool. It has filed a grievance dated September 15, 2025 seeking to remedy these alleged breaches. The issues raised by the Association are serious. But it remains unclear whether the alleged breaches, if they are indeed occurring, arise from anything inherent in the resource float pool model, or rather from the manner in which it is being operated. That is a determination better made in a rights arbitration, where both parties will have a robust opportunity to present their

case. The outcome of a rights arbitration may of course be relevant to future collective bargaining.

23. To be clear, the Association's arguments against maintaining the resource float pool are not limited to alleged breaches and "illegalities". It also argues that the scheduling uncertainty and demands placed on members of the resource pool are excessive and unfair, impact retention and the development of new firefighters, and are unnecessary in providing coverage under a 24-hour shift model. The Municipality denies that these are issues and points to development advantages that arise from working with different crews. LOU #9 contemplates that the parties will continue to discuss and work through these issues. In my view, before substantially altering the balance of interest in the parties' existing bargain, they should have an opportunity to revisit the issue in the next round of bargaining, perhaps with the benefit of a determination or settlement of the ongoing rights dispute. Failing agreement, the issue can of course be brought back to interest arbitration, in circumstances where the agreement arising from this award has already expired. In the result, I am awarding the renewal of LOU#9, subject to housekeeping changes which I remit to the parties.

24. In respect of the Municipalities' proposals, I note that there are several areas where the parties may be close to agreement, but which would benefit from further discussion. As the parties will immediately be in a position to begin bargaining the next agreement, I will not comment on most of these issues further. I note, however, that the Association indicated a conditional willingness to accept the Municipality's Article 7.07 proposal, which addresses the circumstance where an individual is promoted while on an extended sick leave. In particular, the Association indicated that it would not oppose the proposal subject to the Municipality confirming that it will continue its current practice of temporarily promoting the next active individual in line to fill the position. The Municipality provided that confirmation on page 36 of its reply brief, and I have awarded the Municipality's Article 7.07 proposal on that basis. I have also awarded other minor changes that were not controversial.

25. The balance of the award grants normative and incremental improvements to existing benefits, in line with the comparator data and sectoral norms and the principles of replication, gradualism and total compensation. I note that while there are comparators for further changes to

the total compensation package, there are limits to what can be achieved in a single round of collective bargaining. I have not commented on every proposal that has not been awarded, preferring to allow both parties to “keep their powder dry” into the next round of bargaining.

PROVISIONS AWARD

26. For all of these reasons, the renewal collective agreement shall consist of the expired terms as amended by any previously agreed-to items and the following additional terms. All proposals not specifically addressed are deemed dismissed:

Term—4 years (January 1, 2021-December 31, 2024)

Wages

Wage increases are effective and retroactive as follows, inclusive of interim award:

January 1, 2021-\$101,901

January 1, 2022-\$104,958

January 1, 2023-\$108,106

January 1, 2024-\$111,249

Wage Differentials

Effective and retroactive to January 1, 2023:

- Captain, Training Officer and Fire Prevention Officer to 117%
- Senior Captain to 122%

Effective and retroactive to January 1, 2024

- Captain, Training Officer and Fire Prevention Officer to 119%
- Senior Captain to 124%

Benefits

Changes to benefits shall be implemented as soon as practicable following date of award:

- Increase Vision to \$650
- Increase paramedical benefit to \$850 per practitioner
- Replace existing clinical psychologist paramedical benefit with the following mental health benefit as per Association proposal: Clinical Psychologist or Counsellor with a Masters of Social Work – 100% coverage to a maximum of \$4500.
- Life insurance: increase maximum to \$300,000
- AD&D: Amend AD&D provision as follows:

e) AD&D

Two point five (2.5) times annual salary to a maximum of \$300,000.

AD&D benefit to include line of duty death due to occupational disease, whether or not death occurs during or following active employment, as determined by the Workplace Safety and Insurance Board.

- Health Care Spending Account: Amend Provision as follows (struck out language not to be included in collective agreement):

iii) Health Care Spending Account:

ELIGIBILITY: For members retiring on an unreduced OMERS pension, the Municipality shall, consistent with the rules and regulations of the plan, provide for a Health Care Spending Account commencing at the age of sixty five (65) and ending at the age of seventy five (75).

BENEFIT: Effective January 1, 2026, \$2600 will be provided and any unused credits can be carried forward for one year. Eligible claims will be claimed against prior year's credits before current year credits are accessed. Any prior year unclaimed credits at the end of the subsequent year will be lost.

~~Effective January 1, 2019, \$1,800 will be provided Effective January 1, 2020, \$1,900 will be provided~~

[Rest of provision to remain as is]

New Article 7.07 as follows:

7.07 Individuals that are on an extended sick leave, may qualify for promotion, but will not receive the rate of pay for the position, until they are able to return to work and perform the expected duties of the position.

Amend Article 10.01 and 10.02 a) and b) as follows:

10.01 Pregnancy **and parental** leave shall be in accordance with the pregnancy and parental leave as set out by the Employment Standards Act.

10.02 During pregnancy and/or parental leave(s), the Municipality shall provide a Supplementary Employment Insurance Benefit (E.I.) Plan as follows:

a) While collecting Employment Insurance Benefits (E.I.) for 15 weeks pregnancy leave, or a shorter period if the member returns to work, **the Employer** shall pay the member a rate equivalent to the difference between E.I. pregnancy benefits the member receives and 80% of her regular rate of pay.

b) While collecting Employment Insurance Benefits (E.I.) for 10 weeks parental leave, or a shorter period if the member returns to work, **the Employer** shall pay the member a rate equivalent to the difference between E.I. parental benefits the member receives and 80% of their regular rate of pay.

Vacations

Amend Article 6.03 to increase holidays from twelve (12) days to thirteen (13) days and add Family Day to the list of holidays.

DZ License

Add the following new provision to the Collective Agreement:

The Municipality will reimburse each employee that is required by the employer to maintain a DZ license, up to \$100 to cover the cost of one mandatory medical examination to complete the Ministry of Transportation of Ontario (MTO) Medical Report at each age-based frequency as required by MTO. The employee will be required to provide evidence of payment to be eligible for reimbursement.

Letters of Understanding

Embed the following LOUs into the collective agreement as per the parties' agreement and subject to housekeeping changes:

- LOU#4-Dispatchers
- LOU#8-Hours of Work-Training Officer and Public Educator
- LOU #10-Fire Investigations

Renew the following LOUs subject to housekeeping changes:

- LOU#1-OHIP Coverage
- LOU#2-Use of Volunteer Firefighters (Renew Schedule "A" only as per parties' agreement)
- LOU#6-Ontario Fire College Gravenhurst
- LOU#7-Association Attendance at OPFFA/IAFF Labour Events (Revised to reflect 24-hour shifts)
- LOU#9-24-Hour Shift

Delete the following LOUs:

- LOU#3-Fire Operations Committee
- LOU#5-Fire Prevention Vehicles
- Appendix B-Performance Benchmarks

27. I remain seized with respect to the implementation of this Award and in accordance with ss.50.5(4) of the *Act*.

Dated at Toronto, Ontario, this 6th day of February 2026.

"Eli Gedalof"

Eli A. Gedalof
Sole Arbitrator