

National Joint City Delivery
Committee Meeting
Wednesday, November 16, 1983

Present for Management

Robert Yoder, Labor Relations Department
Steve Furgeson, Labor Relations Department
Charles Edmiston, III, Delivery Services Department
Harvey White, Labor Relations Department
Robert Eugene, Labor Relations Department

Present for NALC

Joseph Johnson, Director, City Delivery Craft
Ed Masiello, Boston, Massachusetts
Richard Winter, Wichita, Kansas
Efren Barron, Los Angeles, California
Jerry Kerner, Baltimore, Maryland
J. G. Arrambide, El Paso, Texas

The union asked why the APMG for Delivery Services was not present at the meeting, and why management had not submitted agenda items. While having had no agenda items to augment those submitted by the union, management explained that it would be willing to discuss all matters which arose at the meeting. The APMG was on a travel assignment but is under no obligation to attend meetings of this committee.

It was established during the initial discussion that the union would be adding an agenda item on pivoting (Item 1) and that the November 17 meeting would begin at 9:30 a.m. at NALC Headquarters.

Procedural requirements for delivery of marriage mail, such as USPS delivery policy when mailings arrive without the detached labels, were discussed at length.

The union said very little has been published on procedures for handling marriage mail, and wanted to know what happens when detached labels or the mailings arrive at the delivery post office at different times. Management responded that, as a common sense matter, the detached label should not be sent out until the mail piece arrives and vice versa.

The union indicated that some postmasters have sent out mailings before the detached labels arrived and this created problems when the labels were delivered later and customers asked carriers where the mail piece was. Management reiterated its position that the detached labels and the marriage mail pieces should always be delivered together. The union suggested something be put in the Postal Bulletin showing examples of marriage mail with procedures outlining the proper handling of such items.

The union asked whether there are restrictions on the dimensions of marriage mail. The answer, which was deferred pending additional review, is as follows:

There is no maximum size for single piece third-class mail, as provided in 651.211 Domestic Mail Manual (DMM). Minimum size standards for third-class mail are described in 651.212 DMM.

The union asked whether a simplified address, i.e., postal customer, can be used by all mailers. The answer, which was deferred pending additional review, is as follows:

No. Simplified address, or other exceptional forms of address, may be used only as described in 122.4 DMM.

The union asked whether addressed pieces of marriage mail are to be handled as a "third bundle." Management replied that marriage mail pieces bearing an address should be sequenced/collated with regular mail.

The union asked whether there is any regulation relative to folding newspapers. The answer, which was deferred pending additional review, is as follows: Publishers are encouraged, as set forth in 454.2 DMM, to fold publications to a size not larger than 11 3/4 by 14 1/2 inches when practical.

-4-

The union asked whether the use of detached labels on second-class mail, i.e., newspapers, is permissible. The answer, which was deferred pending additional review, is as follows:

No. Addressing requirements for second-class mail are found in Section 452 DMM, and specify that each piece, including the top copy of a firm package, must bear the name and address of the subscriber.

The union commented that a dispute over the use of detached labels, specifically their being delivered on curb line routes without having been cased, is being reviewed at USPS headquarters. NALC calls this a fourth bundle, while management regards it as a third bundle.

There was some discussion about whether the preparation of simplified address mail for delivery should be performed in the office or on the street. Management said it did not see a problem with whether the preparation for delivery is accomplished in the office or on the street, so long as the preparation time was credited somewhere, either as office time or as street time.

The union asked how marriage mail volume is recorded. This was followed by discussion of some carriers reportedly having been disciplined for expanding their street time. Apparently, a problem exists in that a record of the marriage mail delivered was unavailable for use in preparing a rebuttal in such cases. Management said that marriage mail should be recorded for each route. Managers should be contacting the carrier to determine the volume. Marriage mail is counted as "uncased" or "noncased" mail, per route, and is not identified under the specific heading of marriage mail.

There was much discussion about local management having been authorized to use locally developed methods for establishing and changing reference volume figures. The union indicated that the calculation of reference volumes was one of the most controversial issues it is facing. The union holds that the validity of locally developed reference volumes is questionable, and that some local managers increase reference volumes of individual carriers as a form of harrassment.

-6-

Management responded that it has not developed any one "best way" to calculate reference volume, and that the union previously has been invited to provide input on how reference volume could best be calculated. Local managers have been authorized to develop reference volumes using any of several nationally approved methods. The recourse for carriers unable to resolve disputes with their supervisors over the validity of reference volumes established for routes they serve is to request a special inspection provided the criteria in 270 of Handbok M-39 are met.

There was much discussion about discipline for street expansion resulting from the reference volume issue, and about not using reference volume as the "sole basis" for discipline. Management responded that reference volume, standing alone, without additional evidence to substantiate wrongful expansion of street time could not sustain a disciplinary action.

The union would like to see the matter resolved by identifying problem offices and conducting new route inspections resulting in a new Form 1840. In addition, the union said that the Regions should take a closer look at

reference volume grievances, and that it would send in examples of discipline cases to demonstrate how local managers have relied on reference volumes to support charges of expanding street time.

The union asked if management could legitimately make a minor adjustment to a route based only on information recorded on Form 3999 as the result of a one-day walk with the carrier. Management said minor adjustments should not be based solely on Form 3999 information, but should also include review and analysis of other current information such as, DUVRS, Form 3996, 1571, etc., concerning the route being considered for adjustment.

A union question as to whether there is an official definition of the specific amount of time which constitutes a "minor adjustment," was answered in the negative.