

Joint City Delivery  
Committee Meeting

Wednesday, September 25, 1985

Present for Management

Steve Furgeson, Labor Relations Department  
Andrea Wilson, Labor Relations Department  
Tom Lang, Labor Relations Department  
Tom Call, Delivery Services Department  
Michele Denny, Delivery Services Department  
Darvin Schlepitz, Delivery Services Department  
Tony Colatrella, Delivery Services Department  
Jim Nachman, Delivery Services Department

Present for NALC

Joseph Johnson, Director, City Delivery Crafts  
Ed Masiello, Boston, MA  
Jerry Kerner, Baltimore, MD  
J.C. Arrambide, El Paso, TX  
Terry Anderson, San Diego, CA  
Richard Winter, Wichita KS

Management Agenda Items

1. Briefing of current levels of Express Mail performance and a discussion as to what we can do to improve performance.
2. What can be done to meet our service commitment without raising our delivery costs.

A briefing was provided on the current status of Express Mail Service by Jim Nachman. Express Mail service levels dropped in January of this year. At that time, we held onto 36% of the overnight business and we have 24% of the market. A big improvement was made in Express Mail Service by sending Express Mail through a hub center in Houston, Texas.

The main failure being experienced in collecting accurate data on our service is that the carrier is not filling

- 2 -

out the forms properly which may reflect incorrectly that mail was not delivered within the time standard when it actually was delivered. Two critical issues we would like the NALC to emphasize to carriers in their magazine is to underscore carrier commitment to deliver all Express Mail before 3 p.m. and that all forms be filled out correctly.

It was also suggested that the U.S. Postal Service raise the sensitivity and commitment of managers as well.

Other suggestions were that the U.S. Postal Service provide training for new employees, and that they handle Express Mail like registered mail. Tom Call indicated that it would slow down the processing of Express Mail.

The NALC members of the committee expressed concern that CFS units were failing to forward mail expeditiously and were canceling out too many collections. According to J.C. Arrambie, EL Paso, Texas is operating at 23% no record which is requiring additional handling by carriers of time by supervisors. Boston reportedly was delaying CFS forwards several days. Management acknowledge there may be areas where CFS units may not be moving the mail out as quickly as expected. However, overall the service performance was good. Forwarding costs are included in the first class rate of stamps. Management asked to let us know through appropriate channels of CFS unit problems.

NALC expressed concerns as to Collection boxes for local mail - what is policy? Guidelines are in Chapter 3 of Postal Operations Manual. Local postmark requirements and "Local Delivery" boxes are specified under sections 312 and 321, respectively.

3. PS Form 3982 - Is there a better system?

Terry Anderson suggested we adopt the use of color coding of Form 3982, a concept developed through the E.I. process in San Diego, California. Mr. Anderson agreed to send samples to Delivery Services through Joe Johnson. Management agreed to look at that system.

4. One Bundle Single Sliding Case - A short presentation on the case was given to the NALC with an opportunity to view the model of one used in testing.

NALC Agenda Items

1. Alpha Numeric Test Program

There are four offices participating in testing Alpha Numeric Sortation System (ANSS). Three of those offices, Talmadge, Ohio; Aliquippa, Pennsylvania; and Dover, New Hampshire, have manual sortation and the fourth, St. Paul, Minnesota, has a mechanized version. So far the findings are not conclusive. A commitment was made to respond with statistical data before the end of next month. [A meeting was scheduled with Joe Johnson on November 8, 1985 to present further information on ANSS.]

2. Marriage Mail - Simplified Address Mail. [Also management agenda item #4, Marriage mailings with detached labels] - explore the possibility of special holder for address cards so that they will not have to be cased on foot or park and loop routes.

The union raised the issue concerning the procedures carriers should use to handle multiple sets of mailings

- 4 -

on foot park and loop and curb delivery routes. The union's concern is that carriers on park and loop and foot routes are only required to use the two bundle systems.

After lengthy discussion between the USPS and NALC on this subject at this meeting and succeeding discussions and correspondence, it was agreed that the following procedures would be applicable:

When two detached address label card mailings are identically addressed (intended for the same deliveries), and both mailings are to be delivered on the same day, the following preparation and delivery procedures should be used on city delivery foot and park & loop routes.

The address label cards for both mailings are cased, the unaddressed flats for each mailing are collated together and (the appropriate number) placed at the back of the regular flat bundle(s). When the address label cards are delivered, the appropriate unaddressed flat pieces are obtained from the back of the flat bundle and delivered along with the address label cards.

An alternative is to case the address label cards for both mailings, collate the unaddressed flats from one mailing with the regular flats and place (the appropriate number) of unaddressed flats from the remaining mailing at the back of the regular flat bundle(s). When the address label cards are delivered, the appropriate unaddressed flat piece from one mailing is obtained along with the regular

- 5 -

flats and the appropriate unaddressed flat piece from the remaining mailing is obtained from the back of the flat bundle. Both are delivered along with the address label cards. NOTE: If the unaddressed flats represent less than 100% coverage in a swing or relay this alternative is not desirable since it would require the carrier to refer back to the address label cards (that were previously cased) in order to determine the precise deliveries for which the unaddressed flats are intended.

These procedures do not apply in situations where delivery is to apartment buildings, NDCBUS, or other similar central delivery points. In those instances it may not be necessary to collate the unaddressed flat pieces. Additionally, these procedures do not apply on curblines deliveries served by motorized routes or curblines deliveries that may be on a portion of a park & loop route.

With reference to the separating and counting of marriage mail on foot and park and loop routes, the union was advised this issue was addressed in the grievance procedure at Step 4. The decision of the Postal Service was that the counting of mail would normally take place on office time; however, there are instances, depending upon circumstances prevailing at the local office, which may cause management to determine if it would be more efficient to perform this function on the street.

Additional discussions concerning the mail requirements for simplified address mail were addressed. The Postal Service's

response to this topic was that all mailings are subject to the preparation requirements of the Domestic Mail Manual, Part 660.

The feasibility of a holder for address cards to eliminate the casing of address cards on park and loop and foot routes was also discussed. It seemed to be the consensus of the NALC group that such a holder would not be feasible on foot or park and loop routes. However, for curblin delivery routes a possibility exists that some time could be saved with the use of the subject holder. There is currently an employee suggestion pending review on this matter which will be addressed at a later date.

### 3. Multiple Carrier Business Route

The union requested a definition of the Multiple Business Route. The Postal Service reply was that the Multiple Business Route was designed to serve a business area which is presently served by many routes. In order to provide for a more efficient method of mail delivery this concept is being considered. Basically, an industrial area would be isolated and more than one carrier would deliver the mail to the businesses which now require one or more eight hour routes. This would permit the businesses to receive their mail earlier in the day. After the carriers have completed delivery of the business mail they would be utilized the remainder of the work day on "router type" work or on delivery to residential areas.

National Joint City Delivery  
Committee Meeting

Thursday, September 26, 1985  
At NALC Headquarters

Present for Management

Andrea Wilson  
Steve Furgeson  
Tom Lang  
Tom Call  
Michele Denny  
Darvin Schlepitz  
Tony Colatrella

Present for NALC

Joseph Johnson, Director City  
Delivery Craft  
Ed Masiello, Boston, MA  
Jerry Kerner, Baltimore, MD  
J.G. Arrambide, El Paso, TX  
Terry Anderson, San Diego, CA  
Richard Winter, Wichita, KS

Prior to the beginning of the session, Mr. Vincent Sombrotto, President of the NALC, addressed the group regarding some of his ideas on how centralized mark-up service could be improved.

Some discussion was carried over from the day before regarding the procedure to handle marriage mail on park and loop and foot routes. There was also some additional discussion on mail classification requirement for preparation for marriage mail. Management was provided samples of marriage mail from Messrs. Masiello and Arrambide. These samples illustrate handling problems because of small inserts that tend to fall out, and oversize inserts that are also difficult to handle. Samples will be used for discussion at the next meeting of the Mailers Technical Advisory Committee to try to find solutions to the problem. Additionally, he expressed that the Postal Service should be more forthcoming with the NALC about future ideas and programs. We indicated that in the future such a presentation will be made.

NALC Agenda Items

4. Unit and Route Review Process

Explanation was given that the Route and Unit Review process was moving forward in all Regions and to date we have had no reason to believe that progress would not continue to be made and that each Region would implement the annual route and unit review process in accordance with the established guidelines.

Joe Johnson raised his point that reference volumes are way off and there should be more discussion between the carrier and supervisors regarding reference volume. He requested that we define reference volume once again and send out a notice to the field managers to direct the manager as to what is the purpose of reference volumes. (This request was taken under consideration.)

Joe Johnson also inquired as to whether Annual Route and Unit Reviews are able to show performance in Centralized Mark-up Units. CFS as it affects delivery units is reviewed as part of Unit Review process.

5. Temporary Relief by means of "Hand-Off" where interim adjustments are necessary

Joe Johnson indicated there should be some limitation on the term temporary hand-off. No carrier likes putting up another carrier's route.

Management indicated it is difficult, if not impossible, to define what might be temporary in all cases. It all

- 3 -

depends on local conditions. Moreover, management indicated that with the changes to the M-39 Handbook, hand-offs would be one method used for making permanent adjustments on a route. Tom Call indicated to the group that the Postal Service was moving away from the concept of one carrier serving one route.

6. Proper Route Adjustment

There was general discussion as to the meaning of 242.122 of the M-39 Handbook.

7. Establishing and Adjusting Carriers' Street Time

The issue was whether the supervisor could make a minor adjustment to a carrier's route based on one day observation. Management responded that an adjustment should not be based solely on one observation. Consideration of other relevant factors should be included.

The NALC also asked what the national conversion rate was for determining the number of mail pieces per foot. We indicated the national conversions rates were 115 for flats. The programmable calculator which is used for DUVRS calculations uses 195 pieces per foot which averages all mail types (flats, pref. & non-pref letter sizes).