



UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE  
Labor Relations Department  
475 L'Enfant Plaza, SW  
Washington, DC 20260-4100

October 04, 1988

Mr. Brian Farris  
Director, City Delivery  
National Association of  
Letter Carriers, AFL-CIO  
100 Indiana Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20001-2197

Dear Mr. Farris:

Enclosed is a copy of the Minutes of the Joint City Delivery Meeting held April 27 and 28 and follow-up Meetings held to resolve problems resulting from the router program. Should additional discussion be necessary, please contact me at 268-3818.

Sincerely,

*Andrea B. Wilson*  
Andrea B. Wilson  
Labor Relations Executive

cc: Charles Edmiston

National Joint City Delivery Committee  
 April 27, 1988  
 USPS Headquarters

Representing the NALC

Brian Farris, Director, City Delivery  
 Angelo Parker, Branch 496, Richmond, Va.  
 Terry Anderson, Branch 70, San Diego, Calif.  
 Dick Winter, Branch 201, Wichita, Kans.  
 Ed Masiello, Branch 34, Boston, Mass.  
 J. G. Arrimbide, Branch 505, El Paso, Tex.  
 Eloy Valdez Branch 505, El Paso, Tex.

Representing Management

Thomas Call, Delivery Services Department  
 Norman Cloher, Delivery Services Department  
 Charles Edmiston, III, Delivery Services Department  
 Mario Principe, Delivery Services Department  
 Anthony Colatrella, Delivery Services Department  
 Darvin Schlepitz, Delivery Services Department  
 Annamarie Campbell, Delivery Services Department  
 Harvey Moritz, Delivery Services Department  
 Pamela Patrick, Delivery Services Department  
 Gary Infante, Delivery Services Department  
 Andrea Wilson, Labor Relations Department  
 Charles Dudek, Labor Relations Department

Presentations by Members of the Delivery Services Department

Mr. Cloher

Mr. Cloher presented an outline of the "Delivery Management Guide." The Guide will consist of five series and an "Awareness Inventory." The five series are:

1. Day to Day Management;
2. Management Effectiveness;
3. Route Maintenance;
4. Specialized Activities;
5. Case Studies.

Mr. Cloher emphasized that this is not an attempt to rewrite the M-39. The Guide is meant to focus attention on basic management skills. We are trying to upgrade the knowledge of the first line supervisor. Our purpose is to focus on the goals of the organization and to get the supervisors to think about human relations skills. We hope to have the first

draft of series 1 and 2 by June 1, 1988. And we plan to have series 3 and 4 ready by August 1, 1988.

During Mr. Cloher's presentation, Mr. Farris stated that the NALC's main concern was with series 3 and 4, and that the parties really know all about the Router job.

#### Mr. Infante

Mr. Infante spoke on the topic of "Innovations." Our purpose is to tap into our human resources. To do this we have formed innovations teams - two from Headquarters and one from each region. Their main purpose is to decide how we can innovate. Ideas are being generated in the field, but not being communicated through the system. Our major focus will be on the day-to-day things that field units do to deal with the large volume of mail, etc.

We want to identify the good ideas and disseminate them to all other field units that may be able to use them. We will be visiting field installations to discover these ideas and disseminate them. We want to allow field personnel the flexibility to try new ideas.

We don't intend this effort to replace the EI process or the Suggestion Program.

Mr. Farris asked whether craft employees would be involved in this program. Mr. Infante replied the program involves mostly management but there will be open and continuous communication with the NALC.

#### Ms. Patrick

Ms. Patrick spoke on Management's efforts to educate our customers to the specifics of Postal operations. Our objective is to increase the customer's knowledge of our operations. To make them aware of the specific problems some of their mailings create for our delivery operations. We are demonstrating the potential impact of the mail piece design and mail preparation problems to their return on mailing investments. As an end result to these and other actions, we want to see an increase in the quality of their mail preparation.

#### UBBM Hamper Analysis

Industry wanted to get an idea of what the key problems are regarding their mailings. We conducted surveys on 50 Routes (10 per region) from the end of February thru mid-April.

Fifty routes were specified as mixed - apartment and residential. We analyzed a single day's volume of UBBM. We found that out of 3600 pieces of mail that 64.6 percent were in the addressed moved category with valid change of address on file. Thirty-four percent of the UBBM fell into categories such as no apartment number, deceased, etc. Three percent of the UBBM consisted of deliverable as addressed, correctly placed, etc. The industry reaction was one of surprise, it did not confirm their assumptions. They clearly saw the need for attention to addressing and list maintenance.

#### BBM Video

This was prepared to address the problems associated with BBM. It's purpose is to give visibility to specific mail preparation and design problems. It discusses these problems in terms of the impact to the deliverability of their pieces to our delivery operations.

This video will be shown initially at the Los Angeles Forum, and will be made available to all Regions and Divisions.

#### Endorsement and Exceptional Address Specifications

This program is to try to eliminate the current problems with Mailers' endorsements and their use of the exceptional address format. The final version of the endorsement specifications should be sent to the Federal Register within one week. The key changes are: We are going to enforce adherence to the specifications. The word "should" will be replaced with "must" in the text. Acceptance clerks will be trained in the new requirements. We will specify approved abbreviations. We've also specified print size minimums, amount of clear space around endorsements, no reverse printing or brilliantly colored envelopes. Endorsements must be placed at certain locations, if it is not in the required location, it won't be accepted.

There's no allowance for bending the rules. If the endorsement is not proper, it won't be accepted. Compliance will be effective on 11/1/88. We will be training clerks during the interim period.

#### Joint Visits With Mailers to Postal Sites

The Postal Service has conducted two joint visits to postal sites with industry representatives and one joint visit with NALC representatives. We've scheduled more visits to Postal

and industry facilities. The reaction from industry has been encouraging. Mailers have a better understanding of our problems.

Ms. Campbell

Ms. Campbell discussed the Service's efforts to improve the quality of NDCBUs.

Headquarters has been receiving complaints from the field about the poor quality of NDCBUs. Specifically, rust, deterioration, poor paint coverage, etc. We have requested Quality Assurance to investigate these problems.

We have three major manufacturers. There are a total of 12 approved manufactures. Our effort is aimed at getting all manufacturers to comply with the original specs. On March 25, 1988, we stopped purchasing new NDCBUs. We have required our vendors to submit new samples. The three major suppliers all failed to submit acceptable samples. Our plan to correct the problem is:

1. Get the major manufacturers back on line.
2. Get the other nine to submit new samples.
3. Resume purchasing in May 1988. We are working on the reissuance of a specification publication.

We are working on the reissuance of a specification publication.

These are other areas want to address:

1. Develop a model with variable size compartments.
2. Optional front and rear loading of the NDCBUs.
3. Improve the quality of the material.
4. Be more specific regarding the manufacturing process.

We will soon be working on the next generation of NDCBU's. We then plan to develop parcel lockers.

Mr. Moritz

Postal Service plans are to test demand pick-up of Express Mail. Mr. Farris was sent a letter regarding this concept.

Mr. Farris acknowledged that he received the letter, however, he is concerned as to who will be doing the pick-up of the Express Mail.

Mr. Moritz explained that our purpose is to collect data and plan for the best way to get it done. We have to accomplish the expansion of a new service with existing resources. We will use a mix of employees. We are dealing with a short-time frame. From about 2 P.M. to 6 P.M. This is our prime product, and a revenue generator. The purpose of our effort is to get the right information so that we can make an informed decision. We realize that a busy carrier may not be able to make on-demand pick-ups.

The basic concept is that the customer can call as late as 1:00 p.m. in the West and 3:00 P.M. elsewhere, or 3:00 P.M. and 5:-- PM. We have said that we will respond within 2 hours. We want to increase our volume in this area. Seventy-nine percent of our competitors business is on-demand pick-up, the Postal Service has only 2.5 percent of business as on-demand pick up.

We are going to advertise in select markets.

We plan to contact the carriers to make the pick-up using radios, beepers, etc.

We plan to share the test results with the NALC.

**National Joint City Delivery Committee**

April 28, 1988

USPS Headquarters

**Representing the NALC**

Brian Farris, Director, City Delivery  
Angelo Parker, Branch 496, Richmond, Va.  
Terry Anderson, Branch 70, San Diego, Calif.  
Dick Winter, Branch 201, Wichita, Kans.  
Ed Masiello, Branch 34, Boston, Mass.  
J. G. Arrimbide, Branch 505, El Paso, Tex.  
Elay Valdy, Branch 505, El Paso, Tex.

**Representing Management**

Thomas Call, Delivery Services Department  
Charles Edmiston, III, Delivery Services Department  
Mario Principe, Delivery Services Department  
Anthony Colatrella, Delivery Services Department  
Darvin Schlepitz, Delivery Services Department  
Andrea Wilson, Labor Relations Department  
Charles Dudek, Labor Relations Department

This is a continuation of the meeting which began on April 27, 1988.

Mr. Valdez provided address information on customers who were never consulted about changes in delivery from curbside to NCDBUs. Mr. Edmiston took the information and will investigate.

**Union Agenda Items****Posting Router Assignments**

Mr. Farris began by stating his understanding of the purpose of the Router. The router is used to make an adjustment to the route without making a change in territory. The posting should show how much time the Router will be responsible for tasks. Street duties should also be clearly shown. At negotiations, we said that management had to be specific as to the times spent on each component of the route, for example, a handoff is to be to the same street to the same carrier every day. We are concerned that the Router could get different streets and times every day. This is not the way adjustments are to be made.

Ms. Wilson stated that this subject was discussed at negotiations. When we take territory and make a Router, we are required to show the specific street duties, and the list of routes. We never agreed to specific times. Management's position is that specific means specific route and assignments. Whereas, the NALC's position is that specific means a particular street.

Mr. Farris stated that the time on the various routes should be specified on the posting.

The parties agreed to meet again to discuss this issue. Both parties agreed that a mutually beneficial resolution is desired.

#### Part-Time Regular Routers

Mr. Farris stated that the NALC has no interest in a part-time regular Router.

Ms. Wilson stated that the agreement between the USPS and NALC is that management would maximize full-time positions in those offices that have enough hours for full-time positions. We understand that the NALC wants these hours worked by part-time flexibles not part-time regulars. This, however, is not the agreement between the parties.

The parties agreed that they would meet again, after management has reviewed the job postings provided by the Union. Management will provide a recommended solution to the problem. Both sides agreed that the Router issue needs to be put to rest.

#### Route Adjustments

Mr. Farris advised management that local units are not getting special route inspections upon request.

Mr. Call responded that Headquarters has instructed field units to specifically comply with these requests.

#### Revisions to the M-39 and M-41

Mr. Farris asked about the status of the revisions to the M-39 and M-41.

Ms. Wilson informed the parties that the revisions are in draft form. Management agrees to discuss changes with the union before they become final.



National Joint City Delivery Committee  
Follow-up Meetings  
USPS Headquarters

Follow-up meetings to the Joint City Delivery Meeting were held May 18 and 23, June 14, and September 6, 12 and 19 to resolve the router issue.

In attendance at the meetings were the following:

Brian Farris	NALC
Andrea Wilson	Labor Relations
Charles Edmiston	Delivery Services
Thomas Fritsch	APMG Delivery Services (attended 6/14)
Thomas Call	Delivery Services (attended 5/18 and 5/23)
Robert West	Delivery Services (attended 9/19)
Mario Principe	Delivery Services (attended 9/19)

After extensive discussions it was agreed by management and the NALC representative that the attached letter signed by Mr. Fritsch and Mr. Mahon would be distributed to the field and will be used to clarify the intent of the negotiated Memorandum of Understanding on the router program.

It must be noted that Mr. Farris has stated that he agrees with the letter with one exception, the NALC does not agree with the U.S. Postal Services' use of part-time regulars as routers.

Additionally, we agreed that the router program may be a subject for discussion at the next Joint City Delivery Meeting to attempt to clarify other problems regarding the router program, such as, how the route is to be inspected, Form 3996, etc.

UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE

M-00885

Washington, DC 20260

DATE:

OUR REF: DS510:MPrincipe:cb:7223

SUBJECT: Letter Carrier Router Assignments

TO: Field Division General Managers/Postmasters

This is for divisions that presently have letter carrier router assignments at delivery units, or installations within the division implemented, or for those divisions and delivery units planning to implement or expand the number of these bid assignments.

When implemented and managed properly, routers provide an opportunity for better utilization of vehicles; fuel conservation; elimination or avoidance of some expense items such as additional floor space, casing equipment, and satchels; control of overtime; better management of increasing or fluctuating mail volumes; improved service to customers by consistent delivery times; and reduced AIS and scheme change costs where router is the method of making needed adjustments.

The router assignments were a topic of much discussion during the last labor contract negotiations. As a result, a Memorandum of Understanding, Router Program, is now part of the National Agreement. At the most recent joint city delivery meeting with the National Association of Letter Carriers (NALC) and Headquarters representatives, examples of improper or poor management practices in the planning, implementation, and day-to-day management of routers were discussed.

To clarify the intent of the negotiated Memorandum of Understanding agreement with the NALC, the following is provided.

-2-

- o City carriers are awarded router assignments through the same bidding process as any other full-time assignment in the letter carrier craft. Routers are level 5 city carriers who case mail for a number of delivery routes and perform office activities associated with preparing mail for delivery. These assignments may include street duties or any other activity in city carrier duties and responsibilities. Every effort should be made to maximize office time and minimize street time duties when establishing router positions.
- o A router must be treated like any city delivery letter carrier who bids on a specific route, and must not be moved around like a part-time flexible, or any other unassigned employee. Therefore, in day-to-day management, routers must be kept on their bid assignment and not moved off the routes in the bid description unless there is an undertime situation, or in "unanticipated circumstances." This is not only a contractual obligation, but also a good management practice. For further explanation, see Article 41, Section 1.C.4 of the National Agreement.
- o Router positions should be maximized to full-time, 8-hour positions to the extent practicable. For example, if a unit has 35 routes, and through the evaluation of workload it is determined that the router workload is 30 daily hours, three 8-hour router positions should be created. The establishment of full-time router positions should be considered in the unit overall 90/10 and maximization requirements.

An example of poor management practice and violation of the intent of the agreement with the NALC is creating several part-time positions (part-time regular or part-time flexible) in the example described above. We recognize that there may be legitimate reasons at some units that may make it impractical to create one router position consisting of other specific activities, or the operations window may make 8-hour positions impractical. These factors must be considered when establishing router assignments or when changing bid assignments.

- o Establishing router positions is an effective method of adjusting routes that are out of adjustment because of changes in mail volume or handling new deliveries. The adjustment of those routes is permanent. The fact that only office time is removed from a route rather than a combination of office and street time does not lessen the importance of the adjustment. Prior to creating router positions, local management must determine the workload by using all available information. Management should determine the workload for each route to be included in each router position.

The Notice of Vacancy in Assignment(s) posting must include the position title and the statement "City Carrier, KP-11, PS-05," the specific routes in the bid position, and the amount of time for preparing mail for delivery on each route. For example: If the permanent adjustment is for one hour on Route 1, the posting will state, "Route 1, one hour." If street duties are applicable, list the specific letter route street assignments and amount of time. If another appropriate assignment such as a collection run is part of the assignment, list the time for the activity, nonscheduled days, hours of duty and work location.

The supervisor still has the flexibility to assign a router to work more time or less time on each route based on local conditions. When the supervisor instructs a router to spend more time than allotted on a given route, appropriate arrangements should be made to handle the workload on the other routes. Routers on undertime may be assigned duties outside their bid assignment. This is no different than handling the workload on a traditional letter route. However, if frequent changes are made on the amount of time allotted on the routes in the router's string, appropriate permanent adjustments should be made.


The following language should also be included in the router vacancy posting:

Appropriate morning and afternoon office breaks will be scheduled by management.


Any other applicable information required by bargaining unit agreements or USPS rules and regulations should be included in the router vacancy posting.

-4-

please ensure that copies of this letter are furnished to all appropriate delivery units and managers. Questions concerning operations may be directed to Mario Principe, PEN 268-3538 or (202) 268-3538. Questions dealing with our contractual obligations may be directed to Andrea Wilson, PEN 268-5359 or (202) 268-5359.



Thomas J. Fritsch  
Assistant Postmaster General  
Delivery Services Department



Joseph J. Mahon, Jr.  
Assistant Postmaster General  
Labor Relations Department

cc: Regional Directors  
Operations Support