



November Consultative Meeting Agenda

11/9/2016 Held at USPS HQ

US Postal Service Headquarters

Bruce Nicholson, USPS Labor Relations
 Phong Quang, USPS Labor Relations
 Seth Lennon, USPS Labor Relations

National Association of Postal Supervisors

Brian Wagner, NAPS President
 Ivan Butts, NAPS Executive VP
 Chuck Mulidore NAPS Sec-Treasurer

1116-01. NAPS has received correspondence dated October 19, 2016, concerning the installation of an additional Flat Sorting System (FSS) in the Akron P&DC.

NAPS would like to know the current staffing of EAS in this facility to include employee to Management ratios. NAPS is requesting to know if there are any EAS job vacancies in this facility. NAPS would like to know what considerations have/are being given to EAS staff that have left this facility due to "pending closure" status now that the installation is being repurposed. A similar was brought up during a consultative in 2012/2013.

Response: The current staffing of the Akron P&DC is as follows:

EAS Staffing:

Title	Pay Scale/Grade	Total Authorized	Total On Rolls	
PLANT MANAGER	EAS-25	0	1	NAU
SUPV MAINTENANCE OPERATIONS	EAS-17	0	1	NAU

Craft Staffing:

JOB TITLE	COUNT
CASUAL	2
MAIL HANDLER	31
PLANT MANAGER	1
GENERAL EXPEDITOR	9
ELECTRONIC TECHNICIAN	10
MAIL PROCESSING CLERK	3
MAIL EQUIPMENT HANDLER	1
MAIL HANDLER ASSISTANT	4
MOTOR VEHICLE OPERATOR	4
PARCEL POST DIST-MACHINE	10
TRACTOR TRAILER OPERATOR	11
MAINTENANCE SUPPORT CLERK	1
BUILDING EQUIPMENT MECHANIC	1
SUPV MAINTENANCE OPERATIONS	1
MAIL HANDLER EQUIPMENT OPERATOR	4
TOTAL	93

There are currently no EAS job vacancies in this facility. The first step is completion of a site survey. In addition, determination has not been made regarding staffing needs until such time the facility is fully operational.

NAPS Response is that the USPS information is not correct, as the Akron facility is now under the responsibility of the Akron Postmaster. The facility is currently a Function 4 operation, and EAS do work in the Akron facility.

USPS Follow Up - As we responded during our November consultative meeting, we are still awaiting completion of the site survey. Once that is done, the Postal Service will determine the number of machines that will go into the facility and that will determine the amount of bargaining unit employees needed. The number of bargaining unit employees will in turn determine the staffing ratio for EAS. None of that has been determined.

1116-02. NAPS has been informed that there are F1 and F4 operations working under the same finance number in the Dakotas' district. Local leadership has moved this transparency issue up to the Western area. NAPS is aware that the Western area moved this issue to USPS HQ before September 2016.

NAPS would like to know the status of this request. NAPS would also request the rationale for having different functions working under the same finance number as it relates to each functional areas impact on the budgetary, NPA, and reporting of revenue and financial transactions.

Response: Situations where F1 and F4 operations coexisting under the same finance number is nothing new in the Postal Service. On April 8, 2016, a correspondence was sent to the management associations informing that the Postal Service intends to assign unique finance numbers to mail processing annexes and mail processing operations that currently share a finance number with post offices and/or host plants. This initiative was in an effort to provide greater visibility and insight into the operation. The process of establishing unique finance numbers is still ongoing and includes facilities in the Dakotas District.

We discussed NAPS' agenda item with cross-functional stakeholders and we do not see any impacts on budgetary, NPA, and reporting of revenue and financial transactions as NAPS had stated. In addition, we looked into the four facilities that Ivan provided to Bruce in the Dakotas District and did not find any anomalies that would present a negative impact to NPA.

Bismarck PO – Has two finance numbers separating F1 from F4.

Missoula PO – Has 5 distinctively separate scorecards employees choose from.

Grand Forks PO – Has 6 distinctively separate scorecards employees choose from.

Rapid City PO – Has 5 distinctively separate scorecards employees choose from.

It's important to note that employees should choose the appropriate scorecard attached to their operation and the employees' managers review and verify the selections, but again, we do not see the potential impact as stated by NAPS.

1116-03. NAPS has been made aware of a newly promoted member at the Material Distribution Center (MDC). The Occ Code, Title, and Level is listed below. It is currently on the SDA chart in the position group with "All Other Eligible" where the salary differential is compared with PS-06, Step O.

0356-6003	SUPV CPTR MAINT LABL PRNTG	19	\$60,346
-----------	-------------------------------	----	----------

Considering the position title (MAINT) and the staff for which this position is responsible it is NAPS contention that this position should be included in the "Plant Maintenance" group with a salary differential compared with PS-10, Step P. (Names of employees removed)

Level

Position

PS10

ELECTRONIC TECHNICIAN

PS10	ELECTRONIC TECHNICIAN
PS07	MAINTENANCE SUPPORT CLERK
PS07	MAINTENANCE SUPPORT CLERK (DTL)

NAPS is requesting that the SDA for this position be changed to reflect the Management work that is being accomplished.

Response: Compensation will complete a full analysis on the details of the position and provide a response on the findings no later than Friday, November 18, 2016. The response is still pending, so NAPS will follow up with the USPS to provide this data.

1116-04. NAPS received correspondence dated October 20, 2016, concerning organizational changes impacting Marketing and the Deputy Postmaster General.

NAPS would like to be briefed on any impacts that will move EAS from field to headquarters reporting.

Response: Bruce Nicholson provided NAPS on two separate occasions, October 21 and October 26 that zero EAS positions will be moved from field to headquarters reporting.

RES16-30. EAS discipline has been unjustly “rolling downhill,” and EAS supervisors and managers are receiving discipline after discipline has been issued to their direct reports. EAS supervisors and/or managers have been issued discipline whether warranted or not when higher-ups are disciplined.

NAPS contends that EAS supervisors and/or managers may not have any control over the situation for which the discipline is issued.

NAPS is requesting that a root-cause investigation is conducted before issuing discipline, using a standardized discipline chain that has been created by the USPS.

Response: ELM 650 Nonbargaining Disciplinary, Grievance, and Appeal Procedures is appropriate in this situation. If an employee believes the proposed discipline is unwarranted, an appeals process is in place, ELM 652 Appeal Procedures. The Postal Service is not interested in implementing anything in addition to ELM 650.

RES16-31. When an incident occurs that results in an investigation by a management team and an EAS supervisor/manager is given an investigative interview, the results of the investigation and/or action are not issued in a timely manner.

On many occasions, the length of time passed results in a second and, sometimes, third investigative interview. At times, the EAS supervisor/manager is left in limbo for months and, in some cases, more than a year.

NAPS contends that at some point, it must be deemed an untimely action on the part of management.

Therefore, NAPS is requesting that an investigative interview is conducted only at the end of the formal investigation and that the supervisor/manager be given access to material gathered during the investigation.

NAPS also requests that EAS supervisors/managers be afforded due process and that the results of the investigation or action are issued to the supervisor/manager within four weeks of the investigative interview; otherwise, it will be deemed untimely and removed from the employee’s OPF.

Response: While we do not fully understand the issue presented in Resolution-16-31. If NAPS’ request is for the Postal Service to establish a time limit from the date an investigation is conducted of an alleged offense to the time management issues any type of disciplinary/adverse action, we provided that response during the December 2014 consultative meeting.

Resolution #62 – Response: The Postal Service expects that decisions concerning whether disciplinary action will be imposed are to be made without undue delay. Such decisions should be made based on consideration of relevant factors and should comport, where applicable, with regulations delineating elements that should be considered. Some circumstances may allow for such decisions in less or more time than others. Some circumstances may call for investigatory, consideration, evaluation, and other situation-specific elements that could require more time than is needed in other circumstances. The Postal Service will not establish the time limit NAPS recommends in this item.

RES16-32. Investigative-interviews (II) and fact-findings (FF) scheduling are getting excessive in some areas, and some offices schedule three or four a week.

Many NAPS representatives who are assisting members are working and on the clock, and the offices in which these qualified, requested representatives are working are losing productive work hours and raises concerns about budget restrictions regarding these lost hours.

NAPS is requesting that the work hours NAPS representatives are gone from their home offices, including driving time, be charged to the office requesting the II/FF.

Response: ELM 651.2 Representation contains policy regarding representation by NAPS. We do not fully under the issue presented.

RES16-35. Supervisors' and managers' workloads are very intense, and it is increasingly more difficult for supervisors to complete their duties in eight hours. Many supervisors are working six-day weeks, 10 to 12 hours daily.

Supervisors come to work fearing more duties will be added and if these additional duties, as well as their regular duties, are not completed, they will have an investigative interview and face possible disciplinary action. The current environment facilitates bullying and psychological aggression.

NAPS is requesting that the USPS recognizes bullying as a form of unprofessional management behavior. NAPS also requests the Postal Service put a process in place that includes an official PS form to report bullying and a committee to process and investigate these reports. NAPS also requests that a system is put in place for any person bullying non-employees to be placed on probation and/or corrective action be taken, up to removal from the Postal Service to ensure an environment free of this type of treatment/harassment.

Response: The Joint Statement on Violence in the Workplace (JSOV) specifically addresses bullying in the workplace. The current discipline mechanism in place is more than adequate to addressing instances of bullying through corrective action when warranted. The Postal Service has no interest in creating a separate, parallel discipline mechanism strictly for bullying. In addition, employees can contact the Inspection Service when there is an immediate threat and there are multiple channels an employee can work through to have matters address outside of their installation.