



NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF POSTAL SUPERVISORS

NAPS/USPS Consultative Meeting Minutes

December 11, 2013 @ 10 AM - USPS HQ

In attendance

US Postal Service

John Cavallo, Labor Relations
Bruce Nicholson, Labor Relations
Jennifer Vo, Manager Post Office Operations
Margaret Pepe, Manager A/Retail Operations
Art Gilbert, Manager, Field Operations Support
Jenny Utterback, Organizational Effectiveness
Debbie Judy, Enterprise Customer Care
Liz Hepner, A/Manager HR Shared Services
Tom Bunnell, Manager, HR Shared Services Center
Robin Ware, Manager Blended Learning & Effectiveness, Service & Market Development

National Association of Postal Supervisors

Louis M. Atkins, President
James Killackey, Exec. Vice President
Brian J. Wagner, Secretary/Treasurer
Larry Ewing, Chairman (telecom)

1. **Resolution from 2012 National Convention:** That the USPS provides EAS personnel with an immediate and retroactive COLA quarterly, as calculated from the Consumer Price index, for the duration of the EAS pay freeze, beginning in the year 2011.

USPS Response: USPS decision on pay and benefits is outlined in Title 39. The current pay agreement from 2011-2015 has already been established, NAPS request is outside the pay policy process.

2. At the November Consultative meeting, NAPS discussed EAS participation in piloting 4 – 10 hour days in operations in the field. At the November meeting, we were advised that the USPS had methods to overcome some of the issues in TACS that a 10 hour day would impact, including; use of Sick Leave and Holiday scheduling.

NAPS fully supports the expansion of this adjusted schedule in the field and would like to meet with appropriate management officials from USPS HQ to discuss the methods that can be employed to override the current scheduling model in TACS to accommodate a pilot for 4/10 in Customer Services and Processing & Distribution. NAPS also would like to move forward in identifying sites for pilots for the 4/10 workweek.

USPS Response: The USPS was waiting for a NAPS proposal.

NAPS stated that it has discussed proposals, but it was not NAPS' place to come up with all the details as to how a 4/10 work week would be implemented since NAPS does not have all the information needed to make the system work. NAPS requested to talk with those involved to come up with a plan. NAPS is in favor of a 4/10 work week for its members and wants to get this plan implemented. NAPS is asking if the USPS will consider the 4/10 work week and is requesting pilot sites in customer services and plants. USPS will check with Delivery Operations to see if they are interested in 4/10 work weeks in those functions. USPS advised that there are other issues involved with a 4/10 schedule; like position descriptions and Share Services programming. However, TACS can handle the 4/10 work schedules.

3. NAPS has learned that there are Product Information Quality Analysts (EAS-17) Exempt employees who are supervising two or more craft employees. We know that this is occurring in the Puerto Rico District and an Exempt EAS employee is being required to work additional hours, non-scheduled days and is subject to changes in schedules that would be compensable if the employee was special-exempt.

NAPS would like this position to be reviewed throughout the country in installations where they are domiciled to determine if the FLSA status is correct as Exempt and change the position to special-exempt in situations where there are subordinates reporting to this individual position.

USPS Response: When the Product Information Quality Analysts (EAS-17) position was created it was exempt, except for one in Alaska that was made non-exempt due to an FLSA rule. The position qualifies as exempt by FLSA standards because they are supervising 2 full-time or equivalent or more employees. The question becomes, should the position be coded in USPS guidelines as special-exempt. SDO and SCS are USPS special-exempt, but not all EAS-17's receive special-exempt status. FLSA law is very complicated as to who meets the criteria for exempt or non-exempt status. The issue that needs to be addressed is why the Product Information Quality Analyst is being required to work six days a week. That issue should be addressed at the local level first and the office should be following the Megan Brennan letter that addresses working exempt EAS excessively.

NAPS requests that vacancies not filled and those positions that are vacated by VERA and optional retirement requests open from December 31, 2013 and January 31, 2014 retirements get posted on time. Once all impacted EAS employees in a competitive area are placed, initial level positions need to be posted for all career employees immediately. NAPS believes that there is no sense in waiting.

Throughout the country all vacant positions went up area wide so anyone who wanted a job could have applied. Because of the continued vacancies in the field we have 204bs who may be suitable for promotion. Our current EAS morale and upcoming vacation scheduling in 2014 will be affected if we don't fill these jobs soon.

USPS Response: There has been discussion within HR and operations regarding Function 2 and 4 operations. USPS is in the 2nd phase of RIF postings. USPS is considering the next step to take. USPS recognizes NAPS' issue on this item and is working on it. Once a clear resolution is determined, USPS will notify NAPS of their actions. The compounding factor is the 2014 potential plant closing sites and whether or not a district is cleared on being impacted.

4. What is the status of the face-to-face meetings with EAS employees in the field to discuss FY 2014 Corporate and Unit objectives?

USPS Response: The Administrative Rules requires an interactive discussion on the PFP Scorecard. A face-to-face requirement is not required due to the number of employees that may report to a manager and the logistics to meet face-to-face not being practical. The interactive discussion could be through email, teleconference, phone call, or face-to-face. The scorecard is a tool to conduct the required discussions. Managers do document that discussions have taken place by entering the date into PES along with a required comment. Only a handful of EAS have not had discussions due to employee leave issues. Employees have access to their scorecard. The employee can also see in their own PES the comments of their evaluator and the date of discussion. If the EAS employee wants to challenge that the discussion took place, they should print out their PES record and bring the issue to the attention of their evaluator first and inquire that they did not recall the interactive discussion and get clarification as to when the required discussion took place. In some instances, the discussions could have been conducted in a group setting.

5. At the October Consultative Meeting we had a discussion on CSV and some of the changes that were implemented transitioning work functions from LDC 48 to “soft” LDC 45. Our feedback from the field is that there are concerns with this transition and that not enough credit has been provided in this “soft” time. NAPS would like to discuss this item further.

USPS Response: USPS is getting the same feedback. USPS is reviewing the data again to re-evaluate “soft” time, including UBBM. If any nixie mail is still being handled at the local level that work should be stopped and sent to CFS. Nixie mail should not be done at a local unit. In October 2012 a letter was sent to units informing them that nixie credit was going away. Initially, the carriers sent mail to nixie; mail was prepped by a clerk, and then dispatched. Now, the nixie mail goes from the carrier directly to dispatch, eliminating the need for the clerk to prep the nixie mail. USPS will provide the differences between FY13 and FY14 business rules as it relates to CSV.

NAPS wants to know if the value of LDC 48 to Soft 45 will be 1 for 1 or prorated? USPS stated that telephone and 2nd notice values along with increasing WOS to 100%, should balance itself. Now USPS is looking at LDC hygiene. There was work being done that was not being properly allocated to the correct LDC. USPS wants to account for any and all workload and drive behavior to properly allocate LDC time by placing workload in the correct operation. USPS is looking for a closer representation of the workload in each LDC operation as viewed in audits. There is a loss of workload in some areas due to the workload actually going away. PARS and CFS prep-time is being considered for credit in CSV. USPS HQ is meeting with Area and District groups to review CSV and give credit where work is performed and deduct credit when work is no longer being done. LDC 43 was changed to actual scans and adding an addition 8% to the total scan number to account for non-barcoded parcels.

USPS stated it is eliminating the on-hand rollover in CSAW. There is no need to carry over package volume on CSAW. The unit gets credit in workhours the day the packages are scanned, even though the packages may not be delivered until the next day due to the packages arriving after the cut-off time.

6. At the October Board Meeting, a discussion was held with Jenny Utterback about the former Canton Processing facility. The Canton Plant had the mail processing relocated to Akron OH. However, the EAS staffing remained in the facility and has not had any notification of pending action on their positions. We were advised that this situation would be looked at.

The Canton facility still maintains a 24/7 dock operation with EAS employees, MVS employees, Mailhandlers and Clerks who remain assigned as Canton P&DC employees. Although there has been discussion that these positions will be considered impacted in February, there has been no information relative to what the staffing will be in the next phase of the transition.

NAPS would like to know what the plans are for Canton and the staffing that the office will have from both an EAS and craft perspective. We also have received concerns of the same nature from the Northeast Area; Stamford and Southern CT. The same issue also exists at facilities in Detroit and Flint, Michigan.

It may be beneficial for NAPS to have an overview of management’s plans on how facilities on the closing lists and facilities whose structure will result in their being platform transfer points are being managed through the closure process and the impact on staffing of EAS employees in platform transfer facilities.

USPS Response: The facility closed and all mail processing operations have been moved out.

NAPS asked if a staffing criterion has been established for the unit on a management viewpoint. How is the USPS going to make sure the facility is staffed properly? How is the model going to address that including the hours of operation 12-16 hours? NAPS stated that such units are doing dock transfer of direct containers of mail in many F2 & F4 operations that lost plant staffing. Hours of operations have also expanded.

USPS Response: USPS will talk with P&DC and transportation offices to get further information.

7. NAPS has been advised by our members at the Customer Care Centers that there are “mini-sites” being operated on a temporary basis being managed by contract employees, not postal employees. Although these sites have been explained as temporary in nature, we have been advised that EAS employees who have sought detail opportunities to broaden their experience have been denied the opportunity to be detailed into these apparent short-term positions. NAPS would like to be updated on this situation.

USPS Response: For only the holiday season, the retention sales centers are being utilized during December 3 to January 10 to handle the extra calls from customer care centers; Sales retention centers are not doing sales calls at this time. Most retention business is slow during Christmas that is the reason the retention centers are being utilized to handle the calls. USPS is using experience customer care center management to supervise the retention centers. This is only a temporary situation.

Pending Item 1 (November, 2013 Consultative)

NAPS requests an update on this prior agenda item. NAPS is concerned about the workload that is being placed on Local Services at the District level throughout the country. Staffing of a single authorized HR Generalists per District is not sufficient to support the Human Resources activities that are still managed at the District level. There are many Districts that have been required to detail individuals to assist in supporting Local Services.

While all Districts are authorized the same staffing levels in Local Services, that is; one Human Resources generalist per District, the number of employees in the Districts across the country vary widely, with some Districts being double the size of other Districts.

Many Districts are detailing employees into non-existent positions to support the work that is done locally and we believe that a review of the workload of Local Services at the District level should be undertaken. We also understand that this situation is also occurring at the Area level.

NAPS asked what is considered constant work all year long and what is considered ad-hoc? NAPS asked how the USPS baselines an HR Generalist position in a District. Is it based on the number of employees in a District? NAPS stated that workload in the District needs to be considered. NAPS also stated that there is an extreme rollover of City Carrier Assistants (CCAs) where it appears there is a 30% attrition rate and therefore duplication of work for inbound and outbound CCAs.

USPS Response: USPS acknowledges the amount of workload in local field services. The USPS has a new hiring pilot at the Shared Service Center to work with Districts to hire non-careers. USPS is looking at reducing the workload from local field services, by moving it to Share Services with the new hiring pilot

NAPS requested information on what is the baseline in determining the number of HR Generalist positions in a District. NAPS also asked to be briefed on the new USPS Hiring Pilot Program. USPS will work with Organizational Effectiveness to provide baseline information and will schedule a briefing on the Hiring Pilot.

USPS 12/11/13 follow-up Response: In 2013, the USPS tried a pilot by taking on more duties of local services. USPS used a District in the New England Area to be a test site. USPS mapped out a process for hiring between Share Services and the districts. On August 1, eight new pilots were started throughout the various locations in the USPS Areas. Representation was in major metro locations. USPS has identified with the Districts what work will be accomplished between Share Services and the District. USPS believes it has a process that will work. USPS will take the entire volume for the country and try to determine what new staffing is needed to help in the hiring. A Lean Six Sigma approach will be utilized in February 2014. It is a standardization process that is making the hiring of new employees go from 79 days to only taking 39 days. Long term, the USPS is looking at reducing time to hire and consistency in hiring. The process still involves local interviewing. The idea is to streamline the hiring process.

NAPS: The anomaly is in district sizes. NAPS asked if there would be cutback in HR Generalist position at Districts.

USPS Response: USPS stated it is going to go out and do observations on all district staffing. There is no consistency in staffing to the size of the District. USPS wants a more thorough review of workload at the Districts along with the staffing. The USPS will have more data during the pilot sites to see what system changes need to be made. The biggest plus is to reduce the time to hire. More discussion with NAPS will take place after the first of the year after District reviews and focus groups are completed.

Pending item 2: (October, 2013 Consultative)

NAPS requests an update on this prior agenda item. NAPS requested that EAS employees be given at least an adjective rating of Contributor at a minimum, considering that goals and objectives were not shared with the field in FY 2013.

USPS Response: At this time, Jeffrey Williamson, Chief Human Resource Officer (CHRO) has the information, but has yet to make a final decision. The request is still under consideration.

Pending Item 3 (April, 2013 Consultative)

NAPS requests an update on this prior agenda item. This agenda item was originally provided to the USPS at our April, 2013 Consultative Meeting. This agenda items has been submitted again with additional verbiage:

With the district consolidations over the past several years, the scope of work for remaining district VMFs has greatly increased. Gaining districts have seen the number of vehicles increase, sometimes as much as 100 percent or greater, as workload shifted from closing districts. As the workload increased in these instances, EAS staffing remained the same.

VMF manager positions assumed greater responsibilities without a review of the levels of the manager positions and EAS staffing levels in VMF operations. With the critical importance of transportation in the Postal Service, NAPS requested that a position review be conducted in VMF operations to determine the adequacy of VMF manager levels and overall EAS staffing in VMFs. Reviewing all VMF positions would be a large undertaking. A number of criteria go into determining levels.

NAPS provided examples of VMFs that absorbed more work due to consolidations, but with no additional staffing to accommodate the work. NAPS developed a spreadsheet on the VMF workload issue and will make it available to the USPS for review. Previously, NAPS also provided a comparison for three Districts that gained vehicles responsibilities from Districts that had been

consolidated. The comparisons that we provided are similar to the increase of vehicles that gaining VMF's received from other District closures.

NAPS believes that an analysis of the all VMF operations that gained vehicles as a result of consolidations will show that the gaining offices should receive upgrade consideration. NAPS recommends the USPS look at how the consolidations increased territory and VMF workload. In some cases, VMF workload increased and some evaluations went up but others did not.

USPS Response: USPS has received the information from NAPS and will take the information back to USPS HQ department that handles VMFs to decide if a rework in evaluation is required.

USPS 12/11/13 follow-up Response: There is no additional information or an official timeline. It will take time to do this review similar to District reviews. As soon as additional information is available, NAPS will be briefed.