



NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF POSTAL SUPERVISORS

NAPS/USPS March 2015 Consultative Minutes

In conjunction with the 2015 NAPS Spring Executive Board Meeting
March 11, 2015 @ 9 AM – NAPS HQ

US Postal Service

John Cavallo, Labor Relations
Bruce Nicholson, Labor Relations
Phong Quang, Labor Relations

National Association of Postal Supervisors

Louis M. Atkins, President
Ivan D. Butts Executive Vice President
Brian Wagner, Secretary/Treasurer
Entire Executive Board Members

Agenda Items

1. NAPS is requesting that a USPS representative with oversight of the Pay for Performance (PFP) program explain the PFP process to the NAPS Executive Board so they have a better understanding of the entire process including how mitigation is handled.

***USPS Response:** USPS brought a copy of the PFP rules, but stated the rules are also available on the USPS Blue Page. USPS advised that the mitigation process is pertains to a unit not an individual. It is the installation head who must decide to initiate a unit mitigation request. The PFP mitigation will then go to the District, if approved then forwarded to the USPS Area for review, if Area approves the mitigation, it will be sent to USPS HQ for final review by USPS HQ sponsor of that unit indicator. The sponsor either approves or disapproves the mitigation and that decision is final.*

If a person is a USPS HQ employee working at USPS HQ or in the field, they receive a different PFP rating than EAS field employees represented by NAPS. USPS HQ reporting employees' PFP rating is averaged to the corporate number given to the respective USPS HQ unit. USPS HQ requires HQ employees to receive three objectives related to their unit as part of their PFP process. The objectives are not rated but used as a determination to decide the employee's unit rating when averaging the overall unit score received by USPS HQ. Those EAS employees represented by NAPS in the field, who do not report to USPS HQ, will not have three objectives and the EAS employees in the same unit, receive the same unit score.

NAPS asked who is considered the Unit's installation head.

***USPS Response:** USPS stated the NPA report card has defines the unit and whoever is the boss of that unit is considered the Unit's installation head. If the unit's installation head does not request mitigation, mitigation cannot be submitted by the subordinate EAS.*

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF POSTAL SUPERVISORS

NAPS asked if USPS HQ tracked the number of mitigations and those that were approved or disapproved. NAPS asked if there is a possibility to track mitigations that were denied prior to getting to USPS HQ.

USPS Response: *USPS HQ stated that only 14 mitigation requests made it all the way to USPS HQ. USPS HQ does not track whether or not mitigation requests were denied at the District or Area levels, never making it to USPS HQ for final mitigation review.*

NAPS Board commented that it becomes a morale issue when the averaging of the USPS HQ unit ratings amongst employees does not create a team effort. Those believe it is a team effort and caused a lot of confusion. USPS HQ employees working in the field did not get the PFP process explained to them properly.

NAPS asked what overall NPA score did USPS HQ receive?

USPS Response: *USPS stated it was 3.9 or PFP Box 4. The USPS HQ further explained that if you are not a USPS HQ reporting employee then you have the 60/40 (Corporate/Unit) PFP calculation.*

NAPS clarified that if a non-HQ reporting EAS employee has been on detail and not in their Form 50 job for the full year, there is a proration of their PFP or if they were promoted into an EAS position in a year there is a proration. Therefore, some EAS would not have received the entire unit score affecting their overall PFP rating.

2. There is a concern at the LA Call Center that this Call Center has double the employees and responsibilities which including international calls then the other Call Centers throughout the country, but were allotted the same EAS staffing as all other call centers. NAPS is requesting an staffing review to identify the additional EAS staffing needed since this facility that has employee staffing and workload that surpasses its sister facilities around the country.

USPS Response: *USPS met with NAPS in May 2012 to discuss this Call Center staffing. The 1:20 ratio applies to the Call Centers like the Plants. If a Call Center is not staffed to the established ratio the issue should be forwarded to NAPS HQ. For example, if a Call Center has 200 craft employees it should be staffed with 10 EAS employees.*

NAPS HQ is contending that support positions are not equitable. NAPS will get with USPS HQ on reviewing the staffing. NAPS asked if the 1:20 Call Center ratio included EAS support positions and besides supervisors, similar to the how the 1:20 ratio in plants include MDOs and SDOs? It was referenced by USPS that the 1:20 ratio includes all EAS.

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF POSTAL SUPERVISORS

3. NAPS is requesting that the Western Nassau plant be re-evaluated due to additional APBS that has been installed and the additional approximate 100 + employees that have been hired in concert with this new equipment.

***USPS Response:** After Phase II of Network Rationalization the USPS will re-evaluate the plants to determine if a plant requires re-ranking. USPS plant managers do have the authority to fill EAS vacancies. Since April 2014, USPS has filled over 6,000 vacancies. However, the USPS is also holding landing spots for those who will be impacted by the Phase II consolidation and closings.*

NAPS requested an EAS staffing review, but USPS HQ did not provide it as the USPS stated the agenda item was not clear and needs to be more specific.

4. NAPS HQ is requesting that Postal HQ reconsider the OCC Codes included in consideration of SDA. It is assumed that the SDA was intended to assure a supervisor would not make less money than the people for whom he/she is responsible. This was of course designed to set the level of pay at a percentage (5%) above a certain class and level of employee.

***USPS Response:** Title 39 1004(a) is to provide reasonable pay differentials. ELM 413.21 reviews salary increases and the SDA and provides a reasonable differential. District Court Judge Linda Green in 1978 was out of line in ruling on USPS SDA as it is the USPS' responsibility through the consultative process to determine pay differentials for EAS after consideration through the consultative process. The SDA was not intended to ensure that all EAS do not make less than the employees' they supervise. A change in the SDA can be brought up by NAPS during the pay consultation process. USPS stated NAPS should prepare a proposal for pay talks on SDA.*

NAPS commented that the SDA was not part of the consultative process.

***USPS Response:** USPS stated anytime it is considering changes in pay and benefits outside the pay consultative process, the USPS must contact NAPS. Nothing prevents USPS and management associations to agree to discuss pay and benefits issues outside of pay talks. If USPS wants to make independent changes on pay/benefits outside of pay talks they cannot do it without approval of the management associations. If not in pay consultation, only a mutual agreement will allow discussion to move forward, otherwise it must be discussed during the pay period process. If NAPS has some ideas on SDA changes and why, then NAPS should present to USPS HQ as an official proposal.*

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF POSTAL SUPERVISORS

5. NAPS is requesting the following:

- a. That the EAS-21 NDC Supervisor of Information Systems be renamed a "Manager of Information System". This position oversees several EAS employees.
- b. That the position of Product Information Quality Analyst be changed to special-exempt status. This EAS position is required to supervise craft employees.
- c. That the EAS-17 Information Systems Coordinator position be re-named Process Control Assistant and changed to an EAS-16 level, given the position has been assigned OSS and other duties.

USPS Response: *USPS can take the above items to Organizational Effectiveness (OE) to request the changes and upgrades; however, without specific reasons why NAPS wants the above changes, most likely they will not be granted. When USPS receives agenda items that are not clear, it takes time to respond back to NAPS because USPS HQ needs additional time to gather information and discuss with the USPS officials who oversee that function or operational issue. Therefore, a response may not be ready for the consultative meeting.*

6. NAPS would like to be briefed on the process of the USPS being placed on the GSA schedule for mailing services of non-dominant products and the process the agency is using to work towards this revenue generating initiative.

USPS Response: *USPS is working on getting more GSA business. NAPS stated that USPS has a 3% share of GSA business. GSA is comparing USPS Express Mail service over FedEx Ground.*

7. NAPS in reviewing the USPS policy on SDA. NAPS would like to know the total number of craft employees by level in the following functional areas: VMF, Customer Services, Plant Operations and Plant Maintenance.

USPS Response: *USPS provided a chart to NAPS, but it only covers career employees.*

8. Since the APWU won a National Arbitration placing BEM's back in to facilities that once had such positions, the term Non-Maintenance capable no longer applies to these facilities and requires supervisory positions. NAPS contends these supervisory positions are needed because craft employees need daily work sheets issued, data entered into eMARS, and other SMO duties based on SPD. Supervisor staffing criteria is listed below.

Supv, Maintenance Operations (SMO) Criteria

Authorized Craft Positions		SMO Positions Earned
Min	Max	
0	10	0
11	27	1
28	39	2
40	51	3
52	63	4
64	75	5
76	96	6

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF POSTAL SUPERVISORS

USPS Response: *USPS will review the respected facilities to ensure that when BEM's are returned to the facility that the USPS will follow the process to return EAS to those facilities. USPS Organizational Effectiveness (OE) stated as the craft positions come back the EAS staffing will return. If the craft employees are in those units and EAS staffing was not, then NAPS needs to bring to USPS HQ attention where it is occurring to resolve the staffing deficiency.*

NAPS HQ contends that EAS staffing is not being considered for these non-maintenance capable offices. Using the USPS' own data for Hub-staffing has a flaw in the EAS staffing. USPS is running mini-plants and calling them as hubs. Kevin Trayer for the last four board meetings as brought up the Hub EAS staffing issues. When asked, NAPS has been told that hubs don't qualify as plants for maintenance EAS staffing. NAPS contends that the 82 plant facilities targeted for closing/consolidation this year may become hubs and be in the same situation with the lack of EAS.

9. NAPS HQ is requesting a briefing on the Street Supervision Initiative Program (SSIP), whereas a big EAS-22 office is required to do sixty hours of Street Supervision a week. This is where our members are mandated to go out to check on certain carriers who are considered the vital few. Additionally, the district has a member on detail to an unauthorized position to monitor this program. With the new scanners, the USPS has the technology to track carriers without requiring supervisors to be out of the office for 60 hours per week.

A board member contends SSIP is national issue now since it is throughout the country. However, the Northeast Area does not have this program.

USPS Response: *It is an initiative by USPS Area VPs. USPS HQ delivery operations stated that this is not a national program. It is an idea from the field. This issue needs to be addressed in the field. USPS stated that this is not a national USPS program.*