

### NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF POSTAL SUPERVISORS

### **NAPS/USPS** Consultative Meeting Minutes

August 12, 2015 @ 10 AM - USPS HQ

#### In attendance

#### **US Postal Service**

John Cavallo, Labor Relations
Phong Quang, Labor Relations
Joseph Bruce, Mgr., Organizational Effectiveness

#### **National Association of Postal Supervisors**

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

#### **Agenda Items**

NAPS has received concerns surrounding EAS that are requesting Lateral or Downgrades in
response to job postings that list "RELOCATION IS AUTHORIZED". We have EAS that are being
successful in being selected for Lateral and/or Downgrades but not receiving the authorized
relocation due to ineligibility.

NAPS stated that there has been instances in the field that EAS have applied for positions that referenced relocation, but then found out after accepting the position the employee did not qualify. NAPS would like to change this job posting statement to include "RELOCATION IS AUTHORIZED FOR ELIGIBLE EMPLOYEES". A further statement could include "Refer to Handbook F-15-A.23"

USPS Response: USPS HQ stated that it is possible to adhere to NAPS' request to add relocation type language to future EAS postings. It will review with USPS Human Resources to determine the proper language that must be added. This change may take a few weeks to implement. USPS HQ will inform NAPS if or when this change will take place.

2. NAPS has been made aware of an issue surrounding the recovery of 2.1 million dollars of revenue that was defrauded from the agency by a mailer. See attached (LID Mail Fraud.pdf) and/or link below; <a href="http://postalnews.com/blog/2015/06/30/long-island-bulk-mailer-pleads-guilty-to-multi-million-dollar-mail-fraud-scheme/">http://postalnews.com/blog/2015/06/30/long-island-bulk-mailer-pleads-guilty-to-multi-million-dollar-mail-fraud-scheme/</a>.

NAPS is requesting that this money be credited to the Long Island District's Tot Rev FPR % Plan for the year that the money is restored to the agency based on the recovery by the OIG.

USPS Response: USPS HQ asked if the local NAPS representatives checked with the District or Area office regarding how the recovery of these funds will be handled when received. Also, did local NAPS inquire about how it would impact the respective District and post offices' NPA?



NAPS stated it was looking for the process the USPS used to collect funds when the USPS is defrauded by the mailer.

USPS HQ will follow up USPS HQ finance office on the process, but re-stated that this issue may have already been resolved by the respective District or Area office. It is necessary for NAPS to inquire at the District and Area levels first before bringing to the USPS HQ, because the District and Area may already have the answer.

3. NAPS is submitting this prior agenda item based on a request for a specific answer to the specific issues of this agenda item.

NAPS has received concerns surrounding the memo on involuntary reassignment from the Western Area. This issue was properly moved up the chain and an Area response was given. NAPS is deeply concerned when the agency creates EAS job posting with scheduled work hours and days off which are necessary to establish the time that the agency wants and needs the applicant to committed to fulfilling the duties and responsibilities of the position. NAPS presumes that the expectation of the Agency is that the successful applicate schedule his/her personal life events around those work hours and non-scheduled days off and be available during the work hours listed on their job posting. NAPS contention is that when EAS are involuntarily reassigned for any reason, that the agency is not only negatively impacting the EAS employee's work life, but also impacting the employee's personal life events.

In the response from the Western Area regarding this issue it is stated that the agency's actions "do not fall under the criteria outlined within the letters." NAPS notes that criteria identified in the memorandum states;

Again, there is a difference between temporary involuntary reassignments made in order to meet operating, training, or developmental needs, and involuntary reassignments made for punitive or arbitrary reasons. The latter are inappropriate. If management perceives that action is needed in order to address unsatisfactory performance then corrective action should be taken in a manner compliant with applicable rules and regulations.

NAPS believes that the memorandum issued by the Agency (Western Area) concerning this matter does contain the necessary due diligence requirements that should be maintained by managers if a temporary involuntary reassignment is necessary. NAPS is requesting that any involuntary reassignments not made in accordance with the memorandum issued be ruled as inappropriate and be immediately terminated.



USPS Response: NAPS HQ met previously with Dave Williams, USPS COO, who is in the process of drafting an updated Involuntary Reassignment (IR) Memo. Labor Relations is waiting for the memo to provide to NAPS. USPS HQ further stated that the Involuntary Reassignment (IR) Memo is a guideline and not an official Postal Service policy or rule. The IR Memo is a guideline for managers in the field to consider when making decisions. The intent of the IR Memo is not to be interpreted as a policy or regulation like the ELM or any other published USPS manual or publication. The USPS HQ's position is that this particular response only pertains to the IR memo. USPS HQ further stated this agenda response does not cover other USPS memos that have been given to NAPS.

NAPS is not satisfied with this response and will seek the PMG's intent and interpretation of USPS memos that are issued to the field that have an effect on NAPS membership.

NOTE: On Thursday, August 13, 2015, the Resident Officers met with Dave Williams, USPS COO, and Doug Tulino, USPS VP Labor Relations, at USPS HQ to discuss the intent of USPS HQ issued memos and who is NAPS HQ to contact at Postal Headquarters when a memo is violated. In the past, former and current PMG's and COO's had instructed NAPS HQ to let them know where violations are occurring. NAPS HQ did that through the Labor Relations office and received the response noted in Agenda item #3 of the consultative.

Mr. Williams and Mr. Tulino went on to state that USPS HQ memos are very specific guidelines, but do not rise to the level of an ELM rule or USPS policy. However, they expect the USPS HQ memos to be followed. They further stated if NAPS can pin-point where the USPS HQ memos are not being followed and if the issue is not resolved at the USPS District or Area levels, then NAPS HQ can forward the issue directly to them. They in turn will contact the person who did not follow the memo to resolve the issue.

4. NAPS would like to be briefed on the impacts of the agreement (MS-47 TL-5 MOU) between the APWU and the Postal Service on a new custodian manual. This program (group cleaning) has already been implemented in some larger plants. We are being told that it required a dedicated supervisor to oversee this program. In the large plants EAS are struggling to have a supervisor dedicated to the program. When this process is implemented in the medium and smaller plants this is really going to hamper operations in maintaining maintenance standard.

NAPS is requesting the creation of EAS positions to ensure that all OSHA rules and regulations are properly complied with and the agency continues to provide working conditions that will assure the attraction and retention of qualified and capable supervisory and other managerial personnel.



USPS Response: In July 2014 NAPS was sent a notice about changes to the MS-47. USPS does not believe there is a need to create new EAS positions based on the MS-47MOU. USPS currently has EAS employees in safety to address OSHA issues. USPS stated that if NAPS would like a briefing on this issue, it would accommodate.

NAPS has no record of receiving the July 2014 document referenced by USPS HQ. In addition, it was never part of a 2014 consultative meeting. NAPS pointed out that this MS-47 process was requiring full-time oversight by an SMO, which detracts from that SMO completing other required SMO duties, which includes OSHA required oversight. NAPS received the MS-47 document from the USPS at the August 12, 2015 consultative meeting. NAPS will review the document and request a future briefing.

5. NAPS is requesting to bring back to the table the VMF issue that was originally consulted on at the NAPS/USPS consultative meeting on June 10, 2015, where the agency response to a specific non-competitive lateral request for a VMF position in Georgia was noted as:

USPS stated selecting officials have a right to take non-competitive laterals or require EAS to apply competitively. In this case, the selecting official was only accepting applications competitively through eCareer. The USPS understands that when an employee receives a RIF letter it can be very emotional for that person. The goal is for impacted EAS to look for a new EAS position during the RIF process.

NAPS has been informed that this position was awarded as a non-competitive lateral and that the employee that received the position was not eligible based on the agency eligibility standard. At the time of selection, the employee that was given the position was performing the duties of Operation Programs Analyst, Cap Metro Area Office. The eligibility requirements established by the agency for the VMF posting are (see attachments Job posting.pdf and NCL Request.pdf);

Persons Eligible to Apply

This position is posted with a limited area of consideration (LAC) to all impacted and non-impacted career, non-bargaining employees within the VMF competitive areas. Reimbursement of relocation expenses will NOT be authorized.

NAPS is concerned that the agency reactions to the VMF restructure does not demonstrate a preparedness on the agency's part to implement this restructure in accordance with RIF Law, OPM guidance or its own Policies and Procedures.

USPS Response: This item is not suitable for the NAPS/USPS consultative process as it is an individual issue. This individual issue is currently under the appeal process and a response cannot be given. USPS did state that a selecting official can ask applicants to apply competitively for a position, rather than accepting lateral requests.



NAPS issue is that the entire VMF restructuring was not properly handled. This agenda item is just one of the problems related to the VMF restructuring. In addition, a person was selected for the VMF position in question and they were not an impacted VMF employee in the Limited Area of Competition (LAC). NAPS is requesting clarification as to what is the process for when candidates must compete "competitively." USPS HQ stated it will provide NAPS with clarification.