

American Postal Workers Union, ANT-CIO

817 14TH STREET, N. W., WASHINGTON, D. C. 20005

November 14, 1978

Mr. James C. Gildea 'Assistant Postmaster General Labor Relations Department U. S. Postal Service Washington, D. C. 20260

Dear Mr. Gildea:

In response to your letter of August 11, 1978, we have reviewed the document which you enclosed and have further reviewed a similar but changed document which you presented to the American Postal Workers Union yesterday, November 13 at a meeting at United States Postal Service Headquarters.

At that meeting, we stated the position of the American Postal Workers Union in that we object strongly to the departure from the procedure outlined in the Memorandum of Understanding regarding Jurisdictional Disputes. It is the position of this Union that the issuance of any such work assignment criteria should not take place until the procedures outlined in the Memorandum of Understanding have been completed.

This Union is quite disturbed to find that the document which you presented to us on November 13 contains numerous changes when compared with the original document which you submitted on August 11. The many alterations in the original document does not in our judgment constitute a good faith effort by the Postal Service in attempting to solve matters in dispute, considering that your late delivery of your amended decision provides this Union no opportunity for effective challenge prior to your intended issuance of implementing instructions this week.

We list the dissimilarities which we have detected in the two documents. Some of the changes may not be consequential, other changes constitute a reversal of the primary craft designation, comparing your first issuance and the second. Other language changes require explanation as to their intended significance.

The American Postal Workers Union also objects to the fact that Postal Service Headquarters entered into a bi-lateral agreement with the Mail Handler Craft but chose to include work assignments of the Clerk Craft in an issuance sought and obtained by the Mail Handler Craft alone. Since there are obviously numerous

other work assignments in mail processing functions, we believe the issuance of an incomplete document of this type will only tend to invite further jurisdictional disputes at local level.

We cite the changes which we have noted, comparing your document of November 13th with the document which you submitted with your letter of August 11th.

Page 2 Item No. 11, Operation 010, changes the craft designation from Clerk to Mail Handler.

Item No. 14, Operation 010, is an additional item.

Item No. 4, Operation 020, changes the primary craft from Clerk to Mail Handler

Items No. 5 & 6, Operation 020, are additional items.

- Page 3 Item No. 8, Operation 030/035, is an additional item.
- Page 4 All three items identified as No. 9 are additional items.
- Page 5 Item No. 9, Operation 045, is an additional item.

 Item No. 6, Operation 050/055, is reworded
- Page 6
 Item No. 14, Operation 050/055, is an additional item as are Items No. 9 for both Operations 060 and 070.
- Page 7 Item 8, Operation 073, is an additional item as are Items No. 9 under that operation and Operation 074.
- Page 8
 Item No. 9, Operation 075, is an additional item.
 The language in the footnote for Operation 080087 has been changed, as have Items No. 4 & 5 under
 Operation 100.
- Page 9 Item No. 7, Operation 100, is reworded.

 Item No. 8, Operation 100, is an additional item.

 Item No. 7, Operation 105, is an additional item.
- Page 10 For Operation 110-129, Item 4 is reworded.

 Item No. 7, Operation 110-129, introduces new terminology into Post Office operations by the

Mr. James C. Gildea November 14, 1978

Page 10 use of the initials IPP, a term used only at Bulk Mail Centers.

Item No. 4, Operation 134, is reworded.

Item No. 9, Operation 134, is an additional item.

Page 11 Item No. 4, Operation 150, is reworded.

Item No. 9, Operation 150, is an additional item.

Item No. 4, Operation 160, is reworded.

Item No. 9, Operation 160, is an additional item.

Page 12 Item No. 5, Operation 168/169 is reworded.

Item No. 10, Operation 168/169, is an additional item.

Item No. 4, Operation 170, is reworded.

Item No. 9, Operation 170, is an additional item.

Page 13 Item No. 4, Operation 175, is reworded.

Item No. 9, Operation 175, is an additional item.

The description of 180-189 has been changed and an additional Item No. 8 is listed.

Page 14 Item No. 5, Operation 200, is reworded.

Item No. 7, Operation 200, is an additional item

For Operation 210-239, we find the identical work description for Items 7 & 8 with different craft designations.

Page 15 Operation 240-339, there is a change in the description of the function.

In your document for Bulk Mail Centers, page 2, we find additional Items Nos. 5, 6, 7, and 8 for the Operation designated as Primary Parcel Sorting.

On Page 3, we find a change in Item No. 7 under Sack Sorting Rewrap, IPPs and Non-Zip Coding as well as an addition Item No. 11. On that same page we find a change in craft designation for Item No. 1 under Loose in the Mail.

On Page 4, we find five additional items under the operation of Outgoing, SPR Opening and Distribution.

We believe that this number of changes justifies discussion and explanation as to the significance of the changes. We object strongly to this very late decision to alter the primary craft designation which you furnished in your document with your letter of August 11th. We therefore request that there be no implementing instructions issued until the parties have an opportunity to discuss hese changes and we further request that implementing instructions be deferred until the provisions of the Memorandum of Understanding regarding Jurisdictional Disputes have been followed.

We will list our specific objections to craft designations in a second letter.

Sincerely yours,

Forrest M. Newman, Director Industrial Relations

FMN/aw