

February 24, 1984

Mr. Vito Magrino  
Regional Director  
LIUNA  
325 Broadway - Suite 505  
New York, New York 10007-1112



Dear Mr. Magrino:

This will serve to address the several items that continue to be in dispute between the parties at the New Haven, Ct. MSC in relation to ongoing implementation of Regional Instructions #399. I have recapped these items below and their current status;

1. Operation #185

The undersigned in September 1983 advised local management in response to an APWU grievance that the work of sorting in this operation was more properly classified as distribution and therefore should be assigned to the clerical craft and not the Mailhandlers. Mr. Allen has steadfastly disagreed with this decision and a grievance in the matter has been forwarded by you to Step 4 as interpretative. Since a grievance is pending at Step 4 and no new evidence has been presented by the local union, in my view, to alter my decision, there is no action that need be taken at present until a decision is rendered at Step 4.

2. Operation #186

Like Operation #185, this operation has been turned over to the clerks and has been grieved to Step 4. Specifically, individuals cut open bundles of 3rd Class mail and place them in one (1) of seven (7) trays of mail according to zip code. The primary purpose of the operation is to make a primary sort of New Haven City mails so that the trays can be taken directly to the incoming MPLSM's for distribution. If the mails were trayed helter-skelter without regard to zip code, we would have no hesitation in stating this was Mailhandler work. But as long as the mail is broken down by zip code so as to avoid a second rehandling (i.e. - a second pass) on the LSH's, we must conclude that the primary function is distribution, not cutting open bundles and traying. We will be guided by the Step 4 decision.

3. Attrition Factor

As stated to you, I have requested of Headquarters direction as how to implement the attrition factor as it relates to Operations #185 and #186. Once that answer is provided you will be advised promptly.

4. Operation #200

In this instance, the Mailhandler organization is claiming that the allied functions (i.e. - transporting empty equipment; handling and labeling sacks; containerizing and transporting; etc.) incident to the manual distribution of parcel post should properly be assigned to mailhandlers. Local management has reviewed this operation and found no basis for a mailhandler to be continuously employed 4 hours or more performing these functions but rather felt it more efficient and rational to utilize the clerks to perform the work as an integral part of the overall distribution function. As in the above cited Operations, this issue has been referred to Step 4 (NLM-LJ-C 25431) by you as interpretative. We will be guided by Headquarters' determination in this matter. As a side note, I have attached a copy of the union's Step 2 appeal in this matter - Management does not dispute that the clerks are doing the work in question. The question is, what has the local union offered in the way of proof to demonstrate that we have erred and the matter should be rectified in another fashion?

I trust the foregoing reflects the status of each of these four items and as soon as I hear concerning Item #3, you will be promptly notified.

Sincerely,



Paul V. Tartaglia  
Manager  
Grievance Branch

bcc: ✓ W. Downes - Headquarters  
J. Merrill  
C. Scialla  
Case File #25431  
New Haven, Ct. PO File  
District - Ct. Valley  
Postmaster/MSM Manager - New Haven  
S. Pearson