

COR—It's Not Your Father's Route Adjustment

The Postal Service is always rolling out new computer programs, in a seeming endless quest for added efficiency. Although management always intends to improve postal operations, often it implements new programs in ways that violate the contract.

COR—Carrier Optimal Routing—began as one such program. In short, COR is a program which assembles key route inspection data, and then accomplishes route adjustments by redesigning the configuration of routes.

In a perfect world, COR would simply have applied the existing rules for route adjustments from the M-39 and other contractual materials. The only difference would have been greater speed and improved optimization of route configuration.

However, as often happens when engineers' plans meet the reality of mail delivery, some things went wrong. Management developed and tested COR without any input from letter carriers or the NALC. Those early efforts failed. Although route data was collected in the same manner, the adjustment formulas ignored the realities of letter carrier work.

NALC filed grievances challenging the adjustment of routes using COR, locally and ultimately at the Interpretive level. The national parties met many times to discuss the problems with COR, and the Postal Service made many incremental changes to the program in the months prior to national negotiations last year.

When the parties reached a settlement in national negotiations, they made an agreement about COR as well. The agreement was included in the tentative contract booklet mailed to all members during ratification balloting (pp. 129-130).

The COR Agreement

In the COR agreement, the parties first reaffirmed that, although the program is a management tool, it does *not* replace or in any way alter the National Agreement or the M-39.

The Carrier Optimal Routing (COR) process is a management tool to assist with the adjustment of letter carrier routes pursuant to Chapter 2 of Handbook M-39. No components of the COR program or application of the COR process

will be inconsistent with the route inspection, evaluation, or adjustment process found in Chapter 2 of the M-39 Handbook.

The parties also agreed that management would fix a series of problems with the COR program—problems that undermined compliance with the M-39's requirements. These included:

- COR often adjusted routes to more than 8 hours. The M-39

(Continued on page 2)

INSIDE

**DOIS Memorandum—
page 3**

**TEs and the Contract—
page 5**

**Training Seminars and
State Conventions—
page 7**

**USPS By the
Numbers—page 8**

COR Route Adjustments

(Continued from page 1)

requires routes to be adjusted as close to 8 hours as possible.

- Allied times—time spent rearranging mail in the vehicle, loading a satchel before a loop, and so forth—are recorded on the Form 3999. However, COR failed to include allied time.
- Under COR, management could make subjective time adjustments, but the program did not flag or track these adjustments or require any kind of explanation. However, when management completes a Form 1840, it must flag and fully explain any disallowance of measured times; absent explanation and documentation, disallowances cannot be made. The problem was that COR lacked **transparency**—it produced results without revealing precisely how they were reached.
- In the computer-generated Form 1840, COR produced piles of data which were difficult to interpret. This interfered with the ability of affected carriers or NALC representatives to provide input to the adjustment process.
- COR assumed that vehicles moved at a constant speed—the speed limit—while traveling between two points. Obviously, this is impossible. The program failed to account for time spent accelerating, decelerating, pausing at stop signs, etc. Computer-generated travel times were not validated through measurement of actual travel time.

To address these problems and resolve NALC's national grievance, the COR settlement commits USPS management to make a series of changes intended to fix these shortcomings. Management has promised, for example, to:

- Increase transparency;
- Require explanations of time disallowances;
- Give credit for and validate relay, travel, and allied times; and
- Document, by sector-segment, any change in street credit from the actual street time indicated on Form 3999.

From the COR Memo:

To facilitate the practical application of this understanding, when transferring territory the back of the PS Form 1840 will indicate, by sector segment, any change in street credit from the actual street time used in sector-segment on PS Form 3999; including all relay, travel, allied time, etc. Any such adjustment to the carrier's actual street time must be documented and explained by appropriate comments on the reverse of PS Form 1840. Additionally, any time adjustment to the base street time, which must be selected pursuant to M-39 Section 242.321, will be documented and explained under the comments section on the reverse of PS Form 1840. Travel To, Travel From, and Travel Within times must be validated, documented, and discussed during carrier consultation. The actual time should be taken from the Inspection PS Form 3999, unless a new pattern is created during the route adjustment process. If a new travel pattern has been created, the new times must be validated.

Notwithstanding any disputes regarding documentation of and/or justification for time adjustments made, the intent of the previous paragraph is for the letter carrier to be made aware of any proposed time adjustment to the carrier's base street time and/or to the street time of the territory being transferred. Time adjustments for territory being transferred will

be by sector-segment, including all relay, allied, parcels, accountables, etc. Anytime adjustment to a carrier's base street time must comply with the M-39 Section 242.345 through 242.347.

Please note that COR has never been intended to be used in minor route adjustments or 1-day counts. Rather, the parties agree that COR presently may be used only to facilitate full 6-day counts and inspections. However, the COR agreement notes that USPS may adapt or extend COR to other processes so long as contractual rules are followed.

Should the Postal Service develop COR for use in the minor route adjustment process, related components of the COR program or application of the COR process will be consistent with the specific minor route adjustment formula in Section 141.19 of Handbook M-39. Local parties that have established, by mutual agreement, an alternate route adjustment method may also use applications of COR consistent with their alternate route adjustment process. ■

ACTIVIST

A NEWSLETTER FOR BRANCH LEADERS OF THE
NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF LETTER CARRIERS

VOL. 20, NO. 3

November 2007

Published quarterly by:

National Association of Letter Carriers
100 Indiana Avenue, NW
Washington, D.C. 20001-2144

William H. Young, President



© 2007

The DOIS Memorandum

DOIS says you owe me thirty minutes.” Who, in recent years, hasn’t heard that comment from a supervisor on the workroom floor. The letter carrier response might be: “I was thinking I’ll be lucky to make it back in eight!” And so, the battle begins.

On the one hand, the supervisors have managed the daily workload based on a belief that DOIS was infallible. Meanwhile, the letter carriers were at a loss as to why the system was so far off.

It’s been a daily fight on workroom floors across the nation ever since DOIS was implemented in 2001. DOIS became sort of a club—used to try to intimidate carriers into running or skipping lunch in order to match the numbers. The intent of the DOIS Memo was to stop this daily battle by addressing some of the most troublesome differences between the parties.

DOIS background

DOIS stands for Delivery Operations Information System—a method for plugging a route’s volume figures into a computer program with route base data so that it would spit out a number of anticipated necessary work hours.

Management’s reliance on DOIS as anything more than a management tool was always at the core of the dispute between the parties. Some of the other issues included:

- Supervisor’s failure to accurately record volumes of non-DPS mail.
- Failure to give carriers time credit for all office work.
- Route base data that was not consistent with the handbooks and manuals.
- Management’s use of a “percent

to standard.”

Addressing these and other issues was central to reaching a solution on the national level dispute on DOIS. By enforcing the terms of the DOIS Memo, the union representative will be able to ensure that supervisors are no longer intimidating letter carriers into meeting impossible expectations created by inaccurate computer data. The terms of the DOIS Memo are designed to bring a greater degree of accuracy to the system, while recognizing that it is nothing more than a tool.

Handbooks and Manuals

The first way the Memo acknowledges DOIS’s function is by making the clear statement that DOIS is simply a management tool for estimating a carrier’s daily workload. There is nothing special about DOIS that would allow a supervisor using it to violate any handbook or manual. The Memo specifically points out that the use of DOIS does not change certain carrier and supervisor responsibilities that are outlined in the M-41 and M-39.

Carrier’s reporting requirements

The Memo states, “The use of DOIS does not change the letter carrier’s reporting requirements outlined in section 131.4 of Handbook M-41. . .”

This means that nothing has changed with regard to how a letter carrier handles the situation when he or she becomes aware of an inability to case all the mail distributed to the route or perform

other required duties and still leave on schedule—or an inability to complete delivery of all the mail. Section 131.4 requires the letter carrier to verbally inform management of this well in advance of the scheduled leaving time, though not later than immediately following the final receipt of mail. The supervisor will then instruct the carrier what to do.

The use of DOIS does nothing to negate the carrier’s written reporting requirements, either. Sections 131.43 and 44 require the carrier to complete a Form 3996 if overtime or auxiliary assistance is authorized and a Form 1571 if mail is undelivered (including mail brought to the route, but not cased or taken out for delivery).

This part of the DOIS Memo ensures that the above process continues. The act of a supervisor going to a carrier’s case with DOIS figures in hand may not in any way replace the established procedures in the M-41 under section 131.4.

Scheduling carriers

Likewise, the Memo states, “The use of DOIS does not change. . .the supervisor’s scheduling responsibilities outline in section 122 of Handbook M-39. . .”

Stewards can find good enforcement tools in section 122—tools to address several issues that have caused arguments on the workroom floor since the arrival of DOIS in 2001.

Section 122.22 requires the manager to “be aware of and record the daily workload for each route. . .” Section 122.22(a) requires management to “provide assistance where necessary for carriers to meet scheduled leaving times. . .” In addition,

Continued on page 4

DOIS Memorandum

continued from page 3

section 122.32 outlines management's responsibilities in assigning overtime or auxiliary assistance when relief is essential. The use of DOIS does not allow management to ignore any of these obligations.

However, in terms of enforcing the DOIS Memo, the steward may find section 122.33 to be the most relevant:

"The employee, upon request, will be provided a Form 3996, Carrier-Auxiliary Control, after the supervisor has been verbally informed as to the reason for the request. The employee shall not be denied the form and, upon request, a duplicate of the completed form will be provided to the employee."

The union representative should enforce this language in the event a supervisor refuses to give a Form 3996 to an employee because he or she believes DOIS figures indicate that one is not necessary.

Carrier-Auxiliary Control

The Memo also addresses the Form 3996 specifically where it states, "The use of DOIS does not change. . .the letter carrier's and supervisor's responsibilities contained in section 28 of Handbook M-41."

This part of the M-41 provides the specific requirements for filling out each line on the Form 3996. The use of DOIS in no way changes the way this form has been filled out. Carriers still explain their reason for requesting assistance. They still enter the estimated hours and minutes being requested. They still give the form to management.

The supervisor's job regarding the form remains as before. There is still an obligation to make a decision about auxiliary assistance or overtime and to so advise the carrier of that decision. Further, DOIS pro-

jections should not be used as the sole basis for determining workload when considering such requests for overtime or auxiliary assistance. The union representative can use the Memo to ensure that supervisor does not try to use DOIS as an excuse to ignore management's obligations toward the Form 3996.

Accuracy required

Accuracy of volume recording has long been a dispute associated with DOIS. Not only can the steward address it with Section 122.22 of the M-39 (mentioned above), but it is also specifically covered in the Memo: "Management is responsible for accurately recording volume and other data in DOIS."

It is not acceptable for supervisors to "forget" to count mail placed in the distribution cases. Mail that is brought later on in the morning to the carriers' cases can no longer be ignored—not without violating the Memo.

The "other data in DOIS" is base data derived from the route inspection. Some examples where the Memo can be used to enforce the requirement for accuracy include:

- Base street time
- The regular carrier's average actual office time compared to the average standard time for the week of count and inspection.
- Actual line item time (or established minimum if less) for all line items 8-21.

Part of the problem with DOIS projections being inaccurate has been altered base data. This Memo ensures that this is no longer the case. It does so by limiting management's ability to change the base data:

"Other than obvious data entry errors, route based information

may only be changed through a full-count and inspection or minor route adjustment."

Further, the DOIS Memo reemphasizes an agreement previously reached that "functions in DOIS which relate to route inspection and adjustment process must be in compliance with the city letter carrier route adjustment process in Subchapter 141 and Chapter 2 of the M-39 Handbook."

The only exception to this is for offices that have jointly established their own alternate route adjustment method. Even in that case, the Memo requires the DOIS base information to be accurately drawn from that process.

DOIS projections

This article started off by comparing DOIS to a club—used to intimidate carriers into working beyond any reasonable expectations or perhaps even outside of safe work methods in order to meet the numbers. The Memo addresses that, too. It states, "DOIS projections are not the sole determinant of a carrier's leaving or return time, or daily workload. As such, the projections cannot be used as the sole basis for corrective action."

Clearly, DOIS is not the final word. It's just a management tool. It's no different than any other tool at the supervisor's disposal—no different than a pen, a ruler, a clock, a computer, or a clipboard. DOIS is simply a tool that management has decided to use to help them figure out the resources needed to handle the daily workload.

That is why, since it is merely one of their tools, it in no way diminishes any obligation that management has in the Handbooks and Manuals cited above. The union representative should keep this in mind and should not let it distract him or her from enforcing those

Transitional Employees & the Contract

Before the most recent NALC contract was signed, many local union officials may never have encountered a transitional employee (TE). That will soon change. As a consequence of the new contract, all casuals will soon be gone and TEs will be a lot more prominent in postal installations. Some may already be working in your station. Remember, as bargaining unit employees, they are all potential NALC members.

With the expected influx of workers in this classification, it's important that everyone be familiar with the contractual rules governing their employment. Much of the 2006-2011 agreement applies to TEs, but not everything. This article will explain the most important things branch officers and stewards need to know about this newly important class of employee.

Hiring

Article 7 of the new contract lets the Postal Service hire TEs. In many installations, casual employees, once their current contracts are finished, will then be hired as TEs and continue doing the same work. Nationally, the number of TEs may not exceed 3.5% of the career city carriers covered by the contract. Within each district, TEs may not exceed 6% of the career city carriers. This hiring authority runs throughout the life of the contract. The good news for stewards and local union activists is that these numbers will be monitored by the

national office and the NBAs, not the local branch.

In addition to those hired under Article 7, the *Memorandum of Understanding Re: Transitional Employees (Flat Sequencing System)* signed September 11, 2007, gives the Postal Service the right to hire up to 8,000 additional TEs during implementation of the Flat Sequencing System (FSS). These TEs may not exceed 8% of the authorized city carrier complement for each district. These TEs are no longer authorized once all phases of FSS are complete.

How will branches know under which contractual provision a specific TE has been hired? The relevant occupation codes for the PS Form 50 are:

City Carrier Transitional Employee
(Article 7) CC-01: 2310-0030
(Article 7) CC-02: 2310-0040
(FSS MOU) CC-01: 2310-0031
(FSS-MOU) CC-02: 2310-0041

TEs are hired for a term of no longer than 360 days (compared with 359 under the previous contract). They may be rehired, but there must be a break in service of at least five days between appointments.

Hours and pay

An important aspect of the increased use of TEs—and one that rightfully is of great concern to local union officials—is its impact on

part-time flexible (PTF) and career letter carriers. Article 7.B.3 and the *Memorandum of Understanding Re: Transitional Employees – Additional Provisions* address this issue. An available and qualified PTF is to have priority for work over a TE in the same work location and on the same tour, assuming the reporting guarantee for the TE has been met. And before career employees are reassigned outside of their section, craft or installation, they must be offered any work being performed by TEs. If a full-time letter carrier is exceeded, the vacancy must not be filled by a TE, unless postal management can demonstrate that, because of operational changes, there no longer is sufficient work to justify a full-time position.

Any TE who is scheduled and reports to work is guaranteed four hours pay. There are no other guarantees: TEs may be scheduled for less than eight hours in a service day, and less than 40 hours in a service week. Under Article 8, section 4, the rules for overtime pay are the same as for career letter carriers. TEs are eligible for overtime pay for all work over eight hours in a service day and 40 hours in a service week. The rules for penalty overtime (Art. 8.4.C and 4E) and wash-up time (Art. 8.9), along with the night shift differential (Art. 8.7), also apply to TEs.

Former casual employees who are hired as TEs will notice a substantial increase in their paychecks.

Continued on page 6

obligations through the use of the DOIS Memo.

Let's emphasize again this important point: The Memo clearly states that DOIS projections alone cannot be used to determine a car-

rier's workload or leaving and return times. This represents a change from the way supervisors have used DOIS in the past. Starting now, stewards should file griev-

ances upon the actions of supervisors who continue using DOIS projections as their sole source for determining workload—in order to bring them into compliance with the Memo.

Transitional Employees

continued from page 5

TEs will be hired at Grade 1, Step A, and will be paid at Step A for the position to which they are assigned. Although pay rates for casuals varied across the country, most employees changing from casual to TE status will see an approximately \$4.00/hour increase. Article 9, Sections 1 and 3 define the salary increases and COLA adjustments to which TEs are entitled over the life of the contract.

Benefits

The benefits to which TEs are entitled differ substantially from those of a career letter carrier. TEs earn one hour of annual leave for each 20 hours worked, up to a maximum of four hours per pay period. TEs do not earn any sick leave; they must use annual leave for illnesses or injuries. As explained in the *Memorandum of Understanding Re: Transitional Employees – Additional Provisions*, except for emergencies, annual leave must be requested in advance with Form 3971. Annual leave cannot be carried over by TEs from one 360-day appointment to another; a separating TE will be paid for any accumulated leave. The Leave Sharing Memorandum of Understanding also applies to TEs.

TEs are not eligible to participate in the Federal Employees Health Benefits (FEHB) program during their first 360-day appointment. If reappointed to another 360-day term, they may pay the necessary premiums on a pre-tax basis for health insurance. The TE is responsible for the **total** cost of health insurance; the Postal Service does not make any contribution.

The *Memorandum of Understanding Re: Transitional Employee Employment Opportunities* provides that any TE who has completed 180

days of employment and is still on the rolls may take the entrance exam for a career city letter carrier position. Only one opportunity per TE will be offered. TE scores will be merged with the existing city letter carrier register.

As was the case under the previous contract, Article 26.3 provides TEs with 25% of the uniform allowance for each three months of service. This applies during the first term of appointment.

Discipline and discharge

The discipline procedures outlined in Article 16 apply to TEs, with some significant changes to the just cause provision. Using the same language contained in Appendix B of the 2001 contract, TEs may be removed at any time upon completion of their assignment or for lack of work. Such removal is not grievable.

TEs may also be removed for just cause. Such removal is subject to the grievance procedure (all of Article 15 applies), if the employee has completed 90 work days, or has otherwise been employed for 120 days. However, the concept of progressive discipline does not apply. The issue to be determined is simply whether the employee is guilty or innocent of the charge. If the employee is found guilty, the arbitrator does not have the authority to modify the penalty. In the case of removal for cause, a TE is entitled to advance written notice of the charges against him or her in accordance with Article 16.

Union membership

Unlike casuals, TEs are in the bargaining unit and can join the union. According to Article 17, Section 6, they may participate in new employee orientation, and per Article 17, Section 7, have their dues deducted from their pay-

checks. As NALC members, they may of course hold union office, if elected, or act as stewards. If TEs are union representatives, under the terms of the contract, they are permitted to use and maintain bulletin boards (Article 22), enter postal installations to perform union duties (Article 23), and go on leave to conduct union business such as training seminars or conventions (Article 24).

Because TEs are bargaining unit employees, every branch should attempt to organize them. TEs represent a large potential source of new members for the NALC, and should not be ignored. Branch officials have a compelling case to make for the value of union membership. There are at least three reasons why every TE should join the NALC:

Pay, benefits and rights. The increased pay a TE will enjoy compared to a casual's compensation. The chance to acquire health benefits after one year of service. Contractual protection through the grievance procedure unavailable to casual employees.

Strong union representation. Capable and experienced NALC representatives in every post office, working to make sure the Postal Service abides by the contract.

Membership in a leading democratic organization. Excellent union publications and training. Committed legislative activists striving to safeguard the interests of the Postal Service, protect the interests of letter carriers, and improve conditions for all working Americans.

Remember, TEs who join the NALC deserve our attention and representation, just like career letter carriers. It's important that local officials start preparing now to provide that representation, by familiarizing themselves with the contractual protections TEs enjoy. ■

Training Seminars & State Conventions

Listed below are training seminars and state association conventions for 2008. For more information, contact your National Business Agent.

Region 1—NBA Manny Peralta (714) 750-2982

California, Hawaii, Nevada, Guam
 April 10 Regional Training, Los Angeles
 April 11-12 California State Convention, Los Angeles

Region 2—NBA Paul Price (360) 892-6545

Alaska, Utah, Idaho, Montana, Oregon, Washington
 Feb. 6-9 Basic OWCP Training, Blue River, OR
 Feb. 10-14 Shop Steward College, Goldbar, WA
 Feb. 28-Mar. 2 Shop Steward College 1, Blue River, OR
 Mar. 3-6 Shop Steward College 2, Blue River, OR
 Mar. 31-Apr. 3 Shop Steward College, Bryce Canyon, UT
 April 7-10 Shop Steward College, Seely Lake, MT
 April 13-18 Shop Steward College, Boise, ID
 April 20-24 Shop Steward College, Goldbar, WA
 April 24-26 Idaho/Montana State Convention, Idaho Falls
 May 1-3 Oregon State Convention, Pendleton, OR
 May 16-17 Washington State Convention, Wenatchee
 Oct. 5-10 Regional Assembly, Olympia, WA

Region 3—NBA Neal Tisdale (309) 762-0273

Illinois
 June 25-28 Illinois State Convention, Peoria, IL
 Sept. 28-Oct. 1 Fall Statewide Training Seminar, Peoria, IL

Region 4—NBA Wesley Davis (501) 760-6566

Arizona, Arkansas, Colorado, Oklahoma, Wyoming
 Jan. 25-26 Colorado State Training, Denver, CO
 Apr. 18-19 Colorado State Convention, Colorado Springs
 May 1-3 Oklahoma State Convention, Tahlequah, OK
 May 15-17 Wyoming State Convention, Riverton, WY
 June 13-14 Arkansas State Convention, Hot Springs, AR

Region 5—NBA Mike Weir (314) 872-0227

Missouri, Iowa, Nebraska, Kansas
 Feb. 23-24 Regional Rap Session, St. Louis, MO
 April 18-20 Nebraska State Convention, Norfolk, NE
 May 1-3 Kansas State Convention, Wichita, KS
 June 6-8 Missouri State Convention, Branson, MO
 Oct. 18-19 Nebraska State Fall Training, Grand Island
 Oct. 26-28 Iowa State Fall Training, Coralville, IA

Region 6—NBA Pat Carroll (248) 589-1779

Kentucky, Indiana, Michigan
 Mar. 1-2 Kentucky Spring Training, Cumberland Falls
 May 16-17 Indiana State Convention, Merrillville, IN
 May 18-20 Michigan Spring Training, Detroit, MI
 Oct. 11-13 KIM Fall Training, location to be announced

Region 7—NBA Ned Furr (612) 378-3035

Minnesota, North Dakota, South Dakota, Wisconsin
 April 11-13 South Dakota Training, Chamberlain, SD
 April 25-27 North Dakota Training, Minot, ND
 April 28-May 2 Regional Training Seminar, Minneapolis, MN
 May 16-18 Wisconsin State Convention, Green Bay, WI
 Sept. 12-14 South Dakota Training, Chamberlain, SD

Region 7 (continued)

Oct. 5-8 Minnesota State Training, Deerwood, MN
 Oct. 24-26 North Dakota State Training, Williston, ND
 Oct. 31-Nov. 2 Wisconsin State Training, Neenah, WI

Region 8—NBA Lew Drass (256) 828-8205

Alabama, Louisiana, Mississippi, Tennessee
 Feb. 24-27 Regional Rap Session, Tunica, MS
 April 17-18 Mississippi State Convention, Vicksburg, MS
 May 30-31 Tennessee State Convention, Nashville, TN
 June 27-28 Alabama State Convention, Montgomery, AL

Region 9—NBA Judy Willoughby (954) 964-2116

Florida, Georgia, North Carolina, South Carolina
 Feb. 23-24 Steward Training, Atlanta, GA
 March 7-9 Steward Training, Orlando, FL
 March 28-29 Steward Training, Durham, NC
 April 10 Steward Training, Hilton Head, SC
 April 11-12 South Carolina State Convention, Hilton Head
 April 16-18 Regional Congressional Lobbying Trip, DC
 Summer (TBA) Georgia State Convention

Region 10—NBA Gene Goodwin (281) 540-5627

New Mexico and Texas
 Feb. 16-18 Spring Regional Rap Session, Del Rio, TX
 June 5-7 New Mexico State Convention, Albuquerque
 Oct. 11-13 Fall Regional Rap Session, Kerrville, TX

Region 11—NBA William Cooke (518) 382-1538

Upstate New York and Ohio
 April 22-24 New York Congressional Breakfast, DC
 June 10-11 Ohio Congressional Breakfast, DC

Region 12—NBA William Lucini (215) 824-4826

Pennsylvania, South and Central New Jersey
 Feb. 24-26 Regional Training, Atlantic City, NJ
 March 4-6 New Jersey Congressional Breakfast, DC
 May 4-6 New Jersey State Seminar, Atlantic City, NJ
 May 20-22 Pennsylvania Congressional Breakfast, DC

Region 13—NBA Tim Dowdy (757) 431-9053

Delaware, Maryland, Virginia, West Virginia, Wash DC
 Feb. 12-13 Maryland/DC Shop Steward Training, Waldorf
 Feb. 17-18 Delaware Shop Steward Training, Wilmington
 Feb. 21-22 Virginia Shop Steward Training, Richmond
 March 11-12 West Virginia Shop Steward Training, TBA
 April 20-22 Regional Officers' Training, Dover, DE
 May 1 Regional Congressional Breakfast, DC

Region 14—John Casciano (617) 363-9299

Connecticut, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, Rhode Island, Vermont
 April 6 Maine Congressional Breakfast, Bangor, ME
 May 16-17 Massachusetts State Convention, Sturbridge
 June 13-15 New Hampshire State Convention, Bartlett

Region 15—NBA Lawrence Cirelli (212) 868-0284

New York, North New Jersey, SW Connecticut, Puerto Rico, Virgin Islands
 May 4-6 New Jersey Training, Atlantic City, NJ

USPS

BY THE NUMBERS

2007—3rd quarter

<u>USPS Operations</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Change from SPLY*</u>
Total mail volume year-to-date (YTD) (Millions of pieces)	161,504	0.2%
Mail volume by class (YTD in millions)		
<i>First-Class</i>	73,363	-1.3%
<i>Priority Mail</i>	696	-2.5%
<i>Express</i>	42	-2.3%
<i>Periodicals</i>	6,681	-2.7%
<i>Standard (bulk mail)</i>	78,281	1.8%
<i>Packages</i>	879	-0.2%
<i>International</i>	648	6.1%
Daily delivery points		
<i>Percent city</i>	68.4%	-0.8%
<i>Percent rural</i>	29.6%	1.8%
<i>Percent Highway Contract</i>	1.9%	3.1%
City carrier routes	163,412	-0.6%
Rural carrier routes	74,871	3.0%

*SPLY = Same Period Last Year

<u>USPS Operations</u>	<u>Number</u>	<u>Change from SPLY*</u>
Estimated Net Income (\$mil.)**	\$1,634.0	182.0%
<i>Total Revenue</i>	\$74,973	3.2%
<i>Total Expense</i>	\$73,339	2.3%
City carrier employment	223,093	-1.0%
<i>Percent union members</i>	93.0%	0.5%
City Carrier Casuals	4,818	-10.8%
<i>Percent of bargaining unit</i>	2.3%	—
Transitional	0.0	-100.0%
<i>Percent of bargaining unit</i>	0.0%	—
City carriers per delivery supervisor	17.4	-3.5%
Career USPS employment	686,823	-1.6%
City carrier avg. straight-time wage	\$23.17/hr	3.9%
City carrier overtime ratio (OT hrs/total work hours)	14.5%	—
Ratio SPLY	14.2%	—

**Income figures are for the full year 2007. These figures do not take into account the effect of Postal Reform.



A NEWSLETTER FOR BRANCH LEADERS OF THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF LETTER CARRIERS



Non-Profit
U.S. Postage
PAID
Washington, D.C.
PERMIT NO. 2255