

# FROM THE OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

## Differences of Opinions

As leaders of our local branch part of our responsibility is to share with you the policies, directives, or just general information from NAPS HQ. That may include information relative to a new initiative by the Postal Service, or a concern NAPS sent to postal HQ needing a response. Periodically we get a policy agreement that has been entered into by NAPS and the Postal Service, which is the focus of this article.



Recently NAPS HQ and the Postal Service agreed that “if exempt employees are required to do craft work” they will be paid additional pay. While I have no issue with that premise. I do have a concern with NAPS agreeing to put such a policy

in writing as if it is some formal agreement. Let me be clear. I am in total agreement that EAS employees should be paid for any and all work they perform. And, I understand that all employees can be required to work in the event of an emergency. From my first day in the Postal Service it was understood that in the event of an emergency all employees can be required to work overtime. The example given to us working in plant operations was if the mail truck somehow turned over in the street, and all of the processed mailed needed to be reworked, all employees could be required to work in such an emergency. That has always been the policy. What appears to be the catalysis for this new policy is that following the impact of COVID the Postal Service has begun to ask (require) supervisors and managers to go out and carry mail, and unfortunately some are doing it. My concern is that by NAPS entering into a “formal” policy relative to this issue, it gives the impression that we tacitly agree with these new directives as long as our EAS are paid for it.

Again, I agree that if some EAS are willing to go out and deliver mail they should get any and all additional pay that is available to them. However, I’m in agreement with North Central Area Vice President, Dan Moorey, who makes it clear in his

latest article that EAS are not trained on the vehicles, does not dress for the delivery role, numerous safety violations are imminent, as well as those hours are not properly captured to reflect those delivery hours. Which means in effect we are not accurately reflecting the workhours needed to run our operations. Sounds like “endorsed” falsification to me.

In offices under the jurisdiction of Branch 23 I want it to be clear that we do not endorse, or in any way support the idea that EAS should be directed to do craft work. If an emergency occurs, then we understand. But an emergency means that it is unforeseen and definitely not scheduled.

In many of these instances senior management raises the issue of attendance, and supervisors ability to control it. We get it! But that cannot be the excuse and surely it does not constitute an emergency.

## Update on The Lawsuit

I recently read NAPS response to the Postal Service’s motion to the court to deny NAPS motion for discovery. Which simply means the Postal Service does not want NAPS to have the data necessary to prove its position that EAS was not properly compensated during the pay agreement period 2016-2019. What I found most interesting while reading this latest filing is that our Postal Service has taken the position that the law does not require it to provide EAS employees fair and equitable salaries, it just require them to consider it. Certainly NAPS does not agree with that interpretation of the law, and from previous rulings neither does the courts. Stay tuned!

## Schedule Inconsistent with Operation

While discussing the issue of supervisor’s schedules in customer service operations, I discovered that on numerous occasions managers have posted supervisory positions with starting times that are inconsistent with their actual needs. It appears they have been led to believe they can simply change the supervisors hours after they get them in. Not True!

Ken Bunch, President