



## Mind reading

**E**ver think how much easier things would be if we could read each others' minds? Take MIARAP, for instance. The initial step in the process requires the District Evaluation and Adjustment Team (DEAT) to discuss potential problem areas in the Post Office that they are about to discuss with the Local Office Contacts (LOCs). The NALC LOC may not have been aware of any data integrity issues in the office if it hadn't been for the shop steward investigating a grievance and discovering management inappropriately changing MODS codes, which served to classify a letter carrier as an inanimate object during a time frame, instead of what he/she was really doing, delivering mail.

Those grievances would come in handy in discussing the data integrity issues with the DEAT, whether the

**“If the DLT couldn't agree on a resolution, the area/regional team could read their minds and there would be no reason for the DLT to elevate the issue.”**

issue was changing MODS codes, time clock rings, not accurately tracking auxiliary assistance, or running a fabricated “phantom” router system. Without this information that the steward uncovered, the DEAT would have to be mind readers.

If the DEAT could read minds, why not the LOC and the shop steward? The steward could have read the minds of the manager who changed the codes or changed the time clock rings or didn't track auxiliary assistance or didn't provide router relief to a route that was adjusted by that means. That steward would then have immediately requested the documented evidence to support his/her grievance, but then that wouldn't be needed, either, because the grievance handlers on both sides could read the appropriate culprit's mind and stipulate to what went on and deal with it.

Then there's the matter of the MIARAP carrier consultations. If the carrier could read minds, he/she would instantly know what the DEAT's initial evaluation of his/her route was and what went into their individual thought process that caused them to consider that initial “take” of that route. The DEAT could shortly read the mind of the carrier and tell whether or not he/she agreed with their agreed-upon time and, if the carrier didn't, be able to tell exactly why the carrier viewed the route differently. The LOCs could read the DEAT and the carrier's minds and provide some input as to which one's viewpoint was more valid in their minds. Of course, that input wouldn't be needed, because the DEAT could read the LOC's minds and automatically understand that.

And say the DEAT members disagreed with each other over how the route(s) should be adjusted. They could instantly read each other's minds and tell what the logic in the other's position was. If that didn't act as a means to resolve the issue, they wouldn't have to elevate the issue to the District Lead Team (DLT), because they would automatically read the DEAT's minds and tell that they disagreed on an issue.

If the DLT couldn't agree on a resolution, the area/regional team could read their minds and there would be no reason for the DLT to elevate the issue, because the area/regional team would already know it and work on resolving it. All issues in dispute would be instantaneously elevated to the next level of MIARAP. We could expeditiously resolve issues in dispute quicker than it would take if one simply read and understood the MIARAP agreement and got all disputed issues elevated through all levels within one week, when necessary, if the time limits within the agreement were adhered to.

**Of course, the problem with reading minds is that you can not only read what someone else's opinion is, but also their motive for having that opinion. And right now I'm wondering if anyone can read my mind and uncover my motive for writing this.** ☒