

## **New deliveries update**

resident Rolando recently asked me to take on oversight responsibility for our assignment of city delivery project. This task has changed hands at headquarters several times since the Memorandum of Understanding Re: Assignment of City Delivery (M-01694) was signed in October 2008. (The text of this MOU is reprinted on the next page.)

Well, I guess it's my turn to take a shot at this long-standing problem. Let me begin by expressing my thanks to all of you who have participated in seeking compliance with the M-01694 to this point. Your efforts are greatly appreciated!

This issue is a source of frustration for many of us at all levels of the NALC. I'm no exception, and no stranger to the issue. However, frustration and experience with the issue just gives me more incentive to see this thing through.

So, where are we? The first thing you need to remember is that there are two sides to this issue now. Each side is marked by dates. One side is from Oct. 22, 2008, through Nov. 20, 2011; the other side is from Nov. 21, 2011, forward.

**Let's look at the Oct. 22, 2008, through Nov. 20, 2011,** side first. There were about 2.5 million delivery points added nationwide between the signing of the M-01694 and Sept. 30, 2011.

Almost 1 million of these new deliveries were assigned to our craft. That leaves about 1.5 million delivery points that were not assigned to our craft. About 120,000 of the 1.5 million deliveries were assigned to highway contract routes, but the rest were assigned to the rural craft.

Our task has always been twofold. First, we have to figure out how many of the 1.5 million new delivery points (that weren't assigned to our craft) were assigned in error. Then we have to convince the Postal Service that we are correct in our claims.

I can report that our quest to achieve compliance with the M-01694 is alive and well and will continue. We have approximately 1,600 total disputes involving nearly 250,000 new deliveries as of this writing.

You can form your own opinion about whether or not we should have more disputes, but in the end, it doesn't

really matter what any of us think about it. All we have to go on are the errors pointed out by local branches since 2008.

We have had a new delivery lead coordinator set up in each region for close to a year now. We added NALC district coordinators for each postal district around the country somewhere around the first of this year. The lead coordinator's role is to oversee our efforts to achieve compliance with the M-01694 within each region. The NALC district coordinator's role is to communicate with local branches to ensure that each case file is fully documented. They are also responsible for meeting with management in each postal district to discuss new deliveries assigned in error.

The point is that there are a lot of NALC representatives actively working on the assignment of city delivery project. If you are contacted by one of them, please try to provide the needed assistance.

Initial meetings have been held in nine of 67 postal districts (a few have met twice) to discuss the errors we believe were made. There were 27 more meetings scheduled before Aug. 1 (a few districts had more than one meeting scheduled). It's really too early to report on the results of these meetings, but we'll update you as things develop.

The other side of this issue involves the timeframe from Nov. 21, 2011, forward. USPS has taken the position that M-01694 expired on Nov. 20, 2011. We disagree and responded by filing an interpretive dispute on the issue.

The only difference between the two timeframes is how claims of improper assignment of what should be city delivery are handled. For all new deliveries that came/come online after Nov. 20, 2011, branches are advised to file grievances citing a violation of M-01694 via Article 15 of the National Agreement. You can read more about it on the next page.

If you need help with filing claims or processing grievances on this issue, please contact your national business agent's office for guidance.