Overtime equitability

The equitable distribution of overtime hours and opportunities is an important benefit to the city letter carrier craft that ensures parity. In most cases, such as bidding on assignments and selecting annual leave during the choice vacation period, seniority is the deciding factor. The distribution of overtime to full-time letter carriers on the overtime desired list (ODL) is one of the exceptions to the seniority rules. Under Article 8 of the National Agreement, management is required to ensure that the overtime hours, as well as the opportunities to work overtime, are kept equitable among those carriers on the ODL.

Article 8, Section 5 contains the provisions regarding equitability and explains that when there is a need for overtime, employees from the ODL will be selected. This section also explains that during the quarter, every effort will be made to distribute the opportunities for overtime equitably among those signed up to the ODL. Equitability applies only to carriers who have signed up to the ODL.

Article 8, Section 5.C.2 of the National Agreement states in part:

a. When during the quarter the need for overtime arises, employees with the necessary skills having listed their names will be selected from the "Overtime Desired" list.

b. During the quarter every effort will be made to distribute equitably the opportunities for overtime among those on the "Overtime Desired" list.

Of course, to distribute the overtime equitably, there needs to be a record or system to monitor the distribution. Article 8, Section 5.C.2.c explains:

c. In order to insure equitable opportunities for overtime, overtime hours worked and opportunities offered will be posted and updated weekly.

Although the above provision is a requirement for management, many branches and shop stewards discover that the best way to prevent inequitable overtime distribution is to regularly review the posting and alert management to opportunities to improve the distribution. Heading off the problem avoids depriving letter carriers of their rights and the need to file a grievance at the end of the quarter. Efforts to fix the problem also can be used as evidence to support a remedy when management does not make appropriate corrections to distribute the overtime.

The methods used to calculate the inequitable distribution of overtime can vary, depending on the circumstances. Shop stewards who are unsure what constitutes equitability in their section or installation should consult their branch president or national business agent for guidance.

Prior to the 2016 National Agreement, the only overtime that was counted when determining equitability was the time an ODL carrier worked more than eight hours off of their bid assignment, or all work on a non-scheduled day. This provision made determining equitability more difficult, especially in situations where a letter carrier was properly assigned in the Time and Attendance Collection System (TACS). This language was changed in the 2016 National Agreement to count all hours worked, whether on or off a letter carrier’s regular assignment on a regularly scheduled day. All overtime worked on a non-scheduled day continues to be counted as it was prior to 2016. The requirement to count all overtime is found in Article 8, Section 5.C.2.e, which states:

e. All overtime hours worked by, and all opportunities offered to, employees on the "Overtime Desired" list, regardless of whether the overtime/opportunity is on or off the employee’s own route, will be considered and counted when determining quarterly equitability.

The 2022 Joint Contract Administration Manual (JCAM) explains that the number of hours of overtime as well as the number of opportunities for overtime must be considered. Missed opportunities for overtime must be made up for in the quarter. Page 8-11 of the JCAM states:

Missed opportunities for overtime—i.e. one ODL carrier worked instead of another—must be made up for with equitable distribution of overtime during the quarter unless the bypassed carrier was not available—i.e. the carrier was on leave or working overtime on his/her own route on a regularly scheduled day, etc.

Article 8, Section 5.C.2.f clarifies how work on holidays or designated holidays is counted, stating:

f. Only overtime hours worked or opportunities offered beyond eight hours on a holiday or designated holiday will be considered and counted when determining equitability.

Full-time flexible (FTF) employees can complicate equitability as they might have flexible reporting locations within an installation. When a FTF letter carrier works in the same overtime section for the entire quarter, determining their equitability is straightforward and the same as other ODL carriers. However, if the FTF works in multiple overtime sections during the quarter, only the share of overtime from the time they sign the ODL in the new section will be considered. Page 8-12 of the JCAM explains that FTF letter carriers will not be moved to circumvent their equitability rights, stating:

Although the rules governing the distribution of overtime to letter carriers on the ODL are straightforward, manage-
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ment often will fail to keep these carriers equitable during the quarter. When this occurs, letter carriers who were not kept equitable are entitled to a remedy for the violation. The appropriate remedy for violations of Article 8, Sections 5.C.2.a-c was established by National Arbitrator Howard Gamser in case NC-S-5426, April 3, 1979. According to Arbitrator Gamser’s award, management must pay the letter carrier who was not kept equitable during the quarter or offer a makeup opportunity during the next quarter. The explanation of Arbitrator Gamser’s award is found on page 8-12 of the JCAM, which states in part:

[T]he Postal Service must pay employees deprived of equitable opportunities for the overtime hours they did not work only if management’s failure to comply with its contractual obligations under Article 8.5.C.2 shows “a willful disregard or defiance of the contractual provision, a deliberate attempt to grant disparate or favorable treatment to an employee or group of employees, or caused a situation in which the equalizing opportunity could not be afforded within the next quarter.” In all other cases, Gamser held, the proper remedy is to provide “an equalizing opportunity in the next immediate quarter, or pay a compensatory monetary award if this is not done...”

Determining the proper remedy requires an investigation into the specific facts of the case and applying Arbitrator Gamser’s award.

Equitable distribution of overtime protects letter carriers, but it must be monitored and maintained to be effective. Thanks to all the shop stewards and branch officers who play a role in enforcing the National Agreement.

NACL offers deepest sympathies to the families and friends of departed brothers and sisters

Scott L. Gmelin Br. 1477 West Coast FL
Edward G. Sax Br. 1477 West Coast FL
Roger L. Edmondson Br. 1690 West Coast FL
David D. Harvey Br. 263 Augusta, GA
Kingley S. Andrews Br. 219 Aurora, IL
Thomas A. Barnes Br. 219 Aurora, IL
John E. Burghardt Br. 219 Aurora, IL
Gerald R. Fermazin Br. 219 Aurora, IL
William Nevicosi Br. 219 Aurora, IL
Janis M. Martin Br. 1870 Downers Grove, IL
Art Johnson Br. 1151 Naperville, IL
William J. Stilieen Br. 80 Springfield, IL
Roger T. Craig Br. 39 Indianapolis, IN
Harry J. Douglass Br. 39 Indianapolis, IN
Edward L. Early Br. 39 Indianapolis, IN
David W. Lawson Br. 39 Indianapolis, IN
Tine P. Martin Br. 39 Indianapolis, IN
Gary A. Milbrath Br. 39 Indianapolis, IN
William D. Penick Br. 39 Indianapolis, IN
Wayne C. Ellis Br. 39 Wichita, KS
Joseph A. Mueller Br. 201 Wichita, KS
Jonrikia A. Lastie Br. 6377 Mandeville, LA
Mark Heywood Br. 391 Central ME Mgd.
Frank F. Braunstein Br. 391 Baltimore, MD
Paul A. Kelly Br. 4422 Glen Burnie, MD
Frank D. Fazzina Br. 34 Boston, MA
Gary D. Ferdelman Br. 434 Ann Arbor, MI
Kenneth D. Kwedel Br. 3 Detroit, MI
Theodore W. Robinson Br. 2555 E. Lansing, MI
Robert W. Conibear Br. 320 N. Oakland Co., MI
Lathila W. Paul Br. 320 N. Oakland Co., MI
William A. Mayhew Br. 217 Austin, MN
William F. Massmann Br. 205 Melrose, MN
Robert D. Landa Br. 9 Minneapolis, MN
Harry J. Bealke Br. 28 St. Paul, MN
Kevin G. Hevelone Br. 8 Lincoln, NE
Margaret A. Romanic Br. 67 Elizabeth, NJ
John J. Vayar Br. 924 Freehold, NJ
John Carigg Br. 42 Jersey City, NJ
Gerald J. Dorman Br. 42 Jersey City, NJ
Angelo C. Ingratta Br. 42 Jersey City, NJ
Meyer Pollack Br. 38 NJ Mgd.
Quentin Q. Christian Br. 38 NJ Mgd.
Christopher L. Hines Br. 38 NJ Mgd.
Gary A. Travies Br. 38 NJ Mgd.
Jesse N. Duran Jr. Br. 506 Albuquerque, NM
B. B. Campbell Br. 29 Albany, NY
William D. Matthews Br. 29 Albany, NY
Robert Robinson Br. 29 Albany, NY
Andrew T. Treglio Br. 41 Brooklyn, NY
Zhong M. Wang Br. 41 Brooklyn, NY
J. A. Howland Br. 21 Elmira, NY
Carmin F. Masi Br. 36 New York, NY
Frank S. Pullara Br. 36 New York, NY
C. E. Frost Br. 134 Syracuse, NY
Henry L. Goldacker Br. 134 Syracuse, NY
Lee D. Morrow Br. 2262 Burlington, NJ
Warren R. Brey Br. 1152 Minot, ND
Richard L. Brady Br. 182 Dayton, OH
Harold W. Pickens Br. 458 Oklahoma City, OK
Jimmy L. Wilson Br. 458 Oklahoma City, OK
Brian P. Nemeczek Br. 82 Portland, OR
Gail R. King Br. 284 Erie, PA
Robert W. Gulla Br. 4973 Levittown, PA
Barney H. Seaton Br. 84 Pittsburgh, PA
Eugene T. Gates Jr. Br. 132 Dallas, TX
Brittany N. Mayfield Br. 283 Houston, TX
Carlos R. Martinez Br. 3520 Northern VA
Eric N. Graham Br. 111 Salt Lake City, UT
Deborah J. Hubbard Br. 372 Lynchburg, VA
Herold A. Bell Jr. Br. 496 Richmond, VA
William J. Vild Br. 247 Tidewater, VA
Michael A. Jones Br. 853 Aberdeen, WA
Lyke M. Norquist Br. 728 Eau Claire, WI
Frank L. Grueuer Jr. Br. 2 Milwaukee, WI
Virgil A. McCullough Br. 463 Laramie, WY