Many of you who attended the Anaheim convention saw the display “Still Delivering: A History of the Letter Carriers 1889-2009.” This display was based on a larger exhibit which ran from September 2009 - May 2010 at the Reuther Library in Detroit, home of the NALC’s official archives. While that exhibit was open, hundreds, if not thousands, of NALC members had the opportunity to take in the detailed story of NALC’s proud history, told through the treasures of NALC’s historical collection.

But of course, not everyone could get to Detroit. To reach a much larger portion of the NALC membership, Reuther archivist Katie Dowgiewicz put together a version of the exhibit for the 67th convention. She and Reuther Director Mike Smith brought this smaller display to Anaheim. They were available at the convention throughout the week to discuss the display and the Reuther collection. They even meet the subject of one of the photographs used in the exhibit.

Continued on page 8
Grievance handling . . .

The rest of the story

It could be a problem...and it’s your fault! No one ever wants to hear those words, so make sure you never have to hear them.

What are we talking about? Grievances—grievance forms and grievance packets completely filled out and accurately documented. Every grievance file should be completed as if it is going to arbitration.

When you file a grievance you should make only one assumption—no one knows anything about the grievance. If your case isn’t settled at Informal Step A, don’t assume your case will be settled at any other stage of the process prior to arbitration. Don’t assume the B-Team will fix it when they get their hands on it and don’t assume anyone else knows anything about the case or the circumstances of the grievance—even if it is a repeated violation that you’ve filed on time after time.

This may seem like Steward 101 but every grievance should tell the story as if it’s being told to someone for the first time with no knowledge of the particulars. Tell the story like you are talking to a civilian. You may be thinking this is over-kill, but it is not. The fact of the matter is you may be telling this to a civilian, since you may be telling the grievance story to an arbitrator.

Once the grievance is appealed to arbitration, you don’t have a chance to clear things up or add more complete information. The time to add information is at the beginning, when you are creating the grievance file. It is a well established principle that no new arguments or evidence shall be admitted for the first time in arbitration. In a national level arbitration, Arbitrator Benjamin Aaron wrote clear language about new arguments or evidence presented for the first time in arbitration:

It is now well settled that parties to arbitration under a National Agreement between the Postal Service and a signatory Union are barred from introducing evidence or arguments not presented at preceding steps of the grievance procedure, and that this principle must be strictly observed. The reason for the rule is obvious: neither party should have to deal with evidence or argument presented for the first time in an arbitration hearing, which it has not previously considered and for which it has had no time to prepare rebuttal evidence and argument. Arbitrator Benjamin Aaron C-04085

This well known principle is recognized for a very good reason. The parties have agreed to attempt to resolve all grievances at the lowest level and that means all the facts and supporting evidence must be available at those lower steps. If the matter can’t be resolved by a careful review of all the facts in the earlier steps then the arbitrator is the last resort and it is patently unfair and unethical to introduce “new facts” or “arguments” at that late date. So, the point—take the time, make the effort, fill in all the details, include all the contractual arguments at the very beginning of the process to insure there are no surprises along the way.

Dot the i, cross the t

Remember, you are telling the story to someone with no previous knowledge of the facts and circumstances. So let’s look at some very simple examples of what might be missing from the story and what’s needed to make it clear. In a grievance the union tells the story on PS Form 8190 (union’s full, detailed statement of disputed facts and contentions). In this example let’s look at the union’s statement regarding an overtime violation:

Rusty was available to work on Tuesday (October 27th).
Rusty is on the OTDL and was non-scheduled on Tuesday the 27th. The shop steward spoke to Supervisor Reynolds on the preceding Monday and told him there were two (2) vacant routes on Tuesday and that Rusty was non-scheduled and available. Supervisor Reynolds said he knew about the vacancy and Rusty’s availability and that it would “be alright.” On Tuesday, Rusty was available to work, was not scheduled or called in to work and five (5) non-OTDL carriers were forced to work in lieu of the available OTDL employee…  

This seems to be a pretty straightforward account of what happened. Clearly there would be more information, such as the names of the non-OTDL employees who worked and their clock rings, but there is one very significant fact that is missing. There is no one named “Rusty” on any of the TACs reports and no one named “Rusty” on any of the other supporting documents. What happened? How can this oversight be fixed?

This is an example of failing to dot the “i” or cross the “t.” The grievant’s name is Thomas Smith, but everyone—and I mean everyone—knows him as Rusty. In fact, there are a lot of carriers who know him only as “Rusty” and would have to think long and hard to remember him as Thomas that Thomas is Rusty. If the B-Team doesn’t settle the case, it may be appealed to arbitration and the proper identity of “Rusty” is quite possibly a serious issue.

Can the identity of “Rusty” be fixed at arbitration? Perhaps, but probably only after management objects to the introduction of evidence because there has been no connection made to link Thomas Smith with “Rusty.” Remember, the TACs reports will be for Thomas Smith and the daily schedule is probably under that name too. It will take additional testimony at the hearing to connect the names. This potential problem can be easily solved. When you write the union’s statement, make the link at the beginning:

The grievant, Thomas Smith, who is known as “Rusty” was available to work on Tuesday (October 27th). Rusty is on the OTDL and was non-scheduled on Tuesday…

The addition of eight words, which identify Smith as “Rusty,” fixes the problem neatly and easily.

Make it clear and understandable

When you explain the facts of the grievance, don’t use acronyms or jargon, without first explaining what the acronym stands for or what the jargon means. You may have filed a similar grievance, say an overtime violation, over and over and you know the B-Team is aware of the situation. That is all the more reason to be careful with the details.

If you are talking about the Overtime Desired List, spell it out first followed by (OTDL). From that point on you can simply write OTDL and everyone will know what it means. If you are talking about the “throw-back case” explain that it is a piece of postal equipment used by all carriers in the section to place endorsed mail or mis-sorted mail. It only takes a small amount of time to make clear to anyone reading your grievance file what you mean and what you’re talking about.

When you include names, make sure you explain each name and the significance of the person. For instance, if you list Sam Mackey in your grievance, explain he is a carrier, that he regularly carries RT 485, that he is on the overtime list and that he was available to work on the day in question. If you reference supervisor Reynolds, be careful to use her correct title and accurately describe her duties. Make sure whoever is reading your grievance file knows that supervisor Reynolds is the supervisor on duty when carriers arrive and is responsible for scheduling the daily overtime assignments.

(Continued on page 9)
Reversion revisited

We have been arguing reversion and maximization issues since the start of collective bargaining. And while much has remained the same, there are new twists and turns.

Article 41, Section 1.A.1 in part provides the rules which allows management to revert an assignment. To start, let’s differentiate between abolishment and reversion. In both cases the end result is the same – the full-time assignment is eliminated. The assignment may by eliminated completely or it may become an auxiliary assignment; either way no full-time incumbent remains on the assignment. The difference is “abolishment” is a broad term that defines situations such as the elimination of an assignment as a result of route adjustments. “Reversion,” on the other hand, is very specific. It’s defined in Article 41.1.A.1 as “a vacant or newly established duty assignment”; in other words it’s an assignment without an incumbent letter carrier on it.

Secondly, the contract places limits on management’s right to revert assignments. Requirement number one is that the “decision” to revert must be made within 30 days after it becomes vacant. The second requirement is that if management does not make the decision to revert within 30 days the assignment must be posted for bid. The third requirement placed on management is that it must provide the local union with written notice of its consideration to revert the assignment and the results of that consideration.

In addition to the requirements in Article 41, Section 1.A.1 you must consider both Article 3 and Article 7 when considering reversion.

It is important to understand that while the provision in Box #1 below gives management broad managerial rights, the first sentence requires that those provisions are subject to the rest of the National Agreement. Management cannot hide behind Article 3 if other provisions of the Agreement are breached.

Article 7, Section 3 deals with various forms of maximization. The union has historically argued that the reversion of assignments must be contemplated with consideration to its obligation to maximize assignments (see Box 2).

So the union has historically argued that before management may revert an assignment, it must minimize the number of part-time employees and maximize the number of full-time employees in all postal installations; however, nothing in this paragraph B shall detract from the USPS’ ability to use the awarded full-time/part-time ratio as provided for in paragraph 3.A. above.

Box 2

### Article 41: Management Rights

The Employer shall have the exclusive right, subject to the provisions of this Agreement and consistent with applicable laws and regulations:

C. To maintain the efficiency of the operations entrusted to it;

D. To determine the methods, means, and personnel by which such operations are to be conducted, , , ,

Box 1
for in paragraph 3.A. above.”
This means that if management
has met the 88 percent full-time
staffing requirement for 200
workyear offices provided by
Article 7.3.A, then Article 7.3.B
does not require any further
maximization of full-time posi-
tions.

New arguments?
So given these limitations, are
there any new arguments that can
be made? Several recent regional
arbitration awards shed new light
on this issue. It should be noted
that regional arbitration awards,
while citable, are not precedent
setting except for the office where
the grievance was filed. Arbitra-
tors, however, consider such
awards to have persuasive value.

Arbitrator Joseph W. Duffy in
Case No. E06N-4E-C 09328061
(C-28631) found that management
improperly reverted a reserve letter
carrier (RLC) position because a
full-time flexible (FTF) remained
employed. In his finding Arbitrator
Duffy states:

In my judgment, the em-
ployer made a reasonable deci-
sion based on facts and did not
act arbitrarily or capriciously
when it reverted position
#95797406.

The second major question
raised by this case is whether
the employer could revert a
RLC position while a FTF con-
tinued to work. This question
presents a difficult problem of
interpretation. A 1980 Mitten-
thal arbitration decision re-
quired the parties to return to
the bargaining table to develop
maximization criteria concerning
the conversion of PTFs to
full-time status (N8-NA-0141).
The parties at the National
Level subsequently negotiated
the 1981 Letter of Intent (LOI).
The LOI state the following in
paragraph 6:

6. In those installations
where conversions have been
made under this Memorandum
of Understanding, and there
are subsequent reversions or
excessing, any reduction in
full-time letter carrier posi-
tions shall be from among
those position(s) converted
pursuant to this Memorandum
of Understanding until they
are exhausted.

Looking only at the LOI, one
could argue that it deals only with
the conversions made in 1981 as
part of the settlement of that par-
ticular grievance. The JCAM, how-
ever, discusses the 1981 LOI and
provides some guidance on the cur-
cent applicability of the LOI.... The
JCAM, however, states the follow-
ing:

A 1978 memorandum of un-
derstanding, similar to the 1987
memorandum above first estab-
lished a type of letter carrier
status—“full-time flexible”—not
mentioned in Article 7. The
1981 letter of intent reprinted
above was created in settlement
of a grievance brought under
the 1978 memorandum, and
remains in effect under the 1987
memorandum...

Accordingly, the JCAM makes
clear that the 1981 LOI remains in
effect.

In this case, however, the union
does not contend that the Postal
Service is prohibited from rever-
ting positions that are no longer
needed. The union argues instead
that the LOI that remains part of
the parties National Agreement
requires that FTTs be reduced first
before other full-time positions are
reverted or excessed.

In offices that have Full-Time
Flexible letter carriers, the argu-
ments made in the above case can
be advanced as additional reasons
for stopping management from
reverting an assignment.

In another recent decision Arbi-
trator Jonathan S. Monat grappled
with a claim by management that
the case was not substantively arbi-
trable. In Case No. F06N-4F-C
09312147 (C-28797) management
argued that the union filed a griev-
ance before the assignment was
actually reverted. Management
argued that since the assignment
had not yet been reverted, no harm
had come to the union and there-
fore the grievance was filed prema-
turely. In finding the grievance
arbitrable, Arbitrator Monat states:

In order for the Union to
prevail on the arbitrability is-
uue, it must show some harm.
There must be a demonstration
of an “actual present or imme-
diately threatened injury.” In
this case, the Arbitrator finds
(Continued on page 11)
Route Reviews

Beginning October 18, 2010 the District Lead Teams for the Joint Alternate Route Adjustment Process (JARAP) began analyzing Route Review Reports to determine if routes were properly adjusted under JARAP. If a team determines a route is out of adjustment it will initiate adjustments based on available data and/or assign a District Evaluation and Adjustment Team (DEAT) to conduct the adjustments using the JARAP methodology. (See M-01720 below)

(Continued on page 9)

M-01720

3. The District Lead Team will use the following period to review the evaluations and adjustments conducted pursuant to paragraph 2 above, unless the District Evaluation and Adjustment Team mutually agrees to select a different period.

The District Lead Team will review the Route Review Reports for the time frame below to jointly determine if the routes/zones are in proper adjustment. If the team determines that all previously evaluated routes within a zone are properly adjusted, no further action is required. If the District Lead Team determines otherwise, a District Evaluation and Adjustment Team will be assigned to complete an evaluation of the routes/zone using the below period, unless the District Lead Team mutually agrees that only small changes need to be made. In such case, the District Lead Team may initiate changes based on available data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation Period</th>
<th>Analysis Start Date</th>
<th>Implementation Period</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>September–October 15</td>
<td>October 18</td>
<td>October 18—February 28*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*No adjustments will be implemented between November 15 and January 1.

If it is determined that several routes will likely need adjustment the District Lead Team may assign the evaluation/adjustment over to a District Evaluation and Adjustment Team for completion. The team completing the evaluation will use the methodology outlined in this agreement for those routes needing adjustments.

Evaluation and adjustment of collection and parcel post routes that do not include any casing and delivery of mail are not covered by this agreement. Evaluation and adjustment of these types of routes will be handled pursuant to the relevant provisions of Handbook M-39. However, when a collection or parcel post route includes the casing or delivery of mail, it is covered by this agreement. Additionally, when a collection or parcel post route that does not include casing and delivery of mail is going to be adjusted to include the casing or delivery of mail, the inspection paperwork will be given to the District Evaluation and Adjustment Team to include in their adjustment package under this process.

Evaluation and adjustment of city delivery routes in non-DOIS offices will use the following procedures except that PS Forms 3997 and 3921 will be used in place of the Workhour Workload Reports referenced below.
NRP vs. President Obama

The Postal Service has been implementing its National Reassessment Program (NRP) nationwide since 2007. In some areas, the Postal Service has managed the program in compliance with its contractual and legal requirements. These requirements include the obligation to make every effort towards finding limited duty work for partially disabled employees who have on-the-job injuries.

Unfortunately, in too many jurisdictions, local Postal Service management has implemented NRP in ways that violate its contractual and legal obligations. In too many places, local management has withdrawn limited duty work from injured employees who had previously successfully performed that work, and then assigned the same work to PTFs, TEs and regular employees on overtime. One regrettable result has been a reduction in the number of employees with disabilities who are employed by the Postal Service. A significant body of arbitral, Merit System Protection Board (MSPB) and Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC) authority establishes these claims as fact. To date, those decisions have not noticeably slowed the Postal Service’s pace of implementing NRP, nor its rate of violations of contract and law when it does so.

Hopefully, the authority of the President of the United States will have more of an influence on the Postal Service leadership responsible for the wholesale violations when NRP is locally implemented.

Executive order 13548

On July 26, 2010 President Barack Obama signed Executive Order 13548 on increasing federal employment of individuals with disabilities. It was published in the Federal Register on July 30, 2010.

President Obama’s order seeks to establish the Federal Government as a model employer of individuals with disabilities. The order clearly states,

Executive departments and agencies (agencies) must improve their efforts to employ workers with disabilities through increased recruitment, hiring, and retention of these individuals.

Section 3 specifically addresses the retention of those injured on the job,

Agencies shall make special efforts, to the extent permitted by law, to ensure the retention of those who are injured on the job. Agencies shall work to improve, expand, and increase successful return-to-work outcomes for those of their employees who sustain work-related injuries and illnesses, as defined under the Federal Employees’ Compensation Act (FECA), by increasing the availability of job accommodations and light or limited duty jobs, removing disincentives for FECA claimants to return to work, and taking other appropriate measures.

It is difficult to reconcile the President’s order to make special efforts to ensure retention of those injured on the job with the (in too many cases) local implementation of NRP where it appears that the Postal Service is making special efforts to ensure the removal of those injured on the job from their existing, long-held limited duty and rehabilitation jobs.

Section 3 of the order also requires:

The Secretary of Labor, in consultation with the Director of the Office of Personnel Management, shall pursue innovative re employment strategies and develop policies, procedures, and structures that foster improved return to work outcomes, including by pursuing overall reform of the FECA system. The Secretary of Labor shall also propose specific outcome measures and targets by which each agency’s progress in carrying out return to work and FECA claims processing efforts can be assessed.

The NALC has communicated with Postal Service headquarters requesting information about its intentions regarding compliance with Executive Order 13548. We await a response.

In the meantime, local contract enforcers should obtain a copy of the Executive Order and ensure it is placed and argued in every grievance file that protests a withdrawal of limited duty or a failure to provide limited duty. The Executive Order can be found online here:

Exhibit tells NALC story
Continued from page 1

The display can now be in your branch

Branches can borrow the display for use at a branch meeting, retirement luncheon or other union function. It’s an easy way to educate branch members, many of whom may not know much about the union to which they belong. The 15 panels are arranged in groups of three, and will fit on four standard six-feet tables. The display comes in five boxes; it’s very easy to set up.

Requests to borrow the display will be taken on a first-come, first-served basis. While there is no charge to borrow the display, the branch will have to cover the cost of either returning it to the NALC’s Washington office or sending it on to the next location.

panels can be affixed to foam core for a permanent exhibit, or used as posters or handouts.

To borrow the display, or to get a set of the images, please contact Nancy Dysart at the address which follows. Requests for digital images will be filled upon receipt; requests to borrow the actual display will be honored in the order they are received.

Nancy Dysart
Director
NALC Information Center
100 Indiana Ave. NW
Washington DC 20001
202-662-2879
dysart@nalc.org

More information on the Reuther Library and the NALC collection can be found at www.reuther.edu.
Continued from page 3

Don’t assume it will settle locally

As another example, let’s look at a situation where a grievance is filed because a letter carrier has received discipline based on the observation of a supervisor on the workroom floor. The letter of discipline says,

...Supervisor Reynolds was seated at her desk and saw you, Thomas Smith (also known as Rusty), case a full coverage set of circulars into his letter case in direct violation of the explicit instructions given by the supervisor the morning of the incident...

The union claims Rusty didn’t case the circulars and further claims the supervisor has no proof to support the allegation—a typical “did not/did too” situation. Like it or not, arbitrators often accept eye witness observations as credible.

Remember, you need to tell the story as if you are telling it to a complete stranger who has no knowledge of the circumstances.

The union may be correct that supervisor Reynolds has no proof, but she has claimed to have seen what she’s seen—a first person eye-witness. The union may also be correct when they claim “she doesn’t like him anyway,” but without anything to support it, that allegation it is only an allegation.

In this case, the union states quite simply in Rusty’s defense,

...Supervisor Reynolds has not proof Rusty cased the circulars and everyone know she doesn’t like him anyway...

Remember, you need to tell the story as if you are telling it to a complete stranger who has no knowledge of the circumstances. The union may be correct that supervisor Reynolds has no proof, but she has claimed to have seen what she’s seen—a first person eye-witness. The union may also be correct when they claim “she doesn’t like him anyway,” but without anything to support it, that allegation it is only an allegation.

What the union has counted on is a belief the grievance would be

(Continued on page 10)
The rest of the story
(Continued from page 9)
settlement at Formal A. Unfortunately, the case was not settled at Formal A and because of a heavy workload at Step B the case was sent to an available Step B Team in another part of the country. That’s right—the grievance you file may not go to the B-Team in your district.

When a district Step B Team is overburdened with a backlog of cases it isn’t uncommon for some of that backlog to be redistributed to B-Teams in other parts of the country who aren’t as behind. While this shuffling of cases has always happened in order to keep decisions timely, it appears to be occurring more often as grievance activity spikes in different areas of the country. The point, again, is that you may be sending a story to someone who has no knowledge of the people involved or the office.

When Rusty’s grievance gets to the B-Team the case may be impassed based on the supervisors eye-witness account and the union’s statement that there isn’t any proof. The B-Team has made their decision based on what is before them.

Then, when the case is appealed to arbitration the union’s advocate discovers the supervisor’s desk was located 60 feet away from Rusty’s case and the line of sight is obscured by equipment, but that’s not in the file. The union advocate discovers that there are carriers who can substantiate Rusty’s claim that he didn’t case the circulars; one is the carrier who carried one hour off Rusty’s route. Also, the union advocate finds out supervisor Reynolds and Rusty had exchanged harsh words at the beginning of the tour, but it isn’t in the file. None of this is in the file. If the advocate tries to introduce this “new” evidence and arguments at the hearing, management will no doubt object and the arbitrator would be justified in sustaining management’s objection and exclude the “new” information.

From this example it is apparent the union didn’t provide the Union’s full, detailed statement of disputed facts and contentions. If the union had planned on the grievance moving past Formal Step A it would probably have prepared differently, but that’s exactly the point. The union would have provided a detailed layout of the workroom floor showing where supervisor Reynolds’ desk was located and where Rusty’s case was and the distance between the two along with the narrative and possibly a photograph. The layout of the workroom floor would have shown what equipment would have obstructed supervisor Reynolds’ view. The file would provide a copy of PS Form 3996 showing Rusty handed off a one hour pivot and the statement of the carrier who would state the circulars were not cased but carried as a third bundle on that hour. The grievance file might have provided statements from other carriers who saw Rusty not case the circulars, and others who heard the harsh words between the two. Remember, the grievance file is the union’s full and complete defense for Rusty. If it goes beyond the local level without all the necessary information, the grievance may prove to be lacking.

Is there something unique to your installation?
Don’t neglect to add any information which might be relevant even if you are filing this particular grievance for the 50th time. If your

You may be sending a story to someone who has no knowledge of the people involved or the office

(Continued on page 11)
Training Seminars & State Conventions

Not many seminars, meetings or state conventions are scheduled for the remainder of 2010. Check this space in the next issue of the Activist for the educational and training seminars planned for 2011. For more information, contact your business agent. Regions not listed have not reported training scheduled for November – December 2010.

Region 5—NBA Mike Weir, (314) 872-0227
Missouri, Iowa, Nebraska, Kansas
November 7-9 Iowa Fall Training, Coralville IA

Region 9—NBA Judy Willoughby, (954) 964-2116
Florida, Georgia, North Carolina, South Carolina
November 5-6 SC State Training, Columbia SC

Reversion revisited

(Continued from page 5)

that there was an “immediately threatened injury” when the Union was advised in a letter from the Postmaster dated June 9, 2009, that: “This is your official notification the position listed will be reverted effective June 12, 2009.” The letter was written in the imperative and reflected the decision to revert the position within thirty (30) days of the position becoming vacant as required by Article 41.1.A.1. The position was reverted two days later, carrying out the notice of intent to revert.

A dictionary definition of the word “immediately” defines it to mean “very close in time, space, or relationship.” “Threatened” means “to make or express a threat.” There is no doubt of the causal connection between the initial notice of intent to revert RLC 5 and the results of the consideration process in the form of the notice that the position will be reverted. There is an immediate threat of actual injury when management communicates by certified letter that it will take a specific action on a specific date following the required procedures in the NA. The letter of June 9th communicated management’s decision to revert with no equivocation. The Union properly reacted to the threat by filing its grievance upon receipt of the letter. The Arbitrator finds that the grievance is properly before the Arbitrator and is not premature.

The above decision is helpful in those cases where management attempts to argue arbitrability because the grievance was filed prior to the assignment actually being reverted. It is important to file other grievances once notification is given; to wait until the assignment is actually reverted will lead to management arguing that the grievance was filed too late (untimely).

While reversion cases where management has met the basic requirements in Article 41, Section 1.A.1 continue to be challenging cases, they are far from being a lost cause when due diligence and effort is put into the case file.

The rest of the story

(Continued from page 10)
an arbitrator will have insights to see past the smokescreen management has put in front of them. You can hope someone else will ask the right questions and add facts to your case file when you neglected to include them, but don’t count on it.

Arbitrators are influenced by union cases that are full and complete. Every time management objects because the union advocate is trying to fill in the voids left by the absence of facts and evidence, it hurts the union’s case. When the union has fleshed out its case completely and all the facts are present, the arbitrator can see the time and effort you put into making the grievance file. When the arbitrator can see how important the process is to you and how complete your preparation has been the union gains credibility toward a favorable decision.

It’s all in the details, all in the planning, all in the effort and time you put into the grievance presentation. When you have done all this, then you won’t have to assume someone else will understand. They will understand because you will have given them everything they need to know. Good luck comes with good preparation so you never have to hear those awful words...we have a problem...and it’s your fault.
## BY THE NUMBERS

### Operations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 2010 - August</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Change from SPLY*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total mail volume YTD</td>
<td>156,443</td>
<td>-3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Millions of pieces)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mail volume by class (YTD in millions)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First-Class</td>
<td>72,365</td>
<td>-6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Periodicals</td>
<td>6,732</td>
<td>-8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard (bulk mail)</td>
<td>74,986</td>
<td>-0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Packages</td>
<td>608</td>
<td>-10.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shipping Services</td>
<td>1,301</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workhours (YTD in thousands)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Delivery</td>
<td>375,149</td>
<td>-3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mail Processing</td>
<td>206,729</td>
<td>-10.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Delivery</td>
<td>162,593</td>
<td>-2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer Service/Retail</td>
<td>147,844</td>
<td>-10.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>194,489</td>
<td>-4.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Workhours</td>
<td>1,086,804</td>
<td>-6.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*SPLY=Same Period Last Year*

### Finances

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 2010 through August (millions)</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Change from SPLY*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Operating Revenue</td>
<td>$61,744</td>
<td>-2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controllable Operating Expenses</td>
<td>$62,197</td>
<td>-2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Controllable Operating Income</td>
<td>-$450</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Employment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FY 2010 —Pay Period 17</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Change from SPLY*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City carrier employment</td>
<td>192,866</td>
<td>-4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full Time</td>
<td>172,510</td>
<td>-4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PT Regular</td>
<td>822</td>
<td>-6.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTF</td>
<td>19,534</td>
<td>-5.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transitional</td>
<td>6,467</td>
<td>-5.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOU Transitional</td>
<td>7,645</td>
<td>-4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City carriers per delivery supervisor</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career USPS employment</td>
<td>585,871</td>
<td>-6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-career employment</td>
<td>88,309</td>
<td>-2.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>