



## STEP B DECISION

**Step B Team:**  
USPS:  
**Rene Benavidez**  
NALC:  
**Karrie Blough**

Decision: **RESOLVE**  
USPS Number: **G06N-4G-C 1132 9458**  
Grievant: **Class**  
Branch Grievance Number: **421-624-11**  
Branch: **421**  
Installation: **San Antonio**  
Delivery Unit: **Lockhill**  
State: **Texas**  
Incident Date: **08/10/2011**  
Date Informal Step A Initiated: **08/25/2011**  
Formal Step A Meeting Date: **09/07/2011**  
Date Received at Step B: **09/13/2011**  
Step B Decision Date: **09/22/2011**  
Issue Code: **07.2260, 19.2000**  
NALC Subject Code: **600111**

District:  
**Rio Grande**

Formal A Reps:  
USPS: **A. Alderete**  
NALC: **R. Gould**

COPY

**ISSUE:** Was there a violation of Articles 3, 7 and/or 19 of the National Agreement? If so, what is an appropriate remedy?

### **DECISION:**

The dispute resolution team mutually agreed to **RESOLVE** this grievance. Management violated the National Agreement when cross-craft assignments were made outside of the provisions of Article 7. The DRT could not agree any additional remedy was appropriate at this time.

### **EXPLANATION:**

**The union** states that management violated Article 7.2 of the JCAM by forcing carriers to cross crafts when instructing certain carriers to pitch parcels on 08/10/2011. It is very clear to the union that Lockhill is short staffed on the clerk side due to the mistreatment of these clerks. Many have opted to bid to other stations as opposed to the continual harassment. Considering the lack of clerks, management should have scheduled the overtime clerk that was available for a full day of overtime. Management is well aware of their deficiencies and could have very easily called in this clerk to avoid crossing crafts. Had management properly staffed, the situation of crossing crafts could have been avoided. The contract is clear that management cannot create a void in one area in order to mandate a cross craft scenario. As documented, there was more than ample work in the carrier craft.

**Management** contends that on August 10<sup>th</sup> the unit was bombarded with parcels, this was not foreseen or expected. On the average for this week the unit was getting approximately 600 parcels a day. However, on Wednesday the 10<sup>th</sup>, the unit received an extreme amount of heavy parcels which impacted the clerks and carriers both. The data on the parcels recorded for that day was 2,410 parcels which was 1840 over our average.

Due to the parcel impacts on Wednesday, once the carriers finished casing, many moved to the clerk operation 2400 to assist in pitching parcels. The carriers could not leave to the street due to committed parcels so the carriers started pitching some of the

parcels to help the clerks. The union's contentions talk about bringing in a FDOT clerk – management is not required to bring in a clerk just because it's his SDO. Again, the average parcels did not warrant a FDOT, it was the unforeseen drop shipments and plant sending out heavy parcels on just this one day.

The DRT reviewed the entire contents of the case file and was able to determine that there was a violation of Article 7.2 on August 10, 2011.

Article 7 allows for the combining of work across craft lines in three circumstances.


1. To Create Full-Time Assignments
2. In the event of insufficient work
3. During exceptionally heavy workload periods for one occupational group, employees in an occupational group experiencing a light workload period may be assigned to work in the same wage level


Inadequate staffing as a resulting of scheduling, to include unscheduled leave, is not shown to be a basis for making cross-craft assignments. Management does not provide any position which would show cause under Article 7.

In fashioning an appropriate remedy, the DRT did consider the union's request for compensation. The remedy referenced in Article 7 is not appropriate in this case.

“...a “make whole” remedy involving the payment at the appropriate rate for the work missed to the available, qualified employee who had a contractual right to the work would be appropriate...”

Carriers performed the work – clerks had the contractual right to the work.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Rene Benavidez  
USPS Step B Representative

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Karrie Blough  
NALC Step B Representative

**Grievance File Contents:**

Additions and Corrections (2 pgs)  
Management Contentions (6 pgs)  
Employee Moves Report (22 pgs)  
PS Form 8190 (2 pgs)  
Management Contentions (2 pgs)  
Route/Carrier Perf Report (12 pgs)  
Prior Settlements (6 pgs)  
Union Contentions (2 pgs)  
Clerk Schedule

Clerk OTDL  
Hours Analysis Report (11 pgs)  
Employee Everything Report (16 pgs)  
Carrier Schedule (2 pgs)  
Prior DRT Settlement (3 pgs)  
Memorandum of Record  
Informal A Request  
Request for Formal A

RIO GRANDE DISPUTE RESOLUTION TEAM  
10410 Perrin Beitel Road, Rm 1059  
San Antonio, TX 78284-9608  
PHONE 210-368-1760, 210-368-1784, FAX 210-368-8525

cc: Manager, Labor Relations, Southwest Area  
Manny Arguello, District Manager, Rio Grande District  
Kathy Baldwin, NALC NBA, Region 10  
Manager, Human Resources, Rio Grande District  
Manager, Labor Relations, Rio Grande District  
Postmaster, San Antonio  
NALC Branch President  
NALC Formal A Representative  
USPS Formal A Representative  
DRT File