



RESOLVE



STEP B DECISION

Step B Team:	Decision:	<u>RESOLVE</u>
USPS:	USPS Number:	G11N-4G-C 1600 8370
Alex Zamora	Grievant:	Class Action
NALC:	Branch Grievance Number:	421-722-15
Jose Portales	Branch:	421
	Installation:	San Antonio
District:	Delivery Unit:	Leon Valley
Rio Grande	State:	TX
	Incident Date:	10/06/2015
	Informal Step A Meeting:	10/20/2015
	Formal Step A Meeting:	10/30/2015
	Received at Step B:	11/09/2015
	Step B Decision Date:	06/10/2021
	Issue Code:	11.6300
	NALC Subject Code:	506002

ISSUE: Did management violate Article 11.6.A of the National Agreement when they failed to poll and schedule full-time volunteers for the Columbus Day Holiday/designated holiday? If so, what is the remedy?

DECISION: The Dispute Resolution Team (DRT) mutually agreed to **RESOLVE** this grievance. Based on the settlement of the National Interpretive Case Q11N-4Q-C 1427 0600 and the resulting MOU M-01937 resolution, the case file evidenced a violation of Article 11.6 of the National Agreement. Management must poll for volunteers and post the holiday schedule by Tuesday of the preceding service week in which the holiday falls on. Management must comply with the holiday scheduling "pecking order" provisions of Article 11.6 for the day of the employees' holiday/designated holiday and the day of the actual holiday. Carriers R. Gomez (02289999) and A. Sambila (03308283) will be compensated each eight (8) hours of holiday scheduling premium (\$118.00). The payment has been processed through GATS at Step B. See the DRT Explanation below.

EXPLANATION: This is a class action grievance filed on behalf of the city letter carriers assigned to the Leon Valley Station in San Antonio, TX. Management did not poll full-time regular carriers for volunteers for the Columbus Day Holiday and instead only worked CCAs.

The union filed this grievance to protest management's failure to seek and utilize full-time volunteers before working CCAs on the holiday. Unable to resolve the dispute through the Informal and Formal A steps of the grievance procedure, the union appealed to Step B. The Step B team placed the grievance on **HOLD** pending settlement or arbitration of the National Interpretive Case Q11N-4Q-C 1427 0600.

The union contends management violated Article 11.6.A. of the NA and/or Article 11 of the Branch 421 local memorandum of understanding (LMOU) by failing to poll and schedule regular full-time volunteers for the Columbus Day Holiday according to the proper pecking order, by Tuesday of the preceding week.

RIO GRANDE DISPUTE RESOLUTION TEAM
10410 Perrin Beitel Road, Rm 1059
San Antonio, TX 78284-9608
PHONE 210-368-5547, 210-368-5547, FAX 210-368-8525

The union requests management cease and desist refusing to poll the full-time carriers for the holiday and to post the schedule by the Tuesday preceding the holiday. The union also requests Carriers R. Gomez and A. Sambila be compensated each eight hours of holiday scheduling premium or whatever the Step B deems appropriate.

Management contends the schedule was posted by Tuesday of the preceding service week in which the holiday fell on. Management has the right under Article 3 to schedule employees as needed for the holiday/designated holiday and it was determined on Tuesday, when the schedule was posted, that only one carrier was needed. Ms. Sambila was asked if she would be willing to work on her holiday and she stated, "Yes." On Friday, Mr. Gomez brought it to the attention of Ms. McDowell that he wanted to work on his holiday; however, he was never asked. Management failed to poll every employee due to the needs of the service and scheduling needs. However, management attempted to correct the error by allowing both employees to work their holiday. This is the first time the poll was not done in writing due to only needing one employee to work on the Saturday.

The DRT reviewed the case file and determined management violated Article 11.6 of the National Agreement when they failed to poll for volunteers for the Columbus Day Holiday/designated holiday. The Formal Step A manager contended the schedule was posted by Tuesday as required in the National Agreement. However, the case file evidenced two statements from the grievants involved stating they were never polled prior to Tuesday of the preceding service week in which the holiday fell on. Therefore, the DRT agreed management must comply with the holiday scheduling "pecking order" provisions of Article 11.6 or the provisions of a LMOU for the day of the actual holiday and/or the employees' holiday/designated holiday. Article 11.6.B of the Joint Contract Administration Manual (JCAM), on pages 11-3 and 11-4, provides the scheduling procedure for holiday assignments in relevant parts:

The intent of Article 11.6 is to permit the maximum number of full-time regular, full-time flexible and part-time regular employees to be off on the holiday should they desire not to work while preserving the right of employees who wish to work their holiday or designated holiday.

*Article 11.6.B provides the scheduling procedure for holiday assignments. Keep in mind that Article 30.B.13 provides that "the method of selecting employees to work on a holiday" is a subject for discussion during the period of local implementation. The Local Memorandum of Understanding (LMOU) may contain a local "pecking order." In the **absence** of LMOU provisions or a past practice concerning holiday assignments, the following **minimum pecking order should be followed**:*

- 1) All part-time flexible employees to the maximum extent possible, even if the payment of overtime is required.
- 2) **All full-time regular, full-time flexible and part-time regular employees who possess the necessary skills and have volunteered to work on their holiday or their designated holiday—by seniority.**
- 3) City carrier assistant employees.
- 4) All full-time regular, full-time flexible and part-time regular employees who possess the necessary skills and have volunteered to work on their non-scheduled day—by seniority.
- 5) Full-time regular, full-time flexible and part-time regular employees who possess the necessary skills and have not volunteered on what would otherwise be their non-scheduled day—by inverse seniority.
- 6) Full-time regular, full-time flexible and part-time regular employees who possess the necessary skills and have not volunteered on what would otherwise be their holiday or designated holiday—by inverse seniority. [Emphasis Added]

RIO GRANDE DISPUTE RESOLUTION TEAM
10410 Perrin Beitel Road, Rm 1059
San Antonio, TX 78284-9608
PHONE 210-368-5547, 210-368-5547, FAX 210-368-8525

Holiday Schedule Posting. *The provisions of Article 11.4.A concerning straight-time pay for holiday work apply to all full-time employees whose holiday schedule is properly posted in accordance with this section. If the holiday schedule is not posted as of Tuesday preceding the service week in which the holiday falls, a full-time employee required to work on his or her holiday or designated holiday, or who volunteers to work on such day, will receive holiday scheduling premium for each hour of work, up to eight hours. However, the ELM Section 434.53.c(2) provides that:*
[Emphasis Added]

ELM 434.53.c(2) *In the event that, subsequent to the Tuesday posting period, an emergency situation attributable to Act(s) of God arises that requires the use of manpower on that holiday in excess of that scheduled in the Tuesday posting, full-time regular employees who are required to work or who volunteer to work in this circumstance(s) do not receive holiday scheduling premium.*

Arbitrator Mittenthal held in H4N-NA-C 21 (2nd Issue), January 19, 1987 (C-06775) that a regular employee who volunteers to work on a holiday or designated holiday has only volunteered to work eight hours. A regular volunteer cannot work beyond the eight hours without supervision first exhausting the ODL. He also ruled that management may not ignore the holiday "pecking order" provisions to avoid the payment of penalty overtime and remanded the issue of remedy for such violations to the parties. The relationship between Article 11 and the overtime provisions of Article 8 is discussed further under Article 8.5.

The JCAM states on page 11-5:

The Memorandum of Understanding dated October 19, 1988 (M-00859) provides:

The parties agree that the Employer may not refuse to comply with the holiday scheduling "pecking order" provisions of Article 11.6 or the provisions of a Local Memorandum of Understanding in order to avoid payment of penalty overtime. The parties further agree to remedy past and future violations of the above understanding as follows.

1. Full-time employees and part-time regular employees who file a timely grievance because they were improperly assigned to work their holiday or designated holiday will be compensated at an additional premium of 50 percent of the base hourly straight time rate.
2. For each full-time employee or part-time regular employee improperly assigned to work a holiday or designated holiday, the Employer will compensate the employee who should have worked but was not permitted to do so, pursuant to the provisions of Article 11.6, or pursuant to a Local Memorandum of Understanding, at the rate of pay the employee would have earned had he or she worked on that holiday.

While Mittenthal ruled that it was a violation to ignore the "pecking order" to avoid payment of penalty overtime, he did indicate that "...the Postal Service can, of course, choose from among the part-time flexibles (or from among the regular volunteers, etc.) in order to limit its labor cost. That kind of choice would not conflict with the 'pecking order'."

National Arbitrator Fasser ruled in NC-C-6085, August 16, 1978 (C-02975) on the appropriate remedy for violations of Article 11.6. He found that when an employee who volunteered to work on a holiday or designated holiday is erroneously not scheduled to

RIO GRANDE DISPUTE RESOLUTION TEAM
10410 Perrin Beitel Road, Rm 1059
San Antonio, TX 78284-9608
PHONE 210-368-5547, 210-368-5547, FAX 210-368-8525


work, "the appropriate remedy now is to compensate the overlooked holiday volunteer for the total hours of lost work." [Emphasis Added]

On 01/22/2021 the parties agreed to resolve the interpretive dispute in a Step 4 settlement (M-09137), which provides the following relevant language:


*The Employer determines the number and categories of employees needed for holiday work. In instances where there are **eight or more hours of work available, the normal holiday pecking order is used to schedule employees to work on a holiday.***

*In instances where the holiday pecking order applies and a parcel delivery hub and spoke model is utilized, employees of the installation **where the carriers report and from where delivery originates on the holiday or designated holiday will be scheduled pursuant to the holiday pecking order, and existing local memorandum of understanding (LMOU) provisions regarding the holiday pecking order in that installation will apply.** This does not preclude the scheduling of CCAs from other Post offices consistent with existing contractual provisions.* [Emphasis Added]

Based on its review of the case file, the DRT mutually agreed to the decision and remedy above.



Alex Zamora
USPS Step B Representative



Jose Portales
NALC Step B Representative

cc:
LR Manager, Southern Area
NALC Region 10 NBA
Texas 3 District HR Manager
Texas 3 District LR Manager
Management Formal A F. Cazares

NALC Branch President
NALC Formal A T. Boyd
Manager, Texas 3 District
Postmaster, San Antonio, Texas
DRT File

Grievance File Contents

PS Form 8190
Request for Information
Union's Contentions
Request to Meet at Formal Step A
Emails (3 pgs)
Weekly Schedule
Arbitrator Javits' Award (13 pgs)
Fax Cover Sheet
Route/Carrier Daily Performance/Analysis Report (3 pgs)

Statements (3 pgs)
Management's Contentions
Steward Designation Letter
Request for Information
Article 11 Excerpt
ELM Excerpt (3 pgs)
Employee Moves Report (11 pgs)
Employee Everything Report (2 pgs)
Arbitrator Bowers' Award (16 pgs)

Payout Request History for Grievance 16008370

[HELP](#)

no data

<p><u>Not Processed By Payroll</u></p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> New (Not yet sent to Payroll)</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Pending (Not back from Payroll)</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Submitted (Received acknowledgment from Payroll, awaiting processing)</p>	<p><u>Payroll Processed</u></p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Paid (Back from Payroll without error)</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Payroll Error (Back from Payroll with error)</p>
--	--

New, Pending and Submitted Requests

Status	GATS Code	App Seq	Request Amount	Last Name	First Name	SSN	Relevant PP	Requested By	Date Requested	
New		2	\$118.00	GOMEZ	RUBEN	4675	PP22 FY2015	KBY9N0	06/11/2021	<input type="button" value="Details"/>
New		2	\$118.00	SAMBILA	APRIL	6214	PP22 FY2015	KBY9N0	06/11/2021	<input type="button" value="Details"/>
Total New: \$236.00										
Total Pending: \$0.00										
Total Submitted: \$0.00										

Paid and Errors from Finance

Status	Error or Warning	App Seq	Request Amount	Amount Paid	PP Paid	Last Name	First Name	SSN	Relevant PP	Requested By	Date Requested
No Data											
Total Paid: \$0.00											
Total Error: \$0.00											