



June 25, 2024

RECEIVED
JUN 28 2024

Mr. Ivan Butts
President
National Association of Postal Supervisors
1727 King Street, Suite 400
Alexandria, VA 22314-2753

Dear Ivan:

This is in response to your correspondence of May 15, May 17, and May 21, 2024 concerning changes in authorized non-bargaining positions in postal facilities. I received an email from you on May 17 (with an attachment of an unsigned document stating that the letter would be mailed, however, we have yet to receive the document in the mail). Your May 21 correspondence references your May 17 correspondence. Additionally, I received an email from you on May 15 regarding an alleged Reduction in Force ("RIF") at the Brockton, Massachusetts Processing and Distribution Center (P&DC). I responded to your email on May 15, and we discussed further on May 20.

Among your correspondence, were numerous requests for information and allegations of the Postal Service violating 39 U.S.C. § 1004 by not consulting with NAPS on the Postal Service's alleged recalculation of staffing ratios of manager and supervisor positions. Your allegation that the Postal Service recalculated or modified staffing ratios is inaccurate. Your allegation that the Postal Service is conducting RIF activities based on recalculated staffing ratios is inaccurate. Rather, field positions were reviewed, by facility, as part of an annual event to determine whether certain positions are earned based on the established staffing criteria. At that time, after review, authorized staffing by facility is adjusted and is either increased or decreased. The intent of this event is to ensure that positions are earned consistent with the staffing criteria and, if not, to notify employees once a position is no longer earned and, thus, unauthorized. If a position is unauthorized at a facility, affected employees are provided with options of reassignments to earned positions, that they may accept if interested. These notifications are not part of a RIF, nor do they constitute an organizational change.

As I explained during our May 20 phone conversation, the staffing ratios that were established through consultation with NAPS have not been changed. The most recent annual review determined that decreases in bargaining unit complement at some facilities resulted in certain positions no longer being earned at those facilities and therefore, those position(s) were unauthorized. Conversely, in other instances, additional positions were authorized where the earned staffing criteria were met. I also explained during our May 20 phone call that positions may become unearned with a decrease in bargaining unit positions at that facility, just as more positions become earned with increases in bargaining unit positions at the facility.

Your May 15 email attached correspondence from local Human Resources in the Massachusetts-Rhode Island district, which informed an employee at the Brockton P&DC that the position in which he was assigned was no longer earned and included encouragement to the employee to

475 L'ENFANT PLAZA SW

WASHINGTON, DC 20260-4101

WWW.USPS.COM

seek a reassignment. It included a list of vacant earned positions that were local to that facility. This correspondence confirms the Postal Service's intent to review positions to determine whether they are earned and, if not, to notify the employee.

I've re-stated the questions that you provided in your correspondences, followed by the Postal Service's responses:

- What are the staffing ratios currently in the plants that EAS received letters?

Response: There has been no change in the staffing ratios. Your May 15 email stated, "The EAS position at the P&DC are based in the USPS 22:1/25:1 ratio." This is the current staffing ratio.

- If not due to the S&DC consolidation, what is the SWCS calculation currently in the Post Offices of EAS that received letters?

Response: The SWCs formula was established with NAPS and modified, in consultation with NAPS, in 2023. There is no change to the SWCs calculation (i.e., "the formula").

Additionally, you alleged that the Postal Service "violated its own ELM 55.155 by failing to follow the procedures required when it decides to implement an organizational change....". We assume that NAPS is referring to *Employee & Labor Relations Manual* (ELM), Chapter 1, specifically section 155, *Documenting Requests*. Relating to this allegation you requested the following:

For every facility that has implemented or implementing these RIFs (i.e., elimination of occupied positions), please provide copies of all documents (including correspondence and emails) relating to:

- a. The formal request from the officer of the functional area to the Vice President, ERM for the organizational change, including the supporting documentation and description of the organizations change, its rationale, potential efficiencies, and cost savings.
- b. ERM review of the request and forwarding of the request to the Manager, Organizational Effectiveness (OE).
- c. The Manager, Organizational Effectiveness (OE)'s review of the request.
- d. Any correspondence or other communications from OE to the business customer (NAPS).
- e. The completed organizational change restructure proposal packet (provided by OE).

Response: The documents requested are not available because the relevant notification to employees stating that they are no longer in earned positions is not part of a RIF, nor does it constitute an organizational change. Further, please note that this means that ELM section 155 is inapplicable.

Please let me know if you have any additional questions.

Sincerely,



For Bruce A. Nicholson
Director
Labor Relations Policies and Programs