

REGULAR ARBITRATION PANEL

In the Matter of Arbitration between:)	Grievant: Class Action
)	
UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE)	Post Office: Prairie City, Iowa
)	
and)	USPS Case No: E00C-4E-C
)	06208814
AMERICAN POSTAL WORKERS)	APWU 0620558
UNION, AFL-CIO.)	

BEFORE: JEANNE M. VONHOF, Arbitrator

APPEARANCES:

For the U.S. Postal Service	Anjeanette Pettinger, Labor Relations Specialist
For the Union:	Robert Kessler, National Business Agent
Place of Hearing:	Prairie City, IA.
Date of Hearing:	January 28, 2009
Date of Award:	February 28, 2009
Relevant Contract Provision:	Articles 1.6, 3, 15, 19, 37
Contract Year:	2006 - 2010
Type of Grievance:	Contract Interpretation
Issue:	

Did Management violate Article 1.6.B of the National Agreement when it reduced the scheduled clerk hours and if so, what shall the remedy be?

Award Summary

The Service violated the National Agreement when Management shifted hours spent in distribution and window clerk work from the bargaining unit to the Postmaster. Except for a small amount of time historically performed by the Postmaster at this location on this work, the bargaining unit always performed the work in the past. The Service did not show that changes in conditions or operations occurred which supported a transfer of the work, and did not show that any alternatives were considered. The work shall be returned to the bargaining unit and a monetary remedy shall be awarded as described in the body of the opinion. The Arbitrator will retain jurisdiction solely over the remedy portion of the award.


 Jeanne M. Vonhof
 Panel Arbitrator

Background

This is a case brought by the Union under Article 1.6.B. The Grievant was hired as a Part Time Flexible in April, 2006. Another PTF, Ms. Marlene McReynolds, had retired in 2005, and a second PTF was working there as well. Shortly after the Grievant began working the second PTF left. Management attempted to obtain a second PTF at this location, but failed to receive approval for this position. Sometime thereafter, a Function 4 audit was performed, which Management says determined, among other things, that there was no need for a second PTF position.

The Grievant contacted the Steward several months after she began working, telling him that her hours had been significantly reduced and a grievance was filed in August 2006. The grievance stated that the clerks traditionally worked from 5:00 to 11:45 five days per week and that that amount had been cut so that the Grievant was working only 5:30 to 9:00. Mr. Mike Gillespie, Steward, testified that he investigated the grievance and found that there was a drastic reduction in clerk hours at this location compared with the historical number of clerk hours. He testified that his investigation showed that during 2005 Ms. McReynolds performed more than 34 hours per week of clerk work, working from 5:30 a.m. until 11:30 a.m. five days per week. (Saturday hours are not at issue in this case, according to the Union). In addition his records show that a second PTF also was working between 12.5 and 14 hours per week

The Grievant testified that when she began working at this facility she first worked 6 a.m. to 8:00 a.m., assisting the other PTF, who came in at 5 a.m., with distribution work. She said that after she completed the distribution work she normally went home and the other PTF worked on the window from 8:30 a.m. until 11:30 a.m., working a total of about 6 1/2 hours per day. She testified that the Postmaster came in at about 7:45 a.m., went to her desk and performed Management work. According to the Grievant the Postmaster did not perform window work in the morning, and provided help with distribution only occasionally, although she performed more during the holidays or if one of the PTF's was not working. According to the Grievant the Postmaster did not perform distribution worked even once per week. The Postmaster did work the window in the afternoon normally, according to the Grievant.

When the other PTF left several months later, Management informed the Grievant that she would be working “a lot of hours” and she did so, performing all of the distribution and morning window work herself. She testified that over time her start time was changed to 5:30 a.m. and then 6:00 a.m. and she could still complete all the distribution work by 8:30 a.m. without help. She said that at the time of the cuts in her hours she was working about 27.5 hours per week, 5.5 hours per day, Monday through Friday. Under questioning from the Service she said that there has been some decrease in mail volume since she was hired, but not very much, and that it had been handled by delaying her start time. According to the Grievant one person can perform all of the distribution work now between 6:00 and 8:30 a.m. She also testified that since the change in question the Postmaster had taken over work like mark-ups, forwarding of mail, u bumps and web bats, all of which had been performed by clerks.

The Grievant testified that after the change in issue in the grievance here, the Postmaster began shifting her around, first giving her afternoon window hours. She testified that someone then reported that the Postmaster was not working full time so the Postmaster began to take the afternoon window hours again and shifted the Grievant to the morning distribution work, but only for a few hours until about 7:45 a.m. to 8:00 a.m., when the Postmaster arrived and took over the remaining distribution duties as well as the morning window work. The Grievant said that the Postmaster told her that the Function 4 review had indicated that there should be only one clerk working about 20 hours per week. The Grievant testified that her schedule in 2008 shows that the Postmaster now is normally performing the bulk of the distribution work in the morning, unless she wishes to come in later. She said that the Postmaster also performs all of the window work generally, although she sometimes assigns the Grievant some window hours in the afternoon if the Postmaster decides to leave early. She said that sometimes the Postmaster works from 5:00 or 6:00 a.m. until closing, about a 12-hour day. The Union presented evidence of pay periods showing that in 2006 before the change the Grievant was working between 27 and 42 hours per week in clerk work at this location. In 2008 she had many weeks working 10-13 hours per week, with a few in the 15-18 hour range.

The Postmaster, Ms. Jeanne Smith, testified that she relies upon the flash reports in order to determine the workload of her facility from week to week, and uses that

information to determine her scheduling. According to the Postmaster mail volume is down, and she can complete the distribution work on her own in two hours, because the flats are carrier-route sequenced and the DPS system is improved and covers more mail, resulting in less to sort. She testified that in the past she routinely helped the clerks with distribution work by putting up the box mail when she arrived at 7:45 a.m. She testified that she also handles the forwarding of mail and similar functions.

Under questioning from the Union the Postmaster testified that she uses the flash reports as one tool, but not strictly as a budget. She said that she does sometimes schedule more hours than are “planned” with the flash reports. She said that she had been trained by the prior Postmaster to perform the box work in the morning. However, she acknowledged under cross-examination that she did not perform the box work every morning. The Union introduced e-mails between the Postmaster and Labor Relations over this issue, which the Union says indicates that the Postmaster was not performing distribution work or window work in the morning before the change at issue here, but rather spent her morning time performing Management functions. In addition the Union presented evidence from e-mails concerning the budget constraints.

Mr. John Miller, retired Postmaster from Prairie City, testified that he came to the office in 2001 and at that time had one PTF working nearly full time and another working four hours per day. He said that the mail at that time was not in delivery sequence and every morning he performed distribution work at the post office boxes. He said that he also trained the new Postmaster to perform some distribution work. Under questioning from the Union, he said that he helped out with the distribution work to ensure that it was done on time.

In talking with the current Postmaster about the grievance, the Steward said that she raised a reduction in mail volume in the last few years and other changes in mail operations as a reason for the decline in clerk hours. According to the Steward there is no evidence of a sudden drop in mail volume corresponding with the significant drop in scheduled clerk hours. He also testified that he spoke with Ms. McReynolds, and said that she told him that most of the time when she was working the clerk had performed all of the distribution work with the Postmaster helping them only occasionally, when there was high mail volume, for example, or a late truck. The Steward presented a statement

from the long-time custodian of the facility which states that the Postmaster performed Postmaster work in the mornings while the clerks performed the distribution work and window work. Management presented evidence that the custodian is there for only about two hours in the morning, that her hours vary somewhat and that she leaves before the window is open.

Mr. Lance Coles, Craft Director for the Union, testified that although Management presented a Small Office Variance form in this case they did not explain how it justified decreasing the clerk hours. He noted that there already had been a significant reduction in scheduled clerk hours at this location through the elimination of one of the PTF positions. The remaining PTF was not standing around with nothing to do each day, although the Union acknowledges that there has been some reduction in mail volume over the years. The DPS program had been put into place long before the clerk hours in this case were reduced, however, and Management never described exactly how the changes applied to this office to cause a reduction in clerk hours at this point in time. Window hours had not been reduced at all. According to Mr. Coles, he was never informed that a Function 4 review was occurring, and he believes the process may be used to justify Management's prior decision to reduce hours. There has been no operational change in this office that would trigger the reduction in clerk hours which occurred in this case. In addition, when he investigated, Mr. Coles found that there was no evidence that the Postmaster historically had worked alongside the clerks every morning doing distribution work. He also found that there was a direct correlation between the reduction in the clerk hours and an increase in bargaining unit work that went to the Postmaster. In addition, Mr. Coles disputed Management's argument that there were so many clerk hours in the past only because there had been a rehab job designed for Ms. Reynolds. He noted that after Ms. McReynolds left the remaining clerks still performed more than 30 hours of work per week.

The Union's Position

The Union argues that the national awards regarding Article 1.6 .B support the Union's position in this case. The Garrett award rejected the notion that the Postmaster is "the basic clerk," according to the Union or that Management may increase the amount of work to be performed by a Postmaster because the work is in his or her job description. The Union also argues that the Das award notes that the Garrett award addresses change and change is what occurred in this case. This is not a case, the Union argues, where there has been any change in operations such as a reduction in window service hours or a significant reduction in the mail. The change here, according to the Union is simply that the Postmaster has transferred clerk work to herself. Postmasters here did not historically come in to work and perform distribution work as a routine part of their work every day, according to the Union. They assisted the clerks to ensure that the work was done on occasion and the Postmaster's testimony that she traditionally performed more distribution work is not credible, the Union argues.

The Union acknowledges that Postmasters here have historically worked the window but neither Postmaster testified that he or she ever performed window work in the morning until the change at issue here, asserts the Union. According to the Union, the Postmaster in this facility has basically taken over the clerk's job.

The Union asserts further that the change here came about because upper-level Management told the Postmaster that the number of clerk hours must be cut, as demonstrated by the e-mails introduced as evidence, according to the Union. To the extent that there has been a decrease in the mail volume or improved methods of operation, these changes already have been addressed by the elimination of one PTF and by a reduction in the hours of the remaining clerk. The Union notes that no grievances were filed over these actions and acknowledges that if further reductions are necessary, additional clerk hours may need to be cut.

No operational changes occurred to cause the Postmaster to take over the remaining distribution or window duties, the Union contends. According to the Union the retired clerk who was on injury compensation performed productive work all day. In addition the Union argues that the documents relied upon by the Service do not provide a sound reason for the transfer of the work. The change occurred because the Postmaster

was informed that she should not schedule more than 20 hours of clerk work per week, the Union asserts. That work is still being performed every day, the Union argues, but it is the Postmaster who is performing the work and not the clerks. The Union argues that the Postmaster may not increase the amount of craftwork she is doing at the expense of the bargaining unit. In the current situation the clerk sometimes gets back some of the window clerk hours, but only at the discretion of the Postmaster, if she decides to leave early. In this case, the Union argues, the Postmaster has become the PTF and has picked up 15 hours of clerk window time alone.

As for the remedy, the Union is requesting that the clerk work hours be restored to the Grievant. The Union stresses that it is not requesting a full-time guarantee, but simply requesting that the distribution work and three hours of window work be returned to the clerk craft, and that the Grievant be compensated for the difference between the hours she was working and the hours she is working now. The Union also urges that it is not a justification for Management to say that the Grievant found work in another office.

The Position of the Service

Management argues that an operational decision was made to reduce the complement of clerks in this office from two to one and to make other changes needed to run the facility efficiently. Management alone has the right to make such changes in order to maintain the efficiency of the operation under Article 3. According to Management the position description of the Postmaster allows her to perform distribution work and window transactions. Furthermore, the evidence from both Postmasters demonstrates that the Postmaster has performed distribution and window activities in the past.

In addition Management acknowledges that a clerk who preceded the Grievant worked 37 hours per week, but argues that Management was required to give her that many hours as a result of her being in an injury compensation job. The Service argues that it had an obligation to provide her with a 37-hour per week job, but that does not establish that there were 37 hours of work to perform. According to Management the

flash report is used by the Postmaster as a guide for scheduling. It results in a varying number of hours each week, based on mail volumes. The flash reports do not provide a hard and fast rule, based upon budgeting concerns, and the Postmaster testified that sometimes she goes over the projected figures.

The current Postmaster testified that she was trained to work the box section by the prior Postmaster, and the Service argues that the testimony of both Postmasters demonstrates that they did perform this distribution work in the mornings. The Union did not call the retired clerk to testify, Management notes. Furthermore, the Service argues that operations in the office have changed, and notes that the percentage of mail being processed through the DPS system has substantially increased. In addition mail is now sequenced not only to carriers, but also by customer within the routes and by box as well, according to the Service. The Service contends that there is a reduction in need for the clerk hours, and Grievant, as a Part Time Flexible has no right to any hours beyond two hours per day.

In conclusion the Service argues that no violation existed here, because the duties are included in the Postmaster's job description and have been historically performed by the Postmasters in this office. Valid operational reasons exist for the Postmaster's performance of these duties, according to Management, and therefore the grievance should be denied.

Findings and Decision

The Union has filed a grievance under Article 1.6.B over a reduction in hours for the clerk craft at the Prairie City, Iowa post office. This is a facility in which only the Postmaster and one PTF clerk perform all the distribution and window clerk work, although there used to be another PTF assigned to this location until shortly before the grievance was filed.

This is a case in which two national awards, often referred to as the Das award and the Garrett award, have significant impact. In the most recent award, Arbitrator Das has concluded that the parties must return to Arbitrator Garrett's 1978 national award in order to properly interpret Article 1.6.B., and in commenting on that award, he said,

Arbitrator Garrett did not accept the Postal Service's position that it was free to increase the amount of bargaining unit work performed by a postmaster or supervisor in a small office to achieve full and efficient use of supervisory work time, irrespective of the impact on hours worked by clerks. He did not accept the notion that Article 1.6.B incorporated the Postal Service's position that the postmaster is the "basic clerk" who was supplemented by additional clerks only as required.

Arbitrator Garrett also did not accept the Union's argument that there could be no regular practice of having supervisors perform lower level work in a small office. Nowhere in his decision does Arbitrator Garrett state or imply that Article 1.6 .B might require the Postal Service to reassign bargaining unit work historically performed by a supervisor in a particular office to clerks, because such duties are performed on a daily, regular or routine basis, or because clerks are or could be available to perform the work.

The Garrett Award focuses on change, in particular on Postal Service action that increases the amount of bargaining unit work performed by supervisors, whether in response to changes in workload or to promote efficiency.

(USPS and APWU, Case No. Q98C-4Q-C 01238942, Das, Arb. 2005).

Arbitrator Das also stated that regional arbitration awards which had ignored historical practice in a particular office in favor of other concerns did not square with the Garrett Award. According to Arbitrator Das, "historical practice sets the baseline for what is 'necessary' in a particular office. Any substantial change, thereafter, has to meet the requirements Arbitrator Garrett spelled out."

According to Arbitrator Das, therefore, Arbitrator Garrett rejected any suggestion by the Post Office that the Postmaster in a small office is the "basic clerk," whose performance of clerk work is only to be supplemented by bargaining unit clerks as necessary. He also rejected the Union's argument that there can be no regular performance by a supervisor of clerk work in a small office. Both of those factors are important in this case.

Arbitrator Das concluded, from Arbitrator Garrett's award, that supervisors in small post offices, whose position descriptions include performance of work like distribution and window work also performed by the bargaining unit,

may continue to perform those duties historically performed by a supervisor at that office on a daily, regular or routine basis, where there has been no shift or transfer of work or change in the amount of such duties performed by the supervisor.

In considering the standards set by Arbitrator Garrett's award, and reaffirmed by Arbitrator Das, this Arbitrator notes in particular Arbitrator Garrett's statement that Article 1.6,

grants no authority to substitute a supervisor for a bargaining unit employee unless (1) such action can be justified by some change in relevant conditions or operating methods affecting the office or (2) otherwise results from good faith action by Management in the exercise of its authority under Article III. (USPS and APWU, Case No. AC-NAT-5221, Garrett, Arb. 1978).

He went on to define the proper exercise of managerial authority under Article III, which will be discussed in more detail below.

Thus in applying the national awards to this case the first step is to determine what the evidence establishes about the historical practice in this small post office. As Arbitrator Das and Garrett have indicated, this historical practice helps establish a baseline for what amount of work traditionally has been "necessary" for Management to perform to assist the clerks, under the language of Article 1.6. If there was in fact a change in that practice, then the Arbitrator is to examine whether that change violates the collective bargaining agreement, under the standards set out in Arbitrator Garrett's award.

The Postmaster testified that historically she helped put up the box mail when she came in to work in the morning and that she had been trained to do so. The Grievant testified that the Postmaster helped out only occasionally, less than once per week, if there were a specific reason such as the absence of one clerk, or unusually heavy mail volume. The Union did not call the other clerks – one had left the Service under unfavorable circumstances and the Steward presented evidence concerning the retired clerk's statements to him. Although his statements are not as strong as hers would be, they are entitled to some weight. Of more weight are the Postmaster's e-mails to Labor Relations regarding her duties in regard to this case which do not support the view that she was performing distribution work routinely and regularly alongside the clerks on anything like a daily basis. Although she testified at arbitration that she "put up" mail in the boxes every day before the change, her e-mails in 2006 indicate that she did not have time in the morning to "put up mail" or work the window because of the demands of her Management work. The e-mails indicate that Postmaster duties occupied most of her

morning time when she arrived at work. Unlike the prior Postmaster, who came in earlier, her testimony and other evidence suggests that until the change she did not routinely come into work until 7:45, when a good deal of the distribution work already would have been completed.

The Postmaster's testimony and e-mails suggest that she may have been performing somewhat more distribution work with the Grievant after the second clerk left and was not replaced. There were fewer people to perform the work, the Grievant was still new to the job and was slower than the clerk who left, according to the Postmaster's e-mails; thus it may have taken more help from the Postmaster to get all of the mail in the boxes at the expected time. However, the evidence does not indicate that the practice had altered from the clerk(s) performing most of distribution work in the morning and the Postmaster helping out only to ensure that the mail was distributed in time.

The Postal Service has argued that the rehab/injury compensation position of Ms. McReynolds may have skewed the numbers of clerk hours upwards and not reflected the actual amount of clerk work that existed. However, if there was not even sufficient work for Ms. McReynolds to perform, it is not clear why the Post Office would have assigned a second clerk to that location as well. Furthermore Ms. McReynolds had retired about a year before the change at issue here and during that time the second clerk's hours increased to encompass her hours and another clerk was hired.

The Postal Service argues strongly that a reduction in mail volume and changes in operational methods have substantially reduced the need for clerk hours at this location. There was not clear evidence concerning the existence of any significant reduction in mail volume in 2006 when the grievance was filed. The Service also has argued, however, that there has been an impact on this post office of national operational changes such as increased DPS processing or better sorting and sequencing of mail before it arrives at the facility. As noted in my award at Titonka, Iowa, USPS and APWU, Case No. E00C-4E-C 06146851, some of these changes may cause a gradual reduction in clerk hours over the years. The evidence here indicates that there has been a significant reduction in hours over the years for the morning distribution work and it is likely that these reductions reflect these operational improvements. The evidence indicates that in the past there were two clerks working distribution, one from 5:00 a.m. and the other

from 6:00 to 8:00. The Grievant acknowledged that now one employee can handle all the morning distribution work from 6:00 to 8:30 a.m. without help, and the Union is not requesting that a second clerk be assigned to this location.

However, the Postal Service already had eliminated one PTF position at this facility shortly before reducing the remaining clerk's hours. The Service also has moved the starting time for the remaining clerk forward, first from 5:00 to 5:30 and then from 5:30 to 6:00 a.m. The Union does not object to the Service adjusting hours in this way to reflect real reductions in clerk work. Nevertheless the Union argues that several hours of distribution work remain to be performed each morning that has traditionally been performed by the bargaining unit and that has been taken over by the Postmaster.

There was no indication that either the current or the former Postmaster ever routinely performed the three hours of morning window work – that work always was assigned to the bargaining unit until the events triggering the grievance. The Postal Service has not argued that all of the window work historically was performed by Management, or that there has been any change in the hours of operation of the window that would have resulted in a reduction of clerk hours. The Postal Service has not really offered any explanation for this change.

This is not a case like the case cited above in Titonka, Iowa where the evidence showed that the Postmaster historically performed a substantial amount of distribution work alongside the clerk virtually every morning and where the evidence also suggested that the hours there were eliminated, not transferred to the Postmaster. Here the evidence indicates that work that was not historically performed by Management remains to be performed and has been transferred from the clerk craft to the Postmaster. The evidence on the record indicates that on a routine daily basis the Postmaster now schedules herself to perform the bulk of the distribution work and virtually all of the window work at this location. In essence the Postmaster has become the “basic clerk” at this facility, using the clerk only as supplemental help. Here, the Postmaster freely admitted that she was performing work that previously had been done by the bargaining unit, as in USPS and APWU, Case No. A00C4AC07035627 (Parker, Arb. 2008). This factor distinguishes cases where the arbitrator determined that there was not sufficient evidence to conclude that Management hours had been increased at the expense of bargaining unit hours, such

as USPS and APWU, Case No. E94C-4E-C96026821 (Hauck, Arb. 2001), cited by Management here.

In this case the evidence supports the conclusion that there was a significant change and transfer of work from the bargaining unit to the Postmaster. It occurred after higher level Management expressed concern over the number of clerk hours being utilized at the office and even questioned, in an e-mail, whether the Postmaster realized that she was required “to clerk most of the day.” Both the Das and the Garrett awards rejected the notion that the Postal Service is free to increase the amount of bargaining unit work performed “by a postmaster or supervisor in a small office to achieve full and efficient use of supervisory work time, irrespective of the impact on hours worked by clerks.” They specifically rejected the idea that “the postmaster is the “basic clerk” who was supplemented by additional clerks only as required.”

The Garrett award leaves open a door for transferring bargaining unit work to supervisors under certain conditions. One of those conditions involves whether such action can be justified by some change in relevant conditions or operating methods affecting the office. The evidence here demonstrates that any changes in relevant conditions and operating methods already have been addressed by the substantial reduction in clerk hours before the change at issue here was put into effect. Arbitrator Garrett also would permit the transfer of such work to supervisors if it “otherwise results from good faith action by Management in the exercise of its authority under Article III.” In further defining such good faith action Arbitrator Garrett said,

There is no way, therefore, that 1-6-B reasonably could be read to grant an unlimited license to eliminate Clerk hours by transferring Clerk work to supervisors without also giving consideration to other possible means of reducing total work hours.

In light of this analysis, it is clear that the USPS errs in claiming an unfettered license under I-6-E to assign Clerk duties to supervisors. Proper observance of the policy enunciated in Article I, Section 6 would require at a minimum that – before such action is taken in any given office – the USPS should also give full consideration to other reasonably available means of eliminating excess manpower. If, after such a good faith review has been conducted, it nonetheless reasonably appears that Clerk hours must be reassigned to supervisors in any given small office, appropriate action then might be taken in the exercise of Management authority under Article III.

Although there is evidence here that higher level Management considered the number of hours being expended on clerk work at this office as excessive, there is no evidence that Management considered any course of action other than simply transferring clerk work to the Postmaster. Absent any evidence on this point there is simply not sufficient evidence in this case to establish that the conditions of the Garrett award were met. USPS and APWU, Case No. G98C-4G-C 9925033 (Finston, Arb. 2005). In addition, to the extent that Management relies solely upon the Function 4 review, the parties have signed an agreement that no bargaining unit work will be transferred to a supervisor or Postmaster solely on the basis of such a review.

As for the remedy, Management provided no evidence that Postmasters historically have performed the morning window work or any sound basis for the transfer of those three hours of clerk work each weekday from the clerks to the Postmaster. That work is performed every day and must be returned to the bargaining unit. For the same reason the bulk of the distribution work shall be returned to the bargaining unit as well.

The Grievant shall be recompensed at the straight time rate for the difference between the amount of local clerk hours she performed and the three hours of window work each day, combined with the distribution work that was improperly transferred to the Postmaster. The period of compensation shall extend back to 14 days before the filing of the grievance. In computing the Grievant's hours, hours spent at other locations or in higher level duties generally shall not be considered. However, hours when the Grievant was paid at the higher level locally, but was actually performing clerk work while the Postmaster was out of the office may be deducted – other than Saturdays, which are not at issue in this grievance.

The evidence shows that the amount of window clerk work that has been shifted to Management is three hours per day. That number has remained consistent since the filing of the grievance. In determining the proper amount of distribution work, the Arbitrator concludes that at the time of the filing of the grievance the Grievant was working from 5:00 to about 8:30 on the distribution of the mail. As noted above, as the amount of work has been reduced, the starting time has become later, and that may be taken into account in determining the number of hours for which the Grievant is to be

compensated, with the end time remaining 8:30 a.m. Although that number is somewhat higher than the Postmaster's current estimate of the time it takes to perform the distribution work, the Arbitrator also has considered the supplemental work such as forwarding mail etc. that also has been taken over by Management. Of the total number of hours that are counted as clerk hours for distribution, 15 minutes per day may be deducted to account for the historic help provided by Management in performing distribution work at this location. The Arbitrator will retain jurisdiction over the remedy.