



THE VOICE



OF THE GOLDEN GATE LETTER CARRIERS

BRANCH #214

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF LETTER CARRIERS, AFL-CIO

May/June 2005

Award-winning newspaper

Vol. XXXV, No. 3



Photo: Leland Chune

Vicki Sawicki, left, and Audrey Davis, not at all retiring.

Annual Dinner 2005



Photo: Leland Chune

Spence and Cathy Burton celebrating his retirement from Marina Station.



Photo: Martha Raup

Photo: Leland Chune

Downtown Carrier Reuben Fielder

At the 2005 annual dinner honoring retirees. From left, Bruce Siegner, James Hendry, Tom Marino, all from Rincon North; John Bolts, Station 'F'; Spence Burton, Marina; Martha Raup, PCA/Sunset; James Roe, Parcel Post; John Watanabe, Steiner.



Photo: Leland Chune

President Tony Gallardo, Nonagenarian Bill Lawrence, and National Business Agent Dale Hart.



Photo: Leland Chune

Steiner Station Retiree John Watanabe, left, Roland Menis, Mohammad Yeganeh, Rolando Novicio, Jin Song Lin and Isauro Caparaz.

Branch 214 notes

Welcome new alternate stewards: **Bill Foster**, Rincon North/EPC (94104); **Juan Dominguez**, San Rafael and San Rafael Mission.

The Voice thanks **Lynda Beigel** and **Carol Maggio** for their help in putting together this issue.

Kim Truong, Branch 214 **Food Drive coordinator**, received 15 extra T-shirts from the union T-shirt maker. He sold them (himself included), for \$150. He is donating this cash to the Food Bank. Kim's mother, Mrs. Anh Ho, is donating another \$50 for a total of \$200 to the Food Bank.

FOR THE RECORD:

Proposed by-law changes, printed in the January/February 2005 Voice, were read at the April 6 meeting, and voted on at the May 4 meeting. Some of the by-laws printed here were withdrawn by the makers prior to the April meeting:

Article VII, Section 1, a language clarification on dues,

not an increase, passed 72 to 5.

Article VII, Section 3, was a clarification of retiree dues, \$12 a year, and passed 84 to 0.

Article IV, Section 2, was a proposal to elect branch officers to three-year terms effective 2006, instead of the current 2-year terms. The proposal, which needed 2/3 approval, lost 37 to 52.

Article IV, Section 7, was a proposal to make the post of Assistant Secretary-Treasurer a full-time position to allow for the extra reporting time required by a new Labor Department directive. The proposal lost 26 to 48.

Article VI, Section 6.5, Numbers 5a, b and c were technical adjustments on language and passed unanimously, with no vote count taken.

San Rafael Postal Golf Tournament: Sunday, July 31, 2005. At The Peacock Gap Golf & Country Club. Open to all current and retired postal employees only. The cost of a 4-person team is \$95 per person and includes the rental of a golf cart. A BBQ Chicken Buffet will be served after the tournament. The deadline is June 25, 2005. For entry forms, please contact Victor at 1-707-477-9782 or sanrafaelpogolf@pacbell.net.

Welcome new NALC (Joint) Safety Committee co-leaders: **Celass Bernstein**—San Rafael, **Patrick Filer**—San Rafael, **Patricia Gutierrez**—San Rafael, **Val Palattao**—Mill Valley, **Cherry Vargas**—Daly City, **Roberta Bojo**—Redwood City.

Branch Officers

- Tony Gallardo President
- Lili Buencamino Beaumont .. Executive Vice-President
- Bill Thornton Vice-President
- Jerome Tercero Secretary-Treasurer
- Ray Fong Field Director
- Carol Maggio Assistant Secretary-Treasurer
- Leonard Cruz Sergeant-at-Arms
- Franklin Woo NALC Health Benefits
- Larry Gerigk Safety and Health
- Cathy Simonson EEO Officer
- Mike Callahan MBA representative
- Kim Truong Director of Organization
- June Buccat Trustee
- Kathleen McConnell Trustee
- Vicki Sawicki Trustee

Voice Staff

- Ivars Lauersons Editor
- Juliette Chen Associate Editor
- Gerry Lee Graphics

Permission is given to trade union and labor publications to copy or reproduce any article contained in this publication, providing appropriate credit is given. Permission to others must be granted in writing by the Voice Editor or Branch President. Opinions expressed by contributors are their own, and not necessarily those of Branch 214. If possible, all articles and letters to the editor should be submitted on disk in a standard word processing program with a hard copy included. Articles typewritten or written may also be submitted.

GOLDEN GATE BRANCH
2310 Mason St., 3rd Floor, San Francisco, CA 94133
Phone: (415) 362-0214
WEB page: <http://www.nalc214.org>
Office hours: 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. Monday to Friday



Gallardo (continued from page 3)

for us for many years and has been very effective in getting us fair route adjustments with very few disputes.

Belvedere-Tiburon office

The Belvedere-Tiburon Post Office has just been adjusted using this method. We lost one route in Bel-Tib, going from 18 routes to 17.

The San Francisco district's route inspection schedule for 2005 does not include any other post offices covered by Branch 214.

Route Inspections the hard way in San Leandro

San Leandro is represented by Branch 214, but it is not in the San Francisco District. Management in San Leandro was unwilling to use any of the models currently used in the San Francisco District. We settled for a monitoring program, after trying and failing to establish a true Co-leader agreement.

(continued on page 11)

T.V. 214 Schedule

SAN FRANCISCO, AT&T Cable Channel 29:
Every third Sunday of the month at 7:00 p.m.
June 19, 2005; July 17, 2005;
August 21, 2005

Volume of mail and

Route adjustments around the Branch

By Tony Gallardo, President

The volume of mail has gone down overall around the nation. However, management's heavy handed unilateral response in most cases around the Country has resulted in overzealous route inspections and disastrously drastic route adjustments. Across the nation the union has been forced to respond by filing massive numbers of grievances, to bring the routes back to a semblance of contractual compliance.



National also has issued each NALC branch office, a textbook for carriers, shop stewards and union officers, called *The NALC Route Protection Program*. Additionally, each NALC member around the country has been mailed a small

booklet called *The NALC Route Protection* pocket handbook. If you are a member of Branch 214, and you have not received this pocket handbook, please contact us and we will send you one.

A better way

In some fortunate areas around the country, management and the local union leadership have decided to work together and find methods to adjust routes fairly to 8 hours. Branch 214, for the most part, falls within this category.

In the January/February issue of *The Voice*, I reported that Postmaster Noemí Luna and I had signed an agreement on route evaluations and adjustments for San Francisco. In this article I will update you on the progress of that agreement, as well as the progress made in route adjustment issues in other offices represented by Branch 214.

Most of our route adjustments have been done jointly, in a clear and transparent manner, and in compliance with the National Agreement. Most significantly, these adjustments have, so far, resulted in routes that are as close to 8 hours in length as possible.

On December 21, 2004, I negotiated and signed an agreement with the Postmaster of San Francisco, in which we defined and implemented a joint route evaluation process. This process applies only to the routes in the city of San Francisco.

This process was described in the January/February issue of *The Voice*. A copy of the agreement appears on

Page 3 of that issue. In this method, Co-leaders talk to the carriers and supervisors in a Station, and look at all the relevant data to evaluate the routes. The interviews and data are used as a guide. If the Co-leaders are satisfied that the information is consistent, the route is evaluated, and adjusted to 8 hours.

If there is a disagreement between the Co-leaders, a 6-day count and inspection is conducted using the Co-leader process that has been in effect for many years in the San Francisco District. The route inspection is in full compliance with the M-39. The Co-leaders process all the paperwork jointly, and the route is adjusted to 8 hours based on the count and inspection.

In the City of San Francisco we currently have four co-leaders, 2 from the union and 2 from management. June Buccat and Audrey Davis are representing the union, while Carlos Zidek and Dan Penrose are management's representatives. Management and the Union each have assigned a backup Co-leader, who can step in when a Co-leader is sick or on vacation. The number of Co-leaders is always balanced one for one. The backup Co-Leaders are Quang Luu for the union and Ravinder Bainiwal for management.

Our first route evaluation, under the San Francisco joint process was completed in March at Rincon North at EPC. This station lost a total of 6 routes, reducing the number of routes from 24 to 18. The station also lost a T-6 position and an RLC position. While this may seem drastic, what must be acknowledged is that Rincon North (94104) is exclusively made up of business routes within the Financial District of San Francisco.

This area has been dramatically afflicted with a precipitous drop in mail volume, as well as business failures and relocations that resulted in very high vacancy rates in previously fully occupied high rise buildings. Given these factors, the loss of 6 routes, a T-6 position and an RLC position was a fair and reasonable adjustment for this station.

Golden Gate station

Our second route evaluation process under the San Francisco joint process was recently completed at Golden Gate Station. The station lost 2 routes, reducing the total number of routes there from 44 to 42.

The four co-leaders are expected to split up into two teams of two after the completion of the Golden Gate adjustments. Later on this year, similar adjustments will be made in 94115, and 94124.

Route Inspections you can count on

Outside of the city of San Francisco, but within the San Francisco district, we still have an agreement in place, which uses Co-leaders to oversee the standard route inspection process defined in the M-39. This method has worked

(continued on page 2)

Opinion

Brouhaha at The Voice?

By Bill Thornton, Vice President

When I started to write this article it was to be a response to recent articles/events involving **The Voice**, allegations that the paper was being censored, the nature of **The Voice** was to be changed, poor editorial morale, and my desire, I guess like everybody else who writes, to express opinions and see my name in print. But then I noticed some other disturbing phenomena in the course of the story, having to do with allegations of cronyism and tales of unionists failing to treat each other with dignity and respect.



Recently, there has been an increase in same issue responses by a branch officer to respond to *offending articles*. The March/April issue also included an article entitled “. . . Chief Censor” indicating increased scrutiny of **The Voice** by the branch office. There were issues when the branch officer took the “opportunity” to respond to an “offending” article in the same issue of the newsletter that that article appeared. This is in direct contradiction to the general criteria to the publication of submitted articles as indicated in a recent article by the Associate Editor.

There were two controversial articles in the November/December issue. One was entitled *Got Friends?* and the other *The Secret Castle*.

What happened in Vegas didn't stay in Vegas

In *Got Friends?* the steward, who very ably initiated and investigated and laid the important groundwork for a large grievance settlement, wrote an article questioning the size of the monetary settlement. A well regarded/loved person from the union's business agent's office signed the Pre-arbitration settlement. In the course of the article, this steward brought up some ugliness from an NALC Convention in Las Vegas in the 1980s. The writer/steward named people involved in a shouting match in the Vegas hotel room who currently hold high level national union positions. At issue was a California State Association position that his fellow Branch Officer was interested in but was told that he would NEVER get. That this kind of *cronyism* is present is hardly shocking and the alleged behaviors is neither to those who have had experiences in this organization or any other for that matter. I personally doubt that cronyism entered into the Pre-Arbitration settlement but the steward/writer obviously differs and the ugliness he was subjected to years earlier

certainly did not assuage his concerns.

Years ago I had experienced something similar to the Vegas incident but in a less exciting venue, a Chinese restaurant. At the time there was a Local Joint Steering Committee for the Employee Involvement Process and the National Union had the authority to appoint members. A person from the Business Agent's office pulled a couple of **Voice** articles from a briefcase and confronted the two prospective members of the committee. Questions were proffered about opinions that had been expressed by the two prospective committee members that were critical of Employee Involvement. I ultimately passed muster and was placed on the committee but the other branch officer was informed that he would NEVER be on the committee. The interrogator was one of the same people referenced in the 1982 incident. But not one of the screamers. In retrospect and after a passage of time, these kinds of incidents take on an absurd and humorous quality.

Does the *Got Friends* kind of article that lends itself to “fact checking”? Should this article have been fact checked in terms of what really happened in that hotel room over 20 years ago? Should the people remaining on this planet been interviewed? How many cocktails were consumed?

In an apparent response to this and other controversial articles involving national officers, the writer in *Chief Censor* wrote “Other times misrepresentations of the actions of regional or national NALC officers cause members to resent and withhold support of these officers that is not deserved”.

Secret Castle

Secret Castle was pure shoot from the hip stuff typical of the writer and was critical of the branch office purchase, certainly a subject of interest and relevance to members. The branch officer responded to *Secret Castle* in the same issue and used four plus pages to do so while

There has been a tradition of independence at The Voice.

complaining in a subsequent article, about the crowding out of articles. *Secret Castle* was not a direct personal attack and while containing inaccuracies an immediate response was probably unnecessary. The March/April issue had yet another *offending* article that got a same issue response from the branch officer. The *offending* article was entitled *Laboring over labor relations* in which the writer/steward described the circumstances by which a grievance he was investigating was eventually handled at Informal A by the branch president. He questioned the handling of the grievance outside normal grievance channels and referred to the acting manager of labor relations as a coward, for not submitting to an interview by him.

(continued on page 5)

Thornton (continued from page 4)

The branch officer wrote a same issue response to the article.

Historical Voice

There had been a tradition of independence in **The Voice** and no attempt to squelch criticism of national policy in regards to many subjects including Employee Involvement, the Dispute Resolution Process, expanding the parameters of Article 2. Unfortunately, the writer of the so-called offending article does not have an opportunity to respond to the counterpoint if he/she finds the counterpoint offensive. One episode years ago maybe points up the absurdities in all this. An article, somewhat funny especially after the passage of time and if you have

Protect the nature of The Voice and the qualities that have made it an award-winning paper.

a jaded sense of humor, was written that lambasted an officer for some political views he had espoused, etc. Essentially, the article indicated some “communist” tendencies or other and was one of these guilt by association pieces. The paper had been printed before the branch officers became aware of the “offending article”. It was decided that a counterpoint article would be inserted in the already printed copies of the newsletter. The response from the offended officer was physically inserted in about 3000 copies of that issue. I remember disagreeing with the decision to do this but participated nonetheless in the inserting exercise. This was one of those cases where there was a serious personal attack on an individual.

In recent cases—about 5—where a branch officer responded in the same issue, it probably was not necessary for a same issue response even if it is a given that it is sometimes reasonable and necessary. Are we really not talking about fact checking but about articles that offend somebody?

Certainly there should be a realization that the branch has relationships with the National Union and with management and that there is always pressure to mitigate any unnecessary ill will. This relates to a reference to **The Voice** being “widely read.”

Technology and content

While improvements, technological and otherwise are always appropriate, to change this multiple award winning paper into other than an independent, creative, high spirited voice of the letter carrier and union would be a shame.

This is a fact of life but not one that necessitates mea-

asures at **The Voice** unseen in years past despite a history of iconoclastic articles offensive to some union officers. Previous administrations have withstood such pressure.

There is something disturbing in the use of terms and phrases like “disinformation, grave injustice, damage inflicted, willful disinformation, retaliating against reported injustices that have not occurred . . .” “Many articles are being given serious review before going to print,” “In most incidents, this one included, I have been given the opportunity to publish a counterpoint to the offending article.” Are these Orwellian terms?

“Goebels was in favor of free speech for views he liked. So was Stalin. If you’re really in favor of free speech, then you’re in favor of free speech for precisely the views you despise. Otherwise, you’re not in favor of free speech.” Noam Chomsky, *Manufacturing Consent*, 1992.

Facts and opinion

Protect the nature of **The Voice** and the qualities that have made it an award winning paper.

There is no conflict between a newsletter including practical contractual information and one that also is interesting, fun and has a diversity of opinion, etc. within civilized parameters.

Fact check carefully anything of a contractual nature but don’t waste resources on over scrutinizing what are strictly opinion pieces.

Immediate responses in the same issue should be prohibited or strictly limited.

We have people who are hungry to write, feel passionately about issues, and have helped make **The Voice** into what it has become, a vibrant union newsletter consistently acknowledged for its excellence.

Getting along

But the overriding issue may be our treatment of each other. The recent Bush nominee to be representative to the UN came under fire for his treatment of people, and was described as a kiss up/ kick down kind of guy. (SF Chronicle 4/05/05.) This is a reference to sucking up to the people with authority above but berating/abusing those below. In cases of abuse, findings indicate that abused people tend towards abuse, and so the conditions for such behavior continue, in families and in organizations.

Not wanting to sound too saccharine, it is nonetheless not exactly the golden rule. People are treated not as we would have them treat us but the way we have been treated.

The union is so much about the biblical admonition of what we “. . . do for the least of thee . . .” but it can quickly devolve into such mean spirited activities and a kind of bullying mentality.

Can’t we get along?

Postal X-Files

Censoring Voice articles

By Audrey A. Davis, Alternate Steward, Sunset PCA

This is my response to an article that appeared in the last issue about censoring **Voice** articles. (See "A response from the Chief Censor", page 15 in the March/April 2005 issue of **The Voice**.) I know it is sometimes hard to remember what the previous article said, but unfortunately not all of us get the opportunity to respond to a disagreeable **Voice** article in the same issue.



Presidential quotations

President Tony Gallardo wrote, "no articles in **The Voice** have been censored, though many articles are now being given serious review before going to print. Why are we giving these articles such careful scrutiny? Articles published in **The Voice**, which put forward willful disinformation

disguised as fact, have frequently alarmed me."

Okay.

Tony goes on to say, "When so-called facts are published that are false, misleading, or inaccurate, the branch is responsible for the damage inflicted. Oftentimes the damage is to our own organization, since people can be incited to retaliate against reported injustices that have not, in fact, occurred."

Criticism and individual opinions matter

Even after reading his reasons, I'm still not sure why Tony wants to censor or "scrutinize" articles, but the reasons given in his article don't really hold water, in my opinion. And that *is* the point; *it's my opinion*.

It's important that individuals be allowed to voice their ideas and beliefs.

Many things happen that are open to interpretation and it's important that individuals should be allowed to voice their ideas and beliefs. Most people can recognize the difference between branch policy and opinion. (And for those who aren't sure, they can check at the bottom of each page.)

I don't believe that criticism is a bad thing. Articles that are critical of some event or activities within our union, our job or our country, create an opportunity for debate and deeper understanding of ideas and positions. In my

opinion, contradictory ideas are better presented out in the open than festering as gossip and innuendo.

As every shop steward knows, this job does not go without criticism and sometimes lots of it from all sides. Any time an individual stands up for something, there will be others who disagree. It just goes with the territory.

Contradictory ideas are better presented out in the open than festering as gossip and innuendo.

There is no individual or group that is always right. Everyone has to be wrong sometimes and there's nothing wrong with having an open, honest dialogue about it. I believe that through struggle over our differences and disagreements we can become stronger and more united.

Shining a light on issues

Tony seems to see articles that are critical of him as divisive, instead of as opportunities to get an issue out in the open. Usually, by the time someone writes an article the issue has already been talked about by scores of people. So the article is simply bringing the issue to light.

I completely disagree with Tony when he writes, "every word printed on these divisive issues crowds out an opportunity to publish more practical fact-based articles that the members desperately need." That statement

Tony seems to see articles that are critical of him as divisive, instead of as opportunities to get an issue out in the open.

is factually incorrect. Please check out the Jan/Feb 2005 issue of **The Voice** and you will see that eight out of ten articles were "practical fact-based articles." There were articles on the following subjects: on-the-job injuries, route inspections, shop steward duties, E-activists, grievance basics, retirement, know-your-rights and proposed by-law changes. To my knowledge, not one article of any type has ever been "crowded out" because of too many critical/divisive articles.

Since Tony reported to you as fact; that certain articles are crowding out other articles, when that is actually "willful disinformation disguised as fact", does that mean we should not have published Tony's article?

As you can see, censorship will depend on whose opinion you agree with. I vote against censorship! I would like to hear more opinions, not less.

Believe It Or Not.

Feet to the fire

“Safety, second to none”

By Larry Gerigk, Safety and Health Officer

We see these words on banners around the workplace and what do they mean? Nothing. Actually, they are words used in a sentence; without actions behind them, they are meaningless.

We should always write up an unsafe piece of equipment.

I was asked six months ago to fill the vacant Safety and Health Officer position. In the period since, I have seen some good and more bad practices which take place every day. Safety is a concern to all of us, but sometimes it gets pushed to the background.

Stand-ups

Management will give stand-up talks, do street supervisions and participate in safety groups when they have to. Their day-to-day operations often cause them to overlook small infractions of safety rules. Carriers too often make choices that they shouldn't, in order to get the job done.

The 1767 form is used to report hazards.

All of us have been guilty of using unsafe equipment or acting in an unsafe manner with the feeling that “it's just this one time” or “it's not worth the trouble to write it up”. Most of the time things work out fine, but all it takes is once to make us regret our actions. Using defective equipment or rushing to finish our assignments can have

All it takes is one accident to make us regret not reporting a safety hazard.

a bad result. If there is an accident there is a good chance discipline will follow, because according to management all accidents are preventable.

Utilize the 1767 form

What can we do? Each of us can make it a practice to work in a safe and professional manner. When the unions do safety inspections, I often notice these things. Some

carriers regard the union reps with disdain. Other carriers address safety practices as if they are an imposition. Third, when we request the past year's 1767 unsafe condition forms, there are very few on file.

The 1767 is used to report hazards. The carrier or stew-

Management will overlook small infractions of safety rules.

ard can use this form to document hazards and offer possible solutions. The form can be submitted anonymously or directly to the immediate supervisor. The supervisor fills out the appropriate response section and returns one copy to the person who filed it. Often carriers will tell me that nothing happens when they file 1767s. The next step would be to file a grievance under Article 14, Safety and Health. It is up to all of us to make sure that we have a safe work environment and we need to do it, hopefully with management cooperation, but even without it. There is only one person who can truly make sure that you go home every day safe and healthy and that is you.

M. J. Finch
Brookfield®
Uniforms

UNION MADE



HAVERT HILL

Retired Member
Greater East Bay Branch 1111
Weinbrenner-Rocky Shoes

**Brookfield's Newest Representative
Serving Branch 214**

1646 PARTRIDGE DR.
HERCULES, CA 94547-1520

(510) 799-5533
(510) 799-5440
1-800-200-8616

WELCOME NEW MEMBERS

Kearney D. Challenger - San Leandro	Jerry Insisoulath - San Rafael
Kathy Chan - Diamond Heights	Sio C. Ku - Bayview
Elaine W. Chu - San Leandro	Kam Lau - Golden Gate
John S. Curtis - San Rafael	Zeppelin B Lui - Steiner
Virgil Dizon - Station J	Joseph Massicci - Marina
Gary D. Endaya - Novato	Patrick McElroy - Redwood City
Marcus Elizondo - Mill Valley	Jack H. Morris - Novato
Marcelito T. Enrile - San Leandro	Charlotte Pasqual - Steiner
Teresita M. Evangelio - San Leandro	Tran X. Pham - Daly City
Tandra Faus - San Rafael Mission	Christina Romero - Station E
Marrissa Ferguson - Novato	Russell D. Willmes - San Leandro
Janis Gomez - Redwood City	Hua H. Xiao - Diamond Heights
Raymundo H. Guevarra, Jr. - Corte Madera	Jack Zins - Collections PM
Lien D. Ha - San Leandro	

Dues Adjustment

NALC Headquarter failed to stop the dues assessment in Pay Period 8 due to personnel changes in the membership department. Your dues were deducted with the assessment during pay periods 8-11. The following schedule will correct the assessment amounts in pay periods 12 through 15 and effective pay period 16 the correct dues amount of \$23.55 will be deducted from your pay check:

PP	Assessment	Dues Amount
8	\$3.00	\$26.55
9	\$3.00	\$26.55
10	\$3.00	\$26.55
11	\$3.00	\$26.55
12	-\$3.00	\$20.55
13	-\$3.00	\$20.55
14	-\$3.00	\$20.55
15	-\$3.00	\$20.55
16	\$ 0	\$23.55

Branch 214 Meetings

Branch meetings, 7:00 P.M.

June 1, 2005	ILWU Hall, 400 North Point, SF
July 6, 2005	ILWU Hall, 400 North Point, SF
August 3, 2005	ILWU Hall, 400 North Point, SF

Steward meetings, 6:00 P.M.

June 1, 2005	ILWU Hall, 400 North Point, SF
July 6, 2005	ILWU Hall, 400 North Point, SF
August 3, 2005	ILWU Hall, 400 North Point, SF

Retiree social meeting, 12:30 P.M.

June 6, 2005	740 Del Monte Ave., South SF
August 1, 2005	740 Del Monte Ave., South SF
October 3, 2005	740 Del Monte Ave., South SF

IN MEMORIAM

Vance Randolph



Mardi Gras theme at Annual Dinner: with and without mask, Tom and Marilyn Green (Station P).



Photos: Leland Churne

A new cop on the block

The Office of the Inspector General

By Carol Ann Maggio, Assistant Secretary-Treasurer

Be sure to watch the upcoming *Postal Record* for information about the Office of the Inspector General (OIG). With approval from the US Postal Service, the OIG will now be investigating allegations of misconduct or improper performance of official duties in conjunction with, or separately from, the Postal Inspection Service.



What's different? Whereas the Postal Inspection Service does not necessarily prosecute all cases, the Office of the Inspector General usually does prosecute the majority of their cases.

When faced with a Kalkines Warning...

You may be called into the office to meet with OIG officers. They may give you a **Kalkines Warning** form. It will explain their authority to interview you under the Inspector General Act of 1978 and tell you the purpose of the interview. The form will also advise you that they are going to ask a number of specific questions concerning your official duties as an employee of the USPS. The form also states you have a duty to reply to the questions

If you lie, the information you provide can be used in criminal prosecution against you.

and that the USPS disciplinary proceedings, including your dismissal, may be initiated if you refuse to answer or fail to reply fully and truthfully.

The form will tell you that neither your answers nor any information or evidence which is gained by your statements can be used against you in criminal proceedings. Think you're home-free? Not! The information you provide, written or oral, if proven false, **can be used in criminal prosecution against you.**

The kicker? You can be subject to disciplinary action and dismissal if you refuse to answer any questions or fail to respond truthfully to any questions or you give misleading information.

Then? They are going to ask you to sign the form asking you if you understand your rights; that you have been

advised of why they are asking you questions; that you are willing to discuss the reasons you are being questioned; that they have made no threats, promises, or have coerced you; and that you know and understand what you are doing.

Even when you're truthful and cooperative, you can be disciplined or dismissed if you admit to wrongdoing.

The really scary part? *Even if you answer all the questions truthfully and cooperate fully, but in the course of the interview you admit to a wrongful act, you can still be disciplined and/or dismissed.* Damned if you do, damned if you don't.

...invoke your Weingarten Rights

What can you do? Under your Weingarten Rights (NLRB vs. Weingarten, INC. 420 U.S. 251, 88 LRRM 2689), if you believe that discipline or other adverse consequences may result from the interview, you must ask for union representation, since management does not automatically notify your union representative that there will be an interview. Management is required to allow you to speak with your union representative before the interview. Normally we advise employees not to respond to management's questions, however, since the OIG is

When faced with an OIG interview, invoke your Weingarten Rights, ask for a postponement and get a lawyer.

involved, we would advise you to ask for a postponement of the interview until you have provided yourself with legal representation (an attorney). The Supreme Court has ruled that during an investigatory interview management must inform the union representative of the subject of the interview and that the union representative has the right to assist and counsel workers during the interview. During the interview the union representative can interrupt to clarify a question or to object to confusing or intimidating tactics. Ask for a copy of their questions and write down your answers. If they do not provide you with their questions, get paper and write them down and write down your responses to those questions, no matter how long it takes.

This is just a short article to provide you with some basic information until NALC specifically outlines what to do in these cases in the next *Postal Record* issue.

Enforced inactivity**Brain waves**

By Ivars Lauersons, Editor

One of the advantages to being forced to sit on a couch for two weeks is a chance to catch up on reading. We routinely skim other branch newspapers, and read some of the articles fully, but this was a first time to sit down and read all of the articles in other papers.

Other branch papers provide great insight into what's going on in other parts of NALC-land. And you can miss



the good stuff, if you just skim. There are gems of revelations of what makes other places tick. And there is more detail than in the 300 word limit scribe articles we get in the national "Postal Record." This was a great chance to write an article written by others.

There is nothing like a joke, especially if you haven't heard it before, to start the day:

There was a truck driver sitting at his table eating his breakfast when three bikers came in, sat down and began eating his food trying to get a rise out of him. He calmly got up, paid his bill and left. One of the bikers said to the waitress, "There's not any fight left in that old trucker, you know." The waitress said, "His eyesight ain't too good either. He just ran over three motorcycles."

From "Sooner Script," Branch 485, Oklahoma City, OK, January 2005, "Happy New Year," by Clarence "Hambone" Hamm, self-described age 79.

Puzzles

To those of you who like to calculate your annual leave schedule to coincide with long weekends and holidays, Dave Lotte of Allentown, Pennsylvania has gone the extra step. He ranks the color codes we have as to how well they do during this year. Let him explain:

"What is the best letter for your day off?"

"I came up with a formula, which looked at the letter's day off and included the designated holidays. I gave the most weight to the 4 bagger when your long weekend is followed by the holiday. I also gave credit for not having to work the six-day week. Then I looked at the ratings when you did not take any holidays and opted for the pay. I used this as the tiebreaker, since you may not get any holidays off and this ranking is about the best letter to be off on.

The winner was "F" by just nipping out "E" on the hol-

iday factor. "B" got the booby prize especially if you didn't get your holiday off and also you could end up working every six-day week during 2005.

Note-I used both 04/05 & 05/06 New Year's holiday weekends."

This is followed by a chart (not reproduce here) detailing the calculations for ranking the six different letters (color codes). Number 3 is "A," then "D," and "C," and "B." The equivalent color codes for San Francisco are....

This article is like a crossword puzzle, an afficianado will love, anyone else will get frustrated.

From "The Clan," Branch 274, Allentown, PA, January, 2005, "What is the best letter for your day off?" by Dave Lotte.

Laid-back parable

For sheer laid-back, have another beer type of storytelling, there is nothing to compare to the stories of Tom Anderson of Ontario, California. This one is called "The New Postal Math," and involves his dog as a main player. He weaves a story of a dog that honks, a route check that ends up in more hours worked by carriers than before the route check (the new postal math), a dog's water bowl cleaned with Comet cleanser, and a dog with very clean teeth who doesn't honk any more after an encounter with a water hose. And it all makes sense. For the full story see "The 1439'er," Branch 1439, Ontario, CA, January 2005.

The bad supervisor

We all informally track the careers of bad supervisors, hoping they will not come to our station or that they will leave our station. The writer J. Kingbury, Ass't Editor of "The Seventy-Niner," Seattle, Washington has proposed making this a formal union function. Writing in the February issue ". . . I suggested that we spend the time and money to also track these same issues by supervisors, station managers and postmasters in the Associate Offices outside the city of Seattle. This would allow the Union to identify and track mistreatment by the bad managers, even as they move from station to station throughout the Seattle district."

The writer concedes that this won't resolve the true problem., but continues "we'll have documentation to show that certain bosses shouldn't be promoted." This is an idea whose time has come, and is just an extra step from what is already being done in Seattle, tracking grievances by station and by grievance type. From the February, 2005 issue of "The Seventy-Niner," Branch 79, Seattle, WA.

There is more and more original writing in other branch papers. They draw attention to events like Black History Month. They reflect the difference in postal jargon from region to region: what is a split, what is a bump, what is a part? They question our lives as letter carriers from many perspectives.

Gallardo (continued from page 2)

As a result of this agreement, San Leandro is having their routes inspected unilaterally by management, with the union thoroughly monitoring the process. Our union representative, Sue Garshol, has been examining all the data, which has been unilaterally generated by management. She has found many violations and has given management every opportunity to comply with the contract, with very little success.

These inspections are still in process as I write this article. They started the inspections on 4/18/05 and are expected to finish by 5/27/05. San Leandro currently has 112 routes and three auxiliaries. At this time it is projected that San Leandro will lose 9 routes.

Our agreement with San Leandro, could have been an opportunity for management to follow the contract, and for the union to verify that the process was fair. Instead, these inspections will be the source of many grievances and quite possibly will lead to further inspections and adjustments, before management gets it right. In the meantime, carriers in San Leandro will probably face further strife and conflict.

Overall, the branch is facing up to, and dealing with the route adjustment issue fairly well, with the notable exception of San Leandro. It is my sincere hope that management in San Leandro and the rest of the country will take a closer look at the results we are achieving in San Francisco, and decide to work more closely with the union on route adjustments.

In the long run, management would save a tremendous amount of money, and garner the good will of the carriers by working with instead of against the Union. The amount of money saved on grievances not filed alone would save a mint. Cheating on route counts, then losing hundreds of grievances, only to have to recount the routes the right way is a sure way to lose money. Also, by attempting to cheat the carriers in this manner, management is virtually guaranteeing that the carriers will reject any effort to work with management on issues such as Customer Connect.

Customer disconnect

In most of the branch, the union and management are working together to bring back the parcel, express mail and priority mail business. Carriers are talking to residents on their routes that use the delivery services of our competitors. These carriers, after talking with these potential customers, are turning in these leads, so that the USPS marketing department can convince these people to try our products.

In a situation like the one we find in San Leandro, there is no way that the carriers who feel cheated and exploited are going to agree to help management accomplish anything. So, these route inspections not only have cost the

Working toward retirement . . .

Planning for your retirement

By Daniel SooHoo, Part-Time Regular, PM Collections

About eight years ago, a co-worker in my unit mentioned that he has three more years before he will reach his 55th birthday. He also mentioned that if you do not plan on retiring when you are eligible, you will miss the opportunity. *Retirement requires planning.*



I can say I have been planning for my retirement for about eight years. I have tried to sign up to attend the U.S. Postal Service's Pre-Retirement Seminar and was told that I do not qualify. Employees with three or fewer years to become eligible for retirement may sign up to attend the seminar. No "buts" about it. Human Resources has your record and know if you are eligible.

Retirement plus

At present, what a retired person receives from their pension fund might not be enough to maintain their life styles. Retirees end up relocating to less expensive parts of the country or moving to another country to make ends

All of us need to supplement our retirement fund.

meet. All of us need to *supplement our retirement fund*. All of us need some kind of activity to keep our bodies and minds functioning.

I have been talking to many members of Branch 214 and heard the many different "Working Toward Retirement" *plans* there are. It is great to hear that other members are planning their retirement. I hope I have provided good information to you all. I feel the seed has been planted to all the members about retirement. I will continue to discuss and help you on a one-to-one basis about your retirement. This will be my last article...!

P.S. I just called Human Resources to make my appointment.

Postal Service on the expenditure side of the ledger, they have also severely impacted the revenue generating side of the ledger, by insuring that San Leandro is a non-starter in the Customer Connect program. Way to go, San Leandro.

Retirement run amok

Personnel Management assaults injured employees!

By Martha Raup, Retiree

I've been reading with interest Dan SooHoo's series of **Voice** articles on "Working toward retirement" (eight have been published since November 2003). However, I have another, less sanguine, story to tell. I have found out the hard way that, for some of us, no amount of planning can possibly prepare us for what's ahead when we retire. In fact, the planning process itself, for some of us, may be a shill and a sham. Let me tell you why.

Retirement horror story

On January 1, 2005, I retired from the USPS after 34-plus years as a letter carrier in San Francisco. Four months later, I have yet to receive a dime of my promised pension. The Office of Personnel Management (OPM) is the government agency that controls and manages our pensions. They have yet to even acknowledge, in writing, my application for retirement, other than issuing me a Civil Service Annuity Number (CSA#)! It turns out the US Postal Service may be only too happy to see you go, they may offer you a pretty package of published benefits, which they say you'll receive (this is the shill), but unless OPM releases the money, nothing will come your way. And OPM washes its hands of any connection to whatever the employing agency may have offered you as an enticement to retire. Specifically, the money quoted on the annuity estimate issued every six months to anyone eligible to retire within the next three years is a sham. The figures the Postal Service presents you may in fact bear no relation to reality. At least that's what happened to me.

OPM treats injured employees as part-timers

I have attended every retirement seminar our agency presented over the last six years. I have read every brochure and asked every question I could imagine about what I might need to know, of anyone who might know anything about retirement. All of the information I could gather has assured me that my injuries sustained in 1998 and 1999 would NOT impact my pension. Surprise, surprise—OPM thinks differently. And *they* are the ones who hold the purse strings. OPM chooses to believe, contrary to what the manuals preach, contrary to what the retirement counselors tell you, contrary to what the NALC negotiates in our contract—OPM chooses to believe that if you are injured by the employer's working conditions, and if you are only *partially* injured (that is, you are not fully disabled, yet you are not totally able to

continue working an eight-hour shift), then they will consider you to have become a part-time employee! Your pension will no longer be computed at the salary rate in effect during the high three years of your employment, as it is supposed to be. For example, I've been informed by OPM via phone (three months *after* I retired) that OPM will consider *my* high three years to have been 1996-98, before my incapacitating injuries began. This effectively eliminates, for me, the pay raises negotiated by our union in the last contract—pay raises I specifically waited to roll into my pension, and it reduces my pension by \$4,200/year, or \$350/month.

How could this have come to be? Apparently, OPM has interpreted the modified job offer the USPS presents to its partially-injured employees as if it were an offer of a part-time position which, should you accept, transforms you into a part-time employee. It does not matter that the post office still considers you a full-time carrier working a modified work schedule to accommodate your injuries. It does not matter that the Office of Workers Compensation Program (OWCP) threatens to cut off your compensation benefits if you *don't* accept the offer. And disregard the manuals and the contract that say your pension will be paid at the salary rate in effect at the time of your high-three years. OPM has other ideas entirely. And it is their interpretation that rules.

Skewed interpretation of rules by OPM

Here's the rub—even though, as the NALC informs us, "All injuries, including disease proximately caused, aggravated, accelerated, or precipitated by employment, sustained while in the performance of duty by employees of the Postal Service are covered" by the Federal Employees Compensation Act (FECA—see: <http://www.nalc.org/depart/owcp/FAQ.html>), *no one* tells us that if we *accept* these payments, OPM will use it as evidence to hold against us! Of course, it seems obvious to us that OPM is dead wrong in their recent "interpretation" of the rules, and we all hope the legal appeals process reaches a permanent resolution in a speedy and just manner *soon*. In the meanwhile, however, be aware that OPM may take two to ten times (or more) of the money OWCP pays you away from you when you retire. The \$4,200/year I'm told (via phone) that OPM intends to confiscate from my pension will, over my lifetime, pay for two times *all* the medical expenses and compensation benefits that OWCP paid for my injuries. *So*, not only was I injured for life, but OPM expects me to pay the government two times what they spent on all costs for my injuries. What a racket.

To top things off, OPM won't release any money to me until I signed a waiver of claims against OWCP—and OPM won't even tell me what pension they'll offer me until I turn down whatever OWCP might offer! I call it

(continued on page 13)

Raup (continued from page 12)

catch-44. It's a game played with a bullet that pierces you, no matter what you choose, but you won't know what you're choosing until after you've done so. The USPS won't *really* tell you what your pension will be, or what the terms of your retirement package are—because

OPM chooses to believe that if you are injured by the employer's working conditions, and if you are only partially injured, then they will consider you to have become a part-time employee!

there *are* no terms, or at least none they'll stand behind. OPM won't tell you what they'll pay you until you close the back door to your government job—and even then they won't pay you until you slam the door in OWCP's face. And OWCP won't tell you what ransom money OPM will extract down the road from you. What a government!

Let me make something very clear—full-time letter carriers injured on the job are *not* part-time employees! We are *full*-time employees whose injuries have created permanent limitations in our ability to function—both on and off the job. The OWCP benefits we receive are *compensation* for lost work-hour-wages. They are not a gift, and they are not a free ride, and in no way do they cover our financial losses. In addition, nothing can ever repay us for the pain and injury and lost opportunities that are the real price of chronic conditions. And injuries unseen by others are *not* invisible to those afflicted!

Adding insult to injury

What OPM is really doing by this recent re-interpretation of the rules is to abolish the long-standing system of recompensing employees who are injured on the job. This is an insidious assault against each and every letter carrier, and against any government employee. Don't be fooled into thinking this won't affect you. We are all playing Russian roulette when we deliver mail for the US Postal Service. One in 10, or some statistical number of us, *will be injured*. Our jobs are designed for the efficiency of the movement of mail, and *not* for the efficiency of the human body. As one example, look at the carrier cases we face every day, and then look around you. How many people do you see are over-extending their shoulder's reach, raising their heads and straining their necks to read labels on shelves that tower over them, or holding and carrying bundles that torque their bodies, twist their elbows, and hyper-extend their thumbs, and

wrists? Furthermore, our cowboy culture of rugged individualism encourages all of us to work through or past the pain, and to deride those who succumb to injury (as if that made us unfit, rather than proved the equipment is unworkable and the environment unbearable). Remember, repetitive stress injuries cannot be ignored, and they will not go away without rest, rehabilitation, and the removal of aggravating conditions.

Get the union on your side

If you are an injured employee, and you're interested in fighting back, please call the union office and let them know what are your injuries and hours of work. They will be able to advise you on the current status of the issues I've raised here. Isn't it time our union started tracking the injuries we suffer? Wouldn't you like to know how many of us are injured, and under what circumstances? The US Postal Service has proven unable and unwilling to make our work environment safe for ourselves or for the next generation of letter carriers. Maybe it's up to us to figure out remedies for that which can be fixed, and defenses against that which cannot. Are you interested in other solutions? Get more involved in the union; get your co-worker to pay union dues for their union benefits; become an e-Activist; become an American citizen; become politically active in your community; write your Congressional Representative, or mine (Tom Lantos); support your co-workers and protect yourself; above all, talk this issue up, and educate yourselves and your society about issues that affect us all.

Getting back to planning for retirement—fortunately, many of my efforts *did* pay off. Firstly, to prepare financially, I practiced living on half of my income for the last two years before I retired, and I saved or invested the rest. It is that cushion of savings that has helped me survive OPM's assault. Also, I waited to retire until my mortgage was paid, and I carry no consumer debt. Furthermore, I maxed out my TSP deposits, and I fully funded my Roth IRA (and invested the funds there more aggressively). Secondly, I developed new hobbies and interests. For instance, I replaced bowling with photography. Having passionate pursuits is what keeps anyone thinking and feeling young, and it is all the more important for injured or aging Americans. Thirdly, I developed a strong social network. It is here, in my circle of friends, that I find the real "wealth" I've gained from my years at the PO. I've also reached out to my parents and partner, and become more active in my neighborhood and community. In short, saving for unimaginable events, changing spending habits, investing wisely, expanding the range of one's interests, and establishing a firm friendship base beyond the job—all these are vital parts of the planning process for retirement.

I can be reached at: mailladymartha@yahoo.com.

Approved Budget— April 1, 2005–September 30, 2005

Expense	Spent 10/1/04 - 03/31/05	Projected 4/1/05 - 9/30/05
1. Salaries, Lost Time:		
President's Salary (CSRS)	27,075.00	27,490.00
Executive Vice President's Salary (FERS)	26,435.00	26,770.00
Vice President's Salary (CSRS)	27,505.00	27,855.00
Secretary-Treasurer's Salary (CSRS)	27,505.00	27,855.00
Field Director Salary (CSRS)	27,505.00	27,855.00
Asst. Secretary-Treasurer's Salary (CSRS)	12,405.00	12,530.00
Health Benefits Representative Salary	1,041.00	1,075.00
Lost Time/Paid Time and Services (excl. Voice, Education)	9,975.00	11,000.00
Leave Reimbursement	525.00	525.00
Officer's Leave Fund (30% of potential liability)	14,500.00	650.00
TOTAL	174,471.00	163,605.00
2. Part Time Officers & Stewards Salary/Expenses		
Shop Steward Salary	32,685.00	30,160.00
Sgt/Arms, MBA, EEO, Safety/Health, Trustees, Dir of Organization (8)	4,760.00	4,825.00
President's Expenses	1,226.00	1,320.00
Executive Vice President's Expenses	1,017.92	1,320.00
Vice President's Expenses	1,238.00	1,320.00
Secretary-Treasurer's Expenses	1,280.00	1,320.00
Field Director Expenses	1,089.00	1,320.00
Asst. S/T Expenses	660.00	660.00
Misc. Expenses (Other Officer & Stewards)	482.00	500.00
TOTAL	44,437.92	42,745.00
3. Taxes & Officer's Benefits		
Officer's Benefits	36,543.00	38,000.00
Payroll Taxes/City Taxes	18,257.00	20,000.00
Property Taxes	4,959.00	4,960.00
TOTAL	59,759.00	62,960.00
4. Building/Office Expense		
Architect - Tenant Improvements	9,000.00	5,000.00
Building Maintenance & Repair	1,425.00	4,000.00
Hall Rental/RWC Office	4,460.00	1,200.00
Loan Payment/Mortgage	—	13,650.00
Janitorial Service Office	2,550.00	2,550.00
Office Utilities (Phone)	3,702.00	4,000.00
Printing	5,107.00	3,500.00
Insurance (OWCP/Business Liability/Bonding)	2,431.00	11,050.00
Insurance (Representational Liability)	—	8,500.00
Maintenance (Security/Service Contracts/Serv-Maint)	7,756.00	5,000.00
Computer Expenses	4,823.00	12,000.00
Office Supplies/Equipment/Office Expense	5,640.00	11,000.00
Payroll Services	2,019.00	3,125.00
TOTAL	39,913.00	84,575.00
5. Building Corporation		
BC Architect - Base Building	—	—
BC Pre-Construction Costs	—	—
BC Elevator	768.00	770.00
BC Garbage	213.00	215.00
BC Insurance	3,754.00	3,800.00
BC Janitorial	1,546.00	1,550.00
BC Office Expense	7.00	25.00
BC Professional Fees	4.00	1,000.00
BC Serv Maintenance	740.00	1,500.00

BC Utilities (PG&E/Water/Elevator Phone)	3,123.00	3,500.00
TOTAL	10,155.00	12,360.00

6. Fees & Dues		
Professional Fees	—	2,500.00
Affiliate Dues	5,497.00	5,500.00
TOTAL	5,497.00	8,000.00
7. Convention & Conferences		
Convention Fund	20,000.00	12,600.00
Seminars & Conferences (HBR/DC Lobby Trip)	6,970.00	2,000.00
Committee of President's Meeting/National Rap Session	1,476.00	1,200.00
TOTAL	28,446.00	15,800.00
8. Education		
Training, Seminars	14,582.00	7,470.00
Other: Books, Materials, NALC Supplies	485.00	500.00
TOTAL	15,067.00	7,970.00
9. Communications		
Voice: Lost Time	2,489.00	2,500.00
Expenses	11,857.00	12,000.00
TV 214	1,200.00	1,200.00
TOTAL	15,546.00	15,700.00
10. Entertainment		
Good of the Order/Other Refreshments	2,546.00	2,700.00
Annual Dinner	196.00	4,000.00
Recreation/Picnic	—	2,000.00
Steward Brunch (previously in Education Budget)	10,715.00	—
TOTAL	13,457.00	8,700.00
11. Representational Expenses		
Representational Expenses	300.00	500.00
Contract / Picket Action / Legislative Action	—	1,200.00
TOTAL	300.00	1,700.00
12. Other		
Retirement and Other Gifts	2,335.00	2,500.00
New Member Services / Recruitment	1,500.00	1,900.00
Elections	—	7,550.00
Food Drive	285.00	1,500.00
100% Union Celebration (\$4.00 per person)	—	250.00
Miscellaneous	467.00	500.00
Proposed By-Law Change*	—	18,915.00
TOTAL	4,587.00	33,115.00
TOTALS	411,635.92	457,230.00

*If not approved in May, Budget Committee will come back with an adj. Budget.

Projected Income

	# of Members	Per Member	Projected Income
Active Members (13 pay periods @ 16.91)	2,061	219.83	453,070
Retired Members	381	2.25	860
Interest Income			300
Miscellaneous Income			3,000
Projected Income Total			457,230
TOTAL PROJECTED INCOME:			457,230
Total Projected Expenses			(457,230)
Projected Surplus			—

Make a difference

COLCPE (Committee on Letter Carrier Political Education)

by Karen Schuler, Shop Steward, Novato

After reading the February 2005 issue of the Postal Record in which National thanked and listed the names of the COLCPE contributors by branch, including the automatic and the occasional contributors, I was really shocked by how many carriers don't make a contribution. National President Bill Young simply asked for every letter carrier in the Postal Service for one dollar a pay period. That's not very much. I wouldn't and don't miss my contribution. We're fighting for our jobs and the future of the postal service. We **all** need to secure the future of the Postal Service. I work with some really nice people in Novato and I was disappointed to see that only two of my co-workers were contributors. Looking at all the names, I was even more frightened when I saw my fellow brothers and sisters who are really active with Branch 214 and their names were not there. I ask all brothers and sisters of Branch 214 to do better than that. Step up to the plate. Become a COLCPE contributor. You'll never miss it. What you'll have is peace of mind knowing you're joining in the fight to secure our future. I encourage all of you to do the right thing. Do it now and make Branch 214 proud!

HOW TO CONTRIBUTE (forms found in the February 2005 issue of the Postal Record):

Electronic Fund Transfer (monthly deduction from your bank account on the first of the month)

I hereby authorize my bank to deduct from the checking account monthly the sum of:

\$25 \$20 \$15 \$10 \$5 Other: \$ _____

and forward that amount to NALC's Committee on Letter Carrier Political Education (COLCPE). I make this authorization voluntarily and may revoke it at any time by notifying the NALC COLCPE Committee in writing.

Signature _____ Date _____ Name _____

Social Security Number _____ or Postal Record Number _____

Address _____ City _____ ST _____ Zip _____

Attach a voided check to this form

PostalEASE (through your paycheck every pay period)

Refer to the COLCPE PostalEASE form in the February 2005 issue of the Postal Record, call the union office to have a form mailed to you, or go to the NALC website www.nalc.org.

Annuity

You will need your CSA retirement claim number; and Personal Identification Number (PIN). Retirees who don't have a PIN can obtain one by contacting OPM by telephone at 888-767-6738; in writing at Office of Personnel Management, Retirement Operations Center, Boyers, PA 16017; or online at www.opm.gov. Here are 3 easy ways to start your allotment:

1. **Telephone OPM** to start your COLCPE allotment by telephone, call 888-767-6738 and speak with a customer service representative.
2. **Write to OPM** to start your COLCPE allotment via mail, send a letter to: Office of Personnel Management (OPM), Retirement Operations Center, Boyers, PA 16017. Be sure to include your CSA number, the amount you want to contribute monthly, and the organization name: National Association of Letter Carriers—COLCPE.
3. **Sign up on the Internet**—Go to www.opm.gov. Click on "Employment and Benefits". Click on "Retirement Benefits". Under "How do I", scroll to "Set up an allotment to an organization" and click "Go". After reviewing the page describing services OPM provides retirees, scroll to the bottom and click "Yes". Enter your CSA number and PIN. Click on "Set organizational allotment" and select "Natl Assn of Letter Carriers—COLCPE". Enter the amount of your monthly contribution and click "Submit".
4. You will receive a confirmation by mail from OPM notifying you of the date of the first contribution that will be withheld from your annuity.

GOLDEN GATE BRANCH NO. 214
NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF LETTER CARRIERS, AFL-CIO
 2310 MASON ST., THIRD FLOOR
 SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA 94133



Address service requested

A Non-Profit Organization
 U.S. POSTAGE

PAID

San Francisco, Calif.
 Permit No. 10302



Photos: Ivars Lauerson

Mavy Ralleta, Marina assistant food drive coordinator, with some of the food donated on letter carrier food drive, May 14, 2005.

A few people dropped off their donations at the relay box in San Francisco.



Photo: Ivars Lauerson

Tom Ryan, AFL-CIO community services, left and Ray Fong, Field Director Branch 214, volunteering on food drive to pick up food from relay boxes and apartment houses. Photo at Marina station, San Francisco.

2005 Food Drive Results

San Francisco	75,000 lbs.
Daly City	11,944 lbs.
Redwood City	18,906 lbs.
San Leandro	28,000 lbs.
Sausalito	1,978 lbs.
Bel-Tib	3,823 lbs.
Mill Valley	9,434 lbs.
Corte Madera	5,481 lbs.
San Rafael (Main)(Mission)	14,350 lbs.
San Rafael (Civic)	6,518 lbs.
San Anselmo	6,917 lbs.
Novato	17,794 lbs.
Total	200,145 lbs.

Branch 214 would like to thank everyone who made the food drive such a great success: Station coordinators, carriers, mail handlers, clerks, motor vehicle drivers, supervisors, managers and postmasters. Without all of your help, we would not have been able to accomplish our mission.