



UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE  
475 L'Enfant Plaza, SW  
Washington, DC 20260-0001

ARTICLE	10
SECTION	
SUBJECT	
ATTENDANCE CONTROL	

AUG 27 1985

Mr. Thomas Freeman, Jr.  
Assistant Director  
Maintenance Craft Division  
American Postal Workers  
Union, AFL-CIO  
817 14th Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20005-3399

Re: Class Action  
Albany, NY 12207  
H1C-1Q-C 24889

Dear Mr. Freeman:

On April 3, 1985, we met to discuss the above-captioned grievance at the fourth step of our contractual grievance procedure.

The issue in this grievance is whether the Albany, NY Attendance Control Program constitutes an invasion of privacy and harassment. Also at issue is whether the local program is inconsistent or in conflict with Articles 8, 10, 19 and 30; and subchapter 510 of the Employee and Labor Relations Manual.

After further reviewing this matter, we agreed that there was no national interpretive issue fairly presented as to the meaning and intent of Article 10 of the National Agreement. Whether the Local Attendance Control Program is a form of harassment or an invasion of privacy, and whether it is in conflict with Article 10 and ELM procedures can only be determined by evaluating the fact circumstances. We further agreed that per Frank Jacquette's December 1, 1983 letter, Management Instruction EL-510-83-9 ". . . should not be relied upon as interpretive authority of regulations, but is only intended as guidance for managers and supervisors on how to effectively administer leave regulations on an ongoing basis. As such, any challenges to management actions in this area must be pursued on a case-by-case under the provisions of Article 15."