

**TEAMSTERS NATIONAL UPS FREIGHT
GRIEVANCE COMMITTEE**

September 14 – 16, 2011

DOCKET

**HYATT REGENCY MISSION BAY
1441 QUIVIRA ROAD
SAN DIEGO, CA**

9:00 A.M.

CASES CARRIED OVER:

- NUPSF-10-031: Local 519 v. UPSF, Knoxville, TN
On behalf of **George Allen**, Union alleges that the Company violated **Articles 41 and 29**, claiming that past practice is tractors are bid by seniority for use during work week. The Union requests to be able to bid on a tractor.
- NUPSF-10-038: Local 413 v. UPSF, Columbus, OH
On behalf of **all affected road drivers**, Union alleges that the Company violated **Article 44**, claiming that the Company is in violation of the UPS Freight Agreement, contract, up to and including **Article 44**. Asking the Company to stop using subcontractors and or to recall all drivers and not to lay off any more drivers and make them whole for all lost wages.
- NUPSF-10-054: Local 431 v. UPSF, Fresno, CA
On behalf of **Ed Robinson**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 5 and all that apply**, claiming that Ed Robinson was not offered work in seniority order. The Union requests that the Company make Ed Robinson whole for all lost wages and benefits and a cease and desist.
- NUPSF-10-075: Local 174 v. UPSF, Tukwila, WA
On behalf of **Dave Ellis**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 15**, claiming that the Company is in violation of **Article 15** of the UPS Freight Agreement by no repairing the potholes at the sea terminal causing unsafe working conditions.
- NUPSF-10-129: Local 391 v. UPSF, Morrisville, NC
On behalf of **Craig Watson**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 18, Section 2**, claiming that the grievant is a bid road driver from the Morrisville, NC terminal. The Company cancelled him on 2/17/10. The Company ran a non guaranteed extra board driver from Fayetteville, NC to run the same route. The Union requests the grievant be made whole for all lost wages and benefits (480 miles).
- NUPSF-10-132: Local 317 v. UPSF, East Syracuse, NY
On behalf of **Anthony Dean**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 21, Section 2**, claiming that the grievant is a senior full time employee who lost his COLA. He was not assigned available dock work he is qualified for ahead of casual employees. The Union requests the grievant be made whole for all lost wages and benefits.
- NUPSF-11-11: Local 745 v. UPSF, Irving, TX
On behalf of **Adam Ridge**, Union alleges that the Company

violated **Articles 5, 18 and 29**, claiming that schedule was cut and Orlando Team (team we meet) was allowed all the way to Dallas. The Union requests 1210 miles to each driver.

- NUPSF-11-35: Local 631 v. UPSF, Las Vegas, NV
On behalf of **Emmanuel Neri**, Union alleges that the Company violated **Article 17**. The Company violated the collective bargaining agreement when it had pre-seniority employee working ahead of seniority employees.
- NUPSF-11-40: Local 690 v. UPSF, Spokane, WA
On behalf of **Roger Shmidt, Mark Hensch and Mike Schreindl**, Union alleges that the Company violated **Article 5, Sections 1(E) and 3**. On 04/20/2010, 05/19/2010 and 07/02/2010, extra work was generated in Spokane, WA center and a Hermiston, OR driver was sent with empty trailers to Spokane and took the work back to Hermiston, OR, over 150 miles one way the work has always been out of Spokane and now it is being done by Hermiston driver. The Union requests \$963.47.

CASES WERE PUT ON COMMITTEE HOLD:

- NUPSF-131-09: Local 509 v. UPSF, Gaffney, SC
On behalf of **David Brown, et al.**, Union alleges a violation of **Articles 5, 43, 44, and all that apply**, claiming that on 04/23/08, the Company laid off the grievant and others from fill in board due to freight being ran by sub-contractors and owner operators. The Union requests all money due.
- NUPSF-149-09: Local 174 v. UPSF, Tukwila, WA
On behalf of **all affected employees**, Union alleges that the Company violated **Article 44 and all that apply**, claiming that the Company subcontracted bargaining unit work on 09/30/08 and 10/30/08 while line driver on layoff.
- NUPSF-151-09: Local 63 v. UPSF, Fontana/LAX/Los Angeles, CA
On behalf of **all affected employees**, Union alleges that the Company violated **Articles 13 and 44**, requesting interpretation of payment decision and for the National Grievance Panel to clarify decision for panel filing NUPSF-95-09 not paid correctly.
- NUPSF-195-09: Local 512 v. UPSF, Jacksonville, FL
On behalf of **all affected employees**, Union alleges that the Company violated **Articles 5, 7 and 18**, claiming that the Company is not offering all available work to full-time laid-off employees, allowing part-time employees to exceed four (4) hours while sending regular employees home.

- NUPSF-205-09: Local 385 v. UPSF, Ocoee, FL
On behalf of **Greg Bavaro**, Union alleges that the Company violated **Articles 20, 38, 32 and 44**, claiming the Company should not be subcontracting bargaining unit work while road drivers are on layoff.
- NUPSF-10-001: Local 480 v. UPSF, Nashville, TN
On behalf of **all affected employees**, Union alleges that the Company violated **Article 44**, claiming that the Company using subcontractor to move LTL loads from Nashville to Harrisburg (Summit Transportation) when bargaining unit members are not working. The Union requests all lost wages due to subcontracting.
- NUPSF-10-004: Local 480 v. UPSF, Nashville, TN
On behalf of **Ronnie Bimstein**, Union alleges that the Company violated **Articles 16, 5 and all that apply**, claiming that the grievant should have been allowed to perform dock work ahead of part time employees that worked from September 3, 2009, until the date of his medical certification. The Union requests all lost wages and benefits.
- NUPSF-10-006: Local 745 v. UPSF, Dallas, TX
On behalf of **William Dawson**, Union alleges that the Company violated **Articles 43 and 44**, claiming that the Company is subcontracting while there are laid off employees. The Union requests that all the laid off employees be made completely whole for all lost wages and benefits and a cease and desist this practice.
- NUPSF-10-007: Local 745 v. UPSF, Dallas, TX
On behalf of **all affected employees**, Union alleges that the Company violated **Articles 29 and 44**, claiming that the Company cancelled wild sleeper schedules. The Union requests that the Company reinstate all wild team jobs.
- NUPSF-10-011: Local 745 v. UPSF, Dallas, TX
On behalf of **Ken Collinsworth**, Union alleges that the Company violated **Articles 1 and 3**, claiming that UPS Freight has unilaterally implemented a light duty program without negotiating with the Union over the effects. The Union requests all monies due for not allowing the grievant into the light duty program.
- NUPSF-10-015: Local 745 v. UPSF, Dallas, TX
On behalf of **Phillip Shelton**, Union alleges that the Company violated **Articles 40 and 44**, claiming that the Company contracting HRS freight out of Garland. The Union requests that this matter be made whole in every way.

- NUPSF-10-017: Local 745 v. UPSF, Dallas, TX
On behalf of **William Dawson**, Union alleges that the Company violated **Article 44**, claiming contractor violation on hub lane. The Union requests back pay for all affected employees and a cease and desist this practice.
- NUPSF-10-034: Local 385 v. UPSF, Orlando, FL
On behalf of **Misael Rodriguez**, Union alleges that the Company violated **Articles 5, 43 and 44**, claiming that the Company cannot subcontract bargaining unit work with employees on layoff.
- NUPSF-10-035: Local 385 v. UPSF, Orlando, FL
On behalf of **Misael Rodriguez**, Union alleges that the Company violated **Articles 20, 38, 43 and 44**, claiming that the Company cannot subcontract bargaining unit work with employees on layoff.
- NUPSF-10-045: Local 61 v. UPSF, Hickory, NC
On behalf of **Brian Keith Watson**, Union alleges that the Company violated **Article 44**, claiming that the Company subcontracting loads out of the Hickory terminal with road drivers laid off. The Union requests all lost earnings to senior laid off road driver. (This case is the pilot for case number 117-09).
- NUPSF-10-047: Local 707 v. UPSF, Newburgh, NY
On behalf of **all affected employees**, Union alleges that the Company violated **Article 44 and all related Articles**, by subcontracting runs from Newburgh, NY to Atlanta, GA and return. The Union requests the Newburgh, NY Road Drivers to perform the work currently being subcontracting.
- NUPSF-10-056: Local 174 v. UPSF, Tukwila, WA
On behalf of **Local 174, et al.**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 44**, claiming that the Company subcontracting bargaining unit work on June 25 and July 9, 2009.
- NUPSF-10-057: Local 483 v. UPSF, Boise, ID
On behalf of **all affected employees**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 44 and all that apply**, claiming that the Company is using subcontractors to do bargaining unit work.
- NUPSF-10-073: Local 104 v. UPSF, Phoenix, AZ
On behalf of **Jim Leggitt**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 21, Section 2(A) and Article 5, Section 1**, claiming that the Company will not recognize brother Leggitt's medical certification, nor will they allow him to work in a non CDL position.

- NUPSF-10-081: Local 769 v. UPSF, North Miami, FL
On behalf of **Johnny Fryer**, Union alleges that the Company violated **Article 44**, claiming that the Company is not affording seniority employees the opportunity to pull road runs out of the Miami terminal. The Union requests amount base on mileage.
- NUPSF-10-097: Local 200 v. UPSF, Milwaukee, WI
On behalf of **Ronald W. Bowser**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 16, Section 1**, claiming that the grievant was given a DOT physical by the Company's doctor at the Sensia Clinic, New Berlin, WI on 2-3-10. The grievant was never told that he failed the DOT physical but was told by the doctor performing the physical that his boss Dr. Seter wouldn't let him sign the DOT medical card. On 2-22-10, the Union was informed by Service Center Manager Mike Clark that corporate wouldn't let the grievant return to work because he wasn't issued a DOT medical card. Feeling an injustice had been done the grievant was sent to Dr. Toledo for a second DOT physical on 3-1-10. The grievant was issued a DOT medical card at that time. On 3-2-10 a letter was sent to Mike Clark requesting a third DOT exam for the grievant and asking for a written response. At a local level grievance meeting on 3-5-10 the Union was given a negative response to our request. The Union has yet to receive a written response as requested. The Union wants the grievant to have a third DOT physical as required by **Article 16, Section 1** that is binding on all parties.
- NUPSF-10-103: Local 728 v. UPSF, Atlanta, GA
On behalf of **Waymon E. Bowman**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 26**, claiming that the Company is in violation of the contract and Memorandum of Understanding concerning sleeper team delay pay. The grievant was not paid properly. The Union requests 9.5 hours.
- NUPSF-10-105: Local 745 v. UPSF, Dallas, TX
On behalf of **Chris O'Neal**, Union alleges a violation of **Articles 5, 20, 38 and 40**, claiming that the Employer cut the GAR 002 meet to Zpr. The Union requests to be made whole in every way, including conditions of **Article 40** be adhered to.
- NUPSF-10-121: Local 745 v. UPSF, Irving, TX
On behalf of **Mike Jones and Wade Lay**, Union alleges that the Company is in violation of **Article 26 and Memorandum of Understanding**, claiming breakdown and delay. The Union requests 10.3 hours for each driver.

- NUPSF-10-122: Local 745 v. UPSF, Irving, TX
On behalf of **Mike Jones and Wade Lay**, Union alleges that the Company is in violation of **Article 26 and Memorandum of Understanding**, claiming delay due to weather. The Union requests 14 ¾ hours pay to each driver.
- NUPSF-10-123: Local 745 v. UPSF, Irving, TX
On behalf of **Bobby Dutton and Dwight Pierce**, Union alleges that the Company is in violation of **Article 26 and Memorandum of Understanding**, claiming breakdown and delay. The Union requests 11 ½ hours to each driver for delay.
- NUPSF-10-124: Local 385 v. UPSF, Ocoee, FL
On behalf of **Harold Vegas**, Union alleges that the Company is in violation of **Articles 43 and 44**, claiming Company having sub-contractors perform bargaining unit work while Road Drivers are on layoff.
- NUPSF-10-133: Local 63 v. UPSF, Fontana, CA
On behalf of **all affected employees**, Union alleges that the Company violated **Article 44**, by cancellation of work on Good Friday but didn't offer work to cancelled teams. This work should have been done by Teamsters 63 members but Company subcontracted work out.
- NUPSF-11-01: Local 480 v. UPSF, LaVergne, TN
On behalf of **all affected employees**, Union alleges that the Company violated **Articles 5, 40 and all that apply**, claiming that on September 27, 2010, the Company abolished two (2) longstanding bids at the Nashville facility. This work was moved without a proper hearing. The Company made a change in the manner in which freight was relayed from Baltimore/Richmond to Memphis beyond. Change was made with out notice to Local Union. The Union requests all affected employees be made whole.
- NUPSF-11-02: Local 480 v. UPSF, LaVergne, TN
On behalf of **all affected employees**, Union alleges that the Company violated **Article 40, Section 1, Articles 5, 44, and all that apply**. On September 27, 2010, the Company abolished two (2) longstanding bids at the Nashville facility. This work was either moved without a proper hearing or is being subcontracted. The Company made a change in the manner in which freight was relayed between the points of Baltimore/Richmond to Memphis beyond. Change was made without notice to Local Union. It was revealed by the Company at the SRTUPSFGC hearings that the Company is now subcontracting freight that was relayed through the

Nashville facility. The Union requests all affected employees be made whole.

- NUPSF-11-10: Local 745 v. UPSF, Irving, TX
On behalf of **Mike Jones and Wade Lay**, Union alleges that the Company violated **Article 26 and MOU**, claiming breakdown and delay. The Union requests 10.3 hours for each driver.
- NUPSF-11-13: Local 728 v. UPSF, Atlanta, GA
On behalf of **Teamsters Local Union 728**, Union alleges that the Company violated **Articles 18 and 44**, claiming that the Company has opted to use the rail instead of road drivers for run 310Z which is a meet and turn to Roanoke, VA. The Union requests 872 miles per week since violation.
- NUPSF-11-22: Local 385 v. UPSF, Ocoee, FL
On behalf of **Ed Muntz**, Union alleges that the Company violated **Article 44 and all that apply**, claiming the Company cannot subcontract when road drivers are on layoff. (07/01/2010)
- NUPSF-11-23: Local 385 v. UPSF, Ocoee, FL
On behalf of **Ed Muntz**, Union alleges that the Company violated **Article 44 and all that apply**, claiming the Company cannot subcontract when road drivers are on layoff. (06/16/2010)
- NUPSF-11-26: Local 988 v. UPSF, Houston, TX
On behalf of **Teamsters Local Union 988**, Union alleges that the Company violated **Article 5, Section 1 and Article 21, Section 2**, claiming the Company needs to honor seniority and allow its full time employees to work ahead of part timers.
- NUPSF-11-30: Local 776 v. UPSF, Mechanicsburg, PA
On behalf of **all affected employees**, Union alleges that the Company is in violation of **Article 44**. The work being sub-contracted violates Article 44 and creates a loss of work that was and could be performed by the bargaining unit employees at the Harrisburg service center.
- NUPSF-11-32: Local 70 v. UPSF, San Leandro, CA
On behalf of **all affected employees**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 44**, claiming the Company notified Union on May 7, 2010 that on June 6, 2010 they were going to cut SLO to Chambers, AZ turns from 3 and 2 trips per week down to 2 and 1 trips per week and put those loads on the rail. The Union requests the Company discontinue this practice and all affected to be made whole in every way.

NUPSF-11-34: Local 104 v. UPSF, Phoenix, AZ
On behalf of **Matt Peterson on behalf of the senior affected employees**, Union alleges that the Company violated **Articles 43 and 44**. The Company has dispatched loads with a ground carrier while utilizing the rail on return freight and not offering the work to the bargaining unit employees.

NUPSF-11-38: Local 104 v. UPSF, Phoenix, AZ
On behalf of **Matt Peterson on behalf of all affected employees**, Union alleges that the Company violated **Article 44**. The Company is in violation of Article 44 when they utilized sub-contractors for schedules from Phoenix to Memphis and return schedules from Memphis to Phoenix and failed to utilize bargaining unit employees.

WESTERN REGION

NEW CASES

- NUPSF-11-41: Local 174 v. UPSF, Tukwila, WA
On behalf of **Dave Ellis and all affected**, Union alleges violation of **Article 25**, claiming the Company in violation of Article 25 UPS Freight Agreement, May 11, 2009 MOU by paying employees on 4x10 hour workweek eight (8) hours holiday pay for 12/25/10 and 1/1/11. The Union requests two (2) hours holiday pay.
- NUPSF-11-42: Local 63 v. UPSF, Commerce, CA
On behalf of **all affected**, Union alleges that the Company violated **Article 18, Section 3**, claiming that the Company has a Sunday bid. The Union requests for members to be paid time & half for all hours.
- NUPSF-11-36: Local 63 v. UPSF, Los Angeles, CA
On behalf of **Victor Gonzalez**, Union alleges a violation of **Articles 5 and 25**, claiming the Company did not pay medical causing member to have an unpaid claim in the amount of \$2,502.00. **(REDOCKETED)**
- NUPSF-11-43: Local 431 v. UPSF, Fresno, CA
On behalf of **Steve Bates**, Union alleges that the Company violated **Article 5**, claiming that the Company has failed to provide enough line work to justify Steve Bates' bid Extra Board position. Steve Bates' bid position should have been cut for lack of work, Steve should have been laid off and allowed to exercise his seniority to bump into a different classification. The Union requests to be made whole for all lost wages and benefits.
- NUPSF-11-44: Local 431 v. UPSF, Fresno, CA
On behalf of **Chris Bonjorni**, Union alleges that the Company violated **Articles 5 and 41**, claiming that the extra work that is developed and built in the FRE Terminal belongs to the Extra Board drivers at the FRE Terminal. The Union requests that the grievant be made whole for all lost wages and benefits.
- NUPSF-11-45: Local 431 v. UPSF, Fresno, CA
On behalf of **Steve Bates**, Union alleges that the Company violated **Article 5, Section 1, Articles 15, 18, 28 and Article 18, Section 2**, claiming on May 21, 2011, the Company violated Steve Bates' seniority by not allowing him to take an Extra Board run. The Company deliberately

delayed this Extra Board run until May 22, 2011 and allowed the junior laid off driver Chris Bonjorni to take the run. The Union requests the grievant be made whole for all lost wages and benefits.

NUPSF-11-46:

Local 542 v. UPSF, San Diego, CA

On behalf of **Flossye L. Montgomery**, Union alleges that the Company violated **Article 5, Section 1**, claiming the Company cancelled part of the grievant's bid run. On several occasions the grievant had one leg of his bid, run cancelled. The Union requests difference of lost wages and benefits.

NUPSF-11-47:

Local 70 v. UPSF, Oakland, CA

On behalf of **all affected**, Union alleges that the Company violated **Articles 5, 18 and all that apply**, claiming the senior employees that work the Sunday through Thursday shift are being denied overtime on Friday. Casual employees working the same schedule have been put on layoff for Thursday then posted for mandated work Friday. This is work that should be assigned to full time employees first.

CENTRAL REGION

NEW CASES

- NUPSF-11-48: Local 651 v. UPSF, Lexington, KY
On behalf of **Archie Miles**, Union alleges that the Company violated **Article 5, Section 4**. On 12/16/2010, job posting on the upcoming bid posting for jockey positions the opening created by the retirement of Elmer Parks is now being posted as a CDL position. It is our contention that it should remain as red-circled position only and not available to a CDL employee. A CDL requirement is necessary for a new hire employee to be considered for a full-time position only and should not be a required qualification to hold a jockey position.
- NUPSF-11-49: Local 200 v. UPSF, Milwaukee, WI
On behalf of **David Friske**, Union alleges that the Company violated **Article 21, Section 2**. According to the contract if an employee's operating privilege is taken away without termination cause, the Company is to provide non-CDL job opportunities without loss of seniority. The grievant would like to return to work as soon as possible, he has been cleared by his own doctors to return to work. Please make David Friske whole. He should receive driver's pay while working and back pay for time lost.
- NUPSF-11-50: Local 705 v. UPSF, Palatine, IL
On behalf of **Teamsters Local Union 705**, Union alleges that the Company violated **Article 29**, claiming the Company has violated the CBA by forcing Local 705 bargaining unit employees employed as drivers to perform non-bargaining unit work with the threat of reducing the employee's Workers Compensation Benefits if they refuse to perform non-bargaining unit Temporary Alternate Work.

EASTERN REGION

NEW CASES

- NUPSF-11-51: Local 776 v. UPSF, Mechanicsburg, PA
On behalf of **all affected**, Union alleges that the Company is in violation of **Holiday MOU**, claiming that the Company did not pay teams that worked on the July 4th Holiday correctly. The Union requests that all affected be made whole for all lost wages and benefits.
- NUPSF-11-52: Local 776 v. UPSF, Mechanicsburg, PA
On behalf of **all affected members**, the Union alleges that the Company violated **Article 5**, claiming that the Local Cartage employees that had CDL license before ratification should be forced to maintain their CDL or DOT card. The Union requests the Company cease and desist this practice.
- NUPSF-11-53: Local 384 v. UPSF, Stowe, PA
On behalf of **Dennis Shields**, Union alleges that the Company is in violation of **Articles 5, 29, Article 18, Section 3 and all that apply**, claiming that the company circumvented the contract by paying the grievant mileage after he has already worked seven (7) hours into his tour off duty in Local Cartage. The grievant should be paid overtime for all hours after eight (8) hours, not mileage. The Union requests the grievant be made whole for all lost wages and benefits.
- NUPSF-11-54: Local 707 v. UPSF, Bayshore, NY
On behalf of **Anthony Salvatore**, Union alleges that the Company is in violation of **Article 18, Section 2 and all that apply**, claiming that the Company did not pay Brother Salvatore, who is a full-time employee holding a bid job, his eight (8) hours pay for work on January 4, 2011 and on January 6, 2011. The Union requests the grievant be paid for all lost wages and benefits.

SOUTHERN REGION

NEW CASES

- NUPSF-11-55: Local 79 v. UPSF, Tampa, FL
On behalf of **Raymond Phillips**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 18**. The grievant is in 90%. The Company cut half of his run because of no work. (They caused no work to be available) Company has previously settled four (4) grievances for the exact same violation for the second half of this run a double turn to Orlando, FL. The Union requests \$137.30.
- NUPSF-11-25: Local 988 v. UPSF, Houston, TX
On behalf of **George Koch**, Union alleges that the Company violated **Article 40**, claiming the Company should have had a change of operations and should have allowed a driver from Houston, TX to follow the work to San Antonio, TX and dovetail in his appropriate seniority slot. **(REDOCKETED)**
- NUPSF-11-56: Local 612 v. UPSF, Trussville, AL
On behalf of **Chris Niles**, Union alleges a violation of **Articles 5, 26 and 44**, claiming work performed by Montgomery road driver rather than dispatching our bid extra board driver with Birmingham loads. The Union requests to be paid for this run and that the Company cease and desist from giving bid extra board driver loads away.
- NUPSF-11-57: Local 769 v. UPSF, Miami, FL
On behalf of **Leonte Martinez**, Union alleges a violation of **Articles 5, 18 and 20**, claiming the grievant wants the hours he spends on road while being paid mileage to count towards hours worked for the purpose of being compensated at the overtime rate of pay.
- NUPSF-11-58: Local 657 v. UPSF, Austin, TX
On behalf of **Darrin Speer**, Union alleges a violation of **Articles 16, 26 and 29**, claiming the Company should reimburse all Haz-mat background check charges. The Union requests \$78.20.
- NUPSF-11-59: Local 657 v. UPSF, Austin, TX
On behalf of **Leonard Lewis**, Union alleges a violation of **Articles 5 and 26**, claiming the grievant should have been offered the earlier start time ahead of the casual. The Union requests one (1) hour and thirty-four (34) minutes at time and a-half.

- NUPSF-11-60: Local 667 v. UPSF, Memphis, TN
On behalf of **Mark Hall**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 5, Section 1-D, Article 18, Section 3, Articles 29 and 41**, claiming City/Cartage employee's have lost jobs and earning power due to the fact that a Road/Line-Haul driver is forced to break down his/her sets at end of day and forced to do city P/D and run rails. The Company has not hired or trained City/Cartage employee's due to the fact that the work is being done by Road/Line-Haul drivers at straight time and not overtime. Therefore, the Company has no reason to hire more employees. The Union requests to be made whole for all lost wages and benefits.
- NUPSF-11-61: Local 667 v. UPSF, Memphis, TN
On behalf of **Mark Hall on behalf of all road drivers**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 5, Section 1-D, Article 18, Section 3, Articles 29 and 41**, claiming the City/Cartage employee's have lost work opportunities and earning power due to the fact that the Company has forced the road drivers to break down sets and do City P/D local work at the end of a road run and pay the road driver at straight time. The Union requests all affected to be made whole for all lost wages and benefits.
- NUPSF-11-62: Local 512 v. UPSF, Jacksonville, FL
On behalf of **Derrick Bing**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 5 and all that apply**, claiming road driver laid off from classification was not given opportunity to bump specific P&D route.
- NUPSF-11-21: Local 512 v. UPSF, Jacksonville, FL
On behalf of **Teamsters Local Union 512**, Union alleges that the Company violated **Article 40**, claiming the Company moved runs from Jacksonville resulting in layoffs from Jacksonville road board, the Company has not allowed drivers to follow work. **(REDOCKETED)**
- NUPSF-11-63: Local 745 v. UPSF, Irving, TX
On behalf of **Gary Loyd and David Calhoun**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 18**, claiming five (5) day work week M-F or T-S, current bid is two (2) days a week. The Union requests to have full week of work, five (5) days a week.
- NUPSF-11-64: Local 745 v. UPSF, Garland, Tx
On behalf of **Bryan Meador**, Union alleges a violation of **Articles 26 and 29**, claiming insurance not paying medical refill. The Union requests \$45.00 and \$72.00.

- NUPSF-11-65: Local 528 v. UPSF, Ringgold, GA
On behalf of **Stan Lee**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 44**, claiming Mr. Lee's bid run was cancelled and he did not run on the day in question. Contract carrier on regular schedule should have been cut not Mr. Lee's run. The Union requests to be made whole for bid run.
- NUPSF-11-66: Local 385 v. UPSF, Ocoee, FL
On behalf of **Teamsters Local Union 385**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 40**. The Company claims that moving of run is not a change of operations.
- NUPSF-11-67: Local 385 v. UPSF, Ocoee, FL
On behalf of **Teamsters Local Union 385**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 23, Section 1**, claiming the Company is requiring city drivers to maintain daily hours of service records, which violated the CBA.
- NUPSF-11-68: Local 385 v. UPSF, Ocoee, FL
On behalf of **Teamsters Local Union 385**, Union alleges a violation of **Article 40**. The Company claims that moving of run is not a change of operations.
- NUPSF-11-69: Local 480 v. UPSF, Nashville, TN
On behalf of **Frank Jones**, Union alleges a violation of **Articles 5, 21 and all that apply**, claiming the grievant in this case, as a full-time employee, should be allowed to perform all non-driving work ahead of any part-time employees.