



NEW YORK POST

Targets Transit Workers

AGAIN!

Our contract does not expire until Jan. 15, 2012. And negotiations with the MTA won't begin for several months. But the *New York Post* is already attacking Local 100. It started on July 13, with an op ed piece by transit worker nemesis Nicole Gelinas (photo



inset) of the right-wing Manhattan Institute, a regular contributor to the Post.

Gelinas demanded in her piece on July 13 that: "Gov. Cuomo should insist that when their

contract is up this winter, workers at the MTA's biggest union, the TWU, take the same three-year wage freeze that other state workers are taking. Moreover, the governor and lawmakers should make sure that the MTA doesn't hide behind secrecy in negotiating with its unions."

TWU fired back with a
LETTER TO THE EDITOR
(upper right) from Local
100 President John
Samuels, printed in the
July 19, 2011 edition.

The Post returned fire in
the same edition with the
editorial at the right.

Keep *Posted*. It's only
going to get worse.



letters@nypost.com

Heroes, Not Zeroes

•Note to Nicole Gelinas and The Post for publishing her article, "MTA's Too-Nice Pay" (PostOpinion, July 13).

When the MTA lays off transit workers, there isn't less work — just fewer workers doing more to keep the system going.

That means more overtime, not less. More overtime means more wages paid out by the MTA.

The increase in wages paid out in 2010 stems from a faulty management decision, not from the workers who keep

the system running everyday.

As for Gelinas' call for a three-year wage freeze for transit workers in our next contract: Local 100 is not agreeing to zeroes — particularly when the tax on New York's wealthiest people was eliminated.

Our members are not overpaid and won't be scapegoats for right-wing assaults on the public sector.

John Samuels
President
TWU Local 100
Manhattan

Don't Go Wobbly, Mike

Gov. Cuomo reached a tentative deal over the weekend that will save the state billions while averting 1,000 public-sector layoffs. Neat trick.

The agreement with the 54,000-member Public Employees Federation calls for a three-year wage freeze, higher employee health-care contributions and a retirement age raised to 65.

In theory, the last of those provisions alone could save \$90 billion over the next 30 years.

The deal is similar to one struck with the 66,000-member Civil Service Employees Association some weeks back. (Both must still be ratified by members.)

The key question: Is Mayor Bloomberg taking note?

Better hope so.

When it comes to labor negotiations, precedent counts.

Bloomberg's folks are in the midst of hammering out new contracts with the city's unions — and whatever deal the mayor signs off on will not only affect city finances but also influence talks on a transit-worker contract.

So the stakes are high.

Now, the mayor's office says it will push for city contracts that mirror the deals made by the state.

But City Hall's "pushes" have fallen flat

lately: Despite the mayor's warnings of looming teacher layoffs, for example, his team failed to wrest any major givebacks from their union.

Meanwhile, Bloomberg can't afford to be weak: Not only are the city's finances already grim, but thanks to "pattern bargaining," any union deal he reaches will set the tone for the MTA's talks with the Transit Workers Union.

If the mayor caves, the TWU can point to the city deal while pushing for unaffordable pay hikes.

And the radical TWU (which called a strike during Christmas week in '05) is already digging in — demanding a cost-of-living increase, if not more.

As the head of the union's city shop threatens in a letter on this page today, "Local 100 is not agreeing to zeros."

In sharp contrast to the deals Cuomo struck.

Never mind the nearly 12 percent bump over three years that TWU got last time around. Or that average pay at the MTA is more than \$70,000.

New Yorkers should remember well: If the TWU gets hikes, straphangers will suffer — via higher fares or service cuts.

For the sake of riders — and city residents — Bloomberg can't afford to veer from the Cuomo-deal pattern.