

INVOICE.
THE M 54 HAS BEEN
REPLACED BY PO-445.
DATED MAY 1984



JUN 7 1982

STATES POSTAL SERVICE
475 L'Enfant Plaza, SW
Washington, DC 20260
June 3, 1982

OFFICE	19
SECTION	
SUBJECT	M-54
ALLIED DUTY	
ZERO-400	

Mr. Wallace Baldwin, Jr.
Administrative Vice President
Clerk Craft
American Postal Workers Union, AFL-CIO
817 - 14th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005

ACC-2855
Re: Local/APWU
Lansing, MI 48924
E8C-4B-C-35886

Dear Mr. Baldwin:

On May 17, 1982, we met to discuss the above-captioned grievance at the fourth step of our contractual grievance procedure as set forth in Article XV, Section 2, of the National Agreement.

The question in this grievance is whether management can assign specific allied duties to ledgeloaders when 12 consoles are in operation. These duties include relief of operators for personal needs and for rotation purposes; and other allied duties of disposing of non-machineable mail, sweeping the Zero and 400 bins, and procuring additional mail for processing.

The matters presented by you as well as the applicable contractual provisions have been reviewed and given careful consideration.

The Union contends that the above-referenced duties are not ledgeloaders' duties and that there is no unproductive time to perform these duties when more than 10 consoles are in operation.

It is the position of the U.S. Postal Service that the above-referenced duties are already a portion of the Distribution Clerk-Machine, MPLSM duties as contained in the Standard Position Description (SP2-633) and described in the MPLSM training and operating manuals (P-24, M-54, M-15). As such these duties may properly be assigned to a qualified ledgeloader, in addition to the primary duty of loading console ledges.

I suggest that because the MPLSM operation is so widely distributed among our facilities, it does not permit the establishment of a single policy that will cover each and every situation in each and every office. Rather, the handling of problems that arise from the assignment of allied duties should be handled on a case-by-case basis after evaluating the fact circumstances involved. For this reason, I believe that this case does not fairly present a National interpretive issue.

Based upon the above considerations and the case file, I have determined that management is properly assigning the cited duties to ledgeloaders. Therefore, this grievance is denied.

Sincerely,



J. Johnson
Labor Relations Department