



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

ARTICLE	37
SECTION	3A1
SUBJECT	P. Hyers
JOB ESTABLISHED	

October 19, 1982

Mr. Wallace Baldwin, Jr.  
Administrative Vice President  
American Postal Workers Union,  
AFL-CIO  
17 - 14th Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20005

*W. XXVIII  
JL*

Re: APWU Local  
Denver, CO 80216 (BMC)  
H8C-5F-C 14267  
A8W 1544

Dear Mr. Baldwin:

On several occasions, the most recent being October 6, 1982, we met with you to discuss the above-captioned grievance at the fourth step of our contractual grievance procedure.

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

The question in this grievance is whether management violated Articles VII and XIX of the National Agreement by creating two parcel post distributor (machine) SP2-439 positions rather than two distribution clerk KP-12 positions.


The position of the union is that the two positions in question should be posted as KP-12, because they replace two mail handler KP-8 positions.

It is our position that no national interpretive issue involving the terms and conditions of the National Agreement is fairly presented in this case and the following represents the decision of the Postal Service on the particular facts and circumstances involved. There simply are no contractual requirements to create a KP-12 position to replace a KP-8 position. The requirements as to what positions are necessary for the Postal Service to complete its mission is determined by management based upon the local service needs. The file reflects that local management has determined the need to post these two positions as SP2-439 rather than as

It is noted that the November 6, 1980, Step 2 response contains the statement: "Management will survey the PSM-3 and SM-4 sections on both Tour 2 and Tour 3 to determine if additional KP-12's are required."

Accordingly, as we find no violation of the National Agreement, this grievance is denied.

Sincerely,

  
Howard R. Carter  
Labor Relations Department