



REV

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

November 3, 1982

not as

DATE	25
SECTION	
SUBJECT	
CFS	
COMPUTER INPUT	

Mr. Gerald Anderson
Assistant Director
Clerk Division
American Postal Workers Union, AFL-CIO
817 - 14th Street, NW
Washington, DC 20005

Re: APWU - Local
Colorado Springs, CO 80901
H1C-5F-C-3749

Dear Mr. Anderson:

On September 29, 1982, we met to discuss the above-captioned grievance at the fourth step of our contractual grievance procedure.

The issue in this case is whether management properly compensated a Mark-Up Clerk - Automated (PS-4) for work performed inputting H-601 Window Survey information into a computer terminal.

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

Our respective case files indicate that a CFS Clerk (LV-4) was used to input data concerning the H-601 Window Survey into a computer terminal. Occasionally in the local office, management has assigned this duty to other clerks, both level 5 and level 6 clerks have been used.

The Union contends that the CFS clerk is entitled to level 6 pay for the time spent performing these duties.

It is our position that the disputed work performed by the CFS clerk was similar to work performed by CFS clerks on a regular basis. In addition, the disputed duties performed by the CFS clerk are quite similar to those duties performed by a Level 4 Data Conversion Operator (Standard Position 2-626). When management has utilized clerks at a higher level than PS-4 to perform these duties, they have been compensated at the higher level not because of the work performed but because they are normally a higher level.

It is also our position that no National interpretive issue involving the terms and conditions of the National Agreement is fairly presented in this case. The above represents the position of the Postal Service on the particular fact circumstances involved.

Based upon the foregoing considerations, we have determined that there is no violation of the National Agreement in this case. Therefore, this grievance is denied.

Sincerely,



A. J. Connon
Labor Relations Department