ARTICLE
SECTION
SUBJECT Trainings
Selection
Not Interpretive

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

June 24, 1983

Mr. Richard I. Wevodau
Director, Maintenance Division
American Postal Workers
Union, AFL-CIO
817 - 14th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005-3399

Re: S. Rosenblatt
Phoenix, AZ 85026
H1T-5K-C 11183

Dear Mr. Wevodau:

On June 8, 1983, we met to discuss the above-captioned grievance at the fourth step of our contractual grievance procedure.

The 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 Article 38 of the National Agreement by not selecting the grievant, an ET-9, for training.

It is our position that no national interpretive issue involving the terms and conditions of the National Agreement is fairly presented in this case. Whether or not an employee at a local office should be selected for training not covered by the National Agreement, as in this case, is not a national interpretive question.

Based on a thorough review of the grievance file, and pertinent regulations including ELM 713, I find no justification for disturbing the determinations relative to training needs made by local management officials.

Accordingly, the grievance is denied.

Sincerely,

Margaret H. Oliver

Margaret H. Oliver
Labor Relations Department