

U.S. Office of Personnel Management
Office of Merit Systems Oversight and Effectiveness
Classification Appeals and FLSA Programs

Atlanta Oversight Division
75 Spring Street, SW., Suite 1018
Atlanta, GA 30303-3109

Classification Appeal Decision
Under section 5112 of title 5, United States Code

Appellant: [appellant]

Agency classification: Supervisory General Engineer
GS-801-12

Organization: Department of the Navy

OPM decision: Supervisory Civil Engineer
GS-810-12

OPM decision number: C-0810-12-04

Virginia L. Magnuson
Classification Appeals Officer

September 23, 2002
Date

As provided in section 511.612 of title 5, Code of Federal Regulations (CFR), this decision constitutes a certificate that is mandatory and binding on all administrative, certifying, payroll, disbursing, and accounting officials of the government. The agency is responsible for reviewing its classification decisions for identical, similar, or related positions to ensure consistency with this decision. There is no right of further appeal. This decision is subject to discretionary review only under conditions and time limits specified in the *Introduction to the Position Classification Standards*, appendix 4, section G (address provided in appendix 4, section H).

Since this decision changes the title and series of the appealed position, it is to be effective no later than the beginning of the fourth pay period after the date of this decision, as permitted by 5 CFR 511.702. The servicing personnel office must submit a compliance report containing the corrected position description and a Standard Form 50 showing the personnel action taken. The report must be submitted within 30 days from the effective date of the personnel action.

Decision sent to:

[appellant]

[Civilian Liaison Officer]

Mr. Allen Cohen
Office of Civilian Human Resources (OCHR)
Nebraska Avenue Complex
321 Somer Court, NW., Suite 40101
Washington, DC 20393-5451

Mr. Will Maltbie
Director
Office of Civilian Human Resources (OCHR)
Nebraska Avenue Complex
321 Somer Court, NW., Suite 40101
Washington, DC 20393-5451

Introduction

On May 30, 2002, the Atlanta Oversight Division, U.S. Office of Personnel Management (OPM), accepted an appeal for the position of General Engineer, GS-801-12, Public Works Department (PWD), [organization], Department of the Navy, [geographic location]. The appellant requests that his position be reclassified to GS-801-13. We received a complete administrative report from the agency on June 26, 2002. We have accepted and decided this appeal under section 5112 of title 5, United States Code.

Agency management rewrote the appellant's position description in March 2002 and submitted it to the agency's Human Resources Office (HRO) staff with a request for classification as Supervisory General Engineer, GS-801-13. The agency HRO issued a decision sustaining the existing classification in May 2002. The appellant subsequently appealed to OPM.

General issues

In reaching our classification decision, we have carefully reviewed all information furnished by the appellant, his supervisor and his agency, including his official position description.

Position information

The appellant is assigned to position number [#]. Both the appellant and the supervisor certified the accuracy of the position description.

For approximately 70 percent of his time the appellant performs nonsupervisory facility planning, design engineering and studies related to new construction projects and special projects to repair or renovate existing structures at [organization]. He develops requirements and plans and participates in meetings with involved project personnel to assure adherence to design requirements and schedules. He provides technical review of design calculations, analyses, drawings, specifications, and cost estimates to ensure compliance with project objectives and standards. The remaining 30 percent of his time is devoted to the direction, review and evaluation of the engineering functions carried out by the PWD shops and divisions. He is also responsible for handling all administrative matters (e.g., organization, work flow, civilian personnel actions, office services, reports) for the PWD. The PWD has primary responsibility for the planning and design work related to new and special construction projects at [organization]. The organization is also responsible for the maintenance, operation and repair of all the [organization] infrastructure including buildings, utility plants and distribution systems, water and wastewater systems, and paved surfaces. The [organization], including remote sites at [geographic locations], consists of 100 facilities valued at \$100,000,000 with a population of 5,250 active duty, reserve component and civilian personnel.

The appellant's work requires general knowledge of the physical sciences and the theory of structures. It requires consideration of the nature of soils and/or earth formations used as foundations, construction materials, and familiarity with related engineering disciplines to make sound judgments and to identify problems in proposed construction projects.

The appellant reports to the Public Works Officer, a military civil engineer who provides administrative direction in terms of broadly defined missions or functions. He is independently responsible for planning, designing and carrying out programs, projects, studies and other work assignments. The results of his work are considered technically authoritative and are usually accepted without significant modification. If the work is reviewed, the review concerns such matters as fulfillment of program objectives, effect of advice and influence on the overall program. The appellant is expected to advise his supervisor, or his military deputy in his absence, of issues and matters that warrant the attention or require approval of the installation commander.

Series, title and standard determination

The agency placed the appellant's position in the General Engineering Series, GS-801, and titled it as Supervisory General Engineer. The appellant does not contest the agency's title or series determination for his position. We disagree.

The GS-801 series includes all classes of positions which advise on, administer, supervise, or perform research or other professional and scientific work of a special or miscellaneous character not specifically classifiable in any other engineering series, but which involve the application of a knowledge of such engineering fundamentals as the strengths and strain analysis of engineering materials and structures, the physical and chemical characteristics of engineering materials such as limits, maximum unit stresses, coefficients of expansions, workability, engineering methods of construction, processing, etc.; or positions involving professional work in several branches of engineering.

The appellant's work requires familiarity with the general principles of other engineering disciplines. It does not, however, require the level or degree of knowledge required for classification to the GS-801 series. Positions classified in the GS-801 series typically perform journey level work in three or more engineering disciplines.

The Civil Engineering Series, GS-810, includes professional positions in the field of civil engineering, typically requiring application of general knowledge of the physical sciences and mathematics underlying engineering, and specialized knowledge of the mechanics of solids, particularly of soils, hydraulics, theory of structure, strength of materials, engineering geology, and surveying. Positions in this series have responsibility for management, supervision, or performance of planning, designing, constructing, and/or maintaining structures and facilities that provide shelter, support, transportation systems and control of natural resources; investigating, measuring, surveying and mapping of the earth's physical features, and phenomena; and research and development activities.

Civil engineers involved in planning and design functions require familiarity with electrical, mechanical, utility and structural requirements for projects, as well as related disciplines, e.g., environmental, safety, geology, and architectural. Civil engineers also have responsibility for any or all phases of facilities engineering such as initiation of technical and economic feasibility studies, development of presentations for work proposals and budget approval, planning and design, and construction and maintenance.

The appellant's primary work is similar to the work performed by civil engineers. His facilities engineering activities require application of a professional knowledge of physical science, theory of structures, soil, etc., similar to the general and specialized knowledge utilized by civil engineers. Since the work and knowledge requirements are specifically covered by the GS-810 series and do not require performance of work in several branches of engineering, the position is excluded from the General Engineering Series, GS-801.

The position is properly placed in the Civil Engineering Series, GS-810. It also meets the requirements for coverage by the General Schedule Supervisory Guide (GSSG). In accordance with the titling practices outlined in the GS-810 series and the GSSG, the position is titled Supervisory Civil Engineer.

Grade determination

The grade level criteria in the GS-810 standard are used to evaluate the appellant's engineering program responsibilities. The GSSG is used to evaluate the appellant's supervisory responsibilities.

Evaluation using the GS-810 standard

The GS-810 standard is divided into four parts. Part I covers grading criteria for entry-level professional engineering positions at grades GS-5 and GS-7 and is not applicable to this position. Part II covers civil engineering planning and design functions; Part III covers construction; and Part IV covers facilities engineering management. The appellant's work involves some aspects of both planning and design functions and construction. However, we find that Part IV is best suited for classifying the appellant's engineering duties and responsibilities. Positions covered by Part IV may have responsibilities pertaining to any or all phases of the engineering of facilities, such as initiation of technical and feasibility studies, development and presentation of proposals for work and budget approval, planning and design, construction, and maintenance.

Facilities engineering management falls into three broad groups found often in separate organizational settings: *Guidance*, *Development*, and *Coordination*. Facilities engineering programs are in agencies with three general types of engineering responsibility defined in the standard as *Construction agency*, *Control agency* and *Sponsor agency*. We find that the appellant performs various degrees of guidance, development, and coordination tasks for a construction agency at the operating level of the agency (the lowest level responsible for carrying out a full range of facilities engineering activities in a locality or area).

Grade levels under Part IV are defined principally in terms of the scope and complexity of facilities for which the position has engineering management responsibility, the range of facilities engineering activities managed, and the level of responsibility assigned. The grade-level definitions include a description of the grade in relation to these elements and examples of assignments that characterize that level.

At GS-11, facilities engineering management assignments typically concern facilities in one locale or installation. While facilities are varied in type and purpose, there exist ample precedents for their planning, design and construction. The engineer at the GS-11 level performs work such as (1) development of programs and coordination of project accomplishment with respect to maintenance, repair and minor construction for an installation or activity that has facilities to carry out a variety of operations, or that has facilities used by a number of different kinds of activities or organizations; or (2) program development covering proposed construction of a variety of new facilities for an installation or activity similar to (1) above. The engineer usually performs such assignments under the supervision of a higher-grade engineer who administers the entire facilities engineering program for the managing activity. The facilities engineering management functions are performed under comprehensive standards and guidelines issued by a higher organizational echelon. There is relatively limited contact with the public because of the limited facilities program.

While the appellant's assignment concerns facilities at one activity and its two remote sites, the difficulty of the assignment, contacts and level of supervision exceed the GS-11 level. The appellant is responsible for coordinating the data collection, planning and design phases of major military construction projects and special projects for facility repair/renovation. Comprehensive standards and guidelines are not directly applicable and must be extended in developing solutions to problems. Private sector firms generally undertake all major and special construction projects at the installation. The appellant develops requirements and plans. He prepares documents used to solicit bids on projects and is responsible for the overall technical review of information from firms submitting bids to ensure adherence to design requirements and schedules and compliance with project objectives and standards. The appellant has personal contacts with Federal personnel at various organizational levels as well as personnel from private architect-engineer firms. He works with considerable freedom from technical guidance, and his recommendations for actions in normal engineering practice are considered authoritative.

At GS-12, the engineer is fully responsible for development or coordination functions relating to facilities of substantial complexity and variety, possibly in a number of locations, or under the control of a number of different activity managers. At an agency or intermediate level of organization, the GS-12 engineer in facilities engineering management usually serves as an assistant to a higher grade engineer, with responsibility for a portion of the facilities program assigned to that engineer. In such assistant assignments, the facilities for which the GS-12 engineer is responsible exceed in complexity and variety those typical of the full responsibility assignments previously described at the GS-12 level. The GS-12 engineer at the operating level of a construction agency coordinates construction activities for a few large projects (such as for a multiple purpose dam, power plant, reservoir, and associated relocation and construction of utilities and community facilities) or for an extensive group of smaller projects (such as levees, channel improvements, bank stabilization, flood control reservoirs, and floodways). The GS-12 engineer must apply experienced professional judgment in dealing frequently with specialized facility requirements. This often requires that the engineer searches out and develops new or greatly modified methods and approaches to accomplish the facility engineering management function. The engineer works with considerable freedom from technical guidance, and recommendations for action in matters of normal engineering practice are considered authoritative. The engineer is expected to obtain supervisory guidance or clearance on actions

that may be of a controversial nature, or that represent a new approach or course for the organization.

The GS-12 level is met. Similar to this level, the appellant is responsible for the coordination of activities related to the planning and design of major new and special construction projects. He is also responsible for coordinating activities related to the maintenance, repair and renovation of existing and new real property facilities, and compliance with environmental regulations and other applicable laws and regulations (building codes, requirements, etc.) for [organization]. The installation's facilities include 100 buildings and other assets containing 600,000 square feet of floor space covering 200 acres. They are valued in excess of \$106,000,000 and encompass specialized and unique requirements. The PWD has an annual budget of \$4,000,000, a military new construction budget averaging \$4,000,000 and a special project program of approximately \$2,000,000. Facilities range in age from 1955 to new construction in progress and are of various types of construction (e.g., steel, masonry, concrete block, wood frame).

The appellant develops requirements and plans; reviews architectural and engineering statements of work and project time schedules; and provides technical review of design calculations, analyses, drawings, specifications, and cost estimates to ensure compliance with project objectives and standards. Comparable to the GS-12 level, he develops alternatives to economic analyses to determine the feasibility of renovating existing assets versus new construction. Solutions to problems often require substantial modification of, or compromise with, standard guides, precedents, methods, and techniques. The appellant maintains contacts with installation personnel, officials and managers, private architectural and engineering firms, members of the installation construction board and professional personnel at the agency's headquarters, the staff of the Naval Facility Engineering Southern Division, and other Department of Defense agencies.

The appellant independently carries out work responsibilities based on broadly defined missions or functions received from the Public Works Officer and within established program guidelines and requirements. Review of his work, if any, is in terms of fulfillment of program objectives, effectiveness of advice, and influence on the overall program. While the appellant's supervisor is a military engineer, the supervisor, as well as his deputy, have broader responsibilities and are not normally involved in the technical aspects of the appellant's assignment.

At the GS-13 level, the engineer has full responsibility for development and/or coordination over a broad range of facilities engineering activities, covering a variety of complex facilities in a sizeable geographic area. Often, the facilities are under the control of a number of separate organizations. Because of the geographic dispersal of the facilities and the number of controlling organizations, the engineer must be conversant with and apply a variety of statutory, regulatory, funding, and procedural controls in facilities engineering management. The GS-13 engineer receives assignments on the basis of recognized competence, demonstrated through considerable experience related to the area of assignment. The engineer is subject to very general supervision. Work is judged mainly for achievement of productive results.

The GS-13 level is not met. The appellant does not oversee the broad range of facilities engineering activities covering a variety of complex facilities in a sizeable geographic area, found at the GS-13 grade level. He also does not have responsibility for major projects or

facilities that are under the control of a number of separate organizations or contend with the variety of statutory, regulatory, funding, and procedural controls typical of the GS-13 level.

The appellant's engineering program functions are properly evaluated at the GS-12 level under Part IV of the GS-810 Civil Engineering Series standard.

Evaluation using the GSSG

The GSSG uses a point-factor approach with six evaluation factors designed specifically for supervisory positions. Under each factor there are several factor level definitions which are assigned specific point values. The appellant contests the agency's assessment of factors 3, 4A and 5. We agree with the agency's assessment of factors 1, 2, and 4B. We also agree that three of the special situations covered under factor 6 are present in the appellant's assignment and allow credit of Level 6-4, rather than Level 6-3, for the factor. We will only address the factors contested by the appellant.

Factor 3 – Supervisory and managerial authority exercised

This factor covers the delegated supervisory and managerial authorities that are exercised on a recurring basis. To be credited with a level under this factor, a position must carry out the authorities and responsibilities to the extent described for the specific level. Levels under this factor apply equally to the direction of specialized program management organizations, line functions, staff functions, and operating and support activities. The agency credited Level 3-3b. The appellant believes that Level 3-4 should be credited.

Level 3-3 describes two situations, either of which meets the level. In the first situation, Level 3-3a, the position exercises delegated managerial authority to set a series of annual, multilevel, or similar long-range work plans and schedules for in-service or contracted work; assures implementation by subordinate organizational units of program goals and objectives; determines which goals and objectives need additional emphasis; determines the best solution to budget shortages; and plans for long-range staffing needs. Positions in this situation are closely involved with high-level program officials or comparable agency staff personnel in developing overall goals and objectives for assigned functions or programs. The second situation covers second-level supervisory positions that perform the full range of supervisory functions described at Level 3-2, and at least eight of the conditions described at Level 3-3b, including such matters as using subordinates to direct or lead work, exercising significant advisory or coordinating responsibilities, assuring equity of performance standards and ratings among subordinate units, directing a program segment with significant resources, making decisions on matters elevated by subordinate supervisors, exercising personnel authority over subordinate supervisors and employees, approving serious disciplinary actions, making routine decisions, and approving the expenditure of funds.

Level 3-3a is not met. The appellant has a key role in the development of the [organization] long-range plan, but this activity is primarily focused on making recommendations, rather than managerial decisions, affecting the workload and budget for assigned projects. The statement of work for the appellant's supervisor indicates that the emphasis in that position is on long-range

development plans. Planning at the installation is driven by requirements established at and passed down from higher levels that control programs, money, projects, etc. The appellant's position does not have the managerial authority intended at this level.

Level 3-3b is met. The appellant directly or indirectly supervises 32 General Schedule (GS) and Federal Wage System (WS, WG and WD) employees. In doing so he performs the full range of duties identified at Level 3-2. The agency credited this level and the appellant does not contest it. The appellant plans work to be accomplished by subordinates and sets and adjusts short-term priorities. He assigns work to subordinates based on priorities, selective consideration of difficulty and requirements of assignments, and the capabilities of employees. He provides advice, counsel, or instruction to employees on both work and administrative matters. The appellant interviews candidates for positions in his unit and recommends appointment, promotion or reassignment to such positions. He hears and resolves complaints from employees, referring group grievances and more serious unresolved complaints to a higher level supervisor or manager. He also identifies developmental and training needs of employees and provides or arranging for needed development and training, and finds ways to improve production or increase the quality of the work directed.

The appellant also performs more than 8 of the duties identified at Level 3-3b. He:

Uses supervisors to direct, coordinate, or oversee work;

Exercises significant responsibilities in dealing with officials of other units or organizations, or in advising management officials of higher rank;

Assures reasonable equity (among units, groups, teams, projects, etc.) of performance standards and rating techniques developed by subordinates;

Makes decisions on work problems presented by subordinate supervisors or similar personnel, or by contractors;

Evaluates subordinate supervisors and serves as the reviewing official on evaluations of nonsupervisory employees rated by subordinate supervisors;

Approves selections for subordinate nonsupervisory positions;

Recommends selections for subordinate supervisory positions and for positions responsible for coordinating the work of others;

Hears and resolves group grievances or serious employee complaints;

Makes decisions on non-routine, costly, or controversial training needs and training requests related to employees of the unit;

Approves within-grade increases;

Recommends awards or bonuses for supervisory and nonsupervisory personnel; and

Finds and implements ways to eliminate or reduce significant bottlenecks and barriers to production, promote team building, or improve business practices.

Level 3-4 is not met. This level describes two situations, either of which meets the level. In the first situation, the position being evaluated exercises delegated authority to oversee the overall planning, direction, and timely execution of a program, several program segments managed through separate organizational units, or comparable staff functions. Such positions include responsibility for development, assignment, and higher level clearance of goals and objectives for subordinate organizations; approving multiyear and long-range work plans developed by subordinate supervisors; overseeing the revision of long-range plans, goals and objectives; managing the development of policy changes; managing organizational change; and exercising discretionary authority to distribute funds in the organization's budget. In the second situation, the supervisor exercises final authority for the full range of personnel actions and organizational design proposals.

Level 3-4a is not met. Both paragraphs a and b of Level 3-3 must be met before Level 3-4 can be met. Since the appellant's position does not meet Level 3-3a, Level 3-4 cannot be considered.

Level 3-3b is credited for 775 points.

Factor 4 – Personal contacts

This is a two-part factor which assesses the nature and the purpose of personal contacts related to supervisory and managerial responsibilities. The nature of the contacts, credited under Subfactor 4A, and the purpose of those contacts, credited under Subfactor 4B, must be based on the same contacts.

The agency credited Level 3 for Subfactor 4B. The appellant did not contest this subfactor determination. We concur with the Level 4B-3 determination and will only discuss Subfactor 4A here.

Subfactor 4A – Nature of Contacts

To be credited under this subfactor, the level of contacts must contribute to the successful performance of the work, be a recurring requirement, have a demonstrable impact on the difficulty and responsibility of the position, and require direct contact. The agency credited Level 4A-2. The appellant believes that Level 4A-3 should be credited for this subfactor.

At Level 4A-2, frequent contacts are with members of the business community or the general public; higher ranking managers, supervisors, and staff of other units throughout the activity or at levels below bureau or major military command level; representatives of local public interest groups; case workers in Congressional district offices; technical or operating personnel in State and local governments; reporters for local or other limited media outlets; or comparable contacts. These contacts may be informal, occur in conferences and meetings, or take place through

telephone, televised, radio or similar contact. They sometimes require non-routine or special preparation.

At Level 4A-3, recurring contacts are with high-ranking military or civilian managers at bureau and major organizational levels within the agency, with agency headquarters administrative personnel, or with comparable personnel in other agencies. They are also with key staff of public interest groups having significant political influence or media coverage or with journalists representing influential city or county news media. Contacts also include Congressional committee and subcommittee staff assistants; contracting officials and high level technical staff of large industrial firms; or local officers of regional or national trade associations, public action groups or professional organizations, or with State and local governments' managers. These contacts take place in meetings and conferences and often require extensive preparation.

Level 4A-2 is met. The appellant's regular and recurring contacts are with personnel, officials and managers at various levels at NAS Atlanta; headquarters personnel at Commander Naval Reserve Forces (planners, engineers, program funding personnel, etc.); professional personnel from other Navy and Department of Defense organizations; and officials and personnel from private sector architectural and engineering organizations.

Level 4A-3 is not met. The appellant does not have frequent contacts with high-ranking military or civilian managers, supervisors, and technical staff at bureau and major organization levels of the agency or with the other levels of personnel described at Level 4A-3. His contacts do not have the political influence or attract the level of national interest intended at Level 4A-3.

Level 4A-2 is credited for 50 points.

Factor 5 – Difficulty of Typical Work Directed

This factor measures the difficulty and complexity of the basic work most typical of the organization(s) directed, as well as other line, staff, or contracted work for which the supervisor has technical or oversight responsibility, either directly or through subordinate supervisors, team leaders, or others. The agency determined that the highest level of work supervised by the appellant for the purpose of this factor is GS-7. The appellant believes that he should have higher level credit based on the supervision of engineering work.

Based on our findings, the highest grade which best characterizes the nature of the basic (mission-oriented) nonsupervisory work performed or overseen by the organization directed and which constitutes 25 percent or more of the workload (not positions or employees of the organization) is GS-9. A workload analysis follows.

Workload Analysis

The PWD organizational chart shows that the appellant supervises a total of 32 full-time positions with 24 presently classified as wage grade jobs.

The GSSG allows two methods for determining the highest level of work for a second level supervisor. The first involves determining the highest grade of nonsupervisory work which constitutes 25 percent or more of the workload. However, excluded from consideration in the basic work most typical of the organization is the work of lower level positions that primarily support or facilitate the basic work of the unit and any subordinate work that is graded based on criteria in this guide (i.e., supervisory duties). Also excluded is work that is based on an extraordinary degree of independence from supervision (or adjust the grade for purposes of applying the guide to that appropriate for performance under normal supervision); personal research accomplishments; and work for which the supervisor or a subordinate does not have the responsibilities defined under Factor 3. FWS, military, contractor or volunteer work that is similar to that described should also be credited, adjusted or excluded from consideration.

Based on the evaluation criteria, the supervisory work performed by subordinate GS and WS positions such as the Maintenance Foreman and Utilities Foreman positions and the work of all lower level positions that primarily support or facilitate the basic work of the unit are excluded from base level consideration. The two subordinate GS-12 engineer positions in the organization perform supervisory work for approximately 15 percent of their time. A third position, the Transportation/Mobile Equipment Maintenance Supervisor, is incorrectly graded as a supervisor since it now supervises only two positions. For purposes of this analysis, we estimate that it, like the GS-12 engineer positions, performs supervisory work for 15 percent of the time. All the nonsupervisory work performed by these three positions is considered in the workload count.

We eliminated the following positions from base level consideration: Budget Technician, GS-561-7; Procurement Technician, GS-1106-5; two Laborer (Motor Vehicle Operator), WG-3502-05; Maintenance Foreman, WS-4701-9; and Utility Foreman, WS-4701-10.

The highest level of nonsupervisory WG work is carried out by the Pest Controller, WG-5026-10, Electricians, WG-2805-10, Air Conditioning Equipment Mechanics, WG-5306-10, Utility Systems Repairer-Operators, WG-4742-10, and the Heavy Mobile Equipment Mechanic, WG-5803-10. While there is no direct correlation between GS and FWS grades, the level of work performed by the WG-10 positions does not exceed the level of work performed at the GS-7 grade level. For example, the complexity of work assignments, and the skills and knowledge of Electricians, WG-2805-10, do not exceed the level of complexity of Engineering Technician, GS-802-7 positions. This takes into consideration that journey level electricians install, modify, repair, maintain, troubleshoot, test and load a variety of complete electrical systems and equipment. They are skilled in planning, layout, positioning of complete systems and portions of systems in industrial complexes and buildings or structures of similar complexity. They have the ability to interpret and apply the National Electrical Code, local codes, blueprints, wiring diagrams, and engineering drawings and to use trade formulas to calculate common properties. The electricians know the characteristics of and use the full range of electrical materials, equipment and components. They are skilled in the use of various electrical tools and test equipment. The electricians' work assignments frequently require familiarity with electronics to the extent of troubleshooting electrical circuits containing electronic components. Electricians also are responsible for planning and laying out the routing, placement, and arrangement of industrial or similar complex systems, circuits, controls, and equipment.

At the GS-7 level, Engineering Technicians perform work which involves planning non-routine assignments of substantial variety and complexity; selecting guidelines to resolve operational problems not fully covered by precedents; developing revisions to standard work methods; modifying parts, instruments, and equipment; and taking actions to or making recommendations based on preliminary interpretation of data or results of analysis. For example, some Engineering Technicians, GS-802-7, review designated portions of plans submitted by contractors for interior electrical wiring of residential or office buildings for light and power; check the accuracy of calculations of loads, illuminations, conductor size, etc., and the adequacy of switches, controls, and other equipment selected by the contractor. They base their review on a practical knowledge of methods and techniques of electrical engineering design. They review drawings, the basis for design, and design analysis for conformance with established engineering standards and criteria set forth in manuals, codes, and other guides, and the specific project requirements.

At the WG-10 level, Electricians work within the bounds of available guides and trade techniques. They are responsible for assuring the selection and application of the appropriate electrical practices and techniques based on code and project requirements. They plan and lay out the routings, placement, and arrangement of systems, circuits, controls and equipment of WG-10 complexity. At this level, electricians complete installations, modifications, and repairs, and load and test systems, circuits, equipment, and controls with little or no check during the progress or upon completion of work. The supervisor checks overall work to see that it meets accepted trade practices and is completed timely. Recurring work assignments performed by Engineering Technicians, GS-802-7, are occasionally observed and are subject to only occasional spot checks for technical adequacy.

While the Electrician, WG-2805-10, and Engineering Technician, GS-802-7, carry out their assignments within comparable degrees of established procedures, the overriding consideration is the level of complexity of the work performed. The comparison of the kind of assignments performed in the two occupations demonstrates the WG-10 electrical work is not inherently more complex than GS-7 Engineering Technician work. Applying the same rationale to the other FWS positions, except the Planner and Estimator (General), WD-4701-8, position, and without attempting to equate FWS and GS grades, we conclude that the representative FWS work performed within the Public Works Department does not provide a basis for crediting a higher level than GS-7.

The agency determined that the level of work performed by the Planner and Estimator (General), WD-4701-8, position is comparable to the GS-9 level when compared to the Engineering Technician Series, GS-802. We concur.

The positions performing nonsupervisory work representing the substantial mission-oriented work for base level consideration are:

1 Environmental Engineer, GS-819-12 (85% of time)

1 General Engineer, GS-801-12 (85% of time)

1 General Engineer, GS-801-11

1 Mechanical Engineer, GS-830-11
 2 Environmental Specialists, GS-028-9
 1 Transportation/Mobile Equipment Maintenance Supervisor, WS-5801-9 (85% of time)
 1 Pest Controller, WG-5026-10
 2 Electricians, WG-2805-10
 2 Air Conditioning Equipment Mechanics, WG-5306-10
 3 Utility Systems Repairer-Operators, WG-4742-10
 1 Heavy Equipment Mechanic, WG-5803-10
 2 Carpenters, WG-4607-9
 2 Maintenance Mechanics, 4749-9
 1 Electrical Worker, WG-2805-8
 1 Planner Estimator (General), WD-4701-8
 1 Maintenance Worker, WG-4749-7
 1 Materials Expediter, WG-6910-7
 1 Materials Handler, WG-6907-6
 1 Motor Vehicle Operator (Dispatcher), WG-5703-6

The substantive work is performed by 25.5 positions in the organization (This includes the nonsupervisory work of the supervisors as noted above).

The GS-12 workload is performed by 1.7 positions and represents 6.6 percent of the nonsupervisory substantive work of the organization.

The GS-11 workload is performed by 2 positions and represents 7.8 percent of the work.

The GS-9 workload is performed by 3 positions and represents 11.7 percent of the work.

The GS-7 and lower workload is performed by 18.8 positions and represents 73.7 percent of the work.

The highest grade level that best characterizes the nature of the basic nonsupervisory work performed and which constitutes 25 percent or more of the nonsupervisory duty hours expended on work at or above the base level credited is GS-9. The GS-9 and above equivalent positions represent 26 percent of the total nonsupervisory, mission-oriented workload of the organization. GS-9 is the highest grade level that best characterizes the nature of the basic nonsupervisory work performed.

A second method is used to determine the base level of work when a heavy supervisory or managerial workload related to work above that base level may be present. For these positions, the guide specifies determination of the highest grade of nonsupervisory work directed which requires at least 50 percent of the duty time of the supervisory position under evaluation. The resulting grade may be used as the base level for second (and higher) level supervisors over large workloads - if sound alignment with other supervisory positions in the organization and agency results. This method does not apply to the appellant's position because he spends at least 70

percent of his time performing other duties as described in his position description. Therefore, the GS-9 grade is assigned for base level purposes.

Using the chart on page 24 of the GSSG, GS-9 converts to Level 5-5. Level 5-5 is credited for 650 points.

Summary applying the GSSG

<i>Factor</i>	<i>Level</i>	<i>Points</i>
Program Scope and Effect	1-2	350
Organizational Setting	2-1	100
Supervisory and Managerial Authority Exercised	3-3b	775
Personal Contacts		
Nature of Contacts-	4-A2	50
Purpose of Contacts	4-B3	100
Difficulty of Work Directed	5-5	650
Other Conditions	6-4	1120
<i>Total</i>		3145

A total of 3145 points is in the 2755 to 3150 point range and converts to GS-12 according to the point-to-grade conversion chart in the GSSG.

Engineering program responsibilities equate to GS-12 and supervisory responsibilities equate to GS-12. Therefore, the appropriate grade for the appellant's position is GS-12.

Decision

The position is properly classified as Supervisory Civil Engineer, GS-810-12.