

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



Philadelphia Oversight Division
600 Arch Street, Room 3400
Philadelphia, PA 19106-1596

Classification Appeal Decision
Under Section 5112 of Title 5, United States Code

Appellant: [appellant's name]

Agency classification: Detective
GS-083-8

Organization: Investigative Branch
Law Enforcement Division
Physical Security/Public Safety Department
Shore Management Group
Naval Air Station
U.S. Department of the Navy
[location]

OPM decision: Detective
GS-083-8

OPM decision number: C-0083-08-01

Robert D. Hendler
Classification Appeals Officer

/s/ 3/17/98

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).

Decision sent to:

[appellant's name]
[appellant's address]

Director
Human Resources Office
Naval Air [activity name]
U.S. Department of the Navy
[address]
[location]

Director, Plans, Programs, and Diversity
Office of the Deputy Assistant Secretary
of Navy, Civilian Personnel (CP/EEO)
U.S. Department of the Navy
800 North Quincy Street
Arlington, VA 22203-1998

Chief, Classification Branch
Field Advisory Services Division
Defense Civilian Personnel
Management Service
1400 Key Boulevard, Suite B-200
Arlington, VA 22209-5144

Introduction

On October 6, 1998, the Philadelphia Oversight Division of the U.S. Office of Personnel Management (OPM) accepted a classification appeal from [appellant's name]. His position is classified currently as Detective, GS-083-8, Position Description (PD) #K784AA890. The appellant, however, believes the classification should be Criminal Investigator, GS-1811-11. The position is in the Investigative Branch, Law Enforcement Division, Physical Security/Public Safety Department, Shore Management Group, Naval Air Station, U.S. Department of the Navy, [location]. We have accepted and decided his appeal under section 5112 of title 5, United States Code (U.S.C.).

General issues

The appellant stated that his PD is accurate, but is not classified correctly by series and grade. Acknowledging that his organization is not a component of the Naval Criminal Investigative Service (NCIS), the appellant states that his work involves planning and conducting investigations relating to alleged or suspected violations of criminal law covered by the Criminal Investigating Series, GS-1811. He took issue with the methodology used by his servicing human resources office in evaluating his position, and provided copies of Criminal Investigator, GS-1811 positions at other Navy activities in support of his appeal.

These submissions have raised procedural issues warranting clarification. The classification appeal process is a de novo review that includes a determination as to the duties and responsibilities assigned to the appellant's position and performed by the appellant, and constitutes the proper application of position classification standards (PCS's) to those duties and responsibilities. All positions subject to the Classification Law contained in 5 U.S.C. must be classified in conformance with published PCS's of OPM or, if there are no directly applicable PCS's, consistently with PCS's for related kinds of work. Therefore, other methods or factors of evaluation, such as comparison to other positions that may or may not be classified correctly, e.g., the positions cited by the appellant, are not authorized for use in determining the classification of a position.

Like OPM, the appellant's agency must classify positions based on comparison to OPM standards and guidelines. Section 511.612 of 5 CFR, requires that agencies review their own classification decisions for identical, similar, or related positions to insure consistency with OPM certificates. Thus, the agency has the primary responsibility for ensuring that its positions are classified consistently with OPM appeal decisions.

The PD's provided by the appellant include functions materially different from those assigned to his position. One functions in a program management capacity. The other is assigned to an Inspector General staff with a mission and functions substantially different from those assigned to the air station Physical Security/Public Safety Department. If the appellant considers his position so similar to others that they warrant the same classification, he may pursue this matter by writing to his agency's personnel headquarters. In so doing, he should specify the precise organizational location, classification, duties, and responsibilities of the positions in question. If the positions are basically the same as his, or warrant similar application of the controlling PCS's, the agency must correct their

classification to be consistent with this appeal decision. Otherwise, the agency should explain to him the differences between his position and the others.

We have evaluated the work assigned by management and performed by the appellant according to these position classification requirements. In reaching our decision, we carefully reviewed the information provided by both the appellant and his agency, including the appellant's PD of record, that he and his supervisor agree is accurate. In addition, we conducted a telephone audit with the appellant on January 7, 1999; a telephone interview with his immediate supervisor, [name], on January 14, 1999, and a telephone interview with [name], head of the NCIS Patuxent River office, on January 26, 1999. Our audit with the appellant focused on reviewing a representative sample of what he considered the most complex and difficult cases he had worked on the previous 12 to 18 months. We found the PD contains the major duties and responsibilities assigned by management and performed by the appellant and is hereby incorporated by reference into this decision.

Position information

The PD of record states that the appellant works in the Investigative Branch that is responsible for "conducting criminal investigations that involve violations or offenses against the federal Government and/or persons employed by the Federal Government and tenant Commands." The appellant conducts the "more complex criminal investigations involving possible violations of Federal and State Criminal Laws, Uniform Code of Military Justice, and Administrative Regulations." The appellant stated that the Branch and NCIS frequently conducted joint investigations. The appellant stated that he conducts long term complex investigations that include surveillance and undercover work that can be:

of heinous crime such as spousal abuse resulting in major injuries, thefts that involve large sums of monies, crimes exceeding local authority, murder, etc., which require lengthy in-depth investigations. These investigations have extended into other areas outside the local jurisdiction and across state lines.

In his letter of November 10, 1998, commenting on the activity's appeal administrative report, the appellant stressed his assigned major duties include conducting more complex criminal investigations involving possible violations of Federal and State criminal law. He recounted his having: (1) investigated "numerous felony cases where the suspect could receive a prison term of more than one year and a fine greater than \$2,500"; (2) conducted serious felony investigations without NCIS involvement; and (3) conducted theft investigations above the \$2,500 threshold after having informed NCIS as required by "verbal agreement." The appellant stated he has daily contact with county and State police. He said that he has investigated felonies that have "developed into major criminal investigations," and has conducted possible fraud investigations concerning to submitting false claims against the Government, false worker's compensation claims, and/or making false sworn statements to the Government. These cases involve traveling outside the local area and across state lines. For most cases, the facts are not available and only limited information is provided. Almost every investigation involves checking the background, life style, and history of the subject. This work

entails obtaining criminal background information from the courts, and interacting with State and local agencies. The appellant stated he has investigated many cases generated by a tip from an informant, and set up covert surveillance equipment to monitor the activities of the suspects both on and off the base. These investigations have included “prominent individuals not affiliated with the Naval Air Station, and higher level Government employees.” Many were “classified as long term, and continued for over a year.” He stressed the public interest in and sensitivity to the theft of Government property, as evidenced by the number of fraud, waste, and abuse calls he investigates that are called in by the public. The appellant said he also works cases with other Federal agencies, e.g., Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI), Drug Enforcement Administration (DEA), Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms (BATF), and Defense Investigative Service (DIS) where NCIS is not involved.

Our fact-finding revealed that the majority of cases investigated by the appellant involve theft of Government property. Cases may extend for six to eight months from opening until closing, usually by means of a plea bargain. Following are examples of more recent cases:

- (1) Since February 1997, the appellant has been investigating a series of approximately 33 different thefts in a large, multi-story air station building, including approximately 11 laptop computers, tools, and cash. He has set up two surveillance cameras twice for extended periods of time. The appellant has developed a suspect who has access to all areas where the thefts occurred and has been seen in those areas shortly after each theft.
- (2) An informant working as a station contractor advised the appellant that a division head GS-13 manager was running an outside business from his office. The investigation started in January 1998, and the suspect was arrested February 13, 1998. After interviewing approximately 15 to 20 people who worked in the area, the appellant developed sufficient information to obtain a search warrant. Sheriff’s Department and DOD police staff recovered several hundred dollars of stolen Government property, including 55 gallon drums of cleaning solution, a lawnmower, and shop tools. He was charged with seven separate counts of larceny of Government property, considered a felony because it was more than \$100. He was convicted in U.S. District Court in December 1998, of three counts of larceny of Government property.
- (3) In a November 1997, case the appellant was referred a Hot Line complaint of computer misuse. The complaint from a woman in Texas alleged that pornography was being sent over the Internet from a web site contacted through chat boxes. From interviewing the complainant, the appellant received E-mail files of the suspect showing him in an office area with his clothes off. Pulling telephone records, the appellant traced long distance calls from the suspect’s station computer to the chat boxes. The suspect had been deleting and fragmenting the suspect files. His hard drive was pulled and sent

out for analysis, and some pornographic E-mails were recovered. The suspect was arrested approximately five days after the initial complaint, and pleaded guilty in U.S. District Court about three or four months after his arrest. The suspect was a contractor employee, and the appellant met with DIS that investigated whether the suspect's security clearance should be suspended.

- (4) On or around March 5, 1998, the appellant was notified by the store manager that liquor was missing from a station convenience store (around \$1,400 for the month of February). The appellant installed a surveillance camera and recorded store activity through March. The suspect was arrested March 25, 1998. An audit conducted during the surveillance period revealed that approximately \$40,000 worth of liquor was missing. The suspect was charged with approximately six counts of larceny of Government property based on video camera evidence. The case ended in a plea bargain.
- (5) Based on a complaint, the appellant was alerted to juveniles skipping school and entering a sewer system through manholes. Responding to the call, the appellant apprehended approximately three juveniles and equipment stolen from a bowling alley/gym hall on the station. The appellant had set up cameras at the hall to determine who had been stealing the equipment. One juvenile confessed and implicated others by informing the appellant of three other houses where he would find other stolen items. The case was transferred to county juvenile court for prosecution.
- (6) The appellant received a complaint from a woman living in station housing that some checks were missing and one of them had been cashed at the bank, followed by others being cashed. Tracing the canceled check through the timed bank video camera film, the appellant saw the same vehicle for two of the three transactions. Tracing the vehicle, the appellant found that the complainant's daughter had cashed one check, and the daughter's friend had cashed the other two, one when the daughter was present. The friend entered a plea bargain agreement.
- (7) On November 11, 1997, the appellant received a call from the Equal Employment Opportunity Office that a management contract employee was trading sex for favors. The victim had complained to police that she was receiving harassing communications. Already under investigation, the suspect filed a harassment complaint on November 24, 1997, concerning the complainant. On January 1998, an unsuccessful search was conducted for tapes alleged to have consisted of the conversations. The appellant interviewed approximately seven other employees. Based on the information developed, the suspect was charged with three counts of assault and three

counts of harassment resolved in a plea bargain. The suspect was removed from his job and barred from the station.

- (8) The appellant investigated a non-appropriated fund employee who had filed a worker's compensation claim. The organization's internal audit clerk referred what was believed to be a forged doctor's certificate. By interviewing the suspect's physician, the appellant found that the suspect had forged the doctor's certificate. The suspect was fired.

The appellant described a range of other assignments, including investigating accident claims involving injury and/or property damage to determine who is at fault. Many involve off-site motor vehicle accidents. He obtains the police report, medical records, travel orders, rental agreement, copies of any violations, and any other pertinent documentation. The appellant interviews the people involved. Usually the employee is interviewed in person and others involved in the accident by telephone. This information is forwarded through the appropriate Naval legal office.

Other investigations concern claims of sonic boom damage from station aircraft flying as far away as western [state name]. The appellant typically travels off-station four or five times a year to these sites to inspect the claimed damage. Fact-finding includes checking with Air Operations to find out whether station aircraft were in the area that day and whether they had gone sonic, and if weather conditions were such to create a boom.

The appellant stated that he had not yet conducted any complete investigations of potentially fraudulent worker's compensation claims. He has, however, conducted surveillance in one case by videotaping a base contractor employee, who claimed that he had been injured on the job and was disabled, performing heavy labor off-station. Other cases he described included: (1) arresting a person for prescription forgery since she had changed the number of tablets from 30 to 80 on a controlled item for which prescriptions greater than 30 were not permitted; (2) arresting a person who was attempting to steal an aircraft by breaking through a fence; (3) helping to subdue a mentally disturbed individual who attacked two women in a parking lot; and (4) fact-finding for industrial accidents and other injuries. The appellant has helped the FBI by executing search warrants and conducting an inventory at another Navy activity, and has testified as a witness in third party hearings. He conducts crime prevention classes on the station that range from one to three hours in duration.

Other functions include training new DOD police officers and conducting internal affairs investigations when necessary.

Series, title, and guide determination

The agency determined the appellant's position is covered by the Police Series, GS-083, is titled Detective, and is graded using the Grade Evaluation Guide for police and Security Guard Positions. The appellant believes that his position is allocated properly as Criminal Investigator, GS-1811.

The Police Officer Series, GS-083 includes positions that perform or supervise law enforcement work in the preservation of the peace; the prevention, detection, and investigation of crimes; the arrest or apprehension of violators; and the provision of assistance to citizens in emergency situations, including the protection of civil rights. The purpose of police work is to assure compliance with Federal, State, county, and municipal laws and ordinances, and agency rules and regulations concerning to law enforcement work.

The Criminal Investigating Series, GS-1811 includes positions that involve planning and conducting investigations relating to alleged or suspected violations of criminal laws. They primarily require a knowledge of investigative techniques and a knowledge of the laws of evidence, the rules of criminal procedure, and precedent court decisions concerning admissibility of evidence, constitutional rights, search and seizure and related issues; the ability to recognize, develop and present evidence that reconstructs events, sequences, and time elements, and establishes relationships, responsibilities, legal liabilities, conflicts of interest, in a way that meets requirements for presentation in various legal hearings and court proceedings; and skill in applying the techniques required in performing such duties as maintaining surveillance, performing undercover work, and advising and assisting the U.S. Attorney in and out of court.

The Grade-Level Guides for Classifying Investigator Positions (GS-1810/1811 Guide) states that covered positions are those that involve cases whose development requires application of the full range of knowledge, skills, and abilities described in this standard. Typically, this full range of knowledge, skills, and abilities is called into use only in the development of cases that are so complex that they normally unfold over a period of time, i.e., days, weeks or months. This distinguishes investigator positions from certain other law enforcement occupations that require incumbents to use some investigative techniques, e.g., interviewing, or records checking in on-the-spot or short-term situations that end with the arrest or detention of the suspect.

The GS-1810/1811 Guide, published in February 1972, must be read in concert with the more recent information contained in the April 1988, Grade Evaluation Guide for Police and Security Guard Positions (GS-083/085 Guide). That Guide clarifies that the GS-1811 series covers positions primarily responsible for investigating alleged or suspected *major offenses or violations of specialized laws of the United States*. While Navy policy typically requires NCIS involvement in violent crimes, this must not be construed as meaning the GS-1811 series alone covers all such crimes within its occupational definition. The GS-083/085 Guide defines major crimes found in the GS-1811 occupation as “capital crimes, those involving prescribed monetary values, or others that may vary in different jurisdictions.” Level 1-4 in the GS-083/085 Guide specifically includes investigating violent crimes, such as conducting long term investigations, within the meaning of the GS-083 occupation, to detect and apprehend individuals committing acts of violence.

Police work includes preventing, detecting, and investigating violations of laws, rules, and regulations involving accidents, crimes, and misconduct involving misdemeanors and felonies. Within their jurisdictions, police officers enforce many Federal, State, county, and municipal laws and ordinances, and agency rules and regulations relating to law enforcement. They must be aware of the rights of

suspects, the laws of search and seizure, constraints on the use of force (including deadly force), and the civil rights of individuals. GS-083 personnel are commissioned, deputized, appointed, or otherwise designated as agency and/or local law enforcement officers by statute, delegation, or deputization by local governments, or other official act. Arrest and apprehension authority includes the power to formally detain and incarcerate individuals pending the completion of formal charges (booking); requesting and serving warrants for search, seizure, and arrest; testifying at hearings to establish and collect collateral (bond); and/or participating in trials to determine innocence or guilt.

GS-083 detectives conduct investigations of crimes and maintain surveillance over areas with high rates of crime. Investigations involve searching crime scenes for clues, interviewing witnesses, following leads, analyzing and evaluating evidence, locating suspects, and making arrests. In cases involving major crimes (capital crimes, those involving prescribed monetary values, or others that may vary in different jurisdictions), the FBI or other specialized law enforcement agencies may assume jurisdiction and control over the investigation. In these cases, police detectives may perform some investigative work under the direction of assigned criminal investigators. Full-time detectives typically work in civilian clothes, although, depending on the availability of investigative personnel, uniformed officers may also perform investigative duties.

Investigations conducted by police detectives are distinguished from those conducted by criminal investigators (GS-1811). Detectives handle cases that occur within a prescribed local jurisdiction, where the violations are clearly within the authority of the local police force. Police investigations are limited by agreements with investigative agencies, e.g., FBI and DEA, that prescribe responsibility according to the seriousness of crimes committed and monetary values involved, are conducted totally within the local jurisdiction, and they are commonly of relatively short duration (e.g., a few days). Criminal investigators, by contrast, tend to handle cases that clearly involve felonies, violate Federal law, extend over other Federal and civil jurisdictions or involve large monetary values, and extend for periods of weeks, months, or even years.

These Guides discuss a range of work typically performed in their respective occupations. Both recognize, however, that employees in the GS-083 and GS-1811 occupations frequently help one another. GS-1810/1811 Guide grade level distinctions are based on primary case agent responsibility. Helping in a case by executing warrants, conducting surveillance, and conducting interviews, has no particular impact with respect to determining the grade level of an investigator's position. Similarly, the fact that the appellant has participated in serving warrants with local and State authorities; traveled across state lines to other Navy activities to perform similar duties; contacting local and State authorities to obtain and/or provide background information on suspects cannot be construed as proving the appellant is performing GS-1811 functions. For example, travel across state lines in the GS-1811 occupation typically means investigating criminal enterprises that operate in multiple jurisdictions. It is not intended to cover conducting interviews for damage claims against the Government outside a Federal installation, or the similar off-post work examples provided by the appellant.

The use of informants in the GS-1811 occupation does not mean responding to tips provided by one or a few station contract employees, or a local informant network, either directly or by way of Hotline complaints. Rather, developing informants means cultivating individuals knowledgeable of and frequently operating within or on the fringes of criminal enterprises to expose or further penetrate those enterprises. Similarly, surveillance in the GS-1811 occupation pertains to determining when and where its use is appropriate in developing the facts surrounding a criminal conspiracy and also actually conducting the surveillance. Watching a potential homicide suspect at the behest of the county Sheriff's Department, and video recording heavy manual labor being performed by an employee claiming incapacitation due to injury on the job do not rise to the breadth or depth of surveillance intended in full performance level GS-1811 positions. While worker's compensation investigation may be of interest to and may be performed by law enforcement personnel, that work is also performed by people in other occupations. For example, some Personnel Assistant, GS-203 positions are responsible for investigating and developing facts concerning on-the-job injuries or illnesses, and processing routine claims that require identifying and substantiating relevant information in narrative. As discussed in the GS-1810/1811 Guide, other occupations outside the law enforcement field involve some aspects of investigating work, but do not require their incumbents to apply the full range of investigator knowledge, skills, and techniques. This is particularly true of certain subject-matter positions that involve fact-finding and reporting, e.g., accountants who perform fact-finding and reporting within their area of specialization, when their primary objective is to discover and solve accounting problems. Similarly, Claims Examiner, GS-998 and Loss and Damage Claims Examiner, GS-992 positions frequently conduct interviews and perform fact-finding for damage claims against the Government outside a Federal installation, typical of off-post non-criminal work examples provided by the appellant.

Duties and responsibilities assigned to a position flow from the mission assigned to the organization in which it is found. The positions created to perform an assigned mission must be considered in relation to one another; i.e., each position reflects part of the work assigned to an organization. Thus, the duties and responsibilities assigned to the Investigative Branch and the appellant's position may not be considered in a vacuum. Secretary of the Navy (SECNAV) Instruction 5520.3B, Criminal and Security Investigations and Related Activities Within the Department of the Navy, January 4, 1993, stipulates that NCIS "is responsible for investigating actual, suspected or alleged major criminal offenses." Major criminal offenses are defined as punishable by confinement for a term of more than one year. In contrast, commands are authorized to maintain "a limited investigative capability for resolving minor offenses and those of a purely military character." Minor offenses are defined as punishable by confinement of one year or less.

These definitions, however, must be interpreted within the context of other requirements stated in the instruction. The instruction stipulates that command investigators are permitted to investigate major crimes "when NCIS has declined jurisdiction." Certain types of matters, e.g., fraud offenses under the U.S. Code or Uniform Code of Military Justice, must be referred to NCIS. Information must be provided to NCIS on such cases as loss or ordnance, narcotics, dangerous drugs or controlled substances; incidents of aberrant sexual behavior involving force/coercion or when children are involved; and thefts of minor amounts of personal property when ordnance, contraband, or controlled

substances are involved. The instruction states that command off-base investigative activities are to be limited to “minor offenses and to the immediate area surrounding the installation and off-base housing areas.” However, this policy is not meant to restrict such functions as preventing the escape or loss of identity of suspected offenders, preserving crime scenes, and ensuring the integrity of physical evidence.

The record shows that the local NCIS office and the Investigative Branch have a verbal working agreement under which NCIS will not accept property crimes of \$2,500 or less. Traditionally, felony larcenies begin at around \$1,000. NCIS does accept motor vehicle theft cases (grand theft auto). It works all sexual assaults, although Investigative Branch services may be used, e.g., conducting preliminary interviews and neighborhood screening interviews. NCIS conducts death investigations, including unattended deaths, suicides, murders, and accidental deaths, and aggravated assaults.

We find SECNAV Instruction 5520.3B limits the breadth, depth, and complexity of investigations that may be managed by the appellant. The cases discussed previously evidence the characteristics of long-term investigation within the meaning of the GS-083/085 Guide in that they extend from several days to several weeks, are local in nature, and are resolved by applying investigative and related techniques typical of the GS-083 occupation. These are defined at Level 1-4 of the GS-083/085 Guide as including conducting stakeout operations; long-term investigations from several days to several weeks to detect and apprehend persons committing acts of violence, theft of Federal or personal property, or violating laws concerning controlled substances; developing informants and informant networks; developing and following leads, taking statements, and otherwise gathering bits of information and facts; analyzing facts to identify suspects and develop case information for use in pressing charges and bringing suspects to trial; coordinating with U.S. and other prosecuting attorneys on case development and plans to perform arrests and prosecutions; developing cover conditions and working under cover to detect and prevent criminal activities; and coordinating with other law enforcement agencies to gather facts or evidence for use in assigned cases.

For example, while the computer misuse Hotline complaint involved improper interstate use of Government telephone and computer resources, the case was local, i.e., limited to improper use of a computer by that one individual, confirmed by review of local telephone records, with additional evidence recovered directly from the suspect’s hard drive. Similarly, while the non-appropriated fund convenience store liquor thefts exceeded the normal dollar limits under the SECNAV instruction, the case techniques applied were typical of local case surveillance, installing a video camera to record daily thefts by an employee who was arrested approximately three weeks after the initial complaint was made. The appellant’s investigations of check forgery and larceny, drill hall breaking and entering, and theft of Government property by the division head represent the scope and complexity of local felonies and lesser crimes typically handled by detectives in the GS-083 occupation.

Therefore, we find the appellant’s position is allocated properly to the GS-083 series and is titled Detective. Because it is the directly applicable published standard, the GS-083/085 Guide must be used to decide the grade level worth of the appellant’s work. Because his position is excluded from

the GS-1811 series, the grade level criteria in the GS-1810/1811 Guide may not be used to evaluate the appellant's work.

Grade determination

The published GS-083/085 Guide is written in Factor Evaluation System (FES) format. Positions graded under the FES format are compared to nine factors. Levels are assigned for each factor and the points associated with the assigned levels are totaled and converted to a grade level by application of the Grade Conversion Table contained in the PCS. Under the FES, factor level descriptions mark the lower end, i.e., the floor, of the ranges for the indicated factor level. If a position fails in any significant aspect to meet a particular level in the standard, the next lower level and its lower point value must be assigned unless the deficiency is balanced by an equally important aspect that meets a higher level.

The appellant has not disagreed with his agency's application of the GS-083/085 Guide that credited Levels 1-4, 2-3, 3-3, 4-3, 5-3, 6-3, 7-3, 8-2 and 9-2. We reviewed carefully the levels assigned to these factors by the agency and the accompanying rationale with which the appellant has not taken issue and fully considered the appellant's other duties not addressed in detail in this decision, e.g., video and other technical work, and program training. We found these determinations to be appropriate based on our review of the most difficult and complex cases described by the appellant occupying a sufficient amount of his work time to control the classification of his position.

Summary

In sum, we have evaluated the appellant's position as follows:

Factor	Level	Points
1. Knowledge required by the position	1-4	550
2. Supervisory controls	2-3	275
3. Guidelines	3-3	275
4. Complexity	4-3	150
5. Scope and effect	5-3	150
6. Personal contacts	6-3	120
7. Purpose of contacts	7-3	60
8. Physical demands	8-2	20
9. Work environment	9-2	<u>20</u>
Total points:		1,620

A total of 1,620 points falls within the GS-8 grade level point range of 1,605-1,850 points on the Grade Conversion Table in the GS-083/085 Guide.

Decision

The appellant's position is classified properly as Detective, GS-083-8.