

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



San Francisco Oversight Division  
120 Howard Street, Room 760  
San Francisco, CA 94105

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

**Appellant:** [appellant's name]

**Agency classification:** Assistant District Manager-Recreation  
GS-301-12

**Organization:** [appellant's installation]  
U.S. Department of the Interior

**OPM decision:** GS-301-12  
(title at agency discretion)

**OPM decision number:** C-0301-12-03

\_\_\_\_\_  
Carlos A. Torrico  
Acting Classification Appeals Officer

10/30/98

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

As provided in section 511.612 of title 5, Code of Federal Regulations, 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]

[name and address of servicing personnel officer]

Assistant Director for Human Resources  
[appellant's agency]  
Mail Stop 5628  
1849 C Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20240

Director of Personnel  
U.S. Department of the Interior  
Mail Stop 5221  
1849 C Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20240

## **Introduction**

On September 9, 1997, the San Francisco Oversight Division of the U.S. Office of Personnel Management (OPM) received a classification appeal from [the appellant], whose position is currently classified as Assistant District Manager- Recreation, GS-301-12. However, he believes that the position should be classified at the GS-13 grade level. The appellant works in the [appellant's installation, U.S. Department of the Interior]. We have accepted and decided this appeal under section 5112 of Title 5, United States Code (U.S.C.).

## **General issues**

This appeal decision is based on a careful review of all information submitted by the appellant and his agency, and telephone interviews with the appellant and his immediate supervisor. Both [the appellant] and his supervisor have certified to the accuracy of the appellant's official position description (number 03519). However, our interviews disclosed that Factor 7 - Purpose of Contacts, as described in the position description does not accurately reflect our findings for that factor. The agency should amend the discussion of Factor 7 in the position description to comply with our findings discussed under Subfactor 4B - Purpose of Contacts in this evaluation statement. Prior to appealing to OPM, [the appellant] appealed to his agency. In a letter to him dated July 31, 1997, the agency sustained the current classification. In his appeal, [the appellant] compares his position to two other Assistant District Manager positions (those for Renewable and Non-renewable Resources) in the [appellant's installation] which are classified at the GS-13 level. Therefore he believes that his position should also be classified at that level. In addition, he makes various statements about his agency and its evaluation of his position. In adjudicating this appeal, our only concern is to make our own independent decision on the proper classification of his position. By law, we must make that decision solely by comparing his current duties and responsibilities to OPM standards and guidelines (5 U.S.C. 5106, 5107, and 5112). Since comparison to standards is the exclusive method for classifying positions, we cannot compare the appellant's position to others as a basis for deciding his appeal. In addition, we have considered the appellant's statements about his agency only insofar as they are relevant to making that comparison.

Like OPM, the appellant's agency must classify positions based on comparison to OPM standards and guidelines. However, the agency also has primary responsibility for ensuring that its positions are classified consistently with OPM appeal decisions. If the appellant considers his position so similar to the two others mentioned above that they all warrant the same classification, he may pursue the matter by writing to his personnel office. In doing so, he should specify the precise organizational location, classification, duties and responsibilities of the positions in question. If the positions are found to be basically the same as his, 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.

In his appeal [the appellant] requests that should his position be upgraded he receive time-in-grade credit and back pay from the date his current position was originally classified. Concerning the first issue, OPM delegates authority to make qualifications determinations to agencies, thus it would be up to the appellant's agency to make such a determination. Regarding backpay, the U.S. Comptroller

General states that an “...employee is entitled only to the salary of the position to which he is actually appointed, regardless of the duties performed. When an employee performs the duties of a higher grade level, no entitlement to the salary of the higher grade exists until such time as the individual is actually promoted.... Consequently, backpay is not available as a remedy for misassignments to higher level duties or improper classifications” (CG decision B-232695, December 15, 1989).

### **Position information**

The appellant serves as the Assistant District Manager for the [the appellant’s organization] on the staff of the [appellant’s installation] (formerly District) Manager. In that capacity he is responsible for both staff functions and line management related to Field Office wide recreation activities, wilderness management, environmental education, fire ecology, and operation of the [the appellant’s subordinate organization] (RRCNCA). As a staff officer on the Field Office staff, and line manager of the RRCNCA, he develops and maintains a program of conservation, protection and management of the public lands used for recreation including designated wilderness areas within the Field Office’s area of jurisdiction. He provides input for the preparation, implementation and conformance of land use plans, interdisciplinary activity plans, and ecosystem management plans - particularly the plan covering management of the RRCNCA. He makes resource management decisions on recreation and wilderness management, and coordinates ecosystems studies with other Divisions in the Field Office. In carrying out his program management functions, the appellant supervises a total of twelve employees working at the [appellant’s installation], and onsite at the RRCNCA.

The appellant’s position description, results of our interviews, and other material of record furnish much more information about his duties and responsibilities and how they are performed.

### **Series, title, and standard determination**

The agency has classified this position in the Miscellaneous Administration and Program Series, GS-301, and the appellant does not disagree. We concur with the agency’s determination. As discussed in the series definition of the classification standard for the GS-301 (dated January 1979), that series includes positions which are to perform, supervise, or manage nonprofessional, two-grade interval work for which no other series is appropriate. The work requires analytical ability, judgment, discretion, and knowledge of a substantial body of administrative or program principles, concepts, policies, and objectives.

Administrative work is defined in section III.C.2 of the Introduction to the Position Classification Standards as work that “involves the exercise of analytical ability, judgment, discretion, and personal responsibility, and the application of a substantial body of knowledge of principles, concepts, and practices applicable to one or more fields of administration or management.” It may be performed as part of the principal mission or program of an agency or subcomponent, or it can be performed as a service function which supports the agency’s mission or program. As a staff officer and program manager, the appellant performs a variety of administrative and program related duties in overseeing and administering the recreation and wilderness programs of the Field Office. His work requires

knowledge of the principles, concepts and objectives applicable to and supportive of the agency's recreation and wilderness management programs, including the budgeting process, personnel management, procurement and contracting, and resource planning and utilization. Although his work does not require education in a specialized field, it does involve application of a number of critical skills, e.g., analysis, research, writing and judgment. OPM has prescribed no titles for positions in the Miscellaneous Administrative and Program Series, GS-301. Therefore, according to section III.H.2. of the Introduction to the Position Classification Standards, the appellant's agency may choose the official title for this position. In doing so, the agency should follow the titling guidance in that section, particularly as it applies to supervisory positions.

There are no published grade level criteria for positions classified in the GS-301 series. The standard directs that positions classified in this series are to be evaluated by reference to an appropriate multiseries guide or, if none is applicable, a standard for a specific occupational series that involves analogous knowledges and skills. Positions that meet the criteria of the General Schedule Supervisory Guide (GSSG) for evaluation as supervisors are to be evaluated by that guide.

The appellant's position meets the criteria in the GSSG, dated April 1998, for evaluation and classification as a supervisor (page 4). Our fact-finding disclosed that he spends all of his work time supervising twelve employees and performing related managerial responsibilities to oversee the operation of the [the appellant's organization]. Therefore, the GSSG is the appropriate guide to evaluate the grade level of this supervisory position.

### **Grade determination**

The GSSG employs a factor-point evaluation method that assesses six factors common to all supervisory positions. To grade a position, each factor is evaluated by comparing the position to the factor level definitions for that factor and crediting the points designated for the highest factor level which is met in accordance with the instructions specified to the factor being evaluated. The total points accumulated under all factors are then converted to a grade by using the point-to-grade conversion chart in the GSSG. Each factor is evaluated as follows for the appellant's position:

#### *Factor 1, Program Scope and Effect - Level 1-2-350 points*

This factor addresses the general complexity, breadth, and impact of the program areas and work directed, including the organizational and geographic coverage. It also assesses the impact of the work both within and outside the immediate organization. To credit a particular factor level, the criteria for both Scope and Effect must be met.

a. Scope - This element addresses the general complexity and breadth of (a) the program or program segment directed; and (2) the work directed, the products produced, or the services delivered. The geographic and organizational coverage of the program or program segment within the agency structure is included under Scope.

At Level 1-2 (pages 13-14 of the GSSG), the program segment or work directed is administrative, technical, complex clerical, or comparable in nature. The functions, activities, or services provided have limited geographic coverage and support most of the activities comprising a typical agency field office, an area office, a small to medium military installation, or comparable activities within agency program segments.

At Level 1-3 (page 14) the supervisor directs a program segment that performs technical, administrative, protective, investigative, or professional work. The program segment and work directed typically have coverage which encompasses a major metropolitan area, a State, or a small region of several States; or when most of an area's taxpayers or businesses are covered, coverage comparable to a small city. Providing complex administrative, technical, or professional services directly affecting a large or complex multimission military installation also falls at this level.

A large military installation is defined in the GSSG (page 7) as a military base with one or a few missions or a group of activities with a total serviced or supported employee-equivalent population exceeding 4,000 personnel, and with a variety of serviced technical functions. These personnel are directly affected by the position under evaluation. Federal civilian and military employees, estimated contractor personnel, and similar personnel may be used to derive the population total.

A complex, multimission installation or a group of several organizations (directly supported by the position under evaluation) includes four or more of the following: a garrison; a medical center or large hospital and medical laboratory complex; multimillion dollar (annual) construction, civil works, or environmental cleanup projects; a test and evaluation center or research laboratory of moderate size; an equipment or product development center; a service school; a major command higher than that in which the servicing position is located or a comparable tenant activity of moderate size; a supply or maintenance depot; or equivalent activities. These activities are individually smaller than the large installation described above.

The appellant's position meets Level 1-2, but falls short of Level 1-3. Similar to Level 1-2, he directs work which is administrative and technical in nature (e.g., park rangers and outdoor recreation planners) covering a limited geographic area, and which encompasses the activities of a typical [the appellant's agency] field office. His recreation/wilderness management program provides services to the general public (e.g., issuance of recreation permits, visitor information at RRCNCA) amounting to a relatively small population of clients who actually tour the visitor center at [the appellant's subordinate organization], or utilize the recreation and wilderness facilities covered by the [the appellant's installation]. This is in contrast to Level 1-3, where the technical or administrative work directed covers a major metropolitan area, a State, or a small region of several States. Although we recognize that the city of [the appellant's duty station] could be considered a major metropolitan area, the services provided by the appellant's programs involves a much smaller population. Indeed, our interviews disclosed that the appellant's recreation/wilderness program management work does not directly involve the population or the municipal activities of the city of [the appellant's duty station]. The focus of his work is on the geographic area immediately outside the metropolitan area. Unlike

Level 1-3, the appellant's work does not provide complex administrative or technical services directly affecting a large or complex multimission military installation as defined in the GSSG.

The element of Scope is evaluated at Level 1-2.

b. Effect - This element addresses the impact of the work, the products, and/or the programs described under "Scope" on the mission and programs of the customer(s), the activity, other activities in or out of government, the agency, other agencies, the general public, or others.

At Level 1-2 (page 13), the services or products support and significantly affect installation level, area office level, or field office operations and objectives, or comparable program segments; or provide services to a moderate, local, or limited population of clients or users comparable to a major portion of a small city or rural county.

At Level 1-3 (page 14), activities, functions, or services accomplished directly and significantly impact a wide range of agency activities, the work of other agencies, or the operations of outside interests (e.g., a segment of a regulated industry), or the general public. At the field activity level (involving large, complex, multimission organizations and/or very large serviced populations), the work directly involves or substantially impacts the provision of essential support operations to numerous, varied, and complex technical, professional, and administrative functions.

The appellant's position meets Level 1-2 for this element, but does not reflect the kind of impact typical of Level 1-3. Similar to Level 1-2, the program services provided by his division supports and significantly affects the operations and objectives of the [the appellant's installation], particularly when interfacing with other divisions (e.g., Lands, Renewable and Non-renewable Resources) in the conduct of interdisciplinary studies on the overall impact of recreation activities or mining on the wilderness, endangered species (e.g., desert tortoise), or the natural habitat of certain plants and animals (wild burrows and horses). As a division director the appellant provides critical input to the [the appellant's installation] Resource Management Plan which establishes overall processes and objectives for ecosystem management of lands under the jurisdiction of the Field Office. Unlike Level 1-3, the appellant's program services do not directly and significantly impact a wide range of the agency level activities of the [the appellant's agency], the work of other agencies, the operations of outside interests such as a segment of a regulated industry, or the broad general public. Although the appellant works at the field activity level, his work does not involve large, complex multimission organizations, substantially impacting the provision of essential support operations to numerous, varied, and complex technical, professional, and administrative functions.

In summary, we find that both Scope and Effect are evaluated at Level 1-2, and thus the correct overall evaluation of Factor 1 is 1-2 and 350 points are credited.

*Factor 2, Organizational Setting - Level 2-2 - 250 points*

This factor considers the organizational situation of the supervisory position in relation to higher level management.

The appellant's position is properly evaluated at Level 2-2. As discussed at that level (page 18), his position is accountable to a position that is one reporting level below the first SES, Flag or general officer, or equivalent or higher level position in the direct supervisory chain. Specifically, the appellant reports directly to the [the appellant's installation] Field Office Manager, whose position is classified as GS-340-14. That individual reports to the [the appellant's agency] State Director whose position is assigned to the SES.

Factor 2 is evaluated at Level 2-2 and 250 points are assigned.

*Factor 3, Supervisory and Managerial Authority Exercised - Level 3-2 - 450 points*

This factor covers the delegated supervisory and managerial authorities which are exercised on a recurring basis. To be credited with a level under this factor, a position must meet the authorities and responsibilities to the extent described for the specific level.

In order to meet Level 3-2 (pages 18-20), a position must meet any one of the conditions described in paragraphs a, b, or c under Factor Level 3-2. This position meets Level 3-2c. Supervisors at that level must carry out at least three of the first four, and a total of six or more of the 10 responsibilities listed on pages 19-20 of the GSSG. The appellant carries out all 10 authorities and responsibilities. For example, he exercises responsibilities 3 and 4, since he evaluates subordinates' work performance and gives them advice and instruction on both work and administrative matters.

In order to be credited with Factor Level 3-3, a position must meet paragraph a or b described under that factor. The appellant's responsibilities do not meet Level 3-3a (page 20). Unlike that level, he does not exercise delegated managerial authority to set a series of long-range work plans and schedules. In addition, he is not as closely involved with high level program officials in developing overall goals and objectives for his assigned functions as envisioned at Level 3-3a, and in the examples cited at that level.

At Level 3-3b, a supervisor must exercise all or nearly all of the supervisory responsibilities and authorities described at Level 3-2c, plus at least 8 of the 15 responsibilities listed under Level 3-3b (pages 20-21) of the GSSG.

This position exercises all 10 of the supervisory responsibilities described at Level 3-2c. The appellant also exercises 3 of the 15 responsibilities listed under Level 3-3b. Specifically, he exercises responsibilities 2, 13, and 14. For example, he carries out responsibilities 2 and 13 since as a staff officer he exercises significant responsibilities in dealing with officials of other units and in advising management officials of higher rank (Field Office Manager), and he approves expenses comparable



to within-grade increases and employee travel. The appellant's position cannot receive credit for the other 12 responsibilities listed under Level 3-3b. That is, it cannot receive credit for responsibilities 1, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12 and 15. Our reasons for this determination are discussed below.

Responsibility 1 describes a supervisor who uses subordinate supervisors, leaders, or comparable personnel to direct, coordinate, or oversee work. The appellant believes he meets this criterion. We cannot agree. The GSSG uses the plural when speaking of subordinate supervisors and leaders, rather than using a phrase such as "one or more subordinate supervisors, leaders...." This is deliberate. Precedent OPM appeal decisions and central office guidance show that Level 3-3b is intended to credit only supervisors who direct at least two or three persons who are officially recognized as subordinate supervisors, leaders, or comparable personnel. Further, the supervisor's subordinate organization must be so large and its work so complex that it requires using two or more subordinate supervisors or comparable personnel. The mere presence of two or more supervisors or comparable personnel, in and of itself is not enough, absent such conditions, to credit Responsibility 1. Information in the case file indicates that there is one subordinate (currently vacant) Supervisory Park Ranger, GS-025-11, position which supervises the Visitor Services Team at the RRCNCA. Additionally, the appellant has designated one position classified as Natural Resource Specialist, GS-401-12, as a team leader of the Program Management Team in the [the appellant's organization]. However, the position has not been officially classified as "Lead" by the agency using the General Schedule Leader Grade Evaluation Guide. Although the appellant has identified this position to monitor the work of three positions assigned to the Program Management Team, we believe that the organization led is of insufficient complexity to justify establishment of a quasi-supervisory position. Thus we cannot consider the Natural Resource Specialist as a team leader within the context of Responsibility 1. We base this conclusion on several observations: (1) the limited scope of the "lead" position's duties relative to the majority of positions in the Program Management Team which encompass the highest grade level of the work led which is Outdoor Recreation Planner, GS-023-11. According to the GS-023 standard (June 1970), at that grade level Outdoor Recreation Planners have considerable freedom from supervision in planning and carrying out their work, and it is reviewed only for overall adequacy and soundness of results obtained. Journey level positions of this type generally need little or no guidance on such matters as selecting appropriate problem-solving methods and techniques, or locating the appropriate regulations. Thus we question to what degree these positions would require a "lead" worker, particularly given the information in the record that the incumbent of the GS-401-12 position has never worked in the area of recreation and the agency questions whether he would qualify for positions in the GS-023 series. (2) The fact that there are already two positions in the [the appellant's organization] officially classified as supervisors (i.e., the appellant's job and the Supervisory Park Ranger, GS-025-11, noted above), in an organization consisting of a total of only 11 nonsupervisory positions, yielding a small supervisory span of control of one supervisor to 5.5 employees. Therefore we doubt whether there is additional quasi-supervisory work present to consume a minimum of 25% of the work of another position. (3) The fact that the team leader duties described in the position description of the GS-401-12 job fall short of the minimum authorities and responsibilities required for coverage of Part II of the General Schedule Leader Grade Evaluation Guide. For the preceding reasons we believe that the appellant's organization does not warrant the use of a third position to monitor and oversee work, and thus

cannot recognize the Natural Resource Specialist, GS-401-12, position as a team leader. Moreover, since Responsibility 1 requires the use of more than one subordinate supervisor to direct, oversee, and monitor work, the appellant's position fails to meet that requirement as well.

Responsibility 3 requires assuring reasonable equity of performance standards and rating techniques developed by subordinates or assuring comparable equity in the assessment by subordinates of the adequacy of contractor capabilities or of contractor completed work. Our interviews disclosed that only the appellant develops the performance standards for positions in his division. In addition, although contractors do perform some work at the RRCNCA, the contracting officer at the [the appellant's agency] is responsible for assuring equity in the assessments performed by the appellant's subordinates (e.g., Contracting Officer's Representative) of contractor work.

Responsibility 4 requires direction of a program or major program segment with significant resources, e.g., one at a multimillion dollar level of annual resources. Our interviews disclosed that no single budgetary item for the appellant's program reaches a multimillion dollar level. For example, the recreation budget for FY 98 amounts to \$652,000, facility maintenance for RRCNCA totals \$300,000, and the fees collected from visitor and contractor use of RRCNCA comes to about \$900,000 per year. In the case of fees, although the appellant proposes how the funds will be spent at the [the appellant's subordinate organization] facility, the Field Office Manager must concur with spending plans.

Like Responsibility 1, responsibilities 5, 6, and 8 are intended to credit only supervisors who direct at least two or three subordinate supervisors, team leaders, or comparable personnel. Therefore, we cannot award credit for these three responsibilities.

Responsibility 7 requires making or approving selections for subordinate nonsupervisory positions. We cannot award this responsibility because the appellant recommends selections for subordinate nonsupervisory positions to his supervisor, who has final approval authority. This procedure conforms to the current agency delegation of authorities which specify that only the Field Office Manager (formerly District Office Manager) can make final selections for positions in the Field Office.

Responsibility 9 requires hearing and resolving group grievances or serious employee complaints. Responsibility 10 requires reviewing and approving serious disciplinary actions (e.g., suspensions) involving nonsupervisory subordinates. We cannot award credit for responsibilities 9 and 10 because these authorities are held by the [the appellant's installation] Field Office Manager.

Responsibility 11 involves making decisions on nonroutine, costly, or controversial training needs and training requests related to employees of the unit. Our interviews revealed that no division in the Field Office has an individual training budget. Most Field Office training is funded through a centralized, local training budget which is monitored by the Assistant District Manager for Support Services. Thus any requests/decisions the appellant makes on training are subject to the availability of funds which must be obligated by the Support Services Division. Our fact-finding revealed that the appellant has only dealt with requesting routine training, e.g., first aid training, recertification

training for Contracting Officer's Representatives. We found no indication that he has been confronted with making decisions on nonroutine, costly, or controversial training needs. Additionally, both he and his supervisor noted that approval of requests for costly training would be made by the field office management team. Based on the preceding information, this position does not warrant assignment of Responsibility 11.

Responsibility 12 involves determining whether contractor performed work meets standards of adequacy necessary for authorization of payment. Although there are several contracts in force to maintain the RRCNCA (e.g., visitor center, scenic drive), when interviewed the appellant indicated that he is not involved in determining whether the work performed by the contractors meets standards of adequacy necessary for authorization of payments. Those duties are carried out by two employees of the division who are trained, appointed and function as the Contracting Officer's Representative (COR) onsite. These two individuals are tasked with periodically inspecting and certifying that contractor work meets the standards and specifications of the contract. They report their findings directly to the [the appellant's agency] State Contracting Officer in [the appellant's state office], who authorizes payment to the contractor. For the preceding reasons, Responsibility 12 is not credited to this position.

Responsibility 15 involves finding and implementing ways to eliminate or reduce significant bottlenecks and barriers to production, promote team building, or improve business practices. Our interviews disclosed no instances in which the appellant has been faced with and had to resolve significant barriers to production, or had to promote extensive team building or significantly improve business practices. His responsibility in this area would not exceed routine methods to improve production and increase the quality of work which has already been recognized in our evaluation under Factor Level 3-2c.9.

Because the appellant's position can receive credit for only 3 of the 15 responsibilities listed under Level 3-3b, Level 3-2 is awarded and 450 points are credited.

*Factor 4, Personal Contacts - Levels 4A-2, 50 points/4B-2, 75 points*

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 contacts, credited under Subfactor 4A, and the purpose of those contacts, credited under Subfactor 4B, must be based on the same contacts.

**Subfactor 4A - Nature of Contacts**

The nature of the appellant's contacts meets Level 4A-2. As described at that level (page 24) he has frequent contacts with technical or operating level employees of State and local governments, higher ranking managers, supervisors and staff of program and administrative work units throughout his field office and the [the appellant's state office], the general public, and administrative assistants and case workers in congressional offices. These contacts are informal, occur in conferences and meetings, and sometimes require nonroutine or special preparation. The position does not meet Level 4A-3

(pages 24-25) where frequent contacts are with high ranking civilian managers, key staff of public interest groups, journalists, congressional committees and subcommittee staff, etc.

This subfactor is evaluated at Level 4A-2 and 50 points are assigned.

#### Subfactor 4B - Purpose of Contacts

The purpose of the appellant's contacts is comparable to Level 4B-2 (page 26). Like that level contacts are made to ensure that information provided to outside parties (particularly visitors at the RRCNCA) is accurate and consistent, to coordinate work directed with that of others outside the [the appellant's organization] (e.g., individuals working on interdisciplinary teams), and to coordinate and resolve differences of opinions with employees of other agencies, such as local public interest groups and county agencies regarding the use of trails and roads for hiking and public events. Unlike Level 4B-3 (page 26), the purpose of the appellant's contacts is not to justify, defend, or negotiate in representing his division in obtaining or committing resources, and in gaining compliance with established policies and regulations. The primary purpose of his contacts is to coordinate work and present accurate information. Contrary to statements in the appellant's position description, we found no indication that the work usually involves participation in conferences, meetings, hearings, or presentations involving problems or issues of considerable consequence. As previously noted, the agency should correct statements made under Factor 7 of the appellant's official position description to reflect our findings for this subfactor.

This subfactor is evaluated at Level 4B-2 and 75 points are credited.

The first subfactor is evaluated at Level 4A-2 and credited with 50 points, the second at Level 4B-2 with 75 points. A total of 125 points is credited for Factor 4.

#### *Factor 5, Difficulty of Typical Work Directed - Level 5-6 - 800 points*

This factor measures the difficulty and complexity of the basic work most typical of the organization directed.

The appellant currently supervises a total of 12 positions: one GS-12, four at GS-11 (we have included here the Supervisory Park Ranger, GS-025-11, position because the grade of the job is based on nonsupervisory duties), three at GS-9 (includes the Maintenance Mechanic, WG-4749-09, which we have determined equates to an Engineering Technician, GS-802-9), two at GS-7, and two at GS-5. When the appellant initially filed his appeal, he also supervised a staff of five Law Enforcement Rangers, GS-1801. However, effective on October 1, 1998, the law enforcement staff was removed from the appellant's division and supervision to form a new organization called the Division of Law Enforcement in the [the appellant's installation]. Therefore, those positions can no longer be credited to the appellant's position.

Based on our computations of nonsupervisory duty hours of substantive, mission oriented work performed in the appellant's division at the grade levels noted above, we have determined that GS-11 work constitutes 25 percent or more of the nonsupervisory workload in the appellant's organization. Therefore, in accordance with the guidance on pages 27 and 28 of the GSSG, the highest level of base work is GS-11, and the appellant's position warrants assignment of Level 5-6 and 800 points are credited.

*Factor 6, Other Conditions - Level 6-4 - 1120 points*

This factor measures the extent to which various conditions contribute to the difficulty and complexity of carrying out supervisory duties, authorities, and responsibilities. To evaluate Factor 6, two steps are used. First the highest level that a position fully meets is initially credited. Then, if the level selected is either 6-1, 6-2, or 6-3, the Special Situations listed after the factor level definitions are considered. If a position meets three or more of the situations, then a single level is to be added to the level selected in Step 1. If the level selected under Step 1 is either 6-4, 6-5, or 6-6, the Special Situations may not be considered in determining whether a higher factor level is creditable.

The appellant's position meets Level 6-4a, which is described on pages 31-32 of the GSSG. Like that level, his position requires substantial coordination and integration of a number of major work assignments of technical and administrative work comparable in difficulty to the GS-11 level. His position also meets the first and second examples listed under Level 6-4a, since he identifies and integrates internal and external program issues affecting the immediate organization, such as his role in contributing to the Field Office Resource Management Plan from the aspects of recreation and wilderness management, and he integrates the work of a team or group particularly involving interdisciplinary teams focusing on Field Office wide ecosystem management activities and concerns.

The position does not meet Factor Level 6-5 (pages 32-33) where the supervisor oversees professional and technical work comparable in difficulty to the GS-12 or GS-13 levels, or manages work through subordinate supervisors who each direct substantial workloads comparable to the GS-11 level.

*Summary of Factors*

<u>Factor</u>	<u>Level</u>	<u>Points</u>
1. Program Scope & Effect	1-2	350
2. Organizational Setting	2-2	250
3. Supervisory & Managerial Authority Exercised	3-2	450
4. Personal Contacts		
4A, Nature of Contacts	4A-2	50
4B, Purpose of Contacts	4B-2	75
5. Difficulty of Typical Work Directed	5-6	800
6. Other Conditions	6-4	1120

Total points: 3095

A total of 3095 points is credited to the appellant's position. According to the point-to-grade conversion chart on page 36 of the GSSG, this total falls within the GS-12 range (2755-3150). The appellant's supervisory duties are correctly evaluated at the GS-12 level.

**Decision**

The proper series and grade for the appellant's position is GS-301-12. Assignment of an appropriate title is at the agency's discretion.