

U.S. Office of Personnel Management  
Division for Human Capital Leadership and Merit System Accountability  
Classification Appeals and FLSA Programs

Center for Merit System Compliance  
1900 E Street, NW., Room 6484  
Washington, DC 20415

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

**Appellant:** [name]

**Agency classification:** Park Manager  
GS-025-14

**Organization:** [park]  
[region]  
National Park Service  
Department of the Interior  
[city and State]

**OPM decision:** Park Manager  
GS-025-14

**OPM decision number:** C-0025-14-04

\_\_\_\_\_/s/ Robert D. Hendler\_\_\_\_\_  
Robert D. Hendler  
Classification and Pay Claims  
Program Manager

\_\_\_\_\_/11/3/05\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

As provided in section 511.612 of title 5, Code of Federal Regulations, this decision constitutes a classification 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 the conditions and time limits specified in title 5, Code of Federal Regulations, sections 511.605, 511.613, and 511.614, as cited in the *Introduction to the Position Classification Standards*, appendix 4, section G (address provided in appendix 4, section H).

**Decision sent to:**

[appellant]

[regional office]

Mr. E. Lynn Smith  
Director, Human Resources  
National Park Service  
Room 2328  
1849 C Street, NW  
Washington, D.C. 20240

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

## **Introduction**

On November 1, 2004, the Center for Merit System Compliance of the U.S. Office of Personnel Management (OPM) accepted a position classification appeal from [appellant], who is employed as a Park Manager, GS-025-14, at [park], [region], National Park Service (NPS), Department of the Interior, in [city and State]. The appellant requested that her position be classified at the GS-15 level. We accepted and decided this appeal under the provisions of section 5112 of title 5, United States Code.

We conducted a desk audit with the appellant on May 13, 2005, and a subsequent interview with the appellant's supervisor, [name], (Deputy Director, [region]). This appeal was decided by considering the audit findings and all information of record furnished by the appellant and her agency, including her official position description [number], and other material submitted in the agency administrative report on December 14, 2004.

## **Position Information**

The appellant is the Superintendent of [park] and is responsible for the management of all ongoing park operations and new program development. This is a large urban park constituting one-fifth the land area of [city], with about 75 miles of boundary and serving over 14 million recreators and commuters per year. The park encompasses the nine miles of [waterway] and its tributaries; the major commuter artery of [road]; seven historic structures; over 321 acres of formally landscaped areas; 19 sites on the National Register, including eight Civil War forts; a large number of monuments and memorials; and specialized concessioner-operated recreational facilities such as a boat marina, horse stables, golf course, the 4000-seat [venue] and 7,500-seat [stadium]. A new park area at the [location] is currently in the planning stages and will be a heavily used recreation area.

The appellant is responsible for all matters relating to the preservation and enhancement of the natural and cultural resources of the park, visitor services, interpretive and recreational programs, maintenance operations, park development and land use, and public relations. She must continually establish and foster working relationships with other Federal, State, and local government entities and with cooperating groups and organizations. These responsibilities are addressed in greater detail in the appellant's position description.

## **Series Determination**

The appellant's position is properly assigned to the Park Ranger Series, GS-025, which covers work involved in the conservation and use of Federal park resources. Neither the appellant nor the agency disagrees.

## **Title Determination**

The authorized title for the position of park general manager who directs personnel, controls the use of funds, materials, and facilities, and performs important public relations activities is Park Manager. Neither the appellant nor the agency disagrees.

## **Grade Determination**

The position was evaluated by application of the criteria contained in the General Schedule Supervisory Guide (GSSG), which is a cross-series guide used to determine the grade level of supervisory positions in the General Schedule. The GSSG has six evaluation factors, each with several factor level definitions and corresponding point values. Positions are evaluated by crediting the points designated for the highest level met under each factor, and converting the total to a grade by using the grade conversion table provided in the guide.

### *Factor 1, Program scope and effect*

The bureau (NPS) credited Level 1-3 under this factor for both elements.

#### *Scope*

This element addresses the complexity and breadth of the program or program segment directed (below the agency level, this is the direct mission-related or line work of the organization); or the work directed, products produced, or services delivered (this pertains to administrative or other support-type functions). The geographic and organizational coverage of the program (or program segment) *within the agency structure* is included under this element.

At Level 1-2, the program segment or work directed is administrative, technical, complex clerical, or comparable in nature. The 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. The illustrations provided in the guide at this level include:

Providing an administrative or support service (e.g., budget, staffing, supply, maintenance, protective, library, or payroll services) to a small military base, a typical national park, or a moderately-sized nondefense agency field office. In this situation, the services provided directly impact other functions throughout the organizations supported and/or a small population of visitors or users.

In a field office providing services to the general public, furnishing a portion of such services, often on a case basis, to a small population of clients. The size of the population serviced by the field office is the equivalent of all citizens or businesses in a portion of a small city.

The first illustration depicts internally focused support work, i.e., where the work supervised constitutes services that are provided to support or facilitate the direct mission-related work of the organization itself. Therefore, the first illustration, although it references a national park as an organizational setting, is not applicable to the appellant's line-management position. The second illustration depicts a program segment, where the work supervised actually constitutes the essential purpose of the agency (i.e., the agency's line work). The appellant directs an organizational unit comparable to an agency field office which carries out a *full range* of the basic line functions of the bureau (i.e., NPS). However, the second illustration is likewise not applicable to her position, since it applies to positions that supervise only a *portion* of the broader services of such an organizational unit.

At Level 1-3, the work directed is technical, administrative, protective, investigative, or professional in nature. Coverage of the work typically 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. The following is an illustration provided in the guide at this level:

In providing services directly to the general public, furnishing a significant portion of the agency's line program to a moderate-sized population of clients. The size of the population serviced is the equivalent of a group of citizens and/or businesses in several rural counties, a small city, or a portion of a larger metropolitan area. The serviced population may be concentrated in one specific geographic area or involve a significant portion of a multistate population.

The scope of the appellant's position matches Level 1-3. First, in terms of the complexity of the work directed, the General Schedule (GS) work directed by the appellant encompasses professional and technical work in addition to the "administrative, technical, or complex clerical" work described at Level 1-2. In terms of the breadth of the program directed, although the position would superficially appear to meet no higher than Level 1-2, the nature of the park unit covered by the work more closely aligns with Level 1-3. Level 1-2 involves "limited geographic coverage" consistent with a "typical agency field office" or "typical national park." The concentration and diversity of cultural and recreational resources within the jurisdiction of [park] and its high usage as a direct result of its centralized urban location present issues and challenges not normally encountered in a more traditional park environment and represent coverage encompassing a "major metropolitan area" as described at Level 1-3. Given that the purpose of the element "scope" as defined in the GSSG is to measure geographic and organizational coverage *as it affects "the general complexity and breadth" of the program directed*, the actual geographic area covered (in terms of acreage or square miles) is not in and of itself a determinant of program scope as that term is intended in the guide. The scope of the appellant's work *within the agency structure* is comparable to the above Level 1-3 illustration, in that the appellant's organizational unit provides a significant portion of the agency's line program to a substantial population of park visitors and users within a specific metropolitan area.

### *Effect*

This element addresses the impact of the work on the mission and programs of the customers, the activity, the agency, other agencies, the general public, or others.

At Level 1-2, the services support and significantly affect installation level, area office level, or field office level operations; 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, the services directly and significantly impact a wide range of agency activities, the work of other agencies, the operations of outside interests, or the general public.

Level 1-2 addresses two different scenarios, i.e., positions involved in the provision of support services internal to an organization (where effect is on installation level, area office level, or field office level operations), and positions involved in the delivery of externally-oriented, line functions within a designated geographic area (where effect is on a moderate, local, or limited population of clients or users). As such, Level 1-2 is clearly exceeded, considering that the “population of clients or users,” in this case the visitors to the park unit, far exceeds the small to moderate local population described at that level.

In terms of Level 1-3, the appellant’s organization does not *directly and significantly* impact a wide range of agency activities or the work of other agencies. It does have this degree of impact, however, on the operations of outside interests and the general public. Considering the proportion of the city’s land area encompassed by the park, including a major commuter artery, the appellant and her organization have direct and significant interaction with the public, elected officials, and constituency groups. Therefore, impact extends beyond the “limited population of clients or users comparable to a major portion of a small city” described at Level 1-2. Basically, the appellant’s position is closely aligned with the Level 1-3 illustration cited earlier in its description of furnishing “a significant portion of the agency’s line program” (in this case, a full spectrum of park services) to a “moderate-sized population of clients” (described as being equivalent to a “portion of a larger metropolitan area”).

The position does not meet Level 1-4 under either element. At that level, the work directed involves the development of major aspects of key agency scientific, medical, legal, administrative, regulatory, policy development, or other highly technical programs. The work impacts the agency’s headquarters operations, several bureauwide programs, or most of its entire field establishment. At the field office level, this would cover major, highly technical operations at the largest, most complex industrial or research and development centers (e.g., “major medical centers which include research programs or other medical programs of national interest and standing”). A large urban park has neither the agencywide scope nor broad geographic or other external impact expected at this level.

Level 1-3 is credited (550 points).

*Factor 2, Organizational setting*

This factor considers the organizational situation of the supervisory position in relation to higher levels of management. The bureau credited Level 2-3 under this factor.

The appellant reports to the Deputy Regional Director (GS-15), a position which is both documented and functions as a full deputy to the Regional Director (SES). Therefore, the appellant's position is credited as reporting directly to the Regional Director.

Level 2-3 is credited (350 points).

*Factor 3, Supervisory and managerial authority exercised*

This factor covers the delegated supervisory and managerial authorities that are exercised on a recurring basis. The bureau credited Level 3-3 under this factor, based on both paragraphs a and b.

Level 3-3a involves exercising delegated managerial authority to set a series of annual, multiyear, or similar types of long-range work plans and schedules for in-service or contracted work; assuring implementation (by lower and subordinate units) of the goals and objectives for the program segment; determining goals and objectives that need additional emphasis; determining the best approach for resolving budget shortages; and planning for long-range staffing needs, including such matters as whether to contract out work. These positions are closely involved with high level program officials (or comparable agency level staff personnel) in the development of overall goals and objectives for the program segment.

As the park superintendent, the appellant has delegated managerial authority to determine long-range work plans and schedules and is fully responsible for ensuring that these work plans are carried out by the park staff. She determines what functional areas need particular emphasis and how to accomplish the work within the limited funding available. She determines the long-range staffing needs to accomplish the work and decides when contracting out is necessary and appropriate. The appellant's position fully meets Level 3-3a.

To meet Level 3-3b, a position must exercise at least eight of the 15 responsibilities listed at that level. Our analysis of those responsibilities is as follows:

Responsibility 1 is credited. It involves using subordinate supervisors, leaders, team chiefs, group coordinators, committee chairs, or comparable personnel to direct, coordinate, or oversee work, or providing similar oversight of contractors. The appellant directs a staff organized into four major functional subdivisions and serves as both a second- and third-level supervisor in relation to various segments of the organization.

Responsibility 2 is credited. It involves exercising significant responsibilities in dealing with officials of other units or organizations, or in advising management officials of higher rank. As a park superintendent, the appellant has a significant coordinative, advisory, and public relations role, both internal and external to the bureau.

Responsibility 3 is credited. It involves assuring reasonable equity (among units, groups, teams, projects, etc.) 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 completed work. The appellant carries out this responsibility in relation to the subordinate supervision in four major functional subdivisions under her direction.

Responsibility 4 is credited. It involves directing a program or major program segment with significant resources (e.g., one at a multimillion dollar level of annual resources). The appellant exercises direct control over the park operating budget of approximately \$7 million.

Responsibilities 5 and 6 are credited. As a second- and third- level supervisor, the appellant makes decisions on work problems presented by subordinate supervisors, evaluating subordinate supervisors, and serving as reviewing official on evaluations of nonsupervisory employees.

Responsibilities 7 and 8 are credited. They involve making or approving selections for nonsupervisory positions, and recommending selections for subordinate supervisory positions. The appellant approves selections made by her subordinate supervisors for nonsupervisory staff and makes final selections for subordinate supervisory positions.

Responsibility 9 is not credited. It involves significant authority to hear and *resolve* group grievances or serious employee complaints. Authority to serve as the deciding official for non-union formal employee grievances is retained by the Regional Director.

Responsibility 10 is credited. It involves reviewing and approving serious disciplinary actions (e.g., suspensions) on nonsupervisory employees. The appellant has delegated authority to decide disciplinary actions, including suspensions of up to 14 days (adverse actions, i.e., suspensions of over 14 days and removals, are decided by the Regional Director).

Responsibility 11 is not credited. It involves making decisions on nonroutine, costly, or controversial training requests for employees of the unit. Authority to approve training is retained by the Regional Director.

Responsibility 12 is credited. It involves determining whether contractor performed work meets standards of adequacy necessary for authorization of payment. The appellant performs this role for planning, design, and construction work contracted by the park.

Responsibility 13 is credited. It involves approving expenses *comparable to* within-grades, extensive overtime, and employee travel. The appellant has approval authority for within-grade increases, career-ladder promotions, and travel.

Responsibility 14 is credited. It involves recommending awards for nonsupervisory personnel and changes in position classification subject to higher-level approval. The appellant has



delegated authority to approve cash awards up to \$1500 and may authorize position classification actions up to the GS-12 level.

Responsibility 15 is not credited. It involves finding and implementing ways to eliminate or reduce significant bottlenecks and barriers to production, promote team building, or improve business practices (e.g., a large production or processing unit). This would apply to large organizations whose missions would be susceptible to the application of such methodological or structural improvements. The work supervised by the appellant does not lend itself to these types of management applications.

Since the position can be credited with 12 of the listed responsibilities, it fully meets Level 3-3b.

The position does not meet Level 3-4. At that level, in addition to the delegated managerial and supervisory authorities included at lower levels of this factor, the position must meet the criteria at either Level 3-4a or 3-4b.

Level 3-4a involves exercising delegated authority to oversee the overall planning, direction, and execution of a program, several program segments, or comparable staff functions, including development, assignment, and higher level clearance of goals and objectives for supervisors or managers of subordinate organizational units or lower organizational levels; approving multiyear and longer range work plans developed by the supervisors or managers of subordinate units and subsequently managing the overall work; overseeing the revision of long range plans, goals, and objectives for the work directed; managing the development of policy changes in response to changes in level of appropriations or other legislated changes; managing organizational changes throughout the organization directed, or major change to the structure and content of the program; and exercising discretionary authority to approve the allocation and distribution of funds in the organization's budget.

This level applies to positions at higher levels in the organizational hierarchy that the appellant, i.e., staff-level program managers responsible for policy development and oversight of agencywide program areas, or managers over several program functions such as at a regional office level. The appellant supervises a field office or program segment (i.e., a park unit within the broader Regional organization). Therefore, she does not have the higher level policy, planning, and budgetary authorities associated with positions at those higher organizational levels.

Level 3-4b involves exercising *final authority* for the *full range* of personnel actions and organization design proposals recommended by subordinate supervisors. This level may be credited even if formal clearance is required for a few actions, such as removals and incentive awards above set dollar levels.

Within the [region], there are significant restrictions placed on the park superintendents' approval authority in regard to disciplinary actions, training, awards, and other selected areas, such as the approval of telework schedules and alternative work schedule plans, and on reorganizations that deviate from the traditional arrangement of park functions. Thus, the

appellant does not have the full and final authority for personnel matters and organization design required at this level.

Level 3-3 is credited (775 points).

*Factor 4, Personal contacts*

This is a two-part factor which assesses the nature and purpose of the 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.

*Subfactor 4A, Nature of contacts*

This subfactor covers the organizational relationships, authority or influence level, setting, and difficulty of preparation associated with the personal contacts. The bureau credited Level 4A-4 under this subfactor.

Level 4A-4 is met, which describes frequent contacts with executive level contracting and other officials of major defense contractors or national officers of employee organizations; regional or national officers of trade associations, public action groups, or professional organizations of national stature; key staff of congressional committees and principal assistants to senators and representatives; *elected or appointed representatives of State and local governments*; journalists of major metropolitan or national newspapers; or SES or Executive Level heads of bureaus and higher level organizations in other Federal agencies. The appellant has frequent contacts with the elected officials of [city], including the mayor and city council members, and with the [district] Congressional representative.

Level 4A-4 is credited (100 points).

*Subfactor 4B, Purpose of contacts*

This subfactor covers the purpose of the personal contacts credited under subfactor 4A, including the advisory, representational, negotiating, and commitment making responsibilities. The bureau credited Level 4B-4 under this subfactor.

The purpose of the appellant's contacts is consistent with Level 4B-3, where the purpose of the contacts is to justify, defend, or negotiate in representing the program segment or unit directed, in obtaining or committing resources, *and* in gaining compliance with policies, regulations, or contracts. These contacts usually involve active participation in conferences, meetings, and hearings involving problems or issues of considerable consequence or importance to the program managed. The appellant's contacts with city council members, the mayor's office, and Congressional representatives are for the purposes of explaining and justifying park activities or decisions, committing park resources to accomplish requested work, and ensuring the fulfillment of joint park/local undertakings.

The position does not meet Level 4B-4, where the purpose is to influence, motivate, or persuade persons or groups to accept opinions or take actions related to advancing the fundamental goals and objectives of the program or segments directed, or involving the commitment or distribution of major resources, when intense opposition or resistance is encountered due to significant organizational or philosophical conflict, competing objectives, major resource limitations or reductions, or comparable issues. If this level of controversy were to arise regarding activities or issues of this magnitude, at the level of contacts credited under Level 4A-4, it would engender significant involvement by staff at higher levels in the organization, such as the [regional] or national offices.

Level 4B-3 is credited (100 points).

*Factor 5, Difficulty of typical work directed*

This factor measures the difficulty and complexity of the basic work most typical of the organization directed, as well as other line, staff, or contracted work for which the supervisor has technical or oversight responsibility. The Guide provides separate instructions under this factor for evaluating first level supervisory positions and second (and higher) level supervisory positions. For first level supervisors, the base level of work supervised is derived by determining the highest grade of (mission-oriented) nonsupervisory work performed that constitutes 25 percent or more of the workload of the organization, excluding the work of lower-level positions that primarily support or facilitate the basic work of the unit. The Guide instructs that this method is normally appropriate for second (and higher level ) supervisors, but also provides an alternative method for those cases where there is a heavy supervisory or managerial workload related to work above the base level that was derived by using the first method. In such cases, the base level of work may be derived by determining the highest grade of nonsupervisory work directed which requires at least 50 percent of the supervisor's duty time. 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 results.

The bureau credited Level 5-6 under this factor, identifying GS-11 as the base level work of the park.

The appellant supervises a staff of approximately 65 permanent positions organized into four major divisions for maintenance, administration, interpretation, and resource management/visitor services. These positions range in grade from GS-13 to WG-3. After discounting the subordinate supervisory work and lower-graded support work, including secretarial and clerical support positions, laborers, and motor vehicle operators, the nonsupervisory work directed can be distilled down to approximately 44 staff years of work that is directly related to the primary functional responsibilities of the park. These staff years of nonsupervisory work directed are as follows:

<u>Staff Years</u>	<u>Corresponding Positions</u>
1	Landscape Architect, GS-807-13
1	Safety and Occupational Health Manager, GS-018-12
1	Historian, GS-170-12
1	Purchasing Agent, GS-1105-11
1	Education Specialist, GS-1710-11
1	Environmental Protection Specialist, GS-028-11
2	Facility Management Specialists, GS-1640-11
1	Budget Analyst, GS-560-9
2	Human Resource Specialists, GS-201-9
1	Supply Technician, GS-2005-7
5	Park Rangers, GS-025-9
4	Resource Management Specialists, GS-401-9
1	Mason, WG-3603-10
1	Automotive Worker, WG-5803-10
1	Carpenter, WG-4607-9
1	Maintenance Mechanic, WG-4749-9
1	Gardener, WG-5003-8
1	Asphalt Worker, WG-3653-7
2	Engineering Equipment Operators, WG-5616-10
4	Tree Workers, WG-5042-9
2	Maintenance Workers, WG-4749-7
3	Maintenance Worker, WG-4749-6
1	Maintenance Worker, WG-4749-5
3	Gardeners, WG-5003-6
1	Tractor Operator, WG-5705-6
1	Tractor Operator, WG-5705-7

The appellant also supervises several subordinate supervisors who perform varying degrees of nonsupervisory work, as listed below:

1	Facility Manager, GS-1640-13
1	Administrative Officer, GS-341-12
1	Supervisory Park Ranger, GS-025-12
1	Supervisory Horticulturist, GS-437-12
1	Supervisory Theater Specialist, GS-1054-11
1	Supervisory Park Ranger, GS-025-11
1	Assistant Facility Manager, GS-1640-11

The GS-13 Facility Manager performs maintenance planning and contract oversight work supportive of that position's grade level. The GS-12 Supervisory Park Ranger performs a portion of the GS-11 nonsupervisory work of the unit. The GS-12 Supervisory Horticulturist supervises a Federal Wage System (FWS) staff and performs professional work supportive of the GS-12 grade level. The GS-11 Supervisory Theatre Specialist supervises only a seasonal staff of primarily lower-graded positions such as ushers and cashiers. If these positions are

assumed to be performing nonsupervisory work for about 75 percent of their time (with the remaining 25 percent being the minimum time required for a position to be considered supervisory under the GSSG), this adds an additional 3 staff years of nonsupervisory work at GS-11 or above. The remaining supervisory positions would contribute smaller percentages of nonsupervisory work which would have a negligible impact on the overall grade distribution.

Given a total of approximately 47 staff years of creditable nonsupervisory work in the unit, the grade identified as the base level would have to constitute approximately 11-12 staff years to meet the 25 percent requirement. Based on the above positions, there are approximately 11 staff years of nonsupervisory work at GS-11 and above in the division. (Based on established OPM guidance, none of the FWS work would exceed that performed at the GS-7/9 level.) The appellant's position thereby just meets the 25 percent threshold for crediting GS-11 as the base level of work supervised. This is acceptable given that the park has many more authorized than filled positions due to budgetary constraints, including several vacant/proposed GS-11 and GS-12 positions, and the grade distribution can therefore be expected to fluctuate somewhat as funding becomes available.

There are only three nonsupervisory positions above this GS-11 base level in the unit. Even considering nonsupervisory work above that level that may be performed by the GS-12 and GS-13 supervisors, there are only a few staff years of GS-12 or above work in the unit out of a total staff of 65 employees. Thus, there is insufficient work above the base level to require at least 50 percent or more of the appellant's duty time. Based on established OPM guidance, the workload in the appellant's organization is too small to warrant consideration of the second method of base level evaluation. Thus, the GS-11 base level is correct.

Level 5-6 is credited (800 points).

#### *Factor 6, Other Conditions*

This factor measures the extent to which various conditions contribute to the difficulty and complexity of carrying out supervisory duties, authorities, and responsibilities. The *difficulty* of work is measured primarily by the grade level of work credited under Factor 5. *Complexity* is measured by the level of coordination required.

The bureau credited Level 6-4 under this factor, corresponding to the GS-11 base level assignment under factor 5.

At Level 6-4, supervision requires substantial coordination and integration of a number of major work projects or program segments of professional, scientific, technical, or administrative work comparable in difficulty to the GS-11 level. Such coordination may involve, for example, integrating internal and external program issues affecting the immediate organization; integrating the work of a team or group and/or ensuring compatibility and consistency of policy interpretation and application; and recommending resources to devote to particular projects or to allocate among program segments. Alternatively, Level 6-4 may also

involve directing subordinate supervisors who each direct substantial workloads comparable to the GS-9 level.

The difficulty and complexity of the work supervised by the appellant both meet Level 6-4, in that GS-11 represents the base level of the work and she is responsible for integrating the internal and external aspects of park activities; integrating the work of subordinates involved in the accomplishment of park objectives; and recommending resource allocation among the various functional areas. In addition, her subordinate supervisors direct workloads primarily at the GS-9 level.

The position does not meet Level 6-5. At that level, supervision requires significant and extensive coordination and integration of a number of important projects or program segments of professional, scientific, technical, managerial, or administrative work comparable in difficulty to the GS-12 level, or directing subordinate supervisors who each direct substantial workloads comparable to the GS-11 level. The difficulty of the work supervised by the appellant is primarily characterized by the GS-11 base level, and none of her subordinate supervisors direct a significant workload above the GS-9 level.

Level 6-4 is credited (1120 points).

#### *Summary*

	<u>Factors</u>	<u>Level</u>	<u>Points</u>
1.	<i>Program scope and effect</i>	1-3	550
2.	<i>Organizational setting</i>	2-3	350
3.	<i>Supervisory/Managerial authority</i>	3-3	775
4.	<i>Personal contacts</i>		
	<i>Nature of contacts</i>	4A-4	100
	<i>Purpose of contacts</i>	4B-3	100
5.	<i>Difficulty of work directed</i>	5-6	800
6.	<i>Other conditions</i>	6-4	<u>1120</u>
	Total points		3795

The total of 3795 points falls within the GS-14 range (3605-4050) on the grade conversion table provided in the GSSG.

#### **Decision**

The appealed position is properly classified as Park Manager, GS-025-14.