

U.S. Office of Personnel Management
Division for Human Capital Leadership & Merit System Accountability
Classification Appeals Program

Atlanta Field Services Group
75 Spring Street, SW., Suite 1018
Atlanta, GA 30303-3109

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

Appellant: [appellant's name]

Agency classification: Equipment Specialist
GS-1670-9

Organization: Production Group
Naval Air Station [location]
Project Execution Division
Public Works Center [location]
U.S. Department of the Navy
[location]

OPM decision: Equipment Specialist
GS-1670-9

OPM decision number: C-1670-09-01

Virginia L. Magnuson
Classification Appeals Officer

April 2, 2003
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].
[appellant's address]
[location]

[representative's name]
[representative's title]
[union identification]
[address]
[location]

Personnel Director
Human Resources Division
U.S. Department of the Navy
[address]
Naval Air Station
[location]

Director
Human Resources Service Center, [location]
U.S. Department of the Navy
[address]
[location]

Office of Civilian Human Resources (OCHR)
U.S. Department of the Navy
Nebraska Avenue, Complex
321 Somer Court, NW., Suite 40101
Washington, DC 20393-5451

Office of Civilian Human Resources (OCHR)
U.S. Department of the Navy
Nebraska Avenue, Complex
321 Somer Court, NW., Suite 40101
Washington, DC 20393-5451

Chief, Classification Appeals
Adjudication Section
Department of Defense
Civilian Personnel Management Service
1400 Key Boulevard, Suite B-200
Arlington, VA 22209-5144

Introduction

On August 8, 2002, the Atlanta Oversight Division, now the Atlanta Field Services Group, U.S. Office of Personnel Management (OPM), accepted an appeal from [appellant]. His position is currently classified as Equipment Specialist, GS-1670-9. The appellant requests that his position be reclassified as Equipment Specialist, GS-1670-11 or 12 because of the specialized training, knowledge, and skills required to perform the duties of his position and the degree to which he works without technical supervision. His position is located in the Production Group, Naval Air Station [location], Project Execution Division, Public Works Center (PWC), [location], U.S. Department of the Navy, [location]. We received a complete administrative report on January 6, 2003. The appeal has been accepted and processed under section 5112(b) of title 5, United States Code (U.S.C.).

Background information

In October 2001, the appellant submitted an appeal to his agency requesting that his position, then classified as Contract Surveillance Representative, GS-1101-9, be reclassified as Equipment Specialist, GS-1670-11/12. On May 22, 2002, his agency issued a decision reclassifying the position to Equipment Specialist, GS-1670-9. The appellant subsequently appealed to OPM.

In reaching our classification decision, we have carefully reviewed all information furnished by the appellant and the agency, including information obtained from telephone interviews with the appellant and his immediate supervisor. Information was also obtained from the Department of the Navy's Naval Facilities Engineering Service Center (NFESC) Elevator Program Manager, located in [location]. The program manager has overall responsibility for managing the Vertical Transportation Equipment (VTE) program for the Naval Facilities Engineering Command (NAVFAC). NFESC is the Navy's center for specialized facilities engineering and technology and is responsible for providing the technology and capability to plan, design, construct, maintain, and protect naval shore facilities. Additionally, we fully considered information provided by the appellant at our request on the types of VTE he had inspected, tested, and certified for the past year.

General issues

The appellant believes that the agency did not properly evaluate his work. In adjudicating his 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). This decision is based on the work currently assigned to and performed by the appellant and sets aside any previous agency decision. Therefore, the classification practices used by the appellant's agency in classifying his position are not germane to the classification appeal process.

Position information

The appellant is assigned to position description number [#]. The appellant and his third level supervisor certified the accuracy of the position description. It contains more information about how the position functions and we incorporate it by reference into this decision.

The PWC [location] is responsible for providing public works, public utilities, public housing management, transportation support, engineering services, shore facilities planning, and all other logistical support required by operating forces and other activities served by the PWC. The appellant spends 25 percent of his time engaged in a variety of activities involving the surveillance of facilities' services and construction contracts at installations within the jurisdiction of NAVFAC [location]. He performs pre-bid quality assurance tasks and inspections and certain contract administration functions.

The appellant spends 55 percent of his time engaged in activities related to the administration and management of the VTE program. This program includes the inspection, testing, and certification of work performed by contractors for new and existing VTE systems and subsystems and related fire protection systems. The appellant is the PWC point of contact for all matters relating to VTE. He determines the reliability of contractor maintenance procedures, approves the use of standard and interchangeable VTE parts, and verifies the speed and operational safety of VTE, life cycles, and compatibility of associated equipment. He provides technical input to procurement packages to ensure compliance with standards. The appellant is responsible for establishing and maintaining all required records, reports, certifications, testing data, and inventory for all VTE at all locations serviced by the PWC. He reviews technical and industrial requirements for the repair, refurbishment and modification of VTE and certifies that all required VTE tests have been performed and passed in accordance with applicable codes, standards, policies, and regulations.

The appellant reviews contractor certifications prior to any maintenance, testing, or renovation of VTE fire protection systems. The appellant monitors and inspects contractor-performed work to ensure compliance with all applicable codes, standards, policies and regulations at all locations serviced by the PWC. He reviews post-design specifications for VTE fire protection equipment to ensure compliance with applicable codes and regulations. He also reviews technical requirements for repair, refurbishment and modification of fire protection systems and witnesses or performs required acceptance tests of all installed, adjusted, or modified hardware, wiring, software, and other associated devices to certify proper operation.

The appellant receives administrative supervision from the Supervisory Contract Surveillance Representative. The appellant is responsible for independently planning and carrying out his VTE related duties and determining the scope and level of required activities based on applicable codes, policies and regulations. The supervisor is kept apprised of the status of work in progress and any potentially controversial issues that arise.

Series, title and standard determination

The agency classified the appellant's position in the Equipment Specialist Series, GS-1670, and titled it Equipment Specialist. The appellant does not contest the agency's series or title determination for his position. We concur with the agency's series and title determination. The published position classification standard for the GS-1670 series must be used for grade level determination in evaluating the appellant's position.

Grade determination

The GS-1670 standard is in the Factor Evaluation System Format (FES). Under the FES, positions are evaluated by comparing the duties, responsibilities, and qualifications required with nine factors common to non-supervisory General Schedule positions. A point value is assigned to each factor in accordance with the factor-level descriptions. For each factor, the full intent of the level must be met to credit the points for that level. The total points assigned for the nine factors are converted to a grade by reference to the grade conversion table in the standard. Our analysis of the appealed work follows.

Factor 1, Knowledge required by the position

This factor measures the nature and extent of information or facts a worker must understand in order to do acceptable work and the nature and extent of skills needed to apply this knowledge.

At Level 1-6, the work requires knowledge of equipment and of the established methods, procedures, and techniques of an administrative program, including applicable underlying principles and theoretical and practical limitations, and skill to independently perform projects that include limiting features. These include the following: the objectives are specific and well defined and problems can be solved by varying slightly from established methods, procedures, and precedents; the problem is straightforward and has been singled out of a larger investigation or project; unknown factors and relationships are mostly factual in nature; and the mechanisms involved are fairly well understood.

Level 1-6 is met. Similar to this level, the appellant's work objectives are specific and well defined. The objectives of his work are to ensure that VTE and the related fire protection systems are functioning reliably and in a manner that does not present hazards to users and that the work performed by contractors conforms to the specifications outlined in the contract and meets all applicable codes and regulations. Problems are straightforward and are usually identified and isolated during the inspections that he conducts or when he witnesses testing procedures conducted by contractors. The appellant also identifies problems through review of maintenance records to assess the adequacy of the work performed and compliance with applicable codes and regulations. He cited an instance where equipment was installed without conforming to an applicable seismic code of which the contractor was not aware. The appellant withheld approval and certification of the work until all code requirements were met. The problems he encounters are generally resolved by adapting or varying from established methods, procedures, and precedents. Program issues that cannot be resolved by

adaptation or variation from established methods are referred to the program manager. The appellant has a thorough knowledge of maintenance, operations, and safety related to VTE and fire protection systems and subsystems based on his training, experience, and required periodic recertification. This level of knowledge is used in providing technical information to contractors regarding specifications and requirements that must be met during evaluations of equipment for modifications or upgrades, and developing and discussing statements of work to be performed with customers and officials at locations serviced by the PWC.

At Level 1-7, the work requires knowledge of a wide range of concepts, principles, and practices in the occupation, or those concepts and principles characterized as requiring extended specialized training and experience. It requires skill in applying this knowledge to difficult and complex assignments, such as planning and conducting work that requires significant judgment in evaluating, selecting, and adapting precedents and modifying procedures and criteria. Illustrations of work at this level include technical management of complex subsystem(s) of Automatic Test Equipment (ATE) for a worldwide military organization; technical equipment advice, recommendations, and decisions for a nationwide agency with extensive locations or a worldwide organization; and defining test sequence and pass/fail parameters used in computer programs built into new automatic testing equipment.

Level 1-7 is not met. The work performed by the appellant does not require knowledge of the range of concepts, principles, and practices or the extended specialized training and experience typical of this level. The appellant is required to have a thorough knowledge of the various types and classes of VTE found at installations falling under NAVFAC's [location]. The equipment with which he works does not involve difficult or complex assignments requiring significant judgment in adapting precedents and modifying procedures and criteria. The program manager position is responsible for dealing with any issues of this nature.

Level 1-6 is credited for 950 points.

Factor 2, Supervisory controls

This factor considers the nature and extent of direct or indirect controls exercised by the supervisor, the employee's responsibility, and the review of completed work.

At Level 2-3, the supervisor makes assignments in terms of complete projects or portions of larger projects and provides overall objectives, priorities, deadlines, any necessary background, and suggestions on potential difficulties. The supervisor gives general instructions on new policies, regulations, and procedures, and assists the specialist with controversial or especially difficult situations or those that lack clear precedents. The equipment specialist plans and carries out the successive steps. The employee exercises initiative in obtaining and analyzing data and identifying, resolving, or alerting the supervisor to potential problems. The specialist handles problems and deviations in the assignment in accordance with instructions, policies, previous training, or accepted practices. Completed work is reviewed for technical adequacy, conformance with objectives, and compatibility

with other work. The supervisor reviews work in process and upon completion when it leads to recommendations affecting policy, such as requiring changes in maintenance procedures.

Level 2-3 is exceeded. The appellant receives administrative supervision from the Supervisory Contract Surveillance Representative who certifies timesheets, authorizes leave, appraises performance, and initiates travel authorizations. The appellant keeps the supervisor apprised of the status of work in progress and controversial issues through periodic briefings. The appellant's supervisor stated that he has a minimal role in scheduling the appellant's assignments and cannot provide technical supervision or review of the work as he has no knowledge of the appellant's field and is not VTE trained or certified. The supervisor also stated that, as a rule, he only becomes involved with the appellant's work when there is a lack of cooperation from another organization at the installation, intervention with another supervisor is required, or an issue needs to be elevated to the head of his department. Completed work products, in the form of a variety of reports prepared by the appellant, are accepted as technically sound and accurate.

At Level 2-4, the supervisor assigns continuing areas of responsibility and sets the overall objectives and resources available. Except for externally imposed deadlines such as those in contracts, the specialist and supervisor, in consultation, develop the deadlines, projects, and work to be done. The equipment specialist plans and carries out the work, resolves most of the conflicts that arise, coordinates the work with others, and interprets policy on own initiative in terms of established objectives. The employee keeps the supervisor informed of progress and potentially controversial matters. The supervisor reviews completed work only from an overall standpoint in terms of feasibility, compatibility with other work or effectiveness in meeting requirements or expected results.

Although the appellant works with greater freedom from supervision than is typical of Level 2-3, the full intent of Level 2-4 is not met. Responsibility for the acceptability and applicability of technical matters, and final review authority for payment of invoices lies with the Contracting Officer's Technical Representative (COTR) for the activities and/or installations where the appellant carries out VTE assignments. Level 2-4 typically involves projects or studies requiring a significant degree of flexibility in planning actions and establishing timeframes. In contrast, the appellant's assignments primarily relate to the inspection, testing, and certification of contractor work rather than the accomplishment of projects or studies. The problems encountered at this level are also generally of such complexity or scope that frequent deviation from established procedures is required. Issues of this nature are the responsibility of the program manager.

Level 2-3 is credited for 275 points.

Factor 3, Guidelines

This factor covers the nature of the guidelines used and the judgment needed to apply them.

At Level 3-3, the equipment specialist uses a variety of standard, detailed guidelines and references, such as agency instructions, policies and regulations, technical publications,

manufacturers' catalogs and handbooks, and supply databases. These are not completely applicable to the work or have gaps in specificity. The specialist uses judgment to interpret and adapt the guides for application to specific problems, to analyze results, and to recommend changes.

Level 3-3 is met. Guidelines available to the appellant include inspection standards; Department of Navy and NAVFAC instructions, policies and regulations; state/local codes and regulations; technical manuals; and national standards (National Electrical Code, National Fire Protection Association, American National Standards Institute, American Society of Mechanical Engineers, etc.) as well as international standards. Additional guidance is contained in manufacturers' manuals, engineering plans, drawings, specifications, etc. Although the guidelines and standards are fairly detailed, they do not specifically address every situation that the appellant encounters during the course of carrying out his assignments. Based on his knowledge of the VTE systems/subsystems, his training, experience, and analyses of inspection and testing results, the appellant uses judgment in adapting the guidelines to develop technical solutions or recommend design and construction modifications that comply with code and regulatory requirements. If his determination is that code requirements cannot be met, the installation where the VTE is located must request a variance from the program manager.

At Level 3-4, the equipment specialist uses a wide range of technical material such as manuals, bulletins, textbooks, and manufacturers' catalogs. In addition, the specialist uses guidelines such as agency regulations and policy statements whose contents are frequently quite broad and general in nature. These provide only general guidance as to the most productive approach or methods to solve the most highly complex or unusual problems in the work. The specialist uses initiative and resourcefulness to deviate from or extend traditional methods or to research trends in order to develop new criteria or new policy proposals.

Level 3-4 is not met. The appeal record shows that the appellant does not regularly encounter highly complex or unusual problems that require him to routinely deviate from or extend traditional methods or develop new criteria or propose new policies. The appellant provides input to the program manager on problems or situations he encounters which may need to be addressed through changes in regulations. The program manager prepares NAVFAC criteria and is responsible for developing new criteria and policy proposals such as are creditable at Level 3-4.

Level 3-3 is credited for 275 points.

Factor 4, Complexity

This factor covers the nature, number, variety, and intricacy of tasks, steps, processes, or methods in the work performed; the difficulty in identifying what needs to be done; and the difficulty and originality involved in performing work.

At Level 4-3, the equipment specialist performs assignments consisting of various tasks or duties involving different and unrelated processes and methods. For example, some

equipment specialists work with all categories of equipment within a specialization such as maintenance, and perform all phases of such assignments. They may collect and evaluate all information submitted by operating organizations related to one type of malfunction in, e.g., a subassembly, and recommend changes such as the substitution of a weld for a connecting pin to correct these malfunctions. Occasionally, they work with components such as transmissions and hydraulic pumps to perform relatively uncomplicated tasks, e.g., identifying and describing these items for reference purposes, or recommending their repair or disposal based primarily on visual examination of their characteristics and conditions. The decision regarding what needs to be done depends upon the analysis of the subject, phase, or issues involved in each assignment and the chosen course of action may have to be selected from many alternatives. The work involves conditions and elements that must be identified and analyzed to discern interrelationships.

Level 4-3 is met. Information provided by the appellant shows that that he had inspected approximately 200 hydraulic and electric passenger and freight elevators of various classes, inspected approximately 100 automobile lifts of various types, and conducted more than 20 design reviews of VTE. The appellant also stated that his workload for the previous year basically consisted of the same number of inspections and reviews and the same classes and types of VTE. This indicates that the equipment that he worked with on a regular and recurring basis during the past two years consisted of elevators and automobile lifts. Typical of Level 4-3, these duties require the appellant to perform a variety of different and unrelated tasks requiring analysis and selection of a course of action from many alternatives. His work includes certifying contractors' work on new and existing VTE systems/subsystems and fire protection systems. He is responsible for establishing and maintaining all required records, reports, certifications, testing data, and inventory related to VTE for all installations serviced by the PWC. He determines the effectiveness and reliability of maintenance work, approves the use of standard and interchangeable parts, and verifies the speed and operational safety of VTE. The appellant reviews technical and industrial requirements for the repair, refurbishment and modification of VTE and certifies that all required tests have been performed and passed as required by codes, standards, policies, and regulations. He reviews design specifications of VTE fire protection systems to ensure conformance with applicable codes and regulations. The appellant also reviews technical requirements related to the repair, refurbishment, modification of fire protection systems and witnesses or performs required acceptance tests of all hardware, wiring, software, and devices related to these systems.

At Level 4-4, the equipment specialist performs assignments requiring application of many different and unrelated processes and methods such as those relating to well-established aspects of broad equipment stages, e.g., preproduction and production, or usage and disposal. This category also includes responsibilities for broad categories of equipment. For example, some equipment specialists have continuing responsibility for providing technical support during the usage stage for assigned categories of equipment. They investigate representative material deficiency reports and take broad corrective action. They recommend new designs; evaluate the specifications; examine the mockups and prototypes; provide the contractor, procurement, and supply specialists with technical descriptive and performance data; develop maintenance policies and procedures; and recommend disposal of the items replaced. Still

other equipment specialists make extended visits to field installations or organizations maintaining or using their assigned categories of equipment to provide several different kinds of services in each visit, such as: evaluate those aspects of maintenance shop management and operations that require equipment knowledge; solve operational, maintenance, or repair problems; recommend the redesign of faulty equipment and tools or the substitution of materials; and conduct training courses in the use, repair, and maintenance of equipment.

Level 4-4 is not met. The appellant does not perform assignments requiring the application of many different and unrelated processes and methods relating to well-established aspects of a broad equipment stage such as preproduction and production, or usage and disposal. The range of methods, processes, and approaches that the appellant uses in carrying out his assignments is more limited as previously discussed and are not comparable to the broad range of unrelated processes and methods envisioned at Level 4-4.

Level 4-3 is credited for 150 points.

Factor 5, Scope and effect

This factor covers the relationship between the nature of the work and the effect of work products or services within and outside the organization.

At Level 5-3, the purpose of the work is to treat a variety of conventional problems, questions, or situations in conformance with established criteria. For example, the equipment specialist identifies needed areas of emphasis and develops and presents training to activities in a wide variety of motor vehicle service operations for a variety of types of motor vehicles; or investigates common types of equipment performance or maintenance problems, identifies the causes, and develops and recommends solutions. The work product or service affects the design or operation of systems, programs, or equipment, the adequacy of testing operations, or the physical well being of persons. In some work situations, the service affects the capability of employees to perform their mission.

Level 5-3 is met. The principal purpose of the appellant's position is managing and administering the program for inspecting, testing, and certifying that new or existing VTE systems and subsystems meet applicable operational and safety codes and perform in a manner that meets the needs of users. His work is primarily concerned with detecting and resolving a variety of conventional issues and problems common to VTE systems and subsystems. These problems typically result from deficiencies in equipment design, installation, repair, testing, and maintenance procedures. The appellant communicates his assessments of the adequacy of VTE work performed by contractors at PWC-serviced installations through the chain of command to the program manager. As at Level 5-3, the appellant detects and resolves a variety of conventional problems involving VTE installation, repair, modification, and maintenance that affect the safe and reliable operation of this equipment. The problems or situations encountered are specific to VTE and are generally detected and resolved through following established design review, inspection, and operational testing criteria and procedures. As at Level 5-3, his work affects design of VTE

systems and equipment, the adequacy of maintenance and testing operations, operational reliability and safety, and the physical well-being of VTE users.

At Level 5-4, the purpose of the work is to establish criteria, formulate projects, assess program effectiveness, or investigate or analyze a variety of unusual conditions or problems. For example, the equipment specialist speaks for the agency on technical panels and committees that develop general plans and procedures for the introduction of a new weapon system into the agency's logistical support program; or makes design or provisioning decisions that materially affect the readiness or capability of a total aircraft, weapon, or vehicle system that is distributed worldwide. The work product or service affects the work of other experts in this or related occupations, or the development or accomplishment of major aspects of a weapon systems program or agency mission.

Level 5-4 is not met. The appellant's responsibilities do not routinely involve the formulation of projects, assessment of program effectiveness, or investigation or analysis of unusual conditions. The program manager prepares criteria and develops and maintains master guide specifications for the VTE program. The responsibility for project formulation and overall assessment of the effectiveness of the VTE program also lies with this individual. The appellant's work does not affect experts in the appellant's field or those in related fields. Instead, his work affects VTE users at the installations where the equipment is located.

Level 5-3 is credited for 150 points.

Factor 6, Personal contacts and Factor 7, Purpose of contacts

These factors include face-to-face contacts and telephone dialogues with persons not in the supervisory chain, and the reasons for making those contacts.

Personal contacts

At Level 3, the highest level described for this factor, contacts are with civilian or military individuals or groups from outside the employing agency such as supply, procurement, logistics, budget, machine shop, equipment specialist, or engineering personnel employed by contractors, other agencies, or foreign governments. This level also includes contacts with program officials within the employing agency but several managerial levels removed from the employee when such contacts occur on a non-routine basis.

The appellant's personal contacts meet but do not exceed Level 3. His regular and recurring contacts are with maintenance contractors and their employees, representatives of VTE manufacturers and suppliers, employees in his own and other organizational levels at the PWC, officials at NAVFAC, supported commands and installations, and the Department of the Navy.

Level 3 is met.

Purpose of contacts

At Level b, the purpose of contacts is to persuade individuals or groups with different opinions or interests, e.g., to change criteria or methods, accept findings, or gain information such as during on-site appraisals or inspections.

Level b is met. The appellant establishes contacts to secure and exchange information regarding deficiencies or problems and methods of correcting or resolving problems. He explains contractual requirements, reviews design and technical requirements and specifications, etc. He also has technical contacts to inspect and witness contractor testing, determine the adequacy of maintenance work in ensuring the safe and reliable operation of VTE, and ensure that the installation or modification of VTE meets applicable codes and standards, etc. These contacts require the appellant to persuade contractors, technical personnel, installation officials, and other parties to accept his inspection findings and recommendations to comply with code requirements or NAVFAC regulations. He must also use skill and tact in developing and maintaining good working relationships with contractors and customers.

At Level c, the purpose of contacts is to negotiate, justify, or resolve significant or controversial matters, such as those that substantially influence the ability to maintain, repair, or deliver equipment of a major acquisition program. Equipment specialists at this level lead special study projects or interagency working groups to achieve a common understanding of the causes of complex problems in the ability to maintain, repair, or deliver equipment, and to develop solutions or suitable alternatives.

Level c is not met. The record shows that the appellant does not have regular and recurring involvement in activities related to the resolution of significant or controversial issues or leading special study projects to resolve complex problems, such those significantly affecting the ability to maintain, repair, or deliver equipment of a major acquisition program. Problems of this magnitude are the responsibility of the program manager.

Level b is met.

Factors 6 and 7 meet Level 3b for 110 points.

Factor 8, Physical demands

This factor covers the requirements and physical demands placed on the employee by the work assignments. This includes physical characteristics and abilities and the physical exertion involved in the work.

At Level 8-2, the work requires physical exertion such as long periods of standing; recurring activities such as bending, crouching, stooping, stretching, or reaching; or recurring lifting of moderately heavy objects such as boxes of project files.

Level 8-2 is met. The appellant's duties routinely involve extended periods of standing and walking and recurring bending, crouching, stooping, kneeling, ladder climbing and stretching.

At Level 8-3, the work requires considerable strenuous physical exertion such as frequent climbing of tall ladders, lifting of objects over 50 pounds, or crouching or crawling in limited space.

Level 8-3 is not met. Although the appellant's work requires a moderate degree of physical exertion, the nature of his work does not require the considerable exertion involved in the frequent climbing, lifting, or crawling typical of the this level.

Level 8-2 is credited for 20 points.

Factor 9, Work environment

This factor considers the risks and discomforts in the employee's physical surroundings and the safety regulations required.

The position meets but does not exceed Level 9-2 which is the highest described for this factor. At this level, the work involves regular and recurring exposure to moderate risks and discomforts associated with production areas, such as working near operating machinery, moving vehicles, and cranes; working in dry docks, on and around scaffolding, close to high noise levels from engine test facilities, and near a variety of types of electrical hazards. The work situation requires the employee to be continually alert and to take special safety precautions, including wearing special protective items of clothing. As at this level, the appellant's duties involve regular and recurring visits to construction and maintenance areas. The work involves exposure to operating machinery, high voltage equipment, heights, etc., requiring the use of items such as protective clothing, safety glasses and shoes, hearing protection, and a hard hat.

Level 9-2 is credited for 20 points.

Summary

<i>Factor</i>	<i>Level</i>	<i>Points</i>
1. Knowledge required by the position	1-6	950
2. Supervisory controls	2-3	275
3. Guidelines	3-3	275
4. Complexity	4-3	150
5. Scope and effect	5-3	150
6. and 7. Personal contacts and Purpose of contacts	3b	110
8. Physical demands	8-2	20
9. Work environment	9-2	20

Total 1,950

A total of 1,950 points falls within the GS-9 point range of 1,855 to 2,100 in the GS-1670 standard.

Decision

The appellant's position is properly classified as Equipment Specialist, GS-1670-9.