

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

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

Job Grading Appeal Decision
Under section 5346 of title 5, United States Code

Appellant: [appellant's name]

Agency classification: Utilities and Building Maintenance
Supervisor
WS-4701-10

Organization: General Maintenance Branch
Plant Engineering Division
Office of Production
U.S. Mint
Department of the Treasury
[location]

OPM decision: Utility Systems Repairer-Operator
Supervisor
WS-4742-10

OPM decision number: C-4742-10-01

/s/ Robert D. Hendler

Robert D. Hendler
Classification Appeals Officer

February 11, 2003

Date

As provided in section S7-8 of the *Operating Manual: Federal Wage System* (FWS), this decision constitutes a certificate that is mandatory and binding on all administrative, certifying, payroll, disbursing, and accounting officials of the government. There is no right of further appeal. This decision is subject to discretionary review only under the conditions and time limits specified in section 532.705(f) of title 5, Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) (address provided in the *Introduction to the Position Classification Standards*, appendix 4, section H).

Since this decision changes the classification of the appealed job, it is to be effective no later than the beginning of the first pay period that begins after the 60th day from the date the appellant filed an appeal with the agency (5 CFR 532.705(d)). The servicing personnel office must submit a compliance report containing the corrected position description (PD) and a Standard Form 50 showing the personnel action taken. The report must be submitted within 30 days from the date of this decision.

Decision sent to:

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

Acting Human Resources Officer
Human Resources Division
Department of the Treasury
U.S. Mint
[address]
[location]

Director of Human Resources
Department of the Treasury
U.S. Mint
801 9th Street, NW.
Washington, DC 20220

Director, Office of Personnel Policy
Department of the Treasury
1500 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW.
Attn.: Metropolitan Square
Room 6075
Washington, DC 20220

Introduction

On September 26, 2002, the Philadelphia Oversight Division of the U.S. Office of Personnel Management (OPM) accepted a job grading appeal from [appellant's name]. His job is currently graded as Utilities and Building Maintenance Supervisor, WS-4701-10. He believes that his job should be a higher grade. We received the complete appeal administrative report on November 21, 2002. The appellant works in the General Maintenance Branch, Plant Engineering Division, Office of Production, U.S. Mint, Department of the Treasury, [location]. We accepted and decided this appeal under section 5346 of title 5, United States Code (U.S.C.).

General issues

The appellant states in his appeal letter that he disagrees with his agency's application of the Job Grading Standard (JGS) for Supervisors in its appeal decision that he received on September 12, 2002. He says that he agrees with the agency's grading of Factors II and III. However, other information in the letter shows that the appellant also disagrees with the agency's evaluation of Factor III, Subfactors A and B. The appellant states that his job should be upgraded either by crediting his job with Situation #3 under Factor I or crediting a one-grade upward adjustment under the Grade Level Adjustment part of the JGS.

In his appeal letter, the appellant points to portions of a draft PD which he says does not fully explain his involvement in work planning and direction (Factor I). He says that he does not know if and when the PD will take effect and that he "had to request it to prepare for the appeal." The appellant states that some aspects of his work exceed Situation #3. If the grade of his job remains unchanged, the appellant asks that all work at or above Situation #3 be removed from his PD. He believes that he is being treated differently from other Situation #2 supervisors who have much less responsibility.

Our job grading decisions must be based solely upon a comparison between the actual duties and responsibilities of the job and the appropriate JGS's (5 U.S.C. 5346). Other methods or factors of evaluation may not be used in the job grading process. These include comparing the appellant's job with other jobs that may or may not be graded correctly, e.g., the other jobs at his activity credited with Situation #2. A PD is the official record of the major duties and responsibilities assigned to a job by an official with the authority to assign work. A position or job is the duties and responsibilities that make up the work performed by an employee. Job grading appeal regulations permit OPM to investigate or audit a job and decide an appeal on the basis of the actual duties and responsibilities currently assigned by management and performed by the employee. An OPM appeal decision classifies a real operating job, and not simply the PD. Therefore, this decision is based on the work currently assigned to and performed by the appellant and sets aside any previous agency decision.

The appellant's rationale raises questions about management's authority to assign work since he requested that all work higher than Situation #2 be removed from his job if his appeal is unsuccessful. By law, agency management has the authority to determine the work assignable to jobs and employees (5 U.S.C. 5342(a)(3) and 7106(a)(2)(B)). Therefore, this issue is not germane to or reviewable by the job grading appeals process.

Job information

The appellant supervises the utilities and building maintenance functions of the Plant Engineering Division. The subordinate staff consists of 3 WL-4742-10 Utility Systems Repairer-Operator Leader jobs, 14 WG-4742-10 Utility Systems Repairer-Operator jobs, 3 WG-4204-10 Pipefitter jobs, 1 WL-4749-10 Maintenance Mechanic Leader job, and 3 WG-4749-10 Maintenance Mechanic jobs. The mission of the organization is to control and coordinate the maintenance of building facilities, including construction, building repairs and new installations, and coordinate maintenance and repair of equipment that supply major utilities (electric; process cooling water; domestic water; compressed air; water purification; steam; heating, ventilating, and air conditioning; natural gas; and waste water treatment).

The agency administrative report contains two PD's for the appellant. PD #IF04480, identified as #044800 on a December 30, 2001, Standard Form 50-B, was graded as Utility Maintenance and Repair Supervisor, WS-4742-10, on October 7, 1993. The draft PD cited by the appellant in his appeal letter is unnumbered. It was graded by the human resources staff as Utilities and Building Maintenance Supervisor, WS-4701-10 on May 31, 2002. However, the appellant has not been officially assigned to the new PD. The record shows that the appellant filed his agency-level appeal on April 18, 2001. The undated agency job grading appeal decision identifies the appellant's job of record as Utilities Maintenance and Repair Supervisor, WS-4742-10, and concludes that it should be graded as Utilities and Building Maintenance Supervisor, WS-4701-10. The agency appeal decision is based on the 1993 PD of record.

The appellant and his immediate supervisor have certified that the draft PD is accurate. We conducted an on-site audit with the appellant on December 10, 2002, and conducted a telephone interview with his immediate supervisor, [supervisor's name], Chief, General Maintenance Branch, on January 14, 2003, and [name], Chief, Engineering Planning Branch, on January 31. In deciding this appeal, we fully considered the audit and interview findings and all information of record furnished by the appellant and his activity at our request. We find that the PD of record contains the major duties and responsibilities assigned to and performed by the appellant and we incorporate it by reference into this decision. The proposed PD overstates the scope, difficulty and complexity of the appellant's work situation as discussed under **Grade determination**.

Pay category

The primary duty for the appellant's job is direction of workers in trades and craft occupations. The chief requirement of his job is knowledge and experience in that work. Consequently, his job is exempt from the General Schedule (GS) and falls under the FWS.

Occupational code, title, and standard determination

The agency placed the appellant's job in the 4701 occupation in the 4700 General Maintenance and Operations Work Family because he supervises jobs with no single predominant occupation, titled it Utilities and Building Maintenance Supervisor, and used the JGS for Supervisors to determine his job's grade level. The appeal letter to OPM did not directly address these occupational and titling decisions. However, the appellant requested that his job be titled

Utilities Systems Repairer/Building Maintenance Supervisor and placed in either the 4742 or 4749 occupations.

The “01” code is used for two different types of jobs. One type of job is a general job that is characteristic of the family but not any specific occupation within the family. The other is one that has a narrower range of duties readily identifiable to the job family but for which no specific occupation has been established. In contrast, a mixed job is one that involves work in two or more occupations. It is coded to the occupation which is most important for recruitment, selection, placement, promotion, or reduction-in-force purposes. Mixed jobs are not usually assigned to the “01” code.

The appellant oversees two primary work functions: utility systems operation and maintenance, and building maintenance. Of the 24 subordinate jobs, 17 are engaged in 4742 work. The three 4204 jobs perform work primarily related to utility systems maintenance and repair; i.e., servicing the pressurized piping systems attached to the utility systems. Therefore, we find that utility systems operations and repair constitute the primary and paramount trade knowledge and skill required to oversee the work of the appellant’s organization. While important to facility operations, building maintenance functions are secondary in nature. Based on the titling practices in the 4742 JGS, the appellant’s job is allocated properly as Utility Systems Repairer-Operator Supervisor, WS-4742.

The appellant’s job is properly graded by application of the JGS for Supervisors. This JGS is used to grade the jobs of FWS supervisors who, as a regular and recurring part of their jobs, and on a substantially full-time and continuous basis, exercise technical and administrative supervision over subordinate workers in accomplishing trades and labor work.

Grade determination

The JGS for Supervisors’ grading plan consists of three factors: *Nature of Supervisory Responsibility*; *Level of Work Supervised*; and *Scope of Work Operations Supervised*.

Factor 1, Nature of Supervisory Responsibility

This factor considers the nature of the supervisory duties performed, and the type and degree of responsibility for control over the work supervised. The factor describes four basic supervisory situations. These, in sequence, depict successively higher levels of supervisory responsibility and authority for scheduling work operations, planning use of resources (i.e., subordinate workers, equipment, facilities, materials, and tools) to accomplish scheduled or unscheduled work, directing subordinates in performing work assignments, and carrying out administrative duties. In order for a job to be credited at a level, the job must fully meet the situation. This means that a job must meet all of the bullets under the specific situation. The situations described are successive in nature. Higher level situations include the responsibilities described at the preceding levels.

The record shows that the agency credited Situation #2. In Situation #2, supervisors are responsible for supervising workers directly or through subordinate leaders *and/or* supervisors in

accomplishing the work of an *organizational segment or group*. Supervisors in Situation #2 differ from supervisors in Situation #1 primarily in planning work operations of greater scope and complexity; determining the sequence, priority, and time for the performance of particular operations within the limits of broader work schedules and time limits; and exercising greater administrative authority. In addition to the duties described in Situation #1, supervisors in Situation #2 perform the following:

Planning

- X Plan use of subordinate workers, equipment, facilities, and materials on a week-to-week or month-to-month basis;
- X Establish deadlines, priorities, and work sequences, and plan work assignments based on general work schedules, methods, and policies set by higher level supervisors;
- X Coordinate work with supporting or related work functions controlled by other supervisors;
- X Determine the number and types of workers needed to accomplish specific projects;
- X Redirect individual workers and resources to accomplish unanticipated work (e.g., work resulting from Aopen and inspect@ types of work orders);
- X Inform higher level supervisors of the need to revise work schedules and re-estimate labor and other resources; and
- X Participate with their superiors in the initial planning of current and future work schedules, budget requests, staffing needs, estimates, and recommendations as to scheduling projected work.

Work Direction

- X Investigate work related problems such as excessive costs or low productivity and determine causes;
- X Implement corrective actions within their authority to resolve work problems; and
- X Recommend solutions to staffing problems, engineering requirements, and work operations directed by other supervisors.

Administration

- X Plan and establish overall leave schedule;

- X Determine training needs of subordinates and arrange for its accomplishment, set performance standards, and make formal appraisals of subordinate work performance; and
- X Initiate recommendations for promotion or reassignment of subordinates.

In contrast, supervisors in Situation #3 are responsible for supervising operations of such scope, volume, and complexity that they are carried out by subordinate supervisors in two or more separate organizational segments or groups, and are controlled through two or more levels of supervision. In addition to the functions performed in Situation #2, supervisors in Situation #3 perform the following:

Planning

- X Plan on a quarterly or longer basis the overall use of subordinate personnel and other resources under their control;
- X Determine resource requirements, materials, and the number of subordinates and the types of skill necessary to accomplish long-range work schedules;
- X Allocate resources and distribute work to organizational segments or groups under their control;
- X Analyze work plans developed by subordinate supervisors and monitor the status of their work in relation to the overall schedule requirements, including unanticipated or emergency requirements;
- X Obtain prior approval of changes that would modify or deviate overall work schedules or affect work operations controlled by supervisors not under their control; and
- X Provide information and advice to higher level supervisors, management officials, and staff organizations on the feasibility of work assignments as scheduled, budget estimates, and workload data to assist in developing or reviewing proposed long-range schedules and work requirements, and may participate with superiors in planning conferences and meetings.

Work Direction

- X Assign and explain work requirements and operating instructions to subordinate supervisors and set deadlines and establish the sequence of work operations to be followed;
- X Maintain balanced workloads by shifting assignments, workers, and other resources under their control to achieve the most effective work operations;

- X Review and analyze work accomplishments, cost, and utilization of subordinates to evaluate work progress, control costs, and anticipate and avoid possible problems by recommending corrective action to superiors;
- X Participate with management officials and/or engineering personnel to develop qualitative and/or quantitative work standards;
- X Evaluate work operations and review completed work and inspection reports to assure that standards are met; and
- X Coordinate work operations with supervisors of other organizations and functions.

Administration

- X Assure that subordinate supervisors effectively carry out policies to achieve management objectives;
- X Recommend promotion or reassignment of subordinate supervisors, make formal appraisals of their performance, and determine their training needs;
- X Schedule leave of subordinate supervisors, review personnel actions and performance appraisals initiated by them, and act on personnel problems referred by subordinate supervisors, and maintain administrative records; and
- X Serve as a management representative at hearings, meetings, and negotiations involving labor relations issues.

The appellant states that his job fully meets Situation #3 with the exception of managing subordinate supervisors. He points to statements in his draft PD which he believes meet or exceed Situation #3. These duties include consulting with headquarters, Mint engineers, and production managers to plan capital building and equipment projects. The PD states that he is often involved from initial concept to final completion of the projects which takes many years. The appellant's appeal rationale underlines selected portions of Situation #3 and #4 as printed in the JGS for Supervisors which he believes are applicable to his job. These include the first sentence in the definition of Situation #3; bullets 1, 2, 3, 5, and 6 under Planning; bullets 2, 3, 4, 5, and 6 under Work Direction; and bullet 4 under Administration. His rationale also underlines sections of Situation #4. These selected bullets are included in the draft PD.

The appellant's job fully meets Situation #2. As in that situation, the work that he supervises is sufficiently complex and voluminous to require using subordinate leader jobs to control work. The appellant performs the full range of planning, work direction, and administrative functions creditable at that level. Typical of Situation #2, most utilities maintenance and repair work flows from daily operations requirements and established preventive maintenance practices. When unexpected maintenance and repair problems are found, the appellant redirects workers and resources to deal with unanticipated work. As in Situation #2, the appellant participates in the initial planning of future work, providing input from his organization's point of view regarding

resource and operational needs. For example, when providing input on the Motor Control Center (MCC) replacement project, the appellant projected which equipment and systems would be affected while each panel was down and the time that his staff would need to be available to take down and bring up system connections in sequence while the contractor removed and replaced each panel. The appellant coordinates with other supervisors when planning day-to-day and project operations, e.g., installing utility connections to new industrial equipment.

The appellant does not oversee work operations that require using subordinate supervisors over separate organizational segments and groups controlled by one or more levels of supervision found in Situation #3. This terminology anticipates that segments and groups directed by one level of supervision will be assisted by work leaders and/or other senior staff because of the scope of work operations overseen. The appellant's buildings maintenance and pipefitting workloads are too small to require oversight by full-time FWS supervisory jobs. The small size of each of utility system staff; the nature of utility system operations that require a mixture of daily, monthly, quarterly, annual and/or other periodic preventive maintenance; and the presence of the appellant on the day shift also are indicative of circumstances in which subordinate supervisory jobs are not required to control utility operations.

Situation #3 JGS bullets are directly linked to the scope, volume, and complexity of work operations directed at that level. For example, Situation #3 quarterly or longer work planning responsibilities refer to the volume of work for planning and accomplishing long-range projects. These projects require determining resources, material, and the number of people and types of skills to accomplish the work. The record shows that all major Mint projects are performed by contractors. In contrast, the appellant directly supervises the smaller work projects typical of Situation #2, e.g., restroom renovation and major equipment hookup. Each of the branch components primarily performs specialized tasks. Although the three pipefitters have the skills needed to perform some utility system repairs, the appellant's work operations do not reflect the opportunity for the more extensive resource allocation and work distribution choices found in Situation #3.

The appellant and his first and second level supervisors have emphasized the appellant's planning duties and the nature of his participation with management officials and subject-matter experts on Mint projects, e.g., the MCC project, the compressed air plant replacement, and the process cooling water upgrade. The project work planning and technical advice functions performed in Situations #2 through #4 cover workload directly supervised by the WS job being graded. In contrast, most of the appellant's advice and assistance pertains to projects performed by contractors with limited involvement by his own staff.

The appellant's work direction duties fail to meet Situation #3 for similar reasons. As discussed previously, each of the appellant's three functional group staffs have limited overlapping skills. Therefore, the appellant's situation does not provide him with the opportunity to or continuing responsibility for shifting assignments, workers, and other resources described in Situation #3. His work review and analysis responsibilities are not for the scope, volume, and complexity of operations defined in Situation #3. The appellant states that his writing of standard operating procedures shows that he participates with management officials and/or engineering personnel to develop qualitative and/or quantitative standards, e.g., water sampling, testing, and record

keeping in the waste water plant. All Situations defined in the JGS for Supervisors include responsibility for work quality and timeliness. Unlike the more limited work operations directed by the appellant, Situation #3 qualitative and quantitative work standards development refers to assuring that the multiple groups/segments supervised are held accountable to the same standards, e.g., quality and quantity standards covering multiple sections in a machine shop performing the same production runs. Work coordination with other supervisors is present in all defined Situations. As discussed previously, the appellant's staff is not engaged in performing the long-range work projects with other Mint components described in Situation #3.

The appellant underlined the last Administration bullet in which the supervisor represents management at hearings, meetings, and negotiations involving labor management relations. While the appellant may perform some of these functions occasionally, they are not a regular and recurring part of his work and, therefore, may not be credited to his job. Because Situation #3 is not met, Situation #4 may not be considered or credited. Based on the preceding analysis, this factor is credited at Situation #2.

Factor II, Level of Work Supervised

This factor concerns the level and complexity of the work operations supervised, and their effect on the difficulty and responsibility of the supervisor's job. The level of nonsupervisory work; i.e., WG, credited under this factor considers all substantive work, whether under the direct or indirect supervision of the job being graded, for which the supervisor is technically accountable. Substantive work is that work which directly carries out the main purpose or mission of the work operations supervised, and primarily determines the technical qualifications required to effectively carry out the responsibilities of the supervisory job being graded. Technical accountability is responsibility for the quantity and quality of the work performed by subordinates, requiring the application by the supervisor of knowledge of the methods, techniques, procedures, tools, materials, and practices of the involved occupation (or occupations).

The record shows that the highest level of nonsupervisory work supervised by the appellant meeting the requirements of Factor II is grade 10. Therefore, this factor is credited at grade 10.

Factor III, Scope of Work Operations Supervised

This factor considers the scope of the job's supervisory responsibility in terms of: (1) the scope of the assigned work function and organizational authority; (2) the variety of functions the job is required to supervise; and (3) the physical dispersion, work coordination, and location of subordinates. This factor is divided into three subfactors, which are in turn subdivided into levels with points assigned to each level. An appropriate level is selected for each subfactor and the corresponding point values are totaled. The total points are then converted to specific levels under Factor III using the conversion chart at the end of the factor.

Subfactor A. Scope of Assigned Work Function and Organizational Authority

This subfactor measures the scope of the assigned work function or mission, i.e., the purpose of the job in the organization, the extent and nature of the job's authority in relation to the organizational assignment, and the importance of the job's decision.

The appellant states that his job meets Level A-3 because having subordinate supervisors is not mandatory; i.e., "typically requires supervisors" means that exceptions to having subordinate supervisors can exist. The appellant's job fully meets Level A-2 at which supervisors have first **or** second level supervisory and decision authority over an organizational segment which typically has been established on the basis of being a distinct work function or mission; or a designated geographic location or work area. In this case, the appellant is responsible for the utilities and building maintenance functions for the Mint. The appellant functions within policies established at higher levels, e.g., which work will be performed in-house and which will be contracted out. As at Level A-2, the appellant makes routine decisions regarding execution of that policy. For example, he and his staff deal directly with contractors assuring that utility systems are brought up in the proper order after contractors perform their work. Typical of Level A-2, the appellant uses leaders to help direct day-to-day operations and he balances work when necessary, e.g., using pipefitters to assist in utility maintenance and repair.

The appellant's job does not meet Level A-3. Unlike Level A-3, the appellant does not have second level or higher supervisory and decision authority for work functions or a portion of a mission requirement. He functions as a first level supervisor. The organization that he directs does not have the other characteristics of this level; i.e., the need to use several subordinate supervisors **and** leaders through structured working relationships among subordinate groups of employees, formal procedures for scheduling and assigning work and work results, and the issuance of instructions through subordinate supervisors and leaders. Therefore, this subfactor is credited at Level A-2 (45 points).

Subfactor B. Variety of Function

This subfactor evaluates the difficulties of technical supervision of work functions which may vary from being essentially similar to markedly dissimilar. Similar or related work functions have a common or related body of knowledge, skills, work procedures, and tools, e.g., pipefitting and plumbing, carpentry and woodworking, aircraft mechanic and aircraft engine mechanic, or machining and machine tool operating. Supervision of dissimilar or unrelated work functions requires broader technical knowledge and planning and coordination skills than those required for supervision of similar work functions.

The agency credited Level B-3 because the appellant directs the work of subordinates in three similar or related occupations. The appellant states that Level B-4 is creditable to his job. Level B-4 covers supervising the work of subordinates in dissimilar or unrelated occupations at grades 8 through 13.

The JGS for Supervisors defines similar or related work functions as having a common or related body of knowledge, skills, work procedures, and tools, e.g., pipefitting and plumbing or

carpentry and woodworking. Although the appellant primarily supervises jobs in the 4700 General Maintenance and Operations Family, these jobs performed mixed work as defined in the FWS. For example, the PD provided for the 4749 grade 10 job describes a mix of 4605 Wood Crafter, 4607 Carpenter, 4102 Painter, 3602 Cement Finisher, 3603 Mason, 3806 Sheet Metal Mechanic, 4206 Plumber, and 3606 Roofing work at grades 8 through 10. The PD for the 4742 grade 10 job describes a mix of 5306 Air Conditioning Equipment Mechanic and 5415 Air Conditioning Equipment Operator work at the grade 10 level. The JGS for Supervisors directs that “mixed jobs” or a combination of two or more recognized occupations, such as 5406 Utility System Operating, are to be evaluated on the basis of the separate occupation, series coverage, and grade level criteria. Based on these requirements, we find that the appellant directs the work of subordinates in dissimilar occupations at the grade 8 through the grade 10 levels. Therefore, this subfactor is credited at Level B-4 (60 points).

Subfactor C. Workforce Dispersion

This subfactor evaluates the varying levels of difficulty associated with monitoring and coordinating the work of nonsupervisory and supervisory personnel who vary from being collocated to widely dispersed. Dispersion of workforce considers the duration of projects, number of work sites, frequency of dispersion, and the necessity to monitor and coordinate the work. It is possible to have no points credited for this subfactor if subordinate employees are located in the same contiguous work area with the supervisor, when dispersion occurs infrequently, or when dispersion is inherent, and the work is performed in the absence of direct supervision, e.g., operating a motor vehicle.

At Level C-1, subordinate employees are located in several buildings or at work sites within a defined location such as a military base, National Park, or large Federal complex consisting of many multifloor buildings and support facilities. Work assignments vary in terms of duration; however, most assignments at this level are of limited duration; i.e., assignments are typically accomplished within a few days or weeks. In addition, this level also includes off-base; i.e., within the local commuting area facility support and maintenance assignments.

The appellant’s job does not meet Level C-1. This subfactor does not simply assess whether a subordinate workforce is dispersed; it assesses the extra difficulty, if any, associated with monitoring and coordinating the work of a dispersed staff. This difficulty is a product of a number of factors: frequency of dispersion, the number of work sites, the duration of projects, and the necessity to monitor and coordinate the work because of its dispersion. The appellant’s staff primarily works in a single large building under the control of work leaders. These conditions do not place greater monitoring and coordination demands on the appellant. Therefore, no credit is given for this subfactor.

This factor is credited with subfactor A-2 (45 points) and subfactor B-4 (60 points). No credit is given for subfactor C. A total of 105 points falls within the range of 70 to 110 points which equates to Level B.

Tentative Grade Assignment

According to the Grading Table for Supervisory Situation #2 Level B coupled with a grade 10 level of work supervised equates to the grade 10 supervisory level.

Grade Level Adjustment

Both upward and downward changes from the tentative grade are required based on certain circumstances. A situation requiring a downward adjustment is offset by an upward adjustment. Grade level adjustments may not exceed one grade level.

Downward

A downward adjustment is indicated when the tentative grade would be the same grade as the supervisor's superior. This situation does not apply to the appellant's job.

Upward

Upward grade adjustments are indicated for borderline jobs and work situations that impose special or unusual demands on the supervisor.

Borderline Jobs

An upward adjustment is indicated when the supervisory job substantially exceeds the situation credited under Factor I and the base level of work determined under Factor II is not the highest level of subordinate work for which the supervisor has full technical responsibility.

The appellant's work situation does not exceed the level credited under Factor I and the base level of work under Factor II is the highest level of nonsupervisory work for which he is technically responsible. Therefore, a grade adjustment based on borderline conditions is not appropriate.

Special or Unusual Demands

In some situations, special staffing requirements may impose a substantially greater than normal responsibility for job design, job engineering, work scheduling, training, counseling, motivating, and maintaining security. This may occur under special employment programs and at correctional institutions having *exceptionally* difficult attitudinal, motivational, control, and security problems. An upward grade adjustment is indicated when exceptional conditions affect the majority of the subordinate workforce and (1) are permanent and continuing, require the tailoring of assignments, tasks, training, security, and other supervisory actions to individuals, and (2) require regular and recurring counseling and motivational activities. These conditions are not present in the appellant's job.

The technical advisory and planning work at the core of the appellant's appeal rationale are functions performed by a variety of jobs in the FWS. Senior nonsupervisory trades and craft

personnel routinely provide advice based on their knowledge of work operations. For example, senior machinists often advise engineering personnel on practical design issues including the sequence of machining tasks. The appellant's technical input into statements of work for contracting and similar functions, the 24-hour nature of his work operations, and the addition of building maintenance to responsibilities are not creditable under this factor. They have been considered to the extent permitted under the appropriate factors in our application of the JGS for Supervisors. Therefore, no upward grade adjustment can be credited for special demands.

Neither a downward or upward adjustment to the tentative grade 10 supervisory level is indicated.

Decision

The appellant's job is properly graded as Utility Systems Repairer-Operator Supervisor, WS-4742-10.