

**JOB GRADING APPEAL DECISION
OFFICE OF PERSONNEL MANAGEMENT
CHICAGO FIELD SERVICE OFFICE**

APPELLANTS: **[Appellants]**

REPRESENTATIVE: **[Representative]**

JOB NUMBER: FO3264

AGENCY GRADING: Automotive Worker Supervisor
WS-5823-9

JOB LOCATION: U.S. Department of Justice
Federal Bureau of Prisons
[Installation]
[City, State]

OFFICE OF PERSONNEL **Automotive Worker Supervisor**
MANAGEMENT DECISION: **WS-5823-8**

OPM DECISION NUMBER: C-5823-08-01

This appellate decision constitutes a certificate that is mandatory and binding on administrative, certifying, payroll, and accounting offices of the Government. It is the final administrative decision on the pay plan and series of the job, not subject to further appeal. It is subject to discretionary review only under the conditions specified in 5 C.F.R. 532.705 (f). This certificate must be implemented no later than the beginning of the sixth pay period following the date of the decision.

/s/

FREDERICK J. BOLAND
CLASSIFICATION APPEALS OFFICER

5/15/97

DATE

INFORMATION CONSIDERED

- ▶ Appellants' letter dated January 18, 1996, and earlier correspondence.
- ▶ Agency letter dated February 26, 1996, and its attachments.
- ▶ Copy of the official description of the appellants' job, number FO3264.
- ▶ Copy of the Department of Justice's grading decision, dated November 27, 1995.
- ▶ Copy of the official description of the appellants' supervisor's job.
- ▶ Copy of the appellants' performance standards.
- ▶ Copy of the organization chart and statement of functions for the [Installation].
- ▶ Analysis of the duties performed by inmates supervised by the appellants' representative provided by the [Installation], [City], Human Resource Service, dated September 24, 1996.
- ▶ Audit of the appellants' job by telephone discussion with the representative on January 29, 1997, with the supervisor on January 24, 1997, and through an on-site visit on April 30, 1997.

EVALUATION CRITERIA

- ▶ OPM Job Grading Standard for Supervisors, dated December 1992.
- ▶ OPM Job Grading Standard for Automotive Mechanic, WG-5823, dated June 1990.
- ▶ OPM Job Grading Standard for Mobile Equipment Metal Mechanic, WG-3809, dated September 1974.

INTRODUCTION

The appellants, employees of the [Installation], Federal Bureau of Prisons (BOP), [City, State], contest a classification decision made by the Department of Justice. They are assigned to job number FO3264, graded on November 27, 1995, as an Automotive Worker Supervisor, WS-5823-9, as the result of an appeal adjudicated by the Department of Justice.

The appellants request that their job be graded as Automotive Worker Supervisor, WS-5823-10. The appellants believe that the scope and complexity of their repair operations are unique within BOP and that the scope and complexity are reflected in the level at which inmates assigned to them work. They disagree with the Department's determination that the level of work performed by the inmate workers under their supervision equates to the WG-5823-8 worker level. Specifically, they contend the work performed by inmates to identify and repair problems and to overhaul and recondition mechanical systems is more typical of assignments described at the WG-5823-10 journey level. They recognize that inmates work under closer supervision than would normally be expected of a journey level worker. In a follow up letter dated January 18, 1996, the appellants stated "It is our contention that

three of the four factors at the WG-10 level are fully met . . . the inmates should be recognized as performing work at the constructed grade of WG-9."

JOB INFORMATION

The appellants supervise and train inmates assigned to the [Installation], which performs scheduled maintenance, corrective maintenance, repair and reconditioning of over-the-road diesel powered coaches. The [Activity] performs these services for the entire BOP coach fleet consisting of over one hundred coaches. All coaches in the fleet are brought to the [Activity] once a year for an annual inspection during which maintenance services are performed and coaches are thoroughly inspected. All worn or faulty systems are repaired, reconditioned, or rebuilt to ensure safe, trouble free operation. The [Activity] also performs body and frame repairs on the coaches and, to adapt new coaches for BOP use, fabricates and installs security equipment.

In addition, the appellants assist in supervising the Bureau-wide preventive and corrective maintenance programs. The appellants provide training to garage supervisors from BOP institutions with assigned coaches, explaining and walking them through the maintenance requirements during the annual inspection performed at the [Activity]. They assist maintenance personnel at other BOP facilities with advice and guidance as requested. They handle complaints, emergencies, and problems brought to the [Activity] by any of the 38 BOP institutions to which coaches are assigned. They often provide technical advice and answer questions on the telephone and they may occasionally travel to the location of a coach with problems to provide on-site assistance or to bring the coach back to the [Activity] for repair.

The [Activity] has seven inmate crews engaged in substantially similar work, although crews do specialize in rebuilding engines and transmissions, repairing heating and air conditioning systems, and repairing frame and body damage. The number of inmates assigned to a crew varies depending on the availability of competent inmates in the prison population. A crew of five to eight inmates is common. The length of time the inmates are assigned to the appellants' crews averages two to three years, but may vary from as few as six months to as many as five years. Inmates assigned to the appellants may have some mechanical experience, but usually require additional training to perform their assignments. Training includes completion of the diesel vocational technical training program available to inmates.

The appellants set the standards for quantity and quality of work produced by inmates. They determine work assignments for their crews based on established maintenance schedules, taking into consideration the experience, skill, and training of the available inmates. They demonstrate proper methods and procedures for accomplishing various tasks. They inspect and test all installations to ensure that work has been completed as specified and that appropriate trade standards have been met.

The appellants ensure quality maintenance and overhaul of Bureau coaches and vehicles assigned to the [Activity]. Based on their knowledge of the maintenance schedule and the skill and knowledge possessed by the inmates assigned to them, the appellants make individual day-to-day work assignments. They keep current with new service procedures and technical information and recommend new service equipment and methods. When making specific assignments, they identify

the type of repair needed and what must be replaced. While work is being carried out by the inmates, the appellants provide intermittent supervision. However, upon completion, the appellants inspect and test the completed work to ensure it was performed as specified and in accordance with appropriate trade standards. The appellants are held responsible for ensuring that the coach or vehicle is operable and roadworthy.

The appellants evaluate the inmates' work performance, recommend training, establish performance pay levels, and maintain time and attendance records on a monthly basis. They counsel inmates, hear grievances on work-related issues, and initiate disciplinary action where warranted. They maintain required progress reports, logs, and production status reports on all work for which they are responsible. While inmates identify specific parts and materials necessary to complete assigned work, review and concurrence of the appellants is required to obtain more costly repair parts. The appellants maintain records on equipment use, tools, materials, and parts on hand and ordered, etc. They prepare requisitions for materials and equipment, including equipment justifications. If parts are needed for repairs at BOP installations, the appellants are responsible for shipping needed parts to any of these sites upon request.

ANALYSIS AND FINDINGS

Pay System Determination

A supervisory job is exempt from the General Schedule only if the paramount requirement of the job is knowledge and experience in trades, crafts, or laboring. The primary supervisory duty for the appellants' job is the accomplishment of repair work at the [Activity] through the direct oversight and instruction of inmates. The chief requirement of these jobs, then, is knowledge and experience in trades related to vehicle repair and maintenance. Consequently, the job is exempt from the General Schedule and falls under the Federal Wage System (FWS).

Code and Title Determination

The occupational code of a supervisory job is normally the same as the code for the kind of work that is supervised. When work of more than one occupation is supervised, the occupational code of a supervisory job is the same as the code of the occupation that best reflects the overall nature of the work of the occupations supervised and/or that is the most important for recruitment, selection, placement, and other personnel purposes.

The work supervised by the appellants typically involves routine servicing of coaches and other vehicles; performing corrective maintenance; repairing and reconditioning major systems, e.g., heavy duty diesel engines, transmissions, brake systems, etc.; installing and repairing specialized electrical, electronic, and accessory systems; installing specialized security systems; performing body restoration and repair; and fabricating metal components for installation. This work requires skills and practices associated with several occupations, e.g., Automotive Mechanic, Mobile Equipment Metal Mechanic, and Painter. From a recruiting and placement standpoint, none of these reflects more demanding work or so well encompasses the variety of tasks performed at the Center than the Automotive Mechanic, WG-5823, occupation. Therefore, the appellants' job is properly assigned to the WG-5823 occupational code.

Supervisory jobs are identified by the job title of the occupation selected for code determination, followed by the supervisory designation. Therefore, the appropriate title for the appellants' job is *Automotive Worker Supervisor*.

GRADE DETERMINATION

Jobs responsible for the technical and administrative supervision of subordinates in trades and labor work are graded by the Job Grading Standard for Supervisors when such responsibility is a regular and recurring part of the job and exercised on a substantially full-time and continuing basis. When both supervisory and nonsupervisory work are a regular and recurring part of the job, the final grade of the job is the supervisory or nonsupervisory grade that results in the higher pay rate for the job. Accordingly, we first examine the appellants' supervisory duties and then their personally performed work for comparison.

The grading plan for wage grade supervisors consists of three factors: Nature of Supervisory Responsibility, Level of Work Supervised, and Scope of Work Operations Supervised.

Factor I: Nature of Supervisory Responsibility

This factor covers the nature of supervisory duties performed and the type and degree of responsibility for control over the work supervised. Four basic supervisory situations are described in terms of planning, work direction, and administrative responsibility. To be credited, the level of supervisory responsibility described for a situation must be fully met.

The appellants directly supervise their inmate crews, planning and scheduling work assignments and ensuring that adequate manpower is available for each project. The appellants organize the work and make assignments based on a predetermined maintenance schedule. They have input into the annual maintenance schedule for routine maintenance and overhaul together with their supervisor, as well as input into the budget, equipment, and material requirements for their area. They schedule their specific work daily, weekly, and monthly and make adjustments to accommodate emergencies and problems. They are responsible for making specific inmate assignments, taking into account their levels of experience and skill. Where possible, they assign lesser skilled workers to work with the more experienced workers to enable those with more limited skills to learn and improve. They identify the number of inmates and hours needed to complete an assignment within a given timeframe. When unexpected problems or emergencies arise, the appellants are authorized to adjust priorities and redirect workers to handle the unforeseen work. They keep the General Foreman and [Installation] Manager informed of situations which impact overall operations.

The appellants oversee the work and develop information on problems encountered during the course of the work. They investigate the problems that arise and determine the causes. They have authority to redirect staff and implement other corrective actions to resolve problems. If required action is outside their authority, the appellants advise the general foreman and [Installation] Manager, providing recommended solutions.

The appellants are responsible for explaining requirements and procedures and for training the inmates in the methods and skills necessary to complete assignments. They set performance standards

and identify acceptable quality. The appellants provide required safety training and explain BOP policies and requirements to the inmates. They advise and counsel inmates assigned to their crews on their job performance and behavior. The appellants also complete necessary reports and paperwork.

This fully meets Situation #2 of the standard, where Supervisors plan work operations of greater scope and complexity than shift operations typical of Situation #1. The appellants are responsible for each of the seven Planning elements and each of the three Work Direction elements of Situation #2. The Administrative elements described under Situations #1 and #2 do not all directly apply to inmate supervision; however, the appellants have equivalent administrative responsibility for training, counseling, and motivating inmates. Unlike Supervisors in Situation #3, the appellants are not responsible for work operations carried out by subordinate supervisors in two or more separate organizational segments or groups.

We evaluate this factor of the appellants' work as 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. All substantive work for which the Supervisor is technically accountable (either directly or indirectly through subordinate supervisors, team leaders, or others) is considered. Excluded from consideration is support or facilitating work, work that is graded based upon supervisory or leader standards, work that is graded higher than normal because of extraordinary independence from supervision, and work personally performed by the Supervisor. When the Supervisor is accountable for two or more functions, each with its own primary purpose or mission, the different occupations directly involved in carrying out the separate functions must be identified and evaluated separately.

Repair, maintenance, and reconditioning of BOP's bus fleet are the main purposes of the work operations that the appellants supervise. In accomplishing these purposes, the appellants oversee subordinates in more than one trade, as noted under the Series Determination section of this decision. The highest grade level of nonsupervisory work accomplished by subordinates is reflected in the WG-5823 mechanic work; i.e., no subordinates perform higher graded work than this in other trades.

Because inmates work under job descriptions and pay levels different from the FWS, their equivalent FWS grades must be determined based upon a comparison of their duties and responsibilities against OPM job grading standards. The Job Grading Standard for the Automotive Mechanic, WG-5823, occupation contains four factors for determining grade level: Skill and Knowledge, Responsibility, Physical Effort, and Working Conditions. In order for a grade to be credited to the inmates' work, each of the four factor levels at the grade must be fully met.

Work performed by the inmates involves routine servicing of coaches, including oil changes, fueling, tire changes, transmission and other fluid checks, and other routine preventive maintenance work. They repair and recondition major systems, including heavy diesel engines, over-the-road transmissions, drive lines, hydraulic systems, etc., under the appellants' direction. They also install and repair specialized systems on the coaches according to the appellants' direction and supervision.

The most experienced inmates use diagnostic and test equipment to determine causes of mechanical problems or failures. They indicate what they believe must be done to correct the problem and request parts to accomplish repairs. Some low cost parts which commonly fail are available to the inmates for replacement. Unusual failures or corrective work which requires moderate or high cost parts are brought to the attention of the supervisor. The appellants approve and submit the parts requests if they agree with the diagnosis and recommended corrective actions. The appellants are responsible for ensuring that the most cost-effective repair methods are used by the inmates. The appellants inspect and test work upon completion to ensure that the problem has been corrected. Prior to release of the coaches, the appellants must certify the roadworthiness of the repaired or overhauled coach.

The Skill and Knowledge criteria for the WG-8 level in the standard include removing, replacing, cleaning, and installing a variety of parts, components, and accessories such as filters, radiators, engine thermostats, wheel cylinders, universal joints, wheel bearings, springs, shock absorbers, mufflers, components of heating and air conditioning systems, brake components, catalytic converters, clutch assemblies, carburetors, and suspension components such as lower control arms, struts, constant velocity joints, and stabilizer arms. Workers at this level must have the ability to determine when parts should be cleaned and reinstalled or replaced with standard parts. They must have a basic understanding of electricity and hydraulics and the skill needed to make adjustments and settings, such as performing engine tune-ups, setting engine timing according to specifications, and adjusting brakes and power steering mechanisms. They must have a basic understanding of on-board computer diagnostic systems and other test equipment and the ability to test automotive computer control systems and emission systems. They must be skilled in using basic tools common to the occupation (e.g., wrenches, sockets, ratchets, impact wrenches, torque wrenches, pliers, brake tools, and screwdrivers); in operating equipment common to the trade (e.g., front-end alignment and wheel balancing equipment, turning and grinding equipment for servicing brake drums and discs or rotor assemblies, and drilling and pressure bleeding devices); and in operating a small variety of test equipment (e.g., engine analyzers, capacity testers to determine if batteries are discharging or need replacement, hand-held computer diagnostic equipment, circuit testers, micrometers and dial indicators, tachometers, dwell meters, and battery hydrometers). The regularly scheduled work carried out by the inmates, after receiving appropriate training, is most like these kinds of assignments.

At the WG-10 level, the standard depicts a thorough knowledge of make-up, operation, and installation of complex major systems; the ability to test and troubleshoot major systems to determine how far to tear down major components and what parts to rebuild or to replace; and the skill to use specialized tools such as lathes and electronic test equipment. Some highly skilled inmates may, on occasion, demonstrate the ability to troubleshoot, repair, and/or overhaul major components and systems such as engines, transmissions, etc. However, even these inmates' recommendations for major repairs are discussed with the appellants and actions are subject to the appellants' concurrence or approval. Other inmates clearly perform such tasks as most subjourney level workers would, i.e., as part of their training.

The appellants' representative indicates that as supervisors they are held responsible for repairs made by their crews. As supervisors they may be questioned at any time regarding the type of repair being

made and the necessity/cost effectiveness of the repair. Therefore, they clearly know what work is being performed by the crew and are actively involved in the analysis of mechanical problems and the determination of what repairs are necessary, particularly the more extensive repairs. While some inmates may have the knowledges and abilities to function and to make decisions as described at the WG-10 journey level, they do not have the opportunity to exercise these knowledges and abilities because of the closer control by their supervisors. Indeed, regardless of skill level, all inmates work with considerably less responsibility than typical of the journey level, as discussed below.

At the WG-8 responsibility level, the supervisor assigns work orally or through work orders indicating the nature of the work to be done; the supervisor provides assistance when standard procedures fail, for more complex tasks, or when a task is performed for the first time; and completed work is checked for compliance with instructions. The level of inmate supervision at the [Activity] equates to WG-8 responsibility. The appellants make assignments, are available in the workplace to observe work, provide periodic guidance if inmates are having difficulty with a task, and check all completed work to ensure high quality standards are achieved. In our discussion of these jobs, the appellants' representative depicted a physically close work environment. The appellants' work stations are located in the bays where the inmates work on the coaches. The appellants' representative stated that sitting at his desk in the bay he can see what inmates are doing and is always casually observing. He stated that the goal is not to oversee all work procedures; but, obviously, if he sees something being done wrong, he corrects it. He emphasized that such corrections are not routine, but sometimes he must show inmates what to do if there is something they have not worked on before or if they are proceeding incorrectly.

At the WG-10 responsibility level, employees use judgement and make decisions independently. They independently determine the type and extent of repairs needed with little or no checking during the progress of the work or upon completion of the work. The WG-10 level is not met. While some inmates make judgments and decisions on what to do and what is necessary to do the work, the appellants must review their determinations and all work is inspected both in progress and upon completion.

The Physical Effort criteria and the Working Conditions criteria are the same for the WG-8 and 10 levels, reflecting their common work environment. Both workers and mechanics are expected to endure tiring, awkward, and uncomfortable positions, extended standing, and carrying parts and tools. All are expected to work in environments with drafts, noise, and fumes and are exposed to dirt, dust, grease, shocks, etc.

The appellants believe inmates should be recognized as performing Automotive Mechanic work at the constructed grade of WG-9, an intervening grade between the WG-8 subjourney and the WG-10 journey level. For the reasons already explained, none of the inmates exercises greater independence or responsibility than the WG-8 level, nor will they assume progressively greater independence and responsibility characteristic of higher levels while incarcerated. Their work on major systems is typical of the developmental assignments given to and controls imposed upon subjourney level workers. Consequently, WG-8 fully recognizes the more experienced inmates' assignments and the supervisory constraints under which they labor.

We evaluate the base level of the work supervised by the appellants at WG-8.

Factor III: Scope of Work Operations Supervised

This factor considers supervisory responsibilities in terms of: (1) the scope of the assigned work function and organizational authority; (2) the variety of functions supervised; and (3) the physical dispersion, work coordination, and location of subordinate employees.

Subfactor A: Scope of Assigned Work Function and Organizational Authority.

This subfactor covers the purpose of the job in the organization, the extent and nature of the job's authority, and the importance of the job's decisions.

Supervisors at Level A-2, like the appellants, have first or second level decision authority over an organizational segment that typically has been established on the basis of being a distinct work function or mission. Supervisors at this level make routine decisions regarding execution of policy that has been interpreted or established at the next higher level and maintain a balanced workload between work groups. Decisions typically involve the work or assignments and how they are completed.

At Level A-3, supervisors have second level or higher supervisory and decision authority. The appellants exercise only first level authority. Consequently, we evaluate this subfactor at Level A-2 and credit 45 points.

Subfactor B: Variety of Functions.

This subfactor covers the difficulties of technical supervision of work functions. Similar or related work functions have a common or related body of knowledges, skills, work procedures, and tools (e.g., pipefitting and plumbing, carpentry and woodworking, etc.). Work that is incidental or in support of the primary function is not considered.

The appellants direct subordinates in dissimilar trades, at least two of which involve WG-8 work. Some of their subordinates straighten, knock out dents and creases, handform and fabricate parts from metal, weld cuts and holes, etc. Such work involves skill and knowledge different from the WG-5823 Automotive Mechanic occupation and is representative of subjourney level work covered by the WG-3809 Mobile Equipment Metal Mechanic occupation. This fully meets the criteria for Level B-4, which covers supervisors who direct the work of subordinates in dissimilar or unrelated occupations at grades 8-13.

Level B-5 covers supervision of work at grades 14-15, levels higher than any of the work directed by the appellants. Consequently, we evaluate subfactor B at Level B-4, and credit 60 points.

Subfactor C: Workforce Dispersion.

This subfactor covers the difficulty of monitoring and coordinating work of nonsupervisory and supervisory personnel based upon the duration of work projects, the number of work sites, the frequency of dispersion, and the necessity to monitor and coordinate the work. No points are credited for this subfactor if subordinates 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., as when 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. Work assignments are typically accomplished within a few days or weeks. Crews work within the same contiguous work area at the [Activity]. Consequently, the criteria for assignment of points specified in Level C-1 are not met and no points are assigned for Subfactor C.

The total credit for Factor III is 105 points, which equates to Level B (70 to 110 points) of the conversion chart on page 20 of the standard.

Tentative Grade Assignment

According to the Grading Table on page 23 of the standard, Supervisory Situation #2 coupled with a WG-8 level of work supervised and level B work scope equates to the WS-8 grade level.

Grade Adjustment

Both upward and downward grade adjustments 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. The appellants' superior is a WS-14 and no downward adjustment is indicated.

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 appellants' work situation does not exceed the level credited under Factor I (i.e., Situation #2) and the base level of work determined under Factor II (i.e., WG-8) is the highest level of work supervised by the appellants. 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, 2) require the tailoring of assignments, tasks, training, security, and other supervisory actions to individuals, and 3) require regular and recurring counseling and motivational activities.

The special demands grade adjustment does not automatically apply to all correctional institution supervisors, but only to those facing all three conditions specified. The appellants' representative observes that inmates from the minimum security work camp environment are generally willing to work. Inmates bring different levels of mechanical skill into the work environment and require training. Assignments are individually tailored based on work knowledges, which is a normal and common expectation for most organizations. In association with documentation of inmates' hours worked and pay, inmates receive a monthly performance appraisal that includes individual feedback on both work performance and behavior in the work environment. Occasionally, based on inmates' changed demeanor, the appellants will approach inmates to find out what the problem is and how the situation might be resolved. The appellants' representative recounted one recent example where he and his number one inmate worker observed that one of the crew seemed quite upset. Upon engaging the inmate in discussion, they learned that the inmate's grandfather had passed away and the inmate was not afforded the opportunity to attend the funeral. The appellants' representative discussed the situation with the inmate and attempted to redirect the inmate's attention to the work at hand.

The above instance of counseling does not demonstrate that there are exceptional demands requiring that the appellants regularly attend to counseling and motivational activities for most of their crews, that they tailor assignments, training, security measures, etc., on an individual basis for most of their workers because of exceptional demands, and that such activities and requirements are a permanent and continuing part of their work. The appellants must maintain overall security and control of tools, parts, and raw materials used in a prison work environment. However, the general circumstances referenced by the appellants' representative largely pertain to all correctional institutions and are credited under Factor I in lieu of the fuller administrative requirements otherwise absent from the job. Consequently, no upward grade adjustment can be credited for special demands.

Neither downward nor upward adjustments to the WS-8 tentative grade are indicated. Accordingly, we next examine the appellants' personally performed work to determine which duties represent the higher pay rate for the job.

Work Personally Performed

The appellants' personally performed work is also covered by the FWS but must be evaluated separately from their supervisory duties. Their personally performed work spans several occupations involving different levels of skill. The agency found the highest skill and knowledge requirements for any regular and recurring personally performed work equate to WG-10, based upon its application of the Automotive Mechanic, WG-5823, standard. The appellants do not contest this determination and our review of their regular and recurring personally performed work found none exceeds this grade. (Contrary to the job description, which misstates that an expert level of diesel technology knowledge is required, the appellants' work demands only full journey level knowledge of automotive mechanics.) The representative rate for WS-8 (step 2, \$20.38), in the appellants' wage area [City,

State] is more than the representative rate for WG-10 (step 2, \$16.60). Therefore, the appellants' supervisory duties determine their pay grade.

DECISION

For the reasons stated above, the proper grading of the appellants' job is Automotive Worker Supervisor, WG-5823-8.