

BEFORE THE PERSONNEL RESOURCES BOARD
STATE OF WASHINGTON

ROY SALSBERY,

Appellant,

vs.

WASHINGTON STATE PARKS AND
RECREATION COMMISSION,

Respondent.

CASE NO. R-ALLO-06-013

ORDER OF THE BOARD
FOLLOWING HEARING ON
EXCEPTIONS TO THE
DETERMINATION OF THE DIRECTOR

Hearing on Exceptions. This appeal came on for hearing before the Personnel Resources Board, MARSHA TADANO LONG, Chair; LARRY GOODMAN, Vice Chair; and LAURA ANDERSON, Member, on Appellant's exceptions to the director's determination dated October 4, 2006. The hearing was held at the office of the Personnel Resources Board in Olympia, Washington, on January 25, 2007.

Appearances. Appellant Roy Salsberry was present and was represented by Sally Farrar, Classification Director for the Washington Federation of State Employees. The Parks and Recreation Commission (Parks) was represented by George Price, Human Resource Consultant.

Background. Appellant's position was allocated to the class of Construction and Maintenance Project Specialist 1 (CMPS 1). On July 21, 2005, he submitted a Classification Questionnaire (CQ) to Parks' Human Resource office requesting reallocation to the Construction and Maintenance Project Specialist 2 (CMPS 2) classification.

By letter dated November 1, 2005, George Price, Human Resource Consultant for Parks, denied Appellant's request. Appellant appealed Mr. Price's decision to the director of the Department of Personnel (DOP). On August 18, 2006, Teresa Parsons, the director's designee, conducted a review of Appellant's request. By letter dated October 4, 2006, Ms. Parsons determined that Appellant's position was properly allocated to the CMPS 1.

1
2 On October 24, 2006, Appellant filed exceptions to the director's determination. Appellant's
3 exceptions are the subject of this proceeding.
4

5 Appellant's position is responsible for construction and maintenance projects of various sizes and
6 complexities. He is assigned to an area of parks including Illahee State Park, Scenic Beach State
7 Park, Kitsap Memorial State Park, Fay Bainbridge State Park and Blake Island State Park.
8 Appellant leads and directs crews engaged in the construction and repair of buildings and other
9 structures, pathways, walks, campsites, picnic pads, and related facilities. The project crews may be
10 comprised of other CMPS staff, park rangers, park aides, and/or volunteers. He does not lead
11 journey-level trades employees on every park project he coordinates, but on some projects, he does
12 lead one or more journey-level trades employees. Also on some projects, he directs and coordinates
13 the work of private contract employees working on projects within the parks.
14

15 **Summary of Appellant's Arguments.** Appellant argues that his primary responsibility is for
16 planning, coordinating, and organizing construction and maintenance projects in his assigned area
17 and that in carrying out the projects, he leads other staff, including other journey-level trades
18 employees. Appellant contends that his primary responsibility should be the basis for the allocation
19 of his position. Appellant contends that leading two or more journey-level trades employees is not
20 the sole criteria for allocation under the first option of the CMPS 2 definition. Appellant asks the
21 Board to give weight to the agreement made between WFSE and Parks on how to interpret and
22 apply the CMPS classifications to Parks positions. Appellant contends that information discussed
23 during the director's review supported his contention that he led two or more journey-level trades
24 employees in completing project work. Appellant argues that his supervisors, who are most familiar
25 with the scope of his work, supported reallocation of his position and agreed that he not only plans,
26 coordinates and organizes projects but that he leads two or more journey-level trades employees
27 assigned to projects. Appellant asserts that his position fits the first option in the definition of the
28 CMPS 2 classification and that his position should be reallocated.
29

1
2 **Summary of Respondent's Arguments.** Respondent acknowledges that Appellant is responsible
3 for planning, coordinating, and organizing construction and maintenance projects in his assigned
4 area. Respondent also acknowledges that sometimes he leads other staff, including, on occasion,
5 another journey-level trades employee, in completing projects. However, Respondent contends that
6 Appellant's lead responsibilities do not include leading two or more journey-level trades employees
7 on a regular basis. Respondent argues that Appellant's lead duties do not meet the threshold for
8 reallocation to the CMPS 2 classification.

9
10 **Primary Issue.** Whether the director's determination that Appellant's position is properly allocated
11 to the Construction and Maintenance Project Specialist 1 classification should be affirmed.

12
13 **Relevant Classifications.** Construction and Maintenance Project Specialist 1, class code 70530,
14 and Construction and Maintenance Project Specialist 2, class code 70540.

15
16 **Decision of the Board.** The purpose of a position review is to determine which classification
17 best describes the overall duties and responsibilities of a position. A position review is neither a
18 measurement of the volume of work performed, nor an evaluation of the expertise with which
19 that work is performed. A position review is a comparison of the duties and responsibilities of a
20 particular position to the available classification specifications. This review results in a
21 determination of the class that best describes the overall duties and responsibilities of the
22 position. See Liddle-Stamper v. Washington State University, PAB Case No. 3722-A2 (1994).

23
24 The definition for Construction and Maintenance Project Specialist 1 provides that positions
25 allocated to this class perform "multi-skilled journey level work in the building and construction
26 trades."

1 The definition for Construction and Maintenance Project Specialist 2 provides, in relevant part:
2 “[w]ithin a park area, plans, coordinates and organizes construction and maintenance projects and
3 leads two or more journey level trades employees. . . .”
4

5 Because a current and accurate description of a position’s duties and responsibilities is
6 documented in an approved classification questionnaire, the classification questionnaire becomes
7 the basis for allocation of a position. An allocation determination must be based on the overall
8 duties and responsibilities as documented in the classification questionnaire. Lawrence v. Dept
9 of Social and Health Services, PAB No. ALLO-99-0027 (2000).
10

11 In this case, Appellant’s approved CQ clearly establishes that the focus of his position is
12 planning, coordinating and organizing construction and maintenance projects. Appellant is
13 responsible for projects of various size and complexity and for some projects, he leads crews
14 including other journey-level trades employees assigned to the CMPS 1 and 2 classifications.
15 Appellant’s supervisor, Steve Kendall, is familiar with the level and scope of Appellant’s work.
16 Mr. Kendall agrees with the duties and responsibilities described in Appellant’s CQ and he
17 supports Appellant’s reallocation to the CMPS 2 classification.
18

19 The Glossary of Terms found in the DOP Classification and Compensation Administrative Guide
20 defines the term “lead” as: “[a]n employee who performs the same or similar duties as other
21 employees in his/her work group and has the designated responsibility to regularly assign,
22 instruct, and check the work of those employees.”
23

24 On a project basis, Appellant has designated responsibility to lead the work of others, including at
25 times, journey-level trades employees. While this may not occur for all projects assigned to
26 Appellant, the CMPS 2 does not require positions allocated to that classification to have lead
27 responsibilities a majority of time. Rather, the classification includes lead work as a component of
28 planning, coordinating, and organizing construction and maintenance projects.
29

1
2 In Allegri v. Washington State University, PAB Case No. ALLO-96-0026 (1998), the Personnel
3 Appeals Board (predecessor to this Board) addressed the concept of best fit. The PAB noted that
4 while the appellant's duties and responsibilities did not encompass the full breadth of the duties
5 and responsibilities described by the classification to which his position was allocated, on a best
6 fit basis, the classification best described the level, scope and diversity of the overall duties and
7 responsibilities of his position.

8
9 Appellant plans, coordinates and organizes construction and maintenance projects of the level, scope
10 and diversity anticipated by the CMPS 2 classification, and on some projects, he leads other journey-
11 level trades employees. Therefore, Appellant's position is best described by the Construction and
12 Maintenance Project Specialist 2 classification. On a best fit basis, his position should be
13 reallocated.

14
15 **ORDER**

16 NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the appeal on exceptions by Roy Salsberry
17 is granted, the director's determination is reversed, and Appellant's position is reallocated to the
18 Construction and Maintenance Project Specialist 2 classification.

19
20 DATED this ____ day of _____, 2007.

21 WASHINGTON PERSONNEL RESOURCES BOARD

22
23 _____
24 MARSHA TADANO LONG, Chair

25
26 _____
27 LARRY GOODMAN, Vice Chair

28
29 _____
LAURA ANDERSON, Member

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29