

BEFORE THE PERSONNEL RESOURCES BOARD
STATE OF WASHINGTON

WASHINGTON STATE PARKS AND
RECREATION COMMISSION,

Appellant,

vs.

ROBERT BROAD,

Respondent.

CASE NO. R-ALLO-09-037

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

Hearing on Exceptions. Pursuant to WAC 357-52-100, this appeal was heard by the Personnel Resources Board, DJ MARK, Member, on Appellant's exceptions to the Director's determination dated October 6, 2009. The hearing was held at the office of the Personnel Resources Board in Olympia, Washington, on March 31, 2010. JOE PINZONE, Chair, and LAURA ANDERSON, Vice Chair, reviewed the record, including the file, exhibits, and the entire recorded proceedings, and participated in the decision in this matter. Subsequent to this hearing but prior to issuing this decision, the Board's titles changed. The signatures on this document reflect the Board's current titles.

Appearances. Appellant Parks and Recreation Commission (Parks) was represented by George Price, Human Resource Consultant. Respondent Robert Broad was present and was represented by Kurt Spiegel, Labor Advocate for the Washington Federation of State Employees.

Background. Mr. Broad's position, #465-0288, was allocated to the Park Ranger 2 (PR2) class. His position serves as the Head Park Ranger for Brooks Memorial State Park, a satellite park in the Goldendale Park Area. On July 26, 2007, Mr. Broad and his supervisor, Park Area Manager Richard Davis, completed and signed a Classification Questionnaire (CQ) requesting that Mr. Broad's position be reallocated to the Park Ranger 3 classification. Although Mr. Davis signed the CQ, he did not complete Sections 31 or 32 indicating whether he agreed or disagreed with

1 Mr. Broad's description of his duties. Park's Human Resource Office received the request on
2 August 3, 2007.

3
4 On May 13, 2008, Scott Griffith, Eastern Region Human & Financial Resources Manager,
5 conducted a Park Points Audit for Brooks Memorial State Park and on August 5, 2008, he signed
6 Mr. Broad's CQ indicating that the position did not meet the criteria for allocation to the Park
7 Ranger 3 (PR3) class.

8
9 By letter dated August 12, 2008, George Price, Human Resource Consultant, notified Mr. Broad
10 that his position was properly allocated to the Park Ranger 2 classification.

11
12 On September 15, 2008, Mr. Broad submitted a Request for Director's Review form and asked
13 that his position be reallocated to the PR3 class. By letter dated October 5, 2009, the director's
14 designee concluded that Mr. Broad's position was best described by the PR3 classification and
15 that his position should be reallocated.

16
17 On November 2, 2009, Parks filed exceptions to the director's determination. Parks' exceptions are
18 the subject of this proceeding.

19
20 Mr. Broad's position functions as the Head Park Ranger at Brooks Memorial State Park. Brooks
21 Memorial State Park is a satellite park in the Goldendale Park Area. Mr. Broad independently
22 performs park ranger duties including law enforcement, maintenance, administration, development,
23 staff supervision and visitor services at Brooks Memorial.

24
25 **Summary of Parks' Arguments.** Parks argues that the allocation of park ranger positions is
26 determined by using the parks points system to assign points to each park or park area throughout
27 the agency and that the same standards apply in each assessment. Parks contends that the parks
28 points system classifies Brooks Memorial as a Class 2 park. Parks asserts that the class
29 specifications describe the work that rangers typically perform but that position allocations are

1 based on the parks points system. Parks agrees that Mr. Broad supervises another PR2 position but
2 argues that this occurs in other park areas as well and is allowed by the park ranger class series
3 concept which provides that positions in the series may supervise less trained or lower level staff.
4 Therefore, Parks asserts that supervision of a PR2 should not be used as a determinative factor for
5 the allocation of Mr. Broad's position. Parks further asserts that the duties and responsibilities of
6 Mr. Broad's position do not meet the definition of senior level duties. For example, Parks argues
7 that the area manager approves operational functions and activities at the park, directs the
8 construction and maintenance projects at the park and prepares the park budget. Parks explained
9 that Mr. Broad performs journey level duties at the park such as supervising the operational
10 functions and activities, providing information to the area manager for inclusion in the budget,
11 providing law enforcement at the park and performing duties associated with visitor relations. Parks
12 contends that Mr. Broad's position serves as the Head Park Ranger independently performing
13 journey level duties in a Class 2 satellite park and therefore, his position fits the definition of the
14 PR2 level.

15
16 **Summary of Mr. Broad's Arguments.** Mr. Broad argues that he works beyond the journey level
17 and that his supervisory duties are above the PR2 level. Mr. Broad asserts that his duties are best
18 described as senior level duties as encompassed in the PR3 class and as described by the typical
19 work statements found in the classification. Mr. Broad contends that he performs senior level
20 work such as identifying, planning and scheduling all park activities, directing the construction
21 and maintenance program at the park, preparing and managing the budget for the park including
22 the allocation of funds and purchasing, training and evaluating personnel, receiving and resolving
23 complaints, and planning and assigning work at the park. Mr. Broad asserts that the parks points
24 system is antiquated, was developed when more park ranger classifications were available, and
25 no longer serves as a valid allocation tool for the current park ranger classifications. Mr. Broad
26 further asserts that the points audit done for Brooks Memorial does not accurately reflect the
27 number of park attendees, the park's water systems, or the number of permits, such as firewood
28 cutting permits, issued at the park. Mr. Broad argues that Brooks Memorial is within less than
29 one point of meeting the Class 3 threshold and that if the points were corrected, his position

1 would clearly meet the PR3 definition. Mr. Broad asserts that the level of responsibility assigned
2 to his position, including the supervision of another PR2, meets the PR3 classification and asks
3 that the director's determination be upheld.

4
5 **Primary Issue.** Whether the director's determination that Mr. Broad's position should be
6 reallocated to the Park Ranger 3 classification should be affirmed.

7
8 **Relevant Classifications.** Park Ranger 2, class code 389B, and Park Ranger 3, class code 389C.

9
10 **Decision of the Board.** The purpose of a position review is to determine which classification
11 best describes the overall duties and responsibilities of a position. A position review is neither a
12 measurement of the volume of work performed, nor an evaluation of the expertise with which
13 that work is performed. A position review is a comparison of the duties and responsibilities of a
14 particular position to the available classification specifications. This review results in a
15 determination of the class that best describes the overall duties and responsibilities of the
16 position. See Liddle-Stamper v. Washington State University, PAB Case No. 3722-A2 (1994).

17
18 When allocating positions, the following standards, in descending order, are the primary
19 considerations:

- 20
- Class series concept (if one exists).
 - 21 • Definition or basic function of the class.
 - 22 • Distinguishing characteristics of a class.
 - 23 • Class series concept, definition/basic function, and distinguishing characteristics of other
24 classes in the series in question.

25 Consideration is also given to allocating criteria specifically developed for a class series provided
26 that the criteria are referenced in the classification specifications. In this case, the parks points
27 system, also known as the Park Management Position Allocation System, is referenced in the
28 class series concept for the Park Ranger series. The class series concept states:

Positions in this series administer, operate, and maintain a state park or a park area. Positions provide interpretation of federal and state rules and regulations and provide assistance to park visitors. Positions provide education, visitor services and law enforcement. Positions in all class levels may be required to lead or supervise less trained or lower-level staff.

Allocation to this occupational category and levels is determined by the assignment of points by the Park Management Position Allocation System.

(Emphasis added.)

The definition for the Park Ranger 3 classification states:

This is the senior level of the series. Positions at this level typically have one of the following assignments:

- Responsibility for the management and operation of a Class 3 or Class 4 State park or park area.
- Serve as principal assistant to the manager of a Class 5 or Class 6 State park or park area in developing, controlling and accomplishing all program activities for a group of parks in non-contiguous locations.

In response to Mr. Broad's reallocation request, Brooks Memorial was audited using the Park Management Position Allocation System. The audit confirmed that Brooks Memorial was a Class 2 park. Therefore, Mr. Broad's position does not meet the primary allocating criterion for allocation to the PR3 classification. Both parties agree that the Park Management Position Allocation System is in need of revision. However, until revisions are adopted, the existing system is the allocating standard that must be followed.

The Department of Personnel Glossary of classification terms defines senior level work as:

The performance of work requiring the consistent application of advanced knowledge and requiring a skilled and experienced practitioner to function independently. Senior level work includes devising methods and processes to resolve complex or difficult issues that have broad potential impact. These issues typically involve competing interests, multiple clients, conflicting rules or practices, a range of possible solutions, or other elements that contribute to complexity. The senior level has full authority to plan, prioritize, and handle all duties within an assigned area of responsibility. Senior level employees require little supervision and their work is not typically checked by others.

1 Mr. Broad does not perform senior level duties as described at the PR3 level. For example, while
2 Mr. Broad oversees construction projects at the park, the primary responsibility for planning and
3 development resides with the area manager. Further, Mr. Broad's position does not deal with
4 complex or difficult issues that have broad potential impact. Rather, the primary scope of impact
5 of Mr. Broad's position is within Brooks Memorial State Park.

6
7 The definition for Park Ranger 2 states, in relevant part:

8 Positions at this level independently perform journey level Park Ranger duties
9 including law enforcement and may have one of the following assignments:

- 10 • ...
- 11 • Serve as a head ranger in a Class 2 satellite park unit in an area management
12 concept.
- 13 • ...
- 14 • Leads and direct one or more permanent Park Ranger 1.
- 15 •

16 Department of Personnel Glossary defines independent as the "[a]uthority to make decisions
17 without supervisory approval regarding the work processes and methods which will be used;
18 Individuals can modify procedures as long as changes conform to agency/institutional and
19 departmental policies and regulations."

20 The Glossary provides that positions functioning at the journey-level are "[f]ully competent and
21 qualified in all aspects of a body of work and given broad/general guidance. Individuals can
22 complete work assignments to standard under minimal supervision. Also referred to as the
23 working or fully qualified level."

24
25 Mr. Broad is the Head Park Ranger at Brooks Memorial, a Class 2 satellite park with the
26 Goldendale Park Unit as described in the PR2 definition. Further, his law enforcement duties and
27 responsibilities are encompassed in the PR2 levels. Mr. Broad is given broad and general
28 guidance and he works independently and makes decision without supervisory approval
29

1 regarding the work performed at Brooks Memorial. In addition, he is fully qualified and
2 competent in all aspects of his work and he works under minimal supervision. Mr. Broad's
3 position fits within the definition of the PR2 classification.

4
5 In a hearing on exceptions, the Appellant has the burden of proof. WAC 357-52-110. Parks has
6 met its burden of proof.

7
8 **ORDER**

9 NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the appeal on exceptions by the Parks and
10 Recreation Commission is granted and Robert Broad's position, #465-0288, is properly allocated
11 to the Park Ranger 2 classification.

12
13 DATED this ____ day of _____, 2010.

14 WASHINGTON PERSONNEL RESOURCES BOARD

15
16 _____
17 LAURA ANDERSON, Chair

18
19 _____
20 DJ MARK, Vice Chair

21
22 _____
23 JOE PINZONE, Member