

1
2 On November 21, 2008, Appellant filed exceptions to the director's determination. Appellant's
3 exceptions are the subject of this proceeding.
4

5 Appellant works on a facilities crew for DOT's North Central Region. He performs general maintenance
6 duties including installing, maintaining, troubleshooting and repairing a variety of electrical and
7 electronic systems.
8

9 **Summary of Appellant's Arguments.** Appellant argues that he independently performs work at the
10 TSTB level a majority of the time and that his position fits the class intent, definition and distinguishing
11 characteristics of the TSTB classification. Appellant further argues that he has passed the appropriate
12 exam as referenced in the class intent for the TSTB class. Appellant asserts that the director's designee
13 failed to correctly calculate the time he spends performing the majority of his work assignments.
14 Appellant further asserts that the director's designee failed to consider the minimum qualifications for
15 the TSTB classification. Appellant contends that the TSTB classification encompasses the majority of
16 his work, the level of independence he exercises in the performance of his work and oversight he
17 receives for the work he performs.
18

19 **Summary of Respondent's Arguments.** Respondent argues that Appellant does not perform electrical
20 work a majority of the time. Respondent explains that Appellant works as part of a facilities group that
21 performs a variety of maintenance work for the North Central Region. While Respondent agrees that
22 Appellant performs electrical work as part of the maintenance duties assigned to his position,
23 Respondent contends that electrical work does not represent a majority of his work. Respondent asserts
24 that Appellant's position is best described by the MM1 classification.
25

26 **Primary Issue.** Whether the director's determination that Appellant's position is properly allocated to
27 the Maintenance Mechanic 1 classification should be affirmed.
28
29

1 **Relevant Classifications.** Maintenance Mechanic 1, class code 626J; Transportation Systems
2 Technician B, class code 7284B.

3
4 **Decision of the Board.** The purpose of a position review is to determine which classification best
5 describes the overall duties and responsibilities of a position. A position review is neither a measurement
6 of the volume of work performed, nor an evaluation of the expertise with which that work is performed.
7 A position review is a comparison of the duties and responsibilities of a particular position to the
8 available classification specifications. This review results in a determination of the class that best
9 describes the overall duties and responsibilities of the position. See Liddle-Stamper v. Washington State
10 University, PAB Case No. 3722-A2 (1994).

11
12 Appellant argues that the director's designee should have considered the minimum qualifications of the
13 TSTB classification. However, this Board has consistently held that minimum qualifications are not
14 allocating criteria. The following standards are primary considerations in allocating positions:

- 15 a) Category concept (if one exists).
16 b) Definition or basic function of the class.
17 c) Distinguishing characteristics of a class.
18 d) Class series concept, definition/basic function, and distinguishing characteristics of other classes
19 in the series in question.

20 Jurgensen v. DOC, PRB Case No. R-ALLO-07-016 (2008).

21
22 Most positions within the civil service system occasionally perform duties that appear in more than
23 one classification. However, when determining the appropriate classification for a specific position,
24 the duties and responsibilities of that position must be considered in their entirety and the position
25 must be allocated to the classification that provides the best fit overall for the majority of the
26 position's duties and responsibilities. Dudley v. Dept. of Labor and Industries, PRB Case No. R-
27 ALLO-07-007 (2007).

1 In this case, we have carefully reviewed the documentation provided and find that the majority of work
2 Appellant performs is electrical work. He performs this work independently and in compliance with the
3 applicable standards and codes.

4
5 The class series concept for the MM1 classification states:

6 Positions in this series perform general maintenance, repair, remodeling and
7 construction duties utilizing working knowledge of several related skill fields such
8 as electrical, plumbing, carpentry, welding, painting and machinist work.
9 Incumbents inspect, repair, install and maintain physical facilities, locks and
10 maintain and repair machinery and equipment. Positions may be required to lead or
11 supervise and instruct offenders, inmates or residents in general maintenance
12 activities.

13
14 The definition for the MM1 classification states:

15 Positions perform semi-skilled and sub journey work in the maintenance, repair,
16 remodeling, alterations and construction of buildings, grounds, facilities, and
17 equipment. Positions are used as general repairers when no immediate journey level
18 tradesperson is available. General repairer positions are used when it would be
19 impractical to have several journey level tradespersons on site. Other positions
20 perform a variety of semi-skilled maintenance duties requiring a limited knowledge
21 of various trade skills. These positions work independently in routine maintenance
22 assignments or under the technical direction of a journey level position.

23 Some of the work Appellant performs fits within the MM1 classification. However, this classification
24 does not encompass the majority of the work he performs or the level of independence he exercises in
25 completing his assignments. Further, this classification is intended for positions that perform a variety of
26 general maintenance work in several trades. Appellant's position primarily performs electrical work
27 rather than the variety of semi-skilled work found in the MM1 classification.

28 The class intent of the TSTB classification states: "[t]his class is designed for the Transportation
29 Systems Technician to advance within the job class after satisfactory service, successfully
completing a specific training program, and passing the appropriate exams for each level within the
job class."

The definition for the TSTB class states, in relevant part:

The Transportation Systems Technician will work the majority of their time in one or more of the following functions within WSDOT:

. . .

Perform electrical and electronic work pertaining to WSDOT to the codes and standards set by National Electrical Code (NEC) and/or Chapter 296-46 WAC, Chapter 296-401A WAC and Chapter 296-403 WAC.

The distinguishing characteristics of the TSTB class state: “[w]orks independently within specific instruction installing, maintaining, and testing in one or more areas listed in the definition. Work is subject to quality control review by higher level Transportation Systems Technicians.”

A majority of Appellant’s work involves electrical installation, maintenance, and testing in accordance with DOT codes and electrical standards. Appellant’s position is best described by the TSTB classification.

In a hearing on exceptions, the Appellant has the burden of proof. WAC 357-52-110. Appellant has met his burden of proof and his position should be reallocated to the TSTB classification.

ORDER

NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the appeal on exceptions by David Rey is granted and his position is reallocated to the Transportation Systems Technician B classification.

DATED this ____ day of _____, 2009.

WASHINGTON PERSONNEL RESOURCES BOARD

JOSEPH PINZONE, Chair

LAURA ANDERSON, Vice Chair