BEFORE THE PERSONNEL APPEALS BOARD

STATE OF WASHINGTON

RONALD BIELENBERG, Appellant, v. WASHINGTON STATE UNIVERSITY, Respondent.	Case No. ALLO-01-0001 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 Appeals Board, WALTER T. HUBBARD, Chair; GERALD L. MORGEN, Vice Chair; and LEANA D. LAMB, Member. The hearing was held on February 28, 2001, in the Compton Union Building on the campus of Washington State University in Pullman, Washington.

Appearances. Appellant Ronald Bielenberg was present and was represented by Timothy Esser, Attorney at Law of Nuxoll, Libey, Ensley, Esser and Nelson. Karen Erp, Human Resource Representative, represented Respondent Washington State University (WSU).

Background. Appellant requested a review of the allocation of his Warehouse Supervisor position. By memorandum dated April 28, 2000, Respondent determined that Appellant's position was properly allocated. On May 25, 2000, Appellant appealed that decision to the Director of the Department of Personnel. The Director’s designee, Tammy Tee, conducted a review of Appellant's position. By letter dated December 11, 2000, the Director determined that Appellant's position was properly allocated. On January 5, 2001, Appellant filed exceptions to the Director’s determination. Appellant's exceptions are the subject of this proceeding.

Personnel Appeals Board
2828 Capitol Boulevard
Olympia, Washington 98504

Appellant oversees the operations of the Central Stores warehouse where he is responsible for supervising staff who perform warehouse functions such as receiving, storing, disposal, and delivery of supplies, equipment and materials. In addition, Appellant oversees the store's accounts, inventory, and vehicle and equipment maintenance records. Appellant supervises three full-time Driver-Warehouse Workers and one full-time Warehouse Worker I.

Summary of Appellant's Argument. Appellant argues that he has budget authority for truck purchases and maintenance and for monitoring his employees' work hours to avoid overtime payment; that he supervises employees in the disposal of refuse generated by his department; that he occasionally supervises time-slip employees performing clerical functions; that he maintains records concerning truck maintenance and replacement and staff schedules; that he oversees the disposal of surplus property including flammable or hazardous materials; and that the Driver-Warehouse Workers he supervises spend the majority of their time performing transportation duties. Appellant contends that his duties are found in the Transportation Supervisor classification and that because the majority of the work he supervises involves the transportation of a variety of materials, his position should be reallocated.

Summary of Respondent WSU's Argument. Respondent argues that Appellant does not supervise truck drivers or refuse collectors, that clerical duties are inherent in the warehouse functions, and that he is not responsible for delivery and disposal of surplus property for the overall campus. Respondent asserts that Appellant oversees the delivery and disposal of commodities that are ordered and delivered from Central Stores, which is the intent of the Warehouse Supervisor class. Respondent contends that Appellant's subordinates are not truck drivers, rather they deliver merchandise as part of the warehouse function which is consistent with the Driver-Warehouse Worker classification. In addition, Respondent contends that Appellant schedules deliveries and then the Driver-Warehouse Workers use the delivery manifest to stage and deliver the merchandise.

Respondent asserts that these are warehouse operational functions and that Appellant's overall duties and responsibilities are described by the Warehouse Supervisor classification.

Primary Issue. Whether the Director's determination that Appellant's position should be allocated to the Warehouse Supervisor classification should be affirmed.

Relevant Classifications. Warehouse Supervisor, class code 5740, and Transportation Supervisor, class code 5715.

Decision of the Board. The purpose of a position review is to determine which classification best describes the overall duties and responsibilities of a position. A position review is neither a measurement of the volume of work performed nor an evaluation of the expertise with which that work is performed. Also, a position review is not a comparison of work performed by employees in similar positions. A position review is a comparison of the duties and responsibilities of a particular position to the available classification specifications. This review results in a determination of the class which best describes the overall duties and responsibilities of the position. Liddle-Stamper v. Washington State University, PAB Case No. 3722-A2 (1994).

The Transportation Supervisor classification is intended to encompass positions that function as fleet supervisors and "[s]upervise employees in the movement, delivery, or disposal of supplies, equipment, materials, and refuse by motor vehicle." (Emphasis added.) Employees allocated to this class typically oversee transportation operations for several different service areas and oversee the work of delivery drivers, refuse collectors, clerical personnel, and temporary help in the moving, delivery, and dispersing of a variety of supplies and equipment within campus and off campus. Appellant does not have responsibility for a fleet of trucks, does not oversee operations for refuse disposal or supervise refuse collectors, and does not oversee the breadth of work encompassed by this class. The thrust and intent of Appellant's position is supervising the Central Stores warehouse

and warehouse functions which includes the delivery of merchandise to campus locations. Appellant's responsibilities for overseeing the delivery of merchandise are part of the overall warehouse function. Appellant's position does not meet the intent of the Transportation Supervisor classification.

The Warehouse Supervisor classification encompasses positions that "[s]upervise staff performing warehousing functions and participate in physical and administrative activities." Appellant's position falls within this description. Furthermore, Appellant's duties and responsibilities are described by the typical work for this class. Appellant's duties are found in the following typical work statements:

> Plan and coordinate receiving, storage, shipping and delivery, counter service and customer relations, material inspection, quality control, warehouse and records, and physical inventories in a central warehouse or warehouse complex;
>
> Maintain accounts and reconciliations of physical inventories using manual or automated system;
>
> Assist counter customers and user departments in making determinations for proper materials or substitutes;
>
> Maintain warehouse layout and locater systems; determine locations to be used for new items and relocation policies to be followed;
>
> Maintain inventory levels in accordance with established guidelines and to meet customer demands;
>
> Submit regular reports and inventory records to superior and supportive staffs;
>
> Oversee disposal of surplus or excess property including flammable or hazardous materials.

While the Warehouse Supervisor classification does not specifically address Appellant's responsibility for overseeing and monitoring truck and equipment maintenance and related budgets, this responsibility does not constitute a majority of Appellant's duties. In addition, while the

classification does not specifically address clerical duties, such work is inherent in the overall warehouse functions. Appellant's breadth of duties and level of responsibility are encompassed by the Warehouse Supervisor classification.

Conclusion. Appellant's appeal on exceptions should be denied and the determination of the Director, dated December 11, 2000, should be affirmed and adopted.

ORDER

NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the appeal on exceptions by Appellant is denied and the Director's determination dated December 11, 2000, is affirmed and adopted. A copy is attached.

DATED this _____ day of _____, 2001.

WASHINGTON STATE PERSONNEL APPEALS BOARD

_____
Walter T. Hubbard, Chair

_____
Gerald L. Morgen, Vice, Chair

_____
Leana D. Lamb, Member