BEFORE THE PERSONNEL RESOURCES BOARD

STATE OF WASHINGTON

DOUGLAS FRAZIER, Appellant, vs. DEPARTMENT OF CORRECTIONS, Respondent.	)	CASE NO. R-ALLO-12-008 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, DJ MARK, Chair; JOSEPH PINZONE, Vice Chair; and, NANCY HOLLAND YOUNG, Member, on Appellant's exceptions to the director's determination dated August 10, 2012. The hearing was held in the Personnel Resources Board hearing room in Olympia, Washington, on January 30, 2013.

Appearances. Appellant Douglas Frazier was represented by Joe Kuhn, Business Representative for the Teamsters. Appellant and his representative appeared telephonically. Respondent Department of Corrections (DOC) was represented by Tina Cooley, Human Resource Consultant.

Background. Appellant works at Airway Heights Corrections Center in the Maintenance Department. His position was allocated to the Maintenance Mechanic 1 classification. On March 15, 2011, Appellant submitted a Position Review Request to DOC's human resources office asking that his position be reallocated to the Maintenance Mechanic 4 classification. The time frame relevant for Appellant's allocation review is March 15, 2010 to March 15, 2011.

From February 1, 2010, through May 31, 2010, Appellant worked in a non-permanent Maintenance Mechanic 4 position performing work in the welding shop. At the conclusion of Appellant's non-permanent appointment, he was returned to his Maintenance Mechanic 1 position and DOC place another employee in the Maintenance Mechanic 4 position in the welding shop. Appellant did not perform welding from June through September 2010. From June to September 2010, Appellant primarily performed general grounds keeping and maintenance work. From October 2010 through

March 2011, Appellant performed general grounds keeping work, general maintenance duties, and some welding duties.

By letter dated November 8, 2011, DOC denied Appellant's request for reallocation. Appellant filed a review request with the Office of the State Human Resources Director. On May 15, 2012, the director's designee conducted a review of Appellant's request. By letter dated August 10, 2012, the designee determined that Appellant's position should be reallocated to the Maintenance Mechanic 2 classification.

On August 27, 2012, Appellant filed exceptions to the director's determination. Appellant's exceptions are the subject of this proceeding.

During the time frame relevant to this review, Appellant performed a variety of duties ranging from sub journey to expert level welding and general maintenance duties and grounds keeping work which included operating heavy equipment, such as a front end loader, digging and excavating. Appellant's position reported to a Plant Manager 3. Appellant did not work under the technical direction of a journey level welder.

Summary of Appellant's Arguments. Appellant argues that he has been performing welding duties since 2008. He agrees that he was paid at the Maintenance Mechanic 4 level for a portion of the time frame covered by this review and that for several months during this time frame, he did not perform welding duties. However, Appellant contends that the majority of the work he performed, and continues to perform, consists of duties that the Maintenance Mechanic 4 position in the welding shop performed. Appellant explains that he is not supervised by a journey level welder; rather his supervisor is a journey level electrician and does not oversee Appellant's welding activities. Appellant argues that he independently performs welding work at the journey and expert levels such as manufacturing mechanized vehicle gates, reconstructing lockers and fabricating and building handrails. Appellant contends that welding duties and responsibilities constitute a majority of his work and that his position should be reallocated to the Maintenance Mechanic 4 level.

Summary of Respondent's Arguments. Respondent asserts that during the twelve month period relevant to this review, Appellant's welding duties represented less that 30% of his overall duties and responsibilities. Respondent contends that the time tracker reports show that the majority of Appellant's duties and responsibilities were grounds keeping, general maintenance and other tasks. Respondent argues that the majority of the duties performed by Appellant do not reach the level of duties found in the Maintenance Mechanic 4 classification.

Primary Issue. Whether the director's determination that Appellant's position should be reallocated to the Maintenance Mechanic 2 classification should be affirmed.

Relevant Classifications. Maintenance Mechanic 2, class code 626K, and Maintenance Mechanic 4, class code 626M.

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. 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 that best describes the overall duties and responsibilities of the position. See Liddle-Stamper v. Washington State University, PAB Case No. 3722-A2 (1994).

We have carefully reviewed the exhibits, including Appellant's time tracker reports for the time period relevant to this review, and considered the arguments of the parties. Based on the entirety of the information provided, during the time frame relevant to this review, welding tasks did not constitute a majority of Appellant's duties and responsibilities.

The definition of the Maintenance Mechanic 2 classification states, in relevant part:

> This is the journey, working or occupational level of the series. Positions at this level perform a variety of skilled work in the operation, maintenance, repair, remodeling and construction of buildings, grounds, machinery, mechanical facilities and equipment . . . Incumbents work independently and utilize a general

knowledge of several related skill fields such as plumbing, electrical, welding, carpentry, and machinist work.

The Maintenance Mechanic 2 classification encompasses the majority of the duties and responsibilities of Appellant's position during the time frame relevant to this review.

This decision is based on the duties and responsibilities of Appellant's position during the twelve months prior to March 15, 2011. The duties Appellant performed, and for which he was compensated, while he was assigned to the non-permanent Maintenance Mechanic 4 position are not relevant to the allocation of his Maintenance Mechanic 1 position. Additionally, the duties he performed after March 15, 2011, are not relevant to this review. If Appellant feels that his duties have changed subsequent to the time frame covered by this review, he may request a review of his current duties and responsibilities in accordance with DOC procedures and the Collective Bargaining Agreement between DOC and the Teamsters.

In a hearing on exceptions, the Appellant has the burden of proof. WAC 357-52-110. Appellant has failed to meet his burden of proof. The Maintenance Mechanic 2 classification best describes the overall duties and responsibilities of Appellant's position.

ORDER

NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the appeal on exceptions by Douglas Frazier is denied and the director's determination dated August 10, 2012, is affirmed and adopted.

DATED this _____ day of _____, 2013.

WASHINGTON PERSONNEL RESOURCES BOARD

_____
DJ MARK, Chair

_____
JOSEPH PINZONE, Vice Chair

_____
NANCY HOLLAND YOUNG, Member