BEFORE THE PERSONNEL APPEALS BOARD

STATE OF WASHINGTON

JAMES BUTCHER JR., Appellant, v. LIQUOR CONTROL BOARD, Respondent.	Case No. ALLO-05-0002 FINDINGS OF FACT, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW AND ORDER OF THE BOARD

Hearing on Exceptions. This appeal came on for hearing before the Personnel Appeals Board, BUSSE NUTLEY, Vice Chair, and GERALD L. MORGEN, Member, on Appellant's exceptions to the director's determination dated January 7, 2005. The hearing was held at the Personnel Appeals Board, 2828 Capitol Boulevard, Olympia, Washington, on June 16, 2005.

Appearances. Appellant James Butcher Jr. was present and was represented by Lyle Loncosty and Luis Moscoso of the Washington Public Employees Association. Human Resources Manager Frances Perry represented Respondent Liquor Control Board (LCB).

Background. Appellant submitted a Classification Questionnaire (CQ) to LCB Human Resources on January 28, 2004, requesting that his Plant Mechanic position #0983 be reallocated to a higher level position. In response to Appellant's request, Human Resources Manager Frances Perry and Human Resources Consultant Ron Key visited Appellant's work site to gain more information about his duties and responsibilities. In addition, Ms. Perry reviewed Appellant's updated CQ and a draft specification Appellant created to describe his duties. By letter dated March 30, 2004, Ms.

Personnel Appeals Board
2828 Capitol Boulevard
Olympia, Washington 98504

Perry notified Appellant that the Plant Mechanic classification was the appropriate allocation of his position based on the description of his duties. Ms. Perry also informed Appellant that the establishment of a new classification required approval from the Personnel Resources Board but that a moratorium existed on the establishment of new classes due to the implementation of Civil Service Reform and the new Personnel System.

Summary of Appellant's Argument. Appellant asserts the duties he performs are more complex and specialized than the duties described in the Plant Mechanic class specification. Appellant asserts his duties differ from those performed by other institutional plant mechanics because he is required to have specialized knowledge to maintain the robotics system and complex automated warehouse equipment unique to the LCB Distribution Center. Appellant argues that only a small percentage of the duties he performs is listed in the Plant Mechanic class specification and contends he has more responsibility than the class specification reflects.

Summary of Respondent's Argument. Respondent does not dispute that Appellant's duties are unique and differ from other plant mechanics working at other state facilities. However, Respondent contends the Human Resources Department was involved in an extensive site visit and review of Appellant's work and has determined Appellant's duties best fit within the Plant Mechanic class specification. Respondent further argues that the department does not have the authority to create a new class specification and asserts the Department of Personnel has put a moratorium on the creation of new classes. Therefore, Respondent argues Appellant's duties are best encompassed in the Plant Mechanic classification.

Primary Issue. Whether the director's determination that Appellant's position is properly allocated to the Plant Mechanic classification should be affirmed.

Personnel Appeals Board
2828 Capitol Boulevard
Olympia, Washington 98504

Relevant Classifications. Plant Mechanic, class code 75550; Plant Manager 1, class code 75700.

The definition for the class of Plant Mechanic states:

> Performs skilled mechanical work on plant machinery and mechanical equipment and systems.

The definition for the class of Plant Manager 1 states:

> Directs maintenance, repair, and alteration of buildings, equipment, and grounds at small institution or similar facility or serves as assistant to plant manager of large institution or similar facility.

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).

Appellant performs skilled work in the operation, maintenance, and repairs of specialized plant machinery to ensure minimum downtime at the LCB Distribution Center. Appellant's duties include preventive maintenance on a very specific automated warehouse system. Although Appellant's specific duties may be more specialized than the broader definition of a Plant Mechanic, we must identify the classification that most closely addresses the scope, range of duties and skills Appellant performs. To determine the class which best describes the overall duties and responsibilities of Appellant's position, we have considered all relevant classifications, including

Personnel Appeals Board
2828 Capitol Boulevard
Olympia, Washington 98504

Plant Mechanic and Plant Manager 1. We understand Appellant's duties are unique because of the sophisticated operation of the LCB Distribution Center. However, the Board is limited to reviewing the existing classifications. Appellant has not met his burden of proving that position #0983 should be reallocated to a higher level position based on the classifications available. Therefore, on a best fit basis, we conclude that Plant Mechanic is the correct classification.

Conclusion. The appeal on exceptions by Appellant should be denied, and the Director's determination dated January 7, 2005, should be affirmed and adopted.

ORDER

NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the appeal on exceptions by James Butcher Jr. is denied, and the Director's determination, dated January 7, 2005, is affirmed and adopted.

DATED this _____ day of _____, 2005.

WASHINGTON STATE PERSONNEL APPEALS BOARD

_____
Busse Nutley, Vice Chair

_____
Gerald L. Morgen, Member

Personnel Appeals Board
2828 Capitol Boulevard
Olympia, Washington 98504