

**Department of Defense (DoD)**  
**Civilian Personnel Management Service (CPMS)**  
**Field Advisory Services - *FAS***  
**Classification Appeal Decision**

---

<b>DoD Decision:</b>	<b>GS-301-13 (title at the discretion of the agency)</b>
<b>Initial classification:</b>	Business Development and Transition Officer, GS-301-13
<b>Organization:</b>	Army Depot Directorate of Resources Business Development and Transition Office
<b>Date:</b>	July 15, 1998

**BACKGROUND**

On May 6, 1998, Defense Civilian Personnel Management Service, Field Advisory Services Division, accepted a classification appeal from , who is currently classified as a Business Development and Transition Officer, GS-301-13. The appellant has appealed the grade level and title of his position, requesting that his position be reclassified to Program Manager, GS-301-14.

**SOURCES OF INFORMATION**

- Information contained in appeal file submitted by the appellant
- Information contained in administrative report submitted by servicing personnel office
- Position Audit with appellant
- Telephone interview with first level supervisor
- Telephone interview with Program Manager for U.S. Army, Department of Defense Base Closure and Transition Office

## **POSITION INFORMATION**

The appellant serves as the Chief of the Business Development and Transition Office, under the Director of Resources. The Depot is an ammunition depot, and is principally involved in ammunition operations, to include receipt, storage, issue, renovation, modification, maintenance, and demilitarization of conventional munitions. Other Depot functions include ammunition equipment design and development, as well as the operation of a rail maintenance and overhaul facility. The appellant's position involves two major functions: (1) managing several of depot's administrative programs, including Business Development and Marketing; and (2) serving as Base Transition Coordinator for two other Depot's in other states.

As the chief of the Business Development and Marketing Office, the appellant performs a variety of duties related to the planning, development and execution of a business marketing plan, aimed at marketing the services of the Depot to potential Department of Defense customers. This involves working closely with functional managers of the installation to develop a marketing strategy, identify target customers, define products and services, develop partnering agreements with private industry, and to design marketing tools. The appellant makes marketing visits to potential customer installations and represents the Depot at conferences, trade shows, and other meetings, briefing target audiences on business opportunities and products. Other administrative programs managed by the appellant include developing and maintaining the Depot's Strategic Plan (based on input from a strategic planning committee); overseeing interservice support agreements (ISSA's); managing the Depot's base realignment and closure actions (including caretaker functions); coordinating Commercial Activities Studies and/or other related studies conducted at the Depot; and coordinating the use of the installation's facilities for National Guard and Reserve training.

The appellant also supervises a staff consisting of four management analysts (two GS-11, one GS-12, and one GS-13), as well as the caretaker force at one of the base closure sites, made up of four wage grade maintenance workers (one WL-08, one WG-08, two WG-05). The supervisory duties comprise about 10 to 15 percent of the appellant's duty time. In all, the duties related to business development, marketing and other administrative programs comprise about 50 to 55 percent of the duty time.

The other major function of the appellant's position involves serving as the designated "Base Transition Coordinator" for two BRAC installations, one that closed in 1993 and one scheduled for closure 2003. As the Base Transition Coordinator, or BTC, the appellant performs a variety of tasks and duties which facilitate the transition of the installation from military functions to civilian utilization, and possibly public ownership of the land (e.g., one of the sites is to be transferred to Department of Interior's Bureau of Land Management, then to Bureau of Indian Affairs). Transition-related actions include monitoring environmental clean-up and remediation actions; coordinating the leasing of land and/or facilities to private industry for industrial operations; representing Army at a variety of meetings and hearings; identifying potential or actual problems related to base transition, developing solutions through facilitation and mediation; and providing information on all related issues to interested parties. In this role, the appellant acts as coordinator, facilitator, mediator, ombudsman and communication liaison between the Department of Defense and an array of other interested entities, including private industry, local and state governments, private citizens' groups, members of Congress, and Native American tribal governments. The purpose of the BTC is to provide a single point of contact during the transition process, and to ensure that all base transition actions are in accordance with applicable laws, policies, rules and regulations (McKinney Act, DoD's Economic Adjustment Program, EPA regulations, etc.). The BTC duties constitute 45 to 50 percent of the appellant's duty time.

The appellant reports to the Director of Resources (Resource Manager, GS-501-14) at the Depot, but also receives supervision from the Program Manager for U.S. Army, DoD Base Closure and Transition Office (Washington, DC) for all matters pertaining to his role as Base Transition Coordinator.

The appellant's disagreement with the classification of his position is primarily based on the evaluation of his duties as Base Transition Coordinator for the two installations. Although this

appeal decision will focus on those points of disagreements cited by the appellant, all of the duties assigned and performed will be reviewed, and a decision will be rendered based on the whole position.

#### **STANDARD(S) REFERENCED**

- OPM Position Classification Standard for Miscellaneous Administration and Program Series, GS-301 (series coverage)
- OPM Administrative Analysis Grade Evaluation Guide

#### **SERIES AND TITLE DETERMINATION**

The appellant has not contested the series allocation of his position. The GS-301 Miscellaneous Program and Administration Series covers nonprofessional, two-grade interval work to which no other series is directly applicable. Generally, work classified to the GS-301 series requires analytical ability, judgment, discretion, and knowledge of a substantial body of administrative or program principles, concepts, policies, and objectives. This is characteristic of the appellant's position. Although portions of the appellant's work can be classified to specific occupational series (GS-1101 General Business and Industry; GS-343 Management and Program Analysis), none of those series appropriately captures the miscellaneous nature of the appellant's whole position. The work performed by the appellant essentially involves the planning, development and execution of various administrative programs that support the mission of the Depot, as well as the Department of Defense (with respect to the BTC functions). The work requires knowledge of a variety of administrative policies, laws, rules and regulations applicable to the assigned program areas, as well as skill in analytical and evaluative methods and techniques. The GS-301 series is the best match for the work performed by the appellant.

The GS-301 series has no officially prescribed titles. The assignment of the official title will be left to the discretion of the local personnel office. Note: The appellant has requested the title "Program Manager." This would not be an appropriate official title because it is a prescribed title for another occupational series (GS-340 Program Management Series).

## **GRADE DETERMINATION**

The grade of the position will be determined using the criteria found in the Administrative Analysis Grade Evaluation Guide (AAGEG), which was used by the local personnel office in their evaluation of the position. The criteria in the AAGEG is in the Factor Evaluation System (FES) format. Under FES, the position is evaluated against nine factors, and is assigned a specific level under each factor. In order to be assigned a particular factor level, the position must fully meet that level, or the lower level is credited. The appellant contends that the local personnel office has improperly credited his Base Transition Coordinator duties, specifically under Factor 2 (Supervisory Controls), Factor 3 (Guidelines), and Factor 5 (Scope and Effect). This evaluation will focus on those factors in contention.

### **Factor 1. Knowledge Required**

The local personnel office credited 1-8 for this factor, and the appellant does not dispute this level. Concur with local personnel office.

Level 1-8 is credited. (1550 points)

### **Factor 2. Supervisory Controls**

The local personnel office assigned level 2-4 for this factor. The appellant believes that 2-5 is the appropriate level because of the independence with which he performs the base transition coordination duties, and the lack of direct technical supervision he receives. The appellant reports to the Director of Resources at the depot, who provides general supervision over the administrative programs managed by the appellant (business development, marketing, etc.) For the BTC duties, however, the appellant is supervised by the Army Program Manager at the DoD Base Closure and Transition Office (in Washington, DC). At level 2-4, according to the standard, employees operate within a framework of priorities, funding and overall project objectives. The employee and supervisor develop a mutually acceptable project plan, which includes the identification of work to be done, the scope of projects, and deadlines for completion. At this level, employees are responsible for independently planning and organizing projects, coordinating with appropriate offices and/or personnel, and carrying out

the work assignments free from direct supervision. Generally, at 2-4, work products are reviewed by the supervisor for compatibility with organizational goals, guidelines, and effectiveness in achieving objectives. The appellant's position meets this level.

At level 2-5, the employee is a recognized authority, and is subject only to administrative and policy direction concerning overall priorities and objectives. At this level, employees have complete responsibility to plan, schedule and carry out major projects, and make determinations on whether to broaden or narrow the scope of projects or assignments. Work products (often in the form of analyses, evaluations, and recommendations) are normally reviewed only for potential influence on broad agency policy objectives and program goals, and are normally accepted without significant change. Typically, the level of authority described at level 2-5 is accompanied by full responsibility for a significant program or function. The appellant contends that level 2-5 accurately reflects the supervisory controls exercised over his position (as BTC), based on the language in the position description which says that the position receives "administrative supervision" only, and is delegated "complete" responsibility for carrying out the base transition efforts for the two installations. The fact-finding in this case, however, suggests that although the appellant normally operates free from direct supervision in performing those duties, there are recognizable controls over the position, as well as limits to the authority exercised by the appellant which prevent it from meeting level 2-5. The nature of the base transition process does not allow the appellant to exercise any real authority over the transition-related projects and actions. Rather, the BTC is the facilitator in the process, and is not in a position to make decisions on substantive, transition-related matters. Although the appellant exercises a high degree of independence in facilitating the base transition process, this freedom from supervision is not comparable to level 2-5, at which employees are delegated complete responsibility to plan, schedule, and carry out major projects or programs and have authority to broaden or narrow the scope of projects. In this case, the appellant's authority is limited to process-oriented matters related to base transition rather than substantive matters, and is not comparable to the level of authority described at level 2-5.

Also at level 2-5, work products are reviewed only for potential influence on broad agency policy objectives and program goals, and are normally accepted without significant change. Again, the appellant asserts that this is the case with his position, and, in fact, there is similar language in the position description. The duties do not support this, however. The appellant

performs the base transition work with a high level of independence and very little intervention or review by the supervisor. This level of independence is covered by level 2-4. A distinguishing characteristic of level 2-5 is the delegation of full technical authority to the employee, under only administrative supervision, coupled with significant program responsibility. In this case, the appellant receives program-related supervision from the Army Program Manager, DoD Base Closure and Transition Office, who monitors the base transition actions at the installations and reserves decision-making authority for actions that are beyond the scope of normal base transition procedures. Also, the supervisor, albeit physically far-removed from the appellant's worksite, is available for technical and program guidance on transition-related matters, and is responsible for managing the base transition program for the agency, including analysis and formulation of policies affecting the program.

Level 2-5 is not met. Level 2-4 is credited. (450 points)

### **Factor 3. Guidelines**

The local personnel office credited level 3-4 for this factor. The appellant claims that 3-5 is the correct factor level assignment, based on the base transition coordinator duties. At level 3-4 in the Administrative Analysis Grade Evaluation Guide, guidelines consist of general administrative policies and precedents which provide a basic outline as to the results desired, but do not go into detail as to the methods to be used to accomplish work assignments. Also at this level, guidelines typically cover program goals and objectives, but are generally broad in scope, and require considerable adaptation and interpretation for application to specific issues and problems faced by the employee. Employees at this level may also be required to refine or develop more specific implementing regulations for local use. In contrast, level 3-5 guidelines consist of basic agency policy statements and initiatives which provide no specificity as to how programs are to be carried out. Also at this level, guidelines include federal, state, and local laws applicable to the program managed, court decisions, proposed legislation and other regulatory initiatives that may have an effect on the programs or projects. At level 3-5, employees are required to use a high degree of judgment and discretion in determining intent, and interpreting and revising existing policy and regulatory guidance for use by others within or outside the employing organization. These employees are typically recognized experts, and develop and/or interpret guidelines applicable to the program on an agency-wide basis.

In this case, the appellant works within a broad framework of policies and guidelines that govern the base transition process, including the Department of Defense Base Reuse Implementation Manual (BRIM), and is expected to independently adapt and interpret guidance to the local base transition situations. Because of the nature of the BTC duties, the appellant must be well-versed in local and state regulations in areas such as environmental protection, leasing agreements, and land use. Also, the appellant monitors local transition-related political and court decisions and must be able to determine their impact on the base transition process. The position falls short of level 3-5, however. Although some aspects of the appellant's work are comparable to level 3-5 (specifically the nature of the guidelines), the position does not meet the full intent of that level. This factor measures not only the nature and characteristics of the guidelines, but also how they are applied, and to what extent the employee is required to interpret, adapt and develop guidance. The description of guidelines at level 3-5 suggests work assignments of much broader scope than that of the appellant's, specifically policy development and formulation having program or agency-wide coverage, or reviewing proposed legislation regulations that would significantly change the basic character of the agency's programs. The work of the appellant's position, while requiring considerable interpretation and analysis of guidelines, is limited to the base transition process at two installations, and does not have agency or program-wide coverage.

Level 3-4 is credited. (450 points)

#### **Factor 4. Complexity**

The local personnel office has credited level 4-5 for this factor, and the appellant does not dispute this assignment. Concur with local personnel office.

Level 4-5 is credited. (325 points)

#### **Factor 5. Scope and Effect**

The local personnel office assigned level 5-4 for this factor. The appellant disagrees, asserting that the correct level is 5-5, and possibly 5-6 because of the importance of the base transition process to the installations and their surrounding communities, as well as the interest that some members of Congress have expressed in particular issues.

At level 5-4, according to the Administrative Analysis Grade Evaluation Guide, the purpose of the work is to assess the productivity, effectiveness, and efficiency of program operations, contributing to the effectiveness of program operations at various echelons or locations within the organization. Employees at this level are also required to analyze and resolve problems related to program operations. The duties of the appellant, as Base Transition Coordinator, are comparable to the level described at 5-4. Those duties include coordinating a variety of transition-related actions, identifying potential and actual problems, and facilitating the resolution of those problems by acting as a communication conduit among the parties involved. The BTC is an integral part of the process, and is essential to the success of the installation's smooth transition.

At level 5-5, the purpose of the work is to analyze and evaluate major administrative aspects of substantive, mission-oriented programs, involving the development of long-range program plans, goals, and objectives, or evaluating the effectiveness of programs conducted throughout a large, complex multi-mission field activity. Work at level 5-5 typically involves findings or recommendations of major significance to top management of the agency, and may serve as the basis for new systems, legislation, regulations or programs. Although the appellant's work has significant impact on the base transition process for the two installations to which he is assigned, it does not have the far-reaching scope and impact envisioned by level 5-5 in the standard. The description of work at that level suggests responsibility for projects that significantly affect the primary mission or programs of the organization (Army). While the base transition program is important to the Department of the Army (and to DoD), it does not materially affect the Army's primary mission. Also, the appellant's BTC responsibilities are limited to two small to medium-sized installations and their surrounding communities, which are not comparable to the organizations described at level 5-5.

The appellant argues that his position reaches factor level 5-6 because of the high profile nature of the base transition program, and the interest it generates from some members of Congress (as well as the local community). At level 5-6, however, work involves broad and extensive assignments related to government programs which are of significant interest to the public and members of Congress. Examples given at level 5-6 include nationwide public assistance programs, effects of international petroleum pricing on national energy policy, major adjustments in military force or deployment levels, and national drug enforcement

programs. Projects at this level involve major programs that affect the operations of several federal agencies carrying out key government programs. The appellant's work does not involve assignments of this scope or effect.

Level 5-4 is credited. (225 points)

#### **Factor 6. Personal Contacts & Factor 7. Purpose of Contacts**

The local personnel office credited level 4-D under these factors, and the appellant does not dispute these factor level assignments. While level 4 under Persons Contacted is appropriate, the appellant's position does not warrant level D under Purpose of Contacts. At level D, the purpose of contacts is to justify or settle matters involving significant or controversial issues, such as recommendations affecting major programs, dealing with substantial expenditures, or changes to the nature and scope of organizations or programs. Although the appellant has high level contacts in the performance of his base transition coordinator duties, he is not required to (or authorized to) justify or settle the issues or problems that arise from the transition process. Rather, as the BTC, his responsibility is limited to coordinating and facilitating the process by which those issues are resolved. This responsibility requires the appellant to be well-versed in the substantive (and controversial) issues in contention, and at times, to make recommendations designed to further the transition process. However, the appellant's responsibility in representing the Department of Defense as the BTC does not include the authority and responsibility for settling or resolving those substantive issues which are described at level D. For this reason, the position does not meet level D under Purpose of Contacts. Level C is credited.

The correct level for this factor is 4-C. (230 points)

#### **Factor 8. Physical Demands**

The local personnel office has credited level 8-1 for this factor, and the appellant does not dispute this assignment. Concur with local personnel office.

Level 8-1 is credited. (5 points)

### **Factor 9. Work Environment**

The local personnel office has credited level 9-1 for this factor, and the appellant does not dispute this assignment. Concur with local personnel office.

Level 9-1 is credited. (5 points)

### **Factor Level Summary**

<b>Factor</b>	<b>Level Assigned</b>	<b>Points</b>
<i>1. Knowledge Required</i>	1-8	1550
<i>2. Supervisory Controls</i>	2-4	450
<i>3. Guidelines</i>	3-4	450
<i>4. Complexity</i>	4-5	325
<i>5. Scope and Effect</i>	5-4	225
<i>6. Personal Contacts &amp; 7. Purpose of Contacts</i>	4-C	230
<i>8. Physical Demands</i>	8-1	5
<i>9. Work Environment</i>	9-1	5
	<b>Total</b>	<b>3240</b>

Point Range: GS-13 3155-3600  
GS-14 3605-4050

The points assigned to the appellant's position convert to a GS-13, based on the grade conversion chart in the standard.

**DECISION**

The position is properly classified as a GS-301-13.