



As provided in section 511.612 of title 5, Code of Federal Regulations, this decision constitutes a certificate that is mandatory and binding on all administrative, certifying, payroll, disbursing, and accounting officials of the government. The agency is responsible for reviewing its classification decisions for identical, similar, or related positions to ensure consistency with this decision. There is no right of further appeal. This decision is subject to discretionary review only under conditions and time limits specified in the Introduction to the Position Classification Standards, appendix 4, section G (address provided in appendix 4, section H).

### **Decision sent to:**

[the appellant]

Director of Civilian Personnel  
 Headquarters, Joint Readiness Training Center  
 and Fort Polk  
 Building 413 Radio Road  
 Fort Polk, LA 71459

[the attorney representative  
 for the appellant]

Chief, Classification Branch  
 Field Advisory Services Division  
 Defense Civilian Personnel Management  
 Service  
 1400 Key Boulevard, Suite B-200  
 Arlington, VA 22209-5144

Director of Civilian Personnel U.S.  
 Department of the Army  
 Room 23681, Pentagon  
 Washington, DC 20310-0300

Director, U.S. Army Civilian Personnel  
 Evaluation Agency  
 Crystal Mall 4, Suite 918  
 1941 Jefferson Davis Highway  
 Arlington, VA 22202-4508

## **Introduction**

The Dallas Oversight Division of the U. S. Office of Personnel Management (OPM) received a classification appeal from [the appellant], an employee in the Aviation Division; Directorate of Plans, Training, Mobilization, and Security; Department of the Army; Fort Polk, Louisiana. [The appellant] is currently employed as an Air Traffic Assistant, GS-2154-7. He believes his position should be classified as either Air Traffic Control Specialist (Station), GS-2152-9, or Air Traffic Assistant, GS-2154-8. The appeal has been accepted and decided under section 5112 of title 5, United States Code.

## **General issues**

On March 8, 1995, the Defense Civilian Personnel management Service (CPMS) issued an appeal decision classifying flight service duties as Air Traffic Control Specialist (Station), GS-2152-9. That appeal decision was reversed by a second CPMS decision dated March 1, 1996, which required all Department of the Army positions performing flight service duties to be consistently and properly classified as Air Traffic Assistant, GS-2154-8. The appellant's appeal to CPMS to have his position reclassified as Air Traffic Control Specialist (Station), GS-2152-9, was denied, and the position was classified as Air Traffic Assistant, GS-2154-7, by the CPMS decision issued on April 15, 1997.

To help decide the appeal, an Oversight Division representative conducted telephone audits with the appellant and his immediate supervisor. In reaching our classification decision, we have reviewed the audit findings and all information of record furnished by the appellant and his agency, including his official position description 12136. The appellant, his supervisor, and the agency have certified to the accuracy of the position description.

## **Position information**

The appellant works a rotating shift to provide assistance to pilots by receiving and reviewing flight plans, assisting pilots in correcting flight plans when necessary, and providing information on changing weather conditions. He records flight plans in an automated system and provides appropriate notifications to air traffic control facilities. He maintains flight data on aircraft departing from and returning to the airfield and on planned arrivals. He provides updated weather reports and weather warnings to aircraft by radio. The appellant posts Notices to Airmen (NOTAM's) for pilot information and prepares local NOTAM's as needed (e.g., concerning the operational status of local navigational aids). He assists in aircraft emergencies by notifying crash and rescue units and by initiating search and rescue operations. He maintains information, materials, and forms for use in flight planning.

The appellant is under minimal, immediate supervision of the airfield operations officer who makes general assignments and provides guidance on new or changed procedures. The appellant performs his assignments independently within the parameters of established procedures. When a deviation from the normal method of completing a task is required, the appellant generally has to take action immediately and inform the supervisor about it afterwards.

The appellant's position requires knowledge of Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) and Army regulations and procedures governing the preparation and filing of flight plans. The work also requires knowledge of radio procedures and the ability to transmit weather warnings and other information necessary to the safe operation of aircraft within his area of responsibility. The position does not require FAA certification or training.

### **Series and title determination**

The appellant believes that his position is properly classified in the Air Traffic Control Series, GS-2152. Specifically, the appellant believes that his position falls under the "station" specialization described in the GS-2152 standard. The "station" specialization pertains to positions concerned with: (1) the control of air traffic to insure the safe, orderly, and expeditious movement along air routes and at airports when a knowledge of aircraft separation standards and control techniques, and the ability to apply them properly, often under conditions of great stress, are required; (2) the providing of pre-flight and in-flight assistance to aircraft requiring a knowledge of the information pilots need to conduct safe flights and the ability to present that information clearly and concisely; or (3) the development, coordination, and management of air traffic control programs.

According to the standard, Air Traffic Control Specialists in flight service stations brief pilots on weather conditions, advise on the existence or development of potentially hazardous weather conditions, suggest alternate routes, and, when appropriate, recommend that flights not be attempted. Based on knowledge of airway route structures and air traffic procedures, Air Traffic Control Specialists assist pilots in planning the route of flight, making flight computations, filing flight plans, and obtaining clearances to fly in controlled air space. They develop, disseminate, and monitor the currency of NOTAM's. They provide current and forecast weather data and flight planning information to en route aircraft and request and disseminate pilot reports of significant weather conditions. They also provide assistance to pilots who are lost or who are in an emergency situation, and they initiate search and rescue operations to locate aircraft failing to report their arrival within prescribed time limits.

Positions in the Air Traffic Control Series require an extensive knowledge of the laws, rules, regulations, and procedures governing the movement of air traffic. The GS-22152 standard identifies certain specific knowledges and skills required of Air Traffic Control Specialists in flight service stations. These knowledges and skills include:

- thorough knowledge of aviation weather including causes, effects, and dynamics of weather systems;
- ability to interpret and interpolate a variety of weather data into information useful to pilots;
- ability to determine the capabilities of a pilot to assure that the information presented is such that the pilot is aware of conditions expected and how they will affect the flight;

- detailed knowledge of the station's assigned area of responsibility, including operational features of assigned airports, location and performance characteristics of associated air navigational facilities, airway structures and routes, topography and factors affecting weather, air traffic control procedures pertinent to the area, applicable airspace restrictions, and emergency service procedures;
- detailed knowledge of procedures related to flight handling, routing, airways and airspace structures;
- general knowledge of the performance characteristics of a wide variety of aircraft;
- skill in communicating effectively with pilots of all levels of experience in a variety of situations;
- ability to provide emergency service to aircraft in distress; and
- ability to coordinate actions with other specialists and related air traffic facilities.

To be qualified for work in the Air Traffic Control Series, the GS-2152 qualifications standard requires all persons in the GS-2152 series to possess an FAA certification for the type of facility where they are employed. The qualifications standard also requires applicants for positions in the GS-2152 series to meet certain physical standards.

The appellant performs work that is similar to the work described for the GS-2152 "station" specialization. For instance, he reviews and records flight plans, advises on hazardous weather conditions, and provides assistance to pilots in emergencies. However, we find significant differences between the work of the appellant and the work described in the GS-2152 standard. For example, the appellant does not actually conduct pilot briefings on weather conditions; he simply relays weather updates and warnings to pilots. Pilots receive pre-flight weather briefings twice a day from weather service personnel via closed-circuit television monitors. The appellant does not provide weather information to en route aircraft, and he does not provide assistance to lost pilots. Although the appellant reviews completed flight plans for adequacy, he typically does not actively assist pilots in the planning of flights.

As a result of these significant differences between the actual work of the appellant and the work described in the GS-2152 standard, there are also significant differences in the required knowledges and skills. To perform his weather-related duties, the appellant does not analyze and interpolate weather data, and he is not required to understand the causes and dynamics of aviation weather to the extent described in the GS-2152 standard. He is not required to perform flight computations or to have knowledge of operating characteristics of a wide variety of aircraft. The appellant's position does not require FAA certification for flight service stations, and his position does not require him to meet the physical requirements specified by the GS-2152 qualifications standard. Consequently, we find that the appellant's position is not properly classified in the GS-2152 series.

We find that the Air Traffic Assistance Series, GS-2154, the most appropriate series for the work of the appellant. The GS-2154 series covers work performed to support air traffic control. Positions in this series require knowledge and skill to apply air traffic control procedures, but they do not require the in-depth knowledge of air traffic control functions described in the GS-2152 standard. Positions in the GS-2154 series do not require FAA certification and do not carry physical requirements. In accordance with the GS-2154 standard, the appellant's position is properly classified as Air Traffic Assistant, GS-2154.

### **Grade determination**

The GS-2154 standard does not provide criteria to determine grade level; the standard instructs the classifier to use other standards providing grade level criteria for similar kinds of one-grade interval work. In its decision of April 15, 1997, the CPMS used the grade level criteria in Part II of the standard for the Meteorological Technician Series, GS-1341. (Part II covers positions at or above the GS-4 level.) The GS-1341 series covers work that requires practical and technical knowledge and that is performed to collect and disseminate meteorological information. The work performed by the appellant is similar to that described in the GS-1341 series in that both involve the collection and dissemination of information based on practical and technical knowledge. We find that Part II of the GS-1341 standard provides reasonable criteria to determine the grade level of the appellant's position.

The GS-1341 standard uses two factors to determine grade level. These factors are Responsibility and Complexity.

#### *Responsibility*

This factor covers the kind and degree of supervisory, technical, and administrative controls over the work. Specifically, the factor measures the responsibility for making recommendations and decisions, the extent of personal contacts and commitment authorities, and the availability of guides. The factor describes three levels, covering a range extending from the limited responsibility found at Level I to extensive responsibility at Level III. The CPMS decision of April 15, 1997, reflects evaluation of this factor at Level II.

At Level II, the supervisor provides instructions concerning new procedures, departures from established work practices, and any anticipated complications. The supervisor checks the technician's work to ensure that the critical aspects of the work have been completed satisfactorily and that any decisions and recommendations made are appropriate. Personal contacts at Level II usually involve the collection or presentation of technical information that is mostly factual and straightforward, although some interpretation or supplementation to meet user requirements may be involved. The technician makes recommendations and decisions that involve routine matters adequately covered by available guidelines or precedents.

We find that the appellant's work meets Level II. The appellant works within established FAA and Army regulations and standards and within standard operating procedures established by his installation. The appellant is not authorized to significantly deviate from these procedures without obtaining supervisory approval, except in emergency situations when a supervisor is not available. The supervisor spot checks the appellant's work, as described at Level II of the factor. In his contacts with pilots, the appellant gives factual information covered by established procedures. For example, he reviews flight plans for completeness and accuracy, and he recommends changes when necessary (e.g., if a pilot plans to enter an established airway at an unauthorized altitude, the appellant will point this out to the pilot and recommend an alternative). He provides pilots with updated weather reports.

Level III of the factor differs from Level II primarily in increased freedom from technical supervision; added requirements for the planning and scheduling of assignments; and additional demands for resourcefulness and technical judgments to interpret or adapt guidelines, instructions, and precedent material. At Level III, the supervisor provides very general instructions concerning broad objectives and provides general advice on unusual conditions and administrative matters. The technician receives little or no technical assistance. The supervisor's review of the work typically consists of an overall evaluation of adequacy and timeliness.

The relative freedom from technical supervision typically found at Level III includes work situations requiring, on either a fixed or rotational basis, the performance of work when supervision is entirely absent or not readily available. Level III responsibility covers, but is not limited to, situations where technicians make unreviewed decisions alone on a shift, e.g., to provide warnings of hazardous weather based on their judgment concerning the effect of changes in weather elements. Technicians decide whether to confirm warning conditions by waiting for additional reports or to alert concerned public officials immediately. Personal contacts at Level III typically are extensive and important, constitute a significant aspect of the work, and usually involve the presentation and discussion of complicated technical material that requires considerable supplementation, interpretation, or elaboration to meet user requirements. The technician makes recommendations and decisions that are technically complex. Instructions and informational materials are usually available but are complicated and require interpretation or adaptation in their application to specific work assignments. In many instances, however, demanding production or operational requirements may preclude or severely restrict the practical availability of these guides.

We find that the work of the appellant does not meet Level III. Although the appellant receives little or no technical supervision in the course of his daily assignments, his work is covered by published regulations, standards, and operating procedures that are directly applicable to his work. The appellant does not deviate from these guidelines to any significant extent. Also unlike Level III, the appellant has a supervisor available on each shift except weekends. Although the appellant exercises some judgment (e.g., as in determining when to provide weather warnings to pilots), that judgment is restricted to relaying factual information provided by others. The appellant has few opportunities to supplement or elaborate on the information provided. Similarly, he does not normally need to interpret or adapt guidance materials.

We determine the responsibility factor to be properly evaluated at Level II.

### *Complexity*

This factor measures the nature, variety, and difficulty of the work and the knowledges, skills, and abilities required to perform the work. This factor is described by six degrees, ranging from assignments of limited scope and difficulty at Degree A to complicated and technically demanding assignments at Degree F. The CPMS decision of April 15, 1997, evaluated this factor at Degree C.

Work at Degree C requires considerable planning, scheduling of work sequences, and changing of plans while the work is in progress to adjust to conditions that could not be predicted adequately or program changes that could not be anticipated at the initiation of the assignment. Degree C requires a great deal more skill and judgment than at lower levels because the employee must plan and sequence assignments, adjust or adapt work methods to the specific requirements of the assignment, and, in many instances, set up, operate, and maintain more complex equipment and instrumentation.

At Degree D, the work is very technically demanding and requires considerable knowledge of work methods, techniques, procedures, and equipment. The work also requires employees to apply seasoned judgment and keen skills. At Degree D, the work typically involves complicated methods, use of elaborate equipment or instrumentation, exacting data collection requirements, or heavy public service schedules. Employees at Degree D must use knowledge and judgment to determine how local conditions affect weather forecasts. They must consider reports and observations from various sources and consider whether to take action to protect life and property.

We find that Degree C of the factor best matches the complexity of the appellant's work. Degree C describes work where technicians apply methods and procedures that are less complex and more standardized than the work procedures described at Degree D. Work at Degree C involves considerable planning and scheduling, and it involves using some judgment to determine what actions to take. The appellant's work closely resembles Degree C in that, although the use of standardized procedures characterize the work, the appellant does use some judgment in determining appropriate actions. For instance, when he reviews flight plans, he considers the experience of the pilot and the details of the flight plan in deciding how to provide assistance and information. Changing weather conditions and changes in the operational status of local navigation beacons may require him to make some modifications in procedures. While the appellant does not have the broad discretion to change work methods as described at Degree D, his work requires him to adapt to changes in external conditions, e.g., flight training activities, air traffic, and weather.

The appellant's work does not meet Degree D in that the judgment exercised by the appellant involves applying established regulations, standards, and procedures to specific situations that are directly related to these guides. Most of the decisions he makes while performing his work are based on these established guidelines rather than on the individual assessments. His data collection responsibilities involve the collection of flight plan information on prescribed forms and in prescribed formats which are normally completed by pilots and only reviewed by the appellant. Most of the



judgments made by the appellant concerning the accuracy of flight plan information are based on FAA and Army requirements and on established airways. His work requires him to use more limited judgment than what is described at Degree D. Degree D describes work requiring judgment based on significant technical knowledge. The technician performing work at Degree D must determine how new technical information affects current information and then must identify appropriate actions to take. The appellant's work, however, primarily involves making judgments about whether information (e.g., flight plans) complies with established regulations and procedures and about what changes, if any, must be made to achieve compliance.

We determine the complexity factor to be properly evaluated at Degree C.

### **Decision**

According to the GS-1341 standard, the combination of Level II for Factor I and Degree C for Factor II equates to GS-7. The appellant's position is properly classified as Air Traffic Assistant, GS-2154-7.