

Classification Appeal Decision
Under section 5112 of title 5, United States Code

Appellant: [Appellant]

Agency classification: Transportation Assistant
GS-2102-5

Organization: [Name]
[Name]
[Name]
Veterans Affairs Medical Center
Veterans Health Administration
Department of Veterans Affairs
[Location]

OPM decision: Transportation Assistant
GS-2102-5

OPM decision number: C-2102-05-02

Judith A. Davis for

Robert D. Hendler
Classification and Pay Claims
Program Manager
Merit System Audit and Compliance

7/8/2010

Date

As provided in section 511.612 of title 5, Code of Federal Regulations (CFR), this decision constitutes a classification certificate which 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 5 CFR 511.605, 511.613, and 511.614, as cited in the *Introduction to the Position Classification Standards (Introduction)*, appendix 4, section G (address provided in appendix 4, section H).

Decision sent to:

[Appellant]
[Address]
[Location]

[Name]
Human Resources Office
Department of Veterans Affairs
Medical Center
[Address]
[Location]

Director
Compensation and Classification Service (055)
Office of Human Resources Management
Department of Veterans Affairs
810 Vermont Avenue, NW, Room 240
Washington, DC 20420

Introduction

On February 12, 2010, Philadelphia Oversight of the U.S. Office of Personnel Management (OPM) accepted a classification appeal from [Appellant]. The appellant's position is currently classified as a Transportation Assistant, GS-2102-5, and is located in the [Name], [Name], [Name], Veterans Affairs Medical Center (VAMC), Veterans Health Administration (VHA), Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) in [Location]. The appellant believes her position warrants a higher grade level. We received the complete agency administrative report on April 8, 2010, and have accepted and decided this appeal under section 5112 of title 5, United States Code (U.S.C.).

To help decide this appeal, we conducted telephone interviews with the appellant and her supervisor on May 14, 2010. In reaching our classification decision, we have carefully considered all of the information obtained from the interviews, as well as the written information furnished by the appellant and her agency including the position description (PD) of record (PD#[number]).

Background information

On August 4, 2008, the appellant requested a review of the classification of her position from the VAMC human resources office (HRO). In her request, the appellant stated her PD was not accurate because she performs the duties of a Travel Coordinator managing the Government Travel Credit Card Program and the FedTraveler Program for the [Location] VAMC. She further stated she assists all [Location] VAMC staff with problems encountered using the FedTraveler Program and duties as Travel Coordinator take up 95 percent of her time on a daily basis. The HRO's August 1, 2009, decision changed the position's classification from Secretary, GS-318-5 to Program Support (OA), GS-303-5.

On August 20, 2009, the appellant filed a classification appeal with VA central office (VACO). In her request, the appellant stated her PD was not accurate because her PD does not accurately reflect the level of responsibility and knowledge required to perform the duties of Travel Coordinator/ Agency/Organization Program Coordinator (A/OPC). She further stated the position should be classified as a Transportation Assistant (OA), GS-2102-7. VACO's November 19, 2009, decision changed the position's classification to Transportation Assistant, GS-2102-5. On January 28, 2010, she filed this appeal with OPM.

General issues

Both the appellant and her supervisor have certified to the accuracy of her PD. A PD is the official record of the major duties and responsibilities assigned to a position or job by an official with the authority to assign work. A position is the duties and responsibilities which make up the work performed by the employee. Classification appeal regulations permit OPM to investigate or audit a position and decide an appeal based on the actual duties and responsibilities currently assigned by management and performed by the employee. An OPM appeal decision classifies a real operating position and not simply the PD. This decision is based on the work currently assigned to and performed by the appellant.

By law, we must classify positions solely by comparing their current duties and responsibilities to OPM position classification standards (PCS) and guidelines (5 U.S.C. 5106, 5107, and 5112). The appellant alluded to the issue of amount of work when she stated both her travel and secretarial duties are each full-time positions in support of her assertion the position warrants a higher grade. However, volume of work cannot be considered in determining the grade of a position (*The Classifier's Handbook, Chapter 5*).

The appellant states parts of the Transportation Clerk and Assistant, GS-2102 PCS are antiquated and no longer applicable since contracted government travel is managed using an electronic program. She further states all the responsibilities still apply and are carried out, just not in the exact manner described in the PCS.

The adequacy of grade-level criteria in OPM standards is not appealable (5 CFR 511.607). All OPM GS PCSs are consistent with the grade-level definitions of work established by law. These definitions are based on the difficulty and responsibility of the work at each level and the qualifications required to do that work.

All occupations change over time, some more rapidly and profoundly than others, but the fundamental duty and responsibility patterns and qualifications required in an occupation normally remain stable. Therefore, careful application of the appropriate PCS to the work an appellant performs should yield the correct grade for their position. Any of the duties not specifically referenced in the PCS can be evaluated properly by comparison with similar or related duties the PCS does describe, as well as with the entire pattern of grade-level characteristics. The GS-2102 PCS states use of automated transportation systems to do transportation support work is addressed in the factor levels in the PCS. Use of an automated system, by itself, does not normally affect the grade of transportation support positions. Rather, the primary influences are typically the subject-matter knowledge of the kinds of information available in the system and the way that information is used. Thus, the grade-level criteria in the PCS are still valid and can be applied to evaluate the appellant's work.

Position information

The [Location] VAMC is a 78 bed, general medical and surgical facility that provides a full-range of primary care services. An outpatient Behavioral Health Clinic provides individual and group counseling services, and services for post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD), substance abuse, suicide prevention, and chronic mental illness treatment. The VAMC supports a Geriatrics and Extended Care program with Community Living Centers, respite, inpatient hospice, rehabilitation, home based primary care, care coordination home tele-health, geriatric and evaluation management services.

The appellant reports directly to the Chief [Name] Officer (GS-505-13), serving as the point of contact for resolving problems related to employee travel; provides administrative training; provides cost estimates to assist in evaluating requests for travel; and tracks and reviews itinerary/travel authorizations and expense reports. The appellant advises employees on conditions and requirements under which allowances are payable and provides information on ways to avoid excess cost or misuse of government funds. A verification process ensures all expenses are authorized and documented with receipts as required. Travel related duties include

the maintenance and reconciliation of accounts which involve features such as varying types of advanced or deferred payments, numerous modifications to programs/contracts or transactions involving multiple funds.

As A/OPC, the appellant manages the travel card program for the [Location] VAMC within the limits of authority delegated to her. She serves as the focal point for answering questions, coordination of applications, issuance and destruction of cards, establishment and review of reports, administrative training and serves as liaison between cardholders and the Transportation Management Center. The appellant also provides travel card program information to all [Location] VAMC cardholders.

The appellant and her supervisor estimate she currently spends approximately 70 percent of her time coordinating the facility Federal travel program and 25 percent of her time coordinating the facility Federal travel credit card program. She spends the remaining 5 percent of her time providing secretarial support to her immediate supervisor. This includes taking [Name] team-meeting notes, issuing time cards for each [Name] member as well as typing and filing. As specified in the *Introduction*, section III.J, only duties occupying at least 25 percent of an employee's time can affect the grade of a position. Therefore, we will not evaluate the secretarial duties in this decision.

Series, title and standard determination

The appellant does not question the series or title of her position or the use of the GS-2102 PCS to evaluate her position and, based on review of the record, we concur. Based on the mandatory titling requirements of the GS-2102 PCS, the appellant's position is allocated as Transportation Assistant, GS-2102.

Grade determination

The GS-2102 PCS uses the Factor Evaluation System (FES) under which factor levels and accompanying point values are assigned for each of the nine factors, with the total then being converted to a grade level by use of the grade-conversion table provided in the PCS. Under the FES, each factor-level description in a PCS describes the minimum characteristics needed to receive credit for the described level. Therefore, if a position fails to meet the criteria in a factor-level description in any significant aspect, it must be credited at a lower level unless the deficiency is balanced by an equally important aspect that meets a higher level. Conversely, the position may exceed those criteria in some aspects and still not be credited at a higher level.

The appellant disagrees with her agency's assignment of Levels 1-3, 3-2, and 5-2, and agrees with her agency's assignment of Levels 2-3, 4-3, 6-2, 7-b, 8-1, and 9-1. After careful review, we concur with the agency's assignment of Levels 4-3, 6-2, 7-b, 8-1 and 9-1. However, we disagree with the agency's assignment of Level 2-3. As such, we have limited our analysis to Factors 1, 2, 3, and 5.

Factor 1, Knowledge required by the position

This factor measures the nature and extent of information or facts that a worker must understand to do acceptable work, such as the steps, procedures, practices, rules, policies, theories, principles, and concepts; and the nature and extent of the skills needed to apply this knowledge.

At Level 1-3, work requires knowledge of a body of standardized transportation regulations, procedures, and operations related to one or more transportation support functions. At this level, work may require knowledge of established transportation or traffic management rules to perform a full range of transportation support duties. Work may also require knowledge of frequently used or clearly stated regulations to respond to a range of recurring questions from agency or activity personnel, customers, commercial carriers, or others. Illustrative of passenger work at Level 1-3 is an employee who screens tickets, itineraries, and bills involving foreign and/or domestic travel to ensure that information pertaining to rental cars, dates, travel periods, connections, etc., is compatible with travel authorized and that the lowest contract fare(s) was selected. The employee considers reasons for selection of higher cost or non-contract carrier. For example, he or she considers factors such as urgent timeframes, space availability, and remoteness of origin or destination points to determine if requests should be approved or forwarded for further review. The employee coordinates travel plans involving a combination of domestic or foreign travel with the contract travel service office, passport office or other offices. In doing so, the employee can ensure maximum use of Government-owned/contracted transportation or U.S. carriers and obtain or expedite the receipt of required documents, such as passports and visas. She or he provides information or answer recurring questions such as (1) what kind of paperwork is required for foreign travel (e.g. passports, visas, and medical or security clearances); (2) how much lead-time is needed to process the paperwork; and (3) when it is appropriate to use actual subsistence rates, non-contract carriers, or privately owned vehicles.

At Level 1-4, work requires knowledge and application of an extensive body of transportation regulations, methods, and practices to perform a wide variety of interrelated or nonstandard transportation support assignments and resolve a wide range of problems. At this level, work may require knowledge of extensive and diverse regulations governing a wide variety of types of passenger travel to make arrangements, provide advice, or perform other work requiring authoritative procedural knowledge of various different travel policies or laws. Illustrative of passenger work at Level 1-4 is an employee who uses knowledge of extensive and diverse regulations governing a wide variety of types of passenger travel to make arrangements, provide advice, or perform other work that requires authoritative procedural knowledge of various different travel policies or laws. In some organizations, this might involve authoritative procedural knowledge of travel rules governing official, unofficial, military, civilian, domestic, and mobility deployment travel. In other organizations, this might involve authoritative procedural knowledge of rules governing travel sponsored by non-Federal monies, foreign travel of employees under special appointments (e.g. consultants, experts, visiting scientists), and unilateral and bilateral travel agreements with foreign countries in addition to standard kinds of civilian travel. In either case, the work typically involves knowledge of lead-time needed to plan and arrange travel involving different kinds or combinations of modes of transportation, isolated origin/intermediate/destination points, multiple stops, foreign currencies, and special services (e.g. chartered buses, escorts).

The appellant's position meets Level 1-3. As at this level, her work requires knowledge of standardized regulations, procedures, or operations related to the [Location] VAMC

transportation program. She coordinates and tracks the transportation of medical center staff passenger travel from submission of the approval for travel form to the submission of the expense report for payment. This work requires applying contractor and Federal regulations as well as VA, VHA, Veterans Integrated Service Network (VISN), and VAMC guidance relating to approving travel authorizations and expense reports at the initial level, monitoring travel advances and employee overages, analyzing Transportation Management Center billing statements as well as past due listings of unpaid travel credit card bills from U.S. Bank for accuracy and investigation, faxing completed travel credit card application forms to U.S. Bank for processing and approval, and preparing permanent change-of-station documents for FedTraveler and the Government travel credit card. Her work also requires practical knowledge regarding providing cost estimates to assist in evaluating requests for travel, and determines the most convenient and economical travel arrangements. Similar to Level 1-3, the appellant prints F-16 reports generated through the Veterans Health Information Systems and Technology Architecture (VistA) system for each of the five control point funds she tracks. The control points are amounts of money placed in different pots for Information Technology, Central Office, Administrative Support, Facilities and Medical Services. The F-16 report is generated when an expense report is completed by an employee upon completion of travel. The control point totals for each fund are added to an Excel spreadsheet by the appellant on a daily basis. The Associate Director receives a copy of the spreadsheet each Friday so she knows how much travel money remains in each control point fund. During the first week of each month the appellant completes a Control Point Reconciliation Memorandum for Fiscal. The running balance (which is provided by Fiscal) needs to equal the F-16 report ending balance (which comes from the Excel spreadsheet the appellant updates each day). If the balances do not equal, which can occur during a month covered by a continuing resolution prior to the yearly agency budget approval, the appellant takes the amount of money available for travel and adds and subtracts the running balance with the F-16 report ending balance. If the balances still do not match, an explanation must be provided by the appellant to Fiscal. These functions all involve the application of standard processes and procedures typical of Level 1-3.

Similar to the Level 1-3 passenger work illustrations, the appellant's duties focus on screening travel itineraries to ensure they match the travel authorized. The employee's travel plan and expense report are initially approved by the appellant. She ensures all required information is submitted and correct (to include rental cars, dates, travel periods, connections, meals and incidental expenses, etc.). The appellant compares the employees travel template to the travel plan for consistency. The appellant receives numerous telephone calls and e-mails from employees and alternate preparer's each workday with travel-related questions and concerns. She oftentimes walks the employee through the travel request process or goes into the FedTraveler system herself to input the information. In order to assist employees further the appellant created detailed step-by-step instructions on how to complete such items as expense reports, how to make airline reservations, how to enter a travel plan, etc. These documents were placed on a Travel SharePoint web site so employees can access them anytime and are updated as needed by the appellant. This work is consistent with Level 1-3.

The appellant's position does not meet Level 1-4. The appellant states, and her supervisor concurs, unusual or one-of-a-kind travel situations occur. The examples of unusual or one-of-a-kind travel situation provided by the appellant were (1) setting up the Associate Director's (AD) travel so every two weeks an expense report is submitted for reimbursement of lodging and

meals throughout the AD's three month detail to the Pittsburgh VAMC; (2) the [Location] Mobile Veteran's Center RV driver had his schedule changed and his travel plan had to be amended several times before it ended; the appellant booked the driver on a fully-refundable flight since his departure time changed several times; (3) an employee had an authorized meeting in Washington, DC and wanted to fly to Baltimore, Maryland afterwards for a family function and then drive back to [Location]; the travel plan was set up for a one-way flight from [Location] to Washington, DC and the additional flight to Baltimore was set up by the employee outside of the FedTraveler system; the appellant informed the employee her mileage for ground travel from Baltimore, Maryland back home could not be reimbursed since it exceeded the total amount for a round-trip flight from [Location] to Washington, DC.

Unlike Level 1-4, this type of work does not require planning and arranging travel involving different kinds or combinations of transportation modes, isolated origin or destination points, multiple stops, foreign currencies, and special services. Like Level 1-3, the appellant's phased processing of the travel examples listed above use the standard features and procedures of the FedTravel system. Typical of Level 1-3, the appellant's transportation actions are normally clear-cut, involving domestic travel provided by contract carriers booked through the automated FedTraveler system instead of remote and inaccessible travel locales and non-stop travel instead of multiple stops. Occasionally the appellant receives a travel request for a higher cost/non-contract carrier which is a fully-refundable flight. When submitting the travel request, the employee provides the fully-refundable fare and the non-refundable fare for the trip. If all of the following guidelines do not apply, the employee can choose the higher cost flight: the function has to be "set in stone;" the employee is definitely planning to attend barring an emergency; and the price difference between the flights is at least a \$200 savings to the VA. If the employee has to cancel, the money reverts to the [Location] VAMC to be used for another traveler, with a minimal transaction fee. Each week the appellant receives a past-due listing from U.S. Bank. Employees are required to pay their travel credit card bills in full each month. If that does not occur, the appellant investigates the situation by contacting the employee and reviewing his/her credit card statement. If payment is not made within 60 days, the appellant looks more closely at the employee's on-line credit card statement to include the purchases made with the credit card. After 90 days, the appellant has the authority to lower the employee's credit card limit but this is done rarely. If payment is not made within 120 days, the Chief [Name] Officer is notified and becomes involved. If the appellant discovers an employee made unauthorized purchases with the travel credit card after reviewing the credit card statement, she sends a Bill of Collection to the employee. The appellant's supervisor states this happens approximately once a month which is not considered regular and recurring. Nonetheless, this work does not require applying knowledge of an extensive body of transportation regulations, methods, and practices to perform a wide variety of interrelated or nonstandard transportation support assignments at Level 1-4.

This factor is evaluated at Level 1-3 and 350 points are assigned.

Factor 2, Supervisory controls

This factor covers the nature and extent of direct or indirect controls exercised by the supervisor, the employee's responsibility, and the review of completed work.

At Level 2-2, the supervisor provides standing instructions on recurring assignments by indicating what is to be done, applicable transportation policies and procedures to follow, quality and quantity of work expected, deadlines, and priority of assignments. For example, standing instructions may cover the steps involved in processing transportation documents. The supervisor evaluates the accuracy and adequacy of individual assignments and recurring work by reviewing the frequency and nature of problems resulting from data entry errors or problems with responding to inquiries or requests. The GS-2102 notes that at Level 2-2, some employees work more independently than others. This is because, over a period of time, they have developed knowledge of transportation program objectives, alternatives, local priorities, and operating policies and procedures that influence how transportation support work is done and the kind of adaptation or exceptions that can be made. These employees carry out recurring assignments with less supervisory consultation, but deviations from “standing instructions” still must be approved by the supervisor.

At Level 2-3, the supervisor outlines objectives, priorities, and deadlines and provides guidance on dealing with unusually involved or unique situations. Employees independently plan and carry out the successive steps to complete transportation support duties and use accepted practices to resolve problems and deviations which may result because of the specialized nature of the problems, the existence of various conflicting documentation, lack of documentation or information available, or other conditions. The supervisor reviews completed work for technical soundness, appropriateness, and conformity to policy and requirements. The methods used by the employee to complete assignments are usually not reviewed in detail.

The appellant’s position functions as noted under Level 2-2. Similar to this level, the appellant independently coordinates and tracks the transportation of medical center staff passenger travel, as the sole occupant of the position she has held for an extended period of time. Her priorities and deadlines are uncontrollable and normally driven by the order and priority of employee’s travel requests. Comparable to Level 2-2, the appellant performs tasks according to established procedures and precedents, ensuring transportation support duties are consistent with [Location] VAMC employees reaching their destinations to attend training and/or seminars in a timely manner. When she encounters situations not completely covered by established instructions or guidelines, the appellant researches available guidelines and discusses it with policy experts at the Federal traveler helpline and during monthly conference calls concerning travel policy, FedTraveler and travel credit card issues. She answers all telephone and e-mail requests from employees and alternate repairers with travel-related questions and concerns. She oftentimes walks the employee through the travel request process or goes into the FedTraveler system herself to input the information. As the first-level approver for every travel plan and expense report, the appellant ensures all required information is provided to include transportation expenses, per diem expenses and miscellaneous expenses. There are three additional review levels for travel plans and two for expense reports. These reviewers check the appellant’s work for compliance with established instructions which is consistent with Level 2-2.

The appellant’s position does not meet Level 2-3. Employees at [Location] VAMC travel within the contiguous 48 states without stops in-between. Because of this, the appellant’s work is normally straight-forward in nature and so limits the level of judgment applied and while the appellant and her supervisor acknowledge she encounters one-of-a-kind travel situations, as

discussed previously in this decision, they are not so unique that available guidelines cannot be used, which are required for assignment of Level 2-3.

This factor is evaluated at Level 2-2 and 125 points are assigned.

Factor 3, Guidelines

This factor covers the nature of guidelines and the judgment employees need to apply them. Guides used in General Schedule occupations include, for example, desk manuals, established procedures and policies, traditional practices, and reference materials, such as dictionaries, style manuals, engineering handbooks, and the pharmacopoeia.

At Level 3-2, numerous procedures for doing the work have been established, and many specific guidelines are used. Guidelines include volumes or transportation regulations, manuals, guides, directories, tenders, or operating procedures. For example, guides may cover the kinds of paperwork required, special instructions or markings to use, kinds of carrier equipment available, clearance requirements, conditions for authorizing various entitlements, or carrier selection criteria.

Because of the number and similarity of guidelines or the diverse circumstances of individual actions, employees use judgment to identify and select the appropriate reference and procedure for each phase of the process, question, or condition that develops. For example, employees determine which passenger or personal property entitlement allowances apply under varying circumstances. In most cases, employees must be familiar with the general content of numerous guides since it is not practical to be researching guides continually to locate a specific reference. There may be omissions in guidelines that require employees to use some judgment and initiative to handle aspects of the work not covered completely (e.g. when deciding whether to delay shipments for consolidation purposes, devising clerical instructions to cover procedural gaps, or selecting a better route than the one requested by the customer). Employees refer situations requiring significant judgment or interpretation to the supervisor or others for guidance or resolution.

At Level 3-3, guidelines are similar to those described at Level 3-2 (e.g. transportation regulations, manuals, guides, directories, tenders, or operating procedures) but are not completely applicable to many aspects of the work because of the problem-solving or complicated nature of the assignments. Employees use judgment to interpret guidelines, adapt procedures, decide approaches, and resolve specific problems. This includes, for example, evaluating customer justifications for premium service or reconciling incomplete and conflicting information when precedents or guidelines are not available or are not directly related.

The appellant's position meets Level 3-2. The appellant uses judgment to identify and select the most appropriate guidelines to use in performing her work. She discusses situations which require significant deviations from guidelines with experts at the Federal traveler helpline and during monthly conference calls concerning travel policy, FedTraveler, and travel credit card issues. Guidelines are varied and include: VA, VHA, VISN, and VAMC directives, handbooks, memorandums, bulletins, and notices, in addition to the Federal laws and regulations pertaining

to the [Location] VAMC's transportation program and require choosing appropriate procedures from several established alternatives, consistent with Level 3-2.

The appellant's position does not meet Level 3-3. At that level guidelines are similar to those described at Level 3-2, but are not completely applicable to *many aspects* of the work because of the problem solving or complicated nature of the assignments. Employees at [Location] VAMC travel within the contiguous 48 states without stops in-between. Because of this, the appellant's work is normally straightforward in nature. While the appellant and her supervisor acknowledge she encounters one-of-a-kind travel situations and investigates overdue travel credit card listings, as discussed previously in this decision, they are not so unique that available guidelines cannot be used. The appellant also has access to experts when dealing with unique situations concerning travel, FedTraveler system and the travel credit card policies. While the appellant may occasionally encounter such situations which require interpretation, such situations are rare and not so dissimilar from some preceding cases that the extent of interpretation and absence of precedent meets the intent of Level 3-3.

This factor is evaluated at Level 3-2 and 125 points are assigned.

Factor 5, Scope and effect

This factor covers the relationship between the nature of the work; i.e., the purpose, breadth, and depth of the assignment, and the effect of work products or services both within and outside the organization. Effect measures whether the work output facilitates the work of others, provides timely services of a personal nature, or impacts the adequacy of research conclusions. The concept of effect alone does not provide sufficient information to properly understand and evaluate the impact of the position. The scope of the work completes the picture allowing consistent evaluations, and only the effect of properly performed work is considered.

At Level 5-2, the purpose of the work is to provide a full range of transportation services or to perform other transportation support work covering well-defined and precise program procedures and regulations. Work products affect the accuracy and reliability of further processes or services. Ensuring complete and accurate paperwork and instructions furthers the timely movement of freight, personal property, or passengers.

At Level 5-3, the purpose of the work is to apply conventional practices to treat a variety of problems with transportation transactions. For instance, problems may result from requests to expedite urgently needed items, a carrier's inability to meet the needs of the traveler or shipper, unexpected problems in transit, or conflicting information in documents or reports. In some situations, the work may affect the physical well-being of people, or it may affect substantial costs incurred by the agency or activity (e.g. arranging for the timely transport of emergency personnel, critical equipment, or urgently needed supplies affects the adequacy of patient care).

The appellant's position meets Level 5-2. It requires applying well-defined practices and techniques to perform a full range of transportation support work including communicating with employees requesting government travel services; verifying the information on the request for travel is complete; formulating the most convenient and economical travel arrangements; monitoring travel advances and employee overages; investigating overdue travel credit card

listings from U.S. Bank and analyzing Transportation Management Center billing statements for accuracy. Her work directly affects the travel programs efficiency by ensuring travelers arrive for training and/or conferences safely and in a timely manner, ultimately affecting the broader issue of meeting [Location] VAMC's travel availability. This meets the Level 5-2 description with its impact concerning the timely movement of passengers, as well as the accuracy and reliability of further services.

The appellant's position does not meet Level 5-3. The purpose of her work is to provide front-line support work such as responding to transportation requests, providing assistance to employee's with transportation planning, providing FedTraveler system training and assistance, and validating expense reports upon completion of travel. In contrast, Level 5-3 is intended for positions focused on resolving a *variety* of problems relating to broader operational transportation support issues (e.g. inadequate carriers, conflicting information, etc.) rather than occasional ad hoc issues typical of the appellant's position in which the response is clear-cut as discussed previously in this decision. Her position is not responsible for resolving problems of the breadth or depth expected at Level 5-3.

This factor is evaluated at Level 5-2 and 75 points are assigned.

Summary

<i>Factor</i>	<i>Level</i>	<i>Points</i>
1. Knowledge Required by the Position	1-3	350
2. Supervisory Controls	2-2	125
3. Guidelines	3-2	125
4. Complexity	4-3	150
5. Scope and Effect	5-2	75
6. & 7. Personal Contacts and Purpose of Contacts	2-b	75
8. Physical Demands	8-1	5
9. Work Environment	9-1	<u>5</u>
<i>Total Points</i>		910

The total points assigned to the appellant's position equals 910. According to the 2102 PCS grade-conversion table, positions with total point values between 855 and 1,100 are properly graded at the GS-5 level.

Decision

The appellant's position is properly classified as Transportation Assistant, GS-2102-5.