



STATE OF WASHINGTON
OFFICE OF THE STATE HUMAN RESOURCES DIRECTOR
DIRECTOR'S REVIEW PROGRAM
521 Capitol Way South, P.O. Box 40911, Olympia, WA 98504-0911
(360) 664-0388 · FAX (360) 586-4694

December 30, 2011

TO: Robyn Steacy, Council Representative
Washington Federation of State Employees (WFSE)

FROM: Teresa Parsons, SPHR
Director's Review Program Supervisor

SUBJECT: Melanie Wimmer v. Department of Transportation (WSDOT)
Allocation Review Request ALLO-11-021

On November 30 and December 9, 2011, I conducted a Director's review conference regarding the allocation of the following positions in the Labor & Industries (L&I) Return to Work Unit within the Office of Human Resources at WSDOT:

Tonye Penn	Position #00088
Melanie Wimmer	Position #03572
Rokaih Vansot	Position #03569

All of the employees were present for the Director's review conference. At the conference, you and Sherri Clarke, WFSE Classification Manager, represented the employees. Niki Pavlicek, Classification and Compensation Manager, represented WSDOT.

Director's Determination

This position review was based on the work performed for the six-month period prior to February 22, 2011, the date Ms. Wimmer submitted her request for a position review to WSDOT's Human Resources (HR) Office. As the Director's designee, I carefully considered all of the documentation in the file, the exhibits presented during the Director's review conference, and the verbal comments provided by both parties. Based on my review and analysis of Ms. Wimmer's assigned duties and responsibilities, I conclude her position should be reallocated to the Human Resource Consultant 4 classification.

Background

Prior to 2009, the processing of industrial insurance (L&I) claims and return to work functions were handled by various positions in each region of WSDOT. In February 2009, WSDOT

centralized the process and created the L&I Return to Work Program within the Office of Human Resources (Exhibit A-4-a, items 5-8). The employees' positions were established and allocated to the Human Resource Consultant 3 (HRC 3) class with the working title of L&I Return to Work Specialist. These positions serve the dual role of representing the agency on L&I claims and assisting injured workers through the process. The employees' positions report to a Human Resource Consultant 4 (HRC 4) position, A'Lana Ayers. Ms. Ayers reports to the Leave, Benefits & Staff Development Manager, Kathy Dawley, who reports to the Director of Human Resources, Katy Taylor (Exhibit B-8).

On February 22, 2011, Ms. Wimmer submitted a Classified Position Description (CPD) to the HR Office asking that her HRC 3 position be reallocated to the HRC 4 classification. Ms. Pavlicek conducted a desk audit and met with Ms. Dawley but did not speak directly with Ms. Wimmer's supervisor, Ms. Ayers. On April 28, 2011, Ms. Pavlicek determined Ms. Wimmer's position was properly allocated to the HRC 3 classification (Exhibit B-1).

On May 25, 2011, Ms. Wimmer requested a Director's review of WSDOT's allocation determination (Exhibit A).

Summary of Employees' (Penn, Wimmer, and Vansot) Perspective

The employees assert their positions serve as experts in workers' compensation claims and return to work issues. They indicate that each position has responsibility for two regional areas; however, together their positions manage all workers' compensation (L&I) claims and the return to work process for the agency statewide. The employees note that each case is unique but indicate the majority of their time is spent managing the most complex claims involving multiple sensitive, medical issues. As a result, the employees contend their positions require technical expertise in occupational industrial insurance, personal injury claims, and the return to work process. The employees contend they serve as subject matter experts and communicate regularly with employees, medical professionals, L&I claim managers and vocational counselors, as well as WSDOT management on the progression of each claim.

The employees contend they investigate each claim and independently make a judgment call on whether to protest the L&I claim on behalf of WSDOT. The employees assert they make these decisions without supervisory approval and write and submit the protests to L&I under their signatures on behalf of the agency. The employees further assert they continue to monitor claims through resolution and determine whether to pursue additional actions in support of the injured worker or to defend the agency's position. The employees state their positions represent WSDOT during mediations conducted by an industrial appeals judge and may be required to testify if a case goes to hearing. The employees assert they keep their supervisor informed of their decisions but do not require prior approval before submitting responses to L&I. The employees further assert they write the terms of return to work agreements with employees by assessing specific jobs requirements, job availability, and employees' medical restrictions. The employees contend their level of decision-making and the complexities of each case fit the expert level defined in the HRC 4 classification.

Summary of WSDOT's Reasoning

WSDOT asserts the employees' positions do not meet the threshold for allocation to the HRC 4 level. In addition to the class specifications, WSDOT uses an agency matrix to allocate positions in the HRC class series. As such, WSDOT contends positions allocated to the HRC 4

class have supervisory or expert level responsibilities. WSDOT asserts expert level positions require statewide responsibility for the full scope of a program. WSDOT contends the agency's application of the expert level in the HRC series is supported by a prior Personnel Appeals Board decision (Wells v. Department of Transportation, PAB Case No. ALLO-00-0014 (2001)).

In this case, WSDOT acknowledges the L&I return to work functions were centralized and these employees collectively have responsibility for managing all of the agency's L&I claims and the return to work process statewide. However, WSDOT contends that centralization does not equal statewide responsibility. Instead, WSDOT asserts each employee manages the L&I claims and return to work process for their respective regions. WSDOT contends that responses to L&I are on behalf of an assigned customer group rather than statewide. Since one individual position is not responsible for the statewide function, WSDOT asserts the employees' positions are correctly allocated to the HRC 3 classification. In addition, WSDOT contends the HRC 3 classification allows for senior, professional level work and independent decision-making and asserts the duties and responsibilities assigned to the employees' positions did not significantly change.

Rationale for Director's Determination

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. Liddle-Stamper v. Washington State University, PAB Case No. 3722-A2 (1994).

Duties and Responsibilities

On the Classified Position Description (CPD) completed by Ms. Wimmer, she describes her position's purpose, in summary, as follows:

- Manage the Northwest and Eastern Regions' and Ferries' State Fund Workers' Compensation claims on behalf of WSDOT.
- Serve as essential position in the return to work process by coordinating the physical limitations and abilities of injured workers with modified and transitional return to work opportunities.
- Develop and modify alternative positions in coordination with the regional HR staff and Appointing Authority.
- Impact [significantly reduce] the financial exposure on the agency experience factor and potential rate structure for insurance premiums statewide as a result of early return to work efforts.
- Analyze the risk of injury exposure and mitigate potential long term expense through early and frequent contact with the worker, supervisor and claims management staff.
- Confirm workers' physical abilities with medical documentation to return employees to gainful employment.

The following points summarize Ms. Wimmer's description of her position's key work activities (70%) (Exhibit B-3). However, Ms. Wimmer's supervisor, A'Lana Ayers, disagrees that the

position description she submitted for reallocation accurately reflects the work she performs, and she provided a statement of explanation (Exhibit B-4).

Ms. Wimmer's description of duties and Ms. Ayers' comments (*in italics*) are summarized below. Additional comments from the employees during the Director's review conference are included as well.

- One of three unique positions that provide HR professional and technical expertise in employee occupational industrial insurance, personal injury claims and return to work process.

During the Director's review conference, the employees clarified that personal injury claims occur when an employee becomes injured as a result of a third party, such as a driver hitting a WSDOT vehicle. The employees point out that an L&I claim still exists for the injured worker and their positions continue to work the L&I claim in an effort to return the employee to work. They note that Risk Management handles damages to WSDOT property or equipment. The employees indicate they interact with Risk Management on potential personal injury settlements to determine how they affect the L&I claims.

- Use comprehensive knowledge of Workers' Compensation insurance and an awareness of multiple labor contracts [CBAs] and personnel law.

During the Director's review conference, the employees explained that their positions review CBAs to ensure no violations occur when returning an employee to work in a position different from the one at the time of injury or illness.

- While adhering to agency policy and procedure, provide guidance to HR professionals, Safety Officers, ADA Specialists, Supervisors and Appointing Authorities on employees who have sustained an on the job injury/occupational illness.

During the Director's review conference, the employees indicated the ADA process starts when the temporary job modification no longer works and the injured worker requires a permanent accommodation. The employees stated the medical documentation they examine as part of the workers' compensation and return to work process provides the initial documentation used in the ADA process. As a result, they interact with the ADA unit by providing all case documents and knowledge of a particular case. However, the employees emphasized they continue to work the L&I claim until closure.

- Move claims to resolution, which requires application of extensive knowledge and coordination of complex medical issues.
- Review essential job functions to coordinate options for modified or transitional return to work during recovery process.
- Act as one of three subject matter experts and communicate regularly with medical professionals, L&I claims managers, and vocational counselors on the management and progression of claims.

- Provide counsel to injured employees regarding alternative human resource options including employee assistance program, disability insurance, ADA accommodations, and completion of time sheets to accurately reflect employment status while in recovery.

Ms. Ayers clarified that while this position refers injured employees as needed to the appropriate consultant and/or program lead when necessary, the Employee Assistance Program, disability insurance and ADA accommodations are not part of the Return to Work Program.

In addition, Ms. Wimmer describes 20% of her job as providing counsel to employees, which includes acting as a liaison with L&I to ensure prompt delivery of appropriate services and correct calculation of benefits. This includes ensuring correct reimbursement of wages and permanent impairment awards. Ms. Wimmer indicates her position is the WSDOT representative in the completion of the employer portion of the report of accident. She points out that confirmation is required that medical, physical therapy and vocational evaluations are administered timely and appropriately based on necessity for prompt recovery and return to work.

Ms. Wimmer describes 10% of her job as coordinating and providing input for resolution of employer and worker appeals with the Board of Industrial Insurance Appeals and maintaining records in appealed cases. Further, Ms. Wimmer indicates that she reviews data for trends in injury/illness to use in overall reduction in claims as well as coordination for proactive safety implementation. Ms. Wimmer creates bi-monthly HR data reports to coordinate and analyze data such as job functions, third party activity, prior claim history, age, and injury.

Although Ms. Ayers clarified this is a reporting function, Ms. Pavlicek agreed there is some level of analysis that Ms. Wimmer and the other employees perform to identify trends in work place injuries. Ms. Ayers also noted that knowledge of data trends is not an essential function of the position but the position requires the ability to enter data into multiple data systems.

The prior CPD for Ms. Wimmer's position also describes responsibility for managing L&I claims and the return to work process for assigned regions and serving as the key point of contact between management, the employee, HR and Safety (Exhibit B-2). While the nature of work has not changed significantly from 2009, the employees indicated they have much more autonomy to make independent decisions. They stated that they work directly with their regions and provide reports without their supervisor's review. They also respond directly to L&I on appeal issues. The employees emphasized that they keep their supervisor informed of decisions after the fact and that their supervisor and manager trust their judgment to decide how best to manage each claim. The employees indicated their positions have evolved and require expert level knowledge to proactively manage claims and develop strategies for each scenario to achieve the best outcome for the employee and the agency.

Class Specifications

When comparing the assignment of work and level of responsibility to the available class specifications, the class series concept (if one exists) followed by definition and distinguishing characteristics are primary considerations. While examples of typical work identified in a class specification do not form the basis for an allocation, they lend support to the work envisioned within a classification.

The **Human Resource Consultant 3 (HRC 3)** definition reads as follows:

Serves as senior level human resource consultant/advisor. Independently performs professional level human resource assignments in one or more areas of the human resource function such as classification, compensation, benefits, recruitment and selection, affirmative action and equal employment opportunity, reasonable accommodation, training, organizational development, and/or labor relations.

The HRC 3 distinguishing characteristics include the following:

This is the senior professional level. Under general direction, independently provides administrative direction and counsel to clients regarding a broad range of human resource management issues which require the application of professional judgment in the analysis of complex human resource and operational relationships. Responsibilities include resolving complex human resource issues having broad potential impact. Issues may involve competing interests, multiple clients, conflicting rules or practices, a range of possible solutions or other elements that contribute to complexity.

Ms. Wimmer's position independently performs professional level human resource assignments related to workers' compensation claims and the return to work process. She independently makes decisions and uses professional judgment to determine the appropriate course of action. The issues she deals with are complex, and her decisions have broad potential impact. As a result, the HRC 3 classification encompasses Ms. Wimmer's duties and responsibilities.

At the **Human Resource Consultant 4 (HRC 4)** level, the position serves as "an assigned professional expert in one or more functional human resource areas" or supervises professional, human resources staff. Ms. Wimmer's position has not been assigned supervisory responsibility. Therefore, the primary distinction in this case is whether Ms. Wimmer's position serves as an expert.

The HRC 4 distinguishing characteristics include the following:

. . . Assignments require application of knowledge and expertise to make decisions on complicated issues. These assignments often require proactive intervention and have wide or precedent setting impact. Provides advice and consultation to organization management, lower level professional staff, and peers. Handles or oversees the organization's most sensitive, complex, or critical human resource issues. Provides advice and guidance and/or supervises professional or other staff members.

Both the HRC 3 and 4 classes describe independent work requiring a high level of professional judgment. When considering the expert level, I reviewed the level and complexity of work definitions in the Office of the State HR Director's Glossary of Classification Terms:

Expert - Within the context of the class series, has the highest level of responsibility and extensive knowledge based on research and experience in a specific area. Resolves the most complex, critical, or precedent-setting issues

that arise. Positions act as a resource and provide guidance on specialized technical issues. Although an employee may be considered by their peers as an expert or "go-to" person at any level, for purposes of allocation, the term is typically applied to an employee in a higher class level who has gained expertise through progression in the series.

Highly/Most Complex – Responsibilities include extensive research and analysis of systems, facts, figures, or similar information to determine the nature and scope of problems that need to be solved. Develops new policies, procedures, or techniques to address problems not covered by existing written procedures or manuals.

It is undisputed the three positions included in this review manage all L&I claims and the return to work process for the entire agency. Each has responsibility for at least two regions, and they collaborate regularly to ensure the others have adequate knowledge about the most complex cases to ensure back up coverage. During the Director's review conference, Ms. Pavlicek agreed the employees' supervisor does not perform these functions. Instead, she indicated that the supervisor's responsibilities include day to day operations and normal supervisory functions, as well as special projects for her manager. The employees' supervisor does meet with them on a monthly basis to go over claims information, and the employees keep their supervisor informed of the decisions they make. In addition, the employees indicated their supervisor will sit in on mediations about 50% of the time. However, the supervisor does not review the employees' decisions ahead of time. Rather, the employees research and investigate the specifics of each case including the causal relationship between the injured worker's job functions and type of injury, past claims and medical history. They document any discrepancies or distinctions that need to be highlighted to L&I on claims and write letters of protest on those they dispute. They continue to monitor all claims through case resolution.

In the supervisor's statement to the CPD, Ms. Ayers does not dispute Ms. Wimmer "provides HR professional and technical expertise in employee occupational industrial insurance and return to work process." Rather, she notes Ms. Wimmer's position refers injured employees to program areas outside of the Return to Work Program, such as the Employee Assistance Program, disability insurance, and ADA unit. The employees clarified they continue to work with other program areas on information as it ties to the L&I claim. For example, the employees continue to handle the L&I portion of personal injury claims that may also be part of a claim involving Risk Management. Further, they continue to handle the L&I claim on issues that may later evolve into a request for permanent accommodation. In addition, there is no dispute Ms. Wimmer's position serves as one of three subject matter experts in industrial insurance claims and return to work.

Although Ms. Wimmer's duties and responsibilities fit within the HRC 3 class, the overall level of responsibility assigned to her position exceeds this classification. Each class within the HRC series encompasses the duties performed at the prior class level. For example, the HRC 4 typical work statements denote work performed at the HRC 3 level as well. The distinction between classes includes the level of responsibility and extensive knowledge and expertise gained through progression in the series. The employees in this case perform their duties at a level that goes beyond processing workers' compensation claims and recommending actions. These employees make decisions about whether to protest a claim, and they represent the agency's position when there is an appeal before the Board of Industrial Insurance Appeals. While their supervisor oversees the unit's work, she does not make the daily judgment calls on

how to proceed with each case, and she does not review the employees' decisions before they are issued on behalf of WSDOT.

I understand WSDOT has historically required statewide responsibility for designation to the expert level. In Wells v. Department of Transportation, PAB Case No. ALLO-00-0014 (2001), the former Personnel Appeals Board wrote, in part, "[p]ositions at the HRC 4 level have agency-wide responsibility for the most complex issues, including resolving agency-wide problems and influencing agency-wide changes. The preponderance of Appellant's responsibilities are at the regional level and do not have agency-wide impact." Agency-wide responsibility, however, encompasses the scope of impact on the agency as a whole. In Wells, the Appellant was assigned to the Northwest Region and worked on a variety of human resource issues within the region. The employees here are assigned to a centralized Return to Work Unit at Headquarters, and each position has responsibility for managing workers' compensation claims and the return to work process, which is an agency-wide function, for more than one region. They represent the agency's position on L&I protests and appeals and influence the outcome.

Each case involves specific complexities and nuances. Some are routine but most are complex. For example, there may be multiple issues to consider such as prior injuries that may or may not be related to the job, diagnoses creep, subsequent or ongoing injuries, which all need to be investigated and managed to achieve the best outcome. These positions proactively manage claims with the goal of returning injured workers to employment while minimizing costs to the agency. This involves working with medical professionals to determine how a diagnosis affects an employee's ability to perform job functions; determining when to ask for additional medical exams or obtain segregation of medical conditions; working with payroll and benefits on leave issues, including FMLA; coordinating with ADA staff when permanent accommodations are needed; and working with employees and regional HR staff and management to find viable options for employment or modified duty whenever possible. These daily decisions impact how the agency as a whole manages workers' compensation and return to work issues.

Since the Wells decision in 2001, the Office of the State HR Director's Glossary of Classification Terms has provided additional guidance on the definition of an expert. Neither this definition nor the HRC 4 definition specifically requires "statewide responsibility" for designation as an expert, though such a designation may result in a position being assigned statewide responsibility. The Glossary's definition describes resolution of "the most complex, critical, or precedent-setting issues," and the HRC 4 definition indicates that "assignments often require proactive intervention and have wide or precedent setting impact."

In Salsberry v. Washington State Parks and Recreation Commission, PRB Case No. R-ALLO-06-013 (2007), the Personnel Resources Board addressed the concept of best fit. The Board concurred with the former Personnel Appeals Board's conclusion that while the appellant's duties and responsibilities did not encompass the full breadth of the duties and responsibilities described by the classification to which his position was allocated, on a best fit basis, the classification best described the level, scope and diversity of the overall duties and responsibilities of his position. Allegrì v. Washington State University, PAB Case No. ALLO-96-0026 (1998).

WSDOT places emphasis on having statewide responsibility for allocation to the HRC 4 class as an expert. However, when considering the level, scope and diversity of the overall duties and responsibilities of Ms. Wimmer's position, they best align with the HRC 4 class. Positions allocated to the HRC 4 level require little oversight. They operate at the expert level within the

class series and require expert level knowledge to make decisions. In line with the Glossary's definition, Ms. Wimmer's position is one of three positions serving as a subject matter expert with extensive knowledge in the areas of workers' compensation and return to work. She acts as a resource and provides guidance on specialized issues in these areas. Her position is responsible for resolving L&I claims ranging from routine to the most complex and critical cases. The decisions she makes have the potential to affect future decisions on how WSDOT responds to L&I claims. Although the workers' compensation and return to work program has been centralized in one unit, the volume of claims and size of the agency require more than one individual position to manage the workload. Each position has been assigned responsibility for at least two regions, but the complexity of work remains the same for each position. The individual decisions these positions make on behalf of WSDOT have agency-wide impact. Additionally, the following HRC 4 typical work examples align with the duties and level of responsibility assigned to these positions:

- Provides advice, interpretation and counsel to clients regarding applicable human resource rules, regulations, policies and procedures . . .
- Meets with administrators, supervisors and employees to assess human resource needs; plans, develops and implements strategies to promote effective client relations and to resolve problems;
- Investigates, prepares documentation and recommends position on . . . complaints and appeals; serves as representative in a variety of appeal or adjudicative forums;
- Performs the duties of Human Resource Consultant 3.

Overall, the Human Resource Consultant 4 classification best describes the duties and responsibilities assigned to Ms. Wimmer's position.

Appeal Rights

RCW 41.06.170 governs the right to appeal. RCW 41.06.170(4) provides, in relevant part, the following:

An employee incumbent in a position at the time of its allocation or reallocation, or the agency utilizing the position, may appeal the allocation or reallocation to . . . the Washington personnel resources board Notice of such appeal must be filed in writing within thirty days of the action from which appeal is taken.

The mailing address for the Personnel Resources Board (PRB) is P.O. Box 40911, Olympia, Washington, 98504-0911. The PRB Office is located at 521 Capitol Way South, Olympia, Washington. The main telephone number is (360) 664-0388, and the fax number is (360) 586-4694.

If no further action is taken, the Director's determination becomes final.

c: Melanie Wimmer
 Niki Pavlicek, WSDOT
 Lisa Skriletz, OSHRD

Enclosure: List of Exhibits

MELANIE WIMMER v. WSDOT
ALLO-11-021

A. Director's Review Request (on PRB form), received May 25, 2011

Employees' Exhibit Notebook (Penn, Wimmer & Vansot) includes copies of WSDOT's Exhibits 1 -7 listed below in section B and Employees' Exhibits as follows:

1. Employee Service Center & Human Resources Organizational Chart, dated 7/1/11 (after period relevant for this review)
2. Claims Activity Expectations – February 26, 2009 (informational – prior to review period)
3. Employee Performance Reviews – Penn (2008 – 2010)
 - a. Supportive Documents – Penn (same documents for all three employees):
 - 1) 2010 Annual L&I Worker Compensation Experience Factor & Claim Costs
 - 2) 2009 Annual L&I Worker Compensation Experience Factor & Claim Costs
 - 3) June 15, 2010 email from Kathy Dawley containing L&I Monthly Stats 2010
 - 4) April 13, 2011 email from Katy Taylor regarding news story from Governing Magazine
 - 5) News story: "Being Proactive on Workers' Compensation Claims"
 - 6) News story: "Praise for Return to Work Team"
 - 7) News story: "WSDOT Return to Work unit receives national award"
 - 8) Submittal for NAPSE Award (describes program)
 - b. Position Description including supervisor's concerns with comparison to WSDOT's allocation matrix – written by Mr. Penn
4. Employee Performance Reviews – Wimmer (2009 – 2011)
 - a. Supportive Documents – Wimmer (same as 3-a above)
 - 1) 2010 Annual L&I Worker Compensation Experience Factor & Claim Costs
 - 2) 2009 Annual L&I Worker Compensation Experience Factor & Claim Costs
 - 3) June 15, 2010 email from Kathy Dawley containing L&I Monthly Stats 2010
 - 4) April 13, 2011 email from Katy Taylor regarding news story from Governing Magazine
 - 5) News story: "Being Proactive on Workers' Compensation Claims"
 - 6) News story: "Praise for Return to Work Team"
 - 7) News story: "WSDOT Return to Work unit receives national award"
 - 8) Submittal for NAPSE Award (describes program)
 - b. Position Description including supervisor's concerns with comparison to WSDOT's allocation matrix – written by Ms. Wimmer

- c. Human Resource Consultant 4 class specification comparison to Position Description for Ms. Wimmer – written by Ms. Wimmer
- 5. Employee Performance Reviews – Vansot (2009 – 2011)
 - a. Supportive Documents – Vansot (1-7 below are the same as 3-a and 4-a above)
 - 1) 2010 Annual L&I Worker Compensation Experience Factor & Claim Costs
 - 2) 2009 Annual L&I Worker Compensation Experience Factor & Claim Costs
 - 3) June 15, 2010 email from Kathy Dawley containing L&I Monthly Stats 2010
 - 4) April 13, 2011 email from Katy Taylor regarding news story from Governing Magazine
 - 5) News story: “Being Proactive on Workers’ Compensation Claims”
 - 6) News story: “Praise for Return to Work Team”
 - 7) News story: “WSDOT Return to Work unit receives national award”
 - 8) Submittal for NAPSE Award (describes program)
 - 9) Emails regarding process and specific cases (some outside time period – informational)
 - b. Position Description Break Down – written by Ms. Vansot
 - c. Response to Employer’s Disagreement to Position Description – written by Ms. Vansot
 - d. Position Description including supervisor’s concerns with comparison to WSDOT’s allocation matrix – written by Ms. Vansot
 - e. Human Resource Consultant 4 class specification comparison to Position Description for Ms. Vansot – written by Ms. Vansot
- 6. Employees’ responses to points in WSDOT’s allocation matrix

B. WSDOT’s Exhibits

- 1. WSDOT’s allocation determination April 28, 2011
- 2. Classification Questionnaire on file dated September 2008
- 3. Employee-submitted Position Description date-stamped February 22, 2011
- 4. Clarification notes received from supervisor February 18, 2011
- 5. Classification Specifications
 - a. Human Resource Consultant 3
 - b. Human Resource Consultant 4
- 6. WSDOT’s allocation matrix for HRC series
- 7. PAB decision ALLO-00-0014 William Wells v. Department of Transportation
- 8. Office of Human Resources organizational chart, dated 2/1/11