



March 7, 1974, Respondent failed to renew his objection, but even if he had not failed, it would be unnecessary to pass on it because of the result we reach herein.

There is no longer any question, however, of the Board's power to pass on the correctness of a reallocation action. See Ryczek v. Wettengel, Wis. Pers. Bd. Case No. 73-26, July 3, 1974. We find that the reallocation of Appellant's position to Maintenance Mechanic 3 by Respondent was indeed a correct action. Appellant's position description states that 75 percent of Appellant's time is taken up with doing "steamfitting and related repair and maintenance tasks on complex and intricate heating and ventilating apparatus." The class description for Maintenance Mechanic 3 recites that "employees in this class repair and maintain the most complicated and intricate mechanical equipment associated with heating, ventilating, air conditioning, refrigeration, boiler operation, fuel storage and dispensing and electrical systems." The class description is thus more inclusive, but we think it is a sufficiently accurate reflection of Appellant's duties so as to render the reallocation of his job to the class a correct and therefore valid action on the Respondent's part.

There are three reasons that Appellant's job does not come within the craftsman Steamfitter classification: (1) Appellant does not, as required, spend 100 percent of his time doing steamfitter's work; (2) Appellant's position description suggests that Appellant does not do installation of "steam pipes, valves, traps, fittings, connections and equipment" as set forth in the Steamfitter class description; and (3) Appellant has not completed a steamfitter's apprenticeship approved by the Department of Industry, Labor and Human Relations as also set forth in the steamfitter class description. We find that Appellant's job is not that of a steamfitter within the terms of the class description. For the foregoing reasons the reallocation action of the Respondent must be affirmed.

ORDER

IT IS ORDERED that the reallocation action of the Respondent is affirmed.

Dated January 3, 1975

STATE PERSONNEL BOARD

BY



William Ahrens, Chairman