

12000
NREAD
18 Mar 86

FIRST ENDORSEMENT on Supvy Ecologist ltr 12000 of 18 Mar 1985

From: Director, Natural Resources and Environmental Affairs
Division, Marine Corps Base, Camp Lejeune
To: Assistant Chief of Staff, Facilities, Marine Corps Base,
Camp Lejeune

Subj: FIRST ENDORSEMENT ON ELIZABETH A. BETZ LETTER OF 12 FEB 86

1. Subsequent to my visit to CPO this morning, I talked with Mr. D. Sharpe about Ms. Betz's appeal and the fact Mr. Horne, CPO, advised he would not change the package signed out by Col Airola unless I provided justification.
2. I advised Mr. Horne, Mrs. Downing and Mrs. Radabough that Ms. Betz was operating the gas chromatograph to perform official VOC test and she would be graded on the gas chromatograph work at the end of this appraisal period.
3. Mr. Danny Sharpe has addressed the current situation from his position which I am forwarding (see attached). I agree with the conclusion in paragraph 4 of his memo.
4. Please advise.

JULIAN I. WOOTEN

1944

REPORT ON THE PROGRESS OF THE WORK DURING THE YEAR 1944

The work during the year 1944 has been devoted to the study of the properties of the ...

The results of the work during the year 1944 are summarized in the following ...

CHIEF OF BUREAU

Memorandum

DATE: 18 March 1986

FROM: Supervisory Ecologist

TO: Director, Natural Resources and Environmental Affairs Division

SUBJ: FIRST ENDORSEMENT ON ELIZABETH A. BETZ LETTER OF 12 FEB 1986

(a) PD for Position #12229 dtd 22 Jan 86

1. The subject endorsement and enclosures (4) and (5) thereto have been reviewed per your recent request. By the subject endorsement, the Assistant Chief of Staff, Manpower, acting as Senior Command Official denied Ms. Betz's appeal of the classification of reference (a) and her request that her position be classified as "Supervisory Chemist, GS-1320-11" vice "Supervisory Chemist, GS-1320-10". The endorsement forwarded Ms. Betz's appeal with a recommendation for denial to the Special Assistant for Civilian Personnel via CMC.

2. I have no basis for rebutting any of the major points made by Ms. Betz in her appeal. Further, on 14 March 1986, Ms. Radabaugh advised that based on an audit of Ms. Betz's position and subsequent discussions with the Assistant Chief of Staff and Deputy Assistant Chief of Staff, Facilities, that in her opinion Ms. Betz's current PD is very accurate. Also, the classifier indicated awareness and understanding that Ms. Betz had been assigned new responsibilities in the areas of hazardous waste identification, gas chromatography and groundwater management and protection. Also, the classifier indicated awareness and understanding that Ms. Betz has been expected to work and was in fact working much more independently than was expected under previous position descriptions. The classifier, based on her knowledge of professional chemistry and perception of how the Camp Lejeune environmental program is operated, reached her conclusion that these new duties and responsibilities did not warrant upgrade.

3. I do feel that the classifier made a major error in not giving the incumbent's position proper credit for new duties assigned during FY-1985. Be advised that Ms. Betz will be graded during the upcoming annual appraisal regarding the use of the gas chromatograph in monitoring groundwater quality. I am concerned that the comments in enclosures (4) and (5) regarding the gas chromatograph will undermine the command's current initiative to develop comprehensive inhouse capability to monitor and protect our groundwater from the major chemical contamination problem which exists aboard base. With the Environmental Protection Agency writing letters to LANTDIV and HQMC expressing concern over our progress in this areas, it is no time to be de-emphasizing the role Ms. Betz is playing in this vital program. Ms. Betz is currently running the gas chromatograph weekly and as soon as she has the machine properly programmed,

CONFIDENTIAL

Division

Date

The purpose of this report is to provide a comprehensive overview of the current status of the project. The project has been initiated in accordance with the approved budget and schedule. The following information is provided for your review and approval.

The project has been initiated in accordance with the approved budget and schedule. The following information is provided for your review and approval. The project has been initiated in accordance with the approved budget and schedule. The following information is provided for your review and approval.

The project has been initiated in accordance with the approved budget and schedule. The following information is provided for your review and approval. The project has been initiated in accordance with the approved budget and schedule. The following information is provided for your review and approval.

The project has been initiated in accordance with the approved budget and schedule. The following information is provided for your review and approval. The project has been initiated in accordance with the approved budget and schedule. The following information is provided for your review and approval.

The project has been initiated in accordance with the approved budget and schedule. The following information is provided for your review and approval. The project has been initiated in accordance with the approved budget and schedule. The following information is provided for your review and approval.

The project has been initiated in accordance with the approved budget and schedule. The following information is provided for your review and approval. The project has been initiated in accordance with the approved budget and schedule. The following information is provided for your review and approval.

calibrated and quality control problems ironed out, will be generating routine reports. I have carefully explained this to Ms. Radabaugh. I do not believe that the significance of these duties is properly understood because of their highly technical nature and the fact that we are talking about a relatively new field of technology and environmental management aboard DOD installations.

4. Accordingly, I recommend that unless the Senior Command Official is seriously considering reversing his decision to deny Ms. Betz's appeal, that no action be taken and that the appeal be allowed to move forward in order to protect Ms. Betz's rights to a timely, independent review of her appeal by officials more familiar with position descriptions of this type.

Danny D. Sharpe
DANNY D. SHARPE

