

The job specification for Heavy Equipment Operator indicates that, in comparison with Equipment Operators, incumbents in this title operate equipment that is larger, more complex, and used on more varied types of terrain requiring greater skill and greater motor coordination to manipulate, and/or in more confined spaces where the consequences of error and potential for danger are greater, and which require additional certification or licensure.

At the outset, it is noted that qualifying experience has the announced experience requirement as the primary focus of the position, and each position has only one primary focus. A Senior Traffic Maintenance Worker performs work involved with painting traffic and crosswalk lines, and assisting in the assembly, installation and maintenance of traffic control devices and signals. The duties that the appellant listed on his application compare favorably with this definition. While the operation and maintenance of some equipment is required to perform these duties, this was not the primary focus of the position. Additionally, as a Truck Driver Heavy, the appellant list of duties that essentially involved driving, loading, and maintaining trucks and of auxiliary equipment. As a Laborer Heavy, the appellant indicated that he performed duties moving effects, grading, collecting trash, landscaping, shoveling, performing concrete work, cutting trees, removing tree stumps and brush, and snow removal. For both of these positions, while the appellant operated construction and maintenance equipment, this was not the primary focus. On appeal, the appellant indicates that he operated and maintained Front End Loaders, Street Sweepers, Rollers and other various pieces of heavy equipment on a daily basis, this is not supported by the record. While Front End Loaders, Street Sweepers, and Rollers are considered heavy equipment, there is no indication on his application that the appellant maintained this equipment. Further, the appellant performed numerous other duties in his positions, which do not have the announced experience requirement as the primary focus. The appellant lacks two years of required experience.

An independent review of all material presented indicates that the decision of Agency Services that the appellant did not meet the announced requirements for eligibility by the closing date is amply supported by the record. The appellant provides no basis to disturb this decision. Thus, the appellant has failed to support his burden of proof in this matter.

ORDER

Therefore, it is ordered that this request be denied.

This is the final administrative determination in this matter. Any further review should be pursued in a judicial forum.

DECISION RENDERED BY THE
CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION
THE 15th DAY OF NOVEMBER, 2017



Robert M. Czedz, Chairperson
Civil Service Commission

Inquiries
and
Correspondence

Christopher S. Myers
Director
Division of Appeals and Regulatory Affairs
Civil Service Commission
Written Record Appeals Unit
P. O. Box 312
Trenton, New Jersey 08625-0312

c: Michael Martini
Kelly Glenn
Records Center