

REVIEW COMMITTEE



INTERNATIONAL BROTHERHOOD OF ELECTRICAL WORKERS, AFL-CIO LOCAL UNION 1245, I.B.E.W. P.O. BOX 2547 VACAVILLE, CALIFORNIA 94696 (707) 452-2700

IBEV

F.E. (ED) DWYER Jr, SECRETARY

DOUG VEADER, CHAIRMAN

- DECISION
- LETTER DECISION

PRE-REVIEW REFERRAL

Review Committee Number 21989 Customer Care – Local Office Services - Oakland

Marcus Mitchell Company Member Local Investigating Committee Lou Mennel Union Member Local Investigating Committee

Subject of the Grievance

This case concerns the termination of an employee from the Long Term Disability (LTD) Payroll after her two years of eligibility were exhausted. This grievance concerns whether the grievant was improperly bypassed for a Customer Service Representative (CSR) vacancy two days before her termination.

Facts of the Case

The grievant was a Customer Service Representative with a hire date of August 22, 1985. The grievant went onto LTD on February 10, 2011 and was terminated on February 10, 2013 when her plan benefits ended.

The grievant was bypassed for a full-time Service Representative 1 position two days prior to her termination. Approximately one month before her termination, the grievant provided an updated Attending Physician's Statement of Disability (APSD) which increased the number of hours she could work from 24 to 40. Her physician also indicated that the grievant was unable to sit for more than 3 hours or stand for more than 3 hours a day.

Discussion

The Union argued that while the physician indicated a release for 40 hours per week, he did not specifically exclude overtime. The physician has since clarified that by listing 40 hours he meant full-time. Additionally, the overtime records indicate the amount of overtime worked in this classification and headquarters is minimal. The Company should have offered the grievant the job, or at the very least confirmed that she could not work overtime. work beyond their regular hours to complete business with customers in the lobby at closing time and attend training and meetings regularly occur before starting time. The amount of overtime has no bearing on the fact that it is required to perform the job and the grievant was only released to 40 hours. Any overtime would have exceeded the grievant's limit of 40 hours.

The Committee discussed that, notwithstanding the issue of the grievant's ability to work overtime, there is no dispute that the grievant was restricted to working a maximum of three hours per day sitting and three hours per day standing. A full-time front office employee must either sit or stand for more than six hours per day in order to do their job. The grievant was clearly not released to perform her essential job functions on a full-time (eight hour day) basis.

Decision

The Committee agrees there was no violation of the Agreement and closes this case without adjustment.

Laura Sellheim Rod Williams Tanya Moniz-Witten

Doug Veader, Chairman **Review Committee**

Date

Jeff Campodonico John Blaylock Karen Russel

F.E. (Ed) Dwyer Jr, Secretary **Review Committee**