173

33-15-0036 **BEFORE THE GUAM CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION** GU ΔN BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS GRIEVANCE APPEAL IN THE MATTER OF; CASE NO. 14-GRE-06 DAVID ASOMBRADO, Employee, DECISION AND ORDER vs. GUAM MEMORIAL HOSPITAL AUTHORITY. Management. This matter came before the Civil Service Commission (the "Commission") for grievance hearing on September 18, 2014. Management Guam Memorial Hospital dhe of the Landace Secretary Authority ("GMHA") was represented by the law firm of Fisher & Associates through

Also present for Management was Hospital Minakshi V. Hemlani, Esq. Administrator/CEO Joseph P. Verga. Employee David Asombrado ("Employee") was present and represented by David C. Babauta from Guam Federation of Teachers.

FACTUAL & PROCEDURAL HISTORY

19 On August 14, 2008, the Governor of Guam signed Public Law 29-105 relative to 20the Compensation of Public Safety and Law Enforcement Officers. PL 29-105 amended 21Title 10 Guam Code Annotated, Chapter 55, Division 3, Section 55102 to authorize a 22forty percent (40%) increase for certain safety and law enforcement positions over a four 23(4) year period at no less than ten percent (10%) each year commencing October 1, 2008. 24Employee holds the position of "Guard" at the GMHA. On January 3, 2014, 25Employee filed a grievance with the Hospital Administrator arguing that 10 GCA §



A Macality

Contraction of the second

6036

671-647-1867

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

55102, as amended by PL 29-105 was applicable to hospital guards and Employee was therefore due to retroactive wages dating back to October 1, 2008, with interest. The Hospital Administrator responded that it was GMHA's position that the pay increase authorized by PL 29-105 was not intended for hospital security personnel.

On January 10, 2014, Employee proceeded to Step II of GMHA's grievance procedure. GMHA's Board of Trustee's Human Resources Subcommittee held hearing before Grievance Review Board on March 11, 2014. The HR Subcommittee resolved, on March 13, 2013, to deny Employee's request for retroactive back wages with interest, and further resolved to reject Employee's request that the GMHA fully implement PL 29-105.

On March 19, 2014, Employee proceeded to Step III and appealed to the GMHA Board of Trustees. The Board affirmed the resolutions of the HR Subcommittee. On April 4, 2014, Employee filed his Grievance Appeal before the Commission.

DISCUSSION

GMHA contends that the pay increase authorized by 10 GCA § 55102, as amended by PL 29-105, does not apply to the GMHA's security personnel, and that Employee is not due retroactive back wages. In support of its contention, GMHA set forth the following arguments:

- Title 4 GCA §8104(p), entitled Public Officers & Employees, defines Uniformed Personnel (i.e., law enforcement and public safety uniformed personnel) and includes a list of specific government agencies, but does *not* include GMHA security personnel.
- 2. Section 3 of PL 29-105 amends 10 GCA § 55102(a) and directs the Director of Administration ("DOA") to conduct reviews of public safety and law enforcement officers in specific government agencies, but does *not* direct a review of the GMHA's public safety and/or law enforcement positions.
- 3. Pursuant to Section 21 of Chapter XIII of PL 30-55, the Fiscal Year 2010 Budget Act, the Attorney General's office found that the DOA properly computed and implemented pay increases. Therefore, on October 14, 2009, the DOA issued Organization Circular No. 2010-003 (which included pay schedules for positions held by certain Government of Guam agencies) to specific government agencies, but did *not* include the GMHA.

2 3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

671-647-1867

671-647-1867	7 11/31:22 a.m. 01-07-2015
1 2 3 4 5 6 7	 Exhibits submitted by Employee included a copy of a news article published in the Marianas Variety Guam Edition on May 10, 2011, in which Vice Speaker Benjamin Cruz expressed concern about the public law's application to the GMHA because hospital security personnel were not listed in the review of uniformed officers under PL 29-105 and were "not considered part of the deliberations when the bill was discussed in 2008." Employee also submitted a copy of a KUAM news article published on June 15, 2011, in which then Public Safety Oversight Chair Senator Adolpho B. Palacios said that "the law [PL 29-105] was intended for traditional uniform law enforcement officers" and that GMHA did not have a right to implement pay raises for security guards "under the guise of PL 29-105." The Commission discussed the presentation of arguments and exhibits submitted
8	by the Parties. By a vote of 6 to 1, the Commission determined that PL 29-105 was not
9	intended for GMHA security personnel and ratified the GMHA Board of Trustees
10	decision to deny Employee's request for retroactive back wages with interest.
	CONCLUSION
12	By a vote of 6 to 1, the Commission holds in favor of Management GMHA.
13	
14	IT IS SO ORDERED THIS 6 DAY OF finday, 2015 nume pro tune to
15	September 18, 2014.
16	LUIS R. BAZA MANUEL R. PINAUIN
andre of the second sec	Chairman Vice-Chairman
18	PRISCILLA T. TUNCAP JOHN SMITH Commissioner Commissioner
19	All the All th
20	LOU HONGYBE DANUEL D. I/CON GUERRERO Commissioner
21	Handelin
22	EDITH C. PANGELINAN Commissioner
23	
24	
25	

ų.

ĸ

3 /3