

BEFORE THE COMMISSIONS

GUAM CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSIONS

BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

21-413

ADVERSE APPEAL CASE NO.: 17-AA17T

DECISION AND JUDGMENT

IN THE MATTER OF:

ANTHONY SANDERS,

Employee,

VS.

PORT AUTHORITY OF GUAM,

Management.

This matter came before the Civil Service Commission for merit hearings on May 29, 2018; August 9 and 14, 2018 at 5:45 p.m. at the Commission's regular scheduled meetings. On May 18, 2021, a hearing was scheduled at 9:00 a.m., through Zoom.

On May 18, 2021, the Commission heard the Employee's last witness, closing arguments in this case, and then deliberated and issued its decision as set forth below. This Decision and Judgment reflects the deliberations and votes of the Commission after review of the evidence and testimony taken on

DECISION AND JUDGMENT

Anthony Sanders vs. Port Authority of Guam Adverse Appeal CSC Case No.: 17-AA17T Page 1 of 5

22

21

20

May 29, 2018, August 9 and 14, 2018; and closing arguments held on May 18. 2021. Management's exhibits M014-M025 were admitted into evidence prior to the taking of testimony on May 29, 2018.

Present for Management during the three (3) merit hearings were Attorney Michael Philips, with General Manager Joann Brown of the Port Authority of Guam. However, Luis R. Baza, Deputy General Manager for Administration and Finance took over the case at the hearing on May 18, 2021. Attorney Daniel Somerfleck represented the Employee, who was also present for all four hearings.

Present at the hearing on May 18, 2021, when the Commission deliberated and rendered its oral decision was Chairman Juan K. Calvo, Vice Chair John Smith, Commissioner Priscilla Tuncap Commissioner, Commissioner Emilia F. Rice, Commission Anthony P. Benavente, and Commissioner Robert C. Taitano.

Jurisdiction

Civil Service Commission has jurisdiction to hear adverse action appeals filed by classified employees under 4 GCA § 4403 (b) involving suspensions, demotions and terminations.

DECISION AND JUDGMENT

Anthony Sanders vs. Port Authority of Guam Adverse Appeal CSC Case No.: 17-AA17T

21

22

20

DECISION AND JUDGMENTAnthony Sanders vs. Port Authority of Guam
Adverse Appeal CSC Case No.: 17-AA17T

Facts

Employee was personally served with a Notice of Proposed Adverse Action on September 29, 2017, and signed on September 27, 2017 by the former General Manager, Joann Brown (Exhibits M014-M018).

Employee orally responded to Acting General Manager Felixberto Duenas on October 9, 2017, as set forth in the Notice of Final Adverse Action (M019).

Employee did not have a representative present at this meeting. Present at this oral response was the Acting General Manager Felixberto Duenas, Charlene Yatar, Assistant Harbor Master, and Shawn B. Cepeda, Personnel Specialist II.

Employee had ten (10) days to respond to the proposed adverse action served on September 29, 2017, and answered orally on October 9, 2017. This ten (10) day period to answer ended on October 9, 2017.

Former General Manager Joann Brown terminated Anthony Q. Sanders pursuant to a Notice of Final Adverse Action dated October 20, 2017, with charges of UNLAWFUL MANUFACTURE, DISTRIBUTION, DISPENSING, POSSESSION OR USE OF CONTROLLED SUBSTANCES WHILE ON THE JOB OR ON THE AUTHORITY'S PREMISES INCLUDING WHILE OPERATING THE AUTHORITY'S EQUIPMENT.

17

18

19

20

21

22

DECISION AND JUDGMENT Anthony Sanders vs. Port Authority of Guam Adverse Appeal CSC Case No.: 17-AA17T

The violation of the Drug Free Workplace policy was substantiated by Dr. Brian Heinen's Drug Test Report confirming the urine sample collected on September 15, 2017 from the Employee confirmed positive for THC, as set forth more fully in the Notice of Final Adverse Action (Exhibits M019-M025). Prior to taking final action, General Manager Joann Brown considered Employee's oral response to Acting General Manager Felixberto Duenas (and others present in this meeting), and reviewed the investigative file.

Employee filed an adverse action appeal with the Commission on October 27, 2017, regarding his termination of employment with the Port Authority of Guam.

The Commission finds that Management's action in this case was correct.

Burden of Proof

The Commission determined by a vote of 6 to 0 that the burden of proof was on substantial evidence.

Ruling by Commissioners

After review of the file, Management's exhibits M014-M025, hearing the testimony of the witnesses, as well as the arguments of lay representatives for both sides, the Commission voted 6 to 0 that Management met its burden of proof of substantial evidence as to the charge of Violation of the Drug Free

Workplace policy set forth in the Notice of Final Adverse Action. The Commission finds that Management's action was supported and affirms the termination action.

SO ORDERED this 15th of June, 2021.

		m				<u> </u>	_
JU	ΥN	K.	C	ΑI	\mathbf{V}	O	
Cha	iim	าลท					

(absent)
PRISCILLA T. TUNCAP
Commissioner

ANTHONY P. BENAVENTECommissioner

JOHN SMITH Vige Chairman

EMILIA F. RICE
Commissioner

ROBERT C. TAITANO

Commissioner