

*True Copy*

REVIEW COMMITTEE DECISION

Review Committee File No. 363  
Colgate Division Grievance No. 6-62

Subject of the Grievance

The grievance concerns the accrual of classification seniority of a Groundman headquartered at Marysville. The record submitted to Review Committee denotes that the employee, then a Meter Reader/Power Surveyor, was appointed to a Groundman vacancy July 15, 1960. On the same day a payroll change tag was issued appointing him a Meter Reader, Temporary. The employee continued in the Temporary Meter Reader classification until November 29, 1960, when he first worked as a Groundman.

The Division credited the employee with Groundman classification seniority from the date of appointment to the vacancy, July 15, 1960, for purposes of making temporary appointments to Apprentice Lineman. The correction asked for in this grievance is that the employee accrue classification seniority as a Groundman from the date he actually began working in the classification, November 29, 1960.

Discussion

Section 106.1, of the Agreement, defines classification seniority as the total time worked in a given classification. Such seniority does not start to accrue until he reports for work in the classification to which he is assigned. The accrual of classification seniority is commensurate then with the first day worked in the given classification which may not necessarily coincide with the date of appointment to the classification. For example, in the case at hand, the appointment was made effective July 15, 1960, but the employee would not begin to accrue classification seniority until November 29, 1960, the first day he reported for work as a Groundman.

Decision

The employee concerned in this grievance shall accrue classification seniority as a Groundman from November 29, 1960.

FOR UNION:

R. W. Fields  
W. M. Fleming  
L. L. Mitchell

By *L. L. Mitchell*

Date *Oct 4, 1962*

FOR COMPANY:

C. L. Yager  
E. F. Sibley  
V. J. Thompson

By *V. J. Thompson*

Date *September 12, 1962*

*note: Company agreed this decision would not jeopardize the principle of distortions of relative seniority being adjusted where 2 persons bid on 2 job at same time & 1 is held over for Company reasons.*