
This case concerned the Arbitrator’s finding that the Agency violated the parties’ collective-bargaining agreement when it required an employee to undergo medical examinations without a Union representative present. The Arbitrator directed the Agency to establish procedures to inform bargaining-unit employees and independent medical examiners of an employee’s right to have a Union representative present during such examinations. The Authority rejected the Agency’s contrary-to-law, public-policy, and nonfact exceptions, finding that the award did not require the Agency to exercise control over the medical examiners. The Authority found that, to the extent that the award applied to individuals other than the grievant, the Arbitrator exceeded his authority, and clarified the remedy accordingly.

Member Abbott concurred with the Authority’s disposition of the exceptions and noted that the Agency’s contrary-to-law and public-policy exceptions were inconsistent with concessions made by the Agency and that the Agency’s nonfact exception failed to dispute a central fact. Therefore, he noted that the Agency could have obviated the need for its exceptions if it negotiated with the Union by solely focusing on the exceeds-authority exception.
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