## **PUBLIC LAW BOARD NO. 5418**

Case No. 57

Award No. 57

**PARTIES** 

Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employes

to

-and-

DISPUTE:

Springfield Terminal Railway Company

## **STATEMENT OF CLAIM:**

Appeal of the discipline of dismissal imposed On T. P. Georges. Effective May 7, 2004.

**FINDINGS:** This dispute arose as a result of the claimant being charged with the following offense:

"Violation of Rule G of the Springfield Terminal Employee Safety Rules, when you tested positive on a random drug screen administered on March 23, 2004."

The record shows the claimant held a commercial driver's license (CDL), that placed him in the Carrier's random drug testing pool, pursuant to the following DOT regulations:

## 382,305 - RandomTesting

"Any employee who holds a CDL and may be called upon at any time, on an occasional or emergency basis to drive must be in the random testing pool at all times; Including CDL employees who do not drive as part of regular job functions. A drug test must be administered each time the employee's name is selected from the pool."

The Carrier asserts that undisputed evidence was introduced at the claimant's hearing, showing that he tested positive for Cannabinoids (THC) that exceeded the minimal allowable cut off level. They point out that the claimant requested a reanalysis of the split sample, and that also came back as being "positive". In summary, the Carrier states the record conclusively shows that all applicable procedures were properly followed in this case, and there are no mitigating factors for the Board to consider.

The Organization asserts the claimant was improperly subjected to a random drug test. They

PLB No. 5418 C-57/A-57

Page 2

contend the position held by the claimant was an Electric Welding Foreman, which does not

require him to possess a CDL license; therefore, his name should not have been placed in the

random drug testing pool. However, in any event, the claimant questioned the accuracy of the

Carrier's March 23<sup>rd</sup> test, and states he took another drug test on April 3<sup>rd</sup>, administered by his

personal physician and the results of which were "negative". The claimant steadfastly denies that

he used drugs.

After a thorough review of the hearing record and the parties' submissions, we cannot sustain

the Organization's position in this case. With regarding to the claimant's independent drug test,

aside from the fact that it was not timely, it was outside the chain of custody and thus cannot be

deemed a proper test.

Clearly, we are not unsympathetic to the Organization's arguments and statements proffered

in claimant's behalf, and the Board does not lightly sustain the dismissal of an employee with

claimant's years of seniority. However, in consideration of the serious nature of the proven

offense, we have no proper basis to disturb the Carrier's determination in this case.

**AWARD:** The claim is denied.

T. W. McNulty

Carrier Member

Organization Member

Dated: 7-26-04