## PUBLIC LAW BOARD NO. 3514

Case No. 314 Award No. 314

PARTIES

Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employes

to
DISPUTE:

Consolidated Rail Corporation

## STATEMENT OF CLAIM:

Appeal of Welder Walter E. Karpinski to be returned to the service with all back pay and benefits restored.

FINDINGS: The central issues in this case are concerned with the applications of the Carrier's Drug Testing Policy. On February 20, 1987, the Carrier's Chairman and Chief Executive Officer sent a letter to each employee in which he explained the Carrier's concern for safety and how the use of illegal drugs by employees impaired its operations and, threatened the safety of the public. A summary of its Drug Policy was attached to each of these letters.

A key feature of the Drug Policy provides the employee with an option for an evaluation by the Carrier's Employee Counseling Service. If this evaluation shows that the employee does not have an addiction problem, the employee must provide a negative drug test within forty-five (45) days. In those cases where the evaluation indicates and addiction problem and the employee enters an approved treatment program, he may be returned to service upon appropriate recommendation and he must provide a negative test within 125 days of the date of the initial positive test.

On April 16, 1987, the Carrier advised the Claimant that a drug screen urinalysis conducted as part of his medical evaluation on April 9, 1987 was positive for cannobinoid. He was given a choice of providing a negative urine sample by May 31, 1987 or enter an approved treatment program which would serve to extend the time period for a negative urine sample.

The record shows that the Claimant failed to provide a negative urine sample from an approved service facility. He mainly contends that it was his understanding that he had to wait the full forty-five (45) days before he could submit his next urine sample.

These are difficult cases for all concerned, particularly for the Organization. It has forcefully and with skill advanced its many con- cerns with respect to the application of the Carrier's Drug Policy. In this case, the Carrier introduced the results of the Claimant's urinalysis test, however, the medical experts responsible for the test were not present at the hearing to be challenged by the Organization. Under certain circumstances, the Organization arguments could lead to a sustainable claim. However, we have a testing process here that \_ includes the use of a highly reputable laboratory and withstands vigorous scrutiny. Accordingly, because the key data, in this case the results of the urine test, came about from this process, it can be reasonably judged to be a medical fact. Therefore, the unavailability of a Carrier medical person for cross-examonation with respect to the established medical fact does not make the hearing an unfair one. The Board has carefully considered these contentions. We understand the points raised by the Organization and we do recognize that they are not without merit in certain situations. In this case, we conclude that the claim must be denied.

Railroad work is dangerous. The safety of the Carrier's workforce, as well as the public, requires positive measures to ensure that the inherent dangers are minimized. In furtherance of these efforts, the Carrier initiated a drug testing program which it announced to each of its employees, as noted earlier. The substance of the Carrier's program as well as ones like it used by other Carriers, has been upheld by numerous arbitral Awards. Given the established facts of this case, we have no basis to arrive at an Award that runs counter to these many Awards. In the instant case, the Claimant was put on notice and, in effect, he was provided another opportunity to retain his employment.

The Board does not lightly sustain the dismissal of an employee with the years of service that we find here. Moreover, it appears that prior to the incident giving rise to this claim, the Claimant had a spotless discipline record. Nonetheless, under the constraints that this Board must function, we cannot sustain the claim.

PLB No. 3514 C-314/A-314 Page 3

AWARD

The claim is denied.

F. J. Domzalsk Carrier Member

Eckehard Muessic Neutral Member

Employee Member

Dated: Jan. 8