

Case No. 316 Award No. 316

STATEMENT OF CLAIM:

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 an 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.

In this dispute, the record shows that the Claimant's urine sample had tested positive for cannabis and cocaine. Pursuant to the Carrier's Drug Testing Policy, he was instructed to rid his system of the prohibited drugs and provide a negative urine sample within forty-five (45) days. Because he did furnish a negative urine specimen, the Claimant was returned to duty. However, on June 17, 1987, a urine sample provided by the Claimant tested positive for certain prohibited drugs. This test result triggered the claim before the Board because the Claimant was subsequently dismissed.

These are difficult cases for all concerned, particularly for the Organization. It has forcefully and with skill advanced its many concerns with respect to the application of the Carrier's Drug Policy.

In this respect, it particularly has raised questions about and objections to the Carrier's testing procedures as well as the Carrier's failure to produce medical personnel at the hearing held on this matter who could speak authoritatively about the validity of the urine test and be cross-examined so that relevant information could be elicited.

The Board has carefully considered these contentions as well as the other arguments presented by the Organization and the Claimant. We understand the points raised by the Organization and do recognize that they are not without merit in certain situations. However, the record here shows that the Carrier employed a highly reputable laboratory, which used the latest techniques and procedures to assure the accuracy of its tests. Therefore, the test result or "medical fact" as distinguished from a "medical opinion" is established. Accordingly, the failure to have a medical person present at the hearing held on this matter for cross-examination does not fatally flaw the fairness of the proceedings.

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 consequences of his failure to comply with the Carrier's direction were of his choice.

The Board does not lightly sustain the dismissal of an employee with the years of service that we find here, particularly noting that the Claimant has a good service record. Nonetheless, under the constraints that this Board must function, we cannot sustain the claim.

AWARD

The claim is denied.

F. J. Domzalski
F. J. Domzalski
Carrier Member

E. Muessig
Eckehard Muessig
Neutral Member

J. P. Cassese
J. P. Cassese
Employee Member

Dated: Jan. 8, 1990