

P.E.R.C. NO. 2013-5

STATE OF NEW JERSEY
BEFORE THE PUBLIC EMPLOYMENT RELATIONS COMMISSION

In the Matter of

BOROUGH OF MADISON,

Appellant,

-and-

Docket Nos. IA-2010-109

IA-2010-110

PBA LOCAL 92,

Respondent.

SYNOPSIS

The Public Employment Relations Commission affirms an interest arbitration award establishing the terms and conditions of employment for successor agreements between the Borough of Madison and PBA Local 92 and the Superior Officers Association. The employer appealed the award arguing that the Interest Arbitrator failed to properly apply the criteria specified in N.J.S.A. 34:13A-16g in that he deviated from the established pattern of bargaining by failing to explain and/or sufficiently analyze the effect of his salary increases in contravention of the long standing pattern bargaining; and that the Opinion and Award violates the standards set forth in N.J.S.A. 2A:24-8 by not permitting the Borough to submit an "amended final offer," apparently reflecting the settlement with the FMBA Local 74 which it urged as the basis for the pattern it was asserting.

The Commission affirms the award noting that the arbitrator thoroughly considered the 16g(2) criteria and determined that the internal settlement pattern between the PBA and FMBA was not entitled to substantial weight and pursuant to N.J.A.C. 19:16-5.7(f) the arbitrator was authorized to not allow the Borough to amend its final offer.

This synopsis is not part of the Commission decision. It has been prepared for the convenience of the reader. It has been neither reviewed nor approved by the Commission.

P.E.R.C. NO. 2013-6

STATE OF NEW JERSEY
BEFORE THE PUBLIC EMPLOYMENT RELATIONS COMMISSION

In the Matter of

BOROUGH OF RAMSEY,

Respondent,

-and-

Docket No. IA-2012-015

RAMSEY PBA LOCAL NO. 155,

Appellant.

SYNOPSIS

The Public Employment Relations Commission affirms an interest arbitration award. After remanding the initial award to the arbitrator and the issuance of a supplemental award, the PBA appeals two issues that are identical to the issues it raised in its initial appeal. The first issue is whether the arbitrator was correct in declining to include the cost savings from the retirement of a lieutenant when projecting salary costs for 2012. The second issue is whether the arbitrator adequately explained why he eliminated longevity for newly hired officers. Having directly addressed those issues in our initial decision, we deny the PBA's appeal.

This synopsis is not part of the Commission decision. It has been prepared for the convenience of the reader. It has been neither reviewed nor approved by the Commission.