1 2 MTA - LONG ISLAND RAIL ROAD 3 ----X 4 IN THE MATTER OF 5 IBEW DISCIPLINE CASE NUMBER 3870-22 6 7 EMPLOYEE - DARREN DREW ----X 8 9 April 27, 2023 9:53 a.m. 10 Hillside Maintenance Complex 11 93-59 183rd Street Hollis, New York 11423 12 13 14 CONTINUED TRIAL OF EMPLOYEE - DARREN DREW 15 16 TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS 17 18 19 20 Reported by: Julia M. Speros 21 22 LH REPORTING SERVICE, INC. 23 Computer-Aided Transcription 718-526-7100 24 25

1	
2	APPEARANCES:
3	
4	MTA LONG ISLAND RAIL ROAD TRIAL OFFICE
5	93-59 183rd Street, Building 1 Hollis, New York 11423
6	BY: SETH MAGGIORE
7	Hearing Officer
8	
9	
10	
11	Also Present:
12	Mr. Ricardo Sanchez
13	IBEW General Chairman
14	Mr. Michael Colombo
15	IBEW Financial Secretary
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

1	PROCEEDINGS
2	MR. MAGGIORE: Good morning. Today
3	is April 27, 2023. The time is
4	approximately 9:53 a.m. This trial is
5	being held in Room 251 at the Hillside
6	Maintenance Complex.
7	My name is Seth Maggiore. I am the
8	Manager of the Trial Office. I will be
9	serving as the Trial Officer.
10	Present at this time is the charged
11	employee, Darren Drew, along with his
12	Union representative, Mr. Ricardo
13	Sanchez of the IBEW. Also present as an
14	observer is Michael Colombo, Financial
15	Secretary of the IBEW.
16	Before we begin, I just ask
17	everybody to silence their phones, if
18	you haven't done so already.
19	Mr. Drew, you're being afforded this
20	trial in connection with the charges
21	outlined in the Notice of Trial that has
22	been marked into evidence as Carrier
23	Exhibit 1.
24	Mr. Drew, do you waive a reading of
25	the Notice of Trial?

4

1 MR. DREW: Yes. 2 MR. MAGGIORE: Mr. Sanchez, does the 3 Organization waive a reading of the Notice of Trial? 4 MR. SANCHEZ: Yes. 5 6 MR. MAGGIORE: Okay. After this 7 trial was put in recess on March 8, 2023, a Trial Continuation Notice was 8 sent to Mr. Drew via Certified and First 9 10 Class Mail to 219-53 Ryan Road, 11 Laurelton, New York 11413. A copy was 12 also sent to the Organization. 13 It is a one-page document bearing Certified Mail number 14 70220410000344303991. It is dated 15 16 March 16th. I am handing copies to Mr. Sanchez 17 18 and Mr. Drew. (Handing.) 19 Mr. Drew, did you receive a copy of 20 this Trial Continuation Notice? MR. DREW: Yes. 21 2.2 MR. MAGGIORE: Mr. Sanchez, did the 23 Organization receive a copy? 24 MR. SANCHEZ: Yes. 25 MR. MAGGIORE: If there are no

5

1 objections, I will mark and enter this 2 as Carrier Exhibit 21. 3 Any objections? MR. SANCHEZ: No. 4 MR. DREW: No. 5 6 (Whereupon, Carrier Exhibit 21 was 7 marked.) MR. MAGGIORE: Next, I have United 8 States Postal Service Tracking History 9 10 bearing the same Certified Mail number 11 as Carrier Exhibit 21. 12 I'm showing copies of this to Mr. Drew and Mr. Sanchez -- (handing) --13 for their verification that the 14 Certified numbers match. 15 16 MR. DREW: (Perusing.) 17 MR. SANCHEZ: (Perusing.) 18 MR. MAGGIORE: Do the numbers match? MR. SANCHEZ: Yes. 19 MR. DREW: Yes. 20 21 MR. MAGGIORE: Okay. If there are no objections, I will mark and enter 2.2 23 this as Carrier Exhibit 21-A. 24 Any objections? 25 MR. SANCHEZ: No.

6

1 MR. DREW: No. 2 (Whereupon, Carrier Exhibit 21-A was 3 marked.) MR. MAGGIORE: I note for the record 4 5 it is a two-page document. I note for the record that the First 6 7 Class mailing of Carrier Exhibit 21 has not been returned to the Carrier as 8 "undelivered". 9 10 Mr. Drew, would you please identify 11 yourself for the record with your full 12 name and IBM number? 13 MR. DREW: My name is Darren Drew; IBM number is 50112. 14 15 MR. MAGGIORE: Before continuing, I 16 will remind you of your rights for this trial. 17 18 You are entitled to be represented 19 by a duly-accredited Union representative, subject to the terms and 20 21 conditions of your applicable agreement without cost to the Carrier. 2.2 23 Do you understand that right? 24 MR. DREW: Yes. 25 MR. MAGGIORE: Who would you like to

7

1 represent you? 2 MR. DREW: Mr. Sanchez. 3 MR. MAGGIORE: You also have the 4 right to summon any relevant person or produce any relevant evidence that will 5 enable you to defend yourself against 6 7 the charge placed against you at no cost to the Carrier. 8 9 Do you understand that right? 10 MR. DREW: Yes. 11 MR. MAGGIORE: You're also entitled 12 to cross-examine any witness and examine 13 any evidence that may be produced by the 14 Carrier or have your Union 15 representative do so on your behalf. 16 Do you understand that right? MR. DREW: Yes. 17 18 MR. MAGGIORE: Mr. Drew, are you 19 ready to continue with the trial today? 20 MR. DREW: Yes. 21 MR. MAGGIORE: Mr. Sanchez, is the Organization ready to continue with the 2.2 23 trial today? 24 MR. SANCHEZ: Yes. 25 MR. MAGGIORE: Okay. At this time,

1 the Carrier does not have any witnesses 2 to call. 3 Mr. Sanchez, do you have any witnesses you would like to call or 4 Carrier witnesses you'd like to recall? 5 MR. SANCHEZ: We'd like to recall 6 7 Carrier witness Corinne Swicicki, Senior Manager, Manpower. 8 9 MR. MAGGIORE: All right. The time 10 is approximately 9:58 a.m. We're going 11 to take a brief recess in order to 12 recall Ms. Swicicki. We're off the record. 13 (Whereupon, a brief recess was 14 15 taken.) 16 MR. MAGGIORE: The time is approximately 10:17 a.m. and we're back 17 18 on the record. 19 We've been joined by Corrine 20 Swicicki who has been recalled by the 21 Organization. Before we begin, can you please 2.2 23 state your full name and IBM number for 24 the record? 25 MS. SWICICKI: Sure. Corrine

1 Swicicki, 54910. 2 MR. MAGGIORE: Thank you. 3 Mr. Sanchez, you may question Ms. Swicicki. 4 MR. SANCHEZ: Ms. Swicicki, I'm 5 going to start off by apologizing if 6 7 this is redundant, but I just want to get it into the record, so --8 9 MS. SWICICKI: Okay. 10 MR. SANCHEZ: How long have you 11 worked for Long Island Rail Road? 12 MS. SWICICKI: Approximately 13 15 years. 14 MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. And in what 15 positions? 16 MS. SWICICKI: I was a Central 17 Manpower Clerk and then was promoted to 18 Head Clerk, Assistant Manager, Manager, 19 and now Senior Manager, Manpower 20 Resource Management. 21 MR. SANCHEZ: And how long have you 2.2 been in your current position? 23 MS. SWICICKI: Approximately, 24 three years. 25 MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. And can you

1 explain some of your responsibilities in 2 this position -- in your current 3 position? 4 MS. SWICICKI: Sure. I oversee the Central Manpower Office, that is 24/7. 5 I make sure that all employees adhere to 6 7 corporate and departmental policies, handle all payroll, any payroll issues, 8 and communicate with unions and 9 10 management. 11 MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. And are you 12 familiar with the Collective Bargaining 13 Agreements of the groups you oversee --14 or you manage? 15 MS. SWICICKI: Yes, I have knowledge 16 of them, yes. MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. And are you 17 18 familiar, as part of your job with Long 19 Island Rail Road, of all corporate 20 policies that affect the employees you 21 oversee? MS. SWICICKI: Yes. 2.2 23 MR. SANCHEZ: In your opinion -- or, 24 I guess, have you been led to believe 25 that policy supersedes contract

1 language? 2 MS. SWICICKI: Yes. MR. SANCHEZ: So, that's your belief 3 4 is that the policy can supersede 5 contract language? MS. SWICICKI: The CBA is their 6 7 contract, but the corporate or departmental policy has to -- I'm 8 9 uncertain. 10 MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. Could you give 11 me an example of if you're certain of 12 any -- can you give me an example of one 13 that would supersede -- a policy that 14 would supersede something in the CBA? 15 MS. SWICICKI: About sick forms. 16 MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. 17 MS. SWICICKI: In your CBA, it says 18 a doctor's note is required and corporate policy, it's an SLA-28 form 19 20 that's required. 21 So, it's not just from a doctor's 22 office, it's a corporate doctor's note 23 that is needed. 24 MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. Are you familiar with MED-005, which is the drug 25

1 and alcohol policy? 2 MS. SWICICKI: Yes. 3 MR. SANCHEZ: All right. It's carrier Exhibit 5. 4 If it were amended, would you be 5 made aware? If there were any changes 6 7 or amendments made to that policy, would 8 you be --MS. SWICICKI: Yes. 9 10 MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. You'd be made 11 aware. 12 Do you know if the policy has been 13 amended within the last two years? MS. SWICICKI: Yes. 14 15 MR. SANCHEZ: And can you tell me what the amendment or change was? 16 17 MS. SWICICKI: Yes, I can. 18 MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. And I'm sorry, 19 you're reading from Carrier Exhibit 5, 20 correct -- and that's the policy -- just 21 so we --MS. SWICICKI: Alcohol and Substance 2.2 23 Abuse Corporate Policy and Procedure. MR. MAGGIORE: That's the one that 24 25 was issued in March 2022?

LH REPORTING SERVICES, INC. 718-526-7100

1 MS. SWICICKI: Yes. 2 MR. MAGGIORE: Okay. Yeah, that's 3 Carrier Exhibit 5. 4 MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. Carrier Exhibit 5. 5 6 MS. SWICICKI: (Perusing.) Here we 7 qo -- I apologize. MR. SANCHEZ: No, don't apologize. 8 MS. SWICICKI: It is page 7 of 23 9 10 and they now included the -- "G", Arrest 11 and Conviction Reporting Requirements 12 Pursuant to the Federal Drug-Free 13 Workplace. 14 "An employee convicted of violating 15 any criminal drug statute in the 16 workplace must report the conviction to 17 his or her department head within the 18 five days of conviction. 19 It is the department head's 20 responsibility to report this to Labor Relations and the Assistant Director, 21 Employee Services". 2.2 23 MR. SANCHEZ: And was that amendment 24 communicated to all the employees or 25 affected employees?

1 MS. SWICICKI: Yes, we included it in our Code of Conduct that was mailed 2 3 out to all employees. 4 MR. SANCHEZ: And did the employees 5 receive -- or sign anything confirming receipt. 6 7 MS. SWICICKI: No. MR SANCHEZ: Okay -- all right. Are 8 9 you familiar with the recently passed 10 New York State Cannabis and Marijuana 11 Taxation Act? 12 MS. SWICICKI: I'm familiar with it. 13 MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. So, basically 14 -- I'm just -- layman's terms, right --15 basically it makes marijuana -recreational marijuana legal for 16 17 21-years-old and has certain protections 18 -- legal protections. 19 So, that's the act -- so, you're 20 familiar with it? 21 MS. SWICICKI: (Nodding.) 2.2 MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. And can you 23 tell me if the Long Island Rail Road or 24 the MTA has changed any part of the MEDs 25 or the policy because of the new law?

LH REPORTING SERVICES, INC. 718-526-7100

1 MS. SWICICKI: No. 2 MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. As part of your job responsibilities, do you know the 3 4 difference between regulated employees and non-regulated employees? 5 MS. SWICICKI: Regulated employees 6 7 are considered safety-sensitive employees and --8 9 MR. SANCHEZ: Well -- I'm sorry. 10 MS. SWICICKI: That's okay -- and 11 non-regulated is everyone else who is 12 not safety-sensitive. 13 MR. SANCHEZ: So, safety-sensitive employees and regulated employees --14 15 I'll rephrase the question. 16 The safety-sensitive employees that are covered under Hours of Service, 17 18 what's the difference between those 19 employees and other employees that are 20 deemed safety-sensitive by the Carrier, 21 but not the Federal government? MS. SWICICKI: So, what's the 2.2 23 difference between Hours of Service 24 employees and -- right? 25 MR. SANCHEZ: And employees that are

1 not under Hours of Service. MS. SWICICKI: So, Hours of Service 2 employees are -- they're 3 4 safety-sensitive employees and -- as well, they have a restriction on the 5 hours that they can work in a day. 6 7 They are allowed to work up to -- no more than 12 hours a day otherwise it's 8 a violation. 9 10 MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. And can -- when 11 you say safety-sensitive employees under 12 Hours of Service, who makes that 13 designation; is that the Carrier or the 14 Federal government -- because of their 15 position? 16 MS. SWICICKI: I can only speak on the Carrier, that it has been intact for 17 18 many years that they're considered 19 safety-sensitive. 20 MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. So, is there a 21 difference -- is there a different 2.2 classification of employee --23 electrician in this particular case --24 that's not considered safety-sensitive? 25 MS. SWICICKI: No.

17

1	MR. SANCHEZ: So, all employees
2	all electricians on the Carrier property
3	are safety-sensitive?
4	MS. SWICICKI: Correct.
5	MR. SANCHEZ: Are all
6	safety-sensitive employees subject to
7	random testing on the Carrier's
8	property?
9	MS. SWICICKI: No.
10	MR. SANCHEZ: And can you tell me
11	which ones are not?
12	MS. SWICICKI: We have different
13	groups. We have so, those
14	electricians that own we have an
15	Hours of Service pool, so those
16	electricians that own Hours of Service
17	positions, they would be subject to
18	random drug testing.
19	We then we have another pool a
20	mechanical pool and that's where the
21	other electricians that don't own
22	Hours of Service positions are in.
23	Pretty much every for random drug
24	testing, every craft is considered for
25	random drug testing. It's just the

1 Hours of Service pool for random drug 2 testing is -- only for those that own the position. 3 But electricians that do not own 4 Hours of Service positions, they're in 5 another pool. 6 7 MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. And is that a recent -- the "MEC" position? 8 MS. SWICICKI: Correct. 9 10 MR. SANCHEZ: And that's a recent 11 addition to the hours of testing or the 12 regulations by the FRA? 13 MS. SWICICKI: It was with -- yes. MR. SANCHEZ: And can you -- do you 14 15 know when that came into effect? 16 MS. SWICICKI: It could be, I 17 believe, like, 2018, 2019 it came in 18 effect. 19 MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. I think -- I 20 believe, actually, it was 2021, 2022. 21 So, it's fairly recent. 22 MS. SWICICKI: Okay. 23 MR. SANCHEZ: So, is it fair to say 24 that before it came into effect, there 25 was a classification of employees that

1 were classified as safety-sensitive that 2 weren't subject to random testing? 3 MS. SWICICKI: Correct. 4 MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. And do you know if Mr. Drew was considered -- fell into 5 that classification at the time of his 6 7 employment with this incident? MS. SWICICKI: I wouldn't know that 8 9 right now. 10 MR. SANCHEZ: Could you find out? 11 MS. SWICICKI: I know that he didn't 12 own an Hours of Service position. I would have to find out if he was --13 would be included in the mechanical 14 15 pool. 16 MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. So -- and that's fine. I think that's important 17 18 that we read it into the record. I just 19 want to clarify the question. 20 Can you find out if -- yeah, exactly 21 -- and you need to find out when he was taken out of service for this event and 2.2 23 when the mechanical addition became effective. 24 25 MR. MAGGIORE: Hold on. Just real

LH REPORTING SERVICES, INC. 718-526-7100

1 quick on that subject --MR. SANCHEZ: Mm-hmm. 2 MR. MAGGIORE: -- during the last 3 4 trial date, you asked Mr. Yodice that 5 question. He supplied Union Exhibit 6, which was the listing of the employees 6 7 in the random pool. Mr. Drew was not in that listing, I 8 believe. If you'd like to take a recess 9 10 real quick and confirm --11 MR. SANCHEZ: We can do that -- I 12 mean, yeah --13 MR. MAGGIORE: I just want to 14 clarify for the record because I believe 15 that was raised last time. MR. SANCHEZ: It was -- it was --16 17 MR. MAGGIORE: Okay. 18 MR. SANCHEZ: -- but I want to make 19 sure. 20 MR. MAGGIORE: So -- all right. The time is 10:28 a.m. We'll take a brief 21 recess so Ms. Swicicki can see whether 22 23 or not Mr. Drew was in the random 24 testing pool at the time of this incident, which was June 7, 2022. 25

LH REPORTING SERVICES, INC. 718-526-7100

1 MR. SANCHEZ: Yes. 2 MR. MAGGIORE: All right. We're off 3 record. 4 (Whereupon, a brief recess was taken.) 5 MR. MAGGIORE: All right. The time 6 7 is 10:38 a.m. We're back on the record. Prior to taking a recess, 8 9 Mr. Sanchez was asking Ms. Swicicki 10 whether or not Mr. Drew was in the 11 random testing pool at the -- in 12 June 2022. Ms. Swicicki, have you had an 13 14 opportunity to review your records? Can 15 you please answer Mr. Sanchez's 16 question? MS. SWICICKI: Yes, he was not in 17 18 the mechanical pool for that timeframe. 19 MR. SANCHEZ: So, at the time of his return-to-work physical, the reason the 20 21 Carrier tested him -- gave him a toxicological test -- was based on 2.2 23 company policy? 24 MS. SWICICKI: Correct. 25 MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. And can you

22

1 tell me the last time Mr. Drew was 2 designated as a covered or regulated 3 employee? MS. SWICICKI: He is -- Mr. Drew is 4 5 considered a safety-sensitive employee. MR. SANCHEZ: No, designated as a 6 7 covered or regulated employee. You know, it's funny. Maybe for the 8 9 record, just for clarification, when I 10 say "covered or regulated", I mean 11 someone who owns an Hours of Service job 12 that falls under the FRA regulations for 13 random testing. So, maybe I'm saying it 14 wrong. That's how -- I mean, that's how 15 we understand it. I call it a covered or regulated 16 17 employee, not safety-sensitive. 18 MS. SWICICKI: I understand. So, 19 it's more --MR. MAGGIORE: I'm sorry, just to 20 21 clarify for the record. 2.2 MR. SANCHEZ: Sure. 23 MR. MAGGIORE: There -- for the title of "electricians" --24 25 MR. SANCHEZ: Yes.

1 MR. MAGGIORE: -- there are some 2 that are covered under Hours of Service, i.e., "regulated", as you're referring 3 4 to --5 MR. SANCHEZ: Yes. MR. MAGGIORE: -- and there are some 6 7 that are not, correct? MS. SWICICKI: Correct. 8 MR. DREW: Yes. 9 10 MR. SANCHEZ: Yes. 11 MR. MAGGIORE: Okay. And Mr. Drew 12 is not under Hours of Service? MS. SWICICKI: Correct. 13 MR. MAGGIORE: He's not -- okay. 14 15 MS. SWICICKI: He does not own an Hours of Service job, so, therefore, he 16 would not be under covered -- the 17 regulated service employees. 18 19 MR. SANCHEZ: So, because he doesn't 20 own a covered job and he's not under a 21 -- doesn't own an Hours of Service job, 22 under what circumstances can the Carrier 23 give Mr. Drew a toxicological test? MS. SWICICKI: Because Mr. Drew is 24 25 under -- if you go on page 3 of 23,

1 "Safety-Sensitive Employees": 2 "Though regulated service employees are designated as "safety-sensitive" 3 4 under 49 CFR, Part 219, and Long Island Rail Road authority, and commercial 5 drivers are designated as 6 "safety-sensitive" under 49 CFR, Part 7 382 and Long Island Rail Road authority, 8 9 for the purpose of this policy, the 10 safety-sensitive employees 11 classification refers to those employees 12 whose job title/duties, Long Island Rail 13 Road has designated as safety-sensitive 14 under Long Island Rail Road authority, 15 which does include regulated service employees or commercial motor-vehicle 16 17 drivers who are classified separately". 18 So, he would be listed under there. 19 MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. So, he's -- I 20 mean, I guess -- and you correct me if 21 I'm wrong -- to sum it up, Mr. Drew is 2.2 considered safety-sensitive by the Long 23 Island Rail Road, but he's not 24 considered safety-sensitive by the FRA. 25 MS. SWICICKI: Correct.

1 MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. And because Mr. Drew is considered -- not considered 2 safety-sensitive by the FRA, he's not 3 4 required to submit to random testing while he's working? 5 6 MS. SWICICKI: Correct. 7 MR. SANCHEZ: Can the Carrier submit -- can the Carrier compel 8 9 Mr. Drew, because they've determined 10 he's safety-sensitive, to take a random 11 test during working hours? 12 MS. SWICICKI: No. 13 MR. SANCHEZ: Under any 14 circumstance? 15 MS. SWICICKI: To perform a random drug test? 16 17 MR. SANCHEZ: Yes. 18 MS. SWICICKI: Within his location 19 and position, right -- what he was 20 working at -- no. 21 MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. So, are you 2.2 sure -- I'll back-up. So, the Carrier can't submit 23 24 Mr. Drew -- they can't make him submit to a random test unless -- and stop me 25

26

1 if I'm wrong -- is reasonable cause? 2 MS. SWICICKI: Correct. 3 MR. SANCHEZ: Suspicion? 4 MS. SWICICKI: Suspicion. MR. SANCHEZ: Post-accident? 5 6 MS. SWICICKI: (Nodding.) 7 MR. SANCHEZ: So, unless there's a triggering event --8 MS. SWICICKI: And it's also if 9 10 you're out for more than 30 days --11 calendar days --12 MR. SANCHEZ: A triggering event --13 yes. MS. SWICICKI: -- so that's 14 15 return-to-duty. 16 MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. But that's not 17 a random? 18 MS. SWICICKI: Correct. 19 MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. So, I'm just 20 talking random. 21 So, unless there's a triggering 2.2 event, Mr. Drew is not subject to random 23 testing as a safety-sensitive employee 24 during working hours? 25 MS. SWICICKI: From his job title --

1 MR. SANCHEZ: Yes --2 MS. SWICICKI: -- yes --3 MR. SANCHEZ: -- as an employee. 4 MS. SWICICKI: -- and his current location of where he worked at the AC 5 shop, correct. 6 7 MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. Now, I want to talk about the return-to-work toxicology 8 9 test. 10 So, the return-to-work toxicology, 11 is that based on the belief that 12 employees are under the influence of a 13 prohibited substance? MS. SWICICKI: No, it's -- as per 14 15 the policy, it's just they have to -- if they're absent from work for any reason 16 17 for 30 calendar days, they would be 18 subject to drug and alcohol testing. 19 MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. So, it's 20 30 days if they're out sick? 21 MS. SWICICKI: 30 days if they're 2.2 out sick, vacation --MR. SANCHEZ: Vacation, leave of 23 24 absence? 25 MS. SWICICKI: Yeah.

LH REPORTING SERVICES, INC. 718-526-7100

1 MR. SANCHEZ: So, there's no cause; it's a time. 2 So, if an employee is out for 3 4 29 days, would he be subject to a return-to-work toxicological test? 5 MS. SWICICKI: No. 6 7 MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. MS. SWICICKI: It's -- and it's also 8 9 30 calendar days, so it's including 10 relief days. 11 MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. So, 12 notwithstanding testing for suspension, 13 reasonable cause, post-accident, the 14 Carrier can only test Mr. Drew on a 15 return-to-work physical; is that 16 correct? 17 MS. SWICICKI: Correct. 18 MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. So, the Carrier 19 can only test him when he's actually not 20 working? 21 MS. SWICICKI: He would need this 2.2 test before coming -- being returned 23 back to work. 24 MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. So, the Carrier 25 can only test him when he's actually not

Γ

1	working?
2	MS. SWICICKI: For the
3	return-to-duty test, yes.
4	MR. SANCHEZ: Or any toxicological,
5	other than suspicion, random, or
6	post-accident?
7	MS. SWICICKI: I'm sorry, can you
8	just explain that question one last
9	time?
10	MR. SANCHEZ: So, the Carrier can
11	test Mr. Drew under certain
12	circumstances suspicion, right
13	suspicion, post-accident, and probable
14	cause and the only other time they
15	can test Mr. Drew with a toxicological
16	test is when he's not working during a
17	return-to-work physical?
18	MS. SWICICKI: Correct.
19	MR. SANCHEZ: So, while he's
20	working, unless there's a triggering
21	event, the Carrier can't test him?
22	MS. SWICICKI: Correct.
23	MR. SANCHEZ: Do you have any input
24	in the formation of MED-005, the company
25	policy?

1 When these policies are amended, do 2 they look for any feedback from the 3 departments? 4 MS. SWICICKI: No. 5 MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. So, do you know why the Carrier's policy doesn't include 6 a random test for non-regulated 7 employees deemed safety-sensitive? 8 MS. SWICICKI: No, I can't answer 9 10 that. 11 MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. Do you know who 12 would be able to answer that? MS. SWICICKI: It could be HR --13 14 Human Resources and Labor Relations. 15 MR. SANCHEZ: I'm going to hand 16 you -- I'm going to hand you one and ask 17 you to take a look at that. (Handing.) 18 MS. SWICICKI: Okay. (Perusing.) 19 MR. SANCHEZ: Do you recognize that 20 letter? 21 MS. SWICICKI: Yes, I do. MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. I'd like to 2.2 move that into evidence as Union 23 24 Exhibit 7. 25 MR. MAGGIORE: I note for the record

that Union Exhibit 7 is a three-page 1 2 document. 3 (Whereupon, Organization Exhibit 7 4 was marked.) MR. SANCHEZ: Were you the charging 5 officer on Union Exhibit 7? 6 7 MS. SWICICKI: Yes, I was. MR. SANCHEZ: And why are you 8 designated as the charging officer? 9 10 MS. SWICICKI: Because I oversee and 11 adhere to all corporate departmental 12 policies within Maintenance of Equipment 13 Department. 14 MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. And did you 15 take Mr. Dolginko out of service for 16 this offense? MS. SWICICKI: No, I did not. I had 17 18 Jimmy McGrath, who is the designee, to 19 take Mr. Dolginko out since I was on 20 vacation that day. 21 MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. Can you go to, I guess, page 2 of 3 on Union Exhibit 7? 2.2 23 MS. SWICICKI: (Perusing.) 24 MR. SANCHEZ: It's -- could you 25 read, "Dear Mr. Dolginko" -- the letter,

1 please? MS. SWICICKI: Sure. "Dear 2 Mr. Dolginko, this will inform you that 3 4 you were hereby removed from service on December 17, 2021 at 11:17 a.m. by 5 Manager - M of E Manpower Resource 6 7 Management, J. McGrath, for "Violation of the Corporate Alcohol and Substance 8 9 Abuse Policy". 10 You will be notified if you will be 11 charged, and if so, of the specific 12 trial charge, the time, date, and 13 location of your trial". 14 MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. Can Mr. McGrath 15 take Mr. Dolginko out of service --16 MS. SWICICKI: Yes. 17 MR. SANCHEZ: -- does he have the 18 authority -- okay -- thank you. 19 Can you read the charges on Union 20 Exhibit 7 against Mr. Dolginko? 21 MS. SWICICKI: Sure. It's, "Conduct 2.2 Unbecoming an Employee, Violation of the 23 Corporate Alcohol and Substance Abuse Policy, Section IV, "Prohibited 24 25 Conduct", (D), which states in pertinent

1 part: 2 "D", the detection of a prohibited substance resulting from any required 3 4 toxicological test is a violation of this Policy. 5 In that, on December 13, 2021, you 6 7 reported to the Long Island Rail Road Medical Facility in Mineola, New York, 8 9 where you submitted a urine specimen as 10 part of a Return-to-Duty drug test. On 11 December 17, 2021, the Department 12 received the results of that test, which 13 tested positive for marijuana". 14 MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. 15 MS. SWICICKI: "You may produce 16 witnesses on your behalf, without 17 expense to the company. You and your 18 representative may cross-examine 19 witnesses. You will be expected to be present throughout the entire 20 21 proceeding". 2.2 MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. I'm going to 23 ask you to hold onto that exhibit and 24 I'm going to give you what has been 25 identified as -- I believe it's Carrier

Γ

1	1.
2	MR. MAGGIORE: The Notice of Trial?
3	MR. SANCHEZ: Notice of Trial.
4	MR. MAGGIORE: Okay.
5	MS. SWICICKI: I have one.
6	MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. And are those
7	the same charges as the ones against
8	Mr. Drew?
9	MS. SWICICKI: (Perusing.) Yes.
10	MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. And you stated
11	earlier that you are familiar with the
12	Collective Bargaining Agreement as part
13	of your responsibilities; is that
14	correct?
15	MS. SWICICKI: Yes.
16	MR. SANCHEZ: And can you tell me
17	how many trials you've been to been a
18	part of for violation of the Company
19	policy this Company policy, MED-005?
20	MS. SWICICKI: I've been I would
21	say a handful of these of violations
22	of the MED-005.
23	MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. And how many
24	trials for non-regulated employees
25	deemed safety-sensitive by the Carrier

1 have you been involved with, with this 2 organization? 3 Do you need me to repeat the 4 question? I know it's a lot. 5 MS. SWICICKI: How many trials have 6 I been --7 MR. SANCHEZ: How many trials for non-regulated employees, such as 8 Mr. Drew, who were deemed 9 10 safety-sensitive by the Carrier, have 11 you been involved with, with this 12 organization? 13 MS. SWICICKI: Regarding MED-005? 14 MR. SANCHEZ: Mm-hmm. 15 MS. SWICICKI: I believe this is the only one for trial. 16 MR. SANCHEZ: So, this is the first 17 18 one? 19 MS. SWICICKI: I believe so, yes. 20 MR. SANCHEZ: Do you want to check? 21 If you want, we can take a recess if she wants to confirm. 2.2 23 MR. MAGGIORE: I mean, if you want 24 to just answer in the affirmative, we'll 25 believe --

1 MS. SWICICKI: Yeah. 2 MR. MAGGIORE: If you believe this 3 is the first one --MS. SWICICKI: I believe this is the 4 first one. 5 6 MR. SANCHEZ: Okay -- all right. 7 (Whereupon, a discussion was held off the record.) 8 MR. SANCHEZ: So, I'm going to hand 9 10 Ms. Swicicki Rule 58 and ask you if you 11 recognize the exhibit. (Handing.) 12 Rule 53 -- I apologize. 13 MS. SWICICKI: (Perusing.) Yes. MR. SANCHEZ: I'd like to move that 14 into evidence as Union Exhibit 8. 15 16 MR. MAGGIORE: Okay. 17 (Whereupon, Organization Exhibit 8 18 was marked.) 19 MR. SANCHEZ: And are you familiar 20 with Rule 53? 21 MS. SWICICKI: I'm familiar with it, 22 yes. 23 MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. And can you 24 read Rule 53(a)? 25 MS. SWICICKI: Sure. "Employees

1 will not be suspended, nor dismissed 2 from service without a fair and 3 impartial trial". 4 MR. SANCHEZ: And would you agree 5 that that language is not ambiguous, "A"? 6 7 MS. SWICICKI: Regarding this trial? MR. SANCHEZ: Well, just the rule. 8 9 It says, "Employees will not be 10 suspended, nor dismissed without -- from 11 service without a fair and impartial 12 trial". 13 Would you agree that that language 14 is not ambiguous? 15 MS. SWICICKI: Yes. 16 MR. SANCHEZ: Was Mr. Dolginko 17 suspended after a fair and impartial 18 trial? 19 MS. SWICICKI: No, not after. 20 MR. SANCHEZ: So, he was suspended 21 before -- without a fair and impartial trial? 2.2 23 MS. SWICICKI: Yes. 24 MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. Can you read "B", please? 25

1	MS. SWICICKI: "When a major offense
2	has been committed, an employee
3	suspected by the management to be guilty
4	thereof may be held out of service
5	pending such trial and decision, only if
6	their retention in service could be
7	detrimental to themselves, another
8	person, or the Carrier".
9	MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. Just "B".
10	MS. SWICICKI: Okay.
11	MR. SANCHEZ: And would you agree
12	that "B" gives you certain circumstances
13	when employees can be held out of
14	service without a trial without a
15	fair and impartial trial?
16	MS. SWICICKI: Yes.
17	MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. And what are
18	they?
19	MS. SWICICKI: So, the following
20	types of offenses are
21	MR. SANCHEZ: No, I'm sorry no,
22	for "B". It says, "B", which you just
23	testified to, gives you circumstances
24	where employees can be taken out of
25	service without a trial.

LH REPORTING SERVICES, INC. 718-526-7100

1 Would you agree? 2 MS. SWICICKI: Yes, they can be held out for a major offense -- it has been 3 committed. 4 MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. So, there's two 5 circumstances -- and stop me if you 6 disagree -- "B" gives you two 7 circumstances where an employee can be 8 taken out of service by management. 9 10 So, they have to be considered 11 quilty, correct? 12 MS. SWICICKI: Mm-hmm. MR. SANCHEZ: And only if their 13 retention in service could be 14 15 detrimental to themselves, another person, or the Carrier? 16 17 MS. SWICICKI: Correct. 18 MR. SANCHEZ: So, you have to 19 satisfy both, correct? 20 MS. SWICICKI: And then underneath 21 it, it gives you the following types of offenses. 2.2 23 MR. SANCHEZ: I know, I'm going to 24 get there. 25 MR. MAGGIORE: Hold on. One at a

LH REPORTING SERVICES, INC. 718-526-7100

1 time. 2 MR. SANCHEZ: Oh, okay. I'll get to 3 -- I'll get there --4 MS. SWICICKI: Okay. 5 MR. SANCHEZ: -- but I'm asking 6 about "B" right now. 7 MS. SWICICKI: For "B" -- okay. MR. SANCHEZ: Yes. 8 9 MS. SWICICKI: Okay. So, yes, you 10 are correct. 11 MR. SANCHEZ: So, you have to 12 satisfy -- they have to be guilty of the 13 offense? 14 MS. SWICICKI: Correct. 15 MR. SANCHEZ: And that their retention in service has to be 16 detrimental to themselves, another 17 18 person, or the Carrier before you can 19 take them out without violating Rule 53; 20 would you agree? 21 MS. SWICICKI: Yes. 22 MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. And in 23 Mr. Dolginko's case, did you believe he 24 was quilty? 25 MS. SWICICKI: Yes, from the email

1	from the Medical Department, yes.
2	MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. And did you
3	believe that his retention in service
4	could be detrimental to Mr. Dolginko,
5	another person, or the Carrier?
6	MS. SWICICKI: If you're under the
7	influence of marijuana, then, yes, to
8	yourself and to others.
9	MR. SANCHEZ: So, the Carrier,
10	before they took Mr. Dolginko out of
11	service, determined that he was guilty
12	of the offense and that his retention
13	could be detrimental to himself because
14	he was I'm sorry, I don't want to put
15	words in your mouth.
16	MS. SWICICKI: No, that's fine.
17	For because he tested positive
18	for marijuana, so it could be
19	detrimental to himself and to others.
20	MR. SANCHEZ: Do you know if he was
21	impaired at the time he was taken out of
22	service?
23	MS. SWICICKI: I did not see him at
24	the time.
25	MR. SANCHEZ: Okay.

LH REPORTING SERVICES, INC. 718-526-7100

1 MR. MAGGIORE: Mr. Sanchez, I think we have an issue here because if Mr. 2 Dolginko wanted to exercise his right to 3 4 go to trial, all these questions should've been asked at that time. 5 We're here for a trial for Mr. Drew. 6 7 I understand you want to enter this as evidence to explain the Carrier's 8 actions in terms of how these cases are 9 10 handled, but in terms of the specifics 11 of Mr. Dolginko's case, I am just going 12 to ask that you refrain from asking Ms. 13 Swicicki questions on that. 14 MR. SANCHEZ: Well -- okay. And for 15 the record, I'd like to say that, as 16 Mr. Drew's designated representative, 17 I'm entitled to produce -- summon any person to produce any evidence to enable 18 19 me to defend Mr. Drew against the 20 charges. 21 This is our evidence or 2.2 presentation, so --23 MR. MAGGIORE: Absolutely. But I --24 my only -- again, my concern is that an 25 employee, when they're charged, has the

LH REPORTING SERVICES, INC. 718-526-7100

1 right to a trial. If you want to ask --2 if Mr. Dolginko wanted to go to trial, these are all relevant questions to ask 3 4 during a trial for Mr. Dolginko. I allowed you to enter his Notice of 5 Trial cause I understand you want to 6 7 defend your member and make the point -or make a point -- or try and make a 8 9 point regarding how these cases are 10 handled. I'm allowing that. 11 But, again. Specifics about his 12 case, I'm asking you, please, refrain from asking questions about that because 13 14 if you wanted to, then you could've had 15 a trial for his case -- or he could have had a trial. 16 17 MR. SANCHEZ: And I'll respond, on the record, that the relevance -- I 18 19 don't have to explain relevance here. 20 MR. MAGGIORE: Yeah, you do. 21 MR. SANCHEZ: That's for the 2.2 reviewing officer. What I put in this -- Ms. Swicicki 23 is connected to all these exhibits 24 25 because she was the charging official.

LH REPORTING SERVICES, INC. 718-526-7100

1 So, it shows a pattern and this is -- we establish relevance. 2 So, I'm going to continue to go down 3 4 this road till I'm done. I have other employees and this is a trial. You're 5 right. If Mr. Dolginko was afforded a 6 7 trial, we would've done a trial, if he wanted a trial, right here. 8 9 I'm now representing Mr. Drew, so 10 there's no mistake. This is Mr. Drew's 11 trial, not Mr. Dolginko's trial. 12 MR. MAGGIORE: Okay. You can 13 continue with your questioning. 14 MR. SANCHEZ: Thank you. 15 Okay. Ms. Swicicki, could you continue reading Rule 53 and you can 16 17 start with, "The following types of 18 offenses". 19 MS. SWICICKI: "The following types 20 of offenses justify pre-investigation 21 suspension when there is sufficient 2.2 reason to believe the employee is guilty 23 of the offense and that he or she might 24 commit the offense again if not withheld 25 from service".

1 MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. And I'm going 2 to stop you there -- and I'll read the 3 following offenses. 4 So, first one, "theft". Was Mr. Dolginko guilty of theft? 5 MS. SWICICKI: No. 6 7 MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. Two, "unsafe practices". 8 9 Was Mr. Dolginko guilty of an unsafe 10 practice? 11 MS. SWICICKI: No. 12 MR. SANCHEZ: Three, "serious insubordination". 13 14 Was Mr. Dolginko guilty of serious insubordination? 15 MS. SWICICKI: No. 16 17 MR. SANCHEZ: Number four, 18 "threatening or abusive conduct". 19 Was Mr. Dolginko guilty of 20 threatening or abusive conduct? MS. SWICICKI: No. 21 2.2 MR. SANCHEZ: Five, "fighting on 23 duty or on Carrier property". 24 Was Mr. Dolginko guilty of fighting? 25 MS. SWICICKI: No.

46

1 MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. Number six, 2 "under the influence of alcohol or 3 narcotics while on duty". 4 Was Mr. Dolginko guilty of being under the influence of alcohol or 5 6 narcotics while on duty? 7 MS. SWICICKI: He was guilty of it for his return-to-duty. 8 9 MR. SANCHEZ: That's not my 10 question --11 MS. SWICICKI: But not on duty. 12 MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. So, he was --13 so, the answer is no? MS. SWICICKI: No. 14 15 MR. SANCHEZ: And seven, "rape, assault, or other serious criminal 16 17 activities". 18 Was Mr. Dolginko guilty of rape, 19 assault, or other serious criminal 20 activities? 21 MS. SWICICKI: No. 2.2 MR. SANCHEZ: So, when Mr. Dolginko 23 was taken out of service, the Carrier 24 violated Rule 53? 25 MS. SWICICKI: He was also being

47

1 marked paid using his sick-time, as well being paid by the Carrier -- his 2 sick-time. So, we --3 4 MR. SANCHEZ: So, when Mr. Dolginko was taken out of service -- when 5 Mr. Dolginko was taken out of service by 6 7 the Carrier, did his compensation cease? MS. SWICICKI: Mr. Dolginko or 8 Mr. Drew? 9 10 MR. SANCHEZ: Mr. Dolginko. 11 MS. SWICICKI: We're talking about 12 Mr. Drew, so I don't have Mr. Dolginko's 13 information. 14 MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. So, it's 15 company policy when an employee is taken out of service for a violation such as 16 17 detection of -- for prohibited substance 18 and they're taken out of service, does 19 their compensation stop? 20 MS. SWICICKI: Correct, yes. 21 MR. SANCHEZ: So, they don't get 2.2 paid anymore? 23 MS. SWICICKI: No. 24 MR. SANCHEZ: Can they -- and sick-time? 25

LH REPORTING SERVICES, INC. 718-526-7100

1 MS. SWICICKI: No. 2 MR. SANCHEZ: Vacation? 3 MS. SWICICKI: No. MR. SANCHEZ: Personal? 4 MS. SWICICKI: No, they'll be marked 5 out of service/unpaid. 6 7 MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. So, when Mr. Dolginko was taken out of service 8 for the offense, his compensation 9 10 stopped? 11 MS. SWICICKI: Mr. Drew, yes. 12 MR. SANCHEZ: Mr. Dolginko. MS. SWICICKI: I don't have 13 14 Mr. Dolginko's information in front of 15 me. MR. SANCHEZ: Would Mr. Dolginko be 16 treated differently for this offense 17 18 than Mr. Drew? 19 MS. SWICICKI: No. 20 MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. Thank you. 21 So, Mr. Dolginko took his 2.2 return-to-work physical on December 13th 23 and the results came back on December 24 17th, four days later. 25 Is that correct?

1 MS. SWICICKI: (Perusing.) MR. SANCHEZ: I believe you can look 2 at the Union Exhibit 7. 3 4 MS. SWICICKI: So, he went on the 5 13th and the 17th, the Department received the test results, yes. 6 7 MR. SANCHEZ: And do you recall what 8 Mr. Dolginko's status was from 9 December 13th through January 3rd? 10 MS. SWICICKI: No. 11 MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. Would you be 12 surprised -- he was on vacation and he 13 went from DS to vacation; he was never 14 in service or on the property. 15 Okay. I'm going to -- (handing). MR. MAGGIORE: This is -- you want 16 17 to enter this as an exhibit? 18 MR. SANCHEZ: Yes -- yes. 19 MR. MAGGIORE: This is -- I note for the record that Mr. Sanchez has handed 20 21 me -- it's a two-sided document. It's 2.2 two pages. It says, "Notice of Trial", 23 has the name "R. Dombek" on it. I'll mark it as Carrier -- I'm sorry 24 25 -- Organization Exhibit 9.

LH REPORTING SERVICES, INC. 718-526-7100

1 (Whereupon, Organization Exhibit 9 2 was marked.) 3 MR. SANCHEZ: I'm going to ask Ms. 4 Swicicki if you can take a look at that and if you recognize that document. 5 6 (Handing.) 7 MS. SWICICKI: (Perusing.) Yes, I do. 8 9 MR. SANCHEZ: And can you tell me 10 what that document is? 11 MS. SWICICKI: It was an employee 12 who tested positive for marijuana and it is a Notice of Trial. 13 14 MR. SANCHEZ: And was that employee 15 taken out of service? 16 MS. SWICICKI: Yes, he had to be taken out of service. 17 18 MR. SANCHEZ: And were you the 19 employee -- were you the manager who 20 took him out of service? 21 MS. SWICICKI: I do not recall. 2.2 MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. Are you the 23 charging official? 24 MS. SWICICKI: Yes, I'm the charging 25 official for this Notice of Trial.

LH REPORTING SERVICES, INC. 718-526-7100

1 MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. I'll ask you 2 the same questions. I'm going to refer back to Rule 53. 3 4 So, I'm going to ask you to read "A" 5 again, please. MS. SWICICKI: "Employees will not 6 7 be suspended, nor dismissed from service without a fair and impartial trial". 8 MR. SANCHEZ: And was Mr. Dombek 9 10 afforded a fair and impartial trial 11 before he was removed from service? 12 MS. SWICICKI: No. 13 MR. SANCHEZ: I'd ask you to read "B". 14 15 MS. SWICICKI: "When a major offense has been committed, an employee 16 17 suspected by the management to be guilty 18 thereof may be held out of service 19 pending such trial and decision, only if 20 their retention in service could be 21 detrimental to themselves, another 2.2 person, or the Carrier". 23 MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. And so -- and 24 we've already established that this --25 "B" gives the Carrier two circumstances

LH REPORTING SERVICES, INC. 718-526-7100

1 where an employee can be taken out of 2 service without a fair and impartial 3 trial. Did the Carrier meet those burdens 4 with Mr. Dombek? 5 MS. SWICICKI: Yes. 6 MR. SANCHEZ: So, he's guilty of the 7 offense? 8 MS. SWICICKI: Correct. 9 10 MR. SANCHEZ: And why did the 11 carrier believe the employee was guilty 12 of the offense? 13 MS. SWICICKI: The employee tested 14 positive for marijuana, so it could be detrimental to himself and to others. 15 16 MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. MS. SWICICKI: And this is also 17 18 Mr. Dombek's second case testing 19 positive for marijuana. MR. SANCHEZ: (Handing.) 20 MR. MAGGIORE: Mr. Sanchez has 21 handed me another document. It's a 2.2 23 one-page document. Notice of Trial with 24 the name "Reszka" on it, R-E-S-Z-K-A. 25 This will be Organization

Exhibit 10. (Handing.) 1 (Whereupon, Organization Exhibit 10 2 was marked.) 3 4 MR. MAGGIORE: A copy has been provided to Ms. Swicicki. 5 MR. SANCHEZ: Ms. Swicicki, I'd ask 6 7 you if you could look at that document and tell me if you recognize it. 8 9 MS. SWICICKI: (Perusing.) I do. 10 MR. SANCHEZ: And can you read the 11 charge, please? 12 MS. SWICICKI: "Conduct Unbecoming 13 an Employee of the Long Island Rail 14 Road, Violation of the Corporate Alcohol 15 and Substance Abuse Policy". 16 "Prohibited conduct which provides 17 in pertinent part: 18 "A", all employees are prohibited from, number "3", illegally 19 20 manufacturing, distributing, selling, 21 dispensing, possessing, or using any illegally obtained controlled substance 2.2 23 on or off duty. 24 In that on January 2, 2021, you 25 reported to the Long Island Rail Road

LH REPORTING SERVICES, INC. 718-526-7100

1	Medical Facility in Mineola, New York
2	where you submitted to a random drug
3	test. On January 8, 2021, the
4	Department received the results of that
5	test, which were positive for marijuana.
6	You may, if you so desire, be
7	accompanied by one or more persons of
8	your own choosing, who are accredited
9	representatives of your Organization, to
10	represent you without expense to the
11	Company.
12	You may produce witnesses on your
13	behalf, without expense to the Company.
14	You and/or your representative may
15	cross-examine witnesses.
16	You will be expected to be present
17	throughout the entire proceeding".
18	MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. Now, I'm going
19	to ask you to go back to Union Exhibit
20	8, which is Rule 53, and I'll read and
21	you can answer "yes" or "no".
22	MS. SWICICKI: Okay. (Perusing.)
23	MR. SANCHEZ: It says "A",
24	"Employees will not be suspended or
25	dismissed from service without a fair

LH REPORTING SERVICES, INC. 718-526-7100

1 and impartial trial". Was Mr. Reszka afforded a fair and 2 impartial trial before he was removed 3 from service? 4 MS. SWICICKI: No. 5 MR. SANCHEZ: "B", "When a major 6 7 offense has been committed by an employee suspected by management to be 8 guilty thereof, therefore, may be held 9 10 out of service pending such trial and 11 decision only if the retention in 12 service could be detrimental to 13 themselves or another person". 14 So, was Mr. Reszka's retention --15 did the Carrier believe him to be guilty of the offense. 16 17 MS. SWICICKI: Yes. 18 MR. SANCHEZ: And that belief was based on --19 20 MS. SWICICKI: Him testing positive 21 for marijuana while reporting to Medical for a random drug test. He owned an 2.2 23 Hours of Service position and it's detrimental to himself and another 24 25 person while being an electrician.

LH REPORTING SERVICES, INC. 718-526-7100

1 MR. SANCHEZ: And how is it detrimental to himself or another 2 electrician? 3 4 MS. SWICICKI: He tested positive for marijuana and -- a controlled 5 substance -- and, therefore, to work as 6 7 an electrician, that could be detrimental to himself. He could get 8 9 hurt or hurt others while performing his 10 duties. 11 MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. I'd ask you to 12 read from Union Exhibit 10. Right underneath the charge it says, 13 14 "In that on January 2, 2021" -- if you 15 could read that portion and stop at the end where it says "marijuana". 16 17 MS. SWICICKI: Okay. "In that on January 2, 2021, you reported to the 18 19 Long Island Rail Road Medical Facility 20 in Mineola, New York where you submitted 21 to a random drug test. On January 8, 2.2 2021, the Department received the 23 results of that test, which were 24 positive for marijuana". 25 MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. So, Mr. Reszka

LH REPORTING SERVICES, INC. 718-526-7100

1 took the test on January 2nd. 2 MS. SWICICKI: Correct. 3 MR. SANCHEZ: And that was a -- that 4 was a --5 MS. SWICICKI: Random drug test. 6 MR. SANCHEZ: -- random drug test. 7 MS. SWICICKI: Yes. MR. SANCHEZ: And do you what his --8 was he returned to service after he took 9 10 that random drug test? 11 MS. SWICICKI: Yes. 12 MR. SANCHEZ: So, he was returned back to service. 13 14 So, from the 2nd to the 6th -- till 15 the results came -- I'm sorry -- from the 2nd to the 8th, six days had 16 17 passed --18 MS. SWICICKI: Yes. 19 MR. SANCHEZ: -- and to the best of 20 your knowledge, during those six days, 21 were there any complaints about his 2.2 performance? 23 MS. SWICICKI: Not that I'm aware 24 of. 25 MR. SANCHEZ: Any complaints that he

LH REPORTING SERVICES, INC. 718-526-7100

1 seemed to be impaired? 2 MS. SWICICKI: Not that I'm aware 3 of. 4 MR. SANCHEZ: Any complaints that he 5 had any unsafe acts? 6 MS. SWICICKI: Not that I'm aware 7 of. MR. SANCHEZ: Had there been a 8 complaint that he had committed an 9 10 unsafe act or he seemed impaired, would 11 you have been made aware of those? MS. SWICICKI: Yes, cause there 12 13 would've been charges. 14 MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. So, then he 15 wasn't. Even though you're not aware, the answer is -- and stop me if I'm 16 17 wrong -- he wasn't impaired. 18 There were no complaints of him 19 being impaired, committing any unsafe 20 acts, or any workplace malfeasance; is 21 that correct? MS. SWICICKI: Correct. 2.2 23 MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. (Handing.) 24 MR. MAGGIORE: Mr. Sanchez has 25 handed me another document. It's one

1 page. It says "Notice of Trial", 2 contains the name "P. Pena". 3 I'm marking this as Organization 4 Exhibit 11 and providing a copy to Ms. Swicicki. (Handing.) 5 6 (Whereupon, Organization Exhibit 11 7 was marked.) MS. SWICICKI: (Perusing.) 8 9 MR. SANCHEZ: Ms. Swicicki, do you 10 recognize this document? 11 MS. SWICICKI: Yes. 12 MR. SANCHEZ: And can you tell me what it is? 13 14 MS. SWICICKI: It's a Notice of 15 Trial for Mr. Pena. 16 MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. And is it the same Notice of Trial -- or same offense 17 18 that Mr. Drew is charged with? 19 MS. SWICICKI: This one is the same 20 one as Mr. Reszka because he failed a 21 random drug test and tested positive for 2.2 marijuana. 23 MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. But the charge 24 is -- so, it's not the same charge? 25 MS. SWICICKI: I apologize.

LH REPORTING SERVICES, INC. 718-526-7100

1 It's the -- Conduct Unbecoming an 2 Employee in Violation of the Corporate Alcohol and Substance Abuse Policy" --3 4 yes. MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. And I'm going 5 to ask the same questions. 6 7 Was Mr. Pena afforded a fair and impartial trial before he was removed 8 from service? 9 10 MS. SWICICKI: No. 11 MR. SANCHEZ: Was he suspected by 12 management to be guilty of the offense? MS. SWICICKI: Yes. 13 14 MR. SANCHEZ: And was his retention 15 in service detrimental to the Carrier, or himself, another person -- and if so, 16 how is that determined? 17 18 MS. SWICICKI: Yes, due to being 19 tested for -- testing positive for 20 marijuana. 21 MR. SANCHEZ: Was it marijuana or 22 marijuana metabolites? I'm sorry, I'll 23 strike that question. 24 So, I would like you to read the same under "A". It says, "In that on 25

1 July 12th". MS. SWICICKI: "In that on July 12, 2 2019, you reported to the Long Island 3 4 Rail Road Medical Facility in Mineola, New York where you submitted a urine 5 specimen as part of a random drug test. 6 7 On July 16, 2019, the Department received the results of that test, which 8 9 were positive for marijuana". 10 MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. So, on 11 July 12th he came in and he gave the 12 sample -- Mr. Pena -- and that sample 13 tested positive for marijuana, and on 14 the 16th, he was notified, I guess. 15 So, for those four days, are you 16 aware of any complaints of his 17 performance? 18 MS. SWICICKI: No. 19 MR. SANCHEZ: Unsafe acts? 20 MS. SWICICKI: No. 21 MR. SANCHEZ: Any malfeasance on the 2.2 job? 23 MS. SWICICKI: No. 24 MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. And had he been 25 impaired or exhibited symptoms of being

1 impaired, it would've come to your 2 attention? 3 MS. SWICICKI: Correct. 4 MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. Do you know why 5 the Carrier submits employees to a toxicological test on a return-to-work 6 7 physical? MS. SWICICKI: It's stated in the 8 9 policy. It's as per them being out 30 10 calendar days, they would have to. 11 MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. But what's the 12 -- do you know what the objective of the 13 toxicological test is? MS. SWICICKI: No. 14 15 MR. SANCHEZ: You don't know what the objective of giving someone a 16 17 toxicological test is? 18 MS. SWICICKI: Well, to make sure 19 that they're safe to return back to 20 work. 21 MR. SANCHEZ: That they're not impaired by a prohibited substance? 2.2 23 MS. SWICICKI: Correct. 24 MR. SANCHEZ: And do you know why 25 the Carrier doesn't give an alcohol test

1 to the employees while they're there? 2 MS. SWICICKI: They do drug and alcohol testing. 3 4 MR. SANCHEZ: On a return-to-work 5 physical? MS. SWICICKI: In the policy, it 6 7 states, "subject to drug and/or alcohol testing". 8 9 MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. In Mr. Drew's 10 case, for -- okay. 11 MR. MAGGIORE: You asked this 12 question of Mr. Yodice, just as a 13 reminder, and he responded that drug 14 testing is done for return-to-work, not 15 alcohol. MR. SANCHEZ: I know, but I'm asking 16 Ms. Swicicki if she knows why. 17 18 MR. MAGGIORE: Okay. Fair enough. 19 I'm just stating for the record that was 20 his -- you asked the same question to 21 the person who is in charge of the 2.2 Medical Department and he responded. 23 MS. SWICICKI: I am unsure. 24 MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. Actually, could 25 we have a moment?

LH REPORTING SERVICES, INC. 718-526-7100

64

1 MR. MAGGIORE: Sure. The time is 2 11:15 a.m. We're going to take a brief 3 recess. We're off record. 4 (Whereupon, a brief recess was 5 6 taken.) 7 MR. MAGGIORE: All right. The time is 11:25 a.m. We're back on the record. 8 9 Before the Organization requested a 10 recess, Mr. Sanchez was questioning Ms. 11 Swicicki regarding Organization 12 Exhibit 11. 13 Mr. Sanchez, do you have any other 14 questions? 15 MR. SANCHEZ: No, I don't -- not for Union Exhibit 11. 16 17 MR. MAGGIORE: Okay. 18 MR. SANCHEZ: I'm going to hand you 19 -- this is 12. (Handing.) 20 MR. MAGGIORE: Mr. Sanchez has 21 handed me a document -- a one-page 2.2 document email, subject line, "Message 23 from MTA Safety & Security regarding 24 marijuana use". 25 I'm showing this to Ms. Swicicki --

65

1 I'm giving Ms. Swicicki a copy rather. 2 (Handing.) I will mark this as Organization 3 Exhibit 12. 4 5 (Whereupon, Organization Exhibit 12 was marked.) 6 7 MS. SWICICKI: (Perusing.) MR. SANCHEZ: Ms. Swicicki, do you 8 9 recognize the document that has been 10 identified as Union Exhibit 12? 11 MS. SWICICKI: No, I don't. 12 MR. SANCHEZ: You don't --MS. SWICICKI: I don't recall seeing 13 this before. 14 15 MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. You don't recall -- okay. Earlier you testified 16 17 that if policy -- part of your job 18 function is payroll, administrative, and 19 all corporate and departmental policies. 20 Would this be considered -- you can 21 take a look at it -- would this fall 2.2 under departmental policy --23 MR. MAGGIORE: We'll give Ms. 24 Swicicki an opportunity to review the 25 document first.

Γ

1	MR. SANCHEZ: Sure.
2	MS. SWICICKI: Thank you.
3	MR. SANCHEZ: Okay.
4	MS. SWICICKI: (Perusing.) Okay.
5	MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. So, now that
6	you've had a chance to review the
7	document, does it look familiar?
8	MS. SWICICKI: I am not aware of
9	this.
10	MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. So, you've
11	never seen this document prior to the
12	introduction at this trial?
13	MS. SWICICKI: Correct.
14	MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. Can you read
15	the top where it says "From", "Sent",
16	"To", and "Subject", please?
17	MS. SWICICKI: "From, MTA Employee
18	Communications".
19	MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. Can you stop
20	for a minute I'm sorry.
21	Would you receive any emails from
22	MTA Communications in your current
23	position?
24	MS. SWICICKI: Yes.
25	MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. And the date,

1 please, when it was sent. MS. SWICICKI: Monday, May 23, 2022, 2 3 4:28 p.m. 4 MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. So, May -- so, 5 almost a year -- 11 months. So, this was sent 11 months ago and you testified 6 7 that this is the first time you've seen 8 it, correct? MS. SWICICKI: Correct. 9 10 MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. And "To"? 11 MS. SWICICKI: "MTA Employee 12 Communications". MR. SANCHEZ: And would that -- your 13 14 job encompass MTA Employee 15 Communications -- would you be copied on these types of --16 MS. SWICICKI: I believe I would. 17 18 MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. And the 19 subject, finally. 20 MS. SWICICKI: "Message from MTA 21 Safety & Security regarding marijuana 2.2 use". 23 MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. And since this 24 -- you've never seen this document, I'll just ask you, are you familiar with 25

1 Patrick Warren? 2 MS. SWICICKI: Yes. 3 MR. SANCHEZ: And who is Mr. Warren? 4 MS. SWICICKI: MTA Chief Safety & Security Officer. 5 6 MR. SANCHEZ: And is he a 7 policy-maker in his position, if you're aware? 8 9 MS. SWICICKI: I am unsure of his 10 position and his responsibilities. 11 MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. Is he senior 12 staff? 13 MS. SWICICKI: I am unsure. 14 MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. Do you know if 15 he works in Jamaica on the Long Island 16 Rail Road or in MTA Headquarters? MS. SWICICKI: I don't know where he 17 18 works. 19 MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. So -- but the 20 position of MTA Chief Safety & Security 21 Officer is new to you? 2.2 MS. SWICICKI: I've seen it before, 23 but I don't know everyone that works on 24 the railroad. MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. Well, neither 25

LH REPORTING SERVICES, INC. 718-526-7100

Г

1	do I, but Patrick Warren, MTA Safety
2	I'm sure this guy is an important guy.
3	MS. SWICICKI: Okay.
4	MR. SANCHEZ: I have no further
5	questions with Union Exhibit
6	MR. MAGGIORE: 12.
7	MR. SANCHEZ: 12.
8	Okay. Is it your understanding that
9	it's the Carrier's position that the use
10	of recreational marijuana is prohibited
11	off-duty for all employees?
12	MS. SWICICKI: Yes.
13	MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. And does that
14	include individuals who are not deemed
15	safety-sensitive?
16	MS. SWICICKI: Yes.
17	MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. So, this
18	policy so, the Rail Road's policy, as
19	you understand it, is any employee of
20	the Long Island Rail Road is prohibited
21	from using recreational marijuana
22	off-duty?
23	MS. SWICICKI: Correct. The policy
24	states it's an alcohol and drug free
25	workplace.

1 MR. SANCHEZ: Well, I'm talking 2 off-duty. 3 MS. SWICICKI: Correct -- okay. Off-duty, yes. 4 5 MR. SANCHEZ: I'm going to ask you 6 to look at Carrier 1 again. 7 MR. MAGGIORE: The Notice of Trial? MR. SANCHEZ: It's the original 8 9 trial charges -- yeah. 10 MS. SWICICKI: Okay. (Perusing.) 11 MR. SANCHEZ: Are you familiar with 12 that document; do you recognize Carrier 13 1? 14 MS. SWICICKI: The Notice of Trial, 15 yes. 16 MR. SANCHEZ: And can you read Carrier 1? 17 18 MS. SWICICKI: Sure. It's, "Conduct 19 Unbecoming an Employee, Violation of the Corporate Alcohol and Substance Abuse 20 21 Policy, Prohibited Conduct, "D", which 2.2 states in pertinent part: 23 "D", that detection of a prohibited 24 substance resulting from any required 25 toxicological test is a violation of

1 this policy. In that on June 7, 2022, he reported 2 to the Long Island Rail Road Medical 3 4 Facility in Mineola, New York where you 5 submitted a urine specimen as part of a return-to-duty drug test. On June 13, 6 7 2022, the Department was informed that you tested positive for marijuana. 8 9 MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. And you were 10 the charging officer, correct? MS. SWICICKI: Correct. 11 12 MR. SANCHEZ: And how did you determine the offense that was 13 14 committed? 15 MS. SWICICKI: It was due to him reporting to medical for a 16 17 return-to-duty drug test. 18 MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. I'm going to 19 give you what has been -- actually, you 20 have it -- Carrier 9. 21 Everybody and their mother is on it -- (perusing) -- yeah, you're on there. 2.2 23 MS. SWICICKI: (Perusing.) 24 (Whereupon, a discussion was held 25 off the record.)

1 MR. SANCHEZ: So, Carrier Exhibit 9 2 -- can you tell me what Carrier Exhibit 9 is, if you recognize it? 3 4 MS. SWICICKI: Yes, I do. It's an email from Christopher Yodice from the 5 Medical Department, "Positive Drug Test 6 7 Result" is the subject. 8 Do you want me to start -- read from 9 the bottom? 10 MR. SANCHEZ: Yes, please. 11 MS. SWICICKI: Sure. 12 MR. SANCHEZ: I guess -- yeah. 13 MS. SWICICKI: Okay. So, the email 14 was sent on Monday, June 13, 2022, 12:55 15 p.m. and it says, "Good afternoon. 16 Electrician, Darren Drew, 50112/1023302 17 has tested for marijuana on a return-to-duty drug test conducted on 18 19 June 7, 2022. 20 This test was conducted under Long 21 Island Rail Road authority. The 2.2 employee has requested a split sample. 23 I will forward the results of this once 24 they are received. The Department has 25 been notified and will be taking the

1 employee out of service. Thank you, 2 Chris". 3 MR. SANCHEZ: And what was the 4 prohibited substance detected? MS. SWICICKI: Marijuana. 5 6 MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. And who 7 determines that it's a prohibited substance? 8 9 MS. SWICICKI: It's in the corporate 10 policy -- the Alcohol and Substance 11 Abuse Policy. 12 MR. SANCHEZ: So, the Long Island 13 Rail Road determines that it's a 14 prohibited substance? 15 MS. SWICICKI: There's a Long Island 16 Rail Road and then a Federal list, what 17 is prohibited. It's a Federal and Long 18 Island Rail Road drug panel. 19 MR. SANCHEZ: And is that the same 20 drug panel for covered employees --21 Hours of Service employees and employees that are not covered under Hours of 2.2 23 Service? 24 MS. SWICICKI: Marijuana, yes, it's 25 under both.

1 MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. And is Mr. Drew 2 covered under Federal Authority? 3 MS. SWICICKI: No. 4 MR. SANCHEZ: And I'm going to refer you back to Carrier 1 where it says --5 could you read "D" one more time, 6 7 please? MS. SWICICKI: "The detection of a 8 9 prohibited substance resulting from any 10 required toxicological test is a 11 violation of this policy". 12 MR. SANCHEZ: And could you tell me 13 who determines what toxicological tests 14 are required in this case? 15 MS. SWICICKI: What -- I'm sorry, 16 can you --17 MR. SANCHEZ: Can you tell me who 18 determines what toxicological tests are 19 required in this case? 20 MS. SWICICKI: So, for this, it's 21 his return-to-duty as per the Drug and Alcohol Policy, and that's what he was 2.2 23 being tested for. 24 MR. SANCHEZ: So, that's under Rail 25 Road authority?

1 MS. SWICICKI: The return-to-duty, 2 yes. 3 MR. SANCHEZ: The toxicological was 4 also under Rail Road authority? MS. SWICICKI: Yes. 5 6 MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. Is the charge 7 correct? MS. SWICICKI: Yes. 8 9 MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. And do you know 10 the difference between marijuana and 11 marijuana metabolites? 12 MS. SWICICKI: No. 13 MR. SANCHEZ: All right. I'm going 14 to explain it in layman's terms. It has 15 already been entered into the record, but --16 17 MR. MAGGIORE: Yeah, you asked this 18 of Mr. Yodice --19 Mr. MR. SANCHEZ: But I'm asking 20 Corrine if she knows the difference --21 Ms. Swicicki -- I'm sorry. 2.2 MS. SWICICKI: It's okay. 23 MR. SANCHEZ: Marijuana metabolites 24 is what's left in your system after the 25 ingestion of marijuana.

1 So, THC is the part of marijuana 2 that gets you -- that gets you high, 3 right, and once that's metabolized, you 4 have marijuana metabolites and that stays in your system, but that doesn't 5 cause impairment. That's the 6 7 difference. Okay. I'm going to hand you what 8 has been -- it hasn't been identified 9 10 yet -- I'm sorry. 11 I'm going to -- I guess I'll give 12 you what has been identified as Carrier Exhibit 16. 13 14 MR. MAGGIORE: Can I just take a 15 second? MR. SANCHEZ: Sure. 16 17 MR. MAGGIORE: (Perusing.) This is 18 Carrier Exhibit 13. 19 MR. SANCHEZ: It's 13? Maybe that's 20 -- I don't know what that is. 21 MR. MAGGIORE: Hold on. Let me just double-check this. (Perusing.) 2.2 23 MR. SANCHEZ: Yeah, it looks like 24 16. (Indicating.) 25 MR. MAGGIORE: This doesn't match.

77

1 This is -- looks like -- the donor ID is 2 different on this one. It says it's a 3 different person's lab. 4 MR. SANCHEZ: What do you have, 13? MR. MAGGIORE: I'll show you -- on 5 Carrier Exhibit 13, the donor ID is 6 7 1023302. The donor ID on that is different. 8 MR. SANCHEZ: Wait a minute -- did 9 10 you just hand me mine back? MR. COLOMBO: Hold on. (Perusing.) 11 12 MR. SANCHEZ: So, it has already 13 been entered in as Carrier Exhibit 13? 14 MR. MAGGIORE: Are you referring to 15 the Quest Diagnostic Lab Report for Mr. Drew? 16 17 MR. SANCHEZ: Yes. 18 MR. MAGGIORE: Yes, that's 13 --19 that's Carrier Exhibit 13. 20 MR. SANCHEZ: What is this? Let me 21 see yours, Drew. 22 MR. DREW: (Handing.) 23 MR. SANCHEZ: (Perusing.) 24 Okay -- all right. I'd ask you -- I 25 guess I'd ask you to take a look at

1 Carrier Exhibit 13, please. 2 MS. SWICICKI: (Perusing.) 3 MR. SANCHEZ: Let me see that one --4 it doesn't matter for the question. 5 (Perusing.) And do you recognize this document, 6 7 Ms. Swicicki? MS. SWICICKI: No. 8 9 MR. SANCHEZ: Do you want to take a 10 moment to look at it? 11 MS. SWICICKI: (Perusing.) Okay. 12 MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. So, this is the 13 result from Mr. Darren Drew's test. 14 MS. SWICICKI: Okay. 15 MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. So, it has already been entered in as Union Exhibit 16 -- Carrier Exhibit 13. 17 18 MR. MAGGIORE: I just want to 19 clarify for the record that this is the 20 result of his primary specimen test. MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. 21 22 MR. MAGGIORE: There were two tests 23 done on his urine sample. I just want to make that clear for the record. 24 25 MR. SANCHEZ: Okay.

1 MR. COLOMBO: I'm sorry, you said 2 this was --3 MR. SANCHEZ: That was the primary, 4 yes. MR. MAGGIORE: Primary -- primary 5 6 specimen. 7 MR. SANCHEZ: And do you know, Ms. Swicicki, if this was the genesis of the 8 9 discipline imposed on Mr. Drew? 10 MS. SWICICKI: I'm sorry, can you 11 just repeat that? 12 MR. SANCHEZ: The genesis of the discipline -- so, basically it's because 13 14 of the results on this document, is that 15 what started the disciplinary process 16 for Mr. Drew? 17 MS. SWICICKI: Yes. 18 MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. And can you 19 point out where Mr. Drew tested positive 20 for marijuana? 21 MS. SWICICKI: Point out when he tested --22 23 MR. SANCHEZ: No, where. I said, 24 this is the genesis of the discipline. 25 I'm asking you if you can point out

1 where he tested positive for marijuana. 2 MS. SWICICKI: On this Quest --3 MR. SANCHEZ: Yes. 4 MS. SWICICKI: Oh, okay. It states marijuana -- how do you --5 6 MR. COLOMBO: Metabolites. 7 MS. SWICICKI: Metabolites. MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. Well -- but I'm 8 9 looking at marijuana. 10 Anywhere there, does it say that 11 Mr. Drew tested positive for marijuana? 12 MS. SWICICKI: Not just marijuana 13 alone, no. 14 MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. So, is the 15 Carrier Exhibit 1 accurate -- and I'll 16 ask you to look again at Carrier 1. MS. SWICICKI: I have it. 17 18 MR. SANCHEZ: Oh, you have it. 19 MS. SWICICKI: Yeah, thank you. 20 (Perusing.) 21 Well, it's correct as what we were notified in, that he tested positive for 2.2 23 marijuana. 24 MR. SANCHEZ: So -- but he tested 25 positive for marijuana metabolites; is

1	that correct?
2	MS. SWICICKI: Yes.
3	MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. And he was
4	charged with testing positive for
5	marijuana, correct?
б	MS. SWICICKI: Correct.
7	MR. SANCHEZ: So, the charge is
8	incorrect, correct?
9	MS. SWICICKI: It doesn't state
10	"metabolites".
11	MR. SANCHEZ: I know. That's what
12	makes it incorrect.
13	MS. SWICICKI: Okay.
14	MR. SANCHEZ: So, he was not charged
15	properly, correct?
16	MS. SWICICKI: (Perusing.)
17	MR. SANCHEZ: I guess I can ask
18	another follow-up question.
19	If the initial test results were the
20	genesis of his discipline and he tested
21	for marijuana metabolites, shouldn't he
22	have been disciplined for testing
23	positive for marijuana metabolites and
24	not marijuana?
25	MS. SWICICKI: I understand you

82

1 explained the differences between the 2 two, but I cannot --MR. SANCHEZ: No, I mean, that's --3 4 MR. MAGGIORE: Let her answer, 5 please. MS. SWICICKI: -- I cannot attest to 6 7 what was -- you know, it stated tested positive for marijuana, so -- and this 8 9 is what -- the Medical Department deemed 10 it as marijuana. 11 MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. 12 MS. SWICICKI: So, I would still 13 state it was -- charges are accurate. 14 MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. So, Carrier 15 Exhibit 13, in your possession, which has already been determined to be the 16 initial results of his toxicological 17 18 test, state marijuana metabolites tested 19 positive. 20 It's the Carrier's position that 21 although he tested positive only for marijuana metabolites, we're able to 2.2 23 charge him with a positive test for 24 marijuana. 25 Is that correct?

1 MS. SWICICKI: Yes. 2 MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. I'm going to 3 give you a document and ask you if you 4 recognize it, Ms. Swicicki. (Handing.) MS. SWICICKI: (Perusing.) Yes. 5 6 MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. And can you 7 tell me what it --MR. MAGGIORE: One second. Let's 8 9 just mark it into the record. 10 MR. SANCHEZ: Yeah, I like to move 11 it into the record as Union 13. 12 MR. MAGGIORE: It's a one-page 13 document. It states "Notice of Trial", contains the name "Joe Birnbaum". 14 We'll mark it into the record as 15 16 Organization Exhibit number 13. 17 (Whereupon, Organization Exhibit 13 18 was marked.) 19 MR. SANCHEZ: All right. Ms. 20 Swicicki, do you recognize document --Union Exhibit 13? 21 2.2 MS. SWICICKI: Yes, I do. 23 MR. SANCHEZ: All right. Can you 24 read it into the record, please? 25 MS. SWICICKI: Sure. "Conduct

1 Unbecoming an Employee, Violation of the Corporate Alcohol and Substance Abuse 2 Policy, Marijuana Metabolite in Urine. 3 4 In that on March 8, 2018, you reported to the Long Island Rail Road 5 Medical Facility in Mineola, New York 6 7 where you submitted a urine specimen as part of an FRA Hours of Service random 8 drug test. On March 16, 2018, the 9 10 Department received the results of that 11 test, which was positive for marijuana 12 metabolite". 13 MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. And was 14 Mr. Birnbaum charged with positive for 15 marijuana or marijuana metabolites? MS. SWICICKI: As per the Notice of 16 17 Trial, it states marijuana metabolite. 18 MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. And was that 19 test conducted under Federal authority? 20 MS. SWICICKI: This test was because 21 it was a random drug test. 2.2 MR. SANCHEZ: FRA Hours of Service, 23 correct --24 MS. SWICICKI: Correct. MR. SANCHEZ: Yeah, so -- and in 25

LH REPORTING SERVICES, INC. 718-526-7100

1 2018 was recreational marijuana legal? 2 MS. SWICICKI: No. 3 MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. And is it a 4 prohibited substance under Federal Regulations. 5 MS. SWICICKI: Yes. 6 7 MR. SANCHEZ: And Mr. Birnbaum at the time, fell under Federal 8 9 authorization because of his position; 10 is that correct? MS. SWICICKI: Yes. 11 12 MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. And so 13 Mr. Birnbaum was a regulated covered 14 employee, unlike Mr. Drew, correct? 15 MS. SWICICKI: Yes, he was being sent to Medical for a random drug test, 16 17 not a return-to-duty. 18 MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. Because the 19 Carrier can't send Mr. Drew -- or can't 20 subject Mr. Drew to a random, correct? 21 MS. SWICICKI: Correct. 2.2 MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. Can we take a 23 minute? 24 MR. MAGGIORE: Yes, the time is 25 approximately 11:46 a.m. We're going to

1 take a brief recess. 2 (Whereupon, a brief recess was 3 taken.) MR. MAGGIORE: The time is 4 11:55 a.m. We're back on the record. 5 6 Mr. Sanchez, do you have any other 7 questions for Ms. Swicicki? MR. SANCHEZ: Yes. 8 Ms. Swicicki, I'm going to ask you 9 10 to look at what has been identified as 11 Union Exhibit 8, please. 12 MR. MAGGIORE: (Indicating.) MR. SANCHEZ: Just to have it in 13 14 front of you actually. 15 MS. SWICICKI: Thank you. I don't 16 have numbers on mine. MR. SANCHEZ: Yeah, I'm sorry -- and 17 18 if you could have Carrier Exhibit 1, 19 which is the charge, in front of you at 20 the same time. 21 MS. SWICICKI: (Perusing.) 2.2 MR. SANCHEZ: So, can you tell me what Carrier Exhibit is? 23 24 MS. SWICICKI: Notice of Trial for 25 Darren Drew.

1 MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. And were you 2 the charging official? 3 MS. SWICICKI: Yes. 4 MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. And was Mr. Drew taken out of service with this 5 6 Notice? 7 MS. SWICICKI: Not with this Notice. 8 MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. 9 MS. SWICICKI: He was taken out 10 prior to it. 11 MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. And was he 12 taken out of service without a fair and impartial trial under Rule 53? 13 MS. SWICICKI: He was taken out 14 15 before a fair and impartial trial. 16 MR. SANCHEZ: So, he was taken out of service without a fair and impartial 17 18 trial? 19 MS. SWICICKI: Correct. 20 MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. And did 21 Mr. Drew commit theft? 2.2 MS. SWICICKI: No. 23 MR. SANCHEZ: An unsafe practice? 24 MS. SWICICKI: No. 25 MR. SANCHEZ: Serious

1 insubordination? 2 MS. SWICICKI: No. 3 MR. SANCHEZ: Threatening or abusive conduct? 4 MS. SWICICKI: No. 5 6 MR. SANCHEZ: Fighting on duty or on 7 Carrier property? MS. SWICICKI: No. 8 MR. SANCHEZ: Was he under the 9 10 influence of alcohol or narcotics while 11 on duty? 12 MS. SWICICKI: Not on duty, no. 13 MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. So -- I'm sorry, can you -- so -- I'm sorry, can 14 15 you elaborate on that? 16 He was not -- the question is, was he under the influence of alcohol or 17 18 narcotics while he --19 MS. SWICICKI: Well, he was out 20 using his own sick leave trying to 21 return to work and there's where he tested positive. 2.2 23 So, you can say he was being paid 24 his sick time from the Long Island Rail 25 Road while being on duty and testing

1 positive. 2 MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. So, your 3 answer -- so, an employee who is out on 4 sick time is considered on duty? MS. SWICICKI: No. 5 6 MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. Well, isn't 7 that what you just said? MS. SWICICKI: Yes --8 MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. 9 10 MS. SWICICKI: -- but he was not on 11 duty. 12 MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. So, when it says number "6", under the influence of 13 14 alcohol or narcotics while on duty, was Mr. Drew under the influence of alcohol 15 or narcotics while on duty? 16 MS. SWICICKI: No. 17 18 MR. SANCHEZ: And he did commit a 19 rape, assault, or other serious criminal 20 activities? 21 MS. SWICICKI: No. MR. SANCHEZ: So, the Carrier took 2.2 23 him out of service although -- the 24 Carrier took him out of service without a pre-investigation -- I'm sorry. 25

LH REPORTING SERVICES, INC. 718-526-7100

90

1 The Carrier took him out of service 2 without sufficient reason to believe that he was guilty of the offenses 3 below? 4 MS. SWICICKI: They took him out of 5 service, you could say, retention in 6 7 service could be detrimental to themselves or another person for being 8 9 positive -- for testing positive for 10 marijuana. MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. And that -- but 11 12 that was determined without a fair and 13 impartial trial? 14 MS. SWICICKI: Yes, he didn't have a 15 trial. 16 MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. So, the Carrier made that determination unilaterally 17 18 based on the information they received 19 from Medical? 20 MS. SWICICKI: Yes. 21 MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. Was he offered 2.2 a trial waiver to the best of your 23 knowledge? 24 MS. SWICICKI: I believe so, yes. 25 MR. SANCHEZ: And do you know when

1 he was offered a trial waiver? 2 MS. SWICICKI: No, I don't. 3 MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. If he had signed a trial waiver, could the Union 4 have filed a grievance under Rule 53? 5 6 MS. SWICICKI: If he signed a 7 waiver? MR. SANCHEZ: Mm-hmm. 8 9 MS. SWICICKI: No. 10 MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. So, if he 11 signed a waiver, he'd have no recourse; 12 he would admit guilt and there would be 13 no --14 MS. SWICICKI: Correct. 15 MR. SANCHEZ: Okay -- okay. You 16 testified that MED-005 applies to all 17 employees, which is the drug and alcohol 18 policy. 19 MS. SWICICKI: Yes. 20 MR. SANCHEZ: Is that correct, all 21 employees? MS. SWICICKI: It's correct. 2.2 23 MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. So, employees 24 who are not under Hours of Service and 25 who are not deemed safety-sensitive by

1 the Carrier -- right -- are they subject 2 to return-to-work toxicological tests after a 30-day absence? 3 4 MS. SWICICKI: I'm sorry, can you 5 just repeat that? MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. So, I'm just --6 7 there are employees -- you would agree, that the Carrier has employees who are 8 not under Hours of Service --9 10 MS. SWICICKI: Correct. 11 MR. SANCHEZ: -- and who are not 12 deemed safety-sensitive employed here? 13 MS. SWICICKI: Mm-hmm. 14 MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. So, are those 15 employees subject to a return-to-work toxicological test after a 30-day 16 17 absence? 18 MS. SWICICKI: Those that are not 19 deemed safety-sensitive are not required 20 to perform a return-to-duty test. 21 MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. So, I'll say -that's a little confusing. 2.2 23 So, the policy, even though it says 24 "all employees", not all employees fall 25 under this policy; there's a section of

Г

1	employees who work for the Rail Road
2	that don't have to take a return-to-work
3	toxicological test because they've been
4	out for 30 days or more?
5	MS. SWICICKI: Correct.
6	MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. And who would
7	those employees be?
8	MS. SWICICKI: Non-safety-sensitive
9	employees.
10	MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. Can you give me
11	an example?
12	MS. SWICICKI: Sure. Central
13	Manpower is a clerical staff. They're
14	non-safety.
15	MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. Are you
16	considered a non-safety-sensitive
17	employee?
18	MS. SWICICKI: Yes, I'm considered.
19	MR. SANCHEZ: You're considered a
20	non-safety-sensitive employee?
21	MS. SWICICKI: Yes.
22	MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. So, if you were
23	out for 30 days, you wouldn't have to
24	you wouldn't be subjected to a
25	return-to-work toxicological test?

1 MS. SWICICKI: Correct. 2 MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. Do you know if under the current policy, medical 3 4 marijuana prescribed by a treating physician would be a violation? 5 MS. SWICICKI: As per the policy, 6 7 it's still under -- it's just listed as "marijuana". 8 So, it is still considered -- listed 9 10 under their drug panel as not being 11 allowed. 12 MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. So, medical 13 marijuana that's prescribed by a 14 treating physician would still violate 15 the policy? 16 MS. SWICICKI: Yes. MR. SANCHEZ: And would it be a 17 18 violation of the policy for non-covered, 19 non-Hours of Service employees too? 20 MS. SWICICKI: Yes. 21 MR. SANCHEZ: Would it be a 2.2 violation for employees deemed not 23 safety-sensitive --24 MS. SWICICKI: Yes. 25 MR. SANCHEZ: -- such as manpower?

1 MS. SWICICKI: Correct, cause there's still reasonable cause or 2 3 suspicion. 4 MR. SANCHEZ: Okay -- okay. Mr. Drew took his -- if you look at Carrier 5 1, Mr. Drew took his return-to-work 6 7 physical on June 7th and he tested positive for marijuana metabolites --8 9 and metabolites don't cause impairment 10 -- and that's science, not an opinion --11 he returned to work on the 8th. 12 So, that was -- I'm sorry -- he took 13 it on the 7th and he was notified on the 14 13th, but on the 8th he returned to 15 service; is that correct? 16 MS. SWICICKI: Just give me a second. I have to look. 17 18 MR. SANCHEZ: Sure. 19 MS. SWICICKI: (Perusing.) Correct, 20 he returned on June 8th. 21 MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. And from 2.2 June 8th, when he returned to service, 23 to June 13th when he was taken out of 24 service for the violation of the policy, 25 were there any complaints that he was

1	impaired?
2	MS. SWICICKI: No.
3	MR. SANCHEZ: Were there any
4	complaints of any reckless action
5	unsafe actions?
6	MS. SWICICKI: No.
7	MR. SANCHEZ: Were there any
8	complaints about Mr. Drew that you're
9	aware of?
10	MS. SWICICKI: No.
11	MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. And do you know
12	if the Carrier tested him on the 8th to
13	see if he was positive for any
14	prohibited substance while he was
15	actually back to work?
16	MS. SWICICKI: No.
17	MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. And when
18	Mr. Drew took the test on June 7th, what
19	was his status?
20	MS. SWICICKI: Give me one second.
21	(Perusing.) He was marked sick/unpaid.
22	MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. So, it's
23	sick/unpaid.
24	So, he wasn't he wasn't on
25	Carrier's time, so he wasn't actually in

1 service. MS. SWICICKI: Correct. He was 2 using his sick time and exhausted all of 3 4 it, so, therefore, he was out sick/unpaid. 5 MR. SANCHEZ: So, when you're out 6 sick and unpaid, you're not under the 7 Carrier's employ, correct? 8 MS. SWICICKI: No, he is. He's 9 10 still subject to calls at home. He's 11 still under the Carrier, it's just he's 12 not being paid for the day. 13 MR. SANCHEZ: Is he expected to come in -- can the Carrier call him when he's 14 15 out sick to perform service? MS. SWICICKI: No. 16 17 MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. I have no 18 further questions at this time. 19 MR. MAGGIORE: Okay. Ms. Swicicki, 20 I just have a couple of follow-up 21 questions based on some of the exhibits 2.2 that the Organization has entered into 23 the record. 24 I'd just like to bring your 25 attention to Organization Exhibit 8,

1 which is Rule 53. MS. SWICICKI: Okay. 2 MR. MAGGIORE: The second paragraph 3 4 of Rule 53(b) states, "The following 5 types of offenses justify pre-investigation suspension when there 6 7 is sufficient reason to believe the employee is guilty of the offense and 8 9 that he/she may commit the offense again 10 if not withheld from service". 11 The first words in that sentence 12 were, "The following types of offense". 13 So, in your experience, in terms of 14 in your current role, have employees 15 been removed from service, other than for the reasons stated there in that 16 17 section in 53(b). 18 MS. SWICICKI: Yes. 19 MR. MAGGIORE: Can you provide some examples, you know, if you can recall 20 21 any off the top of your head? MS. SWICICKI: That have been taken 2.2 23 out of service, not for this? MR. MAGGIORE: That were not one of 24 25 these reasons specifically stated.

1 MS. SWICICKI: Well, for example, 2 these cases where they tested positive 3 while doing return-to-duty drug tests. 4 MR. MAGGIORE: Okay. Are there any other reasons you can think of off the 5 top of your head -- and if you can't, 6 7 don't feel obliged to answer? MS. SWICICKI: No, no other reasons 8 9 right now. 10 MR. MAGGIORE: Okay. So, the 11 application of this language, based on 12 your experience, that these are examples 13 and that these are not limited to 14 specifically these causes in terms of 15 taking the employee out of service, 16 correct? MS. SWICICKI: Correct. 17 18 MR. MAGGIORE: And that's -- the 19 Carrier has consistently applied that 20 idea? 21 MS. SWICICKI: Yes. 2.2 MR. MAGGIORE: So, the Organization 23 submitted several Notices of Trial, 24 Organization 9, 10, 11, and 13 in 25 particular.

100

1 All three of them state that the 2 employee in question tested positive or marijuana, or in the case of Exhibit 13, 3 4 marijuana metabolite. In all those cases, are you aware if 5 the employees were removed from service? 6 7 MS. SWICICKI: Yes, they were. MR. MAGGIORE: Is it standard 8 practice for the Carrier to remove 9 10 employees from service if they test 11 positive for a prohibited substance? 12 MS. SWICICKI: Yes. MR. MAGGIORE: And that decision is 13 14 made prior to a trial, correct? 15 MS. SWICICKI: Correct. 16 MR. MAGGIORE: And what is the 17 purpose of doing that? 18 MS. SWICICKI: This is due to them 19 violating the drug and alcohol policy, 20 so that they're -- there's no -- it's a 21 safety issue for themselves and others, and to make sure that they're out of 2.2 23 service and not working in a 24 safety-sensitive position. 25 MR. MAGGIORE: Okay. So, I'd like

1 to draw your attention to Carrier 2 Exhibit 1, the Notice of Trial for 3 Mr. Drew. 4 MS. SWICICKI: (Perusing.) MR. MAGGIORE: The Trial Notice 5 6 states that he tested positive for 7 marijuana. Was he removed from service? 8 MS. SWICICKI: Yes, he was. 9 10 MR. MAGGIORE: So, did the Carrier 11 treat Mr. Drew any differently than any 12 other employee that tested positive? MS. SWICICKI: No, they did not. 13 14 MR. MAGGIORE: I'd like to draw your 15 attention to Organization Exhibit 12, 16 which is the email from Patrick Warren. 17 The second paragraph of this email, 18 I'll read into the record. 19 "While the MTA continues to closely 20 follow --" --21 MR. SANCHEZ: I'm going to object. MR. MAGGIORE: I'm reading your --2.2 23 object on what basis? 24 MR. SANCHEZ: I'm going to object on 25 the basis that when we presented Union

1	Exhibit 12 to Ms. Swicicki, she had no
2	knowledge of it. So, now you're asking
3	her for an interpretation of a document
4	that she has seen for the first time
5	today.
б	So, anything she may say
7	MR. MAGGIORE: You don't know what I
8	I haven't even asked a question yet.
9	You don't know what I'm going to ask.
10	So, allow me
11	MR. SANCHEZ: I'm psychic.
12	MR. MAGGIORE: You're psychic?
13	MR. SANCHEZ: I'm psychic.
14	MR. MAGGIORE: Well
15	MR. SANCHEZ: That's my objection
16	for the record. You can ask the
17	question.
18	MR. MAGGIORE: Fair enough. I note
19	your objection for the record, however,
20	this is an exhibit that was entered by
21	the Organization, and as Trial Officer,
22	I have a right to examine it.
23	I would like to ask the witness, who
24	you recalled, a question about the
25	exhibit that you entered into the

1 record. 2 MR. SANCHEZ: That she could not 3 answer, so go ahead. MR. MAGGIORE: So, I'll read the 4 second paragraph into the record. 5 "While the MTA continues to closely 6 7 follow all developments concerning the new laws, the MTA's substance abuse 8 9 policy currently remain unchanged. Ιf 10 any updates to the MTA drug testing 11 program or substance abuse policies are 12 required, they will be communicated to 13 everyone as soon as possible". 14 So, my question is, are you aware, 15 since May of 2022, of any changes to the 16 drug and alcohol policy? MS. SWICICKI: No, there are none. 17 18 MR. MAGGIORE: Okay. So, I'd also 19 like to read another sentence from this into the record, just to clarify. 20 21 Fourth paragraph, last sentence, "Therefore, individuals in jobs and/or 2.2 23 performing functions covered by these 24 regulations may not use marijuana in any 25 form, even outside of the workplace

1 while off duty". 2 Are you aware of any changes to Carrier policy which allow employees to 3 4 use marijuana off duty? MS. SWICICKI: No. 5 6 MR. MAGGIORE: I believe Mr. Sanchez 7 asked this, but I just want to confirm. If I'm repeating myself, I apologize. 8 Are all electricians deemed 9 10 safety-sensitive by the Carrier? MS. SWICICKI: Yes, they are. 11 MR. MAGGIORE: That's by the 12 13 Carrier, correct? MS. SWICICKI: Correct. 14 15 MR. MAGGIORE: All right. And 16 that's a designation that the Carrier has -- do you know how long the Carrier 17 18 has made that designation of 19 electricians? 20 MS. SWICICKI: It has been an 21 established practice that we recognize electricians as safety-sensitive 2.2 23 employees and the Department has enacted 24 it -- this for a very long time. 25 MR. MAGGIORE: Okay -- all right. Ι

1 don't have any other questions. Mr. Sanchez, do you have any 2 questions? 3 4 MR. SANCHEZ: Yes, actually a follow-up to Union Exhibit 12. 5 So -- and I'll read the second part 6 7 for Ms. Swicicki and I'll ask a couple of questions. You can agree or 8 9 disagree. 10 It says, "Regardless of the new 11 laws, employees of MTA and its agencies 12 -- " -- which are Long Island Rail Road, 13 correct? 14 MS. SWICICKI: Correct. 15 MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. "-- as well as 16 consultants and contractors retained by 17 the MTA or its agencies, may not perform 18 work for the MTA, including, but not 19 limited to, operation of vehicles and 20 equipment while impaired by marijuana. 21 Additionally, the use of marijuana 2.2 in any form during an employee's, 23 consultant's, and/or contractor's work 24 shift, and possession of marijuana in 25 any form at any MTA or agency facility,

1 work site, or office is strictly 2 prohibited". 3 Does it talk about recreational 4 marijuana here or does this say that you can't be impaired while working or have 5 marijuana in your possession; is that 6 7 what this sentence or this paragraph relays? 8 9 MS. SWICICKI: Can you repeat the 10 question one more time? 11 MR. SANCHEZ: Sure. I'll read it 12 again. 13 Its says, "Regardless of the new laws, employees of the MTA and its 14 15 agencies, as well as consultants and 16 contractors retained by the MTA or its agencies, may not perform work -- may 17 18 not perform work for the MTA, including, 19 but not limited to the operation of 20 vehicles and equipment while impaired by 21 marijuana". So, you can't come to work impaired 2.2 23 -- right -- that's what that says, 24 agree? MS. SWICICKI: Agree. 25

1 MR. SANCHEZ: And it says, "Additionally, the use of marijuana in 2 any form during an employee's, 3 4 consultant's, and/or contractor's work shift and possession of marijuana in any 5 form at any MTA or agency facility, work 6 7 site, or office is strictly prohibited". So, what that says -- and if you 8 9 agree -- that you can't have marijuana 10 in your possession and you can't use it 11 during your work shift; is that correct? MS. SWICICKI: Correct. 12 13 MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. And then down 14 below it says, "The new law does not 15 affect the federal regulations that apply to those covered under the United 16 17 States Department of DOT". 18 Is Mr. Drew covered under the 19 Department of Transportation? 20 MS. SWICICKI: No. 21 MR. SANCHEZ: The Federal Transit Administration, the FTA? 2.2 23 MS. SWICICKI: No. 24 MR. SANCHEZ: The Federal Motor 25 Carrier Safety Administration, FMCSA?

1 MS. SWICICKI: No. MR. SANCHEZ: And/or the Federal 2 Railroad Administration, FRA, 3 4 Regulations? 5 MS. SWICICKI: No. MR. SANCHEZ: And it's says, 6 7 "Therefore, individuals in jobs and/or performing functions covered by 8 these -- " -- and those are the ones I 9 10 just asked you about that Mr. Drew is 11 not covered by -- "may not use marijuana 12 in any form, even outside of the 13 workplace while off duty". 14 So, that says -- and stop me if I'm 15 wrong -- if you're covered by any one of these federal requirements, you can't 16 17 use marijuana off duty, even outside 18 your duty workplace, correct? 19 MS. SWICICKI: Correct. 20 MR. SANCHEZ: If Mr. Drew is not 21 covered by any of these, and if he chose 2.2 to partake in marijuana, would that be a 23 violation? MS. SWICICKI: Yes, because if you 24 25 look at the second paragraph, it states,

1	"The MTA substance abuse policy
2	currently remains unchanged. If any
3	updates to the MTA's drug testing
4	program or substance abuse policies are
5	required, they will be communicated to
6	everyone as soon as possible".
7	So, for the drug and alcohol testing
8	the MED-005
9	MR. SANCHEZ: 005.
10	MS. SWICICKI: is still in effect
11	with no changes.
12	MR. SANCHEZ: So, if that's true
13	right why and I guess if you know
14	this, it's a question why would
15	Mr. Patrick Warren add all this other
16	stuff?
17	Wouldn't he just say, Everything is
18	status quo", as opposed to identifying
19	DOT this, that, that, that, that
20	and say, specifically, "even outside",
21	when it has already been prohibited for
22	employees working for the Rail Road?
23	MS. SWICICKI: That would be a great
24	question for him.
25	MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. So, I would

1 have to ask Mr. Patrick Warren -- okay. 2 I want to go back to Mr. Maggiore's 3 questions about the trials that we put 4 into exhibits and he said did they all sign waivers. 5 6 Is that correct? 7 MR. MAGGIORE: I did not say that --I didn't say "signed waives". 8 9 MR. SANCHEZ: I'll ask -- okay. 10 I'll withdraw the question. 11 Did all those employees sign waivers 12 to the best of your knowledge? MS. SWICICKI: Not all of them. 13 MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. You testified 14 15 earlier that this is your first case 16 with this organization for a drug and alcohol violation, correct? 17 18 MS. SWICICKI: For a trial, yes. 19 MR. SANCHEZ: For a trial, yes. 20 And is that because Mr. Drew didn't 21 sign a waiver? MS. SWICICKI: Correct. 2.2 23 MR. SANCHEZ: So, this is the first 24 time the Carrier has ever had to defend 25 its position at a trial?

1	MS. SWICICKI: For a drug and
2	alcohol
3	MR. SANCHEZ: Yes.
4	MS. SWICICKI: yes.
5	MR. SANCHEZ: Okay.
6	MR. MAGGIORE: Your question was
7	regarding your organization, correct?
8	MR. SANCHEZ: Correct, because I'm
9	representing Mr. Drew.
10	MR. MAGGIORE: Okay. I understand,
11	but there's other organizations that
12	have similar charges and I just want to
13	make clear for the record you're only
14	referring to the charges for your
15	members, right?
16	MR. SANCHEZ: Yeah, what happens
17	with the other organizations are
18	irrelevant.
19	MR. MAGGIORE: Yeah, I just wanted
20	to clarify.
21	MR. SANCHEZ: Yeah okay. I have
22	no further questions at this time.
23	MR. MAGGIORE: Okay. The time is
24	approximately 12:17 p.m. We're going to
25	take a brief recess.

1 Ms. Swicicki, I just ask that you 2 not discuss anything regarding this trial while it's still ongoing. 3 4 MS. SWICICKI: Okay. MR. MAGGIORE: Also, you're subject 5 to recall for further questions, if 6 7 needed. So, as I said, the time is 12:17 8 p.m. We're going to take a brief recess 9 10 to allow the Organization to gather any 11 witnesses it may have. 12 (Whereupon, a brief recess was 13 taken.) 14 MR. MAGGIORE: Okay. The time is 15 1:16 p.m. and we are back on the record. 16 Mr. Sanchez, do you have any witnesses you'd like to call at this 17 18 time? MR. SANCHEZ: Yes, Jeff Klein --19 20 Jeffrey Klein. 21 MR. MAGGIORE: Okay. Before you 2.2 begin questioning Mr. Klein, can you 23 please identify yourself for the record 24 with your full name and IBM number? 25 MR. KLEIN: My name is Jeffrey A.

LH REPORTING SERVICES, INC. 718-526-7100

1 Klein. My IBM number is 29254. 2 MR. MAGGIORE: Okay. Mr. Sanchez, 3 you can begin. 4 MR. SANCHEZ: Okay -- all right. Mr. Klein, can you tell how long you've 5 6 worked for the Long Island Rail Road. 7 MR. KLEIN: Presently, I'm in my 26th year of employment. 8 9 MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. And what is 10 your current position? MR. KLEIN: As far as -- I'm an 11 12 electrician in Department 86, which is 13 the air conditioning department. Ιt 14 happens to be the same department that 15 Mr. Drew is in. 16 MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. And to the best of your knowledge, are you familiar with 17 18 Federal Requirements for Hours of 19 Service? 20 MR. KLEIN: Absolutely. MR. SANCHEZ: Yeah -- and are 21 currently covered under an Hour of 2.2 23 Service position in your current 24 position? 25 MR. KLEIN: No -- no, I'm not.

1 MR. SANCHEZ: And why aren't you 2 covered? 3 MR. KLEIN: Because the position 4 that I own is not a requirement under the FRA under the CFR to be an Hours of 5 Service job. 6 7 MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. So, with -- the FRA just included another classification 8 under the Hours of Service, "MEC", and 9 10 you don't fall under that MEC? 11 MR. KLEIN: The MEC qualification --MR. SANCHEZ: Yes. 12 13 MR. KLEIN: -- no because the MEC qualification only pertains to 14 15 mechanical employees who perform inspections that are required under the 16 17 CFR -- federally required inspections. 18 Our department does not perform any 19 of that work. 20 MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. And you earlier 21 said that you're in the same department 2.2 as the grievant, Mr. Drew. 23 So, if you're not covered under 24 Hours of Service requirements, neither 25 is Mr. Drew in that position?

1 MR. KLEIN: That's correct --2 MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. 3 MR. KLEIN: -- and the mechanical as well, he doesn't fall under that either. 4 5 MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. 6 MR. KLEIN: He doesn't perform any 7 federally regulated inspections -required inspections. 8 9 MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. And can you be 10 randomly drug tested? 11 MR. KLEIN: No. 12 MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. So, can 13 Mr. Drew be randomly drug tested? MR. KLEIN: No. 14 15 MR. SANCHEZ: Okay -- under this new 16 MEC qualification? MR. KLEIN: No. 17 18 MR. SANCHEZ: Okay -- all right. Do 19 you currently hold a position with IBEW, Local Union 589? 20 MR. KLEIN: Yes. 21 22 MR. SANCHEZ: And what position do 23 you currently hold? 24 MR. KLEIN: Currently, I hold Lead 25 Local Chairman's position.

Prior to that, I was the President 1 of the Local for nearly 10 years. Prior 2 to my presidency, I was an Executive 3 4 Board Member for five years. Prior to that, I was a shop steward. 5 So, altogether, it's close to 6 7 20 years I've been involved with the Union and advocating. 8 9 MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. What are some 10 of your responsibilities under your 11 position that you currently own? 12 MR. KLEIN: My Union position --13 MR. SANCHEZ: Yes --14 MR. KLEIN: -- or my Rail Road 15 position? 16 MR. SANCHEZ: -- Union position. MR. KLEIN: Well, to enforce the 17 18 contract. I mean, that's paramount. 19 You know, to ensure the rules are 20 followed that were negotiated, to ensure 21 the Company is following any policies or laws -- state laws, federal laws. 2.2 23 MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. And are trials 24 part of your responsibility? 25 MR. KLEIN: Yes.

1 MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. And have they 2 always been part of your responsibility? MR. KLEIN: Well, with 20 years 3 4 experience, I can't --5 MR. SANCHEZ: That's true. MR. KLEIN: -- no, no. I mean, in 6 7 the beginning, no. But certainly as a few years went 8 9 by, I started becoming active in the 10 actual trials and once I became 11 President, any of the reps that were 12 assigned to handle -- that conducted the actual trials, I oversaw -- I advised. 13 14 I sat in on several of them, so --15 MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. And you've conducted trials -- you've conducted 16 trials, personally? 17 18 MR. KLEIN: Yes -- yes. 19 MR. SANCHEZ: And can you give me --20 I'd just like a ballpark number of how 21 many trials you've conducted, if you 22 can. 23 MR. KLEIN: I would say probably a couple of dozen I would say. 24 MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. And have you 25

LH REPORTING SERVICES, INC. 718-526-7100

1 ever conducted a trial for a member who violated the drug and alcohol policy for 2 marijuana? 3 MR. KLEIN: Conducted a trial? 4 MR. SANCHEZ: A trial. 5 6 MR. KLEIN: No, never a trial. 7 MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. And why didn't you conduct any trials or why weren't 8 9 there any trials for violations of this 10 policy with marijuana? 11 MR. KLEIN: In all my experience 12 dealing with these -- with the alcohol 13 and drug policy violations, the -- our 14 members decided to accept a trial waiver 15 that was offered to them by the 16 Department as opposed to going to trial. 17 MR. SANCHEZ: And in your opinion, 18 why would they not go to trial? 19 MR. KLEIN: In my opinion? 20 MR. SANCHEZ: Yeah. 21 MR. KLEIN: In my experience from 2.2 dealing with a multitude of members, the 23 reason is, discussions with prior trial officers, right -- with those 24 25 discussions regarding the waiver, what

1	would happen if the waiver wasn't
2	signed, we were told it was
3	enumerated spelled out to us, in no
4	uncertain terms, that should our member
5	not accept the waiver, in terms of the
6	waiver, they would be found guilty and
7	they would be terminated.
8	MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. And this was
9	explained to us explained to you
10	before the trial?
11	MR. KLEIN: Yes
12	MR. SANCHEZ: Okay.
13	MR. KLEIN: in conversations
14	before the trial, yeah.
15	MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. And what were
16	the terms of the waiver, do you recall?
17	MR. KLEIN: Initially, it was a
18	nine-month suspension. Once
19	nine-month suspension.
20	The individual had to participate in
21	an employee assistance program, go to
22	counseling. They'd have to be cleared
23	through the substance abuse professional
24	from the counseling before they could
25	come back.

1 That usually wasn't an issue cause 2 it was a nine-month suspension, so usually the individuals got cleared to 3 4 come back. And then once they returned to duty, they were subjected to 5 discretionary drug testing, so they 6 7 could be called in to be tested at any time. 8 9 And they were also subjected to that 10 while they were out for their nine 11 months too -- they were subjected to 12 random drug testing. 13 MR. SANCHEZ: And as part of that 14 waiver, was it also a "last chance waiver"? 15 16 MR. KLEIN: It was a last chance, 17 yes. 18 MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. And while they 19 were out, were they being paid? MR. KLEIN: No, it was without 20 21 pay --2.2 MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. 23 MR. KLEIN: -- and after a certain 24 period of time -- and it varied 25 depending on the insurance carrier --

LH REPORTING SERVICES, INC. 718-526-7100

1 they would generally lose their health 2 benefits for between four to six months 3 as well. 4 MR. SANCHEZ: So, when the employees who were out for -- earlier -- right --5 6 I would say --7 MR. KLEIN: Four to six weeks -- I'm 8 sorry. MR. SANCHEZ: So, roughly two years 9 10 ago, it used to be a nine-month 11 suspension? 12 MR. KLEIN: Nine months --MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. And they lost 13 their benefits after four to six months. 14 15 MR. KLEIN: Yes -- yeah, four to six 16 months. MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. And if they had 17 18 families? 19 MR. KLEIN: Their families would lose those benefits. They'd have to --20 21 they'd have to pay for --MR. SANCHEZ: Were they offered 22 23 COBRA? 24 MR. KLEIN: COBRA -- that was it --25 yes, thank you.

122

MR. SANCHEZ: So, the Carrier 1 2 suspended the employees without pay. 3 MR. KLEIN: Mm-hmm -- yes. 4 MR. SANCHEZ: They took away their health benefits. 5 MR. KLEIN: Yes. 6 7 MR. SANCHEZ: And then they offered them COBRA. 8 MR. KLEIN: Yes. 9 10 MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. Generally, when 11 employees choose trials over waivers, is 12 the penalty increased? 13 MR. KLEIN: Could you repeat that, 14 please? 15 MR. SANCHEZ: When employees choose trials over trial waivers, are the 16 17 penalties increased? 18 MR. KLEIN: Yes. 19 MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. And do you know 20 why the penalties are increased? MR. KLEIN: Well, I can speculate. 21 22 MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. MR. KLEIN: It's to dis-incentivize 23 24 (sic) going to trial. 25 MR. SANCHEZ: I'm going to hand you

1 that. (Handing.) Is that one or two --(Whereupon, a discussion was held 2 off the record.) 3 4 MR. MAGGIORE: This is -- so, this is a letter to the Union. It's a 5 one-page document dated September 6, 6 7 2019. It is in regards to Case number 3423-19. 8 9 (Whereupon, a discussion was held 10 off the record.) 11 MR. MAGGIORE: All right. So, it's 12 -- sorry, my apologies. It's a 13 three-page document. First page is 14 dated September 16, 2019; second page is 15 December 7, 2020. The third page is June 30, 2022. 16 17 This will be entered as Organization 18 Exhibit 14. 19 MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. 20 (Whereupon, Organization Exhibit 14 21 was marked.) MR. MAGGIORE: So, 14 will be a 2.2 23 three-page document. 24 MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. Mr. Klein, I am 25 going to ask you to take a look at what

1 has been identified as Union Exhibit 14. 2 There's three pages to it. 3 Is that a familiar document? MR. KLEIN: Yes. 4 5 MR. SANCHEZ: And as part of the waiver, does the Carrier request 6 7 employees to waive their rights? MR. KLEIN: Yes. 8 9 MR. SANCHEZ: And, specifically, 10 which rights are they asking the 11 employee to waive? 12 MR. KLEIN: Well, it would be Rule 13 53 under the controlling agreement, 14 which pertains to trials and hearings --15 fair and impartial hearings. 16 MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. And in your 17 experience, how many employees have 18 signed a waiver under these 19 circumstances? 20 MR. KLEIN: Numerous ones. Under my 21 tenure, I don't have a definitive 2.2 number, but it's, I would say, dozens. 23 MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. In your tenure 24 -- in your 20 years' experience with the Union handling these types of issues, 25

1 how many employees have chosen not to 2 sign a waiver and go to trial? 3 MR. KLEIN: Other than Mr. Drew, 4 none. 5 MR. SANCHEZ: None. So, this is the first time in 20 years that an employee 6 7 who has been charged by the Carrier has actually invoked his contractual rights 8 to trial? 9 10 MR. KLEIN: For a violation of the 11 drug and alcohol policy --12 MR. SANCHEZ: Yes. 13 MR. KLEIN: -- yes. 14 MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. So, once an 15 employee signs a waiver, because the 16 alternative is termination, is there recourse on the Union to file a 17 18 grievance? 19 MR. KLEIN: Could you repeat that, 20 please? 21 MR. SANCHEZ: So, once the employee 22 signs a waiver, can the Union file a 23 grievance? 24 MR. KLEIN: No, cause essentially 25 the employee agreed to waive his rights

1 and -- so, we have -- the Union, I 2 should say, has no recourse once those rights are waived. 3 4 MR. SANCHEZ: And in your discussions with numerous employees who 5 have been found guilty by the Carrier 6 7 for violating this policy, how many of them have expressed frustration that 8 9 they had to sign a waiver as opposed to 10 qoing to trial? 11 MR. KLEIN: I would say 99 percent 12 of them. 13 MR. SANCHEZ: And what was their 14 frustration? 15 MR. KLEIN: They felt as though they 16 were stuck between a rock and a hard 17 place because they knew that if they 18 challenged -- if they challenged the 19 charges, they would be terminated, thus 20 subjecting them to the arbitration 21 process, which is our Rule 53, which 2.2 probably can take up to a year to get an 23 arbitration before they might get their iob back. 24 25 So, as opposed to going through that

1 and taking that chance, they opted to 2 sign this waiver cause it was the safe bet. 3 4 MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. And how long does it generally take to get -- well, 5 I'm going to rephrase that question. 6 7 Employees that go to trial, how long does the process usually take between 8 9 trial and getting to arbitration? 10 MR. KLEIN: In my experience --11 MR. SANCHEZ: Yes. 12 MR. KLEIN: -- often in excess of a 13 year. Sometimes under a year, but through the NMB, and funding, and all 14 15 the issues on a national level, it takes 16 an extensive amount of time. 17 MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. You said the 18 "NMB", so can -- during your tenure as President, you've arbitrated cases, 19 20 correct? 21 MR. KLEIN: Yes. MR. SANCHEZ: Right. And you've 2.2 23 arbitrated cases that didn't fall under the Railway Labor Act with the other 24 25 organizations that this Union

1 represents, correct? 2 MR. KLEIN: Yes. MR. SANCHEZ: And those were 3 4 party-pay arbitrations? 5 MR. KLEIN: Yes. MR. SANCHEZ: And can you tell me 6 7 the difference between a party-pay arbitration, and the funding, and the 8 NMB and what's the difference in the 9 10 timeline? 11 MR. KLEIN: Well, because of the 12 funding, the arbitrations under the 13 National Labor Relations Act, they 14 happen right away. I mean, there's 15 literally days or a week goes by before these proceedings take place. 16 17 Once again, regarding the National 18 Mediation Board and the Federal Funding, 19 it takes time. The funding is not 20 there. Often the funding comes 21 across -- is periodically throughout a 2.2 year. They'll get some one quarter and 23 some money the next quarter. 24 So it's -- the goal line keeps 25 moving throughout the year. So, you

Г

1	know, it's a long drawn-out process.
2	MR. SANCHEZ: Okay all right.
3	I'm going to hand you what has been
4	identified as Union Exhibit 8, which is
5	Rule 53. (Handing.)
6	MR. KLEIN: (Perusing.)
7	MR. SANCHEZ: And I'm going to ask
8	you if you're familiar with Rule 53 in
9	the Collective Bargaining Agreement?
10	MR. KLEIN: Yes.
11	MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. Can you tell me
12	what Rule 53 pertains to?
13	MR. KLEIN: Well, it pertains to
14	discipline and what's considered charges
15	that would allow the Carrier to suspend
16	an employee pre pre-trial to do an
17	investigation.
18	MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. And when you
19	read is Rule 53 optional as far as
20	the circumstances when I'll rephrase
21	that.
22	"A" Rule 53(a), could you read
23	that, please?
24	MR. KLEIN: "Employees will not be
25	suspended nor dismissed from service

1 without a fair and impartial trial". MR. SANCHEZ: Is that rule optional? 2 3 MR. KLEIN: No. 4 MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. And can you read "B", please? 5 MR. KLEIN: "The following types of 6 7 offenses justify pre-investigation suspension when there is sufficient 8 9 reason to believe the employee is guilty 10 of the offense and that he or she might 11 commit the offense again if not withheld 12 from service". 13 MR. SANCHEZ: And would you agree 14 that particular portion describes 15 circumstances where the Carrier can, under certain circumstances, take 16 17 employees out of service without a 18 trial? 19 MR. KLEIN: Yes, the way that's 20 written, there are certain circumstances 21 when they can do that. MR. SANCHEZ: And what are those two 2.2 23 circumstances? MR. KLEIN: Well, if they commit an 24 25 act that they think is likely to be

LH REPORTING SERVICES, INC. 718-526-7100

1 repeated again. It's -- the different types of activities are listed there as 2 well. 3 4 It's theft, unsafe practices, serious insubordination, threatening or 5 abusive conduct, fighting on duty, under 6 7 the influence of alcohol or narcotics while on duty, rape, assault, and other 8 serious criminal activities. 9 10 So, they're itemized right there. 11 MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. So -- but 12 basically those -- an employee that 13 commits any one of those offenses can be 14 taken out without violating Rule 53; is 15 that correct? MR. KLEIN: Yes. 16 17 MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. I'm going to 18 ask you to hold onto Union Exhibit 8 and 19 I'm going to give you a document. It's a two-page document. It's going to be 20 21 identified as Union 15. (Handing.) 2.2 I'm going to ask that you take a 23 look at it. 24 MR. KLEIN: (Perusing.) 25 MR. MAGGIORE: Excuse me, how is

1 this relevant to this trial? This is an 2 email -- this is an email involving an employee that's not Darren Drew and from 3 4 a completely different department. Can you please explain how this is 5 relevant to the trial? 6 7 MR. SANCHEZ: Give me one moment. And once again, it's relevant to the 8 9 trial cause it goes to Rule 53. It's relevant to the trial because it's 10 11 evidence that I'd like to submit to 12 support the defense of Darren Drew. 13 I don't have to prove relevance to 14 the trail officer. 15 MR. MAGGIORE: Yeah, you do. 16 MR. SANCHEZ: That's for the 17 reviewing officer. 18 MR. MAGGIORE: Yeah, in order for it 19 to be submitted into evidence, you do --20 and you marked this as a Carrier exhibit 21 by the way. MR. SANCHEZ: Did I? 2.2 23 MR. MAGGIORE: This is not a Carrier 24 exhibit. MR. SANCHEZ: I'll take that back. 25

1 (Whereupon, Organization Exhibit 15 2 was marked.) 3 MR. SANCHEZ: There you go. Now it's a Union exhibit. 4 MR. MAGGIORE: I need a moment. 5 6 (Perusing.) 7 MR. SANCHEZ: You can look at it while we -- (handing). 8 9 MR. KLEIN: (Perusing.) 10 MR. MAGGIORE: In the interest of 11 allowing the Organization to have a full 12 and fair defense of Mr. Drew, I will allow this, but you need to explain how 13 this is relevant to this trial. 14 15 MR. SANCHEZ: Thank you for allowing us to have a fair trial. 16 Mr. Klein, can you look at what has 17 18 been identified as Union Exhibit 15. It 19 has two pages to it. 20 MR. KLEIN: (Perusing.) Yes. 21 MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. Are you familiar with this document? 2.2 23 MR. KLEIN: The document and the 24 incident, yes. MR. SANCHEZ: All right. And can 25

1	you read the first page of it, please
2	oh, I'm sorry could you start from
3	the beginning? It will be the email and
4	can you go from the "From" who is it
5	from and the "Subject", all the way
6	down to "Natasha Massillon".
7	MR. KLEIN: Well, it's an email from
8	Natasha Massillon I don't know if I'm
9	getting her name right it's to Steven
10	Schmitt, Ricardo Sanchez, and Vincent
11	D'Agostino. CC'd on it is Chandra Sako
12	and Deborah Cuomo. It's regarding
13	Mr. Vincent Buonincontro being taken out
14	of service.
15	Would you like me to read the actual
16	email?
17	MR. SANCHEZ: Yes well, it says,
18	"Importance", and what does it say under
19	"Importance" or next to "Importance"?
20	MR. KLEIN: It says "High".
21	MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. And can you
22	read the email, please?
23	MR. KLEIN: "Good morning, as per
24	our discussion, please be advised that
25	at 10:25 a.m. on March 7, 2023, employee

1 Vincent Buonincontro, 56962, has been 2 taken out of service without pay for violation of Rule 53(b)(2), Unsafe 3 Practices. 4 Employee is no longer authorized to 5 be present on Long Island Rail Road 6 7 property for any reason, except to attend a scheduled trial for which the 8 employee will have received written 9 10 notice, or if advised by Management. 11 Please note the notification has 12 been made to the Department as well". 13 MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. So, can you 14 read -- can you take a look at what has 15 been identified as Union Exhibit 15, 16 page 2. 17 MR. KLEIN: (Perusing.) 18 MR. SANCHEZ: And is that familiar 19 -- that document? 20 MR. KLEIN: Yes. 21 MR. SANCHEZ: And can you tell me 2.2 which -- under the synopsis, which 23 synopsis is in reference to this email? 24 MR. KLEIN: It would be number "2". 25 MR. SANCHEZ: And could you read

number "2", please? 1 MR. KLEIN: "On March 2, 2023, 2 Corporate Safety was notified that a 3 close call occurred as westbound train 4 1905 was approaching Hicksville 5 Passenger Station. An employee was in 6 7 the foul of the track causing Engineer to apply emergency braking to stop the 8 9 train. It was found that an Engineering 10 employee assessed the tracks that Divide 11 4 Interlocking without proper job briefing or proper on-track protection". 12 13 MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. Now, based on Union Exhibit 15, "1" and "2", I'd ask 14 15 you to look at Union Exhibit 8, Rule 53. 16 MR. KLEIN: (Perusing.) MR. SANCHEZ: Now, Mr. Buonincontro 17 18 was taken out of service on March 7th, 19 correct? 20 MR. KLEIN: Yes. 21 MR. SANCHEZ: And do you know if he was afforded a fair and impartial trial 2.2 23 before he was taken out of service? MR. KLEIN: No. 24 MR. SANCHEZ: And did he commit a 25

1 major offense? 2 MR. KLEIN: Yeah, he committed a 3 major -- a serious unsafe practice, 4 absolutely. MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. So -- and 5 6 so where was -- where would that be 7 found on Rule 53, which number? MR. KLEIN: That would be (b)(2). 8 9 MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. So, could you 10 read (b)(2) and -- okay. Can you read 11 (b)(2)? 12 MR. KLEIN: "The following types of offenses justify pre-investigation 13 suspension when there's sufficient 14 15 reason to believe the employee is guilty of the offense". 16 17 MR. SANCHEZ: Can I stop you there, 18 Mr. Klein? MR. KLEIN: Yes, I'm sorry. 19 20 MR. SANCHEZ: Now, did they have 21 reasonable cause to believe that the employee was guilty of the offense? 22 23 MR. KLEIN: Yes, they had the 24 employee performing the unsafe act on 25 video.

1 MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. Can you 2 continue, please? MR. KLEIN: "The following types of 3 4 offenses justify a pre-investigation suspension when there is sufficient 5 reason to believe the employee is guilty 6 7 of the offense and that he or she might commit the offense again if not withheld 8 from service". 9 10 MR. SANCHEZ: And can I hold you for 11 a second -- and was there reason to 12 believe that he would commit the offense again if he was withheld from service? 13 14 MR. KLEIN: He actually did it twice 15 that night, so there was a reasonable 16 belief he'd do it again if he wasn't held out of service. 17 18 MR. SANCHEZ: Could you continue, 19 please? 20 MR. KLEIN: What else would you like 21 me to read? 2.2 MR. SANCHEZ: (Perusing.) 23 Sufficient reason -- and which --24 exactly which offense did he commit 25 under the next if you continue down?

LH REPORTING SERVICES, INC. 718-526-7100

1 MR. KLEIN: Well, that would be number "2", "Unsafe Practices". That 2 would be the one he violated. 3 4 MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. And do you know -- in your opinion -- in your 5 professional opinion as a Union 6 7 official, did the Carrier violate Rule 53 when they took him out of service for 8 this violation? 9 10 MR. KLEIN: In this incident? 11 MR. SANCHEZ: In this particular --12 MR. KLEIN: In this incident, there 13 was ample proof to demonstrate that, no, 14 they weren't violating the contract when 15 they removed him from service. MR. SANCHEZ: And you testified that 16 17 that proof is based on videotapes of it 18 in action? 19 MR. KLEIN: Videotape, yes. 20 MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. So, there was 21 video proof of a major violation? 22 MR. KLEIN: Video proof, yes. 23 MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. Do you know if he was taken out of service? 24 25 MR. KLEIN: No, he was not.

140

1 MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. Do you know, initially, if he was sent to Medical for 2 a toxicology -- a drug and alcohol test? 3 4 MR. MAGGIORE: Excuse me, the -- one 5 second. The -- you ask one question, whether or not Buonincontro was taken 6 7 out of service. The document states he 8 was. MR. SANCHEZ: I said "initially" --9 10 I said "initially". 11 MR. MAGGIORE: It says, "As of 12 September -- " -- oh -- "7th" -- okay. 13 MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. So, I'm sorry. I'll ask you again, was he initially 14 15 taken out of service? 16 MR. KLEIN: Initially, no. MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. Thank you. Was 17 18 he initially sent to Medical for drug 19 and alcohol tests? MR. KLEIN: No. 20 21 MR. SANCHEZ: Under Company policy, are you familiar with the Company's 22 23 policy -- drug and alcohol policy? 24 MR. KLEIN: Yes. MR. SANCHEZ: Would the incident 25

1 that night, or this incident, fall under the parameters of a suspicion for the 2 purposes of a drug test? 3 4 MR. KLEIN: Suspicion or -- I think more appropriate would reasonable cause 5 because of the unsafe act. 6 7 MR. SANCHEZ: Okay -- okay. And was he eventually taken out of service? 8 MR. KLEIN: Yes. 9 10 MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. And is he a 11 covered employee under Federal 12 authority? 13 MR. KLEIN: He is a 14 maintenance-of-way worker, so he falls 15 under a fairly new regulation that, yes, he's a regulated -- he falls under 16 17 random drug testing under Federal 18 guidelines, yes. 19 MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. And do you know 20 if he's provided with training 21 specifically to be -- training for 2.2 working on or near the tracks? 23 MR. KLEIN: Yes, they receive 24 training. 25 MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. And do you know

1 the frequency of that training? MR. KLEIN: If you're referring to 2 3 refreshers for --4 MR. SANCHEZ: RWIC --MR. KLEIN: Yeah -- for -- RWIC 5 6 training -- they receive refreshers. 7 MR. SANCHEZ: Yes -- and do you know how often they receive refreshers? 8 MR. KLEIN: I believe it's every two 9 10 years -- one year. 11 MR. SANCHEZ: Yeah, I think it's 12 every one year. 13 Okay. I'm done with those exhibits. 14 (Handing.) MR. MAGGIORE: I note for the record 15 that the Organization has handed me a 16 17 copy of a document. It's a three-page 18 document entitled "Adult Use Cannabis and the Workplace", "New York Labor Law 19 20 201-D". It will be entered into the record 21 as Organization Exhibit 16. 2.2 23 (Whereupon, Organization Exhibit 16 24 was marked.) 25 MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. Mr. Klein, I'm

1 giving you a document that has been 2 identified as Union Exhibit 16. (Handing.) 3 4 MR. KLEIN: (Perusing.) 5 MR. MAGGIORE: Sorry, I interrupted 6 you. 7 MR. SANCHEZ: That's okay. Are you familiar with that document? 8 MR. KLEIN: Yes. 9 10 MR. SANCHEZ: And can you tell me 11 exactly what the document is or what it 12 pertains to? MR. KLEIN: This is a document from 13 14 the New York State Department of Labor 15 and basically it's a frequently asked 16 questions reference, as well as it's 17 more or less -- it's a compliance --18 compliance information. 19 I don't want to say a manual, but 20 it's giving compliance information 21 regarding New York Labor Law 201-D. MR. SANCHEZ: And what is New York 2.2 23 Labor Law 201-D reference -- or is in 24 reference to? MR. KLEIN: Well, it prohibits 25

144

1	employers from discriminating against
2	employees for extracurricular or I
3	should say, recreational recreational
4	activities outside the workplace.
5	MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. And you've read
6	this document?
7	MR. KLEIN: Yes.
8	MR. SANCHEZ: And in your opinion,
9	does the Carrier have the ability to
10	prohibit the use of recreational
11	marijuana for employers employees who
12	are not covered under Hours of Service
13	or the Federal Government?
14	MR. KLEIN: Yes I mean, when you
15	read the legislation, it's clear that if
16	an employee does not fall under a
17	Federal regulation that prohibits them
18	from using controlled substances
19	recreationally and or marijuana,
20	which isn't controlled, but I lost my
21	train of thought for a moment.
22	MR. SANCHEZ: Take your time.
23	MR. KLEIN: Can you repeat the
24	question, again what was the
25	question?

1 MR. SANCHEZ: The document, does it 2 prohibit the Long Island Rail Road from -- can the Long Island Rail Road 3 4 prohibit the use of recreational marijuana off hours for employees who 5 are not covered under an Hours of 6 7 Service job? MR. KLEIN: No. 8 9 MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. And is that 10 based on your interpretation, or your 11 discussions with attorneys and lawyers, 12 that has been your experience? 13 MR. KLEIN: That has been through 14 numerous discussions with attorneys and 15 counsel -- legal counsel. 16 MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. Now, that's -just to be clear, that's just for 17 18 employees who don't own an Hours of 19 Service job? 20 MR. KLEIN: Right -- that's what --21 that's what I was alluding to earlier, 2.2 yes. 23 MR. SANCHEZ: Yeah -- so, for 24 employees, such as myself, I'm a covered 25 employee.

LH REPORTING SERVICES, INC. 718-526-7100

1 MR. KLEIN: Yes. 2 MR. SANCHEZ: Am I restricted -- am 3 I restricted -- can the Carrier prohibit 4 the use of recreational marijuana in my case, outside of work? 5 6 MR. KLEIN: Yes, cause it's 7 Federally -- it's Federally illegal. MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. I'm done with 8 that document. 9 10 (Whereupon, a discussion was held 11 off the record.) 12 MR. SANCHEZ: (Handing.) MR. MAGGIORE: The Organization has 13 14 submitted a --15 MR. COLOMBO: It's 23 total pages. 16 MR. MAGGIORE: -- a 23-page document 17 entitled "U.S. Department of 18 Transportation", "Office of the 19 Secretary", "Office of Drug & Alcohol 20 Policy & Compliance". 21 This will be entered as Organization Exhibit 17. 2.2 23 (Whereupon, Organization Exhibit 17 24 was marked.) 25 MR. SANCHEZ: Mr. Klein, I'm going

LH REPORTING SERVICES, INC. 718-526-7100

1 to ask you to look at what has been identified as Union Exhibit 17. 2 (Handing.) 3 4 MR. KLEIN: (Perusing.) Yes. MR. SANCHEZ: And is that familiar? 5 6 MR. KLEIN: Yes. 7 MR. SANCHEZ: And can you tell me what that exhibit -- what's this exhibit 8 in reference to? 9 MR. KLEIN: Well, it's from the 10 11 United States Department of 12 Transportation and it's a compliance 13 manual regarding drug and alcohol policy 14 and what -- this informs employees what 15 they need to know about Department of Transportation and drug and alcohol 16 17 testing. 18 MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. And could you 19 go to page -- (perusing) -- page 6, 20 including the cover. It looks like 21 this. (Indicating.) 2.2 MR. KLEIN: (Perusing.) Can I see 23 it here -- what page number is it? MR. SANCHEZ: It says page 1, but 24 25 it's page 6 of the exhibit.

1 MR. KLEIN: Page 6 of the exhibit --2 this one? (Indicating.) 3 MR. SANCHEZ: Yes. MR. KLEIN: Okay. 4 5 MR. SANCHEZ: And it says, "Who is subject to DOT testing". Could you read 6 7 that, please? "Anyone designated in 8 MR. KLEIN: DOT regulations as a safety-sensitive 9 10 employee is subject to DOT drug 7 11 alcohol testing. What follows is an 12 overview of what jobs are defined as 13 safety-sensitive functions subject to 14 testing". 15 MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. So -- and then 16 what follows below are safety-sensitive function jobs, defined as 17 18 safety-sensitive, correct? 19 MR. KLEIN: By the Department of 20 Transportation, yes. 21 MR. SANCHEZ: Yeah, 2.2 safety-sensitive. 23 And is the railroad on there? 24 MR. KLEIN: Yes. 25 MR. SANCHEZ: And can you read the

LH REPORTING SERVICES, INC. 718-526-7100

1 safety-sensitive jobs on the railroad? MR. KLEIN: It says for railroad, 2 "Federal Railroad Administration, 3 4 persons who perform duties subject to the Hours of Service laws -- " --5 MR. SANCHEZ: I'm going to stop you, 6 7 Mr. Klein. So, Hours of Service laws -- does 8 9 Mr. Drew perform any services covered 10 under Hours of Service? MR. KLEIN: No. 11 MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. You can 12 13 continue. MR. KLEIN: "Such as locomotive 14 15 engineers, trainmen conductors, switchmen, locomotive hostlers/helpers, 16 utility employees, signalmen, operators, 17 18 and train dispatchers. In addition, a person who performs a 19 20 maintenance-of-way/roadway worker function -- " --21 2.2 MR. SANCHEZ: And I'm going to stop 23 you. 24 Does Mr. Drew perform any 25 maintenance-of-way, roadwork, or

1 protection functions? MR. KLEIN: 2 No. MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. You can 3 4 continue, please. MR. KLEIN: "As defined in 49 CFR 5 Part 214, who are employees or 6 7 contractors of a railroad, have a potential to foul the track, and perform 8 9 a regulated function such as inspection, 10 construction, maintenance or repair of a 11 railroad track, bridges, roadway, 12 signal, and communication systems, 13 electric traction systems, roadway 14 facilities or roadway maintenance 15 machinery on or near track, as well, flagmen and watchmen/lookouts" -- that's 16 17 it -- and "See FRA Regulations at 49 CFR 18 Part 219". 19 MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. So, these are 20 all the jobs that are considered 21 safety-sensitive from the Federal 2.2 Government, correct? 23 MR. KLEIN: Yes. 24 MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. And can you go to the next page, please -- the very 25

LH REPORTING SERVICES, INC. 718-526-7100

1 next page. 2 MR. KLEIN: (Perusing.) MR. SANCHEZ: And can you read -- it 3 4 says "Remember" on the top of the page. 5 MR. KLEIN: Yes. MR. SANCHEZ: Now, the Carrier has 6 7 designated Mr. Drew and all electricians as safety-sensitive because of their 8 9 job. 10 Could you read what it says under 11 "Remember"? 12 MR. KLEIN: "Remember, The tasks you 13 actually perform qualify you as a 14 safety-sensitive employee, not your job 15 title". 16 MR. SANCHEZ: I'm going to stop you 17 there. 18 So, is that why Mr. Drew and myself 19 are both considered electricians for 20 Long Island Rail Road, and I go, and I'm 21 safety-sensitive because of the job I actually perform -- right -- and I go, 22 23 it's not because of his job title, as the Carrier would dictate? 24 25 MR. KLEIN: That's correct.

LH REPORTING SERVICES, INC. 718-526-7100

1 MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. I have no 2 further questions with this document. 3 (Whereupon, Organization Exhibit 18 4 was marked.) MR. SANCHEZ: All right. Mr. Klein, 5 I'm going to give you a document that 6 7 has been identified as Union Exhibit 18. (Handing.) 8 Are you familiar with this document? 9 10 MR. MAGGIORE: Hold on -- one 11 second. How many pages is this 12 document? 13 MR. SANCHEZ: It's 35 pages. MR. COLOMBO: Total of 44. 14 MR. MAGGIORE: It's a total of 44. 15 16 MR. COLOMBO: Yeah. 17 MR. MAGGIORE: All right. The 18 Organization has submitted a 44-page 19 document entitled "Marijuana-Impaired 20 Driving, A Report to Congress". 21 This will be Organization Exhibit 18. 22 23 MR. SANCHEZ: All right. Mr. Klein, 24 I've given you what has been identified 25 as Union Exhibit 18.

1 Is that a familiar document? 2 MR. KLEIN: Yes. 3 MR. SANCHEZ: And can you tell me what that document details -- or what 4 5 the report says? MR. KLEIN: It's United States 6 7 Department of Transportation -- it's a report or a study on the impacts of 8 9 marijuana in the workplace. 10 MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. And I'll ask 11 you to go to page 10 on the bottom. 12 MR. KLEIN: (Perusing.) 13 MR. SANCHEZ: I'm sorry -- "Specimen 14 Collection" -- it's --15 MR. KLEIN: (Perusing.) Page 10? 16 MR. SANCHEZ: Page 10. MR. KLEIN: Yes. 17 18 MR. SANCHEZ: It says -- the first, 19 one, it says, blood, oral, sweat, hair, 20 urine. 21 Can you read "Blood Testing"? MR. KLEIN: "Blood testing is 22 23 considered the "gold standard" for 24 testing for the presence of drugs in 25 impaired driving cases. However, as

1	described in the background section to
2	this report, currently there is limited
3	ability to relate the amount of drug or
4	metabolite in blood to the presence and
5	amount of impairment. Collecting a
6	blood sample is an invasive procedure
7	typically requiring a search warrant and
8	a nurse or licensed phlebotomist".
9	MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. So, metabolites
10	in the blood, do they indicate
11	impairment?
12	MR. KLEIN: Metabolites no.
13	MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. I'd like you to
14	go to the bottom, "Urine Testing", which
15	is the methodology used on the Rail
16	Road.
17	Could you read that, please?
18	MR. KLEIN: "Urine Testing, The drug
19	testing methodology for urinalysis is
20	well established. Drugs and drug
21	metabolites are detectable in urine for
22	several days after the drug has been
23	used and sometimes for weeks. Urine
24	test results cannot be used to prove
25	that a driver was under the influence of

1	the drug at the time of arrest or
2	testing. Detection of THC or other
3	cannabinoids in urine does not
4	necessarily reflect recent use."
5	MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. So, basically,
6	what they're saying is metabolites in
7	your system don't prove impairment
8	because they can stay in your body for,
9	it says, days and sometimes weeks.
10	Is that correct?
11	MR. KLEIN: Yes, metabolites don't
12	measure don't measure the level of
13	impairment.
14	MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. Is that your
15	opinion?
16	MR. KLEIN: No, that's a scientific
17	fact.
18	MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. I have no
19	further questions with this exhibit.
20	I just need a brief recess.
21	MR. MAGGIORE: All right. The time
22	is 1:57 p.m. We're going to take a
23	brief recess.
24	(Whereupon, a brief recess was
25	taken.)

1 MR. MAGGIORE: All right. The time 2 is 2:05 p.m. and we are back on the record. 3 4 Mr. Sanchez, do you have any other questions for Mr. Klein? 5 MR. SANCHEZ: Yes, I do. 6 7 Mr. Klein, can you tell me the difference between the safety-sensitive 8 designation from the Carrier and 9 10 safety-sensitive designation from the 11 FRA or the Federal Government? 12 MR. KLEIN: Yes, cause they're both 13 -- both agencies or entities have a -there's a distinct difference between 14 15 the two. 16 The way the Department of Transportation and the FRA defines 17 18 safety-sensitive employees is those 19 employees who perform regulated service 20 work, Hours of Service work, 21 maintenance-of-way workers, mechanical employees that perform inspections. 2.2 23 That they define as safety-sensitive for 24 the purpose of drug testing. 25 The Long Island Rail Road considers

LH REPORTING SERVICES, INC. 718-526-7100

1	safety-sensitive basically anybody who
2	can basically get injured on a job. So,
3	a custodian, the Long Island Rail Road
4	consider a safety-sensitive position
5	even though under the FRA does not
6	consider them one.
7	Even though they work for a
8	railroad, they're not performing the
9	functions that fit them in that certain
10	category that essentially permits random
11	drug testing.
12	MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. Just a few more
13	questions.
14	Did the Carrier violate Mr. Drew's
15	Constitutional Rights under the Fourth
16	Amendment and the Fourteenth Amendment?
17	MR. KLEIN: In my opinion
18	MR. SANCHEZ: Yes.
19	MR. KLEIN: yes, the Fourth
20	the Fourth Amendment, illegal search,
21	and seizure, and privacy and as far
22	as Fourteenth, his due process and his
23	his due process rights as well as
24	MR. SANCHEZ: Is he entitled to
25	equal protection?

LH REPORTING SERVICES, INC. 718-526-7100

1 MR. KLEIN: Equal protection --2 thank you. 3 MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. And is this the 4 first time that they violated the Constitutional Rights of employees for 5 drug testing and discipline? 6 7 MR. KLEIN: No. MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. And can you 8 think of one, off the top of your 9 10 head -- another employee whose rights 11 were violated? 12 MR. KLEIN: That would be Ronald 13 Dolginko. 14 MR. SANCHEZ: And can you tell me 15 who Mr. Dolginko was and how his rights 16 were violated by the Carrier? MR. KLEIN: Ronald Dolginko was an 17 18 electrician in the Hillside Car Shop. 19 He was returning to duty from a serious 20 illness and he was subjected to a 21 return-to-duty drug test, the same test that Mr. Drew was subjected to. 2.2 23 He also tested positive for 24 marijuana metabolites. 25 MR. SANCHEZ: And do you know -- do

1 you recall how many years of service Mr. 2 Dolginko had when he returned to 3 service? 4 MR. KLEIN: Mr. Dolginko had 5 approximately 26 years. 6 MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. And do you know 7 what Mr. Dolginko's current status is? MR. KLEIN: He's currently retired. 8 9 MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. And is there 10 any action -- any court or legal action 11 that you're aware of because of the 12 violation? MR. KLEIN: Yes, there's a civil 13 suit in process. 14 15 MR. SANCHEZ: And is there a Federal 16 lawsuit that you're aware of? MR. KLEIN: That's a Federal 17 18 lawsuit, yes. 19 MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. So, this isn't the first time -- and MTA is aware that 20 there's a Federal lawsuit for violation 21 of Constitutional Rights in reference to 2.2 23 drug testing and discipline? 24 MR. KLEIN: Yes. MR. SANCHEZ: So, this wouldn't be 25

1 the first -- so, now -- it wouldn't be 2 the first time that they've done it, so 3 it's willful now in your opinion? 4 MR. KLEIN: I would say yes. MR. SANCHEZ: I have no further 5 6 questions. 7 (Whereupon, a discussion was held off the record.) 8 MR. MAGGIORE: Mr. Klein --9 10 MR. KLEIN: Yes. 11 MR. MAGGIORE: -- I'd like to show 12 you a copy of what has been entered into the record as Carrier Exhibit 1. 13 This is the Notice of Trial, the 14 15 subject of the hearing. (Handing.) 16 Can you please read that document? 17 MR. KLEIN: (Perusing.) 18 MR. MAGGIORE: You don't need to 19 read it into the record. Just read it 20 for yourself. 21 MR. KLEIN: Oh, okay. (Perusing.) 22 Okay. 23 MR. MAGGIORE: Okay. According to 24 Carrier Exhibit 1, the Notice of Trial, 25 what type of drug test did Darren Drew

LH REPORTING SERVICES, INC. 718-526-7100

1 submit a urine specimen for? 2 MR. KLEIN: He submitted as part of 3 a return-to-duty drug test. 4 MR. MAGGIORE: Does the Notice of Trial state that Mr. Drew was impaired 5 at the time of this test? 6 7 MR. KLEIN: No. MR. MAGGIORE: Is he being charged 8 9 with being impaired at the time of the 10 test? 11 MR. KLEIN: According to this 12 document, no. 13 MR. MAGGIORE: Okay. Do you have 14 any direct involvement with the incident 15 described in the Notice of Charge -- the 16 Notice of Trial -- sorry? 17 MR. KLEIN: Can you clarify "direct 18 involvement"? 19 MR. MAGGIORE: Were you present at the Medical Facility on June 7th with 20 21 Mr. Drew? 2.2 MR. KLEIN: No. 23 MR. MAGGIORE: Were you involved in 24 the testing of his urine? 25 MR. KLEIN: No.

LH REPORTING SERVICES, INC. 718-526-7100

162

1 MR. MAGGIORE: Did you receive any 2 lab results regarding the testing of his urine? 3 4 MR. KLEIN: I believe I might've --I might've seen the results afterwards, 5 but as far as definitive numbers, I 6 7 couldn't tell you. MR. MAGGIORE: Okay. You didn't 8 9 order him for testing, did you? 10 MR. KLEIN: Did I order him? 11 MR. MAGGIORE: Yes. 12 MR. KLEIN: I don't have the 13 authority, no. 14 MR. MAGGIORE: Okay. Who has the 15 authority to order him for testing? 16 MR. KLEIN: Well, the Long Island 17 Rail Road has the authority to direct 18 for testing, yes. 19 MR. MAGGIORE: Understood. 20 So, Mr. Drew, as an electrician, 21 he's a safety-sensitive employee as 2.2 deemed by the Company, correct? 23 MR. KLEIN: According to the Long Island Rail Road's definition of 24 25 safety-sensitive employee, he would fall

1 under that definition, yes. 2 MR. MAGGIORE: Okay. Do all 3 electricians -- are all electricians 4 considered safety-sensitive as per the Long Island Rail Road? 5 MR. KLEIN: To the best of my 6 7 knowledge, yes. MR. MAGGIORE: Okay. You have quite 8 9 a number of years on the job. 10 Has that always been the case, that 11 electricians have always been considered 12 safety-sensitive? 13 MR. KLEIN: I would be misspeaking 14 if I said the term safety-sensitive has 15 existed for 26 years, so I couldn't 16 definitively say yes to that. MR. MAGGIORE: Understood. 17 18 Going back to Organization 19 Exhibit 8, which was Rule 53. 20 MR. KLEIN: (Perusing.) Okay. 21 MR. MAGGIORE: You stated you've been a Union rep for what --2.2 23 approximately 20 years? 24 MR. KLEIN: Yes. 25 MR. MAGGIORE: Out of that time,

1 approximately how long did you represent 2 employees when it came to disciplinary matters, such as trial or entering into 3 waivers -- things of that sort? 4 MR. KLEIN: I would say out of the 5 20, I had involvement, I would say, 6 7 17 years of those -- out of the 20. MR. MAGGIORE: Okay. During that 8 period of time, did the Carrier -- was 9 10 the common practice for the Carrier to 11 take employees out of service if they 12 violated the alcohol and substance abuse 13 policy? 14 MR. KLEIN: Typically, that's what 15 they did, yes. 16 MR. MAGGIORE: And then what would happen after they took them out of 17 18 service? 19 MR. KLEIN: Well, typically --MR. MAGGIORE: Typically. 20 21 MR. KLEIN: -- typically, there would be a waiver -- a trial waiver 2.2 23 offered to the employee. 24 MR. MAGGIORE: Would they be given a 25 Trial Notice first notifying them of the

1 charge? 2 MR. KLEIN: Yes. 3 MR. MAGGIORE: And then they would 4 sign a waiver -- sometimes --MR. KLEIN: That would become part 5 of the discussion, yes. 6 7 MR. MAGGIORE: Okay. I just want to turn your attention to Organization 8 Exhibit 14. 9 10 MR. KLEIN: (Perusing.) Is that 11 this one? (Indicating.) MR. MAGGIORE: Yeah, that's 14. 12 13 MR. KLEIN: Okay. 14 MR. MAGGIORE: In particular the 15 last sentence in this letter -- the letters are identical. The only 16 difference in these documents is the 17 18 three different employees signed on 19 different dates obviously. 20 The last line in this letter states, 21 "I herein expressly request that the 2.2 IBEW sign the trial waiver in this case, 23 as I feel it is in my best interest". 24 You've been involved in these cases. 25 Have you signed a trial waiver along

1 with the employee? MR. KLEIN: I believe I have. 2 MR. MAGGIORE: Okay. Do employees 3 4 voluntarily sign trial waivers? MR. KLEIN: Voluntarily -- I mean, 5 in the strict sense of the word, no. 6 7 MR. MAGGIORE: How so? MR. KLEIN: Because they're coerced 8 9 into it. They're threatened with either 10 termination or sign the waiver. 11 MR. MAGGIORE: Who threatens them? 12 MR. KLEIN: It's explicitly implied 13 through dialogue that the Union has with the various trial officers over the 14 15 years and it has never been documented on paper because it would essentially be 16 17 a pre-determination of guilt, which 18 nobody in their right mind would put in 19 writing. 20 MR. MAGGIORE: Okay. So, does the 21 Union voluntarily sign the waiver? MR. KLEIN: Voluntarily -- I mean --2.2 23 well, it's signed. I mean, no one is 24 holding a gun to the Union rep's head, 25 but certainly they're taking into

LH REPORTING SERVICES, INC. 718-526-7100

1 consideration the predicament that their Union member -- their brother is put 2 into. 3 4 So, yes, if the brother believes it's in their best interest -- and 5 that's what's best for their family --6 7 then, yes. MR. MAGGIORE: Then you're typically 8 9 in agreement with the employee when 10 you sign -- you, as a representative, 11 you're signing the waiver as well 12 agreeing to the discipline that's stated 13 in the waiver, correct? 14 MR. KLEIN: We don't judge --15 whatever the employee -- the employees or the members, what they believe is in 16 17 their best interest, we don't judge. 18 MR. MAGGIORE: So, you just sign the 19 waiver if the employee agrees to sign 20 the waiver? 21 MR. KLEIN: We don't judge the reason. If they feel it's in their best 22 23 interest and the best interest of their 24 family, yes, we would sign it, yes. 25 MR. MAGGIORE: I'd like to turn your

LH REPORTING SERVICES, INC. 718-526-7100

168

1 attention to Organization Exhibit 15. 2 This is regarding employee Vincent 3 Buonincontro. 4 MR. KLEIN: (Perusing.) Yes. MR. MAGGIORE: So, was 5 6 Mr. Buonincontro charged with a 7 violation of the alcohol and substance abuse policy? 8 MR. KLEIN: No --9 10 MR. MAGGIORE: No, he wasn't? 11 MR. KLEIN: -- not according to this 12 document, no. 13 MR. MAGGIORE: Okay. Was he sent 14 for testing, are you aware, after the incident that's described? 15 16 MR. KLEIN: No, he wasn't. MR. MAGGIORE: Okay. So -- I don't 17 18 mean to jump back and forth -- but 19 Organization Exhibit 8 --20 MR. KLEIN: (Perusing.) Mm-hmm. 21 MR. MAGGIORE: So, Rule 53(b) has been raised a couple of times. 2.2 23 Could you just read the first 24 sentence of that -- of "B". 25 MR. KLEIN: "The following types of

169

1 offenses justify pre-investigation 2 suspension". 3 MR. MAGGIORE: That's fine. 4 MR. KLEIN: Okay. MR. MAGGIORE: So, the first words 5 6 in that sentence are what? 7 MR. KLEIN: "The following types". MR. MAGGIORE: "Types". So, does 8 9 that mean that anything after that is 10 explicitly the only reasons that someone 11 could be taken out of service or are 12 they given as examples, in your opinion? MR. KLEIN: No, it's limited to the 13 14 scope of what's written here. 15 MR. MAGGIORE: Okay. Turning your 16 attention to Organization Exhibit 16, 17 this document. (Indicating.) 18 MR. KLEIN: (Perusing.) 19 MR. MAGGIORE: Do you know when this -- the law referenced in this 20 document went into effect? 21 MR. KLEIN: I believe somewhere 2.2 around 2021. 23 24 MR. MAGGIORE: Okay. 25 MR. KLEIN: Somewhere in that

1 timeframe, I think -- somewhere around 2 there. MR. MAGGIORE: Okay. So, since the 3 4 law that's described in Organization Exhibit 16 has been enacted, has the 5 Carrier changed its policy -- rather, 6 7 amended it's policy and removed marijuana as a prohibited substance? 8 9 MR. KLEIN: To our knowledge? 10 MR. MAGGIORE: Yes. 11 MR. KLEIN: Just let me preface my 12 answer with this, is typically when 13 there's policy changes, they don't notify us. 14 MR. MAGGIORE: Okay. 15 MR. KLEIN: They do not notify the 16 17 unions of a policy change. We're 18 left to -- we're left to find out the 19 hard way. 20 So, to the best of my knowledge 21 right now, they haven't changed their 22 marijuana policy. 23 MR. MAGGIORE: Okay. So, marijuana 24 is still a prohibited substance as per 25 Company policy?

171

MR. KLEIN: I guess -- I'd be 1 2 speaking for the Company, but yeah. 3 MR. MAGGIORE: Well, Company policy. 4 MR. KLEIN: If that's what you want 5 me to say, yes. 6 MR. MAGGIORE: No -- okay. Turning 7 to Exhibit -- sorry -- your attention to Organization Exhibit 17, it's titled 8 9 "U.S. Department of Transportation, 10 Office of the Secretary". 11 MR. KLEIN: (Perusing.) Is that 12 this one? (Indicating.) MR. MAGGIORE: Yeah. 13 14 Is that policy a Federal policy or a 15 Carrier policy? 16 MR. KLEIN: This is Federal. 17 MR. MAGGIORE: Federal policy. 18 And Organization Exhibit 18, is that 19 Federal policy or a Company policy? MR. KLEIN: Well, it's a Federal 20 21 report. 2.2 MR. MAGGIORE: Federal report --23 sorry. It's a Federal report. 24 So, Mr. Sanchez asked you questions 25 regarding the legality of drug testing

1 and violation of Constitutional Rights 2 or potential violation of. 3 If an employee's Constitutional Rights have been violated, what is the 4 proper forum to remedy that violation? 5 6 MR. KLEIN: The proper forum to 7 remedy it? MR. MAGGIORE: Yes, is it a 8 9 disciplinary hearing; is it a grievance 10 hearing? Is it a court -- what is your 11 opinion? 12 MR. KLEIN: Well, the disciplinary 13 portion is imperative because that sets 14 the record for any future litigation outside -- outside the Rail Road 15 16 property. MR. MAGGIORE: But if somebody's 17 18 Constitutional Rights are violated, 19 wouldn't a lawsuit be the proper method 20 of remedying that? 21 MR. KLEIN: Not without a proper record, which is being established here. 2.2 23 MR. MAGGIORE: A record is created 24 in a court, is it not? 25 MR. KLEIN: It can be.

173

1 MR. MAGGIORE: Okay. Does the 2 Carrier have the authority to make legal 3 rulings? MR. KLEIN: Law? 4 MR. MAGGIORE: Yes, on issues of 5 6 law, does the carrier have that 7 authority? MR. KLEIN: No. 8 9 MR. MAGGIORE: Okay -- all right. I 10 have no further questions. 11 Mr. Sanchez? 12 MR. SANCHEZ: I got a few. 13 MR. MAGGIORE: Okay. MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. Where to start, 14 15 where to start. 16 I'll ask you to look at Carrier Exhibit 1 and I'm going to give you what 17 18 has been identified also for comparison 19 as Union Exhibit 13. 1 is a Notice of 20 Trial. 21 So, I'm going to ask you, do you recognize Carrier 1 and Union 13; are 22 23 they familiar documents? 24 MR. KLEIN: This is the one I was 25 referencing earlier. I had seen this,

1 so yes. MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. And can you 2 tell me -- and Carrier 1 is the Notice 3 4 of Trial. The Carrier's representative stated that it doesn't say anywhere he 5 was impaired in the charge. That he 6 7 took -- it was a return-to-work physical. 8 9 Can you point me -- and that he was 10 charged with positive for marijuana --11 can you show me on Union Exhibit 13 12 where it shows he was positive for 13 marijuana? 14 MR. KLEIN: Well, it doesn't. Ιt 15 shows he was positive for marijuana 16 metabolites. 17 MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. Now, I'm going 18 to ask you to look at what has been 19 identified as Union Exhibit 8, which is 20 Rule 53. 21 MR. KLEIN: (Perusing.) MR. SANCHEZ: And I'll ask you if 2.2 23 you could direct me to the portion of Rule 53 that allows the Rail Road to 24 25 take the grievant out of service for

175

1 testing positive for marijuana. 2 MR. KLEIN: It's not there; it 3 doesn't exist. MR. SANCHEZ: Oh, it doesn't exist. 4 Okay. I'll ask you to look at 5 Mr. -- what has been identified as Union 6 7 Exhibit 15, which is Mr. Buonincontro. MR. KLEIN: (Perusing.) 15? 8 MR. SANCHEZ: That's it. 9 10 MR. KLEIN: Okay. 11 MR. SANCHEZ: All right. So, 12 Carrier's representative asked if 13 Mr. Buonincontro was sent to Medical for 14 a toxicology test after the incident and 15 was he? 16 MR. KLEIN: After the incident --MR. SANCHEZ: Yes. 17 18 MR. KLEIN: -- no. 19 MR. SANCHEZ: And was that a 20 violation of Company policy? MR. KLEIN: Yes. 21 2.2 MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. And is that 23 your opinion or is that based on your 24 understanding of the policy? 25 MR. KLEIN: My understanding of the

1 policy, my understanding of the 2 danger -- how dangerous the job is, yes. 3 MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. And he was taken out of service because --4 specifically for that offense? 5 MR. KLEIN: Yes. 6 7 MR. SANCHEZ: And Rule 53(b)(2), Unsafe Practice, was specifically 8 spelled out in the Notice of Trial. 9 10 MR. KLEIN: Yes. 11 MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. Did the 12 President of the Rail Road agree with you that he should've been tested? 13 MR. KLEIN: Yes, we met with Cathy 14 15 Rinaldi, and Rob Free, and Kelli 16 Coughlin, and they were in agreement. Individuals should've been taken out of 17 18 service. MR. SANCHEZ: So, they were in 19 20 agreement that that was a violation of 21 the policy and that the Rail Road was inconsistent in its handling; is that 2.2 23 correct? 24 MR. KLEIN: Yes, that's correct. 25 MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. I'm going to

LH REPORTING SERVICES, INC. 718-526-7100

1 hand you what has been marked as Union 2 19 --3 MR. MAGGIORE: Let me identify this for the record. 4 MR. SANCHEZ: -- and ask you if you 5 could take a look at it. (Handing.) 6 7 MR. KLEIN: (Perusing.) MR. MAGGIORE: Mr. Sanchez has 8 9 handed me a one-page document. It 10 appears to be an email. I will let Mr. Sanchez describe what 11 12 the contents of this email are. (Whereupon, Organization Exhibit 19 13 14 was marked.) 15 MR. SANCHEZ: All right. Mr. Klein, 16 is this document familiar to you -- this email? 17 18 MR. KLEIN: This is the first time 19 I'm actually seeing this. MR. SANCHEZ: Okay and can you read 20 21 it, please -- well, I'm going to go --2.2 can you go -- can you say who is it 23 from? 24 MR. KLEIN: It is from Catherine 25 Rinaldi, Long Island Rail Road

LH REPORTING SERVICES, INC. 718-526-7100

1 President. MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. And who is it 2 3 to? MR. KLEIN: It is to Ricardo 4 Sanchez, General Chairman of IBEW Local 5 589. 6 7 MR. SANCHEZ: And can you read the email? 8 MR. KLEIN: "Good morning 9 10 Mr. Sanchez, thank you for contacting 11 me. I am also extremely concerned about 12 the incident involving the Third Railman 13 on March 2nd and the safety issues that have been identified after reviewing the 14 15 circumstances of this event". MR. SANCHEZ: And I'm going to stop 16 you -- and those -- the Third Railman 17 18 and incident President Rinaldi is 19 referring to is Mr. Buonincontro? 20 MR. KLEIN: Yes. 21 MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. You can continue. 2.2 MR. KLEIN: "The incident could've 23 24 resulted in a tragedy for the employee, 25 his family, and the railroad, which is

LH REPORTING SERVICES, INC. 718-526-7100

1 something I take very seriously as a railroad professional and as a human 2 being. I was similarly troubled that 3 4 the employee was not subject to toxicology testing after the incident 5 and I also share your frustration that 6 7 the employee was not removed from service properly". 8 9 MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. That's all. 10 Thank you. 11 So, the President agrees that it was 12 a violation and he should've sent for a 13 drug and alcohol test? MR. KLEIN: Yes. 14 15 MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. I'm going to 16 ask you to look at what has been identified as Union Exhibit 14, which is 17 18 -- and I'll give you mine. It's all the 19 same. It's the trial waivers. 20 (Handing.) 21 MR. KLEIN: Okay. 2.2 MR. SANCHEZ: So, it says, "Dear Mr. 23 Sanchez, I have been afforded a trial 24 waiver by the Carrier in Discipline 25 Case" and in this -- they're different

1 numbers. "I understand that the Carrier 2 requires that the IBEW, my bargaining 3 4 agent, sign the trial waiver as it represents a waiver of my rights under 5 Rule 53 of the Agreement". 6 7 Do you know why the Carrier -- just number 53 -- Rule 53 is the only one he 8 has to waive? 9 MR. KLEIN: Well, that -- Rule 53 10 11 grants the employee the right to a fair 12 and impartial trial and a hearing. 13 MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. So, the Carrier 14 is offering -- they don't want to give 15 you a fair and impartial trial. They'll give you a waiver if you waive your 16 17 rights to a fair and impartial trial. 18 That's what this is asking for. 19 MR. KLEIN: Yes. 20 MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. And as a Union 21 official, can you not sign a request? 22 If an employee comes to you -- a 23 member -- and says, "I want you to sign 24 away my rights", do you have the option, 25 as a Union official, to say, "No, we're

LH REPORTING SERVICES, INC. 718-526-7100

1 going to trial"? MR. KLEIN: No. 2 MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. Does the MTA 3 4 have the authority to prohibit marijuana -- the use of marijuana? 5 MR. KLEIN: Does the MTA have the 6 7 right to prohibit --MR. SANCHEZ: Have the authority --8 MR. KLEIN: -- the authority --9 10 MR. SANCHEZ: -- to prohibit the use 11 of marijuana? 12 MR. KLEIN: Outside the workplace or 13 inside the workplace? 14 MR. SANCHEZ: Do they have the 15 authority, and if they do, under what circumstances? 16 17 MR. KLEIN: They would have the 18 authority if an individual was deemed to 19 be impaired by marijuana while working. 20 That would be reasonable suspicion 21 -- no different than alcohol, which is also a legal substance outside the 2.2 23 workplace. MR. SANCHEZ: So, is alcohol also 24 25 considered a prohibited substance by the

1 Long Island Rail Road? 2 MR. KLEIN: Only if you're impaired 3 by it while you're working. MR. SANCHEZ: But is it 4 considered -- okay. So, I'll back that 5 6 up. So, is alcohol a legal substance --7 MR. KLEIN: Yes. 8 MR. SANCHEZ: -- for adults over the 9 10 age of 21? 11 MR. KLEIN: Yes -- yes. 12 MR. SANCHEZ: Is recreational 13 marijuana a legal substance for 14 employees -- for adults over the age of 15 21? 16 MR. KLEIN: In the State of New 17 York, yes. 18 MR. SANCHEZ: Yes -- so, does the 19 Carrier have the right -- does the 20 Carrier's authority supersede New York 21 State to make marijuana a prohibited substance duty for non-covered service 22 23 employees? 24 MR. KLEIN: No. 25 MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. Did the Carrier

1 violate other employees' Constitutional Rights, besides Mr. Dolginko, that 2 3 you're aware of? 4 MR. KLEIN: Well, I would say every -- a majority of the individuals 5 that signed waivers and attested to 6 7 their innocence and -- yes, numerous 8 ones. 9 MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. We talk a lot 10 about policy and the Carrier is -- the 11 Carriers hang their hat on, they have 12 the authority because of their policy. 13 Are you familiar with a policy that revolved around epilepsy that the 14 15 Carrier had? 16 MR. KLEIN: Yes. 17 MR. SANCHEZ: And are you familiar 18 with two individuals, Mr. Durandis 19 (phonetic) and Benny Rodriguez in this 20 particular scope? 21 MR. KLEIN: Very much so, yes. 2.2 MR. SANCHEZ: And could you tell me 23 about Mr. Rodriguez, Mr. Durandis, and 24 the Rail Road policy? 25 MR. KLEIN: Both gentlemen were

1 suffering from epilepsy. Both gentlemen 2 had --MR. SANCHEZ: I'm sorry, I'm going 3 4 to stop you. So, they were suffering 5 from epilepsy. Did they disclose their epilepsy 6 7 condition to the Carrier prior to employment? 8 MR. KLEIN: Yes. 9 10 MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. Thank you. 11 MR. KLEIN: You want me to continue? 12 MR. SANCHEZ: Yes, please. 13 MR. KLEIN: Both gentlemen were 14 epileptics known to the Company. Both 15 suffered seizures while they were on the 16 job and the Rail Road held them to a 17 standard -- a Department of 18 Transportation standard -- where they 19 could not return to work for one year. 20 So, they had to be seizure free. 21 That was their policy, but they're following a DOT regulation, which had 2.2 23 nothing to do with them because they 24 weren't DOT regulated employees. 25 MR. SANCHEZ: And did the

1 Organization try to resolve that dispute for Mr. Durandis and Mr. Rodriguez? 2 MR. KLEIN: Yes. 3 4 MR. SANCHEZ: And, ultimately, was the Organization successful on the 5 property handling it? 6 7 MR. KLEIN: Absolutely not. MR. SANCHEZ: And what was the 8 rationale behind the Carrier's position? 9 10 MR. KLEIN: Their rationale was the 11 Department of Transportation regulation 12 that requires safety-sensitive employees who suffer seizures must be seizure free 13 for a year -- and, really, that 14 15 regulation with safety-sensitive would not pertain to the FAR -- not 16 17 railroad employees -- more truck driving 18 and things of that nature -- commercial 19 drivers. 20 That rule applies more to commercial 21 driving than safety-sensitive under the FRA railroad rules. 2.2 23 MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. 24 MR. KLEIN: It might pertain -- I don't know this for sure -- to engineers 25

1 on the Long Island Rail Road, that they have to be seizure free -- maybe that. 2 But outside of that, no. 3 4 MR. SANCHEZ: So, I just want to summarize -- so, the Rail Road had a 5 policy that said if you suffered a 6 7 seizure from epilepsy, you were taken out of service -- and now the contract 8 9 when that happens, doesn't the contract 10 state, you go to your doctor and you get 11 a doctor's note -- you can return with a 12 doctor's note, right? 13 MR. KLEIN: Yes. 14 MR. SANCHEZ: And either did Mr. 15 Durandis or Mr. Rodrigues do that? MR. KLEIN: Yes. 16 MR. SANCHEZ: And did the Carrier 17 18 accept those doctors' notes? 19 MR. KLEIN: No. 20 MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. And doesn't the 21 contract also say that the Carrier 2.2 has -- if an employee under these 23 circumstances goes out because he had 24 epilepsy, you go to your doctor. 25 The doctor gives you a note, says

1	medication whatever and he returns
2	you to the service of the Carrier
3	right and the Carrier disagrees with
4	the diagnosis.
5	Does the Carrier have the ability to
б	get a second opinion?
7	MR. KLEIN: Well, yes yes.
8	MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. Cause they can
9	question the diagnosis of a doctor?
10	MR. KLEIN: Yes.
11	MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. Did that happen
12	in this case?
13	MR. KLEIN: My recollection I'm
14	not sure if it went to a board second
15	opinion I really don't recall.
16	MR. SANCHEZ: Okay that's okay.
17	So, what was the end result so
18	Mr. Durandis and Mr. Rodriguez, were
19	they out for a year; did they do the
20	full year?
21	MR. KLEIN: Yes, and despite our
22	attempts to ask for reasonable
23	accommodations and numerous attempts
24	to do that so, yes.
25	MR. SANCHEZ: So, they were held out

1 of service for a year? 2 MR. KLEIN: Yes. 3 MR. SANCHEZ: And they eventually returned back to the service of the 4 Carrier? 5 6 MR. KLEIN: Yes. 7 MR. SANCHEZ: And did the Carrier ever change the policy? 8 MR. KLEIN: Yes. 9 10 MR. SANCHEZ: And can you tell me 11 why they changed the policy? 12 MR. KLEIN: Because lawsuits were filed. 13 MR. SANCHEZ: So, the Carrier was 14 15 sued by these individuals and their policy was changed? 16 17 MR. KLEIN: Yes -- yes. 18 MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. And were these 19 individuals made whole? MR. KLEIN: Yes. 20 21 MR. SANCHEZ: So, that was an 2.2 example -- so, that's an example of the 23 Carrier's policy doesn't supersede state 24 law or the contract. 25 MR. KLEIN: That's correct. That's

1 a good example, yes. 2 MR. SANCHEZ: Thank you. I have no 3 further questions. 4 MR. MAGGIORE: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Klein. You are excused. You will 5 6 be recalled for any questions if needed. 7 Please do not discuss this matter with anybody outside this room while the 8 9 trial is ongoing. 10 The time is approximately 2:35 p.m. 11 and we're going to take a brief recess 12 to allow the Organization's second witness to exit the room. 13 We're off record. 14 15 (Whereupon, a brief recess was 16 taken.) MR. MAGGIORE: All right. The time 17 18 is 2:52 p.m. We're back on the record. 19 Since the Organization does not have any additional witnesses to provide 20 21 testimony, I'll move forward to your 2.2 testimony, Mr. Drew. 23 I'll direct questions to you and 24 subsequently the Organization will have 25 an opportunity to cross-examine you.

190

1 Once again, for the record, can you 2 please state your name and IBM number? 3 MR. DREW: My name is Darren Drew, 50112. 4 MR. MAGGIORE: And once again, what 5 is your position with the Rail Road? 6 7 MR. DREW: Electrician. MR. MAGGIORE: Okay. Did you report 8 9 to the Medical Department for a 10 return-to-work exam on June 7, 2022? 11 MR. DREW: Yes. 12 MR. MAGGIORE: Were you required to 13 provide a urine specimen for drug 14 testing as part of your return-to-work 15 exam? 16 MR. DREW: Yes. MR. MAGGIORE: Okay. Mr. Drew, I'm 17 18 going to show you what has been marked 19 as Carrier Exhibit 10. (Handing.) 20 Can you please review this document 21 and tell me if you completed Section 5. 2.2 MR. DREW: (Perusing.) Yes. 23 MR. MAGGIORE: Okay. Is that your 24 name and signature? 25 MR. DREW: Yes.

1 MR. MAGGIORE: Can you please read the first sentence in Section 5? 2 MR. DREW: "I certify that I 3 4 provided my urine specimen to the collector, that I have not adulterated 5 it in any manner. Each specimen bottle 6 7 used was sealed with a tamper evidence seal in my presence and that the 8 9 information provided on this form and on 10 a label affixed to each specimen bottle 11 is correct". 12 MR. MAGGIORE: Thank you. After 13 your return-to-work exam on June 7, 14 2022, were you advised of the results of 15 your drug test? MR. DREW: June 13th. 16 17 MR. MAGGIORE: Okay. What were the 18 results of the test? 19 MR. DREW: Mr. Mujtaba had called me 20 and told me that the test results had 21 came back positive. MR. MAGGIORE: Positive for? 2.2 23 MR. DREW: For marijuana. 24 MR. MAGGIORE: Okay. What did you 25 do upon learning the results of the

LH REPORTING SERVICES, INC. 718-526-7100

1 test? 2 MR. DREW: I was -- I was taken aback because, like I told Dr. Mujtaba, 3 4 I said, "The test must be wrong", I said, "because I did not smoke any 5 marijuana. 6 7 MR. MAGGIORE: Okay. Did you discuss the test results with anybody --8 9 scratch that -- sorry. 10 So, why do you believe the urine 11 specimen you provided on June 7th tested 12 positive for marijuana? 13 MR. DREW: As I told Mr. Mujtaba 14 also, I said, "It has to be maybe due to 15 the medication that I was on dealing 16 with my cancer situation". MR. MAGGIORE: Okay. I am going to 17 18 show you what has been marked as 19 Organization Exhibit 2-A and 2-B. 20 (Handing.) 21 MR. DREW: (Perusing.) MR. MAGGIORE: These are letters 2.2 23 that the Organization submitted on your 24 behalf from your doctor -- or doctors 25 rather. There are two different

193

1 doctors. 2 These letters state that you were prescribed ibuprofen, which "is listed 3 4 as a drug that could potentially cause a false positive test for marijuana". 5 Do you have any medical 6 7 documentation, which definitively states that the results of your June 7, 2022 8 9 drug test was due to a false positive? 10 MR. DREW: Definitive, no -- no. 11 MR. MAGGIORE: Okay. Mr. Drew, Dr. 12 Mujtaba testified that the GCMS test is 13 considered to be the gold standard for 14 drug testing since it is not susceptible 15 to false positives. Dr. Mujtaba also submitted into 16 evidence lab results, which have been 17 18 marked as Carrier's Exhibits 13 and 16, 19 which were both performed at separate 20 labs. Both labs indicate a positive for 21 marijuana. 2.2 Why do you believe that those 23 results are incorrect? 24 MR. DREW: Because -- first of all, 25 the main reason -- like I told these two

1	gentlemen my representatives I did
2	not smoke anything. If I had smoked
3	something, I would've probably signed
4	the waiver.
5	MR. MAGGIORE: Okay.
6	MR. DREW: I wouldn't put my family
7	through this. It's going on a year that
8	we haven't gotten paid I haven't
9	gotten paid.
10	So, therefore, once I contacted my
11	doctors and I told them what the
12	situation was and I asked them I
13	said, "Can any of the medication cause a
14	false positive", and my doctor said,
15	"Yes", and then he told me that
16	ibuprofen that's when I started doing
17	my homework on it and that's when I
18	brought it up to Dr. Mujtaba.
19	After that I also know from working
20	38 years in aviation the technical
21	field that I do I know nothing is 100
22	percent. I know those tests, regardless
23	of what's the gold standard, isn't
24	100 percent.
25	With that being said, I must be that

195

1 one percent or that .1 percent. 2 MR. MAGGIORE: Okay. I have no more 3 questions for Mr. Drew. Mr. Sanchez, would you like to 4 question Mr. Drew? 5 6 MR. SANCHEZ: Sure. 7 I don't if you answered this question, but how long have you been an 8 employee of the Long Island Rail Road? 9 10 MR. DREW: This will be my 25th 11 year. 12 MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. And when did 13 you start? MR. DREW: On the Rail Road? 14 15 MR. SANCHEZ: Mm-hmm. 16 MR. DREW: April '99. MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. Carrier's 17 18 representative asked you if you had 19 definitive proof that your positive 20 finding was caused by ibuprofen and you said no. 21 Has the Carrier produced any 2.2 23 definitive proof that it wasn't caused 24 by ibuprofen? 25 MR. DREW: No.

196

1	MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. When was the
2	last time you took a toxicological test?
3	MR. DREW: June 7th.
4	MR. SANCHEZ: And that was your
5	return-to-work physical?
6	MR. DREW: Yes.
7	MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. And prior to
8	that June 7th return-to-work physical
9	toxicological test, do you recall the
10	last time you took a test before then
11	a toxicological test?
12	MR. DREW: Right has to be when I
13	was hired.
14	MR. SANCHEZ: So, roughly, 25
15	MR. DREW: 25 years.
16	MR. SANCHEZ: 24, 25 years.
17	So, for 25 years, while you were
18	working as an electrician a
19	safety-sensitive electrician on the Rail
20	Road, you didn't take a drug test?
21	MR. DREW: No.
22	MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. I want you to
23	explain in your own words exactly what
24	happened and how you got here today.
25	MR. DREW: Well, over the last few

1 years -- you know, I usually go take my PSA test. A few years back -- I've 2 known for a little while my PSA result 3 4 started rising. My doctor told me, "You 5 need to go check -- see a urologist, you know, to make sure". 6 7 So, up on that, the test -- my PSA results kept getting higher and then it 8 9 got to a certain point where I had to do 10 something because usually, I said, "I do 11 the holistic way". I really don't care 12 too much for the medication and the side effects from the medication. 13 14 So, then, you know, you start 15 thinking about your family. My doctor started saying, "You have to think about 16 17 your kids. You have kids, a wife. You 18 need to do something". So, I said, 19 "Okay. I'll go and have them check it 20 out, see if it's cancerous". 21 So, I had the biopsy done and they 2.2 said it was an aggressive form, but 23 since -- cause of my age and my health, 24 they said that, you know, if I go and 25 take the chemo treatment for

LH REPORTING SERVICES, INC. 718-526-7100

198

1 two years -- so I was on chemo for 2 two years, hormonal treatment for two 3 years. 4 MR. SANCHEZ: So -- I'm sorry. So, 5 you were on -- you were on chemo and 6 hormonal treatment? 7 MR. DREW: For two years. MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. 8 9 MR. DREW: And last year when I went 10 out -- when I finally decided to go out -- was four months of radiation --11 12 MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. 13 MR. DREW: -- for the two months --14 two months of straight radiation -- nine 15 weeks. 16 MR. SANCHEZ: So, when you went out, 17 you were out for over 30 days? 18 MR. DREW: Yes. 19 MR. SANCHEZ: And that's what 20 triggered --21 MR. DREW: Yes, which I wasn't 2.2 anticipating on doing because I know the 23 history of the Rail Road and other co-workers who said, "Look out for 24 25 Medical because they usually give you a

1 hard time to get back to work". 2 MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. 3 MR. DREW: But due to the radiation, 4 it really --5 MR. SANCHEZ: So, let me ask you, 6 when you went out, were you aware that 7 when you came back you would be subject to a drug and alcohol test? 8 MR. DREW: Of course. 9 10 MR. SANCHEZ: And were you subject 11 to an alcohol test? 12 MR. DREW: No. 13 MR. SANCHEZ: Just a drug test? 14 MR. DREW: I found that out through 15 this whole process with the trial. 16 MR. SANCHEZ: So, but -- and that 17 particular day, you took a urinalysis 18 test, no alcohol? 19 MR. DREW: It was just a urinalysis. 20 MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. And how long 21 have you been held out of service? 2.2 MR. DREW: Almost coming up on a 23 year -- since June 13th. 24 MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. And when you 25 got a phone call on the 13th, I believe,

LH REPORTING SERVICES, INC. 718-526-7100

200

1	to say that your results had tested
2	positive for marijuana metabolites, you
3	testified that you called you spoke
4	with the Carrier's MRO?
5	MR. DREW: Yes.
6	MR. SANCHEZ: And you gave them a
7	possible scenario of how that could
8	happen since you
9	MR. DREW: How it would have to
10	yes.
11	MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. And you
12	submitted these two documents, which is
13	Union 2-B 2-A and 2-B, right?
14	MR. DREW: Yes.
15	MR. SANCHEZ: And these are two
16	treating physicians that you saw?
17	MR. DREW: Yes.
18	MR. SANCHEZ: And did your
19	physicians when they provided this
20	letter to you, did you tell them why you
21	needed it?
22	MR. DREW: Yes.
23	MR. SANCHEZ: And these are two
24	MR. DREW: Radiologist and
25	hematologist.

201

1 MR. SANCHEZ: Yes, there's an 2 oncologist at Langone -- they both work 3 for New York Health Langone and that location is in Mineola. 4 MR. DREW: Right around the corner 5 from the --6 7 MR. SANCHEZ: From Medical. MR. DREW: -- Medical. 8 9 MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. So, it's right 10 there. So -- and these are two different 11 12 doctors --MR. DREW: Yes --13 MR. SANCHEZ: -- correct? 14 MR. DREW: -- yes. 15 16 MR. SANCHEZ: And both doctors, when 17 you asked them to provide a possible 18 explanation as to why you tested 19 positive marijuana metabolites, this is 20 the document they gave you? 21 MR. DREW: Yes. 22 MR. SANCHEZ: And Mr. Mujtaba, the 23 MRO, did he contact any of these 24 doctors? 25 MR. DREW: Every time I go back for

1 check-ups and I ask them, has anybody 2 from the Rail Road contacted them, they 3 say, no. 4 MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. So, the Carrier's MRO, who doesn't work for 5 6 Langone -- he works for the Long Island 7 Rail Road Medical -- decided that he didn't have to corroborate these two 8 documents from your doctor --9 10 MR. DREW: Yes. 11 MR. SANCHEZ: -- and took it upon 12 himself to make the determination; is 13 that correct? MR. DREW: Yes. 14 15 MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. Did you 16 willingly submit to the drug and alcohol 17 test? 18 MR. DREW: The return-to-duty? 19 MR. SANCHEZ: Mm-hmm. MR. DREW: Yes. 20 21 MR. SANCHEZ: Why? 2.2 MR. DREW: Because as far as I knew, 23 that's just -- that's procedure. 24 MR. SANCHEZ: So -- okay. So, it's 25 procedure -- so, was it your

1 understanding that you didn't have a 2 choice? 3 MR. DREW: I mean, I guess you could 4 say yes. 5 MR. SANCHEZ: Yeah -- so, it's your -- so, when they say -- and I just want 6 7 to be clear when I ask you if you willingly consented -- you consented to 8 9 the return-to-work physical because if 10 you didn't consent, you would be taken 11 out of service; is that correct? 12 MR. DREW: I still would be out of 13 work. 14 MR. SANCHEZ: You'd be out of 15 service. 16 So, you consented --MR. DREW: And I rushed to come back 17 18 to work because after a while, 19 financially, you need the money to take care of your family. 20 21 MR. SANCHEZ: Sure. Okay. So, you consented because the alternative was to 2.2 23 be held out of service? 24 MR. DREW: (Nodding.) 25 MR. SANCHEZ: Okay.

1 MR. DREW: Yes. 2 MR. SANCHEZ: Okay. I have no 3 further questions. 4 MR. MAGGIORE: Okay. So, since there are no additional witnesses or 5 6 documentation to enter into the record, 7 we're going to move to closing statements. 8 9 Do you need a break first or --10 MR. SANCHEZ: Can we -- yeah, I'm 11 going to need a -- actually, we're going 12 to reserve our closing statements --13 we're going to do it in writing cause 14 there's so much. That's how we do ours. 15 MR. MAGGIORE: Are you going to 16 submit a --17 MR. SANCHEZ: Yeah, we're going to 18 submit it because there's so much. 19 You know, unfortunately we have --20 THE STENOGRAPHER: On the record, all of this? 21 MR. MAGGIORE: Hold on one second. 2.2 23 The time is 3:05 p.m. We're going 24 to take a brief recess. 25 (Whereupon, a brief recess was

205

1 taken.) 2 MR. MAGGIORE: Okay. The time is 3 3:07 p.m. We're back on the record. 4 The Union has requested to submit its closing statement in writing. 5 Ι just would like to note for the record 6 7 that -- while closing statements are not considered testimony, they will be 8 entered into the record as part of the 9 10 trial transcript. The assessing officer 11 will take them into consideration. 12 I will keep the record open until next Friday, May 5th. The Union has 13 14 until May 5th to submit its closing 15 statement in writing at that point. 16 Before we end today, Mr. Drew, I 17 just have a couple of questions for you. 18 Were you allowed to answer all 19 questions in your own words? MR. DREW: Yes. 20 21 MR. MAGGIORE: Were you allowed to 2.2 question witnesses? MR. DREW: Yes. 23 24 MR. MAGGIORE: Were you allowed to examine evidence? 25

1 MR. DREW: Yes. 2 MR. MAGGIORE: Were you allowed to 3 submit evidence in your defense? MR. DREW: Yes. 4 MR. MAGGIORE: Were you permitted to 5 6 have witnesses testify in your defense? 7 MR. DREW: Yes. MR. MAGGIORE: Were you allowed to 8 9 make statements on your own behalf or 10 have your representative do so for you? 11 MR. DREW: Yes. 12 MR. MAGGIORE: Okay. In that case, 13 I'm going to close today's hearing. 14 As I previously stated, the record 15 will be kept open till next Friday for 16 the Union to submit a written closing. The time is 3:09 p.m. and we are off 17 18 the record. 19 (Time noted: 3:09 p.m.) 20 21 22 23 24 25

				20
1		EXHIBITS		
2	CARRI	ER DESCRIPTION	PAGE	
3	21	Trial Continuation Notice	5	
4	21	-A Certified Mail	6	
5		Tracking History		
6				
7	ORGAN	IZATION DESCRIPTION	PAGE	
8				
9	7	Notice of Trial & Out of Service Letter for Ronald Dolginko	31	
10	8	Rule 53[Discipline] - IBEW Rulebook	x 36	
11	9	Notice of Trial for R. Dombek	50	
12	10	Notice of Trial for E. Reszka	53	
13	11	Notice of Trial for P. Pena	59	
14	12	May 23, 2022 email from Patrick Warren	65	
15	13	Notice of Trial for J. Birnbaum	83	
16	14	Waiver of Trial Letters	123	
17	15	March 7, 2023 email and Red Alert	133	
18		Memo		
19	16	NYS DOL Cannabis Use Guidelines	142	
20	17	US DOT Guide "What Employees Need Need to Know about DOT Drug &	146	
21		Alcohol Testing"		
22	18	NHTSA Marijuana-Impaired Driving - A Report to Congress	152	
23		II REPORT TO CONSTERD		
24	19	Email from Cathy Rinaldi	177	
25				

208

1	
2	CERTIFICATION
3	
4	I, JULIA M. SPEROS, a Notary Public
5	for and within the State of New York, do
6	hereby certify:
7	That the witness whose testimony as
8	herein set forth, was duly sworn by me;
9	and that the within transcript is a true
10	record of the testimony given by said
11	witness.
12	I further certify that I am not
13	related to any of the parties to this
14	action by blood or marriage, and that I
15	am in no way interested in the outcome
16	of this matter.
17	IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto
18	set my hand this 27th day of April,
19	2023.
20	
21	
22	Julia M. Sperco
23	
24	
25	