

68 FLRA No. 51

AMERICAN FEDERATION
OF GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES
LOCAL 1917
(Union)

and

DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY
U.S. CITIZENSHIP
AND IMMIGRATION SERVICES
NEW YORK DISTRICT
(Agency)

0-AR-5073

—
DECISION

February 20, 2015

—
Before the Authority: Carol Waller Pope, Chairman, and
Ernest DuBester and Patrick Pizzella, Members

This matter is before the Authority on exceptions to an award of Arbitrator Diane Dunham Massey filed by the Union under § 7122(a) of the Federal Service Labor-Management Relations Statute¹ and part 2425 of the Authority's Regulations.²

We have determined that this case is appropriate for issuance as an expedited, abbreviated decision under § 2425.7 of the Authority's Regulations.³

The Union argues that the award is incomplete, ambiguous, or contradictory as to make implementation of the award impossible, but does not support that argument. Therefore, we deny that exception under § 2425.6(e)(1) of the Authority's Regulations.⁴

As for the Union's remaining exceptions, upon careful consideration of the entire record in this case and Authority precedent, we conclude that the award is not

deficient on the grounds raised in those exceptions and set forth in § 7122(a).⁵

Accordingly, we deny the Union's exceptions.

¹ 5 U.S.C. § 7122(a).

² 5 C.F.R. pt. 2425.

³ *Id.* § 2425.7 ("Even absent a [party's] request, the Authority may issue expedited, abbreviated decisions in appropriate cases.").

⁴ *Id.* § 2425.6(e)(1); *see also Fraternal Order of Police, Pentagon Police Labor Comm.*, 65 FLRA 781, 784 (2011) (exceptions are subject to denial under § 2425.6(e)(1) of the Authority's Regulations if they fail to support arguments that raise recognized grounds for review).

⁵ *U.S. Dep't of VA, Med. Ctr., N. Chi., Ill.*, 52 FLRA 387, 398 (1996) (award not deficient because of bias on the part of an arbitrator where excepting party fails to demonstrate that the award was procured by improper means, that there was partiality or corruption on the part of the arbitrator, or that the arbitrator engaged in misconduct that prejudiced the rights of the party); *Profl Airways Sys. Specialists, Dist. No. 1, MEBA/NMU (AFL-CIO)*, 48 FLRA 764, 768-69 (1993) (award not deficient as contrary to law, rule, or regulation where excepting party fails to establish that the award is contrary to the law, rule, or regulation on which the party relies); *U.S. Dep't of the Air Force, Lowry Air Force Base, Denver, Colo.*, 48 FLRA 589, 593-94 (1993) (award not deficient as based on a nonfact where expecting party either challenges a factual matter that the parties disputed at arbitration or fails to demonstrate that a central fact underlying the award is clearly erroneous, but for which the arbitrator would have reached a different result); *U.S. DOL (OSHA)*, 34 FLRA 573, 575 (1990) (award not deficient as failing to draw its essence from the parties' collective-bargaining agreement where excepting party fails to establish that the award cannot in any rational way be derived from the agreement; is so unfounded in reason and fact and so unconnected to the wording and purposes of the agreement as to manifest an infidelity to the obligation of the arbitrator; does not represent a plausible interpretation of the agreement; or evidences a manifest disregard of the agreement).