P.E.R.C. NO. 2012-15

STATE OF NEW JERSEY
BEFORE THE PUBLIC EMPLOYMENT RELATIONS COMMISSION

In the Matter of

MERCER COUNTY PROSECUTOR,

Appellant,

-and-

Docket No. IA-2010-069
IA-2010-070

PROSECUTOR'S DETECTIVES AND INVESTIGATORS PBA LOCAL 339 and PROSECUTOR'S SUPERIOR OFFICERS ASSOCIATION,

Respondent.

SYNOPSIS

The Public Employment Relations Commission affirms an interest arbitration award establishing the terms and conditions of employment for successor agreements between the County of Mercer and the Prosecutor's Detectives and Investigators PBA Local 339 and the Prosecutor's Superior Officers Association. The employer appealed the award arguing that the arbitrator did not properly consider or give due weight to the interest and welfare of the public in deciding the wage award; did not adequately explain where the County is going to find the money to fund the increases; did not properly consider or give due weight to the financial impact factor; did not properly consider or give due weight to the lawful authority factor; and did not consider or give due weight to the statutory restrictions factor. The Commission affirms the award noting that it defers to the arbitrator's judgment in his application of the statutory factors and his confidence that the award will not present a cap limitation issue for the employer.

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

P.E.R.C. NO. 2012-16

STATE OF NEW JERSEY
BEFORE THE PUBLIC EMPLOYMENT RELATIONS COMMISSION

In the Matter of

BOROUGH OF NORTH ARLINGTON,

Appellant,

-and- Docket No. IA-2011-050

POLICE BENEVOLENT ASSOCIATION
LOCAL 95,

Respondent.

SYNOPSIS

The Public Employment Relations Commission affirms an interest arbitration award. The Commission had remanded the initial award, P.E.R.C. No. 2012-1, finding that it appeared the arbitrator relied on an inaccurate exhibit to support his wage increase. The Borough of North Arlington appealed the award on remand arguing that the arbitrator continued to rely on the inaccurate document. The Commission affirms finding that the arbitrator satisfactorily explained the basis for his award that did not include the alleged inaccurate document.