## [J-133-2002] IN THE SUPREME COURT OF PENNSYLVANIA WESTERN DISTRICT

GREENE COUNTY AND GREENE COUNTY CHILDREN AND YOUTH SERVICES,	<ul> <li>No. 31 WAP 2002</li> <li>Appeal from the Order of the</li> <li>Commonwealth Court entered June 13,</li> </ul>
Appellants	<ul> <li>2001 at No. 3432 CD 1998 reversing the</li> <li>Order of the Court of Common Pleas of</li> <li>Greene County entered November 18,</li> </ul>
V.	: 1998 at No. AD 245 of 1998.
DISTRICT 2, UNITED MINE WORKERS OF AMERICA AND LOCAL UNION 9999,	
UNITED MINE WORKERS OF AMERICA,	: ARGUED: September 11, 2002
Appellees	:

## **CONCURRING OPINION**

## **MR. JUSTICE NIGRO**

## **DECIDED: JUNE 23, 2004**

I agree with the majority's application of the essence test here and write separately merely to emphasize that in my view, this Court's decision in <u>City of Easton v. American</u> <u>Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees</u>, 756 A.2d 1107 (Pa. 2000), did not wholly supplant the application of the essence test in cases in which a core function of a public employer has been implicated. Rather, as this court unanimously stated in <u>Office of the Attorney General v. Council 13</u>, <u>American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees</u>, AFL-CIO, our decision in <u>City of Easton</u> "reaffirmed the deferential essence test," and simply "noted that this usual deference is <u>tempered</u> in a situation in which the arbitrator's interpretation of the agreement led to the governmental employer relinquishing essential control over the public enterprise . . . . " 844 A.2d 1217, 1225 (Pa. 2004)

(emphasis added); <u>see also</u> Maj. Op. at 13-14 (stating that "the usual degree of deference to be accorded to an arbitrator's award is <u>moderated</u>" in such situations) (emphasis added). Thus, like the majority here, I believe that the essence test remains applicable in cases such as this one, albeit in a slightly modified form.