

TESTIMONY BY KALBERT K. YOUNG  
DIRECTOR, DEPARTMENT OF BUDGET AND FINANCE  
STATE OF HAWAII  
TO THE SENATE COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS  
ON  
HOUSE BILL NO. 1977, H.D. 2, S.D. 1

March 28, 2014

RELATING TO COLLECTIVE BARGAINING

This measure amends Section 89-11, HRS, to limit final positions for arbitration to specific proposals that were previously submitted in writing up to the time of the impasse unless there is written mutual agreement by the parties.

The Department of Budget and Finance opposes this measure. The Hawaii Labor Relations Board (HLRB) recently ruled in favor of the employer in Case CE-06-831 in which the Hawaii Government Employees Association (HGEA) sought to prohibit certain proposals in the employer's final position which were different from proposals that were previously submitted before impasse. This bill would amend Chapter 89 to be even more restrictive than the rulings that HGEA sought to implement through HLRB.

In their decision, HLRB cited the legislative history of Section 89-11 to allow arbitration panels "greater latitude: in fashioning a final and binding decision that it deems appropriate, and not be limited to selecting one or the other of the final offers of the parties. Furthermore, the arbitration panel has the authority and duty to "reach a decision . . . on all provisions that each party proposed in its respective final position for inclusion in the final agreement." This bill would restrict the flexibility of the arbitration process to deliberate what an arbitration panel would consider reasonable compromises to either party's position.

We believe arbitration panels should be permitted to consider final positions which take into account the most recent circumstances of the parties. Under Section 89-11 a party could declare impasse as early as September at which time, the Executive Budget is still being formulated and it is more than nine months until the contract period begins. Additionally, arbitration hearings have not been held in recent times until well after the expiration of the contracts. During this time between possible impasse dates, or even the statutory impasse date of February 1, and the arbitration hearings, the State has seen significant shifts in its fiscal position due to revisions in Council on Revenues revenue estimates and other budgetary issues that come to fore during the legislative session.

We believe giving the parties' flexibility in determining their final positions allows arbitrators to best consider the timeliest recommendations of the parties and provides an incentive for the parties to continue to negotiate to avoid arbitration. This measure would offer negative consequences for both parties and severely limit flexibility of authority of arbitration panels to render decisions that more closely compromise either position.

NEIL ABERCROMBIE  
GOVERNOR



NEIL DIETZ  
CHIEF NEGOTIATOR

STATE OF HAWAII  
OFFICE OF COLLECTIVE BARGAINING  
EXECUTIVE OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR  
235 S. BERETANIA STREET, SUITE 1201  
HONOLULU, HAWAII 96813-2437

March 27, 2014

To: Sen. David Ige, Chair  
Committee on Ways and Means

From: Neil Dietz, Chief Negotiator

RE: HB 1977 HD2 SD1

The Office of Collective Bargaining respectfully enters this testimony in opposition to House Bill 1977 HD2 SD1 as proposed. The obvious result of this bill will be to require the parties, especially the employer, to draft initial contract proposals not with a goal of negotiations, but with the goal of arbitration. This will be a disincentive for good faith negotiations and an incentive to move into arbitration. ***Any incentive to move into arbitration is an incentive to increase collective bargaining costs to the detriment of the taxpayers of the State of Hawaii.***

The three sentences HB1977 HD2 SD1 proposes as an addition to Chapter 89 would fundamentally change the process of collective bargaining to the detriment of the Legislature's purpose in establishing public sector collective bargaining. Chapter 89-1, states that "The legislature finds that joint decision-making is the modern way of administering government." Adding the proposed language of HB1977 to Chapter 89 harms this worthy intent of the legislature.

To illustrate this harm, please remember the process of public sector collective bargaining. Hawaii's public sector collective bargaining agreements routinely require parties to exchange initial proposals for negotiations one year prior to the expiration of a collective bargaining agreement. Typically this would occur in May-June of an even numbered year. Ideally, negotiations would then commence. However, if no agreement is reached between labor and management, the Hawaii Labor Relations Board is required to declare that an impasse exists no later than February 1 of an odd-numbered year. Please note that this declaration of impasse is statutorily required and has no bearing on whether or not the parties actually are at impasse or whether or not the parties have even met to negotiate. At the time

the “statutory” impasse is declared, the process culminating in arbitration begins. The arbitration would begin approximately a year after initial proposals were exchanged between the parties.

When approaching arbitration, each party currently must consider and weigh what they want an arbitrator to consider. And for each party, there may be “risk” in taking a specific position to arbitration. It is this “risk” that creates pressure during negotiations leading to compromise, and optimally, resolution by agreement. HB1977 HD2 SD1 negates that “risk” factor. There may be no need to negotiate and compromise. Either or both parties can look at initial proposals and say “This is the worst that can happen. We can do better in arbitration.”

And when that happens, there is no “joint decision-making” as expressed by the legislature in Chapter 89-1. What is left is decision making by an arbitrator with no accountability to the citizens of the State of Hawaii or the union members of a collective bargaining unit. Instead of fostering good faith negotiations, HB1977 HD2 SD1 discourages negotiation and compromise.

In addition, as the Hawaii Labor Relations Board noted in its January 17, 2014 ruling in Case Number CE-06-831: “...interest arbitration is not, itself, negotiations, but rather a process that occurs after the parties fail to negotiate a contract.” To tie the parties to *negotiation proposals* as *arbitration positions* ignores the differences between the separate and distinct processes.

And finally, arbitrators and arbitration panels currently have wide discretion in considering positions submitted by the parties and the decisions rendered regarding those positions.


Therefore, the Office of Collective Bargaining respectfully opposes HB1977 HD2 SD1 and requests your Committee to not pass HB1977 HD2 SD1.

DEPARTMENT OF HUMAN RESOURCES  
CITY AND COUNTY OF HONOLULU

650 SOUTH KING STREET 10<sup>TH</sup> FLOOR • HONOLULU, HAWAII 96813  
TELEPHONE: (808) 768-8500 • FAX: (808) 768-5563 • INTERNET: www.honolulu.gov/hr



KIRK CALDWELL  
MAYOR



CAROLEE C. KUBO  
DIRECTOR  
NOEL T. ONO  
ASSISTANT DIRECTOR

March 28, 2014

The Honorable David Y. Ige, Chair  
and Members of the  
Committee on Ways and Means  
State Senate  
State Capitol, Room 211  
415 South Beretania Street  
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813

Dear Chair Ige and Members of the Committee:

SUBJECT: House Bill No. 1977, HD2, SD1  
Relating to Collective Bargaining


The Department of Human Resources, City & County of Honolulu, opposes H.B. 1977, HD2, SD1, which seeks to restrict the final position in a collective bargaining arbitration to include only proposals that were submitted before impasse. Since impasse occurs early in the collective bargaining process, as early as 90 days after written notice to initiate negotiations, the passage of this bill will create a rigid system which may preclude necessary changes to a party's contract proposals caused by unforeseen factors, such as a drastic change in our economy. Many times, the parties have not begun to meet at the negotiations table when impasse is declared. Moreover, the parties may proceed to arbitration years after impasse is declared.

Based on the foregoing reasons, the City & County of Honolulu again respectfully opposes H.B. 1977, HD2, SD1, and respectfully request that the matter be deferred.

We thank you for giving us the opportunity to testify on this matter.

Sincerely,

Carolee C. Kubo  
Director



THE HAWAII STATE SENATE  
The Twenty-Seventh Legislature  
Regular Session of 2014

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS  
The Honorable Sen. David Y. Ige Chair  
The Honorable Sen. Michelle N. Kidani, Vice Chair

DATE OF HEARING: Friday, March 28, 2014  
TIME OF HEARING: 9:25 AM  
PLACE OF HEARING: Conference Room 211

**TESTIMONY ON HB1977 HD2 SD1 RELATING TO COLLECTIVE  
BARGAINING**

By DAYTON M. NAKANELUA,  
State Director of the United Public Workers, AFSCME Local 646, AFL-CIO

My name is Dayton M. Nakanelua and I am the State Director of the United Public Workers, AFSCME, Local 646, AFL-CIO (UPW). The UPW is the exclusive representative for approximately 14,000 public employees, which include blue collar, non-supervisory employees in Bargaining Unit 01 and institutional, health and correctional employees in Bargaining Unit 10, in the State of Hawaii and various counties. The UPW also represents about 1,500 members of the private sector.

The UPW supports HB1977 HD2 SD1, which requires any further provisions each party is proposing for inclusion in the final position in a collective bargaining arbitration to be limited to those specific proposals that were submitted in writing to the other party and were the subject of collective bargaining up to the time of impasse. Provides the arbitration panel with authority to determine if final positions submitted are compliant with statutory requirements.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify on this measure.



888 Mililani Street, Suite 601  
Honolulu, Hawaii 96813-2991

Telephone: 808.543.0000  
Facsimile: 808.528.4059

[www.hgea.org](http://www.hgea.org)

The Twenty-Seventh Legislature, State of Hawaii  
The Senate  
Committee on Ways and Means

Testimony by  
Hawaii Government Employees Association

March 27, 2014

H.B. 1977, H.D. 2, S.D. 1 – RELATING TO  
COLLECTIVE BARGAINING

The Hawaii Government Employees Association, AFSCME Local 152, AFL-CIO strongly supports the purpose and intent of H.B. 1977, H.D. 2, S.D. 1, which amends a provision of the final positions in a collective bargaining arbitration. We respectfully request and urge the Committee to pass this current version, as written in the S.D. 1, which is compromise language to the original measure.

As currently written, Ch. 89-11(e), Hawaii Revised Statutes, regarding the Employer and the Exclusive Representative's final positions in an arbitration proceeding, is vague and unclear. The purpose of H.B. 1977, H.D. 2, S.D. 1 and the intent behind the current version of the bill is to clarify that the final positions submitted by both the Employer and the Exclusive Representative shall include only proposals that were previously exchanged in writing. This amendment creates a cost-effective dispute resolution mechanism to determine whether final positions can be included in the final agreement by determination of the arbitration panel, versus awaiting a decision from a potentially lengthy Hawaii Labor Relations hearing. Adoption of this proposed amendment to Ch. 89, HRS is a cost containment measure since arbitration hearings will not be unduly and unexpectedly lengthened, mutually beneficial to both the Employer and the Exclusive Representative and ensures collective bargaining is conducted in good faith.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify in support of H.B. 1977, H.D. 2, S.D. 1.

Respectfully submitted,

Wilbert Holck  
Deputy Executive Director