



REPUBLICAN CAUCUS STAFF
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
STATE CAPITOL
DES MOINES, IOWA 50319
515.281.3440
IOWAHOUSEREPUBLICANS.COM

Talking Points for the Collective Bargaining Reform Bill

- A review and reform of Chapter 20 and collective bargaining is long overdue.
- HSB 117 reforms parts of collective bargaining, it does not eliminate it.
- This bill is not the same as Wisconsin's bill. Iowa House Republicans are leaving collective bargaining intact. Wisconsin is removing the right to collectively bargain on everything except for wages.
- The list that can still be bargained for in Iowa includes: wages, hours, vacations, holidays, leaves of absence, shift differentials, overtime compensation, supplemental pay, seniority, transfer procedures, job classifications, health and safety matters, evaluation procedure, in-service training, and other matters mutually agreed upon.
- Chapter 20 and collective bargaining are tilted too far in favor of labor and against the taxpayer.
- Over the last few years, Democrats have tried to further tilt the field by pushing legislation mandating 'Fair Share' and 'Open Scope Bargaining'.
- Chapter 20 is not immune to a thoughtful review. HSB 117 forces that review.
- HSB 117 looks at a number of ideas that have been brought by House Republicans and the Governor's office. These possible changes include:
 - Creating the possibility of a 'free agent employee'. This would be an individual who decides that he/she does not want to be represented by a union and would like to bargain his/her contract individually. Currently, state law provides that a union must cover and represent **ALL** employees in a bargaining unit, even if that individual is not a union member. Democrats attempted to force this very type of individual to pay a 'fair share fee' a few years ago, and we are providing an opportunity for those who do not wish to be represented by a union, to go it alone and waive rights to any representation by the union.
 - Allowing an arbitrator to choose between two impasse points, not just an either/or scenario. One of the biggest fears of management, and

the reason to avoid arbitration is the real perception that, given what an arbitrator is currently allowed to consider, management is likely to lose. Management is only likely to go to binding arbitration if it knows its case is rock solid. Giving the arbitrator power to consider points in between the two parties would allow for a more level playing field at the arbitration level of contract negotiations.

- Changing the scope of negotiations to exclude insurance and procedures for staff reductions from collective bargaining.
 - Insurance - This would allow the state to make all decisions concerning the insurance it provides and the portion for which the state pays. Iowa is one of few states that provides free insurance to its employees. 84% of state employees pay **no** premiums for their health insurance. The taxpayer is forced to pay for what most people in the private sector pay for themselves. The state should be allowed to provide an insurance plan that strikes a balance between fair coverage and taxpayer cost.
 - Procedures for Staff Reductions – This would give the ability for management to make the best decision without having to cater to things like seniority. The most senior employee is not necessarily the one that management should be forced to keep in a staff reduction.

- Changing what an arbitrator is allowed to consider during binding arbitration.
 - Comparison of public wages and benefits to those of the private sector. Currently, an arbitrator compares wages to other public sector employees. Those public sector employees are often represented by the same unions and thus the comparison amounts to comparing a union to itself. By including a comparison to private wages and benefits, an arbitrator could look at the entire spectrum of facts and maintain parity between the public and private sectors.
 - Removing the directive of the arbitrator to consider 'past collective bargaining contracts between the parties...' Using this comparison forces the status quo and does not allow for management to adequately and efficiently respond to changes that might occur given special times and circumstances.