



**MICHIGAN  
ASSOCIATION  
OF COUNTIES**

935 North Washington Avenue  
Lansing, Michigan 48906  
517.372.5374 Fax 517.482.4599  
www.micounties.org

**Timothy K. McGuire**, Executive Director

June 16, 2010

Michigan House of Representatives  
PO Box 30014  
Lansing, MI 48909

Dear Representative:

In House Labor Committee, and potentially on the floor today, the House is scheduled to deliberate on HB 6154 and SB 1072 which would expand the use of binding arbitration in Michigan. You may recall that P.A. 312, as is it is commonly called, guarantees binding arbitration for police and fire department employees. SB 1072 was supposed to help counties, cities and townships by reforming Public Act 312 of 1969. However, it *actually is a step backwards which will add more cost to Michigan's residents*. HB 6154 would add county corrections officers as an additional group being guaranteed binding arbitration under a new act and *would greatly add more cost to Michigan's counties and residents*.

As it stands, the Michigan Association of Counties (MAC) opposes both bills.

**HB 6154** guarantees binding arbitration to county (but not state) corrections officers. It is obvious the state does not want to include state corrections officers in this legislation, as it could greatly increase the state's liability for employee benefits. Unfortunately, binding arbitration is being forced on the counties in this bill.

**SB 1072** actually opens up the 312 bargaining process to include authorities under the guise of reform, granting the possibility for non-peace officer 911 dispatchers to become eligible. Additionally, the bill has Headlee implications which would remove the state's obligation to pay for arbitration, therefore the costs would be pushed down to counties.

Not only do these bills simply add cost to constituents but they do not include critical reforms, such as adding more weight to a county's ability to pay and reviewing internal comparable salaries and benefits instead of looking at other regions. With these two factors taken together, both pieces of legislation are damaging to the long term fiscal health of counties. Reductions in revenue sharing and increased unfunded mandates only compound this problem.

MAC will be seeking an amendment clarifying the provision in SB 1072 to not expand binding arbitration to new groups. If this amendment is not added, MAC will urge the defeat of this legislation entirely. MAC continues to oppose HB 6154. Counties cannot afford the additional expenses of the mandated process or the unsustainable settlements that binding arbitration brings at this time. MAC asks that you please consider our recommendations and the burden these bills would place on counties as well as your constituents.

If you have any questions regarding this matter, please feel free to contact me.

Sincerely,

Tom Hickson  
Director of Legislative Affairs