

# HOUSE BILL REPORT

## HB 1362

---

*As Passed House  
March 19, 1991*

**Title:** An act relating to public employees' collective bargaining.

**Brief Description:** Extending collective bargaining laws to uniformed personnel of all cities, towns, and counties.

**Sponsor(s):** Representatives Heavey, Vance, Prentice, Winsley, R. King, Wood, Van Luven, Beck, Dorn, Forner, Riley and Nelson.

**Brief History:**

Reported by House Committee on:  
Commerce & Labor, February 26, 1991, DP;  
Passed House, March 19, 1991, 97-0.

---

**HOUSE COMMITTEE ON  
COMMERCE & LABOR**

**Majority Report:** *Do pass.* Signed by 9 members:  
Representatives Heavey, Chair; Cole, Vice Chair; Lisk,  
Assistant Ranking Minority Member; Franklin; Jones; R. King;  
O'Brien; Prentice; and Vance.

**Minority Report:** *Do not pass.* Signed by 1 member:  
Representative Fuhrman, Ranking Minority Member.

**Staff:** Chris Cordes (786-7117).

**Background:** Law enforcement officers employed by cities and counties bargain their wages and working conditions under the Public Employees' Collective Bargaining Act. The act authorizes the use of binding interest arbitration as a final step in resolving contract disputes between the officers and employers in the larger cities and counties. The binding arbitration provisions do not apply in cities with a population of less than 15,000 or in counties smaller than the second class, less than 70,000 population.

**Summary of Bill:** The binding interest arbitration provisions of the Public Employees' Collective Bargaining Act are extended to the law enforcement officers of all cities, towns, and counties.

**Fiscal Note:** Available.

**Effective Date:** Ninety days after adjournment of session in which bill is passed.

**Testimony For:** The binding arbitration provisions for uniformed personnel already apply to fire fighters in all jurisdictions. There is no reason why some police officers should not be covered. Binding arbitration is only used as a last resort when other dispute resolution methods have not worked.

**Testimony Against:** When binding arbitration is the last step in bargaining procedures, it tends to "chill" the negotiations and the parties tend to focus on making a case for arbitration. There will be a significant fiscal impact on the smaller cities and counties. These jurisdictions have no extra resources to budget for the costs of arbitration.

**Witnesses:** Mike Patrick, Washington State Council of Police Officers (in favor); Gary Lowe, Washington Association of Counties (opposed); and Kathleen Collins, Association of Washington Cities (opposed).