



Senate Fiscal Agency  
P. O. Box 30036  
Lansing, Michigan 48909-7536

## BILL ANALYSIS



Telephone: (517) 373-5383  
Fax: (517) 373-1986

Senate Bill 280 (Substitute S-1 as reported)  
Sponsor: Senator Marty Knollenberg  
Committee: Commerce

**CONTENT**

The bill would amend the public employment relations Act to prohibit a public employer or an officer or agent of a public employer, on or after the bill's effective date, from entering into or renewing a bargaining agreement that required or allowed paid release time for a union officer or bargaining representative to conduct union business if the release time were paid by the public employer. The bill would not apply to a bargaining agreement for employees subject to compulsory arbitration under Public Act 312 of 1969, or for corrections officers employed by a county sheriff in a county jail, work camp, or other facility maintained by a county that houses adult prisoners.

(Public Act 312 of 1969 provides for compulsory arbitration of labor disputes in municipal police and fire departments, establishes the procedures for arbitration, and provides for the enforcement and review of arbitration awards.)

The bill would take effect 90 days after its enactment.

MCL 423.210

Legislative Analyst: Jeff Mann

**FISCAL IMPACT**

The bill would have an indeterminate fiscal impact on the State and local units of government. Under the bill, employer-paid leave or release time for union officers would no longer be allowable as part of a collective bargaining agreement (CBA) between a union and a public employer. A total of 67 school districts in Michigan have these types of provisions in the collective bargaining agreements with their respective labor unions, and the cost associated totals about \$2.7 million per year. If these provisions were simply eliminated outright from future CBAs, school districts would see total cost savings of \$2.7 million on those contracts relative to otherwise identical contracts that contained the provisions in question. On the other hand, if other concessions were negotiated in lieu of union leave time provisions, the potential savings could be reduced or new costs could be created if the alternative concessions were more expensive than the union leave time provisions would have been.

Date Completed: 11-6-15

Fiscal Analyst: Josh Sefton