



POLICY AND SERVICES COMMITTEE

Special Meeting
June 28, 2011

Roll Call

Chairperson Price called the meeting to order at 7:49 p.m. in the Council Conference Room, 250 Hamilton Avenue, Palo Alto, California.

Present: Burt, Klein, Holman

Absent: Price

Oral Communications

None

Agenda Items

1. Further Review and Discussion Regarding Possible Charter Amendments to: (1) Repeal Binding Interest Arbitration Provision in City Charter for Public Safety; and (2) Substantially Modify Binding Interest Arbitration Provision in City Charter for Public Safety.

Council Member Klein stated they were meant to have two members that did not agree with the revised Binding Interest Arbitration provision to discuss it, but without Chair Price it may not be workable. He asked the Committee Members' present if they were comfortable working on this without Chair Price, or if they would like to continue the meeting without discussing it, or create two subcommittees to work on drafting and revising the language of the Ordinance.

Council Member Holman wanted to hear public comments and Staff materials. She would not support the creation of subcommittees because they would not be a public process and this should be a public process.

Council Member Klein agreed but stated the end product would be public.

Council Member Holman stated the public would like to observe the discussion.

Council Member Klein stated a two-person subcommittee could meet in public.

Council Member Holman agreed but the formalization of the subcommittee would happen in public. She further stated that regarding participating in revisions she would look to the Chair to lead the dialogue. She was not sure what she would have to offer for that discussion until she heard the proposal.

Council Member Burt stated he wanted the discussion to be public. He stated they could then have the subcommittee in public but it would be convoluted and difficult to schedule. He stated he would defer to Council Members Klein and Chair Price, as they supported it.

Council Member Klein moved to proceed on a normal basis.

Council Member Holman stated at the next meeting Chair Price would be able to comment.

Council Member Klein spoke regarding the options that the City Attorney presented. He stated that he and Chair Price agreed on most of them.

City Attorney, Molly Stump stated the Committee might want to consider when the subsequent meetings would be and how far they would like to get tonight.

Council Member Klein stated that attempts to modify were not meant to indicate personal support of the outcome.

City Manager, James Keene stated these were complicated discussions. He stated it seemed that they would need to go over it again in another meeting, so they might want to consider staying with it.

Council Member Klein stated he did not understand the City Manager's meaning.

Mr. Keene stated they should just see how it goes.

Council Member Klein stated there were so many ways for it to be unfair to ask Ms. Stump to draft all of it because it would take so much time. Once it was drafted people would be able to work on it, but it would no longer be such a time commitment.

Council Member Burt believed there was a need for a third meeting because of Chair Price's absence. He attempted to structure the current meeting as what Council Member Klein would like to see included in the reform measure. He suggested in the next meeting having a debate between Council Member Klein and Chair Price, with Ms. Stump coming back at the third meeting with proposed language.

Council Member Klein stated the amount of items they would be debating over was not very lengthy.

Ms. Stump stated it was her hope to have enough direction tonight to come back at the next meeting with something substantial. She stated she would review the current Arbitration provision and repeal, and then the reforming Interest Arbitration.

Council Member Klein asked if any members of the public would like to address any items not on the agenda.

Council Member Holman suggested letting the public comment ahead of the presentation because they had already been waiting.

Ms. Stump stated it would only take ten minutes to review the existing provision.

Council Member Klein clarified that he intended to call on members of the public after the presentation and before the Committee discussion.

Council Member Holman thought the presentation would be lengthy.

Ms. Stump stated this part would not be lengthy. She went over existing language of the Arbitration provision.

Herb Borock stated he was disappointed that the Mayor or Vice Mayor did not substitute for the missing Committee Member. This item has been on the agenda previously and was defeated in a 5-4 vote. It seemed the vote would be the same this time around. Majority ruled while respecting the rights of the minority. It would be simpler to put something on the ballot and candidates for office can take positions. The existing conditions already took into account the City's financial situation. The parties have an opportunity to change it.

Robert Moss stated they have a quorum this evening and should act tonight. He felt that if the three of them agreed on some or all of the modifications that was good enough to take to the full Council. He provided his recommendations for

modifications.

Ms. Stump spoke regarding the handout that showed the Repeal of Palo Alto Charter, Art. V completely stricken. She noted there should be an effective date associated with the Charter Amendment.

Council Member Klein asked Ms. Stump to speak about the possibility of effective dates.

Ms. Stump stated that under state law the vote tallies official results take a few weeks. If there was no other provision describing the date it was effective on that date. Council may specify which date it would be effective.

Council Member Klein welcomed comments from the Committee regarding those issues, when the Measure should be effective, and what its affect should be on disputes that may be currently in process.

Council Member Burt asked the City Attorney to lay out the alternatives for application of the change for negotiations going through different stages of the process.

Ms. Stump stated the primary issue was for Council to be clear with the various parties so the voters would be able to be clear. Once a dispute resolution mechanism was entered into you were in a place where the process would move forward.

Council Member Burt asked Ms. Stump to clarify the term submittal.

Ms. Stump stated Arbitration provides that impasse can be declared but the process after that may include trial-type submission of evidence, and the matter was turned over to the decision-maker.

Council Member Burt stated that it was after all evidence was presented and when it would be going to the judge in a court case.

Ms. Stump agreed, saying the opportunity to provide more information was closed at that point.

Council Member Klein asked if this could be effective on matters under way but not to the point of the prosecution resting.

Ms. Stump thought the latest possible time for repeal would be then.

Council Member Klein asked if it could be any time before that.

Ms. Stump stated it was something the Council could discuss.

Council Member Klein stated he was trying to provide guidance for drafting the language.

Council Member Burt asked if they wanted to include a process of non-binding mediation, eliminating Binding Arbitration and adding a step defining time lines with a non-binding mediation. It would go in the Charter with the effective date and what stage it would apply to. There would possibly be three different new elements. One might be the effective date, one would be what it would apply to in terms of current negotiations, third would be some element that would happen if Binding Arbitration was repealed to include something like mediation as a defined step. A fourth might be an Ordinance in the Charter timeline.

Ms. Stump stated you could put a mediation requirement into the Charter as part of the Ballot Measure, or it could be as part of an Ordinance. She stated if it was in the Charter they would want to be clear about what it would apply to: all impasses or some they would not want it to be mandatory.

Council Member Burt stated that they could think through what they would want to consider as part of the mediation.

Council Member Holman stated if they were eliminating the Charter then they would have no language to replace this in the Charter. She noted it could be expensive.

Ms. Stump stated that was a reason to have other types of labor relations procedures in Ordinances or procedural documents rather than in the Charter.

Council Member Holman stated the language for the Ballot Measure would be to not replace the language with other Charter language, but through an Ordinance or something different.

Council Member Burt asked if the effective date and applicability could be done through an Ordinance.

Ms. Stump stated she did not think so. Perhaps in a non-codified section of the Charter.

Council Member Holman stated that regarding mediation she would be prone to

include the contract items they have as a part of current Arbitration.

Council Member Burt stated he was not prepared to do that at this time.

Mr. Keene stated the Charter language for the contract provisions was already broad.

Ms. Stump stated Interest Arbitration typically applied to contract negotiations, but this one was characterized as a broad provision. She spoke regarding modification of Interest Arbitration. She presented a list of many options and noted an arbitrator looked at each issue separately in the issue-by-issue option. In the packaged final offer system each party presented a total package on all the issues in dispute. The third option could be used with either format but gave the arbitrator greater latitude to deviate from offers and create some other solution. Number four was a packaged final offer situation, but each party could make two packages.

Council Member Klein was in favor of issue-by-issue.

Ms. Stump spoke regarding mediation and Arbitration. The current status quo provision in Palo Alto was that there was a formal Arbitration type of format. Arbitration looked like a trial. Mediation was optional. Parties may decide to do it before they go into formal Arbitration. If they do they select a different mediator. Two separate processes. A few other options: First to keep formal Arbitration but to require mediation before Arbitration. Second, the combination Mediation / Arbitration format, a flexible format where the arbitrator acted as a mediator.

Mr. Keene asked what type of firewall the arbitrator would have.

Ms. Stump stated there was not a firewall. There were benefits such as it allowed both parties to learn what the arbitrator was concerned with. There were drawbacks such as a loss of control.

Council Member Klein stated he preferred Mediation / Arbitration. He had used it as an attorney, but not in the labor context. Weakness of optional mediation and even required mediation was a separate mediator who just shuffled back and forth. They may see things in different lights, so the mediator would be useless. But if they were the same you get the same view, but there was no firewall.

Council Member Burt stated a single arbiter would have to be coupled with a

different selection criterion.

Council Member Klein disagreed. The only difference would be that the person would need experience doing it.

Council Member Burt noted that now there were three.

Council Member Klein stated there was really only one. The City appointed person was more of an advocate.

Ms. Stump stated when you get your arbitration, the decision was always 2-1 with the neutral being the deciding person. She noted you could do Mediation / Arbitration with a panel if you wanted to have party advocates with a neutral.

Council Member Burt stated it seemed impractical.

Ms. Stump stated that practitioners argue that it adds one more element of a person who was in a different role than the party principles.

Council Member Burt stated it seemed they would want to keep the same format if they were to have value keeping the other two parties. He asked if it did not add that value, because he was both an arbitrator and a negotiator.

Ms. Stump stated conceptually each party had to make a strategic decision about whom they want to select. They usually choose someone who understands the position, and also who gets along with the neutral. Parties make this set of decisions all the time.

Council Member Burt stated the original point was he did not see the value to having the other two parties.

Ms. Stump stated it was not tremendously significant to move to just one neutral.

Council Member Burt asked if it was required of all three to have certain qualifications.

Council Member Klein stated no. The parties should keep their right to have whomever they wanted.

Council Member Burt stated that out of a list of qualified persons, there could be a group from both sides still that you could choose.

Council Member Klein stated they wanted an advocate. We chose our advocate.

Council Member Burt stated his question focused on having someone who was an advocate with qualifications as an arbitrator.

Council Member Klein stated they could suggest only having a neutral. This would be tying the hands of the party having the criteria and trying to fill two incompatible roles.

Council Member Burt disagreed.

Council Member Holman asked about how the cost of Arbitration was split currently.

Council Member Klein stated it was always split.

Council Member Holman asked why it was in the Charter if it was always split.

Council Member Klein conceded it was not always split. There could be a provision that one party pays all the costs.

Council Member Holman was just suggesting that if they wanted to include that in the revision.

MOTION: Council Member Klein moved, seconded by Council Member Burt to adopt Mediation / Arbitration Item 3.

Ms. Stump asked if there was a consensus to adopt Mediation / Arbitration.

Council Member Burt asked if other cities with three arbiters used the formula of no constraints on the partisan selection.

Ms. Stump stated that was correct.

Council Member Burt asked if Council Member Klein moved as a placeholder.

Council Member Klein stated the meeting was to give instructions to the City Attorney to move forward.

Ms. Stump asked if the preference would be to keep the three.

Council Member Klein stated he was not committed to keeping the three, but he

was interested in input on whether one or three was more common.

Senior Deputy City Attorney, Melissa Tronquet stated three was common for cities with similar provisions to Palo Alto.

Council Member Holman stated she would support the Motion just to move it forward, but not indicate personal support.

Council Member Klein was clear that these issues did not indicate support.

Council Member Burt asked if this was being broken up between Mediation / Arbitration and three versus four.

Council Member Klein stated at the moment it was just three.

Ms. Stump stated maybe it was better to ask the question in the next section on selection of the arbitrator.

Council Member Burt

Council Member Klein stated a mover and seconder goes forward.

Council Member Burt stated with three they have made a decision as a Committee. Chair Price could weigh in but they already had a majority of the Committee.

Council Member Klein stated no decisions were final.

Council Member Burt asked if this Committee was going to have a final cut.

Council Member Klein stated yes.

Council Member Burt asked if these were not votes, were they just indications of consensus.

Council Member Klein stated the only consensus was the City Attorney would draft language.

Council Member Holman clarified the vote for this was not support; it was just to move the process along.

Council Member Burt stated he understood, but did not see why it required a

vote.

Council Member Klein stated it did because they only wanted the City Attorney to draft up one section.

Council Member Burt stated she could take it off consensus.

Ms. Stump discussed selection of the arbitrator. Option Number 2 was to keep the status quo process but add a requirement of membership of the National Academy of Arbitrators. This may reduce the number of people able to serve as arbitrators because not everyone on the list now had that membership. Option Number 3 was that if parties did not agree on an arbitrator they asked the superior court to appoint a retired judge to hear and decide on issues.

MOTION: Council Member Klein preferred Option Number 2. Option Number 3 was too small a pool.

Council Member Burt agreed with Council Member Klein on Option Number 3. He asked if they were to select mediators if two was also a typical pool.

Ms. Stump asked if he was talking about the Mediation / Arbitration format

Council Member Burt stated no, just mediation. If there was just a mediator, what was the normal pool.

Ms. Stump was not sure.

Council Member Burt stated if this was for a well-qualified person. He stated the question can be returned to later.

Ms. Stump stated it was very common to use state mediation and conciliation lists for that but she can not say if those lists were the same or if there were some people who only did one role.

Council Member Burt agreed on Option Number 2 for Arbitration. He wanted to talk about whether to have three or one.

Council Member Klein stated he thought they were leaving that for later.

Ms. Stump stated it would be easy to draft, so it could be left as three for now or alternatives can be drafted.

Council Member Klein stated he wanted to hear why people would choose one or the other.

Council Member Holman asked if there would be a Motion.

Council Member Klein stated he had made a Motion earlier.

Ms. Stump discussed the scope of arbitration. These were things that got excluded from Arbitration. Factors were about things that went into Arbitration.

Council Member Burt stated for the most part they were framed negative, so would the proposal be framed in the affirmative, saying what was included and everything else was excluded, or delineated all that were excluded.

Ms. Stump stated this section of the chart was more detailed but was not language. It would depend on what the existing provision looked like and where the Amendment was put.

Council Member Burt asked if it would be largely dependent upon the best way to draft the existing Charter.

Ms. Stump stated it would be with the goal of clear and enforceable.

Council Member Klein stated the first page was on subject matter, with the follow pages about how the arbitrator gets there. Inclusions and exclusions need to be consistent.

Ms. Stump stated that they could focus on what arbitration was used for as a core matter, which would be the Memorandums of Understanding. Excluding impasses that arise from other types of meet and confer. Interest arbitration would not happen if there as an impasse. Number two is that it as possible to talk about compensation and economics as the subjects of arbitration with other matters being excluded. She provided a list of items that could be considered part of compensation. Other terms and conditions of employment were mandatory but were not included here. In that type of exclusion, traditional process of bargaining to impasse would be used, and would not go into arbitration.

Chair Klein stated the baseline as State Law. It required negotiation. He asked if that was correct.

Ms. Stump stated they would not need to provide for negotiation in the ordinance because it was already required by State Law to bargain over wages, hours, and terms and conditions of employment.

Chair Klein asked if there's any requirement for arbitration.

Ms. Stump stated no, so Council was able to decide what they want it to apply to.

Chair Klein asked if they could drop down from MMB.

Ms. Stump stated that is correct.

Chair Klein asked if they could adopt number two, they would be dropping down from MMB because they would be getting out of terms and conditions.

Ms. Stump stated that is correct. She noted that there are items that come up in labor relations that have aspects of both, so there could be an overlap in boundaries.

Chair Klein stated that having complete lists of what's in and what's out would be good.

Ms. Stump stated that could be managed in the draft. She stated number 3 excluded a retroactive increase in wages, salaries, and benefits, including all forms of compensation. Number 4 was charter amendments and ballot matters, because they affect wages, hours, and terms and conditions of employment. Under State Law those are items that the whole entities need to meet and confer with labor on. Number 5 could exclude benefits that were vested or able to be vested, which bleeds into the factors. Number 6: a group of issues related to positions and staffing. Some are management rights and outside of mandatory scope of bargaining but there were areas that ere within the scope and could be excluded from arbitration. Number 7: a list of management rights.

Chair Klein asked if, moving forward, six and seven would be combined.

Ms. Stump stated yes. Number 8: rules, policies, and procedures were closely related to six and seven.

Chair Klein asked if she would like to stop there. He stated he would like to include all of them.

Council Member Burt asked about including all the items that speak to the affirmative.

Chair Klein stated yes.

Council Member Burt asked if pensions would be subject to arbitration.

Chair Klein stated yes.

Council Member Burt stated concern about that. He asked about excluding vested members. He stated currently that does not give them a prerogative.

Ms. Stump stated that those issues would not go to a labor arbitrator. It does not address whether the City can reduce current vested benefits. This says an arbitrator couldn't order the City to establish a vested benefit.

Council Member Burt asked if, on number 2, it includes those items as something an arbiter would decide on.

Ms. Stump stated they would need some direction regarding vested benefits.

Chair Klein stated currently benefits and pension accrue and cannot be taken away. To get benefits you have to continue to work. He spoke about how, under this process, a person's account could be negotiated downward as well as upward.

Council Member Burt asked for clarification on where that process was detailed in the report.

Chair Klein stated it combined options 2 and 5 by excluding the vesting. Currently an employee's future benefits could increase but they can't decrease in California, and this would allow for it to decrease.

Ms. Stump stated she was focused more narrowly, thinking about what the arbitrator is allowed to consider and what can the City do.

Chair Klein stated all is based on City and labor not agreeing.

Mr. Keene stated if the language is related to pensions, and option 5 says excluding benefits that apply to pensions, he could see an arbitrator could rule on the question of who pays toward contributions of pension. Who pays wouldn't be vested but the benefit itself would be vested.

Ms. Stump stated that was one type of provision that could be drafted. She stated the options were meant as menu items to prompt a discussion.

Chair Klein stated he would like to see her come back with what help she could get from other places. His focus was on not wanting to see the City creating huge obligations going forward. He stated it was unfair that the pension arrow only goes one way.

Ms. Stump stated the question was how much this charter amendment could take on.

Ms. Tronquet stated that no matter which way the arrow is going, the arbitrator shouldn't decide.

Chair Klein stated agreed stating that he did not understand why pension was put with other forms of compensation.

Council Member Burt stated the two issues were what should arbiters decide and what would be City policy on what we would be included and what would be negotiated. He stated he did not want anything to be implied.

Chair Klein stated he would like it to be as clear as possible.

Ms. Stump noted she would come back with some more focused information on the pension issue. She asked where they were on drafting all the scope exclusions.

Chair Klein stated he had a problem with option four but the City Attorney made a good case for it. His preference was to include them all but would like to hear from the others.

Council Member Burt wasn't able to comment on two and five based on how he read them and what Council Member Klein described as intention.

Chair Klein agreed.

Council Member Burt asked him to clarify as he just stated he wanted to include all but hear more about 2 and 5.

Chair Klein stated he wanted to hear more on the pension issue.

Council Member Holman asked about other retirement contributions.

Ms. Stump stated it did not have to be the same kind of thing.

Council Member Burt asked about what might be included in mediation. He stated he would like to keep that as clean and simple as possible. Too much ambiguity and complexity would cause potential legal contention.

Ms. Stump discussed the factors. Number 1 was a general statement that could use more detail on specifically what the arbitrator was to consider and how they consider it. Item number 2 stated the arbitrator must base the award on the City's current and projected financial condition, using certain documents that are officially adopted by the City. Number 3 was about how the arbitrator could be required to consider the items. Number 4 stated the arbitrator should consider the rate of increase or decrease in ongoing revenues available to fund City services. Number 5 states awards shall consider and be based on total compensation. Number 6 states it could be specified that the arbitrator must count for the continuing cost of providing ongoing benefits. It can also be required that the arbitrator recognizes and accounts for appropriate reserves. She stated the award shall not provide ongoing benefits from one-time funding sources. Number 9 states the arbitrator shall consider and account for infrastructure and investment requirements as determined by the Council. This says that when the City has revenue that's available to fund personnel there are also other competing needs for that. Number 10 states the arbitrator shall consider the rate of increase or decrease in total compensation as well as other terms and conditions of employment for other City employee groups. This item is called internal comparability and for Palo Alto would say the arbitrator should also look at the wages and terms and conditions of employment for other City groups.

Council Member Burt asked about having difficulties competing in the market for certain people, outside of general policy and framework, but it could be used in arbitration.

Ms. Stump clarified that if there were a compensation problem with a particular set of employees, this provision might allow other employee groups to say we're similar to those. She stated that yes, they can do that.

Council Member Burt asked about putting language in that helped clarify that issue. He stated if there were specific reasons for exceptions, those should not be part of the consideration for an employee group being compared to a City-wide practice.

Ms. Stump stated that it could be drafted for it to be a broad look at compensation and equity.

Council Member Burt stated in section 10 the intent should be clarified. He stated even within public safety there was an issue of compaction.

Ms. Stump stated there usually were.

Mr. Keene stated they should consider adding language that would restrict the arbitrator's ability to make decisions that impact the overall compensation classification plan and structure as an organization as a whole.

Council Member Burt clarified that they don't want a circumstance where the arbitrator can create a new exception, which creates a new rule.

Mr. Keene stated there should be language dealing with the impact on the cities and other factors.

Ms. Stump agreed. She continued with number 11, a common provision talking about the rate of inflation with different ways to adjust for that.

Chair Klein requested to add "for inflation" and asked if there is an index for all employees.

Mr. Braulik stated there was one.

Ms. Stump stated they would come back with options. Number 12 was about requiring the arbitrator to consider impacts to services for the public.

Chair Klein asked Ms. Stump to revise the phrasing of number 12.

Ms. Stump stated she would. Number 13 indicated the arbitrator should consider the impact of proposals on other service needs. She stated this is also worded awkwardly.

Chair Klein suggested more emphatic language to clarify it is not the arbitrator's job to determine service levels for the City.

Ms. Stump stated that arbitrators may turn a blind eye to impact.

Chair Klein stated that even though 12 and 13 are separate an arbitrator may

decide that a certain service area is more important than another.

Ms. Stump agreed.

Council Member Burt noted he was worried about what the wording may result in.

Ms. Stump stated number 14 states for any contract provision that results in the reduction of services to the public the employee organization has the burden of proving that the justification for the provision outweighs the public's interest in the services that will be reduced. Number 15 states that the arbitrator has to consider the City's compensation policies. Number 16 states the arbitrator shall consider the City's goals and priorities as established by the Council.

Chair Klein stated that number 16 is not a lot of guidance.

Mr. Keene noted that it might be in conflict.

Chair Klein stated that he didn't like number 1 because it was too general and didn't fit with the others. He noted the City's documents were presumed to be correct unless the union could show clear and convincing evidence otherwise.

Chair Klein stated that 2 and 3 go together. He stated the arbitrator should use the financial documents to make decisions and the documents will be assumed to be correct. He also had trouble with 16.

Council Member Holman asked if he would like to include all except 1 and 16.

Chair Klein confirmed.

Council Member Holman stated that the list makes revision as opposed to repealing difficult.

Council Member Burt shared concern that in the end many could be contentious. He stated the greater the complexity the greater chance of legal challenge.

Chair Klein moved the discussion onto the next category.

Ms. Stump discussed the 'other' category. Other jurisdictions are opening arbitration proceedings to the public for observance. If allowing the public to participate, there has to be some sort of limit applying to mediation because that needs to be done behind closed doors.

MOTION: Chair Klein moved number 1.

Council Member Holman agreed.

Council Member Burt agreed.

Ms. Stump suggested setting up the Arbitration Provision so the arbitrator must consider the factors that were specified and that the boundaries of that are enforceable in court. She suggested that they draft that language.

Chair Klein agreed.

Ms. Stump stated the last point was about transition and affective date. She stated this should clearly state when and to what it applies.

Council Member Holman stated to go back to elimination language.

Chair Klein asked if she would like to do that at this meeting.

Council Member Burt asked about 'other' number 3.

Chair Klein clarified this was just a repeated discussion from previously that they need more information on.

Council Member Holman stated that four things were listed for effective date and what stage of arbitration, which Staff would return with. She also stated mediation, and timeline. Staff feedback on those is necessary. Her preference would be to have these not included in the charter for practicality and flexibility. She also stated that it was necessary to have language on why they were doing this.

Melissa stated it should be 75 words.

Council Member Holman asked about the argument.

Ms. stated the first part of the resolution usually discussed why they're doing it.

Chair Klein asked if she wanted to see that language now.

Council Member Holman stated that it wouldn't hurt to get started on it.

Chair Klein asked Ms. Stump if she has a problem with one or two more assignments.

Ms. Stump stated last year they had basic findings drafted on why the Council was moving ahead. She asked about where they were on that.

Ms. Stump stated they were very general and they want to get more specific.

Ms. Stump stated Staff will update and come forward with it.

Council Member Holman stated it would be important to include accountability, responsibility to electorate, the City's ability to maintain long-term financial viability, and short-term cycles affecting long-term financial viability.

Council Member Burt agreed that the ordinance would be the best way to do it, and to make sure that when Council considered the repeal that they have an ordinance that would apply should the voters support the repeal.

Ms. Stump agreed.

Council Member Burt asked about the timeline for negotiation.

Mr. Keene stated there was a broader discussion not just applying to parties subject to binding interest arbitration.

Council Member Burt agreed that if it becomes more complex by having to deal with all labor groups at once, then he is open to partitioning it.

Mr. Keene stated it seemed that the intent of that would extend across the spectrum of labor negotiations.

Ms. Stump suggested providing timelines related to interest arbitration if deciding to move forward with reform.

Council Member Burt stated there would be additional elements needed under the reform and then other elements to the timeline pertaining to all labor groups.

Ms. Stump stated yes. She suggested a little more structure if arbitration is retained.

Chair Klein asked if the City of San Francisco had that.

Ms. Stump stated yes.

Council Member Burt stated that he was suggesting an established timeline for negotiations pertaining to all labor groups that would either repeal or reform.

Ms. Stump stated that that was a little more complex.

Council Member Holman asked if Staff also had draft language for reform from last year.

Ms. Stump stated no.

Council Member Burt stated last year some members voted to go forward at that time and other members stated they needed more time to study.

Council Member Holman asked if it would be a burden for staff to come up with some 'whereas' statements draft language for reform.

Ms. Stump stated she first has to get the language of the charter amendments and then come forward with non-charter elements.

Council Member Holman stated she's hoping they will do better than last time because the charter has a typo. She thanked the staff for their work.

Ms. Stump thanked the Committee for their flexibility.

Future Meetings and Agendas

Mr. Keene stated the only meeting scheduled that all can attend is July 14. July 7 only has two members responded as available.

Council Member Holman stated that she needs to check her schedule. She asked what would happen if they do not meet on the 7th.

Mr. Keene stated that the next regular Committee meeting is July 12th, with three items.

Ms. Stump stated the 12th and the 14th work better because more drafting will be done earlier and the changes will be more minor.

Adjournment

ADJOURNMENT: Meeting adjourned at 10:14 p.m.