

SENATE FINANCE COMMITTEE
February 17, 2020
9:01 a.m.

9:01:10 AM

CALL TO ORDER

Co-Chair von Imhof called the Senate Finance Committee meeting to order at 9:01 a.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT

Senator Natasha von Imhof, Co-Chair
Senator Click Bishop
Senator Lyman Hoffman
Senator Donny Olson
Senator Bill Wielechowski
Senator David Wilson

MEMBERS ABSENT

Senator Bert Stedman, Co-Chair

ALSO PRESENT

Kate Sheehan, Director of Personnel and Labor Relations, Department of Administration; Senator Cathy Giessel.

SUMMARY

PRESENTATION: LABOR CONTRACTS and MONETARY TERMS

Co-Chair von Imhof relayed that the committee would hear from the Department of Administration (DOA) on labor contracts, get an update on recent negotiations, and look at how state employee pay and benefits had changed over time. She remarked that as the state's savings were depleted and discussions of cash-flow became more important, she believed that it was critical to take a close look at personnel costs.

Co-Chair von Imhof thanked Commissioner Tshibaka and her team for working closely with the co-chairs' offices to put the presentation information together. She had asked the commissioner to provide the committee with a granular look at pay and benefits for the various bargaining units over

time to help give the committee a sense of personnel-related cost drivers.

Co-Chair von Imhof suggested that as the largest employer in Alaska, state government needed to balance cost containment against being a competitive employer that could attract talent to serve the public as efficiently and effectively as possible. She stated that as the legislature considered a spending cap and looked at the Consumer Price Index (CPI) and inflation, there were other cost drivers that could rise faster and crowd out other costs as state spending approached a cap.

^PRESENTATION: LABOR CONTRACTS and MONETARY TERMS

[9:03:19 AM](#)

KATE SHEEHAN, DIRECTOR OF PERSONNEL AND LABOR RELATIONS, DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATION, commented that the presentation would review some bargaining agreements, what the division would be working on in the upcoming fall, and would take a close look at salaries over the previous ten years. She reminded that the state was required to bargain wages, hours, and terms of conditions of employment as found in the Public Employment Relations Act. She referenced AS 23.40. Under statute, DOA chose what to bargain, and any changes to what was bargained needed to be done through legislation.

Ms. Sheehan discussed the presentation "Labor Contracts," (copy on file).

Ms. Sheehan read slide 2, "Bargaining Unit Acronyms

- ACOA - Alaska Correctional Officers Association
- APEA - Alaska Public Employees Association
- ASEA - Alaska State Employees Association
- AVTECTA - Alaska Vocational Technical Center Teachers' Association
- CEA - Confidential Employees Association
- IBU - Inlandboatmen's Union of the Pacific
- LTC - Labor, Trades, and Crafts
- MEBA - Marine Engineers Beneficial Association
- MMP - Masters, Mates, and Pilots
- PSEA (AA) - Public Safety Employees Association (Troopers, Court Service Officers, Deputy Fire Marshalls)

PSEA (AP) - Public Safety Employees Association
(Airport Police and Fire Officers)
TEAME - Teachers Education Associations at Mt.
Edgumbe

Ms. Sheehan spoke to slide 3, "Important Definitions":

COLA - Cost of Living Adjustment
Steps - Steps A-F/G, awarded every year
Pay Increments - Step J and above awarded every other
year with acceptable or higher performance

Ms. Sheehan noted that COLA was bargained with each union and done with legislation for the partially exempt. She added that COLA was also put into the state personnel act. Most employees received merit steps and pay increments. Merit steps were received every other year with or without a performance evaluation, and the steps were an average of about 3.5 percent. The only groups that did not receive the steps and pay increments were the three marine vessel employee types, and the teachers and instructors at Alaska Vocational Technical Center (AVTEC). She detailed that an employee performance evaluation was required to receive a pay increment, which were either 3.25 percent or 3.75 percent depending upon the collective bargaining agreement. There were previously longevity steps, which changed to pay increments in 2009.

[9:07:35 AM](#)

Ms. Sheehan referenced slide 4, "Bargaining Update":

Inlandboatmen's Union of the Pacific:

- 0/1.5/1.5 COLA
- \$210 lump sum payment if enrolled in the Employee Only Economy Plan in January 2022
- \$570 lump sum payment if enrolled in the Employee Plus Family Economy Plan in January 2022
- Employees begin contributions to healthcare
- Length of Agreement: 2019-2022

AK Vocational Technical Center Teachers' Association:

- 0/1.5/1.5 COLA
- \$350 lump sum payment in July 2020
- Hours transferred from Union Hour Leave Bank
- Length of Agreement: 2019-2022

Ms. Sheehan noted that the two contracts on the slide were currently before the legislature for approval. She recalled that there had been a strike that was successfully mediated the previous August. For IBU, a COLA of 1.5 percent was about \$600,000. The department had also bargained employee contributions, which was new for IBU.

Ms. Sheehan informed that there had been a federal mediation to reach agreement on the contract for the Alaska Vocational Technical Center Teachers' Association (AVTECTA).

Co-Chair von Imhof asked if people that lived in Alaska received COLA or if residency affected COLA.

Ms. Sheehan informed that COLA was for all employees in the bargaining unit. She noted that the marine unions had a cost of living differential (COLD) which was for residents versus non-residents. State residents received a higher hourly rate than non-residents. Marine Engineers and Masters, Mates and Pilots (MMP) received a lump sum given with each pay period and more money was given for residing within the state.

Senator Olson thought he had heard Ms. Sheehan comment that a 1.5 percent COLA was equivalent to \$50,000.

Ms. Sheehan clarified that the COLA was equivalent to \$600,000 for the Inlandboatmen's Union and \$50,000 for the AVTEC Teacher's Association.

Senator Olson asked if the unions were getting the funds every year.

Ms. Sheehan answered in the affirmative.

Co-Chair von Imhof clarified that that the whole bargaining unit received the funds rather than each person.

[9:11:06 AM](#)

Co-Chair von Imhof asked about employee healthcare contributions for the Inlandboatmen's Union. She asked about the percentage of the monthly premium.

Ms. Sheehan relayed that the state had only recently started bargaining employee contributions. Previously a

person under the economy plan in AlaskaCare made no contribution. There was only one union that did not have a contribution in AlaskaCare. The rate would vary according to each union. There was currently an 8 to 9 percent employee contribution.

Co-Chair von Imhof asked if the two unions paid 8 to 9 percent or if the amount was an average.

Ms. Sheehan stated that the amount was an average across unions. The goal was for all unions to have the same language and consistency.

Co-Chair von Imhof considered federal pay and had found that federal employees paid 20 percent of healthcare costs.

Ms. Sheehan did not know what federal employees paid. There were two different plans under AlaskaCare, and those that enrolled in the standard plan paid more than those enrolled in the economy plan. She offered to provide the information at a later time.

Co-Chair von Imhof affirmed that she would like comparative numbers to gain an understanding of different plans available in the state. She thought it was interesting to see how the state stood in comparison to other entities.

Ms. Sheehan turned to slide 5, "Bargaining Schedule and Detail," which showed a table that listed the total number of employees and percentage of the total employees. She noted that the state was currently bargaining with the Public Safety Employees Association (PSEA), the Marine Engineers Beneficial Association, and MMP. All three bargaining units were set to expire on June 30, 2020. In the fall the department would start negotiations with the Alaska Correctional Officers Association; Labor, Trades and Crafts (LTC); and the Alaska Public Employees Association (APEA).

Ms. Sheehan continued that in the fall of 2021, negotiations would begin with the teachers of Mt. Edgecumbe, AVTECTA, the Alaska State Employees Association (ASEA), the confidential employees, and the Inlandboatmen's Union. She pointed out that the largest number of employees were in ASEA. She pointed out the number of non-covered employees was listed, which were exempt, partially exempt, and excluded. Excluded employees were classified employees

not represented. The only excluded employees were the staff of the Alaska Labor Relations Agency, with about three or four employees. Any pay increases to the partially exempt were done through legislation.

9:15:30 AM

Senator Wilson asked if market-based pay study had been conducted.

Ms. Sheehan stated that a pay study had been done for the Alaska State Troopers class series, and had increased the series by one range, or approximately 7.5 percent. There was an additional COLA adjustment of 7.5 percent. Additionally, the department was finishing up a large nurse market-based pay study. The adjustment was one to two ranges up, depending upon the job. The jobs were primarily with in the Department of Health and Social Services and the Department of Corrections (DOC).

Senator Wilson asked if there were additional pay studies forthcoming.

Ms. Sheehan stated that the department was working on classification studies and had recently finished studies for police officers and other positions. She offered to provide a complete list of the studies and positions involved.

Ms. Sheehan considered slide 6, "Benefits":

- Health Benefits:
- Employee Premium contribution
- Health Trusts:
- State of Alaska contributing at a rate which seeks balance
- Pension:
- Defined benefit and defined contribution plans

Ms. Sheehan noted that there were four health trusts: MMP, PSEA, ASEA, and LTC. Recently the PSEA joined the health trust for ASEA. She understood that there were employee contributions in the health trusts but did not know the contribution level. She noted that pension was not bargained and pointed out that the Marine Engineers Beneficial Association was not part of PERS, and its pension contribution was bargained.

9:18:21 AM

Ms. Sheehan displayed slide 7, "State Contribution to Health Trust/ Health Insurance," which showed a data table displaying current health insurance rates and types. She noted that starting in July 2020, all employees in AlaskaCare and the trusts were up to the cost of \$1,555. She pointed out that MMP was still at the last negotiated rate of \$1,346 after not being able to reach a new agreement.

Co-Chair von Imhof asked if Ms. Sheehan knew what the trust was able to negotiate with healthcare providers. She asked who would receive any potential savings.

Ms. Sheehan stated that there was bargaining language where the trust would have to provide enough information for the state's actuary to make a decision. The goal was to neither overfund nor underfund the trust. It had been found that the trust was likely overfunded for years because of the formula being used. The actuaries would receive the information and arrive at the appropriate amount to fund the trust. She would provide further information about who might receive any savings, and a list of the information that the trust was required to provide.

Co-Chair von Imhof wondered about the amount of overfunding. She understood that healthcare trust's financials were not public.

Ms. Sheehan affirmed that the trust's financials were not public.

Co-Chair von Imhof wondered if the financial information could be made public through legislation.

Ms. Sheehan did not know.

Senator Bishop thought certain trusts were confidential.

Ms. Sheehan knew that MMP was a multi-employer trust with confidential information.

Co-Chair von Imhof thought as the state considered rising costs and a spending cap, it was tough when public dollars were spent without information. She reiterated her question

about any potential gap between the state dollars and the expense.

Ms. Sheehan highlighted slide 8, "Employee Counts," which showed a table of employee counts in the executive branch. She pointed out that the table listed actual employees that received a paycheck, rather than position counts. The slide included full time, part-time, and non-permanent employees. She clarified that non-permanent employees could work from a month or two up to twelve months.

Senator Bishop looked at the employee count and asked if the total included covered and non-covered employees.

Ms. Sheehan answered in the affirmative.

Senator Bishop thought there were about 12,600 employees in 2009; and the current count was about 12,277.

Senator Wielechowski asked if there was a count of employee vacancies.

Ms. Sheehan did not have the information at hand but offered to provide it at a later time.

[9:23:48 AM](#)

Ms. Sheehan looked at slide 9, "FY2019 All Bargaining Units Comparison," which showed a table. She informed that the slide related to a four-page document entitled "Bargaining Unit Comparison 2009-2019" (copy on file). The first column showed bargaining units. Only permanent full-time employees were used for the data. She explained that the COLA would reflect whatever was bargained in the year; and she pointed out that in 2019 there were no COLAs bargained. The steps previously mentioned were 3.5 percent, and if the column showed "n/a" it meant there was no merit steps or pay increases such as in the three marine unions. Any increases were through a COLA. She noted that the teachers at AVTEC and Mt. Edgecumbe had a step structure like other teacher collective bargaining agreements.

Ms. Sheehan stated that pay increments were 3.75 percent or 3.25 percent. Most pay increments did not have a cap. She looked at the fiscal year overtime pay column, which showed all overtime pay for the year for each bargaining unit. The next columns showed the number of employees paid overtime,

and the average paid per employee. She looked at the "FY Gross Pay" column, which included any terminal leave or leave cash-ins. She made note of the two columns showing SBS employer contributions, (6.13 percent), and the average contribution per employee. She highlighted the columns showing PERS contributions and health insurance.

[9:27:25 AM](#)

Ms. Sheehan continued to address slide 9. She highlighted columns that showed gross totals for SBS, PERS and health insurance. Other columns averaged the cost per employee. There was a comparison of the total gross SBS percentage compared to the CPI. She pointed out that the table started in 2009. She pointed out that between 2017 and 2018, the total gross SBS, PERS, and health insurance change per employee had been significantly increased. The shift was attributed to a change in data systems, resulting in a lost pay period. Starting in 2018, the data reflected an additional pay period.

[9:29:22 AM](#)

Senator Wielechowski asked if there had been an increase or decrease in cost when the state went from twice monthly pay periods to a bi-weekly pay system.

Ms. Sheehan stated that not all employees were moved to a bi-weekly pay schedule. The department was looking to convert all groups June 1, 2020.

Senator Wielechowski asked if Ms. Sheehan could provide some numbers. He recalled that the court system had estimated the change would cost an additional \$247,000 to switch to bi-weekly payroll.

Co-Chair von Imhof understood that when any company changed pay systems there would be a cost shift in the first year because of the last paycheck. She thought there should not be a recurring increase in expense. She emphasized the need for one system.

Senator Wielechowski reiterated that he wanted to know the cost to the state.

Co-Chair von Imhof referenced the document showing ten years of historical costs. She asked about payment steps of

3.5 percent, and the total costs and asked how the math worked out.

Ms. Sheehan stated that not all employees would get a pay increment or merit step every year. She noted that the merit steps and payment increments were not funded because of vacancies. She could not explain all the percentages and acknowledged that some looked strange. She pondered that number of employees, gross pay, and the COLAs were different at different times.

[9:33:00 AM](#)

Co-Chair von Imhof asked Ms. Sheehan to look at previous years when the percentages were higher. She thought it was interesting that the steps were higher than the Alaska CPI. She thought it appeared that a good portion of employees had received overtime pay for the last decade. She wondered if the practice could be managed to save the state funds.

Ms. Sheehan believed in some cases the amount of overtime could be managed, but in other cases could not because of staffing requirements. She referenced minimum staffing levels for correctional facilities and other 24-hour institutions. She mentioned overtime for IT personnel. She thought the amount of overtime differed by division but in many cases was due to lack of staff.

Co-Chair von Imhof observed that at least half of ASEA members received overtime each year, and it had been consistent each year.

Ms. Sheehan noted that many of the employees in ASEA were eligible for overtime under the Fair Labor Standards Act.

Co-Chair von Imhof asked Ms. Sheehan to describe "eligible for overtime" employees.

Ms. Sheehan stated that the ASEA was the broadest group and employees and included nurses, office assistants, psychiatric nurse aids, children's support specialists, eligibility technicians, and engineers. The members of ASEA was the most diverse group, and because of the types of jobs they were eligible for overtime. Many of the members, such as engineers, worked extraordinarily long hours; as did nurses.

Co-Chair von Imhof asked if the employees were salaried or hourly.

Ms. Sheehan thought that most were paid hourly.

Senator Bishop thought there was a lot "baked in" to the overtime statistics. He used the example of competitiveness to the private sector. He thought there were some bargaining units in which you could make almost twice as much by working for the private sector. He thought the matter should be investigated.

Co-Chair von Imhof commented that as healthcare costs went up, not paying any healthcare premium or paying 8 percent to 9 percent was very attractive.

[9:38:13 AM](#)

Senator Wielechowski asked if any of the employees voluntarily worked overtime hours if they were ordered to do so.

Ms. Sheehan stated that overtime was mandatory for many of the employees being discussed.

Senator Wielechowski asked if Ms. Sheehan could quantify the number of employees required to do overtime.

Ms. Sheehan offered to try and find the information.

Co-Chair von Imhof clarified that the overtime pay did not include those who worked four 10-hour shifts.

Ms. Sheehan stated that there were different alternate work-week agreements. She used the example of the Alaska State Troopers. Many unions did not have daily overtime but did have weekly overtime. The overtime was adjusted depending upon the schedule.

Co-Chair von Imhof understood that with some employees, overtime was unavoidable. She believed that it had been consistent over the last ten years. She thought it was either part of the standard operating procedure or that overtime had not been managed well in some cases.

Ms. Sheehan addressed slide 10, "All Bargaining Units Comparison: Wages and Health Insurance," which showed a bar

graph providing another form of comparison. She pointed out that the wages and health insurance benefits were shown as a share of the total compensation for ten years. The gross pay was clearly the largest employer contribution, followed by health insurance.

Ms. Sheehan advanced to slide 11, "All Bargaining Units Comparison: Wages and Health Insurance," which showed a bar graph comparing the average employee pay and benefits. The information was taken from the document provided to members and showed the average pay per employee was not adjusted for inflation.

Ms. Sheehan looked at slide 12, "All Bargaining Units Comparison: Wages and Health Insurance," which showed a bar graph that depicted the same information as the previous slide but adjusted for CPI.

Co-Chair von Imhof asked what it would look like if there was a line drawn to depict the CPI.

Ms. Sheehan thought the depiction would fluctuate. She noted that the department was working on the slide and had some difficulty with the data. She intended on finishing slides and providing them to the committee later in the week.

[9:41:47 AM](#)

Ms. Sheehan noted that the following slides looked at the same information on the document, broken out by collective bargaining unit. Instead of comparing them on one slide, each slide showed year to year for each union. All eleven unions were represented in a separate slide.

Ms. Sheehan showed slide 13, "Bargaining Unit Comparison - Alaska Correctional Officers Association."

Co-Chair von Imhof thought it was helpful to see the different unions. She looked at the average hourly overtime pay, which started at \$4,000 per employee in 2009 and was currently at about \$10,000. She asked if the change was due to labor shortages, or overtime. She noted that the number of employees had not jumped. She questioned whether there was a significant employee shortage, why were employees working longer hours, and why it was costing more money. She wondered what DOC could do to help mitigate the

situation. She referenced the plan to reopen the Palmer Correctional Center and wondered how the state would find the funds.

Ms. Sheehan understood that because of minimum staffing and not being fully staffed, there was a lot more overtime at the institutions. She noted that the department was doing a new type of recruitment and thought if more officers were hired it would reduce overtime. She was happy to follow up with the department and get back to the committee with further information.

Co-Chair von Imhof thought that the percentage of people doing overtime versus full-time employees had been steady for the last decade. She wondered if the department had been understaffed the whole time.

Ms. Sheehan thought there had been perpetually understaffing. She noted that correctional officers signed up for overtime during weeks off. Additionally, the officers worked automatic overtime when a 12-hour shift was extended to 16 hours. Some institutions were more chronically understaffed than others. She offered to get more information from the department.

Co-Chair von Imhof thought it would be nice to know if the mandatory overtime was a bargained concept, or if it was for another reason.

Ms. Sheehan affirmed that overtime and holdover language was bargained.

Co-Chair von Imhof asked if overtime and holdover language was bargained for all unions.

Ms. Sheehan did not know and stated that every contract was slightly different.

[9:46:05 AM](#)

Ms. Sheehan referenced slide 14, "Bargaining Unit Comparison - Alaska Public Employees Association," which showed a table with a year by year comparison. She noted that APEA was the supervisor's union. At the top, the table showed the standard work week. For APEA, there was a bargained change from a 37.5-hour work week to a 40-hour work week for an approximate cost of 6.6 percent. The other

unions on a 40-hour work week were PSEA, the Confidential Employee's Association (CEA), and LTC.

Ms. Sheehan turned to slide 15, "Bargaining Unit Comparison - Alaska State Employees Association," which showed a table. She noted that the ASEA standard work week was 37.5 hours, but there were some class 1 employees at 40 hours.

Ms. Sheehan considered slide 16, "Bargaining Unit Comparison - Alaska Vocational Technical Center Teachers' Association," which showed a table. the AVTECTA standard work week was 7.5-hour days, 5 days a week.

Ms. Sheehan displayed slide 17, "Bargaining Unit Comparison - Confidential Employees Association," which showed a table. The CEA moved to a 40-hour work week the previous year and did not receive a COLA for the year.

Ms. Sheehan highlighted slide 18, "Bargaining Unit Comparison - Inlandboatmen's Union," which showed a table. She noted that the IBU employees worked week-on/week-off for 84 hours per week.

Co-Chair von Imhof asked if the IBU employees were currently working.

Ms. Sheehan stated that some of the employees were working.

Senator Wielechowski asked if IBU employees were still paid if the Alaska Marine Highway System (AMHS) ships were not running.

Ms. Sheehan stated that some employees needed to be on a vessel to make sure it was safe. There was a much-reduced workforce when ships were in layup or at the dock, and employees that were not working did not get paid.

Co-Chair von Imhof asked if there would be overtime paid when employees were on a ship that was not sailing.

Ms. Sheehan stated that marine vessel employees would receive overtime if there was an employee to relieve them. She would inquire and provide further information.

Co-Chair von Imhof thought there should not be overtime other than for mechanics.

Ms. Sheehan offered to provide the list of vessels and how many employees were on each.

Ms. Sheehan looked at slide 19, "Bargaining Unit Comparison - Labor, Trades, and Crafts." She reiterated that LTC had moved to a 40-hour work week.

Ms. Sheehan addressed slide 20, "Bargaining Unit Comparison - Marine Engineers Beneficial Association," which showed a table. She noted that the Marine Engineers Beneficial Association had a 168-hour assignment and worked two weeks on/two weeks off like the MMP.

[9:49:35 AM](#)

Ms. Sheehan advanced to slide 21, "Bargaining Unit Comparison - Masters, Mates, and Pilots."

Ms. Sheehan looked at slide 22, "Bargaining Unit Comparison - Public Safety Employees Association (PSEA-AA)," which showed a table. She noted that the troopers, court service officers, and fire marshals worked a 40-hour week.

Ms. Sheehan spoke to slide 23, "Bargaining Unit Comparison - Public Safety Employees Association (PSEA-AP)," which showed a table. She added that the airport police and fire officers worked 80 hours in a 14-day work period. In Fairbanks, the employees were working 24-hour shifts with three days on and six days off.

Ms. Sheehan referenced slide 24, "Bargaining Unit Comparison - Teachers Education Association at Mt. Edgecumbe," which showed a data table that. The teachers worked a standard work week of 40 hours.

Ms. Sheehan displayed slide 25, "Department of Administration - Championing improvement in the State's performance and results."

Senator Wielechowski asked if Ms. Sheehan could provide a similar spreadsheet that showed exempt employees.

Ms. Sheehan agreed to provide the information.

Co-Chair von Imhof asked about totals in the final slides. She wondered about COLAs by year and what was in the aggregate number. She knew that in previous years,

healthcare costs had risen quite a bit. She wanted to know what was going into the number and if the cumulative increase was higher than inflation. She looked at the bar graph on slide 10 and considered the comparison of wages and health insurance for all bargaining units. She asked about the status of the Janus decision [a 2018 United States Supreme Court ruling that limited the power of unions to collect fees from nonmembers.]

Ms. Sheehan noted that the department was currently bargaining with some unions to change language that was in the collective bargaining agreements. There had been agreements reached under the prior administration with some unions for some language that did not compel union membership. There was outdated contract language that parties were not following because it was illegal after the ruling. There was a temporary restraining order, and no practice had been changed other than membership was not compulsory. Dues were not collected unless an employee signed up for membership in a union.

[9:53:14 AM](#)

Co-Chair von Imhof asked how the state knew which employees signed up.

Ms. Sheehan informed that employees could sign up with the union, and a form was forwarded to the division of finance. If an employee never wanted to become a member, the dues were never set up as a deduction.

Co-Chair von Imhof asked if there were approximately 15,000 forms in the department's possession.

Ms. Sheehan stated that the department had all the forms of those employees that had signed up to be members.

Co-Chair von Imhof asked how many forms the department had.

Ms. Sheehan did not have the information but agreed to provide the number at a later time.

Senator Wilson asked how many members had turned in forms versus how many had opted out of union membership.

Ms. Sheehan stated she would get the information for Senator Wilson.

Co-Chair von Imhof looked at slide 5, which showed the number of employees in 2019 for each bargaining unit. She asked if the forms would need to be renewed each year.

Ms. Sheehan thought part of the pending lawsuit concerned how often the form would have to be renewed. Each union had a slightly different form.

Co-Chair von Imhof asked if the forms were paper or electronic.

Ms. Sheehan stated that the form was paper.

[9:55:10 AM](#)

Senator Wielechowski asked if there was savings to the state if an employee decided not to be represented by a collective bargaining unit.

Ms. Sheehan was not aware of savings to the state.

Co-Chair von Imhof thought the question was debatable. She questioned the savings of other states that had incorporated the Janus decision. She thought there was not sufficient time to address the topic.

Ms. Sheehan stated that employee time processing had remained the same. She thought other states had proceeded differently.

Co-Chair von Imhof thought the act of collecting dues on behalf of unions using state payroll was not the expensive part of the process. She discussed the union's role in collecting dues.

Ms. Sheehan affirmed that there was staff dedicated to the processing of the forms.

Senator Wielechowski thought there was no savings to the state if someone did not become a member of a union.

Ms. Sheehan relayed that the state must pay whatever was agreed to in the collective bargaining agreement.

Senator Wielechowski assumed that the union had to keep representing the employee even if she or he was not paying dues.

Ms. Sheehan answered in the affirmative. She stated that under the Janus decision, the union would still be the exclusive representative.

Senator Hoffman asked if the area cost differentials for troopers in rural areas of the state calculated into the numbers on the slide showing PSEA data.

Ms. Sheehan answered in the affirmative and stated the differentials would be part of the gross pay.

Co-Chair von Imhof discussed the agenda for the following day.

#

ADJOURNMENT

9:58:10 AM

The meeting was adjourned at 9:58 a.m.