Interest Arbitration Checklist

Legislation to improve the current interest arbitration system should:

 A time limit for a binding pre-hearing process

Improve **Efficiency** by requiring:

- A decision no later than 12 months from the start of the arbitration process
- A single arbitrator model for all interest arbitration, rather than a three-member panel
- Limits to submissions after the hearing, which prolong the process
- Written reasons for the award which provide a clearer explanation for how the financial health of the community criteria were considered and applied in reaching a decision



Transparency by directing arbitrators to consider:

Improve Accountability &

- The fiscal health of the community based on clear, measurable criteria
- Settlements reached by the same municipality with other employee groups
- The total compensation of the entire proposed agreement (present and future liabilities) compared to that of comparable collective agreements
- The tax increase that would be needed to pay for a proposed agreement without reducing services
- The employer's ability to find and retain qualified people
- The interest and welfare of the community served by the employer
- Provincial law or ministerial directive that places financial limitations on employer



Better define a municipality's capacity to pay based on **Fiscal Health** indicators, such as:

- Total property tax assessment
- Property tax assessment per household
- Ratio of residential, commercial and industrial properties
- Actual tax revenues
- Proportion of unpaid property taxes
- ✓ Rates of employment/unemployment
- Social service caseload
- Median household income
- ✓ Proportion of low-income households
- Compensation of other municipal employees in the same community
- Compensation of public sector employees in comparable communities
- Compensation of private sector employees in comparable communities

*Produced with the assistance of the Emergency Services Steering Committee

