

### Testimony of Brian A. Doyle

My name is Brian A. Doyle. I am a principal in the law firm of Ferguson & Doyle, P.C. The firm represents many private sector, municipal and state employee unions. Our clients include AFT Connecticut, the University of Connecticut Chapter of the AAUP, as well as numerous municipal firefighter unions.

Today I speak in opposition to Raised Bill No. 6628 an Act Adopting The Revised Uniform Arbitration Act. The purpose of arbitration is to ensure rapid dispute resolution. When an employer and a union negotiate the grievance arbitration procedure, the parties wish to resolve situations as quickly as possible.

Raised Bill No. 6628 does nothing to expedite the Labor arbitration procedure. Instead, it offers layers of judicial intervention that will undoubtedly slow the process down. This may be helpful and necessary for other types of arbitrations. But as far as labor arbitrations, it is burdensome and is totally unnecessary. Additionally, it could add to the costs that both a union and the employer would pay.

Another concern I have regarding Raised Bill No. 6628 is that either party, according to the language, would have 90 days after they have received an arbitration decision, to file what is called a motion to vacate in

Superior Court. That motion to vacate is an attempt to overturn the arbitration decision. The 90 days for either party to decide to file a motion to vacate is unreasonable and unnecessary. The current Connecticut statute allows either party to file a motion to vacate an arbitration award in Superior Court within 30 days. I can think of no other judicial or administrative agency that allows for 90 days for a party to take an appeal.

Let me offer the example of a unionized employee who is terminated by his or her employer. The union files a grievance pursuant to the collective bargaining agreement and the issue is not resolved, and the parties submit the issue to arbitration. This process may take at least 6 months between the grievance procedure and choosing an arbitrator and picking a date for the arbitration. The arbitrator then renders his decision, which returns that employee to his or her job. Now, the employer has 90 more days, 3 months, to make a decision as to whether to file a motion to vacate that arbitration award. In the meantime, the employee is still out of work. This is unfair and unnecessary.

In the context of union contracts, labor arbitration presently works well and is efficient and benefits both the employer and the <sup>union</sup> employees. Raised Bill No. 6628 will not make this process more efficient, but in fact,

makes it burdensome. The labor arbitration process is not broken and therefore does not need to be fixed.

At the very least I would ask that this Committee, if it finds this Bill worthy of consideration, that it substitute language that would exempt labor arbitrations from Raised Bill No. 6628.