

BOARD OF MAYOR AND ALDERMEN

October 6, 1998

7:30 PM

Mayor Wieczorek called the meeting to order.

The Clerk called the roll. There were fourteen aldermen present.

Present: Alderman Wihby, Klock, Reiniger, Sysyn, Clancy, Pinard, O'Neil, Girard, Shea, Rivard, Pariseau, Cashin, Thibault, Hirschmann.

3. Presentation of gift from Mayor of Severodvinsk, Russia to Mayor Wieczorek by Executive Councilor Normand.

Executive Councilor Normand addressed the Board stating as the Mayor knew he had recently traveled to Severodvinsk, Russia and presented to the mayor of that city a proclamation from Mayor Wieczorek. He noted that this community was now faced with some serious problems and the Mayor had to cancel his trip to the United States at this time to address the business of his city. However, Councilor Normand presented a flask with the Russian Seal to Mayor Wieczorek along with a history of Severodvinsk in northern Russia. Councilor Normand noted that the Russians were very unproud of their history, they are very concerned about the fact that they lost most creative folks during the Stalin purges and they are now writing about that, they are talking about what their problems were in the past and the fact that the communist regime was a failed experiment that caused lots of trouble for the Russian people. Councilor Normand noted that not only can we learn from them, but help them find their way by listening to them. He noted in reading an Associated Press article, in Severodvinsk, a City of 210,000 people 40 percent of the homes in this city had their gas terminated because the employers of these people don't have revenue to pay them their wages, so we have a lot to be thankful for in the United States.

CONSENT AGENDA

Mayor Wieczorek advised if you desire to remove any of the following items from the Consent Agenda, please so indicate. If none of the items are to be removed, one motion only will be taken at the conclusion of the presentation.

Ratify and Confirm Polls

- A. Conducted September 18, 1998 approving acceptance of EDA Grant for the rehabilitation project at 1037 Elm Street.

- B. Conducted September 29, 1998 approving the closure of Lowell Street at the request of the Black Brimmer on October 17, 1998 rather than on October 10, 1998.

Approve Under Supervision of the Department of Highways

- D. Bell Atlantic Pole Petitions #'s 921997 and 922010.
- E. PSNH Pole Petitions #'s 11-850, 11-853, and 11-854.

Informational - Referred to Committee on Community Improvement

- F. Communication from representatives of Dockside II Condo Association requesting to purchase property on Riverfront Drive.
- G. Copy of a communication from Barrome and Rolland Paquet regarding properties Map 761, Lots 11 & 2-a, and Map 765, Lots 21 & 22 and expressing their interest in paying the back taxes to date in exchange for property ownership.

Informational to be Received and Filed

- I. Acknowledgment from the family of Julia Cashin for the Board's recent expression of sympathy.
- J. Minutes of Airport Authority meeting held August 20, 1998.
- K. Communication from Executive Councilor Normand submitting copies of agendas for the September 16 & 29, 1998 Executive Council meetings along with copies of minutes from their meetings held on August 26, 1998.
- N. Communication from Major David McCarthy, Enforcement Bureau Commander, NH State Police, advising of his support of the proposed civic center.
- O. Communication from W. L. Hazen praising all City departments.
- Q. Communication from students of the Ecology class at Springfield College urging the City to ensure the protection and maintenance of the Hackett Hill Road area the City proposes to purchase.
- R. Minutes of the Task Force on the Future of Health Care in Manchester meeting held on August 12, 1998.

REFERRALS TO COMMITTEES

**COMMITTEE ON ACCOUNTS, ENROLLMENT
AND REVENUE ADMINISTRATION**

- S. Communication from the Board of Assessors requesting the Board consider the effective date of the next revaluation of the City.
- T. Communication from Captain Phil Doherty, Training Director of the Police Department, requesting the fee for administering entrance exams be raised to \$50.00 to meet their costs.

COMMITTEE ON BILLS ON SECOND READING

U. Ordinances:

“Authorizing the Mayor to dispose of certain tax deeded property known as Map 222 Lot 79 in the vicinity of River Road and Chestnut Street.”

COMMITTEE ON COMMUNITY IMPROVEMENT

- V.** Communication from Director of the Parks, Recreation & Cemetery Department requesting to trade a 1987 and a 1989 pick-up for two (2) one-ton club cab trucks at an approximate cost of \$70,000 in order to address safety concerns expressed by the Risk Manager.
- W.** Petition submitted by Arthur DesMeules on behalf of residents on Wilmot Street requesting that the street be repaved.
- X.** Communication from Robert Iller suggesting that the City invest funding in the City’s parks rather than the Riverwalk.
- Y.** Communication from Executive Councilor Normand submitting an encroachment agreement with the State of NH Department of Transportation relative to the Granite Street parking area associated with West High School.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

Z. Resolutions:

“Amending the 1998 and 1999 Community Improvement Programs, authorizing and appropriating funds for the 1998 CIP 4.20105 and 1999 CIP 420499 Juvenile Jail Removal Program.”

“Amending the 1999 Community Improvement Program, authorizing and appropriating funds in the amount of Six Thousand Dollars (\$6,000.00) for the 1999 Community Improvement Program 710599 LED Replacement Program.”

“Authorizing the Finance Officer to effect a transfer of Three Thousand Seven Hundred Fifty Dollars (\$3,750.00) from Contingency to the Aldermen.”

“Resolution Accepting the Findings Regarding Hackett Hill/UCA Land Transaction.”

COMMITTEE ON TRAFFIC/PUBLIC SAFETY

- AB.** Communication from the City Clerk on behalf of the Special Building Committee requesting to meet to discuss proposed security guard services for the soon to be renovated City Hall complex.
- AC.** Communication from Barry Brensinger , Lavallee/Brensinger PA, on behalf of the Millyard Committee requesting to make a formal presentation with respect to the recently completed Amoskeag Industries Parking Study.
- AD.** Communications from Roger LaChapelle regarding right turns on red at intersections.
- AE.** Communication from Francoise Elise Spradling relative to the pilfering of recyclable aluminum cans which occurs at all hours of the night.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

COMMITTEE ON BILLS ON SECOND READING

AG. Recommending that Ordinances:

“Amending Sections 33.024 and 33.025 (Urban Forester) of the Code of Ordinances of the City of Manchester.”

and

“Amending Sections 33.024, 33.025 and 33.026 (Second Deputy Finance Director/Treasury Manager) of the Codes of Ordinances of the City of Manchester.”

ought to pass.

AH. Recommending that Ordinance:

“Amending Chapter 130, General Offenses, of the Code of Ordinances by inserting a new section 130.13.”

ought to pass.

AI. Recommending that Ordinance:

“Authorizing the Mayor to dispose of certain tax deeded property known as 404 Manchester Street, Map 343, Lot 10.”

ought to pass.

AJ. Recommending that Ordinance:

“Authorizing the Mayor to dispose of certain tax deeded property known as 218 Lake Avenue, Map 92, Lot 1.”

ought to pass subject to execution of a Purchase and Sales Agreement providing for clean-up of the area, paving and fencing. The Committee notes that the amendment provides that the lot be used for parking exclusively by tenants or residents of 215 Lake Avenue and adjacent property.

COMMITTEE ON COMMUNITY IMPROVEMENT

AK. Recommending that grant funds for the 1998 and 1999 Juvenile Jail Removal Program be accepted and authorized for expenditures, and for such purposes, amending resolutions and budget authorizations have been submitted.

- AL.** Recommending that the Board of Mayor and Aldermen accept and expend funds from Public Service of New Hampshire to assist in the purchase of LED replacement traffic lights and for such purpose an amending resolution and budget authorization has been submitted.
- AM.** Recommending that the Board of Mayor and Aldermen establish a five member Special Aldermanic Committee on Riverfront Activities.
- AN.** Recommending that the Board of Mayor and Aldermen find a parcel of land located at Map 222, Lot 52 surplus to city needs and order disposition to the abutter, Grace Episcopal Church, for the sum of \$2,000; subject to the provision that such land not be built upon and further that such land not provide through access to any other developable parcel of land.

The Committee notes that such land is of no value to any other than an abutter, it is in the best interest of the area residents that such land not be developed for access purposes, and the Board of Assessors has advised that \$2,000 is fair compensation for same.

The Committee further recommends that such proposed disposition be referred to the Committee on Bills on Second Reading for Ordinance preparation and review; and that upon conveyance the Finance Officer be authorized and directed to credit tax deed accounts as may be required.

- AO.** Recommending that a request of Ronald Dube to purchase a parcel of property located in the vicinity of Candia Road and Groveland Avenue be denied. The Committee further recommends that such land be removed from tax-deeded status and designated to the Manchester Water Works for its use, and that the Finance Officer be authorized and directed to credit tax deed accounts as may be required.

COMMITTEE ON HUMAN RESOURCES/INSURANCE

- AP.** Advising that a request from the Chief of Police that the Police Department be allowed to pay Special Reaction Team members a tactical operations supplement in the amount of \$25.00 per week was approved.

COMMITTEE ON JOINT SCHOOL BUILDINGS

- AQ.** Advising that it has accepted the enclosed project summaries and contractor's reports for August and September relative to the Henry J. McLaughlin, Jr. Middle School and is submitting same to the Board for informational purposes.
- AR.** Advising that it has accepted the project summary reports for August and September relative to the Central/West Heat & Ventilation Improvements; the Central High School/Locker Room Improvements; the West High School/Special Ed Room 104 w/toilet rooms; the Memorial High School Science Lab and Other Improvements; the ADA Accessibility/School Elevators; the Junior High School-Tech Ed; and the Parkside Addition and are submitting same to the Board for informational purposes.

**HAVING READ THE CONSENT AGENDA, ON MOTION OF ALDERMAN O'NEIL,
DULY SECONDED BY ALDERMAN PARISEAU, IT WAS VOTED THAT THE
CONSENT AGENDA BE APPROVED.**

- C.** Minutes of meetings held August 4, 1998 (two meetings); August 18, 1998; and September 1, 1998 (three meetings).

At the request of the City Clerk, on motion of Alderman Thibault, duly seconded by Alderman Hirschmann, it was voted to table this item.

- H.** Communication from William Ganem, Manchester Babe Ruth Leagues, Inc. Director, requesting the use of Gill Stadium to hold the 50th anniversary Babe Ruth World Series in the year 2000.

Alderman Shea stated this request should receive the first and highest priority and such a message should be given to the Parks, Recreation and Cemetery Department and Commissioners because there has been talk recently of a minor league club coming into Manchester. In 1984 when the world series was conducted here there were 17,000 people, they sold out. So we should give them first priority.

Alderman Shea so moved to request this communication be given first priority by Parks, Recreation and Cemetery. Alderman Pariseau duly seconded the motion. The motion carried with none recorded in opposition.

- L.** Communication from the State Department of Environmental Services regarding financial assurance compliance/solid waste management bureau.
- M.** Communication from the State Department of Environmental Services regarding the Dunbarton Road municipal landfill - shaping, site work and engineering.

Alderman Shea noted that items L and M were closely allied. Alderman Shea asked what had been the response to the communication.

Mr. Thomas stated that this had been coordinated through the Finance Department, if anything it should be referred to them to respond back to the State, it was in regard to the grant program where we are receiving 20 percent for the landfill closure, it was a reporting requirement to continue to receive the funds.

Mr. Sherman advised that they had responded.

Alderman Shea asked if this communication had been responded to.

Mr. Thomas advised that it was done.

Alderman Shea moved to receive and file items L and M. Alderman Pariseau duly seconded the motion.

Alderman Rivard stated he thought it should be referred to the Finance Committee, it was an application that should be filled out and forwarded to the State so that we can be considered for \$2 to \$3 million in assistance in closing the landfill.

Mr. Thomas advised that it had been filed. The information is generated by the Finance Department and periodically the state asks for information. The City is on the grant list and the revolving loan fund list, they would have to pay more attention in providing the information to the state in a more timely fashion in the future.

There being no further discussion, Mayor Wiczorek called for a vote. The motion carried.

- P.** Communication from Francoise Elise Spradling expressing her thanks to Alderman Klock and the Board for their support in funding the sidewalk project on Mammoth Road in Ward 2.

Alderman Reiniger stated he had received a request that the letter be read into the record, and so moved. Alderman Hirschmann duly seconded the motion. The motion carried with Alderman Cashin recorded in opposition noting he felt it was a matter of record having been contained in the agenda.

The letter, addressed to the Board, was read into the record as follows:

The intent of the letter is to acknowledge Alderman Cheryl Klock for her leadership and to thank each and every Alderman on the Board for funding the sidewalk project on Mammoth Road in Ward 2. This sidewalk has been needed for a long time and will provide benefits not only to residents on the street but also to children walking to Smyth Road School, McDonough School, Hillside Junior High, Trinity High School and to patrons of Derryfield Park.

Again Thank You,

s/Francoise Elise Spradling

- AA.** Communication from Assistant Solicitor Arnold advising of receipt of a letter from BlueCross BlueShield inquiring whether or not the City wishes to participate in litigation against major tobacco companies to recoup health care costs.

Alderman Shea asked if this would compromise any litigation from the state level if we were to enter into an agreement with Blue Cross/Blue Shield.

Solicitor Clark responded to his knowledge it would not.

Alderman Shea asked if the state was filing some kind of tobacco claim, we would be included in that even though we are included in another kind of litigation.

Solicitor Clark responded we are still entitled to file our own or to join in any law suit we wanted to, it would not jeopardize the state's action and if we felt that the state's action was more proper we could always withdraw.

Alderman Shea asked if as a community would we benefit more from initiating our own litigation rather than joining them.

Solicitor Clark responded he did not believe so. It would be extremely expensive for the City to pursue this type of litigation on its own.

Alderman Shea stated but if we enter into a negotiation with them we have to follow their type of litigation.

Solicitor Clark responded yes we do.

Alderman Shea stated we don't have any say in it, and asked are we talking about substantial financial recouping or slight financial recouping, when talking about this litigation.

Solicitor Clark responded this litigation is at its initial stages. I discussed that with the attorneys for Blue Cross group, they have not made any determination on what may or may not be recouped at this point.

Alderman Shea stated so this recouping would be done for the people that are in the Blue Cross/Blue Shield program, that for whatever reason have been effected negatively by tobacco.

Solicitor Clark responded correct.

Alderman Shea moved to refer the communication to the Committee on Human Resources/Insurance. Alderman Reiniger duly seconded the motion. The motion carried.

Report of Special Committee on Anti-Graffiti

AF. Recommending that an Ordinance:

“To establish means to prevent, prohibit and remove graffiti from structures and surfaces on public and private property in the City of Manchester”

be referred to the Committee on Bills on Second Reading for technical review.

Alderman Shea stated he wished to give credit to the City Solicitor's office and Attorney Dan Mueller, Tom Arnold, and Tom Clark for this ordinance. The purpose of the ordinance focuses on the criminality of applying graffiti to public or private property resulting in very serious consequences to those found guilty of such crimes. Our committee planned to add additional amendments to this ordinance addressing such issues as funding, contractual agreements for removing graffiti, as well as our committee's evaluation as to the impact signage might have on controlling and ultimately eliminating graffiti from our committee. Alderman Shea complimented members of the committee who had labored long and hard to help resolve this problem including Alderman Clancy, Alderman Thibault, Frank Thomas of Highway, Chief Driscoll and Sargent Robidas, Leon LaFrenniere, Rick Davis of In-Town Management for his poignant insights into what has worked and what hasn't worked relative to removing graffiti from various building structures. Finally, a note of thanks goes to Regis Lemaire, Director of Youth Services, who coordinates this program on a daily basis. Alderman Shea requested Alderman Thibault give an explanation on how they hope publicity through the use of signs will help with this problem.

Alderman Thibault stated the graffiti committee has been working on what we all believe will be an educating problem to let the people know that we will no longer tolerate graffiti in our city.

Alderman Thibault displayed signs which he had made at the request of the Committee. He noted that he also had some pamphlets made that would be distributed to all the schools very shortly in order to educate the public they would start putting up signs shortly in the worst graffiti areas and monitor the difference the signs make and report to the BMA later on our progress.

Alderman Thibault displayed the signs to members of the Board and public, noting the Traffic Department was making the signs for the Committee at a cost of \$10. per sign, with posts rather than placement on buildings, would add an additional \$10. to the cost per sign installation.

Alderman Thibault displayed cards which they had done for distribution to the schools, one side stated "Graffiti is a crime, you could pay \$1,000 fine." The other side stated "Anyone reporting graffiti, if we arrest and prosecute you could receive up to \$1,000 cash," call Regis Lemaire with phone number and Crimeline with a phone number.

Mayor Wiczorek noted his pleasure in thanking those who participated commenting that anytime you see graffiti take over a city you see a city on its way down, and he was glad the group was taking some action.

Alderman Shea noted that Rick Davis had been very helpful to the committee because they had an experimental program with the buildings between Lowell and Hanover Streets and they did run into some problems and that was why they had to amend the initial ordinance so they did not penalize merchants unnecessarily in terms of removing of graffiti, we are hoping through additional meetings they would receive additional funding, now they had seed money, and they had to have contractual services to find out how best to remove the graffiti and not allow it to go back onto the buildings if they did remove it.

On motion of Alderman Shea, duly seconded by Alderman Thibault, it was voted to accept, receive and adopt the report of the Committee.

5. Confirmation of Nominations made by Mayor Wiczorek:

Conservation Commission:

Eric Skoglund to succeed Brett Gifford, term to expire August 1, 1999.

On motion of Alderman Girard, duly seconded by Alderman Pariseau, it was voted to confirm the nomination of Erick Skoglund to the Conservation Commission, term expiring August 1, 1999.

Board of Health:

Sophia Antoniou, RN, to succeed herself, term to expire July 1, 2001; and
Robert Duval, MD, to succeed himself, term to expire July 1, 2001.

On motion of Alderman Thibault, duly seconded by Alderman Rivard, it was voted to confirm the nomination of Sophia Antoniou and Robert Duval to the Board of Health, terms expiring July 1, 2001.

Manchester Development Corporation:

Pamela Diamantis to succeed John I. Snow, term to expire
March 11, 2000.

On motion of Alderman Clancy, duly seconded by Alderman Sysyn, it was voted to confirm the nomination of Pamela Diamantis to the Manchester Development Corporation, term expiring March 11, 2000.

Personnel Appeals Board:

Jenny Stephen to fill a vacant position, term to expire March, 1999.

On motion of Alderman Rivard, duly seconded by Alderman Girard, it was voted to confirm the nomination of Jenny Stephen to the Personnel Appeals Board, term expiring March, 1999.

Police Commission:

Ralph Garst to succeed himself, term to expire September 15, 2001.

On motion of Alderman Thibault, duly seconded by Alderman Girard, it was voted to confirm the nomination of Ralph Garst to the Police Commission, term expiring September 15, 2001.

Mayor Wiczorek made nominations as follows:

Conduct Board

Michael Netkovick to succeed himself, term expiring October 1, 2001.

Parks, Recreation & Cemetery Commission

Thomas R. Murphy to succeed himself, term expiring July 7, 2001.

Norman R. Gill to succeed Michael Lopez, term expiring July 7, 2001.

Alderman Cashin asked if Mr. Lopez had requested not to be re-appointed to the Parks Commission.

Mayor Wiczorek responded no he had not.

Discussion ensued where Alderman Cashin requested Mayor Wiczorek to reconsider his nomination and to nominate Mr. Lopez to succeed himself on the Parks Commission, noting that he was probably one of the hardest working commissioners they ever had in the City. Mayor Wiczorek noted that he had served well for sixteen years on that commission, and he had spoken with Mr. Lopez who was a decent person, if there was something else that comes along that he felt they could use someone of Mr. Lopez's caliber he would be happy to appoint him to that position. Alderman Thibault also requested he reconsider.

Mayor Wieczorek advised that he was appointing a Riverwalk Committee to assist the Board of Mayor and Aldermen in the development of this project as follows:

Richard Davis-Intown Manchester
Ron Ludwig-Parks, Recreation & Cemetery
Robert MacKenzie-Planning
Frank Thomas-Highway
Peter Ramsey-Riverfront Park Foundation

Alderman Shea noted that he had read over the Highway Commission notes and Tom Sommers submitted to the commission a presentation of the proposed riverwalk walkway. The entire length of the walk is approximately 2.1 miles with an estimated construction cost of \$6.5 million. Alderman Shea noted he couldn't get a sidewalk across from Jewett School or one for the kids over at Hallsville School, are we all looking out for everyone, noting \$6.5 million was \$3.1 million per mile.

Alderman O'Neil stated he thought originally when we supported this it was to be a public private partnership led by the private end and it seems to have taken a turn to be a public project, and he wondered what happened there. We know with the private group leading the park it was a very successful in getting it done on time, and he couldn't seem to get a clear answer on why that shifted.

Mr. MacKenzie addressed the Board stating this was an important project for the city and thought they all recognize that money is very scarce and certainly this was a project that was going to take more than just property tax money to fund. It would take state funds, federal funds, private contributions to get the entire project done. The difficulty is once you start dealing with two issues, one when you have state and federal funds you have to follow procurement codes and those are basically the same as the city's so sections that are to be funded with those other funds will have to go through city procurement codes anyway. Certainly if we are going to be reimbursed for any of the design or future portions of that we have to follow all of those regulations. Secondly, it is important when you get out into the river, actual construction within the river, it would be important that it be a city project in order to deal with all the regulatory hurdles that we anticipate. We are going to be dealing with at least four different state and federal permitting agencies, and the only way they he could see that they could get it done expeditiously if those sections are basically city projects. So they designed an approach they think will have the best chance of succeeding over the long run, that was to play to the strengths of the public sector when we need that, and the private sector when we can utilize those strengths. That is why we are using a partnership team, we have the public and private sectors on a team to accomplish this. There are strengths that the private sector can bring to it, for example fundraising like at singer park, they would also have issues dealing with liabilities, which is a major concern to a lot of private entities, that can be handled by the City and through various state legislation. We think that we have come to an agreement on what is the most expeditious way to build a riverwalk which we feel is economically very important to

the City. He noted that in looking at other cities that have turned around they had a riverwalk, they could look at Providence, RI or San Antonio, riverwalks in those communities were vital to their revitalization. Certainly the central city has a ways to go before we make significant progress. The private groups that have been working on this as well as the public group feel that we have the right combination to make this work, while recognizing we have to minimize the amount of public investment, public property taxes to this project.

Alderman Girard stated the numbers that Alderman Shea read to the Board tonight are the numbers that have been attached to this project all along. they are presented in a manner that is not fair or accurate. When Mr. Ramsey and the Riverfront Park Foundation came to the CIP committee to make a presentation and several other members of the Board were present, they said that one of the areas that they could help bring funding would be for the bridge spanning the river to connect the two sides of the river because they felt that those areas would be places where companies could get good advertising mileage. He did not see where there had been any shift in the public/private partnership here, the numbers that have been presented tonight are the numbers that we have looked at all along. There is nothing new. He had attended the trip to Providence with the Chamber yesterday, and had reason to be in Providence over the past few years, and the change that the city of Providence has undergone around its riverfront, which includes a very extensive riverwalk, has been nothing short of amazing. I would caution any member of this board who looks at any project downtown and set it against any project in any neighborhood. The fact of the matter is that the riverwalk isn't just a nice thing to have in a community, it has proven time and again where as part of the package of the downtown they dramatically improve economic development in the area and dramatically improve taxable values which helps with the tax rate and other issues.

Alderman O'Neil stated his intent was not to start a debate on the philosophy of the riverfront walk way project, but noted that they have seen success with the private park foundation taking the lead with regards to Singer Park, he was not sure if the city was the lead on that if the park would be built today, and that's a reality. That is what he was asking, when is there going to be a determination made, understanding there are strengths that the city brings to this, but there are also weaknesses that the city brings to this, there are things that the riverfront park foundation can do that the city can't do, and he did not want to see the thing become bogged down because the city is the lead agent on it. Alderman O'Neil stated that he thought Alderman Reiniger had indicated that this had not been determined yet.

Alderman Reiniger stated this was correct, it was his understanding that they were still working that out.

Alderman O'Neil stated that the decision should be a Board level or at least Committee level, correct.

Alderman Reiniger concurred.

Alderman Shea stated he wished to correct Alderman Girard, because basically when this was presented it was presented as the first mile was \$2.1 million and \$500,000 would be private donations. The second mile was \$2.1 million, the third mile was \$2.1 million. That was the original intent. Alderman Shea noted he had asked Kevin Clougherty if they realized Public

Service had a power plant there, and the power plant is filled with different kinds of things that may not be usable. He responded that this was why they started on the other end. Alderman Shea stated to Alderman Girard as far as your concerned, you were on the CIP Committee and you voted down \$45,000 for the kids across from Jewett and yet your expounding for whatever this is.

Alderman Girard stated he had not voted against any sidewalks at Jewett Street School.

7. Introduction by Alderman Shea of his intern, Kayan Moussoba.

Alderman Shea stated he wished to give Alderman Elise Spradling credit for instituting the intern program. She initiated and designed it, she was very instrumental in starting this program. The purpose of the program is to allow students chosen for the program to get first hand experience relating to how our city government functions. The second is to provide the students with insights relating to city government matters, and how our city government then interacts with state and federal branches of government as well as the private sector of our society. Alderman Shea introduced Kayan Moussoba who will serve as his intern during the coming year. Kayan was born in Beirut, Lebanon and during the war in Lebanon Kayan's parents decided that it would be best for him and his brother to live in America. Thus when Kayan was six years old he moved to Manchester and entered the ESL program at Highland School, a wonderful program that helped him. He then attended both Wilson School, and Hallsville School, Southside Junior High School. Now he is a junior at Memorial High School and participates in several organizations including the SADD program, Kids Voting, UNH Partnership, Student Council, and the Yearbook. He is also one of the school's newspaper editors and most especially he teaches Sunday School at Our Lady of Cedars Church and teaches math at the Summerbridge Program.

8. Introduction by Alderman Girard of his intern from Memorial High School.

Alderman Girard stated he found interns at both West and Central and was pleased to announce that he was able to find Matt Labelzek at Memorial High School. Matt is a member of the school's Assembly Committee, the Student Council, the National Honor Society, and the varsity basketball team. He was last November's nominee for the Frances Wayland Parker Scholar of the Month, he has received the Dartmouth Book Award, he is the student representative from Memorial for the Spirit of Manchester Awards Committee, and he is currently ranked first in his class with a GPA of 4.0.

On motion of Alderman Thibault, duly seconded by Alderman Pariseau, it was voted to recess the regular meeting to allow the Committee on Finance to meet.

Mayor Wieczorek called the meeting back to order.

OTHER BUSINESS

A report of the Committee on Finance was presented recommending that Resolutions:

Amending the 1998 and 1999 Community Improvement Programs, authorizing and appropriating funds for the 1998 CIP 4.20105 and 1999 CIP 420499 Juvenile Jail Removal Program.”

“Amending the 1999 Community Improvement Program, authorizing and appropriating funds in the amount of Six Thousand Dollars (\$6,000.00) for the 1999 Community Improvement Program 710599 LED Replacement Program.”

“Authorizing the Finance Officer to effect a transfer of Three Thousand Seven Hundred Fifty Dollars (\$3,750.00) from Contingency to the Aldermen.”

“Resolution Accepting the Findings Regarding Hackett Hill/UCA Land Transaction.”

ought to pass and be Enrolled.

Alderman Rivard moved to accept, receive and adopt the report. Alderman Girard duly seconded the motion. The motion carried with none recorded in opposition.

12. A report of the Committee on Administration was presented recommending that the Board of Mayor and Aldermen accept the staff recommendation to contract with Rockingham Regional Ambulance, Inc. for the provision of emergency ambulance services; and further that the Mayor be authorized to execute such contract for and on behalf of the City of Manchester, subject to the review and approval of the City Solicitor.

Alderman Pariseau moved to accept, receive and adopt the report. Alderman O’Neil duly seconded the motion.

Alderman Hirschmann asked which provider provides the lowest fare to the end user.

Alderman Pariseau responded that they were about the same. Alderman Thibault concurred noting they were very close.

Mayor Wieczorek called for a vote. The motion carried with Alderman Shea recorded in opposition, and Alderman Cashin recorded as abstaining.

Mayor Wieczorek called a brief recess.

Mayor Wieczorek called the meeting back to order.

13. Report of the Committee on Human Resources recommending that the Yarger, Decker & Associates Report be referred to the Board of Mayor and Aldermen.

Mr. Frank Thomas addressed the Board stating he was pleased to introduce Floyd Decker who will present a completed classification and compensation study. I'm here as chairman of the City's Quality Management Committee. The conclusion of the study represents over three years of efforts by the City's Quality Management Committee and the involvement of both management and the unions on the study's oversight committee. The purpose of the study was to address internal inconsistencies as it related to job worth resulting from a 30 year old personnel system, and to make the municipal employee competitive with the private sector externally. So that we weren't just a training ground for others. In addition the study was intended to develop a performance system based on merit not longevity. It's my opinion that these tasks have been accomplished. Does the plan make everybody happy? No. Does the plan address most of the existing problems? Yes. Does the plan allow for its own maintenance and growth? Yes. Does the plan cost money to implement? Yes. Will the City get a return on its investment? Yes. Should the plan be adopted? In my opinion, yes. The Human Resource Committee has been kept informed of the progress of the study as it was developing and is the reason why we are here tonight.

Mr. Thomas turned the presentation over to Floyd Decker, who in his opinion had done an excellent job developing this plan in an open environment with input from labor, management, and elected officials.

Mr. Decker addressed the Board utilizing an overhead projector stating he would like to give them briefly an overview of the process that they used to conduct the study, very quickly take them through the handouts provided for members, a summary of the findings and recommendations and leave most of the presentation for their questions, concerns and comments because he was sure during the past couple of weeks they had a number of questions from employees and supervisors and bargaining units about different parts of the study. He wanted to make sure that tonight they would get right at those concerns that they may have.

Mr. Decker continued stating first of all let me just say that for your information that we have really enjoyed working with Frank Thomas and the committee. Frank has been a consultant himself as many of you know and he had a very unique talent of anticipating what we were going to do and when we were going to do it and keeping us on the straight and narrow path. So you had a strong advocate with Frank and that smile of his has some teeth and some steel behind it. First of all, it is important for you to know and for everyone else to know that this is not a study to determine employees' personal performance. This is a study about making the City of Manchester competitive in terms of the minimum and maximum range of pay that you have for different kinds of positions or classes of jobs. It is not...its purpose is not to provide raises to employees. Its purpose is to make sure that your range is competitive with the market and is internally fair. So our two principal objectives in this study were to make sure that you were externally competitive with the market which was largely within about an hours drive from here and also to make sure that your pay was internally fair and by internally fair, I think some of you

have seen this chart before. This chart shows, for example, the minimum and maximum rates of pay here and pay grades from low to high going down for different kinds of jobs in a mythical city in New Hampshire. It has a library, it has a public works department, a public safety department, an administrative department and you will notice on this chart that we have a library page here that is paid the same here as a police officer or firefighter and our common sense tells us that this is not correct. You will see that it also shows that a department secretary makes more money than an accounting clerk or a firefighter. Obviously, the department secretary thinks that fair but again common sense will tell you that some jobs are worth more than others so there is very little on this chart that is correct. Our job and the City of Manchester's was to look at about 500+ different kinds of jobs that you had and bring some internal equity and fairness to them so that was the principal function that we had. That, along with making sure that they were externally competitive. This flow chart represents the processes that we used in conducting the study. Obviously, the first thing we did was look at your own current classification and pay system. We then had each employee fill out a description of their work. We personally interviewed about 68% to 75% of all employees in the City, either individually or in groups. We then wrote new job descriptions for them and let them read them and edit them and then we, at the same time, conducted the survey of public and private employers along the bottom here to see what they were paying for similar kinds of jobs and then we rated those jobs and recommended a pay grade for them and so we are here tonight presenting the final report and the final recommendations to you. There is something, if you look at the first handout that you have, it says Part I, Findings and Recommendations. Now we did not provide you with the full final report which is over 300 or 400 pages and is here if any of you want to see any other parts of it you are welcome to do so obviously. Mark Hobson has a copy. Frank Thomas has a copy and you are welcome to look at it. What I am giving you are the principal recommendations and the other deals with how we conducted the study, the methodologies and so forth. If you look on Page 1 of the findings and recommendations, the first thing I want you to know is that we had recommended approximately 314 types of jobs or a reduction of 236 classes of positions. You had over 500 classes of positions. So that represents approximately a 43% reduction in the numbers or types of jobs that you had. What it means is that we consolidated different kinds of jobs together where it made sense so that they have the same job title and same job description in general. We did change some class concepts. We did change how jobs were classified, but in no instance did we change what an employee did. You did not ask us to go and tell you what an employee ought to be doing. You asked us to tell you what they were doing and to classify them accordingly. Now we also, under number six, we provided the Human Resources Department with suggested rules and regulations for the administration of the classification pay plan and as you will see in a few minutes, at the end of this section of Findings and Recommendations, we are providing to you a suggested ordinance that has changes in your existing Chapter 33 and marked up so that you can see the suggested changes it would have for you to implement this system. Now, the one thing I want to say to you is, and one of the principal objectives you gave to us is that you have employees in obviously 30 something different departments, but you have employees like in 14 or 16 different bargaining

units along with non-affiliated employees. In some cases you had like accounting clerks that may be in different bargaining units with different pay grades and different pay ranges or you may have equipment mechanics in different bargaining units and different pay grades so our job was to say how are we going to organize this in such a fashion so that you can tell that an equipment mechanic in the Fire Department should or should not be paid the same relative wage as an equipment mechanic in the Public Works Department. So what we have done is, and we made sure that we are tracking hopefully right along with the bargaining unit representatives, we are suggesting that you eliminate all of these various pay schedules that you have with the different bargaining units and that you go to a single, consolidated pay schedule so that if an accountant in one bargaining unit or one department is in pay grade 10, they know that is the same range for every bargaining unit if they are doing the same kind of work. So, I am going to take you through that new consolidated pay schedule in a few minutes, but I wanted you to know that. Also, you had different longevity schedules for different bargaining units and we will be proposing to you a single longevity schedule for all employees. For example, if an employee has been with the City for 25 years, whether they are a truck driver in Public Works or a fire captain or a police officer or an accountant, we are suggesting that the reward for being with the City for 30 years and staying with you should be the same rather than be individually negotiated. Likewise, we are suggesting that cost of living, hopefully can be negotiated with all the bargaining units so that the cost of living increase each year is the same. The cost of living increase impacts Frank Thomas the same way it impacts the custodian. It is the same cost of living, yet in many cases in your bargaining units, one bargaining unit will say that the cost of living increase is 1.75% and another one will say it is 4%. How can that be? It becomes a negotiating item when, in fact, a cost of living ought to be able to be figured out fairly easily in a City of this size. You will see about six or eight pages in there, a chart where we show the base pay and longevity increases for the various bargaining units and then at the end of that next page our recommendations and we can go over that in a few minutes. Let me talk just a second about this consolidated pay schedule. You have that consolidated pay schedule in your handouts. What you will see is that we have one through, I think, thirty-three pay grades. Now it is important to know that the difference between each pay grade, the difference between pay grade one and pay grade two, is 7.5%. So the difference here between pay grade seventeen and pay grade eighteen is 7.5%. The difference between each step in the schedule, between Step A or Step B, is 3%. So statistically, 7.5% between grades, 3% between steps. Now we have assigned the different jobs to pay grades. For example, we have assigned I think a police officer to pay grade 17. I think that is right. So here is how we have suggested that the plan be implemented to put all of your employees on the new suggested consolidated pay schedule. If an employee's current pay, after your 3% or your cost of living increase you just recently granted, if that employee's current pay is below the minimum, we are suggesting that they be moved to the minimum. If that employee's current pay is higher than our suggested maximum, we recommend that you keep them at their current pay until the cost of living increases in the schedule over the years catches up with them but that you don't cut their pay. Now here is the rub. We are suggesting that if an employee's pay falls between one of these steps, that you

simply move them to the next step. Now, that means that under pay grade 17, if an employee's current pay is \$1 short of Step B, the employee would only get \$1 a year, but if they are \$1,000 short of Step B, they would get \$1,000 to go up to Step B. That is going to average out to about 1.5%. Some employees will be glad, some will be sad and you will hear from those who are sad saying you mean after all this time all I got was a very small amount of money. I got \$50 or I got \$500. For the most part, with very few exceptions, our minimum rate of pay and our maximum rate of pay is much greater than it used to be, than it is now under your current system. So what that employee is trading is they are trading from being where they were in their schedule, perhaps topped out, for an opportunity to grow in the future. There will be some employees who may say to you, well you know I used to be at the top of my schedule. I have been with the City for 25 years and that means that I ought to be paid this rate because that what a 25 year employee is getting in say Concord or Nashua. Well let me tell you, if you do that, you are going to blow the roof off of this building in terms of the budget. I have never seen a City able to afford an implementation system that way. What they are doing is if they were at the top of their scale, they will now be down toward the middle and now they will have a chance to grow again instead of being frozen. Some will say well I am only two or three years away from my retirement so I need this higher step for my retirement and the answer to that is you are coming down here. The best three years are going to be the next three and if you are going to retire in three years it is better than what you would have if you were topped out under your current scale. Now this schedule shows you each of the grades so that as you look and see which grade we propose for a class, you can see what the annual rate is, what the monthly rate is, what the hourly rate is, and what the rate would be for overtime. Now it is also important, as you look at this schedule, to see that we have done a couple of things. You may ask well how would an employee move from step A to step B and from Step B to Step C. We are proposing that they move on the basis of performance. An employee whose performance is judged to be satisfactory during the year would then move from Step A to Step B for example. Perhaps, if their performance was judged to be extraordinary, they might be able to move another step but have the pay be in cash rather than a permanent move in their base pay so you are not rewarding an employee for their whole life for one year's outstanding performance. Also, in addition to movement up the scale in terms of performance, we are suggesting that each grade have a half grade and that is represented on your schedule there as an A grade. You will see 17A, 18A. A stands for achievement and what we want to do is establish for each type of job those kinds of additional knowledge or skills that could be acquired by an employee that is not required at their condition of employment, at the beginning of their employment, but something that would be of value to the City, would be of value to the department, something the employee could do to improve themselves and make themselves and their talents more valuable to the City. For example, if an employee say was an electrician, wasn't required to have a Master's Electrician license, but they got one then they could move from their step say 17 or say 15F to 15AF and then that way they could be awarded as having done that. The rule would be, of course, that that opportunity be available to every employee in that type of job. That is be of value to the City so that favoritism could not be exercised in that way. It is also a way that is not subjective, that is

objective measurements. They either got their credentials or either got their education, they got the skill or they didn't. So we now have those two ways on the basis of performance and the basis of acquiring new knowledge and skill for them to move up the ladder and bring more value to the City. Now, there are some who say that in addition to that what about my longevity. I just touched on that a few minutes ago when I said someone who was at the top end of that pay scale would worry that they were no longer at the top of their pay scale so they lost their longevity. What we are proposing is, again, as I said that longevity be uniform so that an employee who had been with the City for five years, for ten years, for fifteen, twenty, twenty-five, thirty or thirty-five, that when they reach that milestone they move up one more step which is 3%. Your average longevity move today is about 2.5%. It varies among different bargaining units, but it averages out to about 2.5%. We are suggesting that if you keep the consolidated pay matrix, and employee who comes with the City and has joined the City, on the fifth year they would be on Step F so on that fifth year they would move to Step G also for their longevity and so forth. Now you will see on the second page of your handout dealing with the chart, you will see a matrix like this. What this means is that once an employee has achieved Step M, which is the maximum step in their grade, now for the fifteenth year or the twentieth year, depending on where they are on the schedule, here are some additional longevity steps but these are only for longevity they are not for any other purpose other than longevity. I would say that an employee who is topped out in their grade at Step M should qualify for an extraordinary performance rating so that they could have an opportunity to continue to strive for excellence in their job but their base pay should not be moved beyond Step M. Now let me talk a few seconds about, under paragraph eight in your Findings and Recommendations, Implementation Methodologies. I just described to you the methodology that we suggest that you use in putting employees on the pay grades. If you do that, the cost will be approximately 2.8%. You have a chart there that shows the cost. It shows it 3.1%. It will be less than that because Fred Ruscsek pointed out to us that we had on his list in the Health Department the employees pay calculated on the basis of 52 weeks a year and they don't work 52 weeks a year. So the figures we have for Health are inflated by about \$125,000. You subtract that out and the new cost is about 2.8% and the total implementation cost in terms of dollars is \$1.3 million approximately instead of the \$1.4 million we are showing on the chart. Now there are just a few exceptions to what we have recommended to that and those are described in the book, that have to do with the Police Investigator/Specialist position which is a new promoted rank that we are suggesting in the police classes. You have Police Patrol Officer and then you would have a Police Investigator or Specialist like the detectives or like the juvenile people who are recruited from that division. It would become a new promoted class so in order to provide some of those with the incentive to move into that class, we moved them onto the scale with a slightly different methodology and employees in the class of School Nurse II, we put those that had their Bachelor's Degree we put in the achievement grade level. Now I want to talk for a minute about the Fair Labor Standards Act. You have, in the past, basically had a policy something like this. If an employee was in pay grade 20 or higher, you basically said that they had no hours, they were not assigned any particular hours of work. Basically they were what we call exempt from the Fair Labor

Standards Act. We have suggested that you base your determination on whether or not an employee is exempt or non-exempt, on the basis of the nature of the job in accordance with the FLSA regulations. So, we are basically saying that an employee who is exempt from the Fair Labor Standards Act not be paid overtime. There are about 53 classes of positions that you have today that are exempt, but that you are paying overtime for. There is one class that you are calling exempt that we think ought to be non-exempt and that is excellent. We only found one example out of all those 500+ classes where you were not paying overtime where we thought you probably should but you are paying overtime for 53 classes of positions when you ought to not be doing that. Now except that, you will see there that we are recommending that there are approximately 17 classes of positions that we think you ought to consider continuing paying overtime for primarily for the fact that they are falling close to the break point and in some instances they are with workers on a regular basis who may be getting overtime and the overtime then is creating an inequity between their supervisors and themselves and many of them deal with snow removal. But you have a policy already that basically says, if I am interpreting it correctly, that for pay grade 20 and above are what you meant to be exempt positions that overtime should not be paid and we concur with that. We are also recommending that you eliminate on-call and stand-by pay for all exempt employees. All exempt employees unless that is a part of a collective bargaining agreement they may have. Again, we are trying to give you highly competitive pay and what we are saying is that if you are going to pay highly competitive minimum and maximum ranges in the market and an employee is exempt, they don't have fixed hours, that they simply should be doing their job and stand-by or on-call pay is not a part of that. That is different for someone who may be non-exempt, but not for the exempt employees. We are also suggesting under Benefits and I am going to now move through this a little faster for you, we are suggesting that most of the cities we surveyed, their hours of work were 37.5 to 40 hours per week. Forty being generally more common. There is a cost to moving employees from 35 or 37.5 to 40 hours per week. We are suggesting that over a period of two years if you can, longer if you have to, that you move your work force to 40 hours a week. That is the more traditional work week. We are suggesting that you move your department heads and assistant department heads right now to 40 hours a week. Some of them you have down as 35, like the Chief of Police, I think is shown as working a 35 hour week. Mark Driscoll has probably never worked a 35 hour week in his career so it doesn't mean anything. It shows 35 hours but it is really not there. We are suggesting that basically all department heads and assistant department heads or the equivalent immediately go to 40 hours a week and it costs you nothing because we are not suggesting any additional increase in pay for it. We would likewise suggest that any exempt employee, in the next year or two, be moved to a 40 hour work week and there be no additional rate in pay because they are not hourly employees. We think they are within the market with where we have placed them in our recommendation and that they should be moved accordingly. Now for those employees who are exempt, if they are currently non-exempt and they are on a 35 hour work week, some of them are on an extended work week. They are working 40 hours anyway. Most of them, or a good deal of them are. There is no cost to moving them to a 40 hour work week other than simply,

well if they are already on an extended work week there is no cost. If you are going to move to a 40 hour work week, you just want to make sure and we would too, that the hourly rate that they get is the same for 40 hours as it is for 35. Now what about the employee who is non-exempt and they are getting overtime, remember the 53 classes. Non-exempt, but we are suggesting that they be exempt. Now what happens? An employee is working 35 hours, you have moved them to the next step in the pay schedule and you ask them to work 40 hours, they lose out because really what you are asking them to do is to work five more hours a week but they are working at less hours per week. So what we are suggesting is that for those you move them from 35 to 40 hours a week over a year or two, but you make sure that they are moved at the same hourly rate so that they are not losing money and then when you put them on the schedule they no longer get overtime because they now are exempt. I think in some cases that move to 40 hours is not going to be what you want to do for some. Like, for example, in the Health Department some of the school nurses, there is no need for them to work 40 hours. In some areas, it simply, like education assistants in some of the schools you don't want to move them to 40 hours, you don't want to move them to 52 weeks. They don't work that, but you do, for most of your employees, I think most of the cities are working the 40 hour week and you want to do that. Another change that we are recommending to you is vacation policy. Just quickly, we found that most cities are providing three weeks of vacation after the fifth year, four weeks after 12-15 years and five weeks after 20 years or so and we are suggesting that you move toward that. Sick leave policy, we found that you were being very creative with the use of your sick leave banks and congratulate you on that, that eliminates the cost of short-term disability insurance so we recommend no change there. We do, however, suggest that you explore the idea of long-term disability insurance. Simply every other municipal employer and private employer that we surveyed provided long-term disability insurance for their employees. Again, those sick leave banks, you might want to be working towards making some of its practices uniformly applicable to all employees but each of those have their own little governing systems so it would just be interesting to look at it and see if you could strengthen it but it is an excellent system and we congratulate you on that. We would suggest, as most cities do and other employers, that you allow an employee to use their sick leave for family illness but that you not allow them to draw any money down from the sick leave bank for family illness. We found your holiday and personal leave policies to be competitive. We found that the terms of what you provide in health insurance is competitive, but that you eliminate the six month waiting period for an employee to join the health care program. That is going to keep you, in many cases, from recruiting qualified people that come to the City as employees if they know that they have to cover their own health insurance for six months and no other city or private employer that we surveyed required that kind of a wait. The more common wait was 30 days or the next month after employment. You can read through that. The rest we found to be generally competitive. Educational reimbursement leave you may want to look at differentiating some of your total reimbursement costs for graduate and undergraduate studies because graduate studies can be expensive in this part of the country. Now the last half of that packet that we handed to you where it says at the top "To the Board of Mayor and Aldermen, City of Manchester", we

took your Chapter 33, which is your personnel policy and I am sure most of you have served in the Legislature at one time or another or in government long enough to know that we have marked this up like a legislative mark-up. Where we have stricken something it means we are recommending that you take it out and where we have underlined it, we are recommending language be added. So what we have done here is we have gone through your existing ordinance and made those changes that we think would be desirable to implement the recommendations that I have just talked to you about and I think it will make it easier for you to see the changes by putting it in that form. I would like to show you one other piece, two or three of the other handout pieces to show you what they are and then we can open this up for conversation and questions and comments. You have a chart called Appendix B-4. Down the left hand column of this handout, you will see Proposed Class Title and at the bottom of that page you will see Emergency Call Operator. Next to that you will see a Class Code. That Class Code means nothing more than that is the number of the job description. Then it shows the current grade, the minimum and maximum which you are now paying. In some cases, like Office Assistant there, about halfway down or a little further than halfway down, you will see the current grade is 5-12. That means that we found jobs that were called Office Assistant in several grades between grade 5 and grade 12 depending on the bargaining schedule being used. Then we have the minimum and the maximum for those current grades. Then we have our proposed grade so you can see everybody we have proposed for Labor Grade 10, everybody for 11, everybody for 17. You can see where we have thought the jobs should be grouped together in terms of the level of responsibility as it relates to pay and our minimum and maximum. Now our next column, under Proposed Versus, lets take an Emergency Call Operator at the bottom. What that means is where it says 1.29 under Current Minimum, it means that our proposed minimum is 29% higher than your current minimum and it means, under the next column, 1.19, that our proposed maximum is 19% higher than your current maximum. That does not mean that we are recommending that the employees get 21% or 19% increases. It means the minimum and the maximum have changed that amount. The next column, under Survey, 2nd Low, 1.61 means that our minimum is 61% higher than the second lowest that we found in the survey and likewise the 1.19 means that our proposed maximum is 19% higher than the second highest that we found in the survey so that you are competitive, but not at the top of the range in terms of the entire market. That is how you read this chart then you can see for each one that has that information how it came out. Now those that do not have that kind of information beside it means that they were not one of the positions that we surveyed for the study. This next sheet, which I think you have in your packet, is called City of Manchester FLSA Designations. When we talked about overtime, that is a list of all the classes showing where we have recommended that they be placed in terms of whether they are exempt or non-exempt and if they are exempt, why they are exempt. Finally, you will have a chart or a packet, thick packet called Manchester Position Allocation Table of Contents. By department, this is a listing of every employee that was in the study, their name, their current title, their proposed title, their current pay grade and salary and their proposed pay grade and salary and you can see how this affected every employee in the entire City by department. There will be some employees whose

name has beside it no PD. That means no positions description and to this date we have not received anyone with a position description for and those are mainly in the areas of the schools and the Environmental Protection Department. So in those cases EPD, for example, you will see that the proposed salaries are less than the current. That is because we have some missing positions and until we get those in, there is not anything we can do about it. I know that is taking you through it very, very quickly and I am sure you have some questions or comments and I would be glad to have them.

Mayor Wieczorek stated we can take a few questions if you want, but we are not going to take any action on this report tonight. Since everybody just got it, I would like to make sure that everybody takes a couple of weeks to review this, get back to either Frank or to Mark or to Floyd to get their questions answered so that we can be in a position to take some action at a future date.

Alderman Thibault stated I just want to make sure that I understand this correctly. Appendix B-4, on the second line, I guess you got Courier. You have got current minimum at \$21,715. Are you saying that the proposed minimum would go down now to \$17,468?

Mr. Decker replied yes, Sir. We are saying both the minimum and the maximum of that position would go down. We found that to be, your pay level to be higher than is ordinary for a position of that kind among other employers. There are very few of those, Alderman, but there are like, I think as you go through, you will find four or five of those where we found that the pay was skewed. Usually, and I don't know the individual or individuals that we are talking about there, but usually that is a case if where someone has been with the City for a long time, they have moved up, because that includes their longevity and that is moved up and that is why.

Alderman Thibault asked so then if I go down the list to Office Assistant where you have the current minimum at \$10,712, this one is going up to \$20,000?

Mr. Decker answered you have a range of people there. The lowest paid one that you have is \$10,000 now. That is the lowest minimum that you have. I don't think you have any employees who are paid that level, that just represents the current minimum level of your pay. In many cases, your minimum is so low in some of these that you are actually hiring well up into the range but I don't think we have any employee who would move from \$10,000 to \$20,000. Maybe one or two.

Alderman O'Neil asked you have met with, to the best of your knowledge, everybody that has had concerns correct, through the formal process.

Mr. Decker answered yes, Sir.

Alderman O'Neil asked what happens if, it is my understanding that there are some departments that the department heads and unions took a very active role and really crossed T's and dotted I's with regards to this and you may or may not have agreed with them but there was a very good, thorough process. There may be other departments that just misunderstood what they needed to do or employees in those departments that thought the department heads might have been taking care of it. What happens once we formally adopt this and we find that there may be some problems?

Mr. Decker answered first of all, I would be the first one to tell you that we are not perfect and that no process like this is perfect and there may be instances like that. At the same time, I think it is important that you understand that there are some employees out there who simply don't want to take no for an answer. They are going to come back and appeal and appeal and appeal until you agree with them so there has to be some closure to this and a cooling off period so that you can go back and revisit some things, but with regard to your question, Alderman O'Neil, I think if we can identify what those kind of things are, Frank Thomas and I have talked about perhaps one way of dealing with it is to bring that issue to the Human Resources Department and then to the Oversight Committee to look and see if it simply a repeat of an appeal or whether there really is some odd thing there. I know that, for example, on the list that you have there on the FLSA Designations, there may be one or two things that Mark and I have looked at that are questionable so someone may come and say you know that really should be non-exempt rather than exempt or someone else could say you know I thought you have agreed that someone was going to be an Accounting Technician and instead you still have them at a couple of things below so there could be some of that stuff. I don't think there is much, if any, but if there is we are not perfect and I think there should be kind of a release valve here so that if you really see something that looks way out of whack you ought to be able to question it but I would just suggest to you that we need to be very careful with that or we will set off a complete wave of new appeals.

Alderman O'Neil asked what would be the proper mechanics. A letter to the Human Resources Director, to the Quality Management Committee, to the Board's Human Resources Committee? What would be the proper mechanics if somebody was to approach me?

Mr. Thomas answered I would suggest the Oversight Committee because the Oversight Committee has basically been coordinating this project from Day 1.

Alderman O'Neil asked so they should be addressed to you then.

Mr. Thomas answered yes or to Mark Hobson who would then forward it to me.

Mr. Hobson stated I just wanted to point out that on the Oversight Committee there are two members of the Board of Mayor and Aldermen, Alderman Pinard and Alderman Klock, and

there are six representatives of employee labor groups and there are eight representatives of the Quality Management Committee.

Alderman Shea stated when you mentioned about the cost of living and you said that the lower and the higher, in other words are you saying that if the cost of living were 1.2% would the person in the lower level receive the same...I mean obviously their salary would...just for discussion they are making \$20,000 and the other fellow or woman is making \$80,000. 1.2% of \$20,000 is certainly not the same as 1.2% of \$80,000. We both know that so how do you reconcile that?

Mr. Decker replied well I think the cost of living, if someone making \$80,000 a year is paying \$2,000 a month on their mortgage and the cost of living goes up 1.2% and the one making \$30,000 a year is paying \$75,000 or \$80,000 on their mortgage, I mean the cost of living impacts everybody the same. So if you put it in dollar terms then you are saying the cost of living doesn't impact someone at a greater income than someone at a lower income and that can, and where do you draw the line. Do you draw the line between someone who makes \$25,000 and \$30,000? Do you draw the line between someone who makes \$40,000 and \$50,000? Where do you draw that line? The cost of living is the cost of living and so you could have, there are firms and I am sure they are here or in Boston that could come in and tell you precisely in Manchester what the cost of living increase was in this area and then I would say you would apply it to all employees equally all the way from Custodian to the highest paid person in the City.

Alderman Shea asked so what you are saying in essence is that those people that are on the higher scale will get a larger cost of living.

Mr. Decker answered they would obviously get a larger dollar amount of increase unless of course, keep in mind that if we are going to have a consolidated pay schedule that this is the consolidated pay schedule. This goes from pay grade 1 to pay grade 33 so this is what we are suggesting that you would refresh when there is a cost of living adjustment. You would refresh the entire schedule. If you don't you would be refreshing only a part of it and I don't know where you would draw the line in terms of the pay grade but the minute you do that, you create two pay schedules. That is where we were when we had all of these different bargaining unit schedules. If you can get the bargaining units to agree that they are going to play off of this level playing field, the same playing field so they can see where they are relative to each other and relative to the non-affiliateds, then you want to make sure that that is refreshed consistently for everyone.

Alderman Shea stated but by the very nature of doing that you are giving a higher pay scale for those on the top level and the ones on the bottom level are not keeping up. So regardless of how you do it, they are still increasing their salary proportionately depending on what their pay scale

might be and the one at the bottom...the poor are getting poorer and the rich are getting richer. Do you know what I am saying? In terms of that inequality. I am just making that point. You cannot, for instance, equitably give all of these people the right kind of treatment. It is impossible because if you give the one at the bottom level a cost of living and you don't give the one at the top than their salary remains the same but if you give the one at the top and the one at the bottom simultaneously than the one at the top is going to be higher regardless of how you want to word it. That is my first comment. My second is, and it concerns the evaluation. What instruments are being developed to evaluate the performance of either department heads or exempt employees or non-exempt employees or what have you?

Mr. Decker replied we provided, a couple of months ago when we were here, we had a meeting with the Oversight Committee and the bargaining unit representatives and we gave them a sample instrument that we use. It is really...it is a process where each department, each bargaining unit would use this general process to develop their instrument so that the performance standards and measurements would apply directly to the work being performed by the individual jobs. For example, the instrument for a police officer would look different than the instrument for an accountant but the form would be the same, the process would be the same where the employee would sit down with other employees like themselves in similar jobs and their supervisors and work through saying this is what we do, this is what we are expected to do to have a satisfactory performance and this is how it is going to be measured. Now to do that, we want the employees to be a part of helping us develop those because nobody knows the job of a police officer like a police officer. No one knows the job of an accountant like the accountant and their supervisors. So they would work together to develop those so that the process is as objective as possible. One of the problems, I think, as all of you know is that performance evaluation has failed primarily around the country in both the public and private sector where it has failed, because the supervisors have been too subjective and biased in their judgments. Personality plays a role more often than actual job performance. What we are trying to get to is a more objective process. You can never take out the subjectivity but if you, as the Mayor and Board of Aldermen, say to your department heads and your supervisors that we expect you to conduct performance evaluations fairly and equitably and if you don't do it your performance evaluation is going to be a pretty sad thing to see, then it can be made to work.

Alderman Shea asked so you are talking about the members of the Police Department being part of the evaluation tool, but you are saying that the supervisor will then implement that evaluation predicated upon what their particular relationship to that particular officer might be.

Mr. Decker answered well I hope not. I hope not in the way that you said that. I hope that they would all participate in not only what they are being measured on but how they are going to be measured and that the supervisor would be expected to do that in a fair and equitable and objective way. Never mind whether he goes hunting or fishing with that officer on the weekend

and that if there is something inappropriate that happens in that system, we are recommending the establishment of an Oversight Committee made up of supervisors, union representatives, non-affiliateds, to which that employee who has a grievance because they felt they were inappropriately measured in terms of performance could be brought and we could uncover any supervisors that are doing that inappropriately.

Alderman Shea asked have we projected how much this would cost in the Year 2001, 2002, 2003 to implement.

Mr. Decker answered the pay and classification recommendations basically would be, the cost would be approximately 3% if you assume that the average employee is performing satisfactorily, would be approximately 3% because some employees you will find will not perform well and you may not grant them an increase. Others may perform extraordinarily well and you may give them more than one increase for that year but if you have your typical bell curve it should come out to approximately an additional 3% on the pay side of the equation.

Alderman Shea stated we have two things working here. We have contracts that are due next year and then we have the implementation of your particular study so that is kind of like a two headed whatever. So, what I am trying to say is that after the contracts are settled, we still will have the implementation of your study so it is important that the Aldermanic members, I believe, know approximately how much this is going to be in two years, three years, five years, maybe many of us won't be here but somebody will be burdened with that particular cost, the taxpayers you know. So that is what I am suggesting.

Mr. Hobson replied I just wanted to give a point of clarification on the performance evaluation tool. The tool was developed by an associate of Mr. Decker and the full tool was passed out to department heads, members of the Oversight Committee, including all of the bargaining unit representatives, and the Human Resources and Insurance Committee and then we gave an abbreviated or executive summary to the full Board of Mayor and Aldermen about five months ago as just an FYI in your packets. So the full package itself and the details behind that are available in our office and we also did present that to the Human Resources Committee.

Alderman Shea stated you said you had a tool for the evaluation. Was it the same tool that you gave to all department heads? That contradicts what he just said.

Mr. Hobson replied the performance evaluation tool that Mr. Decker brought forward to the Oversight Committee, that an executive summary was given to the Board of Mayor and Aldermen and the full package itself of the tool, the sample, was given to the department heads and to the members of the Oversight Committee and the bargaining units.

Alderman Shea asked so now the department heads are to make out their own evaluations of their personnel predicated upon that particular instrument.

Mr. Hobson answered no. We gave that to them as a sample so they would know what the performance evaluation tool was that was being proposed by Mr. Decker's company.

Mr. Decker stated in addition to that, Alderman, the members of the bargaining units have that same tool. It is like a template. Here is the template we are going to use and we gave it to the bargaining unit representatives, the department heads and some others and said what do you think. We talked about it back and forth. Some people were concerned. Some liked it. The idea is to take that template and go into a department and tailor make it and work with the employees so that the employees are comfortable with the result of that and they feel it is fair. If you just slap it on top of a department, it doesn't work.

Alderman Shea replied that is what I was saying to him. That it is a preliminary instrument that hasn't been fully implemented. Thank you.

Alderman O'Neil stated I just want to follow-up on a couple of things Alderman Shea talked about. The consolidation of pay schedules and longevity pay schedules is really a one year cost of 2.8%, correct.

Mr. Decker replied correct.

Alderman O'Neil stated we also know that the approximate cost yearly for pay performance will be about 3%.

Mr. Decker replied approximately.

Alderman O'Neil asked we don't know what the cost of knowledge-based and skill-based pay will be do we.

Mr. Decker answered no, Sir.

Alderman O'Neil asked when might we find that out.

Mr. Decker answered I think it is going to...here are the factors involved. First of all, we are going to have to develop it and secondly the cost if someone got that skill or new skill would be 3.5% but you can't count on every employee in the City doing that in a given year and it is going to take a while for them to develop it and see it and get it so it is going to be a wild guess but we would have to work on that as we go along and try to get some trend on it. I think at this

point to guess out of 2,000 employees how many would take advantage of that over a period would be hard.

Alderman O'Neil stated the final item would be your recommendation for how to develop a cost of living increase in this so we are really talking about four different levels of funding then. One is the one time of the consolidation and longevity. Then yearly it will be the pay performance, the knowledge-based or skill-based level and then the cost of living. Is that correct?

Mr. Decker replied the cost of living is not necessarily something that you have to do every year because I think the pay schedule that I have given you is highly competitive so what you would want to do is have the Human Resources Department every year look and see as to whether or not that minimum and maximum range was still competitive within the market and only when that minimum and maximum begins to fall back in the market and you think you have suffered some significant increase in the cost of living do you want to take a hard look at it, so it is not an automatic.

Alderman O'Neil asked and do we need to implement the pay for performance and the knowledge-based at the same time or could the knowledge-based come in a year or two later.

Mr. Decker answered knowledge can come in later. As a matter of fact, it would be very difficult...I think you want to bite this off a bite at a time here and I think you would want to look at putting them on the system and working on the performance system and when you get that implemented and you get the bugs worked out of that, go to the knowledge and skill-based pay. But let me say something about knowledge and skill-based pay. That is something that can enthruse your work force and have them really striving to improve themselves and bring added value to you. So it is not something that I think you should just put on the shelf and forget about. Once we can work out the performance system, move to it.

Alderman Girard asked when you started this process, how many different pay schedules were there in the City.

Mr. Decker answered I think 14 or 16. No, 32.

Alderman Girard asked so there were over 32 different pay schedules and that number of pay schedules arose from disparate treatment of disparate bargaining units or treating one group of people different than another group of people on an issue that was perhaps similar such as a cost of living raise.

Mr. Hobson answered right. There could have been subsets of different...the non-affiliated there may have been a subset for people who were in a temporary phase. There would have been for different departments, yes.

Alderman Girard asked these proposed changes to the job descriptions and I don't know if this is a question for Mr. Decker or Mr. Hobson but are we going to have to negotiate the changes in job description with the unions. This is not something, in other words, that the City can implement and say okay your job is now this. It has to become part of the negotiation process.

Mr. Hobson answered if I could put my union hat on and hopefully not melt into the floor, but if I were someone representing a union I would say that everything you were trying to propose to me through the Decker process is something that is an item to be negotiated or discussed at the bargaining table. The good news is that, I think, none of this information is a surprise or a revelation to any bargaining unit senior representative. They have attended the meetings. The attendance has been excellent and their input has been valued and utilized, I think, to a great degree.

Mr. Decker stated this is a sample of a class specification or job description that was developed for each of those 300+ types of jobs. A copy of that was sent to every employee who was in that class. In that class there is only one employee but if it was like Equipment Mechanic, every Equipment Mechanic got it. Then they were asked to edit it or get together in groups with some of their fellow workers and edit it and give it back to us. In every case where they sent us editorial changes we looked at them and for the most part we agreed with most of them and where we didn't, we talked to them and told them why we didn't and tried to work it out. So another answer to your question is whether they are negotiated or not, what we are describing is what they did and they, through the editorial process, have already agreed with us that that is what they do and it is on the basis of that content that we ranked and rated the jobs in terms of whether they would fall on the pay scale.

Alderman Girard stated I don't think any of us here are strangers to what a hornet's nest the personnel system was and I would like to compliment Mr. Decker and Mr. Hobson and everyone who participated because at first look it looks like did an awful lot to bring order out of chaos.

Mayor Wiczorek asked with FLSA, we would be in full compliance right.

Mr. Decker answered yes, Sir. I think so. I mean you have always got the potential of the Department of Labor coming around and...

Mayor Wiczorek interjected changing, yes, of course but I mean with everything that is in place right now with the Feds, this would make sure that we are in total compliance.

Mr. Decker replied as I have said, I think what is important for you to know is that we only found one instance out of all of those jobs where we thought you were “out of compliance”. It is just that you have been awfully generous to a lot of exempt employees in providing overtime and in my case I would say overly generous although I know a lot of you don’t want to be called overly generous, but it was very generous in terms of what you have been doing.

Alderman Hirschmann asked which cities would our department heads be compared with. The max was over \$100,000 recommended.

Mr. Decker stated he would read him a list, but of the cities that I read you in some cases they responded, and in some cases they didn’t so the survey results are just showing of those who responded, which one was the highest and so forth. But the cities, the way we drew the market area is we said approximately within one hour driving time of Manchester. The cities of Bangor, Boston, Concord, Dover, Lebanon, Lowell, Methuen, Portland, Portsmouth, Rochester, Springfield, Worcester, Derry, and Boston. Also Hillsborough County, Massport, US Department of Housing and Urban Development, and nine private industries in the area, and a survey back by Economic Research Associates of Seattle, Washington which does all the surveys across the United States for cities of this size and larger so I would say that that includes probably fifteen or twenty local or regional businesses here.

Alderman Hirschmann stated they would obviously have to compare these people to public administration positions.

Mr. Decker responded only where you can.

Alderman Hirschmann stated that you couldn’t quite compare them to business.

Mr. Decker stated right, but you can with like an accounting clerk or a secretarial or administrative support or custodian, but you’ve got to make sure you’ve matched apples to apples you are absolutely right.

Alderman Hirschmann noted he was reading from the B4 Appendix of the proposed maximums and minimums, and I’m quite frankly surprised at the recommendation it seems a little high for public administration, that’s what I’m trying to tell you. I think that Alderman Shea’s comments of the people in lower grades and lower titles of classes of positions, when you see someone getting a \$300 bump you look at that and say it sounds kind of reasonable, but then you look at a department head or a director of a division and they get \$10,000 and I may be looking at the worst case, I say to myself gee.

Mr. Decker stated he thought there were very few with a \$10,000 bump, like in Mark Hobson’s case he got \$700 or \$1,000.

Alderman Hirschmann stated a lot of the department heads are \$1,500 or higher, and I think that we just took care of these people as aldermen within the past 24 months. If you look at the history of where they came from, to where they are now we took care of these people.

Mr. Decker stated for us, we didn’t interpret it as a charge to take care of an individual employee. What we did, and this is an important thing for all of you to appreciate, is that right

now we found that your minimum and your maximum in your pay schedule was sort of compressed, in other words it wasn't that far from the lowest paid worker to the highest paid worker relatively speaking compared to other jurisdictions. Now, in order to make room for people in the middle and the lower middle, in order to make room for them to grow you've got to raise the upper ones to provide room or else you are going to have people jammed up at the top too. So what we tried to do was to raise the top level but not so much that it made them out of sight, in terms of their competition, and keep in mind that none of your department heads are anywhere near the top of those ranges, they are more down toward the beginning of those ranges so it would be years before they ever grew to that maximum. We had to increase the scale to make room for the lower, middle, and upper middle income workers.

Alderman Hirschmann stated the Airport Director makes \$84,000 now. The nearest associate next to him is \$55,000. but he is getting bumped up to \$86,000. I don't find common sense in it. Mr. Decker responded the reason there is a disparity there of that great is because at the airport he has like four or five assistant directors in charge of different segments instead of a single deputy director or assistant director of the airport. In other cases you don't have that spread, so that those jobs as assistant directors generally are not comparable to some of the others in all cases where you have say a single deputy of the head of a large department.

Alderman Hirschmann stated he would be interest in the town list to be photocopied to all of the aldermen, because he would like to call Lebanon, Dover and all those towns mentioned and find out what a Police Chief gets, what a Fire Chief gets, and see what these rates mean to me.

Mr. Decker stated those are also shown on there and you can double check them.

Mayor Wiczorek stated there being no further questions at this time, the aldermen could now look at it and either call Frank Thomas, Mark Hobson or Floyd Decker over the next couple of weeks and the Board would go from there.

Alderman O'Neil asked what the intent was. Were they looking to take some action in two weeks, and was Mr. Decker going to be back then.

Mayor Wiczorek stated they wanted to find out how many questions people have and he would be checking with Mark and Frank on how many questions there are, if there are not any questions he would assume they had looked at the study, seen the presentation, and were ready to make move on it, if not then we will find out what the problems are and try to work those out.

Alderman Shea stated he didn't mean to give the finance department more work but can we get a projection as far as what this is going to cost for the next three to five years, he thought it important because they would be voting on that.

Mayor Wiczorek asked Mark or Frank if they knew the projections commenting that he saw so many different areas that they were discussing, that unless you were to assign some percentage to each one of those sections he didn't know how they could up with it, what you need to do is look at the basic study and then they have the other with the skill and educational part of it, which would not be coming in right away, so how do you expect to come up with this. Mayor Wiczorek noted that they could come up with the basic part he thought.

Alderman Shea noted that there was probably certain givens in terms of -- we know for instance how much it would cost to implement it the first year, but you can use that then as a bottom line

and then you could say how much more will it cost, because that's the bottom line, like the mayor has said many times the school department gets something from the state and that's the bottom line if they implement it, and then the next year we have to include that in our budget. So what I'm trying to say is before we vote on this, I'm open minded, but I would like to know what I am voting on. Am I voting for a \$6 or \$7 million increase in the tax rate or \$2.3 million, --who knows because once this is implemented it's going to stay in effect for quite awhile.

Mayor Wieczorek stated there were about four facets to this.

Mr. Hobson stated my answer is I could certainly do my best to put some projections together with the oversight committee and with Mr. Decker. The difficulty is that you've got 14 collective bargaining agreements, that would be effected by this. I'm not 100 percent sure about what might, what we try to do with you every time we have a collective bargaining agreement is that through Mr. Hodgen we try to pull information together from the Human Resources side to tell you what the fiscal impact is. And we try to do that with that collective bargaining agreement because we know what the variables might be for that body for that time period. It's a little bit more difficult here because the variables could change. We would do our best with an asterisk that there are variables, and they may change in the future.

Mayor Wieczorek stated he didn't know how you could do it, noting could the alderman tell him what the cost of living was going to be in five years.

Alderman Shea stated no but let's assume they implement the study, they gave each union 3 percent, assuming that is what they are going to get, we also assume that everyone is working well and we give them a little bit of a performance evaluation so that would give us at least partially the top amount. It wouldn't give them an exact amount but it would give us some kind of a feel otherwise how were they going to know what they were voting on.

Mayor Wieczorek stated he thought they could do that with the basic things, but when they are talking about implementing the study, you can come up probably with that, and then you've got the evaluations in -who knows how the evaluations go - but you have the cost of living and the skill and educational part of it.

Alderman Shea asked if somebody gets a pay raise do they get a cost of living too.

Mayor Wieczorek responded the cost of living was not something that you automatically do as they stated tonight, you vote on that.

Alderman Shea stated he would assume that if you give somebody a 3 percent pay raise you don't give them a cost of living of 1.2 cause you've already given them a pay raise and that kind of helps out with the cost of living.

Alderman Thibault asked if Mark and maybe Frank and whoever else who was in charge of that committee if they would meet for instance he believed the courier, was being singled out a little too bad, he wondered if they could get to him and explain to him as to how they arrived at that price because it seemed to be an awful cut there for some reason. He would like them to call the courier in and explain to them how they arrived at that figure. He felt it was important and set the tone for a lot of people in the city.

Alderman Girard stated he would be concerned about Human Resources or anybody trying to generate numbers 3, 4 or 5 years from now. We are no more like to be able to say what the

city's payroll is going to be if we don't implement it then we are if we do implement it. It varies on so many different things from how we negotiate into this changeover. It is going to provide a bunch of bogus numbers as far as I am concerned, I don't think it would be helpful at all to the process.

Mayor Wieczorek noted that the Board gets a chance to decide on it anyway.

Mayor Wieczorek thanked Mr. Decker for his presentation.

Communication from the Second Deputy Finance Officer requesting authorization to expend up to \$140,000 to replace the ECONOMIZER on the WWTF sludge incinerator, utilizing funds from the EPD Replacement Account.

On motion of Alderman Rivard, duly seconded by Alderman Pariseau, it was voted to approve the request to utilize funds from the EPD Replacement Account.

Communication from the Public Works Director requesting authorization for the Highway Department to contact the Towns of Hooksett, Goffstown and Bedford as required by RSA 51:2 Perambulation of Town Lines and appointing Kevin Sheppard and Joseph Przybyla to conduct the perambulation.

On motion of Alderman Sysyn, duly seconded by Alderman Clancy, it was voted to approve the request to authorize Highway to contact the towns and carry out the perambulation on behalf of the Board.

Communication from Assistant Solicitor Arnold requesting the Board's authorization to transfer the appropriate parcel of land to Wallace Pineault rather than Edmond Pineault as outlined in the enclosed.

On motion of Alderman Pariseau, duly seconded by Alderman Girard, it was voted to authorize transfer of the appropriate parcel to Edmond Pineault as outlined.

Communication from Joanne Smoger, Makin' It Happen, requesting permission to send Red Ribbon Week Breakfast invitations and red ribbons to City employees with their paychecks prior to October 28th.

On motion of Alderman O'Neil, duly seconded by Alderman Thibault, it was voted to approve the request for distribution of information.

Bond Resolution:

“Authorizing Bonds, Notes or Lease Purchases in the amount of \$45,000.00 for the Lease Purchase of a new Card Access Security System for the Manchester Police Department.”

On motion of Alderman Pinard, duly seconded by Alderman Reiniger, it was voted to read by title only and it was so done. Alderman Hirschmann was duly recorded as abstaining. Alderman Klock moved that the Bond Resolution pass and be Enrolled. Alderman O'Neil duly seconded the motion. The motion carried with Alderman Hirschmann duly recorded as abstaining. None were recorded in opposition.

Resolutions:

“Amending the 1998 and 1999 Community Improvement Programs, authorizing and appropriating funds for the 1998 CIP 4.20105 and 1999 CIP 420499 Juvenile Jail Removal Program.”

“Amending the 1999 Community Improvement Program, authorizing and appropriating funds in the amount of Six Thousand Dollars (\$6,000.00) for the 1999 Community Improvement Program 710599 LED Replacement Program.”

“Authorizing the Finance Officer to effect a transfer of Three Thousand Seven Hundred Fifty Dollars (\$3,750.00) from Contingency to the Aldermen.”

On motion of Alderman O'Neil, duly seconded by Alderman Pariseau, it was voted to read by titles only and it was so done.

Alderman Clancy moved that the Resolutions pass and be Enrolled. Alderman O'Neil duly seconded the motion. There being none opposed the motion carried.

Resolutions:

“Resolution Accepting the Findings Regarding Hackett Hill/UCA Land Transaction.”

“A Resolution authorizing the establishment of the Hackett Hill Property Acquisition and Development Account.”

“Authorizing Additional Bonds, Notes or Lease Purchases in the amount of One Million Two Hundred Ten Thousand Dollars (\$1,210,000) for the 1999 CIP 650599 UNH Land Acquisition.”

“Amending the 1999 Community Improvement Program transferring, authorizing and appropriating funds in the amount of Four Million One Hundred Sixty Three Thousand Three Hundred Ninety Nine Dollars (\$4,163,399) for the 1999 CIP 650599 UNH Land Acquisition.”

“A Resolution authorizing the Finance Officer to make certain advances of funds in support of the Acquisition of the Hackett Hill Property in the amount of One Million Four Hundred Thirty Two Thousand Six Hundred and Sixty Six Dollars (\$1,432,666).”

“A Resolution Directing the Manchester Development Corporation (“MDC”) to (i) Assign or cause the Assignment to the City of All Right, Title and Interest in Any

Mortgages Granted by University Center Associates (“UCA”) to MDC on Property Located in the Millyard, so-called, and (ii) Cause the assignment by MDC, Inc., of all Right, Title and Interest in a Certain Demand Note Issued to MDC, Inc. by UCA, in Connection With UCA’s Development of Property Located in the Millyard, Each of Which Acts is Necessary in Connection with the Acquisition and Development of the Hackett Hill Property, so-called, by the City.”

On motion of Alderman Klock, duly seconded by Alderman Rivard, it was voted to read by titles only and it was so done.

Alderman Pinard moved that the Resolutions pass and be Enrolled. Alderman Clancy duly seconded the motion.

Alderman Rivard stated that there was mention of a master plan to develop this particular area. He wished to have the Board direct the Planning Director to include the landfill as part of the master plan that is adjacent to that when the masterplan is being developed, to include the landfill for energy purposes, there is a potential for energy and there is also for development of a recreational area that could be included in this masterplan and so moved.

Alderman O’Neil stated he would second the motion.

Alderman Rivard noted that he had spoken with the Planning Director who concurred.

Mayor Wieczorek asked Mr. MacKenzie if in the request for the masterplan for the Hackett Hill area did they include the landfill.

Mr. MacKenzie responded that it was not included in the request, it was reasonable it was a sizable piece of land contiguous.

Alderman Rivard noted that it was 75 acres and together would make a perfect package.

Alderman O’Neil asked if it would include, there had been discussion about one or two houses on Hackett Hill or some other properties that may be adjacent, was it allowed in the scope.

Mr. MacKenzie responded yes, and that comes into some more issues beyond the masterplan but he thought it reasonable given that there are two properties in particular that they should look at as part of that.

Mayor Wieczorek called for a vote on the motion to enroll the resolutions. The motion carried with Alderman Reiniger and Alderman Sysyn duly recorded as abstaining noting their membership on the MDC Board.

Mayor Wieczorek called for a vote on the motion by Alderman Rivard, seconded by Alderman O’Neil that the Planning Director be directed to include the landfill as part of the master plan study for the Hackett Hill area. The motion carried with none recorded in opposition.

1999 CIP Budget Authorization:
650599 UNH Land Acquisition - Revision #1

On motion of Alderman Hirschmann, duly seconded by Alderman Thibault, it was voted to approve the authorization. Aldermen Reiniger and Sysyn were duly recorded as abstaining.

Ratify and confirm agreement with the Health Department AFSCME, Local 298 in accordance with the memorandum of agreement and cost calculations presented on September 1, 1998.

On motion of Alderman O'Neil, duly seconded by Alderman Pariseau, it was voted to ratify the agreement effective September 1, 1998 as presented.

23. NEW BUSINESS

Mayor Wieczorek noted the Airport was in New York today with the bonds and the early figures came back with good numbers, there was not anything in there over 5 percent, including the taxables.

Alderman Girard asked if they were looking at financing existing bonds.

Mr. Sherman advised that they were in the process of doing so for the airport bonds, such having already been authorized by the Board. They could not refinance the General Fund bonds having already done so once.

Alderman Shea questioned the outstanding bond debt.

Mr. Sherman responded in the area of \$180 million.

Alderman Shea stated that the teachers made a plea tonight for the health plan that they had initiated, worked towards. He wanted to ask Dave Hodgen if it were possible for the Board to send a directive to the school department to say that we would be in favor of giving them that prerogative like we are giving everyone else. Could they include that separately in their contract.

Mr. Hodgen stated he thought that this board could send directives to any city department but he questioned the wisdom of dividing a collective bargaining agreement and the wisdom of having the Board of Mayor and Aldermen getting in front of the School Board in the ratification process.

Alderman Shea stated he was not saying that, he was asking if it were possible to break the contract for the inclusion of the medical benefits or health benefits within the contract even though it's not approved for.

Mr. Hodgen stated in his opinion perhaps anything is possible, in my opinion its a phenomenally bad idea.

Alderman Shea asked if they could suggest to them as a group that we sort of encourage them to do that.

Mayor Wieczorek asked if he wanted to send a directive.

Alderman Shea stated if they had to.

Mayor Wieczorek noted that the last time Alderman Shea did not want to send one because he thought they were a district not a department.

Alderman Shea stated they should lend support, maybe not a directive, but at least give them the opportunity.

Alderman Wihby noted that they had a note on April 1, 1998 and it says that money is in the budget, it was there, we had promised it to them, and I don't know why the school department won't give it to them but I feel that we can at least let the school board know that we're willing to approve it if they pass it and it has to come back to us anyway, and let them know that the money is in our budget to take care of that.

Mayor Wieczorek stated the school board would approve it he didn't think there was any problem with that.

Alderman Wihby moved to let the School Board know that the Board of Mayor and Aldermen are in favor of the medical insurance because it is already in our budget.

Alderman Shea seconded the motion.

Alderman Girard stated for clarification, they were basically taking a sense of the Board saying that we are in support of changing the health insurance they were not acting as a board to enact the contract.

Mayor Wieczorek stated they couldn't enact the contract it had to go to the school board, then back to this board.

Mayor Wieczorek called for a vote. The motion carried with none recorded in opposition.

Alderman Wihby stated that in terms of the raises it seems as though they were at a stalemate. It seems like I read in the newspaper, and the newspaper seems to think that the aldermen have it in front of them and that they are voting on it, and that we are holding up the raises, but that's not true we haven't even had anything in front of us to start talking about it. I don't know why the School Board has held it up, I guess they are looking for the number of what they are behind in financing from last year. Alderman Wihby proposed that they set up a committee to work with the School Board, the Union, and try to negotiate something so it makes it best for the taxpayer out there. He stated maybe that undoes what the 3 percent that's on the table but maybe we can come up with something that we can put it off for a year and still make everybody happy just to take care of the financial budget crunch that we have now.

Alderman Wihby so moved to set up a committee of aldermen, school board members, the union representatives, and someone from school administration. Alderman Cashin duly seconded the motion. In response to question it was advised that Mayor Wieczorek would set it up. Mayor Wieczorek called for a vote, the motion carried unanimously.

Alderman Thibault stated he wished to thank the principal of West High School and the group that got together last Saturday to landscape the area in front of the school. About 25 volunteers got together. They did a great job sprucing up the area, it looks really inviting. Talk about group spirit and school spirit. They deserve an awful lot of credit and I would like the Board of Mayor and Aldermen to send them a letter of commendation for their fine work. They even raised the money needed to buy the bark to be laid out.

Alderman Thibault so moved to send a letter to West High. Alderman Hirschmann duly seconded the motion. The motion carried.

Alderman O'Neil stated back when they went through the budget negotiations and they had discussed doing some regular joint meeting with the school board, they had originally tried to do something in September and it got delayed but with all the things that are going on there and the

aldermen seem to get "blamed" they needed to sit down with the school board and he asked the Mayor and wish to move to have a joint meeting of the two boards.

Mayor Wieczorek stated it was premature because they were still waiting, they would be taking up the information regarding school and their deficit when we get the information.

Alderman O'Neil stated it was not just deficit, it was class sizes, it's conditions of the buildings, he wanted to make sure they were all getting the same information. I catch information second and third hand and I would like to get it first hand and make sure that we are all getting it at the same time.

Mayor Wieczorek stated they would have a joint meeting with them, the school board voted to do this too. We are just waiting for an appropriate time to do it. It was in the works, we don't need another meeting.

Alderman O'Neil noted that they were going to do it in September and it got changed.

Mayor Wieczorek noted that they were not ready.

Alderman O'Neil noted that things were not changing, things were continuously getting worse with our school system and whether or not we have direct involvement or not I don't know. It could be condition of buildings, that is something we have direct control over.

Mayor Wieczorek stated that they were going to take care of the important things that had to be taken care of with school. That will come at the meeting on October 20. They are not ready and when they are ready we will have a full blown discussion of what is happening.

Alderman O'Neil stated there will be a joint meeting between the two boards.

Mayor Wieczorek stated it was not going to be a joint meeting, that's our aldermanic meeting.

Alderman Shea noted they had set up two dates, a date in August which was canceled and another date.

Alderman Cashin stated they had been talking about this for some time, it was obvious there was a frustration on this board, there is a frustration on the school board, there is a frustration with the teachers, there is a frustration with education overall. Something was wrong, he didn't know what it was and was not pointing fingers at anyone, but something had to be done. He stated we're hold the teachers hostage because there is a deficit in the budget. That isn't right.

Mayor Wieczorek stated we're not.

Alderman Cashin stated we're not, but the school board is, but we are indirectly -- we can't keep pointing fingers at everybody. The school board says it's us, we say it's them, nobody seems to know what the problem is. We've got to face it there is a problem and it's got to be straightened out, there is a problem Alderman O'Neil is right.

Mayor Wieczorek stated there was a problem, and he knew what it was.

Alderman Wihby stated when we had the school board in front of us we tried to decide, tried to get the base number from last year so we could then decided what we wanted to improve on this year. We asked them for a number and we asked them how much the deficit was and at the time we were getting rumors there is 1.1 million, they were saying it was 800,000 then it was 600,000 and then the chairman of that school board came to us and said it's \$100,000 we hired Mr. Sullivan, he's going to answer all of our questions. If they had been honest with us at that time and told us there was a \$1 million deficit they would have funded that on top of what they

were giving them, because they were trying to get to the base and then we were saying okay, what more do we want to do ... Green Acres, books and all the other stuff... but because they didn't want to tell us at the time they had a deficit, that is why we are in this predicament right now.

Alderman Cashin stated that Norm Tanguay sat at the table and told this Board that this budget was underfunded. We all heard it.

Alderman Pariseau stated that was not the issue.

Mayor Wieczorek concurred.

Alderman Cashin stated that was the issue.

Mayor Wieczorek stated not it wasn't and the alderman would find out it was not.

On motion of Alderman Pariseau, duly seconded by Alderman Girard, it was voted to adjourn.

A True Record. Attest.

City Clerk