

COMMITTEE ON PERSONNEL AND INSURANCE

MARCH 26, 1996

7:30 PM

Chairman Reiniger called the meeting to order.

The Clerk called the roll.

Present: Ald. Reiniger, Domaingue, Cashin, Robert, Hirschmann

Messrs.: R. Girard, Dr. Sullivan, Asst. Chief Driscoll, D. Prew,
H. Moran, D. Schaefer

On motion of Ald. Cashin, seconded by Ald. Hirschmann, it was unanimously voted to meet with legal counsel in non-public session to discuss claims against the city.

Counsel for the city discussed various claims in process.

On motion of Ald. Domaingue, duly seconded by Ald. Robert, it was voted to return to public session.

Chairman Reiniger addressed a communication from Alderman Pariseau relative to part time employee benefits.

Ald. Pariseau stated that he had submitted the letter and noted that the decision of the Committee that he had been a part of back in June or July of 1994, was to include part time employees of the City working less than 20 hours a week, there was also a suggestion and/or motion made by himself that it would also affect the Board of Mayor and Aldermen effective January 1996. Those that were in office at the time, and he had requested copies of the minutes of that meeting, apparently the phone calls he had received were in reference to the Aldermen continuing to receive medical coverage, that was what his letter was about. It affected primarily cafeteria workers at the School Department, and two employees in the Tax Collectors Office who

were job sharing, Joan Gardner had sent a letter to Harry Ntapalis and Hugh Moran. He read the letter to the Committee which expressed Ms. Gardner's support for the part time employees being allowed to get health insurance at a prorated group discount rate. He had spoken with Harry Ntapalis and found that there was sufficient funding in the Personnel Department's line item 1013 to cover the premiums. In the past, the City was concerned about spending money but over the years the City had received reimbursements because of overpayment or whatever adjustments the insurance companies made, and having six or eight part time job sharing individuals included in the rate would not affect the expense that much.

Mr. Ntapalis stated that what Ald. Pariseau was referring to was the unused premiums particularly with the self insured blue Cross/Blue Shield coverage which provided health insurance for approximately 90% of the municipal employees, over the past two years the City had received about 3.5 million dollars in unused premium. That was not to say that practice would go on forever, more recently the reverse could happen, if the rate increased the City would not receive money back. The bottom line was the part timers, on prorated insurance cost the City roughly \$82,000 for cafeteria works and approximate \$18,000 for other municipal departments, the six individuals that had been added to the work force since August of 1994 would run another \$12,000 if they were to be added to the other group.

Ald. Robert asked Mr. Ntapalis to refresh the Committee's memory about how the part time insurance was administered.

Mr. Ntapalis answered that it depended on the amount of hours an employee worked, the part timer working 20 hours per week would have 50% of their medical insurance premiums paid by the City and would contribute out of pocket the other 50%, if an employee worked 30 hours per week, the City would pick up 75%, and the employee picked up the difference, however in August of 1994 effective with the first Committee action referred to the Board, the Personnel Committee had felt that they should grandfather those part timers and any new part time employee would have to pick up 100% of the insurance.

Ald. Robert asked if that had been the full Board's action.

Mr. Ntapalis stated that he had attended a Committee meeting where it had been discussed and recommended to the full Board and the Board in turn took that action.

Ald. Robert asked Mr. Ntapalis to explain the proration basis.

Mr. Ntapalis answered that in a 35, 37.5 or 40 hour week, which constituted full time, the general health insurance premium was a 90/10 spread, with the City paying 90% and the employee paying 10%, for a part time employee, the amount the employer paid towards the part time employee's health benefit in any given year would be determined by the number of hours worked was 20, and the City had been picking up 50% of their premiums.

Ald. Cashin asked what the Committee was being asked to do.

Ald. Pariseau answered that he was asking the Committee to reconsider and make the part timers eligible for medical coverage.

Ald. Cashin stated that if Ald. Pariseau remembered correctly, the full Board had wanted to eliminate all benefits to cafeteria workers, the only way to save them was to make the compromise to grandfather those with benefits.

Ald. Pariseau answered that part of the discussion was about those members of the Board that were receiving medical coverage that would not receive it any longer as of January 1, 1996.

Ald. Cashin stated that he did not remember the Aldermen benefits being discussed, the only reason it was discussed was because the Board wanted to discontinue health benefits for cafeteria workers, the argument in the Personnel Committee had been that most of the cafeteria workers were single mothers who needed the benefits.

Ald. Pariseau stated that at the time it was cafeteria workers and two employees job sharing at Welfare.

Ald. Cashin stated that the subject came up because of the cafeteria workers, he had no problem adding the other six, that it was not the Committee's

intent to deny benefits to anyone, but the only way to save what was already there was to grandfather the existing employees.

Ald. Pariseau added that it was to be monitored by Mr. Ntapalis and if there was not sufficient funding, the people who were grandfathered would lose their benefits.

Mr. Ntapalis agreed that the compromise had been reached in order to save what was already in place, with new hires on hold since that time.

Ald. Domaingue thanked Mr. Ntapalis for his input, and stated that she had not been on the Board for the discussion in question, but that she had been on the Board in 1990 and there was a lot of sentiment on the Board that they wanted to eliminate the part time benefits. As to the discussion regarding members of the Board, if that issue was revisited, she would raise the question of who determined that the aldermen were part time, it was a seven day on call job, and should not be considered part time.

Ald. Robert stated that he had a different perspective on how this came about, that the whole issue came up because part of Mayor Wieczorek's budget proposed to eliminate health benefits to part time employees in general, what was now in effect was the compromise resulting from that proposal, which was that anyone who worked less than 30 hours was not eligible to receive health benefits, it had been discussed at many levels, and he supported the elimination of benefits for part time employees, and would continue to do so.

Ald. Pariseau asked for a clarification from Mr. Moran on the hours needed to qualify for either full or part time.

Mr. Moran answered that the City had two full time schedules, 35 or 40 hours per week, a part time employee would be one who worked half the amount of hours for either schedule, 17.5 hours for a 35 hour schedule or 20 hours for a 40 hour schedule.

On motion of Ald. Robert, duly seconded by Ald. Hirschmann, it was voted to receive and file the communication. The motion was opposed by Ald. Cashin.

A-1 RISK

Request to discuss pending claims with the claims service and legal counsel and City Clerk traffic accident.

Chairman Reiniger asked Mr. Bernier to explain the request.

Mr. Bernier stated during elections, the City Clerk's staff used their own vehicles to visit the polling locations for various reasons, in the se situation in question, Carol Johnson was instructed to visit Ward 1 where she was involved in a car accident, the purpose of the request was to submit a claim in the amount of \$508.00 which was the amount of a bill received by Ms. Johnson by the other party in the accident.

Ms. Johnson stated there was damage to another vehicle and I received a bill in the amount of \$508.00 or \$520.00 from their insurance company. I also received, although I never submitted a claim, a letter from Scott Wetzel Services denying my claim telling me that I backed into somebody and I hadn't. I am not sure how that all came about. In essence it involved a parked vehicle on the street. The police were called in and the police informed me that being on City business the insurance companies, when they call in, they do sometimes ask that, and that I should check with my insurance company. I checked with my insurance and with the insurance commissioner's office, and also with Scott Wetzel - I did have some discussion with someone from their office and was informed that my insurance rates would go up, not based on that it's a chargeable accident but because I was on City business so I would have to pay for my vehicle being used as a business, so my policy would go up on the basis of being in City business and I did not feel it was fair that my policy go up. And it was my understanding, and perhaps that's wrong as I understand it now, but it was my understanding that if I got in an accident and my vehicle was being used by the City that the City would back that. And I know Harry is shaking his head in the back, but Harry is not my supervisor and obviously I have used, I have a van and it is used for delivering voting machines on occasion, I don't even drive it, on occasion it is being used by other employees for those purposes, and in those instances I have not charged the City anything for mileage or gas I just say go ahead and use it because it is a lot cheaper than the City going out and renting something. If we rented a vehicle the City

would be liable for insurance coverage on that, and it was always my presumption that the City would take care of the situation. So that's the dilemma I am faced with, if I report it through my insurance company, yes they will cover the claim but also my insurance policy rates would increase because the vehicle was being used by the City, so the business portion would cause it to be increased.

Ald. Robert stated that as long as he had been on the Committee, he had never seen anything like this come to it.

Mr. Ntapalis stated the practice had been, and I had a conversation with Carol shortly after the accident happened, that it had been City policy, actually there was an ordinance, Section 21-54.1 on insuring personal property of employees whether it's a computer or car, we self insure as I have mentioned earlier on in our discussion, we set aside tax dollars for self insuring and we don't pay a premium to an insurance company that would make that decision, as a self insurer we can only provide coverage for our own fleet, we can't insure non owned vehicles and almost once a week probably for as long as I can recall we get claims in our office relative to personal property whether it be an expensive leather coat or an automobile mishap, computers and things of that nature, and we do deny it, as Carol has said, Scott Wetzel, on non owned personal property there is no coverage, that's been practiced for some twenty one years that I have been associated with the City's insurance program.

Ald. Robert asked is this a personnel matter, or insurance matter, or something for the Transportation Committee, I am not sure where this belongs.

Several Committee members and people present answered "insurance."

Mr. Ntapalis answered why it ended up here was the fact of where is the coverage for an employees automobile, certainly the bargaining groups over the years have always been after us, as we use our car we do collect an IRS allotment of .31 cents a mile to help defray insurance costs and fair wear and tear, are we allowed at that juncture to collect towards an accident if indeed we are only official company business, going to a meeting r making a delivery and the answer has always been no. I double checked even with my predecessor to see if there was any practice that went back beyond my recollection and never was there a case that we can recall since we have self insured that we have paid for personal effects.

Ald. Robert asked if there was something in the Personnel Ordinance that would define this situation.

Mr. Moran answered no, there was nothing in the Personnel ordinance and the reason this was before the Committee is that we determined, at least we thought it was an insurance matter rather than a personnel matter and the Committee was also responsible for insurance.

Mr. Ntapalis stated that he had copies of the insurance ordinance and handed them out.

Ald. Robert asked if there were pool cars available, and was there some sort of understanding as to how they were supposed to be used, and what my structure employees using their own vehicle.

Mr. Bernier answered on election day there are twelve wards, all active, so it is customary for us to use our own car, if you recall, in 1987, I backed into a building at Northwest Elementary School during election time, that it's something we need to address so I can inform my staff, if they are not covered they'd to know that, so maybe they will have to sign a waiver o some sort, to your question of pool cars, there are two pool cars, only one of which we usually have access to, on election day, everybody uses their own vehicle.

Ald. Hirschmann stated this particular case concerns me because on an election day for the City Clerk's office, you have ward clerks delivering boxes back to City hall with ballots, if one of them were involved in an accident and killed someone, they are not covered? The ramifications of this are bigger than just the Clerk.

Mr. Ntapalis stated you broaden the spectrum, what we are talking about, and I can address that, what we have instructed individuals that have contacted us that they were going to a conference or going out of state on official business, they were going to use their car but have a chance to use another auto, we tell them to use the fleet car if they want the full effect of the City's insurance protection, even for a fender bender, you would be better served using one of the fleet vehicles. What you have just mentioned, wonder if we have an employee of the City out there on official business that is involved in a multiple car accident, kills people and so forth, we also indemnify City employees, which means that indeed we have an accident of that magnitude, still the employee is going to be responsible for that magnitude, still the employee is going to be responsible for that vehicle, their insurance is primary, so whoever insures them will be the primary carrier for liability purposes extending beyond, because obviously in a case like that the City will be named in a lawsuit, as well as the employee, so we indemnify the employee and protect the City as well.

Ald. Domaingue stated just to establish facts in this instance, this is a copy of part of the employee manual, is this given to employees, or is this just stated as part of the City policy.

Mr. Ntapalis answered I am unsure if that is given as part of employees orientation.

Ald. Domaingue stated that is what they need to hear, is this information distributed to the employee when they are hired so that they know that if in the performance of their duties, they are called upon to use their own vehicle, that they would know in using that vehicle should they get into an accident, they are responsible for insurance coverage.

Mr. Moran answered he was not 100% sure and would check on it and get back to her.

Ald. Domaingue stated that is something that is appropriate to include it and follow up also, and did someone say employees are compensated .31 cents a mile and is that a direct compensation or benefit through their federal income tax.

Mr. Moran answered mileage reimbursement.

Ald. Domaingue stated so if a city employee was working during the day, doing official business for the Clerk's office or anyone else, they could log in the mile \s and be reimbursed financially from the City of Manchester with a check for .31 for every mile they logged.

Mr. Moran answered that is correct.

Ald. Cashin stated maybe I missed something in the translation but if Carol had killed somebody, the City would cover, but because she was lucky she didn't run over anybody, she had no recourse.

Mr. Ntapalis answered that was correct.

Ald. Cashin asked lets get back to what Alderman 12 said, we have ward clerks or ballot inspectors who are bringing boxes back and forth to City Hall, if they get into an accident they are not covered, and the City is not held responsible.

Mr. Ntapalis answered if they are not employees the City is not accountable.

Ald. Cashin asked, what would happen in the next election if the ward clerks refused to deliver ballots.

Mr. Ntapalis stated he did not have an answer for that.

Mr. Bernier answered he would have to add additional staff to deliver the boxes.

Ald. Cashin stated I feel they should be covered and I think Carol ought to be reimbursed, that is my personal opinion, it is an unfortunate situation and

I am surprised to have you people tell her that there is no recourse for her, I find that pretty difficult. Anyway, I realize what the ordinance says, I appreciate the ordinance but I think one has to look at unique cases and I think this one might be unique, I am not going to belabor this but I feel that tomorrow morning, Leo, you ought to send a letter out to every ward clerk and ballot inspector and tell them that if they use their own car picking up the ballot boxes, they are on their own, and my strong recommendation to my ward people will be don't bother, don't do it, it's not right.

Mr. Bernier stated we need to address that in a policy way, no question.

Ald. Robert asked what ordinance this was from.

Several people answered at once that it is from an insurance ordinance that had been on the books for a long time.

Ald. Robert stated maybe it is not a good example, but I was ready to use it as an example of how contradictory and ambiguous all the ordinances are and really one of the focuses of this Committee should be to look through the ordinances and try to iron out some of these wrinkles instead of decided whether or not someone can hire an employee.

Ald. Domaingue stated she would not belabor it either but it's obvious to me that there is a policy that is very necessary here in citing the ordinance I did not mean that should exempt the City from its responsibilities, my question was really are the employees informed and obviously they are not, that needs to be addressed, and if it were appropriate I WOULD HAVE NO PROBLEM REIMBURSING For this particular accident with the knowledge that the employees should be made aware that we are going to come up with a policy and it may not reflect necessarily what has been in place before, but I don't know as it is beneficial to the City to do both compensation at .31 cents a mile as well as provide the kind of blanket insurance should they get into this kind of situation. I think we need to look at that as well because if we are going to provide reimbursement for insurance, it is a benefit, whether or not it is used on a regular basis, once you get into that accident, it is a benefit to the employee that the insurance will be there for them.

Mr. Ntapalis stated that would require a policy decision of the Board to make that sort of a change, because from an insurance standpoint, where we are self insured, my only concern on a week to week basis, and I have numerous accidents that are reported, are there coverages for, I banged into something, I did such and such, I have a scrape or something was stolen, and we always have to refer back to personal effects and insuring your own personal effects, I am concerned that might set a precedent and where we are self insured I would have no way managing a floodgate of that nature, I would really need some policy direction if change is going to be made.

Ald. Domaingue stated I was only suggesting that we talk about it as a policy committee and then make a recommendation to the full Board.

Ald. Hirschmann asked Mr. Bernier on a daily basis do you have employees going out and doing tasks with their own vehicles.

Mr. Bernier answered at election time, yes.

Ald. Hirschmann asked how about the licensing person, does he have his own car.

Mr. Bernier answered it is a City vehicle, and we have one City vehicle for the courier.

Ald. Hirschmann asked if the licensing officer is out checking poker machines is he using his own vehicle.

Mr. Bernier answered no, he is using a City vehicle.

Ms. Johnson stated I wanted to make two points, one is a follow up to Ald. Domaingue's question. When I initiated a conversation with Harry and he referred me to Scott Wetzel Services, I was informed that there was no written policy by the City with regards to this, and I made not of that as a fact, so this ordinance I was unaware was on the books, and not only is it obviously not distributed to employees but I am not sure that the claim service is aware of it and if they were aware of it, certainly when I asked them about it I was told there is no written policy by the City, and I have notes to that fact. In the second instance in terms of the concern of future liability, I would just make a note personally that it is a delivery situation

that you are talking about on election day, certainly if I was using my car and it's the example that Harry gave me initially for a conference, that's a different story, but this was specific deliveries that were requested to be made on behalf of the City, acting as an agent for the City.

Ald. Cashin stated I do not believe you will be able to draw that distinction, that would be the problem. I knew the ordinance was on the books, however, I feel that someone ought to sit down with the City solicitor and see how we could be worked out so that the City was not put into a compromising position every time someone gets a scratch in the parking lot. I recommend it be sent to the Solicitor's office to see if something could be done.

On motion of Ald. Cashin, duly seconded by Ald. Robert, it was voted to refer the matter to the City solicitor's office for review.

Chairman Reiniger asked if there was further discussion.

Ald. Hirschmann asked could Hugh Moran develop a policy for employees in future travel while working for the City.

Mr. Moran answered he would be pleased to do that in conjunction with the City Solicitor and Risk Management.

Ald. Cashin stated that along with this, I really think a memo ought to go out to probably every City employee if they take their own car it is at their own risk.

Mr. Bernier stated I agree, I always assumed that if you were using your own vehicle to do work for the City you would be covered if something happens, but I was wrong.

Mr. Schaefer stated I am not sure, I don't know what the fellow that works for me; I don't know what the conversation went like, I can only go from what you have said, historically you have a situation like this, the employee, as a representative, and an agent of the City, or another type of employer, a private employer, is covered, there is a pass through back to the employer, whether it's a catastrophic situation or one like this, the City or any entity that has the supervisory responsibility does not relinquish those with the employee, in this jurisdiction does not relinquish those with the employee, in this jurisdiction as in most, what usually happens was the coverage on the vehicle for the individual was primary, so if an employee has insurance coverage on their vehicle, that coverage is primary in regards to the preferred party, the injured party, if it turned out that the accident was so severe that it was greater than the limits on the vehicle that was in the accident or the individual, then the excess, if there was any, would go to the City, as for coverage for an individual's property, there was no precedent where the City was responsible for damage to personal property. That's our approach, not really addressing the ordinance but in addressing common practice, tort law and contract law. That was a premise and it was not addressing the question of City ordinance. But normally that is what we work with and I have never seen it otherwise except when an exception is actually part and parcel of the arrangement between the employee and the employer where it's agreed that the employer will provide for personal property lost or damaged or otherwise of the employee, which we didn't have here.

Ald. Domaingue stated if you follow that logic then City still has not communicated with its employees relative to the fact that should their insurance be the primary coverer, they are probably going to be looking at increased insurance rates as a result, we don't provide that information and I think we have an obligation to do so.

Ms. Johnson stated one last one, when I did speak with the State Insurance commission they informed me that if the City was privately insured, that they would intervene on my behalf and the bills would be paid. The City is self insured and therefore has no rules with the Commission, it's not governed by their rules.

Mr. Ntapalis stated Carol touches on an important aspect because I followed up with the City solicitor, he indicated basically the same thing, that whereas the City pays the IRS rate and it is made available in the form of mileage reimbursement to the employee, we have satisfied a commitment as a self insurer and are not obliged to pick up premium or subsequent claims damage that would fall under the primary coverage. That is the premise by which we have reacted.

Ald. Cashin stated you are saying that because you are paying the .31 cents, you are covered, the City is off the hook, correct.

Mr. Ntapalis answered that's the broad interpretation.

Ald. Cashin stated I think all City employees ought to know that.

Ald. Hirschmann stated because she was working for the City at the time, had she been injured, she would have been eligible for Workman's compensation.

Mr. Ntapalis answered that is correct.

Ald. Hirschmann stated we lack a policy here and have to do something right now.

Chairman Reiniger stated we have a motion to turn the matter to the solicitor for review.

Chairman Reiniger addressed the tabled items, and relayed that the Mayor's assistants were unable to attend the meeting and asked that he inform the Committee that the Mayor would like to leave the following items on the table; Planner position, Reclassification of Highway Superintendent, and Upgrade for the Parks & Recreation/Cemetery Director.

TABLED ITEMS

On motion of Ald. Cashin, duly seconded by Ald. Domaingue, it was voted to take all items except Planner position, Reclassification of Highway Superintendent, and Upgrade for Parks/Recreation Cemetery Director off the table.

SCHOOL

(PC1-96) Reclassification of Cashier II position.

On motion of Ald. Robert, duly seconded by Ald. Domaingue, it was voted to approve the request.

SCHOOL

(PC1-96) Classification review of Clerk Typist II.

On motion of Ald. Robert, duly seconded by Ald. Domaingue, it was voted to approve the request.

SCHOOL

(PC1-96) Reclassification of Video Technician Coordinator positions.

Dr. Sullivan stated that she had information for the Committee regarding the Video Technician Coordinator, the original job description versus what the position actually was responsible for now. What had happened in the past four years since community television had come on line, was that the technicians had to expand their roles as the technology changed rapidly, the technicians of today wore many hats, recently they had been working on implementing two way interactive television in the three high schools, in the original job description, it was not envisioned that there would be a Manchester community Television web site on the World Wide Web, in term of information that the station received requests for, she did not know it the Mayor's office, in looking at this request, was aware of the fact that they produce, with the help of the Health Department, videos that were now being shipped around the world, and have been translated into many languages, within the next two years those tapes would be shipped around the world through the world wide web. With the technology constantly changing, the

job description itself was changing, also the hours that the technicians put in went way over the standard 40 hours, the original upgrade request was from a level 18 to a level 20, and in order to replace either of the two technicians, they would have to put a much larger job description out and probably pay a higher level, when the Highway Department began the recycling, they worked with them to put out a program about recycling, they worked extra hours during the primary season, the municipal election season, and were the only broadcast channel in the City of Manchester to provide election coverage and to give a forum to any candidate who was running for municipal office, the technicians were doing all of that on their own tie. The technicians deserve an increase, and if it had been known that the mayor was opposed to this, she would have sat down with him and explained the request in detail.

Alderman Domaingue asked to clarify that the request was not only a reclassification of the actual job description but also a salary upgrade, and was it retroactive.

Mr. Moran answered that if the request was approved by the Committee it would be effective with the establishment of the Ordinance affecting the upgrade.

Dr. Sullivan stated that the two technicians were committed to the community, and have had other job offers, but were committed to this community.

Alderman Hirschmann asked what it meant in his paperwork where it was noted that funding for the changes was from non-general fund programs.

Dr. Sullivan answered that no money would come from the taxpayers, but would come from a grant that was 1% of the cable contract fees to set up a fund to pay for the community access channel, the idea was accepted and that was how the technicians were paid.

Mr. Girard stated that the Mayor objected because although a good case had been presented as to why two exceptional employees should be upgraded, in the past several cases had come before this Committee and the Board where employees in other departments had the same impassioned pleas, and as a matter of policy for the last several years the Mayor had tried to avoid these

spot reclassifications because the classification system was in a shambles, and if the reclassification requests were granted, other departments would do the same, even when it had come to the enterprise operations in the city, unless there had been some sort of wholesale reorganization of a department and reassignment of duties, the Mayor's position had remained consistent, the points Dr. Sullivan brought up were valid, but he would submit to the Committee that there were several examples of that throughout the City and a precedent could be set even though tax dollars would not be used.

Alderman Domaingue asked why there was no comment from the Mayor on the reclassification of the Cashier II position.

Mr. Girard answered that the reclassifications that the School Department had asked for were basically housekeeping positions from the changes that had occurred in the School Department after the assistant superintendent left and they had various reorganizations to accommodate the hiring of a human resource director and a business administrator, the other reclassifications on the agenda tonight were housekeeping items that followed the reorganization.

Brief discussion ensued regarding reclassifications and the potential for precedents.

On motion of Alderman Hirschmann, duly seconded by Alderman Cashin, it was voted to approve the request.

(PC1-96) Retroactive Date.

Alderman Hirschmann stated that he was not in favor of retroactive dates and would want to see the request go away.

Alderman Domaingue asked for a better explanation of the request than "retroactive date".

Mr. Hobson explained that there were two positions that were reclassified, there was an administrative error, two individuals, in different schools, were requested to be reclassified, they were both approved although on different dates, the difference amount to \$307.00, he did not classify the request as a

retroactive pay, because there had been an oversight, and they simply wanted to correct it.

Alderman Domaingue stated that she respectfully disagreed with Mr. Hobson.

Brief discussion ensued regarding the request.

On motion of Alderman Robert, duly seconded by Alderman Hirschmann, it was voted to approve the request.

HIGHWAY-EPD
(PC1-96) WWTP Operations Supervisor position.

On motion of Alderman Robert, duly seconded by Alderman Cashin, it was voted to approve the request.

A-2 AIRPORT

If approved by the Personnel and Finance Committees the Airport Department will be approved to fill an equipment Mechanic position and any subsequent vacancies.

On motion of Alderman Robert, duly seconded by Alderman Domaingue, it was voted to approve the request.

A-3 BUILDING

If approved by the Personnel and Finance Committee, the Building Department shall be approved to fill a Building Inspector position and any subsequent vacancies..

On motion of Alderman Robert, duly seconded by Alderman Hirschmann, it was voted to approve the request.

A-4 FIRE

If approved by the Personnel and Finance Committees, the Fire Department shall be able to fill a Firefighter position and any subsequent vacancies.

On motion of Alderman Robert, duly seconded by Alderman Domaingue, it was voted to table the request. Ald. Cashin was recorded as opposed to tabling the request.

Alderman Hirschmann asked if the position was not filled, would the Fire Department's overtime budget go up.

Mr. Girard answered yes, but the overtime would cost less to pay than to approve the position at this time.

A-5 HEALTH

If approved by the Personnel and Finance committees, the Health Department shall be approved to fill a School Nurse position vacated by Lisa Smith.

On motion of Alderman Domaingue, duly seconded by Alderman Robert, it was voted to approve the request.

A-6 HIGHWAY

If approved by the Personnel and Finance Committees, the Highway Department shall be approved to fill a Dispatcher position and any subsequent vacancies.

On motion of Alderman Robert, duly seconded by Alderman Domaingue, it was voted to table the request pending the Mayor's budget proposal.

A-7 INFORMATION SYSTEMS DEPARTMENT

If approved by the Personnel and Finance committees, the Information Systems Department will be approved to fill a vacant Microcomputer Systems Specialist.

Ms. Prew stated that the Information Systems Department was in the midst of an enormous upgrade of the city's computer equipment, one of the micro-support specialists had resigned and they were anticipating installing over one hundred additional PC's over the summer, there would be no way for them to keep up with that schedule without filling the position.

Alderman Domaingue asked Mr. Girard when the Mayor would be presenting his budget.

Mr. Girard answered April 2.

Alderman Domaingue stated that they could review this position again at the next Committee meeting.

On motion of Alderman Robert, duly seconded by Alderman Domaingue, it was voted to table the request pending the Mayor's budget proposal.

[NOTE: A telephone poll was conducted on March 27, 1996. A majority of Personnel Committee members approved filling the Micro Support Specialist position. As approved by Mayor Wieczorek, Alderman Reiniger, Cashin and Robert voted yea, a letter was forwarded to Alderman Domaingue and Alderman Hirschmann advising of the action.]

A-8 LIBRARY

If approved by the Personnel and Finance committees, the Library Department shall be approved to fill a part time Account Clerk position and any subsequent vacancies.

On motion of Alderman Robert, duly seconded by Alderman Domaingue, it was voted to table the request pending the Mayor's budget proposal.

A-9 PARKS AND RECREATION/CEMETERY

If approved by the Personnel and Finance Committees, the Parks and Recreation/Cemetery Department shall be approved to fill temporary positions and any subsequent vacancies.

On motion of Alderman Robert, duly seconded by Alderman Domaingue, it was voted to approve the request.

A-10 POLICE

If approved by the Personnel and Finance Committees, the Police Department shall be approved to fill a vacant Police Sergeant and three Police Officer positions, two Police Communications Dispatcher positions and any subsequent vacancy resulting from promotion.

Alderman Hirschmann was opposed to tabling the remaining requests and asked Assistant Chief Driscoll to comment on the importance of the positions.

Assistant Chief Driscoll advised the Committee that the Police Department was in a very awkward position because they had received information from the Mayor's office that they could fill the position and have done so, yesterday the Department swore in ten people, the reason for that was because they had come before the Personnel Committee five or six months ago and informed the Committee about the problems with exactly what was happening here tonight. The Department's intent was to go into the summer at full strength to keep overtime down, at this last minute, he had no idea that the positions would be requested to be tabled. There was money in the budget for the positions, they were funded positions, this had been a long standing problem, that if the City prevented the Department from filling positions and caused it to spend overtime when there were budget positions, that was extremely counterproductive. He had drafted a letter six months ago when Alderman Robert was chairman and had gone all through this issue, and at that time the Personnel Department had supported the concept of hiring people, an over and under system, it was on paper, the Personnel Committee did it.

Mr. Girard stated that there was confusion because in recent weeks the Mayor did not realize that the positions that were being requested tonight were part of the ten positions, the Mayor's office had received three requests from the Department to fill vacancies caused by recent resignations or retirements, so they assumed that tonight's requests were above and beyond the ten vacancies that were already hired. that being the case, the Mayor's office had no opposition to the requests being approved.

On motion of Alderman Hirschmann, duly seconded by Alderman Domaingue, it was voted to approve the request.

A-11 POLICE

If approved by the Personnel and Finance committees, the Police Department shall be approved to establish an Information Support Analyst position at Grade 16. The regularly funded Police Officer complement shall be reduced from 142 to 141 Officers. The action shall require the establishment of the position by ordinance and the position can be filed at that time. The department shall also be approved to fill any subsequent vacancies resulting from promotion.

On motion of Alderman Hirschmann, duly seconded by Alderman Domaingue, it was voted to approve the request.

A-12 WATER WORKS

If approved by the Personnel and Finance Committees, the Water Works Department shall be approved to fill the following summer temporary positions:

Engineering Aide - 1

Laborer I-10

Watershed Maintenance Patrol Officer - 2

Water Treatment Plant Operator Trainee -2

On motion of Alderman Robert, duly seconded by Alderman Cashin, it was voted to approve the request.

The following items remained on the table:

PARKS RECREATION/CEMETERY

Upgrade for Director.

PLANNING

Planner position and temporary position.

HIGHWAY

Reclassification of Highway Superintendent position.

NEW BUSINESS

Previe case.

Alderman Hirschmann stated that he needed a letter of closure from Mr. Moran regarding the Previe case.

Mr. Moran stated that he would draft the letter.

There being no further business to come before the Committee, on motion of Alderman Domaingue, duly seconded by Alderman Robert, it was voted to adjourn.

A True Record. Attest.

Clerk of Committee