

**COMMITTEE ON PERSONNEL/INSURANCE**

**November 25, 1997**

**6:30 PM**

Chairman Reiniger called the meeting to order.

Present: Aldermen Reiniger, Cashin, Robert, Hirschmann

Absent: Alderman Domaingue

Chairman Reiniger first addressed Item 7 of the Agenda:

**TABLED ITEM**

INFORMATION SYSTEMS - Communication from Information Systems Director and Yarger Decker & Thomas, Inc. regarding reorganization of the Information Systems Department. Additional information to be provided at the meeting.

(Tabled: September 23, 1997, PC 7-97)

On motion of Alderman Robert, duly seconded by Chairman Reiniger, it was voted to remove this item from the table.

Mr. Hobson suggested they look at the cover memorandum in the proposed analysis showing three options, asking they consider one of these options. Mr. Hobson noted they had asked Mr. Decker to come back and talk to the committee about preliminary compensation survey for the Information Systems Department, he has done that and was here. Mr. Hobson noted that Mr. Decker was stressing that it was a preliminary report based on the finding they had been able to complete so far, and that there may be additional changes that he might recommend at the end of the study.

Mr. Hobson stated he was asking the Committee to approve the request for reclassification based on the guidelines that we discussed in September, which were items number 1 and number 4; that this was a critical requirement and also a special study. Mr. Hobson stated the three options were that they could choose to take no action, and wait for Mr. Decker's complete study; split the baby in half -- look at it in two ways, act either on the new recruits or act only on the current

people in the current positions; or they could accept Mr. Decker's proposal as presented. Mr. Hobson stated that his recommendation was that they accept Mr. Decker's proposal as it was to be presented this evening.

Mr. Floyd Decker addressed the committee stating when here before we addressed the basic problem which is one of the retention of existing employees and the recruitment of new employees in the information systems area. One of the things that we wanted to be very cautious about is since we have not completed our analysis of all the positions throughout the city, we wanted to be cautious about recommending any increases of any kind because once you've recommended increases you don't want to have to take it back. We've over the last several weeks first had the opportunity my staff and I to visit personally with virtually every employee in the information systems department as well as employees in other departments that are going to the general classification title of computer information support specialist. If you look on the fourth page from the back of your packet, you will see a table entitled information systems department and it has a list of employees names, their position, and present and proposed grade, step and annual pay. In looking at those against the survey that we conducted which is a couple pages further toward the end of the package, if you look at those you'll find that the recommendations that we are making here are extremely conservative. If you look at the column that says proposed salary, or if you look the page after that say information systems department proposed ranges, which compares the classes that we looked at in the department of their present range and grade and their proposed range and grade, if you then take those classes and compare it to the survey, on the last two or three pages they would see that the maximum pay for programmer analyst, micro computer manager, micro systems specialist, you'll see that the maximum pay for those is substantially above what we have recommended here. Basically what we have recommended is that for the director of information services no change at this time. For the secretary in that department we've recommended a two grade increase, on the basis that that was a very clear case of a misclassification, that is a secretary to a department head and that was almost a no brainer that's a clear case of misclassification. No change on the Clerk Typist II because that's wrapped up in a number of many other positions throughout the city that we don't feel comfortable of recommending any increase at all there. For the communications and security supervisor, we recommended a three pay grade increase there, and for the bulk of the rest of them a two pay grade increase with the exception of the systems and programmer supervisor, which we recommended a one pay grade increase. Now, I think that is sufficient to hold the current employees in place until our regular survey is over, and I also feel comfortable that we would not be recommending in the spring anything less than that for those positions. I do want to point out to you that these would be toward the higher range of what we would be recommending generally for the city

because as we mentioned before, we have a special problem here in information services positions that exist across the country. We are currently in the process of concluding a study for Des Moines, Iowa, we have exactly the same problem in Iowa. The only other point I would make is that I think that the proposed increases here are very conservative and would probably be less than what you would have to recruit someone new for should the existing employees leave and certainly they would be far less than if you coupled the new recruitment level with additional training costs that would be incurred in preparing a new employee for these positions.

Alderman Robert moved to approve the recommendations of Mr. Hobson, that being those of Mr. Decker. Alderman Cashin seconded the motion commenting that it has been impossible to keep people in the department. The motion carried with Alderman Hirschmann recorded in opposition.

Chairman Reiniger addressed item 4 of the agenda:

HUMAN RESOURCES - Communication from the Employee Relations Manager submitting class specifications (Youth Community Outreach Worker, Police Evidence Specialist, Public Health Translator/HIB Counselor, Police Crime Analyst, Airport Assistant Director for Marketing & Public Relations.)

Alderman Cashin moved for discussion. Alderman Hirschmann seconded the motion.

Alderman Cashin questioned the Airport position as to whether it was a new position and whether it had been filled.

Mr. Hobson explained that this was submitted prior to his taking office, but his understanding was that these were new positions presented for class specification, and that they would be filled when the job specifications were approved.

Discussion ensued where Clerk Johnson noted that the positions had been filled, Mr. O'Neil held the airport position referred to. It was typical that the positions would be approved, filled and then the class specifications and related ordinances would be processed through the Board because of timing.

On motion of Alderman Hirschmann, duly seconded by Alderman Cashin, it was voted to approve the class specifications as presented.

Chairman Reiniger addressed Item 5 of the agenda:

POLICE DEPARTMENT - Communication from Chief of Police regarding compensation of School Crossing Guards.

A listing of temporary grade levels were presented with Grade L highlighted. Mr. Hobson advised that the current recommendation was to pay the Crossing Guards at a Grade L. In response to questions, Deputy Chief Duffey advised that they believed they could fill the positions and absorb the costs for this school year.

On motion of Alderman Cashin, duly seconded by Alderman Hirschmann, it was voted to approve the recommendation of paying crossing guards at a Grade L temporary pay rate.

POLICE DEPARTMENT - Communication from Chief of Police regarding 28 hours of vacation time be added to Sergeant Jeffrey Perchau's accrual which he lost as a result of injury leave.

Alderman Hirschmann moved for discussion. Alderman Cashin seconded the motion.

Chairman Reiniger noted Mr. Hobson was recommending that this be denied.

Mr. Hobson stated Deputy Chief Dale Robinson approached me on this issue many weeks ago, asking Deputy Chief Duffey when the accident took place. Deputy Chief Duffey responded quite a while ago. Mr. Hobson stated that the accident took place before his tenure in the position. Deputy Chief Robinson approached me a few weeks back. We discussed the issue. I found out that there were a couple of exceptions made in the past. I talked to the Chief and felt that it could be something that the committee could consider and could discuss, and also informed him that he had to look into it more with the chief negotiator and past practice. I met with people in my office and there was a great deal of concern from people in my office that this could in fact set a precedence for the city because it does not confer with the way the ordinance is currently structured. Take the case, this is what took place. Sgt. Perchau was injured in the line of duty. He was ordered to get rid of a weapon. When he did that the weapon discharged and injured him, fairly severely. He went out on a worker's compensation leave, while he was out on leave obviously he couldn't take vacation because he was

hurt. Therefore he would lose this vacation time. It sounds like a reasonable request. We have a number of people who have also petitioned the department in the past, again before my tenure and those people have been denied. So there is a concern that by approving this we may be putting ourselves in a negative light particularly since this involves a workers compensation case. So that's the rationale of why I'm telling you I feel we need to deny it, but with all due respect to the fact that Sgt. Perchau has been with us for 26 years and was injured in the line of duty and it's a terrible thing.

Alderman Cashin asked Mr. Hobson a hypothetical, let's say a police officer gets shot in the line of duty, goes out on workmen's comp, aren't you going to compensate him for his vacation.

Mr. Hobson responded when an employee takes worker's compensation salary under the guidelines in the ordinance we currently have they do not necessarily, and the city solicitor wants to correct him, they do not necessarily collect earned vacation hours while they are on comp time.

Alderman Robert stated necessarily.

Mr. Hobson stated we have, I say necessarily, no they don't, you can waive any circumstance as you can waive the ordinance, as the Board you can vote to approve it.

Alderman Hirschmann stated a comment to follow up on Alderman Cashin's comment, this guy was shot in the line of duty. So, extenuating circumstances, I don't know about that, this is a rare incident I would think.

Alderman Robert questioned the solicitor, asking if he agreed with the Human Resources Director's assessment that they would be setting a precedent, or could they make an exception in this case.

Assistant Solicitor Arnold stated it would certainly be setting a precedent, and he was attempting to find the ordinance referred to so he could review it for a more detailed opinion. Whether the Board wants to consider that policy or look at an amendment to the ordinance was a separate question.

Mr. Hobson noted it had to do with Section H which talked about how much time, an employee can only accrue a maximum amount of time. He noted he had not answered Alderman Cashin's question correctly, if they are on leave and they accrue more than the maximum the answer is no unless the Board of Mayor and Aldermen would waive that.

Alderman Reiniger asked if there was a public safety exception.

Alderman Robert stated he was not sure that the ordinance when written took this into consideration, the exceptions in the past maybe the people could come back in the future, and asked if these folks would the same circumstances apply. He was not so sure that the ordinance as written fits the situation, and if it doesn't perhaps they could make it fit.

Deputy Chief Duffey stated the only thing he wanted to underscore, he thought everyone was on the same waive length and understood the position Mr. Hobson was in but he had great success in address the Board in a human nature in the past on employee issues, and he thought they needed to keep track of something here. Jeff Perchau is a 26 year veteran of the Police Department who was shot in the line of duty. That is exactly what happened. Through no fault of his own he was unable to use the vacation time. We as the top management of the city like to say a lot of times that our employees are our greatest asset. This would be a nice way to show it. If it is a precedent, it is a good precedent. If the Board has the opportunity to examine these on a case by case basis I wouldn't see what the problem is anyway. To some degree a precedent has been set. We have two instances sighted in Mr. Hobson's letter where a waiver was granted, one to do the budget and one because we are opening an Airport, so to deny Sgt. Perchau's request we are going to say that somebody that had a budget to prepare and somebody who had an airport to open is more important than a policeman that got shot, and he did not believe the Board wanted to do that.

Alderman Hirschmann moved to approve the request from the Police Department. Alderman Cashin seconded the motion.

Alderman Robert stated he was sympathetic to the situation but did not want a wide open circumstance, feeling it would be wise if they re-established parameters that they could go by so they would not get inundated with requests like this. He could see them loosing control of this in the future if they were not careful.

Chairman Reiniger noted they could tie the approval to a public safety position, someone injured in the line of duty. He also suggested that they could approve this request and then consider another motion relative to having the Human Resources Director to come up with a policy for the committee to consider in the future.

Chairman Reiniger called for a vote on the motion to reinstate the vacation hours of Sgt. Perchau as requested. The motion carried with none recorded in opposition.

On motion of Alderman Robert, duly seconded by Alderman Cashin, it was voted to request the Human Resources Director to review the issue and submit a policy for future consideration by the Committee.

Chairman Reiniger addressed item 3 of the agenda:

FINANCE DEPARTMENT - Information provided on FY 98 budgeted positions.

Mr. Hobson stated after the last committee meeting that we had as a group a couple of the committee members began to ask about some specific questions regarding the finance department, their budgeted positions for this fiscal year, and their organizational chart in terms of how it was structured. I went back to take a look at what occurred during the budget process, what was actually submitted to you during that process, and what finally was the outcome. Back in very early July when I was working both positions in HR and here, there were three requests on my desk to move or to approve three grade 29 Senior Financial Analyst positions. All three of those people had positions already in the system. Two of those people were Financial Analysts, Grade 27, and they were becoming Senior Financial Analyst, Grade 29. One of those people was moving from a position, you'll have to forgive me I forget the title, but they were moving into the Senior Financial Analyst position that was also a Grade 29 that was specifically for the Aggregation study. When we approve a position change or anything like this from the budget process what I'm told is that we have to make sure that the funding is in the budget, which I was told it was. We have to make sure that the position exists in the compensation study, I was told that it was. We have to make sure that the proper forms are filled out in Human Resources called Employee Information Sheets, and they were. And we have to make sure that the funding actually exists,

it's fiscally capable to do so. So we have four different documents that we looked at. I looked at those documents, they existed, to the best of my knowledge everything was correct. And those three people were in the computer system as of July 19th as all grade 29s'. In addition, there was a question that was brought up, does the Treasury Division report directly to the Deputy Finance Officer because that seemed to be a conflict of interest in terms of who was responsible for auditing process and who was responsible for the Treasury, and I met with Kevin Clougherty on that issue. And I also frankly consulted with the Yarger, Decker Thomas firm which at that time had actually gone through the finance department and we looked at the budget process and we looked at the organizational charts as well. So what I would like to do now is walk you through something. If you through the very next page and it says "City of Manchester Department of Finance Organization Chart" 3/10/97 budget package finance department in the upper top. There is a position that is asterisked that's listed on a spread sheet that you were given. So you were given this chart and there were two positions that were listed on the spread sheet, or I should say there were two positions, the two grade 29s' Senior Financial Analysts, those were not listed on the spread sheet and then you look at the way the chart is described and it shows the Treasury Division reporting up through the Deputy Finance Officer which I don't believe is appropriate. If you look at Document 1A which is the next page, Org Chart revised and it has my initials on it, after I checked with Kevin Clougherty he informed me that in fact the Treasury Division needed to consult with and work with the Deputy Finance Officer but it in fact did directly report to him. And the audit division also directly reported to Kevin and not the Deputy Finance Officer. I took interest in the audit division because as you know when we went through the Human Resources Reorganization, we created that whole division of audit because payroll was moving from Finance to audit so I wanted to know just where was that, who was responsible for that. And so who therefore would be responsible for auditing anything that takes place in payroll, audit would oversee the work that I approve and Janelle Laroch would approve and that position would report to the Finance Officer. So now we go to the last page, this was also submitted to you in the budget package, and it was prepared by Randy Sherman. I met with Mr. Sherman and asked him and Hugh Moran the Employee Relations Manager also met with him and went over some issues. When the Human Resources reorganization was discussed, and I'm not saying that this was tied to the reorganization, but it took place concurrently. When the payroll system was moved out of the Finance Department and moved into Human Resources it was decided that the Second Deputy Finance Officer position, which is asterisked and says not filled, that was a Grade 29, B1, total cost to the city of \$56,900. It was decided by the Finance Department management, as I understand it, that that position would not be filled and the funding for that position would instead be used to upgrade the two financial analysts from Financial Analyst positions to Senior positions. So all

three people who were doing Senior Financial Analysis/Accounting work in the Finance Department, there would be one in each of those three divisions that you saw in the org chart and that they would all be equal; and that the money that would be saved, instead of hiring another person, the money that would be save by adding to those two existing people was approximately a savings of around \$25,000. It could be a little bit less at this point in time depending upon when they hired people and etc. but it was around \$25,000. So that to best of my knowledge that's what I've been able to recapture and report to you, that that is what took place. And so that is why you have two people who were formerly at 27 and now at a 29, and another person who was formerly at whatever position she held, she moved into that aggregation Sr. Financial Analyst position as well.

Alderman Cashin stated so we've upgraded three people, is that what you are telling us, from a 27 to a 29, and did they go through the process.

Mr. Hobson responded two of the people went from 27 to 29 and I have to tell you that I don't remember what the other one was at.

Alderman Cashin stated it didn't matter that was all right.

Mr. Hobson stated it was a promotional step up.

Alderman Cashin stated three people were upgraded.

Mr. Hobson stated I would have to say that one was a physical promotion, the job was posted for an aggregation...Senior Financial Analyst/Aggregation and that person applied for it and got the job.

Alderman Cashin stated all right, so let's say two people were upgraded.

Mr. Hobson responded, yes sir.

Alderman Cashin stated did it go through the process, did it come to the Personnel Committee, approved by the Personnel Committee, go to the full Board, approved by the Board and then acted on, or did it come through the budget process like they did a few years ago.

Mr. Hobson responded to the best of my knowledge it went through the budget process.

Alderman Cashin stated this is exactly what they done a couple years ago when we wound up with...in a very tough position. I feel, and I'm willing to make a

motion, that these upgradings go back to the Finance Department and these people who have been upgraded go back to their original grades at 27 until such time as they go through the same process that everybody else would have to go through. The Finance Department has the ability in the computer to plug these things in. There is no other department in the City of Manchester that can do this. Everybody else has to go through a process, and if the process is good for everyone else I don't see why it isn't good for Finance and I strongly recommend that these people go back to whatever grades they were before this happened and if they want to initiate and go through the process that's fine with me, and that's a motion.

Chairman Reiniger asked Mr. Hobson what would be the procedure entailed in rolling back these upgrades.

Mr. Hobson responded well, my concern would be that obviously we've gone through this paperwork process to get them to this point. The people have been physically paid the dollars, and I would just want to make sure that legally that for everyone's protection, the aldermen's protection as well, that if we did that I would like to go through some kind of a process with the City Solicitor's office to make sure that we are legally following proper steps. In other words maybe Alderman Cashin is correct that tonight we could or should repeal it, and maybe that motion may put the city in some kind of jeopardy. I don't know. I guess Alderman Cashin's point is valid, my only point would be that perhaps we would need to be directed to tell you what that would do before you act on that. Am I being clear. I don't want to put the city in any jeopardy, that's the bottom line.

Chairman Reiniger stated Alderman Cashin made a motion, do you want the motion to be to direct Mr. Hobson to report back to us the proper procedure for rolling back these upgrades.

Alderman Cashin stated no, my motion is that we roll back the upgrades. This is not the first time it's been done Mr. Chairman, it's the second time they've done it. Are we going to condone it again, the first time I brought it to everybody's attention and we said okay it's happened, and we heard the same argument then. Now it's happened again. I'm saying this has to stop. There is a process by which everybody is evaluated and there is no reason why Finance shouldn't go through the same process.

Alderman Hirschmann stated this is for Mark Hobson. Just so I get this straight, the Second Deputy Finance Officer position is not filled at this time.

Mr. Hobson stated right.

Alderman Hirschmann stated the money was used to upgrade three people, the 29's.

Mr. Hobson stated yes, to pay for three people to be a 29.

Alderman Hirschmann stated and it saved the city of Manchester \$25,000 approximately.

Mr. Hobson stated approximately.

Alderman Hirschmann stated that's it, no further questions.

Alderman Robert stated I guess I'm just not clear when these things went through, are we to understand that what we did in the budget process wasn't complete, wasn't proper, or are we saying that somebody in the Finance Department did something that was illegal. Alderman Robert stated he was trying to clear in his mind what happened.

Mr. Hobson stated to the best of my knowledge, and frankly this is something I'm going to spend time with the City Solicitor's office to make sure I get a handle on this as well. When we bring in a reclassification as Alderman Cashin is describing, we do what you saw tonight, we bring in with Mr. Decker's piece for example, you know you have some rationale and he talks about the budget implications, and talk about the fact that you are moving a position from a 20 to a 22 let's say or whatever. That you have put on hold approximately 80, 90 reclassifications over the last year. You directed me last summer, I think in July, to look at what should trigger you people to do a reclassification, and we brought you those guidelines in September which you accepted. So there is generally a process for reclassification. In this case, what took place was some departmental reorganization that happened in the budget process, and the organization charts reflected that, the spread sheet that you saw, which is the only spread sheet I could find, did not necessarily reflect the two 29's instead you saw a position that would cost around 50 some odd dollars that was never filled.

Alderman Robert stated we've done things in the budget process, we've done things outside of the budget process, but it's always been my impression that we've done things legally. I mean, did the Board not do something during the budget process. Did these people do something illegal. I guess in order to vote for or against this I need to know that.

Alderman Cashin stated the question before this committee is not was anything done legally or illegally, the question before them was did it go through the same process that everybody else is required to go through and the answer is no it did not. And it's not the first time, it's the second time it's been done, and I don't think we should condone it. Why should the finance department be any different than any other department simply because they have the capacity to plug these things into the computer. Even the Personnel Director didn't even know about this until he read it.

Alderman Robert stated I'm trying to clarify this in my mind. Am I to understand that Kevin, Randy whatever just went the computer changed these people's pay grades and that was it.

Alderman Cashin stated he would refer that to the Personnel Director.

Alderman Robert stated during which budget process. I've been on personnel for two years. We didn't do any of this.

Alderman Cashin stated it never came to us, that's the point.

Chairman Reiniger concurred that it had not come to them, it had never been requested of this committee.

Mr. Hobson stated when we went back and researched it, what I can tell you, and I'm going to sound like I'm repeating myself because I will. We needed certain pieces of documentation that has to be done in order for these changes to take place. When we went back and researched it, in fact, that documentation was in place, what you saw that was different was that instead of a position that was going to be filled that was going to be a 29, that I was told was approved in the budget process, instead of filling that position that position was never filled we never came to this table and say that we are going to approve these classification, instead that position was not filled and the money was put...and during the budget process to these other two positions and to help support the aggregation program. In doing so the Finance Director and the Assistant Director believe that they were well within their authority to do that as department heads to utilize that funding and that also have stated to me that in the process they will be saving around \$20,000 to \$25,000 by the end of the fiscal year. So when we went back, and the question was brought up to us I really didn't have the answer. I had to go back and do the research. It was different or unusual for me, but I've never been through his process before either on this side of the street in terms of the way in which the budget process flows. So I just wanted you to see what happened.

Alderman Cashin asked, did they go through the process that every other department head or department would have to go through in order to upgrade these individuals.

Mr. Hobson stated they definitely did not follow the process that you see, they went through the budget process instead.

Alderman Robert asked if there was anybody here from Finance that wants to speak to this.

Ms. Schafer of Finance Department was present at the meeting but indicated that this was not within her range of authority to address.

Mr. Hobson stated he did not think that would be appropriate.

Chairman Reiniger stated there was no one present at the director level. He stated that Alderman Cashin had made a motion to roll back the upgrades and asked if there was a second. Chairman Reiniger stated there was no second, he thought that Alderman Cashin had made a point here, and asked if there was another motion, to direct Mr. Hobson to come back.

Alderman Cashin stated he would come in to the full Board with a minority report, that was what he planned to do.

Alderman Hirschmann moved to eliminate the position of Second Deputy Finance Officer so it can't be filled.

Chairman Reiniger called for a second to the motion. There was none.

Alderman Cashin stated that does not solve the problem, alderman. The problem is you've got different strokes for different folks here. The Finance Department for whatever reasons feel that they don't have to do along with the same policies that everybody has to go along with, that's the question here.

Alderman Hirschmann asked if he could give his opinion. He stated that these are financial people, these aren't human resource people. They put together a budget, they presented it to the aldermen, we passed it, and in their new budget package for 98 they shifted things around. They needed assistance from Mr. Hobson's department, he was coming into a new job, the clerks didn't follow up on it. These guys are number people, they don't have a clue about doing this stuff.

Alderman Cashin asked are you that naive.

Alderman Robert stated I'd like to get to the bottom of this very quickly. I'd like to speak with the finance director and have him tell us as soon as possible what the heck is going on here so we can proceed. Because something doesn't seem right, and I'd hate to take somebody's pay check away from them based on, without giving somebody an opportunity to explain what happened.

Chairman Reiniger asked if he wanted to table the item and have the Finance Director come to the next meeting, or make a motion.

Alderman Robert stated next meeting, he was not talking next month or next year, I'm talking like next week or Friday.

Chairman Reiniger stated I would be happy to schedule another meeting.

Alderman Robert stated the sooner the better.

Mr. Hobson stated we may have some business that we would like to do in December, I know usually we don't have a Human Resources Committee meeting in December, but we may have some business that needs to be attended to anyways so we could something very early in December if you'd like.

Chairman Reiniger stated he would schedule another meeting asking if they wished to table the item.

Alderman Robert moved to table the item. Alderman Hirschmann seconded the motion. The motion carried with Alderman Cashin recorded in opposition. He stated he wished to go in with a minority report to the full Board.

## **NEW BUSINESS**

**BUILDING DEPARTMENT -- Employee leave of absence request for Barbara Gaudreault.**

Mr. Hobson advised that it was a simple request, an individual was asking to have a five month unpaid leave. The Deputy Building Commissioner informed him that they would not be picking up any costs for the leave; that the benefit accruals would be waived, and that it would not place any undo burden on the department. Mr. Hobson noted that they had done these types of leaves in the past, and he recommended approval.

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

Communication relative to overtime for Finance Department/HTE  
Conversion

A handout was distributed to the members.

Alderman Cashin stated the package is in reference to overtime because of the new computer system that is in process of being put on line. He stated he did not know whether it should be in executive session or not, but did not think so he thought it was public knowledge and public information that anybody could get if they wanted. Alderman Cashin stated Randy Sherman, who is a deputy finance director and in my opinion is exempt has received to date \$23,341.77 in overtime, and I'd like to make a motion that this be referred to the City Solicitor's office for any recommendations that they want to make. He stated I feel this is definitely wrong, I feel he is exempt and if this goes unchecked I think we are going to open the floodgates that are insurmountable around here.

Alderman Hirschmann questioned Mr. Hobson asking if to his knowledge do any other exempt department heads or deputies of departments receive overtime compensation.

Mr. Hobson stated I'm not sure what else you received from Alderman Cashin. There was a very, this took place before I came on, there was a very lengthy document that was developed by then Connie Roy who was the deputy of HR or number two person in HR. I sat on the advisory committee in Information Systems, and so I was aware that this policy was being developed, and that the Mayor did see the policy and to the best of my knowledge signed off on it. Connie developed this process where people who were going to be working on the conversion could receive overtime, both exempt and non-exempt staff, if it was focused on the conversion, and that's a very lengthy document which we will make sure the City Solicitor has, I believe he had it before this process took place anyway. Also, Janelle laroch, who is the compensation and benefits manager, and to the best of my knowledge she stated that the total that Mr. Cashin received is a little off, its closer to \$16,600. for that position.

Alderman Cashin stated this came from Diane Prew at Information Systems.

Mr. Hobson stated he was handed this about 20 minutes before arriving and was told that the total was closer to \$16,600.

Alderman Cashin stated Diane was here and could answer who own questions, he didn't make up this figure.

Mr. Hobson stated he knew that, he was just stating that we just have two different figures.

Alderman Hirschmann stated to stay on track though there was a policy that you know of that the Mayor signed off on, did it become a policy, did it come to this board or to the full Board.

Mr. Hobson stated I don't know. I don't think it came to the full board, I believe that it went through to all the different department heads and to the Mayor's office.

Chairman Reiniger stated in the interest of time, he thought Alderman Cashin had brought up a good point and he thought they should get to the bottom of it, and he had moved to bring it to the Solicitor to check the legality and asked if there was a second.

Alderman Robert asked for a repeat of the motion.

Chairman Reiniger stated the motion was to send the list to check to see if we are doing this correctly in terms of exempt employees.

Alderman Hirschmann asked if Mr. Hobson wanted this to go to the Solicitor.

Mr. Hobson responded yes and noted that the dollar figure that Alderman Cashin has include numbers from the last figure year, and the dollar figure that he had was from this fiscal year.

Alderman Cashin stated it was from March until now.

Mr. Hobson stated he was right.

Alderman Hirschmann seconded the motion.

Alderman Robert asked if they could add this to the list to be talked to with the Finance Director.

Alderman Hirschmann asked that the Solicitor's report be available at the meeting, the rush meeting, that was to be scheduled.

Assistant Solicitor Arnold stated they would do their best.

Chairman Reiniger called for a vote. The motion carried with none recorded in opposition.

On motion of Alderman Hirschmann, duly seconded by Alderman Cashin, it was voted to adjourn.

A True Record. Attest.

Clerk of Committee