

COMMITTEE ON HUMAN RESOURCES/INSURANCE

June 16, 1998
BMA

Immediately Upon Conclusion of Special

Chairman Sysyn called the meeting to order.

The Clerk called the roll.

Present: Aldermen Sysyn, Klock, Pinard, Shea, O'Neil

Messrs: R. Stanton, M. Hobson, S. Power, M. Roach

Chairman Sysyn addressed Item 3 of the agenda:

Communication from Robert Stanton, Executive Director of the
Contributory Retirement System, requesting changes to benefit provisions.

Mr. Stanton stated I am Executive Director of the City of Manchester Employees Contributory Retirement System and we are here before you tonight to discuss our letter of May 28 with respect to some benefit plan provision changes for pre and post 1974 employees. Before I get into that, I would like to introduce some people that are here tonight with us for the record. First, to my right this is Mike Roach who is Chairman of the Retirement Board. Next to him is Kerry Herlihy who is an Employee Representative and next to Kerry is Kevin Barry who is the Citizen Representative and to my left is Stephanie Power who is the Systems Actuary who will be able to answer any questions with respect to the figures tonight. The reason for our meeting with you is that we, as I stated in the meeting with the Aldermen a couple of weeks ago, that we did a survey with respect to benefit plan changes with the various groups throughout the City a year ago and as a result of that, we met with them and they came up with several recommendations and ways that they would like to see the benefits improved for City employees. Primarily, post-1974 employees. As a result of that, we compiled a list which we sent to you, again in that May 28th letter, of the changes the Board has come forward with. That is the Board of Trustees of the Retirement System. We did actually two studies. One was on the post-1974 employees with respect to changing service credit from 1.5% to 2% per year as well as an additional study to take away the actuarial reduction for people who retire early and then a combination of the first

and second study for a total cost. They had to be done independently of each other to come up with a total cost. As a result of that study, the Board chose to go with what I refer to as Exhibit I which changes the service credit from 1.5% to 2% per year which as well as changes the employees' contribution from 2.5% to 3.75%. Through the Board discussions we chose to come with the rule of cost sharing whereby the employees pick up or their contributions would increase on a weekly basis as well as the City's contribution into the trust would increase as well. We tried to come up with a scenario, again it would be a cost sharing as opposed to having the City pick up the full expense and in our previous discussions with various groups out in the City the employee has been more than willing on several occasions to pay considerably more into the system if benefits improvements could prevail and that is why again we are here this evening, to discuss those with you and answer any questions you may have relative to those benefit plan provision changes. The other issue that came to light was post-1974 employees. Those people were given a little different benefit structure when they joined the system back in 1974 because at that particular time the City of Manchester felt the need to change its retirement system plan because they felt they couldn't continue on a pay as you go basis which was work 20 years you get half pay for the rest of your life. They felt at that particular time that to continue with that benefit would be too costly to the City out into the future so they established a contributory retirement system and allowed people that were pre-1974 to join the system or remain in the old. As a result of them joining the system, their benefits structure was basically...if someone was age 62 and had 20 years of services they could retire with half pay or with a combination of age and years and service that totaled 80, but there was an actual reduction of that. I think that was in 1986 when that actually changed and there was no actual reduction for those people retiring at the 80 points. What is, again, in your package this evening is to allow the remainder of those people who were pre-1974 and there are about 63 of those and of those 63 I would say a little over half are already qualified for retirement either under early retirement or age 62 so they again could actually leave of today and retire. The remainder of those people don't have the 80 points and aren't age 62 and the proposal tonight is to allow those individuals to get out after 20 years of service. At this particular point they would have 25 years of service plus because the system has been in existence since 1974. So that is the other proposal before you. So it is a combination of two. Principally it was the post-1974 issue that I think was at the forefront of us coming before you this evening.

Alderman O'Neil asked on the first issue, the cost to the City for the next fiscal year would be \$42,000.

Mr. Stanton answered yes on the pre-1974. That is if, again, these are and I will let Stephanie get into that, these are their best guesses. If something occurs in their actuarial assumption, they make assumptions. Now if these assumptions don't come true and people don't retire, then those costs are less.

Alderman O'Neil stated I guess I am getting confused here. The \$42,000 is for the pre-1974. What is the cost on the...

Mr. Stanton replied on the post-1974, for the increase from service credit from 1.5% to 2% is an additional cost to the City of \$395,000. The employees contribution would increase by \$348,000 and again that would also increase again as compensation increases.

Ms. Power stated those are both the annual increase in costs and that increase each year for the next 30 years and those numbers go up somewhat as salaries increase as well but the annual cost, you can expect that cost over \$1,038,000.

Mr. Stanton stated just another point, as I stated in the letter there hasn't been any benefit structure changes in 25 years post-1974 employees so they have been living with that same benefit structure for 25 years with no increase in benefits at all.

Alderman Shea stated the post-1974 employees haven't really joined the new retirement system. Those that have joined it have been paying into it but what your proposition is is to bring these other people into the system by, maybe I am not clear.

Mr. Stanton replied post-1974 if anybody who became employed with the City of Manchester after January 1, 1974 it was a condition of employment that they join the system so all of those people are in the system. They have not had any benefit structure changes since that time. If you were hired in 1974, your benefits remained the same through 1998. There have been minor changes.

Alderman Shea asked what were the changes.

Mr. Roach answered vesting. Originally the first three years you have to be five years, three highest out of the last five and that changed January 1, 1977 to three highest out of the last 10. The first three years, all employees within, it was only based on your base pay and from that time since January 1, 1977 it includes overtime as well so the pension is based on your gross pay as opposed to your base pay. Those are really the only positive changes for the post-1974 employees. In 1986, as Bobby stated a little earlier, there was a referendum that went to the

voters and it did change that year and passed by over 4,500 votes but at the time it only affected 130 people that were only pre-1974. When this plan first started in 1974 there was only a total of about 535 members. Today there is over 1,000 active. There are 1,010 as of today so it has grown quite a bit.

Mr. Stanton stated in answer to your question Alderman Shea, there are two groups here. There is a pre-1974 group and a post-1974 group. What you are referring to is the 43 individuals that remain on the old retirement system.

Alderman Shea replied I think you answered that. You said that would be \$42,000.

Mr. Stanton stated no that is the cost for those people who are currently the pre-1974 that are in the system currently but there is another group of people that are pre-1974 that remain in the old retirement system for the City of Manchester. You were referring to get these people into the plan. They can get into the plan, these people that worked for the City that haven't joined the plan in the pre-1974, they have that option to join. I think the principal reason they don't join is if they were to be terminated today they could walk away with half pay because they qualify under the old plan. If they joined the new plan and were to be laid-off if they weren't 62 and had the 80 points, they wouldn't receive the benefits until they were age 62. That is one reason they don't join and the other is the cost factor because these people have to pay back from 1974 until whatever time they join the system in 1998 at 2.5% of their gross pay plus 7.5% interest compounded annually so those numbers add up quickly. We just did a recent buy back for an individual and his fees are in excess of \$30,000+ that he has to pay up front before he can join the system. Now the City of Manchester in those particular instances, the retirement system takes an actuarial loss immediately and we did a study on that some years ago and if it was a low wage earner at that point, it becomes a \$150,000 actuarial loss to us if these people join the plan.

Alderman O'Neil stated I want to make sure I understand this correctly. There are approximately 63 employees who are pre-1974 but are on the new plan. There are another 43 employees pre-1974 that remain in the old plan. So there is roughly 106 pre-1974 employees. Any idea and maybe this would be a question for Mark but has anybody done what the cost savings might be to the City? Obviously these people are all at their max.

Mr. Stanton passed out a worksheet that Mr. Hobson prepared. I provided the individuals. Again, these people right here they are the 20 odd people, actually 30 positions from pre-1974 that are in the new system that don't meet the qualifications of retirement currently. This is what they project out to be the cost

savings in the first year if, again, everybody were to retire tomorrow. This is what the cost savings would be.

Alderman O'Neil asked so even at worst it is probably a wash for the City. It looks like it is a pretty good deal for the City never mind the employees.

Mr. Stanton stated I have had discussions with the Finance Department and I won't go into that but my numbers that I gave you at the Aldermanic meeting were somewhat old. The scope of the Finance Department told me there is 43 in the old system but there is some \$20 million unfunded liability hanging out there that the City has and as you know it is a pay as you go system and those dollars for the old pension system are appropriated on a year to year basis but they still have that unfunded liability out there. I think that Mercer actually did that study several years ago for the City. So that and I think the City would like to see that unfunded liability.

Mr. Roach asked may I just state one other fact. I think it is very important that besides the cost sharing involved, just in the last nine years the City's contribution to the retirement system has gone down by 80%. Back in the 80's and early 90's, the City was contributing over \$2.7 million per year to us. In the last year, it was just under half a million. That is just in the 90's and most of it is because of the investments and also that the employees for a long time didn't get raises so it is based on salary increases as well. That is not a good thing but the City's share did go down considerably in the last decade.

Alderman O'Neil moved to allow pre-1974 employees who have completed at least 20 years of service to retire immediately. Alderman Klock duly seconded the motion.

Alderman O'Neil stated I guess we will have to ask Finance to identify the funding source.

Deputy Clerk Johnson stated my understanding was that probably was going to require a referendum, so the motion would be to recommend the Board place a question on the ballot.

Mr. Stanton replied that is correct.

Discussion ensued where Mr. Stanton advised his legal counsel would submit the language for the question to the Clerk.

Deputy Clerk Johnson noted to members that the report to the Board won't be exactly what you are saying, it is going to be a referendum question. Members concurred.

Chairman Sysyn called for a vote. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Alderman O'Neil asked, Bob, have we had any discussions either with Mark Hobson or Kevin Clougherty about on the second part how at this point we could fund that \$400,000 roughly.

Mr. Stanton answered no we haven't had any discussion with respect to funding. This wouldn't, again if it were to be approved this year would be in the 1999 budget. It is not a current issue.

Alderman O'Neil asked would it be a similar change. Is that a referendum issue?

Mr. Stanton answered all changes to the retirement system have to go to referendums. That is why we started this procedure early.

Alderman Shea asked for clarification. You said it would be in the 1999 budget or the 2000 budget?

Mr. Stanton answered the 1999/2000 budget.

Mr. Hobson stated it is FY2000.

Alderman O'Neil moved to increase the employee's contribution to 3.75% and the City's contributions to 2.0% to the retirement system for service credit after January 1, 1998. Alderman Shea duly seconded the motion. Chairman Sysyn called for a vote. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Mr. Stanton stated just another note I would like to mention to you is that we have been doing pre-retirement seminars for City employees and Human Resources has been a very important instrument in us getting these down. We stopped for the summer due to vacations, but we will be starting them up again in the fall, hopefully in September. We have another 700 employees to do so we do 50-55 at a time so it is a time-consuming effort but we certainly want to thank the Human Resources Department for being part of it because it is something that is long overdue and Mark has certainly been at the forefront of realizing how important it is.

Chairman Sysyn addressed Item 4 of the agenda:

Update by the Human Resources Director of the Classification and Compensation Study recently provided by Yarger Decker & Associates.

Mr. Hobson stated Madame Chairman I apologize for passing this out this evening. I was asked yesterday morning if I could just put something in writing briefly for the Committee to reflect on for informational purposes. I know you just heard Mr. Decker do a presentation to you last week. Post the June 9 night, beginning the next morning at 7:15 a.m. and running until about 10 p.m. that evening and then the same thing the next day and then pretty much the same thing the following day, Mr. Decker, we believe we have met with 1,500 employees. At those meetings, Mr. Decker reviewed within an hour and 15 minutes at each meeting the proposed position allocation list that you received, the pay schedule, the pay grades and the present and proposed pay grade assignments and he also talked at length about how does one appeal. Before I go any further, I want to say that and you may already know this that Alderman Pinard attended I would say close to 80% of every one of the meetings in total that we had so a member of your Committee was present for a lot of the activity that took place. We also found, in meeting with the department heads and the union representatives, that there were some blatant errors on some of the department allocation lists. Blatant in the fact that they were just obvious. The classic example was that during the study an employee may have transferred to a new position with a new pay grade and a new job and for some reason the data base showed them in the old pay grade with the old job so they would look at it and say gee I am not getting as much of a raise as I thought I was, etc. That was the classic example and that occurred in a number of departments. The appeals are going to be logged through our office through June 19. We have encouraged all employees that they are to leave a copy with their department head. If they have a problem with leaving it with their department head we have asked them to leave it with their union representative. If they don't have a union representative, we told them to please at least keep a copy themselves and send it to us. Our job is to just gather them and send them down to Yarger Decker & Associates. As all of you asked, the final revised position classification form for every position in every department, along with a Fair Labor Standard Act grade of exempt or non-exempt is forthcoming. Finally, the revised Human Resources Ordinances that are related to the study is also forthcoming in three to four weeks. I shared with Frank Thomas and Floyd Decker that I would like to see Mr. Decker get everything accomplished in time to at least make a proposal to the Aldermen at their July 7 meeting. That is the overview.

Alderman Klock asked when are they coming to speak in front of the Board.

Mr. Hobson answered I would like that to be in time for the July 7 meeting. The appeals process is important. The employees need to feel that their appeals are seriously being reviewed.

Alderman Klock stated I don't disagree with that, I was just curious because I wish that it was earlier rather than later.

Chairman Sysyn stated it will take awhile I think for all these appeals to go through because I heard a lot of flack and I think until they can go forward and they address it, I don't think it is going to be done in two weeks. How do you feel about that, Mark?

Mr. Hobson answered I think if someone asked me what are you running for a percentage right now, I think we are up to maybe 5% of the cases are being appealed. It is not outrageous but it is a lot when you are looking at 1,800 classifications and I feel that in a sense of justice you have to give those people their due. Some of their appeals might be considered by the consultant to be frivolous in the respect that I used to get paid the same rate as John and he works in Water Works and I work in Parks & Recreation and I want to continue being paid the same rate as John and frankly you do hear some of those types of questions being raised but those are legitimate issues for those people so I think you need to answer their questions and make them feel comfortable with the answer and I am not saying that you would disagree with that, I am just saying that I feel that is something that is critical.

Alderman Klock asked what are most of the concerns that the employees have. What kind of disagreements are they having? Is it an overall general thing or is it just different issues with different employees?

Mr. Hobson answered the most surprising aspect, no, I am sorry I did not mean to use that word, one of the most consistent aspects that is raised or was raised is the concept of longevity. How will longevity fit into the process? The Oversight Committee and the department heads knew going into the study that the original grid that you saw would not include longevity, that longevity would be an overlay on top of that. What we thought, I believe, the Oversight Committee thought that the longevity piece would be brought to the table by now. I am not downing the consultant, it is just that it is not ready. The reason why I believe it is not ready is because some contracts were revised sort of at the last minute if you will and he received those contracts fairly late in the day in maybe May so he wanted to make sure that he brought, the concept of longevity is that regardless of what department you are in, you work for the City of Manchester and so, therefore, longevity should be equal from place to place to place. In order to that, you have to make

sure that you are covering every single contract that involves classified employees and a couple of contracts came in late. I believe that is his rationale.

Alderman O'Neil stated I am glad you touched on that point because that is what I am kind of hearing on the street. I am going to make a generalized statement. It is not factual completely but it seems to be they brought, the study brought the 1-10 year employee very competitive to counterparts in Police, Fire or wherever, but there seems to be almost and I don't want to use the word penalty, but that longevity part of it for the 10-25 or 30 year employee and I am hearing a lot about that out there. That the people who have given 25 years of service to the City, whatever their job is that they seem to get left out. That is how they feel so this longevity part of it is critical that it gets brought in and I hope, I am not sure it has been explained to them properly at these meetings because they are all convinced that they are being penalized.

Mr. Hobson replied this is the first time that a lot of City employees just like at the retirement seminars, in my opinion this is the first time in a long time that City employees are being explained about the way certain things work in their benefit structure. If they are in a union, a lot of them will certainly pay attention to what their bargaining unit has to say and what is going on in that respect. We saw a lot of that, for example, in the retirement meetings where people were just flabbergasted that this was the way their retirement worked because it had never really been explained to them. I saw the same thing in terms of trying to walk people through a number of ways that certain things work or where you are trying to bring them to the next level and maybe Alderman Pinard can talk about that to. We tried to explain to them and I hope that I am not appearing to be either too liberal or conservative in my philosophy but this is my feeling, you have had bargaining units that in my words have mud wrestled Aldermen for what, cost of living, really. 2.5% to 3%. You know CPI is 2.6% in Manchester right now. In fact they are predicting for July and the rest of the year it will be 2.8%. So here you have these employees who are struggling, struggling, struggling with just trying to get a vote approved for a cost of living. The cost of living, whatever we decide cost of living needs to be and for longevity whatever we decide what longevity needs to be I think we need to take those pieces out of the way and put people on a comfort level and say look this is the policy. If the Aldermen can afford to give a cost of living increase across the board for everybody, then this is what it will be for FY2000. Put it on economics instead of politics then you look at the pay grade schedule and you move people through a pay grade schedule that is equal for everybody. The younger employee or the employee that has been with us for the least amount of time, they did see a huge net increase compared to someone who had been here for 20 years but what we tried to explain to the 20 year person was you have not seen the longevity piece yet. Please try to be patient

about what that policy might mean and people kept saying I want to see that longevity piece.

Alderman O'Neil stated I think right now that is a key aspect. It would settle a lot of concerns or fears.

Mr. Hobson replied we saw, for example, Police or Fire for the first year positions we are not competitive with the local towns and cities. We are not for our starting pays. I mean that clearly came out of the survey, yet when you move up the ladder maybe we are competitive but there is that longevity piece that needs to be added to that because as a Captain of Detectives who I met with today explained to me, he said don't you believe that my skills as a 10 year Captain are worth more than the skills of the 1 year Captain to the corporation called Manchester and I said of course just as I would for a first year teacher compared to a 10 year teacher. I would say that that master teacher brings to the table many more skill sets. How would one argue that? I can't. You are right. I agree with you Aldermen that they need to see that in my opinion the Board is establishing a policy that is equal for their longevity and I would really endorse that the Board strongly consider what the Oversight Committee brings to the table and we need to wrestle with that in terms of making it palatable for you obviously as a Board that you are voting on something that makes sense for you and for the City, for the taxpayers.

Alderman Shea stated there are a few issues that might be addressed by Mr. Decker. One would be the study was classification and compensation and I think it would be well for him to elaborate on how that issue of classification has been resolved. In other words, the initial study was undertaken because of the inequities as far as classification of works and so forth. The second is contractual agreements and that might be in terms of the implementation of this particular financial components, in other words will contractual agreements presently in existence with different unions or non-affiliates have an impact on when this should be implemented. In other words the timing of this. The third is, and it is of quite concern to me obviously because there have been a lot of issues in my former life as a principal in terms of evaluation. This is a very ticklish, delicate, it is an issue, for example who evaluates the evaluator. I mean how does one become able because of performance standards to be objectively evaluated. I mean I don't know of any instrument other than perhaps if you believe in the good Lord that it is going to take place and even some people say if you accept the Lord you are all set but I am just saying how can that be done. I mean this is really, talk about politics, this is how people get along in this world.

Mr. Hobson replied I think your three points are very valid. If you could see the eyes of what I would call pink collar and blue collar workers, you could see their eyes light up when you started to talk about the need for the equity issue across the board. A secretary, the Human Resources secretary who is a member of MESPA in this building who worked for me and is still here, for seven years she did not receive a raise and for three years she did not receive a step increase. In the interim, the non-affiliated secretary of the Human Resource Department, formerly Personnel, received longevity steps and 2.5% or 3% raises probably four out of those same seven terms. Almost identical position descriptions, almost identical duties, almost identical amount of employees, etc. Is that fair? No, it is not fair. So what we need to do is to bring her at least, her the woman here, we need to at least bring her into the same pay grade so she now is at the same pay grade as Jackie Curtis who is my secretary down there. So at least they are shooting from the same ship. One was on the big red cruise and the other was on the SS Minnow so at least we are now putting them on the same deck. Some support people said what you need to do is start by paying us all based on what the highest person got paid. I said I don't think so and the reason for that is I don't think the City can afford it so if we take the highest paid secretary and make sure that every secretary gets paid the highest pay I don't think that is going to work. The second piece is that contract agreements, we handed out to the employees the statement that if you are under a contract nothing happens to you until your bargaining unit agrees with doing it and they asked me what is your opinion and I said 13 months. In my opinion it will take 13 months start to finish to convince certain groups that this will work. We had two bargaining units that when we were finished making the presentations they came up and said if the Aldermen approve we are ready, we are ready to go and you can open our contracts. I, frankly, was shocked.

Alderman Shea stated to me it is a no brainer. Why wouldn't they want to open it?

Mr. Hobson replied because of your last piece and that is performance evaluations. It was interesting to me that the biggest sticking point was the longevity and not the performance evaluations because I thought they would kill us on the performance evaluations. The longevity was more important to them then performance evaluations but when longevity is taken care of, I am sure performance evaluations will be the same thing. What we tried to do to solve, you know, try to make them feel a little bit better was and I think we are all sincere about this is to make the employee feel completely involved in how that performance evaluation process will work and we used examples that I think they understood and those examples came from them. For example, Jean Bressard at the Fire Department said to us, if you expect to really do an adequate evaluation for firefighters you may need to take a look at the truck or the house. You may

need to actually take a look at the evaluation process by team, by group and that is not necessarily a bad idea in any way, shape or form. How does the group perform? How do they work together? The EPD said the same thing. They talked about the shift and the three workers that work on the shift out of EPD. If one of those three guys doesn't show up and they are mostly guys, it is a problem. It is an issue or if one of them is not performing it is an issue and it hits home for me and you and everybody else that lives in Manchester. We said, hey we are open to taking a look at that kind of prospect or cash based bonuses on a team basis. I mean maybe the team decides how they want to split it. I think if we are creative, because employees as you know, employees are the ones who know their job the best and I think if you talk to them about their job and try to solicit their opinion and make them feel like they are a part of it, in Human Resources modern terminology they call it 360 evaluation. You go all the way around the circle. Everybody gets evaluated, everybody is a part of the process. You look at the 360 evaluation process and it works. When you said who evaluates the evaluator, I would love for the employees to evaluate the evaluator. I would love for the employees to be able to do blind evaluations of their manager and to have that information charted objectively by some other party and given to them so they can see where they need to grow and develop and how their employees feel about them. The only thing I can tell you is that no tool is perfect and the only way it is going to work, especially in a union environment where there is such a low trust factor, is to get them involved.

Alderman Shea stated lets assume that I am a member of the Taxpayers Association so basically the Taxpayers Association says look, these people have raises the School budget is underfunded and now you are giving raises in the form of upgrades to people. I mean how do you answer this. I am just preparing probably myself and members of the Aldermanic Board for this but you know the flack that is going to take place if the headlines read "Aldermen Grant \$440,000 Upgrade and Classification Compensation Study This Year and Another \$500,000 Next Year". I mean what I am saying is, and I am not opposed to that, I am just saying this is something that the Aldermanic Board, regardless of how we word it, this is what we are going to be confronted with and faced with unless we have a good public relations kinds of situation because people obviously want their taxes to be low. They know that this has to be funded. Once it is implemented it is going to be funded.

Mr. Hobson stated those kind of questions get me very excited. I would keep you here for the next two hours giving you answers.

Alderman O'Neil stated in my opinion this is part of being a major, I mean we are a big employer. We have 2,500 employees and \$160 million budget. That is what this is all about. Whether this costs the City \$100,000 or a million, some people just aren't going to agree that we should be doing it. Just a couple of comments. I think this has appropriately answered the problems with classifications and compensation. I like the discussion about some type of index so that everybody is getting the same pay raise. That is certainly reasonable. We need, the key link is this longevity part of it and I agree with Alderman Shea that the evaluation part could be the hang up but I like the concept that has been thrown out about this team concept. That may help sell the evaluation aspect of it. The entire Scavenger Division of the Highway Department, as a group, not necessarily that truck, are they picking up as a group what they are supposed to be everyday and those types of things I think are going to help sell this. A couple of things I would ask from you and I think I have asked Floyd for this already so you may want to double-check. Examples of these evaluations in other like size communities where this has happened.

Mr. Hobson replied he is working on that.

Alderman O'Neil stated the second thing is, I would just like to and I believe the information is there, how easy it is put together I don't know but with regards to Police and Firefighters and a Laborer at the Highway Department, once this kicks in for a five year, ten year or fifteen year employee where does that put us with regards to other communities. I would be interested in that information.

Mr. Hobson replied the fast answer, but I would asterisk Police, the fast answer is that he attempted to put us in the number two slot, not number one and I think a lot of this came out of the Committee discussion. Not to get shot at by groups that want us to be frugal and I am not saying we shouldn't, they tried to put us in that number two or number three slot. Not number one.

Alderman O'Neil asked but he must be able to show specific numbers based on the data he has, like a 10 year Police Officer or a 10 year Laborer at the Highway Department in Manchester will approximately make this amount of money and that same position in Nashua or Concord is this. I would be interested in that type of data.

Mr. Hobson answered I will get that for you and may I just elaborate on your last piece. I want you all to be aware that I know, in terms of the press, that I believe both WZID and the Union Leader will be running stories probably early next week so I just want you to be aware that you may see those and I don't want you to be surprised by either the radio or the newspaper. Remember that whatever

they print or whatever they say, we don't have a final report yet. We said final is when the appeals process is done so whatever they print or whatever they say, it is not done.

Alderman Pinard stated Mark did a fantastic job and I have been talking to an awful lot of people and the biggest thing right now when you talk to somebody make sure you tell them to make the appeal. I think this is what I found out in talking to the Police Officers. They think that the appeals process is worthless and I said it is not, there is going to be an Appeal Board and everything is going to be looked at and this is the only way that they can make the program work. Don't knock it before you give it a chance.

Chairman Sysyn stated all the Aldermen are getting calls. I get hammered where I am at the cart. So I tell them all make sure you get your appeal in because they are the ones that are going to make the changes and then the report comes to us. I tell everybody not to get excited, get your appeal in and that is what all the Aldermen should be telling everybody, get your appeal in right away.

Alderman Klock stated I just want to concur with Alderman Pinard that you have done an exceptional job on this. It has been a huge project and for it to go as smoothly as it has thus far, you have done an incredible job, Mark. So kudos to you.

Mr. Hobson replied thank you. Janell Laroque is here with me tonight and you know how hard Janell works and our staff as well. I felt kind of bad because our staff was like alone. Floyd and I were out in the trenches doing our thing and our staff was in the back office.

Chairman Sysyn addressed Item 5 of the agenda:

Reports from the Human Resources Director submitted for informational purposes:

- A. New Hire Report
- B. Termination Report
- C. Vacancy Report

On motion of Alderman O'Neil, duly seconded by Alderman Klock, it was voted to receive and file the above items.

TABLED ITEM

6. Communication from Alderman Hirschmann regarding a Sidewalk Action Team proposal.
(Tabled 1/20/98 pending report from the Public Works Director.)

This item remained on the table.

There being no further business to come before the Committee, on motion of Alderman O'Neil, duly seconded by Alderman Klock, it was voted to adjourn.

A True Record. Attest

Clerk of Committee