

## COMMITTEE ON HUMAN RESOURCES/INSURANCE

**July 7, 1998**

**6:00 PM**

Chairman Sysyn called the meeting to order.

The Clerk called the roll.

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

**Absent:** Alderman Shea

**Messrs:** M. Hobson, F. Decker

The Deputy Clerk noted, for the record, that Alderman Shea is in the hospital.

Chairman Sysyn addressed Item 3 of the agenda:

Status report by Floyd Decker of Yarger Decker & Associates.

Mr. Hobson stated we submitted to you last week under a different cover a status report that Mr. Decker wrote to the Oversight Committee Chairman and copied to this Committee. I have some extra copies in case folks didn't bring that with them. What I thought we should try to do since Mr. Decker was available in person as I shared with you earlier that he is here to answer questions or to perhaps use the grease board for about five minutes and more or less take us through some pieces if that is convenient for you.

Alderman O'Neil stated maybe we should hear him out first but I am still concerned about something we talked about at the last meeting and I don't think it has been resolved and that is the longevity, the people with 10+ years. That end of it is what I am still hearing out there. They seem to be penalized and if I recall and I don't want to speak for you but there was supposed to be that portion of it due to us sometime soon, right?

Mr. Hobson replied I will let Floyd address that. I spoke today with a manager at another department and he was asking me and I know that I have spent time with him talking about how longevity will be different from the performance steps and there is no question that Alderman O'Neil is correct. There is still some confusion about how those two pieces work together and that is something that is being worked on by Yarger Decker and it is to be presented to the Committee. Floyd, would you like to address that piece first and talk about longevity and the steps?

Mr. Decker replied sure. Well let me say just before I do that, that I am here this week to listen to appeals from employees, department heads and union representatives concerning our initial recommendations. As the Alderman said, one of the principal questions relates to the issue of longevity. Next week we will provide you with our recommendations concerning longevity. You have got different kinds of longevity depending on which bargaining unit you are talking about. We would like to make a longevity recommendation that is basically common to all employees within the City. For example, some bargaining units may have longevity that starts at five years and they get so much and then at ten years they get so much and so forth. In some bargaining units that line goes like this and then kind of pales off so that you are not really getting any incentive to stay beyond about 20 years. What I would like to do is have a longevity system that runs like this that is five years you get so much, ten years, fifteen years, twenty and twenty-five and the longer you are there the greater percentage of your base pay you get so that when you are out of here 20 years, lets say you started with the City when you were 21 years old, many City workers are interested in retiring at 41. Why? So they can start a second career. What would seem to me is in the public interest is that if you have got good employees, you want to encourage them to stay if you can so that if they decide to retire at 20 years they are at least giving up something. Now one of the reasons that some of you may be hearing some criticism of our recommendation is that lets say this is a pay grade 20 and this is the minimum pay and it goes up to the maximum pay and we have steps, A, B, C, D, E and so forth. The way we have implemented the plan is that if the employees position and class is in pay grade 20, you take their current pay and if it is below the minimum, you move them to the minimum. If their current pay is somewhere in-between one of these steps, you move them to the next highest step. That could be as much as 3% or a little bit less than that, or a few dollars. So what we are hearing is that now that we have, let's say in the old pay grade the minimum was back here somewhere, the maximum was here and say that before they were at the maximum of their pay grade and they couldn't go anywhere, they were frozen. We come in with a new pay scale that we raised the minimum and we raised the maximum and then their current pay moved them to here or to here, some employees are saying well you know I used to be at the maximum of my pay scale because I have been with the City for 15 years so I would like to be at the maximum of my pay scale here so that on your new scale that reflects where I

really should be. Well if you do that, each of these are 3% differences in pay, if you do that you could be looking at a 15% to 20% increase per employee to move them to where they perceive they should be. The other argument is you are right, you used to be at your maximum and you were frozen and you had no place to go and now you are here and we have given you several additional steps to move before your retirement. We have given you a new target to shoot at and then they will argue well if this is the market, this is where we should be now. Ultimately, that becomes a lot of what can you afford to try to correct that inequity and how should you implement the plan. Now the thing that will help alleviate this problem is the longevity issue. So if we come back and say after five years, after ten and so forth, it then doesn't matter where they fall in the scale because they are going to get an add on to their base pay for that longevity wherever they are. In your existing system, your longevity steps are out here. You don't get the longevity until you have reached the top of your scale.

Alderman O'Neil asked is that dollar amount in the dollar amount that has been presented to us at this point.

Mr. Decker answered no.

Alderman O'Neil asked so it is over and above that.

Mr. Decker answered right but you are already paying for longevity so the impact should not be significant because they are already getting longevity.

Mr. Hobson stated if we take a look at all of our...we have a salary and benefits matrix that is developed through the Chief Negotiator's Office. If we take a look at that, we already see that in the lowest paid contract we are paying 12.5% total for longevity for Contract A and lets say for a non-affiliated or for the Fire Department we are paying 17% or 18% over the life of the contract for longevity over that contract. What we are saying to do here is to make longevity fair and equitable across the board and competitive across the board and yes there may be some instances where a contract or a department previously got 12.5% longevity and lets just play a game and say that Mr. Decker comes in and everyone gets 15% longevity and then you might have some contract or some union group saying you can't take 2.5% away from me so somehow we may have to negotiate that but the point is that we are trying to bring in a longevity structure as Mr. Decker just pointed out, that is incremented, that keeps growing with the employees term and not all the contracts do that. Some do, most don't. So basically we have employees that hit a wall and it behooves them to leave because there is nothing out there beckoning them to stay.

Alderman O'Neil asked do you think the employees with 15, 20 or 25 years understand that right now, that aspect.

Mr. Decker answered some do, some don't.

Alderman O'Neil stated because those are the people I am hearing from. People with 28 years of service are saying I am seeing a second year patrolman getting a \$3,000 pay raise and I have given 28 years of service to the City and I get nothing.

Mr. Decker replied you may be hearing more frequently from the Police Department.

Alderman O'Neil responded well it is not limited. I have heard this from the Fire Captain.

Mr. Decker replied I agree that it is not limited. For example, we received a little over 200 appeals out of 1,800 employees. That is pretty low. 15% or less. It means that 85% of the employees did not appeal. I will take that number any day, but 15% out of 1,800 is a few people and they can raise a number of questions. The answer is no, I don't think that some of them understand it and some of them do understand it and what I have tried to say to them when we first started with the Police Department is that this is based from their point of view, if you have been a Patrolman for 25 years or 20 years and we say we think that the minimum should be this and the maximum should that, they can feel with some justification that they should have been here all along and that is what the City ought to do for them and what I said was that if you do that for the Police Department, you got to do it for the Custodian, you have got to do it for the Fire Department, you have got to do it for everybody. At least I think you do.

Alderman O'Neil stated the bottom line is there is still that end of it to come, there is a price to that and it is probably a significant figure.

Mr. Decker asked you mean for the...

Alderman O'Neil interjected cost for the City to...

Mr. Decker replied you mean for the longevity.

Alderman O'Neil responded right.

Mr. Decker stated well you are already paying. Right now lets say that after five years you get a certain percent that I can talk about. What I am going to do is Janell is making a chart for me off of the computer that shows me generally for

each bargaining unit and non-affiliated what that is now. So really the question is will our longevity system on an average be more expensive than your longevity system. I hope not, but I hope what it does is that it provides a new incentive by maybe being less at five years of service and more at twenty-five years of service. Right now, I mean how much money do you want to pay somebody for having been with the City for five years. Do you want to pay them 2.5% or 3%? Are we trying to encourage someone to stay just for five years, maybe ten and then once we have you for ten years we are going to level it off? Does that make sense? So I am saying that at five years, I mean I know a lot of people that have been at a job for five years and then leave for non-monetary reasons. Maybe we won't give as much value for being with the City for five years as we do for ten and fifteen and the longer you are with the City, the more value we place.

Alderman O'Neil stated we have employees right now with 15, 20 and 25 years and what they have seen presented to them on the report, there is no movement in their pay, there is no change in their pay. I think that is a fair statement. Is there an aspect missing that might provide some adjustment to that pay?

Mr. Decker replied yes, let me tell you what those are. There is more than one. There is longevity. There is also, each pay grade is really a pay grade and a half because there is 7% between pay grade 20 and 21 and between every other pay grade. There is also, between each pay grade, what we call a half grade that stands for achievement or the acquisition of certain knowledge or skills that are measurable, that are not subjective like say performance evaluations. So lets say that you have an electrical inspector who after they finish their apprenticeship and get their certificate, they can move from wherever they are into this pay grade which is 3.5% higher than that. Now some of these employees that we are talking about may already have those credentials and one of the things we want to do this fall is work with the unions and work with the department heads and supervisors to identify what are those things. So you take a police officer or a police investigator. Say a police officer who has a college degree, move him into the A grade. So now the minimum is truly, from the minimum here to the maximum here and you will see that for Police for example, that will compete with Boston. It will not be worth anybody to move or drive to go to Boston to be a police officer and it sure would compete with Nashua if you include the grade and a half. Someone who has been with the City for seven years will compete with Nashua. The problem is, it is true that some of them who have been here for a long time, their current pay will move and lets say they get a \$500 increase for that entire year and so they feel that and we told them this when we started. We said this is exactly how we are going to implement the system and this is exactly how you are going to feel. There are other people who are sitting over here that got substantial amounts of money because they moved from here to here. Typically, it would be the lower paid worker who has been with the City for a limited period of time.

That will probably favor the newer employee because everybody else would have been here long enough to advance up the scale. I guess to answer the question in a little bit different way, a lot of employees do understand that. As a matter of fact, I met for almost three and a half hours last night with Greg Murphy and a couple of other people from the Police Patrolmen's Association and I also had lunch today with Mike Rockwell and I met with some department heads and I would say that by and large most people understand this and most people are saying to me anyway, they may be saying something different to you, but they are saying to me that they understand that they are looking into the future instead of something immediate.

Chairman Sysyn stated I wanted to point out that I did talk to Mike Rockwell today just for a second as I was very busy and he did seem to understand.

Alderman O'Neil stated if I hear any concern it is that longevity end of it. The 25 year employee feels slighted so you wouldn't want to say what that cost might be tonight?

Mr. Decker replied no because I don't know. I really don't know and it is going to be an estimate when we give it to you but it shouldn't be that hard to try to figure that out. I couldn't tell you what this cost is going to be because we want to phase this in over a period of time just the way we want to phase in performance evaluations. Performance evaluations you may hear some criticism about that and it will have to do with lack of confidence in the supervisors and feeling that it is too subjective. So we are going to have to work carefully department by department to make sure that the system that is developed within Police and the system that is developed within Water Works or the Finance Office fits those departments and is as objective as it can be, measurable and employees can almost basically evaluate themselves so they understand what it is they are being evaluated on and how it is being measured. If they don't understand that, if you have got a performance evaluation system that measures attitude, how are you going to measure their attitude. That is so subjective that somebody could kill you in a performance evaluation. What if they say I am going to measure your motivation? You got to measure things that can be identified and that you know how to measure so we are going to have to work that out. So we have got both to work out the knowledge and the skill section and we have got to work out performance evaluation collaboratively with the department heads and the employees but the question of what the cost is going to be is going to be around 4% or maybe a little higher just to get everybody on the step. So we have the added pressure of saying if an employee has been here 25 years and they only move to the new step here, we can just about tell you that we are going to have 20-25% and we can't do that and I have said that to them and they said well you have tailored the plan to what the City can afford. Well the City asked me what I

thought it was going to be and I said approximately 3 or 3.5%. That is the way I thought it was going to be because I thought we were going to implement it this way and if I said up front that we are going to protect everybody that has 20 or 25 years of service, I would have given a higher number and you guys probably would have put me on a Greyhound bus or got me an airline ticket. I think by and large I have been pleased with the meetings with employees and I have been pleased with the meetings with the unions and I have been pleased with the meetings with the department heads. I think change disturbs. We were asked to come here and create something different meeting the needs of the future and nobody is perfect and no system is perfect and we are going to have to work to tailor this for Manchester. You can't just take a system that worked in Alabama and put it on top of Manchester. We are going to have to work this out together, but I am convinced that this is a far superior system to what you have now. We just have to make sure that we can do it within the parameters you have got. We may have to phase this in over three years, not two. The idea is to do this in such a way that you don't have this one go on the shelf because I have never had one go on the shelf yet and I don't want Manchester to be the first one. I am sure that you are in an awkward position, all of you on the Board of Aldermen, where you are going to hear the bad and that is why you are here.

Alderman Pinard stated the communication between the Police Department has stopped. In your meeting with them this week, was there a break through in communication? Do they understand this more? I hear a lot of rumbling from police officers. Some are happy, some think that they are going to be left holding the bag. Now that you have met with some of them and I am sure you met with the Chief, are things getting better?

Mr. Decker replied well I think break through would be the wrong word. I think that the Alderman is correct. I think those employees who have been with the department the longest would be the unhappiest by far. Those who have been there five or ten years are less concerned because they know they have got time to grow into the system, but I was really pleased with my discussions with Greg Murphy. I think he understands it. I don't know if he can be quoted as saying he approves it because he did not say that but he understands the issue and I don't want to leave you with the impression that he approves the performance evaluation because he was a big skeptic of this but on the question of how you apply this and on the question of the minimum and maximum pay range that we are giving them and the quality of our data, I haven't had anybody take issue with it seriously yet. There were some who challenged it when we were here last time and I think they did their own double-checking and found that our figures were correct for Nashua and Boston. So first is understanding and maybe I did a poor job of communicating at our first meeting with Mark. I have been in this business for 32 years and that meeting goes down as one of the more memorable meetings.

It is one that I will remember and I think because they reacted so much against being put back down here and not being rewarded for those years of service and I don't know what to tell them other than the fact that I don't think the City...it is not that somebody told me how much the City could afford. I have been on a City Council before and I can read a City budget and I haven't found a City yet that can afford a 25% increase in the pay of their employees to implement this system. The biggest I have ever seen was 8% in the history of our company.

Alderman O'Neil asked is it possible to get some examples of other communities.

Mr. Decker answered you asked me that before and I am going to get that for you.

Alderman O'Neil stated I am very interested in that. I have a hard time figuring out how, you know we provide a service, each department, there is no competition, how we determine if a laborer at the Highway, Water Works or Parks & Recreation is doing their job and how a Police Officer or a Fire Fighter and then going to put a pay raise to it. I would like to see some examples of where that works so that I can pick up the phone and call some people and say what are the things we need to look out for. The other thing I asked for, maybe to Mark, maybe it wasn't to you, is can you just give us some comparisons of where it is going to put, take a sample of different employees from different departments compared to Nashua, to Concord, to Boston, based on the data you have. I am looking for a comparison. You mentioned tonight that it is going to put, you used the example of police officer comparable to Nashua and Boston. Do you have a sample of other departments, you know what is a laborer in a City department going to make compared to Nashua or whatever communities you used.

Mr. Decker stated please understand that this is a recommendation that you would have to accept. Let me tell you this, Nashua, for example, starts their police officers at \$25,698. You currently start your officers at \$28,880. Never mind our recommendations. Now Nashua has a maximum for a police officer of \$42,353. Your maximum is \$38,291. We are going to recommend that the starting pay for a police officer be \$34,379 and go to a maximum of \$49,017. So if you have a current police officer who is making right now \$38,291 and we have a maximum under our new system that is \$49,000 approximately, we got some officers saying they want an \$11,000 increase now. Now I don't want to pick on the Police Department. There are customer service representatives, there are accounting clerks, there are truck drivers, there are others in other departments who have said the same thing. Lets use another example so we are not picking on the police. Lets talk about Nashua. In Nashua, a laborer gets \$25,245 flat. They are in a different kind of system. Our maximum is \$28,528. So I am not going to say in every case we are competitive or above Nashua but you are the biggest City in the state. The difference is they are little closer to Boston so maybe they have higher

property values and a bigger tax base. I can go through, you know what you will get when you get this is a comparison of what we are recommending and you will have those numbers from those cities for the 80 something classes that we selected as well as from the private sector where we found matches. In other words, a laborer you can find a match in the private sector for a laborer, a truck driver, an electrician, a plumber, and those kind of things. You can't find a match in the private sector for a police officer or firefighter but we will give you that data as well as benefit data that will be coming with it so you can see for yourself where that information came from and we will give you some ratios so that you know that our recommended maximum for example for a given type of position is X percent of the highest or the second highest that we found in the survey. Now what we tried to do generally is to keep in mind Nashua may not always be the highest. Boston should be the highest. We are trying to posture you in and around the second highest in the survey. Competitive with Nashua and in some cases competitive with Boston. I was surprised, for example, that some of Boston's salaries are below yours right now. I don't know why. It may be a question of supply. They may have more candidates for those positions so they don't have to pay as much as you do.

Alderman O'Neil asked how many job classifications were there before you started.

Mr. Decker answered I haven't counted them. I think we cut out about 60. For example, you had a whole bunch of accounting clerks and very narrowly defined clerks and we created a class of Customer Service Representative. For example, your Tax Department is called Customer Service Representatives. That is your Building Regulations Department and the Assessor's Office.

Alderman O'Neil asked generally speaking would a laborer in Highway, Water Works or Parks & Recreation under the new system be at the same grade.

Mr. Decker answered yes. A truck driver would, a laborer would, if there is a common job, if it is an accounting clerk, different levels, they are all classified according to duties and responsibilities, not what department they work in. You hit the nail right on the head. What you had in some instances before is an accounting clerk, the job of accounting clerk may exist in eight different departments and they belong to five different unions and they are on six different pay scales. So what we tried to do is bring all that together and say now we are going to have one common pay scale for everybody that includes Tom Clark to the courier and everybody is factor pointed the same. We arrived at values on the same basis for Tom Clark as we did for the lowest paid worker in the City and then you can't challenge it and say well why did you do that. Otherwise, if you have an "Executive Pay Plan" then you have got workers who say well why

should Tom Clark and the department heads have a different set of standards than everybody else and you don't need to do that. I think we have got a good, integrated plan here.

Chairman Sysyn addressed Item 4 of the agenda:

Communication from the City Clerk requesting authorization to increase Deputy Clerk Bergeron's work week from 35 hours to 40 hours per week for the period beginning August 10 and ending October 30, 1998 for the purpose of coordinating City departments' relocation from Hampshire Plaza to City Hall.

On motion of Alderman O'Neil, duly seconded by Alderman Pinard, it was voted to approve this request.

Chairman Sysyn addressed Item 5 of the agenda:

Request of the Human Resources Director that overtime for exempt employees continue as previously approved by the Committee on Human Resources/Insurance pending final outcome of the Yarger Decker & Associates Classification and Compensation Study.

Alderman Pinard moved to approve the request. Alderman O'Neil duly seconded the motion.

Alderman O'Neil stated we still have some very high grade employees getting overtime and I know we had hoped that Yarger Decker was going to address it and it probably will. The only problem is that we could be a year away from Yarger Decker being adopted. I don't want to see this practice continue and I hope that the departments start making moves. Some of them said well you can't do it because of scheduled overtime and coverage and that stuff. I would like to see that start to be addressed and not wait a year if it takes that long.

Chairman Sysyn asked do you think it will take up to a year.

Alderman O'Neil answered it could but again I think we have got to get some of those high paid employees on overtime off of overtime.

Alderman O'Neil moved to encourage departments to start heading in that direction.

Chairman Sysyn asked for clarification as to what motions were being made.

Alderman O'Neil replied I will go along with approving this request with the condition that departments start heading in the direction of getting these high grade employees off of overtime. Alderman Klock duly seconded the motion.

Mr. Hobson stated perhaps what I could do is at the next...well two things. First of all the Fair Labor Standard Act List, the FLSA List, the famous list of exempt versus non-exempt, Mr. Decker is due to produce that in less than two weeks so all the positions will be listed as exempt or non-exempt. So utilizing that information, I can get together with department heads at the next department head meeting and start to identify where there are some problem positions and we can try to work with some of these employees and perhaps bring back some information to the Committee if needed because it looks like things are going to take longer to settle. I don't want to...I certainly agree with you. I don't want to disrail what we are trying to do for the FLSA because according to the Fair Labor Standards Act, we cannot use what one makes for a pay as the sole issue deciding whether or not they are exempt or non-exempt. It doesn't work that way. It is illegal which is what we have done in the ordinance now.

Alderman O'Neil stated but we can determine whether or not a certain position, that job can be done by somebody at a lower grade. We can do that.

Mr. Hobson replied yes that is right. We can make amendments to our pay plan structure and we can make amendments to our ordinance but what I am trying to say which is not finger pointing at anybody or anything because it has been on the books for 20 years, but the current ordinance that defines that overtime versus exempt/non-exempt, its illegal. The ordinance does not work with the federal law. I just don't want to see us spiraling into more things that don't make any sense according to federal law.

Alderman O'Neil stated we had a lengthy discussion two, three or four months ago with many department heads and I think we all agreed that Yarger Decker was going to hopefully address that. My only concern is that I think it is going to take some time to work out Yarger Decker and I just, again, my intent is to just start heading in the right direction unless Yarger Decker goes on for a year.

Mr. Hobson asked would that be acceptable to the Committee that I use the Fair Labor Standards List that is going to be produced and start working with the department heads and try to address those problems.

Alderman Pinard asked is there a way to, like in manufacturing, regulate or emergency overtime. You know painting lines on Saturday or Sunday is that classified or called emergency? The Water Works will have a water main bust on

a Sunday, yes, that is an emergency but anything like that in the City of Manchester there are a lot of things I see that...

Chairman Sysyn replied the lines being painted on a Saturday is probably because there is too much traffic during the week. I have also seen them do it at midnight.

Alderman O'Neil stated we are probably talking about five or ten employees. It is minimal.

Mr. Hobson replied to answer your question, our ordinances on overtime are relatively stable and make sense. There are some places where we have some exempt employees and I know you are raising your hand but some of those people won't be exempt anymore. Some of them may be and some of them won't so you won't have as many as you think. I think that it really isn't that big of a deal. You have some people that are on call back pay and you are right. If we have a water main that busts on a Sunday, we have employees that by contract get paid overtime. We have the manager who doesn't.

Chairman Sysyn and the Committee agreed to have Mr. Hobson work with the FLSA List and the department heads to address the problems.

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

Chairman Sysyn addressed Item 6 of the agenda:

Reports from the Human Services Director submitted for informational purposes:

- a.) New Hire Report;
- b.) Termination Report; and
- c.) Vacancy Report.

Alderman O'Neil asked the summer help, are we hiring out of city people, kids, to do summer help. I noticed there were quite a few out of city people, but it is tough to put them, based on the two lists together, which ones are temporary.

Chairman Sysyn replied we probably can't get any summer help right now.

Alderman O'Neil asked you can't get summer help.

Chairman Sysyn answered the economy is very hard right now. I will tell you I am glad I don't have a restaurant right now because I would be doing dishes myself.

Mr. Hobson stated I can't pinpoint who was where and in what job. You can look at a report that perhaps can help us pull what jobs are temporary. The answer to your question is I can find out who is temporary and who is not.

Alderman O'Neil stated there are certain jobs that probably we are going to have to hire outside the City, but we should be putting Manchester kids to work if we can. That is my point.

Chairman Sysyn replied I agree.

Mr. Hobson stated I will talk to Janell to see if we can pull out the temporary laborers for summer help.

Discussion ensued regarding hiring summer help.

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

### **NEW BUSINESS**

Deputy Clerk Johnson stated we have an item of new business, U.S. Cellular opportunity for employees. There is a handout that was sent to the Committee from Mr. Hobson.

Mr. Hobson stated I forgot to bring some extra copies and I apologize. Basically, we try to bring benefits like this forward. You actually directed me awhile ago and you said go back and make sure it is of benefit to the employees, make sure it is fair and equal to what we are doing to other vendors and that is exactly what I did. We had another case of another vendor that tried to bring something in a couple of months ago. I went back with that person. There was no true value to the employee and we weren't doing it on a competitive basis with anyone else so I didn't bring it back to you. This one I believe is of value to the employees and it is competitive. We are offering this product right now to the School Department and to the Police Department by special agreements of donations that they made to the City. I think it is competitive to what we have now, they are a major player in the City, they have made huge donations to the School Department in the recent past and I feel it is something that we ought to offer to the employees. It is totally up to the employees. If they don't want it, no one is calling them.

Alderman O'Neil asked don't we already have Bell Atlantic. There is no problem having two of the same?

Mr. Hobson answered no.

On motion of Alderman O'Neil, duly seconded by Alderman Pinard, it was voted to approve the handout for distribution to all City employees.

**TABLED ITEM**

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 the Committee