

COMMITTEE ON HUMAN RESOURCES & INSURANCE

September 15, 1998

6:45 PM

Chairman Sysyn called the meeting to order.

The clerk called the roll.

Present: Aldermen Sysyn, Klock, Pinard, Shea

Absent: Alderman O'Neil

Chairman Sysyn addressed Item 5 of the agenda:

Communication from Chief of Police requesting that the Police Department be allowed to pay Special Reaction Team members a tactical operations supplement in the amount of \$25.00 per week.

Alderman Pinard moved to approve the request. Alderman Shea duly seconded the motion.

Alderman Shea asked would the money come out of the regular budget that they have.

Mr. Hobson answered yes, it would come out of their general fund budget.

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

Chairman Sysyn addressed Item 6 of the agenda:

Request for leave of absence without pay and benefits for Annette Lemay, School Food and Nutrition.

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

Chairman Sysyn addressed Item 7 of the agenda:

Vacancy Report through August 31, 1998.

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

Chairman Sysyn addressed a new item of business:

Vacation Accrual Exception Request

Mr. Hobson stated I asked David Hodgen, who is the Employee Relations Manager, to do a review of this issue that was actually first brought up back in March of 1997 with some folks that were members of the conversion team. I think Mr. Hodgen did an excellent job of researching the items and bringing all of the information to your attention. He looked at past practice, a recommendation and a conclusion and what we are basically asking you to do is to give those recommended employees, if you would look in the third paragraph it says, "The employees must use or lose the time allowed beyond the maximum amount based on City Personnel Ordinance Section 33.079H. After June 30, 1999, hours beyond their normal maximum accruals will be lost. Under no circumstances will these affected employees be allowed to convert the extent of time to cash payments. Non-exempt employees involved in the conversion must use their vacation time according to the ordinance". I believe that what we have proposed for you is a reasonable and thoughtful approach.

Alderman Shea asked those pertain to the two people that are in the Information Department, is that correct. The two people that are in the Finance Department, because they did not answer, they are not included in this?

Mr. Hodgen answered that is my recommendation. My feeling, and it is up to the Committee, but my feeling is that the Committee should be apprised of the facts before they make the decision. The Finance Department, for whatever reason, chose not to provide the information. Therefore, I recommended that the request be denied.

Mr. Hobson stated may I just add something to that. We, and I don't disagree with David, we, I want, if there is anyone...there may be other people for example in the Information Systems due to the conversion or we are doing a software upgrade. I guess what I was hoping to do was establish, also try to just establish a policy, and I think David would agree with me, what we were trying to do is establish a policy for those employees that are directly involved in the conversion.

They would let the Human Resources Department know about the issue and then we would bring that to your attention. So we would not ask you to make any exceptions for anyone unless we had the information. So, the answer to your question is yes, however, there may be other people out there that I am just not aware of at this time.

Alderman Shea asked would it be an open question. In other words, will there be a time when there would be resolution to this?

Mr. Hobson answered June 30, 1999, it is gone.

Alderman Shea stated I don't mean that. I mean they can bring their concerns before this Committee up until that time or I mean is there going to be, I guess the word is closure on this.

Mr. Hodgen replied to my knowledge there aren't any other people who are involved at this time. I guess what Mark is recommending is that if some of them should arise as a result of continuing work on the HTE conversion or whatever, that we would gather the information and come back to this Committee and deal with them on a case by case basis. That is what I would recommend.

Alderman Shea stated what I am wondering is have all the people been notified concerning the fact that they have accumulated certain vacation days. I mean has everyone been notified by letter or by correspondence or is it just sort of...I mean the way you are talking, Mark, you are saying that there are certain people who conceivably that you don't know about could but I mean whose responsibility is that? Yours or theirs?

Mr. Hobson responded well the HTE software itself on our checks every week tells us what our accruals are, but you may have a department situation where the employee has actually gone beyond that accrual because the manager has said, or the department head, lets just take Diane Prew, so Diane Prew says to these people look we had a computer crash or we had...you have to cancel your vacation and you have to work on this. Can you? Yes, I will. Okay, fine. That could, again, that is a policy decision and I am just laying the groundwork for that fact that, yes, these are the people I am asking you to approve but I am also telling you that there could be others out there and if there are we are going to bring it to your attention. To your question when will this thing die or go away, June 30, 1999 that is it. They use it or lose it. It is done by the end of this fiscal year.

Alderman Shea stated the two people from Finance, because they have not presented any kind of documentation to you, David, I guess, can they resubmit

documentation next week and then we would have to make a decision or are they off the board, wiped out completely or what?

Mr. Hodgen replied my thought is I think the Human Resources Committee should know what the facts and figures are before you make the decision. Therefore, if the Finance Committee wants to present that information, wants to divulge that information, then I think it could come back to this Board and be acted upon by the Board but my feeling on the matter is if they don't want...if the department head doesn't want to divulge the facts then the easy solution to that is to deny the request. If he changes his mind and wants to make another request and say how many hours are involved, then I have no problem coming back to this Committee. I do think that these have, exceptions to the Ordinance have always been approved only by the Personnel Committee, now the Human Resources Committee. That is the proper procedure in my opinion and so if the Finance Director wants to submit that information then I think that it can be brought to the Committee and the Committee can act as it sees fit.

Chairman Sysyn asked was there a special reason why they didn't submit anything.

Mr. Hobson answered we got earlier information from them and we gave them a time-line and told them when we needed the information done by and for whatever reason it didn't get here and we talked to them about it and I am not really too sure what the scenario was but they knew we had a deadline and David gave them plenty of time. I mean you certainly can make a policy decision and say that you can accept everyone with the approval of the department head and the Human Resources Director if you would like. I just don't want this to be a big to do like we had with the overtime issue. I just want you to know about it. I want you to be involved in the policy and lets just deal with it.

Alderman Shea stated lets assume, for matters of discussion, that the people in the Information Department don't want to work, that they are entitled to a vacation. I mean what if they say I don't want to work anymore overtime or...not overtime but I want to take my vacation, you know I have got plans. What happens? I mean are they forced to do this or is it, are they indispensable? I don't get it.

Mr. Hobson replied I don't know the details about why except for the fact that there are some departments, my own included, that we have obviously taken the brunt of the conversion and then you are going to see some other departments like Highway for example shortly as they go through some things that they are going to be doing, they will be in this crush mode. My department is finally coming out

of it. When the Assessors go on-line, they are going to be under a crush with some of the things they are doing.

Alderman Shea stated so basically every department will be coming back saying the same thing as Information possibly.

Mr. Hobson replied possibly and that is why I said to you that this is a, this is a policy decision and we are bringing this information to your attention and we want to have a policy from the Committee. As David said, if there is an exception we want you to vote on it, but we want you to know up front that this could be a problem. We want to put it to rest by June 30, 1999 and I don't know if the Information Systems Departments says to their people you absolutely have to work. They are professionals. They are being paid a good rate of pay and I assume that they work it out with their department head. I don't really know.

Mr. Hodgen stated my impression of this from having looked at the paperwork is that there was a meeting last March and there was misconception that people could exceed the maximum vacation accrual under the Ordinance and that that would be accepted or approved. I think just like the overtime issue, exceptions to the Ordinance need to be approved by the Human Resources Committee and then the full Board of Mayor and Aldermen and because there appeared to be a misconception last March, it was my position that the employees shouldn't be penalized as they are sort of innocent bystanders or innocent victims of the circumstances and that is why I recommended that the Board would approve the exception for these two individuals in the Information Systems Department which had been identified and all the facts and figures are there. I don't think that there are any others in Information Systems. I can't predict how much work is left for the HTE conversion or whether any of these circumstances might arise in the future, but that is basically the reason why it is before you that there was, I think, a misunderstanding back in March over who had the authority to approve exceptions and we are trying to get it properly approved at this point because it really wasn't done properly back in March.

Alderman Shea stated lets assume that somebody has two week vacation but they accrued another two or three weeks. Can they...

Mr. Hodgen replied the rule is that if they are entitled to accrue two weeks of vacation, then the maximum that they can ever have on the books is one and a half times that or three and then it gets to be a use it or lose it situation. If an employee has, under those circumstances, has three weeks on the books and continues to accrue, they either have to use those days or they lose them under the Ordinance.

So that is the exception that we are asking for in this instance. These are folks who have exceeded their maximum accrual, one and a half times their entitlement.

Alderman Shea stated my point is, David, that if they put in for a vacation they can take upwards of three weeks of five weeks depending upon their length of time. Is that correct?

Mr. Hobson replied their vacation has to be approved by their department head.

Chairman Sysyn stated Mark Driscoll has somebody in here that he denied didn't he, Mark.

Mr. Hobson replied no he is all set. That was Officer Purshaw. That was an example of the fact that the Personnel Committee at that time did make an exception, correct?

Mr. Hodgen responded yes, that is another example of an exception that was granted by this Committee six months or a year ago. So it has been done along these lines in the past under what I would call unusual circumstances. It is not a routine thing and it shouldn't be because, as I said in my memorandum, there are lots of employees in the City who lose vacation on a regular basis who go over their maximum, aren't able to schedule vacation, and lose it so it shouldn't be a situation where we are coming to this Committee on a regular basis asking for exceptions. It should only be done in rare instances.

Alderman Klock asked what makes these necessary exceptions.

Mr. Hobson answered well all of them are long-term employees or else they wouldn't be able to accrue the kind of vacation that they have. They are very, those two individuals by name, are very much involved in the conversion. One at a level of the host software, he is actually the project manager, and the other person is involved in all of the networking throughout the City, the connectivity in each department and they have had to work long and hard hours with HTE, the corporation, and each department to get this project done and they gave up vacation time during the spring and summer so they have gone beyond their accrual amount. The issue from over a year ago as David pointed out was a group of people were sitting around talking and saying this is what we will probably need to do, but we will worry about it when we get to that point and what we are saying to you is look we have got a few cases of these, we booted the overtime issue, we basically want to have a policy that would bring these to your attention and you vote them up or vote them down and by June 30, 1999, it is over with. That is what we are asking for instead of having, I don't know, things coming out

from left field. We want you to know what is going on. Did I answer your question?

Alderman Shea stated, Mark, one of the woman had 240 hours. That is about, I would say 40 hours times, that is almost six weeks, correct and then she had 49 hours more? How is she going to fit all of them in? You know I am not against anyone having it, but...

Mr. Hodgen replied lets be careful if we could. The lady in the Information Systems Department has about 48 hours beyond her maximum accrual of 240 so if this weren't a problem, she would be entitled to accrue 240 hours. In fact, because of what I think was a misunderstanding, she is about 48 hours beyond. Now if she works seven hours a day then she has got seven days of vacation that are on the books beyond what she should have as a maximum under the Ordinance and I am recommending that should be approved because I think that if there wasn't the misunderstanding wherein she understood that she would be able to accrue them, she probably would have taken those vacation days one way or another or she would have understood that she had lost them. So out of my sense of fair play, my thought is sense there was confusion, we should grant that request and tell her she has an extra seven days.

Alderman Shea stated I am not opposed to that, I am just saying that the point of the matter is that some how or another the department head has to, you know, say to these people...I mean no one is indispensable. You know basically these people are entitled to vacation and I don't know how effective they are if they are continuously working and not getting time off. I mean, you know, it just seems that some how or other the Information System and you know you brought it to the attention, but these people after a certain length of time are going to be ineffective. That is my point.

Mr. Hobson replied they can accrue time, though. That doesn't mean, you know David has been here X amount of years and he can accrue a certain amount of vacation time. It doesn't necessarily mean that he has to take it all in one season or what have you. I don't think that there is a problem with the department or the way they are running things. I think the issue is that we have got some people involved in the conversion. As David said, there was a misunderstanding. We want to straighten this out going forward so that everybody knows what the rules of the game are including the employees and you instead of having things happen from one department to the next that isn't logical and fair to all employees.

Chairman Sysyn stated, David, the two people you are asking...you are only asking for these two people to be approved and your recommendation is that we should approve it.

Mr. Hodgen replied yes, my recommendation is that you do approve it, make an exception and deny the request that we had from the Finance Department because I do not know what the number of hours are that are involved with those folks. If they should subsequently divulge those things, we may come back to see you again on that. I am also saying, you know, this should be a rare exception. This should not be a regular occurrence. The HTE conversion is kind of an unusual project. I would not think that this would happen very often and the basic rule of thumb in the City should be that there is a maximum accrual and if you exceed the maximum you will lose those vacation days.

Alderman Klock moved to approve the request from Information Systems and deny the request from the Finance Department. Alderman Pinard duly seconded the motion. Chairman Sysyn called for a vote. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Chairman Sysyn addressed Item 3 of the agenda:

Presentation regarding ADA Transition Plan

Mr. Hobson stated I would like to introduce Ola Lessard and Maureen McCarthy who are the ADA Coordinators for the City of Manchester. They have done an excellent job of working for the City and work within the School District to bring a plan for us so that we may get into compliance with the Americans With Disabilities Act. As everybody knows, we are about five years or so behind the times and they are here tonight to give you an overview of what they have done to date and I must also tell you that they have delivered a final document plan to myself and Sam Maranto, who are the department people involved in this and then we are going to bring that plan to the Access Manchester group which is the group appointed by the Mayor and includes some Aldermen on it as well, in terms of disabilities rights advocacy.

Ms. Lessard stated we were pleased this week to be able to present the city with our recommendations for an ADA transition plan. As you may be aware, a transition plan is essentially a plan that is required under the ADA. It is a plan for a State or local government as to when they will remove structural barriers to access. What the law requires is that City programs, services and activities be accessible to people with disabilities, but that does not always mean physical accessibility's. If there is another way to provide access to a service, such as

bringing that service to a person outside of an inaccessible building or doing something over the phone even though most people may come into the office, that is acceptable access under the ADA. There are, of course, those circumstances where physical accessibility is required to meet the program access standard and the transition plan which Maureen McCarthy and I have put together lays out some time-frames for the City as to what those barriers are, the physical barriers, and some prioritization as to when they should be removed. As Mark mentioned, the transition plan was actually due in 1992 and the Department of Justice provided state and local governments with a two and a half year time-frame in which to remove those structural barriers. We have, despite the fact that the City is about six years behind right now, we have used that two and a half year time-frame as an overall time-frame for providing structural accessibility in the City. It is aggressive, it is true. It will definitely require that the City make ADA compliance a priority, but I also think it is achievable. Obviously, it would have been great to say well the City should get it all done next week or next month or within a year, but that just is not realistic and we wanted to provide a time-frame that was both realistic and achievable. Overall, as we went around and met with different City departments and their staff, we found that actually the City does have an overall pretty high level of accessibility. We were very pleased with what we saw in most departments so that is some great news. The fact that the City has this plan obviously doesn't change the fact that it is late so there may be some people who are not happy with the fact that it is late or that we have provided two and a half years for overall accessibility. What we tried to do in the plan is also pick out some sort of highlights and most important areas and provide some sooner time-frames for the things that are most important to people in the community. We did have, as you know, we had a public forum here in the School Administration Building and we had about 50 people from the community that came and spoke and let us know what was important to them for access. We also traveled out to several of the high-rises in town that house a large number of seniors and people with disabilities to get more public input. We will talk a little bit more about that, but that was a big part of how we prioritized the needs within the City. I am going to turn it over to Maureen to actually give you some of the highlights of the plan. As Mark said, you will be getting the full plan and we won't go into all the detail because it is quite thick, but to at least give you some of the general ideas of what we have looked at.

Ms. McCarthy stated we also have a brief handout for you that I will distribute when we are done and it gives some of the highlights I am about to tell you about. In terms of overall recommendations for the City, we did have a few that hold true for all of the City departments. One of which was regarding signage. We gave the City a year to provide compliant signage throughout departments. Also, in regards to providing visual alarms, we did have a more progressive time-frame. We recommended six months for providing visual alarms and with the recognition that it is a more aggressive time-frame, but it is also a safety issue so we felt that it was warranted because of the safety concerns involved. In terms of parking, there are a lot of areas within the City that do have accessible parking and that is good. They may have spaces that are designated with either an upright sign or a logo on the ground, but they may be lacking an access aisle or a van accessible aisle, so there were some areas that perhaps weren't in total compliance, but were at least in some partial compliance so in terms of parking we gave a range of three months to a year to provide accessible parking in the areas that the City provides parking for the public and with the more aggressive time-frame going to areas that had no accessible parking so at least those areas could get some parking on-site. Also, for the Parks Department...the Parks and the School Department were probably the two most challenging areas for us just because of the size and the complexity of the department. There are a number of facilities, as you know, for both departments and with Parks we gave an overall time-frame of two to two and a half years to provide accessibility to the City playgrounds, athletic fields and other park facilities. In some instances, we gave a shorter time-frame, again to provide parking or signage. Sometimes also to provide an accessible route to the field or to the particular facility. We may have indicated or recommended a year or maybe six or nine months depending on the situation and the level of access that was going to be there. For the School Department we had, again, an overall recommendation of about two to two and a half years for completing accessibility within the schools and again with the additional time-frames for signage, one year. There were a number of schools that didn't have any accessible toilet rooms in the school so we made that a more aggressive recommendation that the City provide at least one boy's and one girl's toilet room in the building or per floor depending on the situation. There were also sort of concurrent recommendations and of course there is some overlap because of the various departments that oversee the school facilities and school grounds, but again with the playgrounds and athletic fields there is an overall recommendation for about two and a half years to provide compliance to the school playgrounds and school fields. We also included some interim access measures. Recommendations such as moving the library. For instance, if the school library was located on the second floor of a building and the building didn't have an elevator, then the school could either swap rooms and bring the library down to the first floor in its entirety so that it would be accessible or perhaps bring segments of the library, the card catalog functions or some of the

research tools that may be housed in the library might be brought down to the first floor so that it would be accessible for kids with disabilities. Lastly, with the Highway Department we had a lot of input regarding the issue of curb cuts and curb ramps throughout the City and sidewalks as well. Those are really, I think, probably one of the most important if not the most popular issue throughout the City in all of the meetings that we had with City residents and various individuals and groups. We did set some priorities for providing the curb ramps. We listed as a first priority the School Department and in terms of making sure that the areas around the school had accessible curb ramps. The second area was municipal buildings or municipal buildings. The third priority was transportation or places of public accommodation. The fourth priority was places where employees frequent, City employees. The fifth and last priority was sort of a catch-all Other category for areas throughout the City. As I said, this is probably the area that had the most public interest. Ola and I met with numerous people individually and in groups and curb cuts were a constant topic. We, in fact, were invited to attend a meeting on the west side that Alderman Reiniger also attended that was dedicated strictly to the topic of curb cuts and we did a lot of brainstorming to try to come up with a plan for the City or a recommendation for the City to address this particular problem.

Ms. Lessard stated I am the one that gets to tell you our incredible brainstorm. This is an idea that we are actually pretty proud of and think works really well for both the citizenry of Manchester, as well as for the City. As Maureen said, we have some overall, overarching priorities for providing accessible sidewalks and curb ramps, but we also recognize that, for example, residential areas are really at the bottom of that list and there is really no way to know what neighborhood in which a person with a disability that may need to have curb ramp would reside. So what we did was, sort of as a subset of that overarching priority list, we developed a concept of what we are calling the Curb Cut and Sidewalk Hotline and essentially what this hotline would be would be a dedicated line within the Highway Department, as they are responsible for sidewalks and curb ramps. The line would have both voice and TTY access and TTY is a telecommunication device for the deaf. Essentially, the hotline goes something like this. If, for example, I use a wheelchair or I am elderly and just can't get up curbs very well and need a curb ramp in my neighborhood or in the place where my grocery store is or where I go to work, I can call the hotline and describe, say at this particular intersection there is no curb ramp and I really need one because this is where I work or this is where I live or this is the route that I have to walk my child to school along and the City would then have three months in which to sort of get to the my curb ramp. It is a good way to, first of all create a public dialogue which is an incredibly important part of the ADA. It is also a way to allocate the City's funds in a way that makes sense. The City is then putting as their top priority the

curb ramp that we know is needed in that neighborhood or in that business district as opposed to just sort of blanketly taking different areas and hope that we hit the ones that people live in or work in. So we thought that was a good way and then at the end of that three months or when the curb ramp is finished, the City gets back in touch with that resident and just says we just wanted to let you know that we finished the work and you should be all set now. If the department has a question, maybe they go and what they thought was a curb ramp but there is some issue that it is not working for the person, they can talk to the individual and say you know why doesn't this work for you or is this the right intersection, it was kind of a funny intersection and we weren't sure what you needed. So, it is a great way to create dialogue and it is a great way for the City to be wisely allocating their resources. Curb ramps are not inexpensive and so we wanted to make sure that as we looked at the priorities there was a way to really get to what folks needed. So that was that idea. The only immediate recommendation that we had for the City was to change the way the curb ramps are being installed right now. There was some confusion in the department as to what the requirement actually was and the ADA actually requires that a curb ramp is flush with the pavement and unfortunately that is not the way they have all been built in town and so you end up spending a lot of money on a curb ramp that doesn't always work for everybody. So that was the only place in the transition plan that we said something needed to happen immediately and that was just to change the way they are building their curb ramps now. Again, that is, we hope, a wise allocation of the resources. If you are going to put it in, let's at least do it in a way that works for people. Maureen mentioned overall interim access. That is a very important part of what has to happen now. We have recommended two and a half years as a time-frame, but again the City is six years behind. In the interim, the City has to make it a priority to provide access in some way. Maybe that building is not accessible and it is not going to be accessible within the next year or two but in the meantime can we move the meetings that are held there or can we go the extra mile to make sure that someone with a disability has access to those services. So that still does need to happen. Finally, we just recommended that the City engage in a continual dialogue with its citizens and visitors who have disabilities. That is certainly something that has started to happen already. We had a tremendous response to the forum that we held. We were very pleased to see the number of people that were here that were interested, that were feeling good that the City was making progress finally and that is important that that continues. So, essentially that is it. As Mark said, we did deliver the plan yesterday morning to both the Planning Department and to the Human Resources Department. I just want to say that we have certainly enjoyed working with the City of Manchester. We would like to thank Mark. We would like to thank Sam Maranto and the Planning Department and this Committee, just for the time and effort you have given to

making this project a success and to putting ADA compliance on the front burner so thank you very much.

Mr. Hobson stated first of all, the ADA is a federal law and the City can't not pay attention to it. I mean it is something that can certainly come back to haunt us and bite us if we don't comply and, in fact, it is a...I saw this actually on Channel 16 so I know it is a public item, is that the School District had a complaint lodged against it by a citizen and the Office of Civil Rights, Department of Education in Boston began a formal investigation with our office, with the Superintendent's Office, and with the ADA Coordinators. We were in danger of losing all of our federal funding. Not just for the school system, but for the entire City. So, we have, since that time, taken remedial steps to address those issues that were brought to us through the complaint, but the City and the School District especially will be placed on a plan to come into compliance and they will, they, the Department of Education, will be looking for what we submit through the consultants and what eventually will be accepted by you. We, in fact, will have to submit our plan to them. We, in taking this very seriously, you have already approved a full-time position in the Human Resources Department for an ADA and Training Coordinator and the Access Manchester Committee, working with the Planning Department, has come up with funding for another full-time position to be paid for out of federal funds in the School Department and the School District and we hope to have that person hired within anywhere from 30 to 45 days. Finally, what I do need to tell you having worked here in Manchester now for four years, I am also facing the reality of money and funding and while the ADA Coordinators are telling us that their recommendation is two and a half years, we don't know what the Access Manchester Committee will, in fact, come back to you as in terms of what the time-frame may be. We may put all of our resources the first year into the School Department because that is where it has to be or for the first two years into the School Department. It could turn out to be a four year plan or a five year plan, but I do know that the Office of Civil Rights is watching what Manchester does and we have to take this issue very seriously. On the more pleasant side, we have some great things happening right now. We have some citizens that are feeling very good about this City and what we are doing and I think we need to keep that momentum and that positive publicity moving with those citizens. What I would like for you to do is basically accept this overview and then we will be coming back to you, through the Access Manchester Group, with a formal recommendation and I will be working with the Planning Department and CIP.

On motion of Alderman Pinard, duly seconded by Alderman Klock, it was voted to accept the ADA Overview Report.

Alderman Shea asked are we going to get some material you said.

Chairman Sysyn answered yes she will give us a brief version. She is not giving us the whole book.

Chairman Sysyn addressed Item 4 of the agenda:

Yarger Decker and Associates overview of Benefit Summary and Recommendations.

Mr. Hobson stated the second presentation we have for you tonight is Mr. Floyd Decker who is the President of Yarger, Decker & Associates and what he is going to do this evening is give you a brief overview of the findings and recommendations to date. Again, I have to caveat that he will then be going to the Oversight Committee which includes Alderman Klock and Alderman Pinard on Thursday. He will be going into much more detail with the Committee. We hope, if it is the wish of this Committee, to come back to the full Board in October to address you once we have gone through the Oversight Committee on Thursday and listened to what their recommendations are.

Chairman Sysyn asked do you need us to move it along to the full Board or can it be done without a vote.

Mr. Hobson answered I would feel best about you folks directing us to come back to the full Board in October.

Alderman Klock moved to refer the Yarger, Decker and Associates Report to the full Board. Alderman Pinard duly seconded the motion. Chairman Sysyn called for a vote. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Mr. Hobson noted that he will work with the City Clerk's Office to have this item put on one of the Board of Mayor and Aldermen's agendas in October.

Mr. Decker stated I have given you several pieces of information there, but I really want to direct your attention to the packet on findings and recommendations. You have seen approximately half of this document the last time that we visited together, but if you will turn to paragraph eight which is about ten pages in to it, and at the top it says implementation methodologies, I would like to pick up from that point forward and discuss with you some of our recommendations regarding implementation and regarding benefits. Before doing that, I want to emphasize that we presented to you before our recommendations of pay and I just handed out to you a document that has a list of the classes down one side and the present and

proposed pay on the other. That document represents our recommendations to you and to the Board of Mayor and Aldermen subsequent to hearing the appeals from employees to our initial recommendations but what we are going to talk about mainly tonight are recommendations regarding benefits and what I want you to know is that in presenting the report to you we are recommending that the Board of Mayor and Aldermen adopt the pay recommendations as soon as practical for you, but that our recommendations regarding benefits are for your consideration both now and in the future. We are not recommending that you adopt all of our recommendations concerning benefits coterminous with the recommendations regarding pay because they have pay implications that need to be more fully explored. Now as I indicated to you the last time we were together on implementation methodology is that an employee whose current pay is below the minimum that we are recommending for that particular type of job be moved from their current pay to the minimum over a two year period with half of this being implemented Year 1 and the other half Year 2 and if an employee's current pay is above the minimum but below the maximum that they be moved to an intermediate step which is immediately higher than their current pay and if their current pay is above the maximum that we are recommending that their current pay remain what it is, but there are some exceptions to that implementation methodology and those are mentioned on this Paragraph 8, Implementation Methodologies under paragraphs E, F and G where we talk about the class of Police Investigator/Specialist, the class of School Nurse II and the Chair of the Board of Assessors and for each of those classes we have explained the reasons why we think they ought to be implemented slightly differently. Now the cost on the next page, the cost of implementing our recommendations, our pay recommendations, would be approximately 2.94% of your current pay cost now or about \$1.3 million. That is about what we suggested it would be last April or May of about 3%. What we found in our survey was that most private/public sector agencies were in the 3% raise for adjustments this past year and in the private sector they were slightly higher than that. Now one thing I want you to know is that in addition to our pay recommendations, one of the things that you asked us to do or that the Oversight Committee asked us to do was to look at each type of position within the City and determine whether it was exempt or non-exempt from the Fair Labor Standards Act. If a position is exempt from the Fair Labor Standards Act, it means that you do not have to pay overtime and if a position is not exempt then you do have to pay overtime. We found that there were approximately 53 classes of positions or types of jobs for which the City is currently paying overtime or designating those jobs as non-exempt when, in fact, we believe that under the Fair Labor Standards Act they should be exempt from the Act which means you would not have to pay overtime for the work of those 53 classes and we found only one class in which you were not paying overtime or the position was classified as exempt when, in fact, we thought it ought to be non-

exempt. That is excellent from the City's point of view to have only one of those found that way. So we are going to be recommending that those employees who are non-exempt, those positions that, we are going to be recommending that those that are exempt do not receive overtime. That those positions that are non-exempt do receive overtime and that those positions that are currently non-exempt and we have moved them to an exempt position, that the rate of pay as you move toward a 40 hour work week in the future, that the hourly rate of pay be maintained the same as they move as it is today at least so that they don't lose money in that regard. Now just because a position is called exempt doesn't mean you could not pay overtime if you chose to do so and we found that there were 16 classes of positions that in our judgment you may want to consider and that we would recommend that even though they are exempt that you pay overtime for those and those are listed under Paragraph 10A and then at the bottom you will see three positions at the Airport and one the next page you will see another 13 positions, both at the Airport and at the Public Works Department or the Highway Department.

Alderman Shea asked why were these people put in that category.

Mr. Decker asked do you mean why were they called exempt and then we recommend that you pay them that way anyway. There are two reasons. One is in most cases those employees are close to what we call the break point between where an employee is not paid overtime but the people they supervise are paid overtime and that they are frequently called out on emergencies and they frequently work with their crews who do get overtime and that there is a potential there for people over whom they exercise supervision to regularly make more money per year, more gross income per year, then these people do. So, for internal equity that is one reason. The second reason is that in some cases they were promised overtime as a condition of employment.

Alderman Shea asked these are all salaried people.

Mr. Decker answered we are recommending that they all be salaried people.

Alderman Shea asked but they are not per hour, they are salaried people, is that correct. In other words, they receive like \$40,000 or \$50,000?

Mr. Decker answered yes, they are administrators. With those few exceptions, we are recommending that you stick with the policy that you have already adopted which is shown on the bottom of that page with those other 13 classes or positions in which we have underlined the relevant section there where you have indicated before that the salaries of supervisory, professional and administrative positions in

class 20 and above and generally we are saying for exempt positions, are fixed according to responsibilities to be fulfilled and are not based on a fixed number of hours and shall not be adjusted with variations in work schedules unless it is part-time employment. We think you should stick with that.

Alderman Shea asked does this change their status. Are they paid overtime now or does this change their status?

Mr. Decker answered some are paid overtime now and we are recommending that they continue to be paid overtime.

Alderman Shea asked and you are adding some others that now are not paid overtime.

Mr. Decker answered I don't think any of these are currently not paid overtime.

Mr. Hobson stated actually, all of those people are currently being paid overtime now. It is the reverse. Mr. Decker has dropped some administrative positions from being paid overtime in his recommendation. No additions.

Mr. Decker stated but we are not recommending that these be dropped. They are exempt. We are saying that they should be classified as being exempt or being salaried, but we are recommending that you continue paying them overtime. Now on the next page, under Paragraph 11, we are also recommending that standby or on-call pay for exempt employees be discontinued where it exists. There are a few places where it does exist and we are suggesting that you discontinue that. For exempt employees, I think you will find that our pay recommendations bring the City to a very competitive position in the market concerning the payment of salaries. We don't believe that standby or on-call pay to exempt employees should be added on top of that anymore than we think that overtime should be paid for most positions in that regard. Now under Benefits, we are going to recommend...the normal hours of work for most jurisdictions in the public and the private sector are either 37.5 hours or 40 hours per week. Right now, your hours of work vary in the City from 35 to 42. Forty-two being, I think, the Fire Department. We are recommending that you move as quickly as you can afford to, to a 40 hour work week and we would suggest the following: that you move everyone who is working 35 hours, a full-time position that is working 35 hours, to 37.5 hours in the next 12 months and to 40 hours within the next 24 months and that those that are working 37.5 hours now be moved to 40 hours. If they are exempt employees, there is no cost to that. If they are non-exempt employees, there will be a cost to that. It will be modified by the fact, if these are agreed to by the Unions, it will be modified by the fact that those who work 35 hours per week

and are moved to a 37.5 hour or 40 hour week you will no longer be paying time and half for overtime beyond the 35 hours. You will be paying time and half overtime beyond the 40 hour work week. Now as I said earlier, an employee who has been considered non-exempt and earning overtime who we move to exempt and move to a 40 hour work week, they would continue to be paid the current hourly wage that they are earning now at least so that they don't lose money under that scenario. All department heads and assistant department heads, we are recommending be moved to 40 hours immediately. Most or all are working more than 40 hours now. The fact that they have a 35 hour work week really doesn't mean anything.

Chairman Sysyn asked if you are moving someone from 35 hours to a 40 hour week are you compensating them for that difference.

Mr. Decker answered not if they are exempt, no.

Chairman Sysyn stated not if they are exempt. If they are non-exempt?

Mr. Decker replied if they are non-exempt and you did move them to 40 hours or to 37.5 hours they would obviously continue to make, they would be working 2.5 or 5 hours more so they would be paid for that. Any questions about that before we move to vacation? The only change in vacation that we would suggest in the future if it makes sense to you is that the more prevailing practice is to provide three weeks of vacation after five years instead of your seven and to provide four weeks vacation after ten instead of your fifteen and then the five weeks vacation would continue to be after twenty years. But more employers are paying the three weeks after five years and four weeks after ten. On sick leave, we found that your use of the sick leave bank is very creative. We found that your policies concerning sick leave accumulation ranged from 76 to 120 days depending on the bargaining unit and probably you want to work toward, when you can, evening that out so that all employees earn sick leave at roughly the same rate, but once an employee exhausts their sick leave, your use of the sick leave bank instead of short-term disability is very progressive and very competitive and the reason it is, is that of course if you didn't have a sick leave bank policy and instead like most other jurisdictions you had short-term disability insurance, one of the things you have to consider is that the short-term benefit is only a portion of the pay, like 66% of the pay. Now of course that is tax free so under your policy they may be taxed on that as part of their income, but they are earning full income during the time of that use of the sick leave bank. So we are suggesting that you think about tying all that together so that an employee, first of all, earns the sick leave the way you have it up to 120 days and when the sick leave is exhausted, whether that is if they have saved up to 5 days or up to 120 days, when the sick leave is exhausted

and only when it is exhausted, they then be allowed to draw up to 120 days of sick leave out of the sick leave bank and then when that is exhausted you look at a long-term disability policy which could partially funded, as we suggest in here, by requiring employees to pay a percentage, 5% or 10%, of their HMO cost instead of paying zero and that possibly could generate enough money to pay the premium cost for the long-term disability policy. Every employer that we surveyed, other than the City of Manchester, provides long-term disability insurance and almost every other employer allows the use of sick leave for family illness which we recommend, but we do not recommend that you allow the use of the sick bank for family illness, that that be only for the employee. With regard to bereavement leave, the prevailing practice generally tends to be five days for the bereavement of an immediate family member instead of three and the other major change that we would suggest your seriously exploring is that your waiting period for group health insurance which currently is six months be changed to provide that it become effective on the first day of the month after the date of hire which would be approximately 30 days or less. Two other comments about benefits and then we can open it up to questions if you like or comments. Since you provide life insurance on a self-funded basis, we found that in the market the most prevailing practice is that life insurance be equal to your annual salary or one and a half times your annual salary and here yours is slightly less than that and we also suggest that your educational reimbursement leave policies, you might want to consider differentiating your total reimbursement amounts between graduate and undergraduate studies because the cost of someone going to graduate school can be substantially more than someone pursuing an undergraduate degree and that would provide you with more flexibility in that regard. We also found under dental insurance that the maximum annual benefit, the more prevailing practice is \$1,200 a year and by and large other than that all the other items that we looked at regarding your benefit package were competitive or highly competitive with both the public and private employers in the market.

Mr. Hobson stated one point of fact is that the HR Committee and the Board of Mayor and Aldermen did approve changes to the health insurance plan and the dental plan. We did not go up as high as Mr. Decker found in terms of \$1,200 for dental. We went up to \$1,000. I don't think that is the end of the world, but it made us more competitive than what we were in terms of the changes that we made in the dental and in the health insurance plan.

Alderman Shea asked, Mark, have the Unions or the people, the employees, bought into this. Where is it now in terms of...?

Chairman Sysyn answered they will have to negotiate.

Mr. Hobson answered we have six employee organizations represented on the Oversight Committee and we have met openly with many different bargaining units, including the Police Department. Tomorrow, Floyd has a meeting with the School Support Union. The last time he was here he met with AFSME and the Nurses and different representatives. This is going to be a great deal of work to get it through Unions. Some Unions have written to David Hodgen saying that they are ready and willing to go back to the bargaining table. We don't assume that they are going to embrace everything about the Yarger Decker Study completely, but I think for the most part it has generated a lot of positive feedback from different employee groups. So, has every employee group told us that, yes, they buy into it? No, but we have certainly met with every employee group and discussed their issues and their concerns.

Alderman Shea stated lets assume that this is presented to the Board and lets assume that the Board adopts this and what does that mean really.

Mr. Hobson replied that is a good question. It means that is goes into play for the non-affiliated employees as soon as you say so and that you then give Mr. Hodgen direction to work with the Human Resources Department and Mr. Decker to implement this across the City with each bargaining unit. So nothing happens to anyone, Mr. Bryant happens to be here from the Airport Teamsters and I don't want to pick on him, but nothing happens to his bargaining unit until he sits down at the table and says so.

Chairman Sysyn asked, David, did you get any feedback from some of the unions already.

Mr. Hodgen answered only that several of them have taken the position that the changes need to be negotiated with them, but no specifics or anything of that nature. They know that a lot of these areas are mandatory subjects of bargaining

and I think as Mark has indicated, some of them are, from what I can judge, anxious to get to the bargaining table and deal with it but of course the first step is for the Board of Mayor and Aldermen to take an action with regard to the Yarger Decker study.

Chairman Sysyn stated in other words we would have to vote first to get this in and then you would bargain with the unions.

Mr. Hodgen replied yes. I think that until the City, as represented by the Board of Mayor and Aldermen, makes a decision about whether they want to accept it and any other specifics or any other aspects of it, I am not in a position to negotiate with the unions. The Board of Mayor and Aldermen needs, in my opinion, to take the first action with regard to adopting the study.

Chairman Sysyn asked you had no positive feedback.

Mr. Hodgen answered it is hard for me to judge. I have had one or two unions that seem to me to be very anxious to get to the bargaining table and I suspect that they are very interested in the study and very interested in implementing it. Some aspects of it, I think, will be of concern to them and those aspects will have to be ironed out. I would like to think that some of them might be relatively easy to resolve and some of them might be quite difficult, but that is customary.

Mr. Hobson stated we have had some very frank and open discussions with union representatives. Most of them have pointed out, of course, the great change of moving towards a performance appraisal system and what does that mean for them. Some groups, and I don't want to put anybody on the spot, some groups like the Fire Department have openly said this is exciting, lets talk about it, we need to know how this performance appraisal system will work though. You know, what will happen because the City has never done it before. There has never been...no firefighter in the City of Manchester has received a written performance evaluation for over 10 or 12 years or something to that effect. They just don't do them and that is a fact. So, I think that David's statement are promising but cautious and I think we need to respect the different bargaining units and what they have to say. I think we have taken a cautious and open approach with them and I think they would all tell you that. If they said anything different, I would certainly like to try to remedy it.

Mr. Decker stated what we have tried to do, Madame Chairman, is to begin working with the bargaining units to build a foundation upon which a lot of these negotiations can be constructively discussed. For example, one of the things we discussed very openly with them is the question of the cost of living increases and we said you know the cost of living increase is the same for a Street Maintenance Worker as it is for the City Attorney or for the City Solicitor and exploring with them ways of seeing if we can't deal with the cost of living matter as a group to find out what really is the cost of living increase and what is the appropriate time to do it so what we have tried to do, all of us, not just our company but Mark, David, and union representatives have tried to work together to build a framework and an atmosphere within which we can look and say well does it make sense to not only implement the pay recommendation, but perhaps some other parts of this. Now in adopting the reports, you would not be adopting, as I said earlier, the fringe benefit recommendations because you can't because there are collective bargaining agreements to be dealt with there and negotiations that the Human Resources Department needs to undertake with some of the benefit providers to see what those actual costs are and does it make sense to the City. What we tried to do is to show you what the prevailing practice is among your competitors, both public and private competitors, in the region.

Alderman Shea stated I think my question probably has been asked before and maybe you partially answered it, Mark. When we, as the Board, say recommend or approve this, then it is up to each individual bargaining unit to either accept it or reject it?

Mr. Hobson replied or modify it or something in-between.

Alderman Shea asked but those that accept it will go on to this particular whatever you call it, classification table, and those that don't will bargain separately outside of the parameters of this.

Mr. Hobson answered no. What we don't want to do is run into what happened in the past and that was several pay plan systems and several longevity systems. That is how we are in the trouble we are in. We have tried to be inclusive with them and make this thing as open as possible so they can live within certain pieces. There might be elements to this plan that the Board might come to a conclusion and say we like all of these things, but we don't like this. You know this part doesn't make sense for us as a City so take that out and it is ready to go. When David gets in to...we actually talked about this today, almost everything in this proposal is a mandatory subject to bargaining so it is not anything that any employee can just accept. I mean it is something, unless they are non-affiliated, I mean it is something that has to be negotiated but the Board has directed the

former Personnel Department and the Human Resources Committee has directed me now to develop a pay for performance based system across the City and that is really what we are trying to do so there is no other plan except this plan and we want the unions to find a way to live within this plan with modifications that they feel are comfortable and that could be anything from a change in the way that performance appraisals are done for the Fire Department versus the Police Department to, well I don't know. I will stop there. That is an example that would readily come to my mind.

Mr. Decker stated, Madame Chairman, there is another piece further back in this packet that has at the top, "To the Board of Mayor and Aldermen of the City of Manchester" and has our logo at the top. That is an effort on our part to take Chapter 33 of your Code of Ordinances and amend it in legislative form to prepare it for the acceptance of our recommendations on pay. Not benefits, pay. So, for example we have done something as simple as change Chapter 33 to Human Resources Policy instead of Personnel Policy to other more substantive changes. We have stricken language that we have proposed to be taken out, but let you see it, and underlined new language and any language that is neither underlined nor stricken is existing language that we propose remain the same. There are a couple of things that I would like to draw your attention to just so you are aware of them. On Page 2, at the bottom paragraph, we have a statement that says "nothing contained in the class specifications" which are the job descriptions that we prepared for this study "shall be interpreted to exclude qualified candidates for employment on the basis of race, ethnicity, religion, age, physical or mental ability, or other forms of illegal discrimination" and then we have a paragraph dealing with the Human Resources Director being authorized to waive any physical or mental requirements, blah, blah, blah. The two women that were here a few minutes ago on ADA indicated to me this afternoon that it would be preferable for that sentence to read something along the lines that the Human Resources Director is directed to implement class specifications in accordance with the Americans With Disabilities Act, which would be a broader way of authorizing waiving of requirements rather than what we have said. That is a fairly technical issue, but one that I promised them that we would recommend to you. Then on Page 4 and 5 at the bottom, we have again discussed this issue of the Fair Labor Standards Act and exempt and non-exempt employees and the 40 hour work week and on Page 6 there is a major change that we are recommending in policy. Paragraph E, Page 6. Right now, if an employee is promoted, generally you have a restriction that says that that employee may not receive an increase of above about 10%. This policy reverses that and says that an employee who is promoted should receive an increase of at least 10%. Now the reason for that is that in many cases if you have an employee who receives a substantial promotion and they are blocked from receiving 10%, they can still be earning less than some

of the people that you have promoted them to supervise and so we are recommending that as a major change in terms of Human Resources policy. We are also recommending that the Chair of the Board of Assessors be put two pay steps higher than the other members of the Board of Assessors for the period of time that they serve as Chair of the Board of Assessors to compensate them for those extra duties and responsibilities. Under Section 33.050, Page 7, under Longevity Rates, we are suggesting that for non-affiliated employees the longevity be paid as shown on Page 8 in the section that is underlined, emphasizing the word continuous City employment. Right now you have a policy basically that says that an employee who works with the City and leaves the City, if they come back within a year they keep their longevity. We are suggesting that you do away with that. If an employee leaves the City, they should leave the City on the basis that they left the City. Otherwise, you are encouraging employees, even some of your good ones, to say no go ahead go on out in the private sector to another employer and see if you can find yourself a better job but if you can't you can come back and go to work for us and we will let you keep your longevity. On the other hand, if you have an employee in which you have devoted a lot of training time and they have been here for 10 or 15 years and they say they want to go take a look at another job, you say well you know you are certainly welcome to do that, we hope you don't go, but if you do go and you decide you want to come back you would be giving up some longevity because we are not going to pay you know if you come back within a year. At the top of Page 9, we believe that the years of service milestone, this is years of service, milestone should be based upon the date of hire but that an employee's performance should be on the date of employment in the position and there is a slight difference there.

Mr. Hobson stated in other words the City differentiates if I am a Street Sweeper and I move into becoming a Truck Driver and that moves me into another class, then my pay and my evaluation would be based on the date that I accept that new position. I mean that just makes sense. I may have been an employee with the City for seven years, but I am new to that position by this date so August 12, 1998 my evaluation would be August 12, 1999 and that is how my performance based evaluation would work.

Alderman Shea asked longevity, just to clarify, a person works for the City, they leave and they come back within a year now they continue their longevity. Under the new system they are working September 15, they decide to transfer to another City, they come back July 22, have they lost the longevity under the new?

Mr. Hobson answered they have lost everything.

Alderman Shea asked in other words, once they leave they lose it.

Mr. Hobson answered yes, it is done.

Mr. Decker stated on Page 9, under Bargaining Units, there is a change that I would like for you to make, it says that employees in the various bargaining units except teacher aides. We are recommending that the phrase "except teacher aides" also be stricken so that the sentence would read that "employees in the various bargaining units shall receive longevity on the same basis as non-affiliated employees unless otherwise provided in the collective bargaining agreement. Nothing herein shall be deemed to modify any existing agreement relating to longevity pay that the City has with any bargaining unit unless and until such agreement with a bargaining unit has modified in writing to include the above longevity for non-affiliated employees by mutual agreement between the City and the bargaining unit." What we are trying to do there is encourage, again, like we talked about cost of living being generally the same, that an employee who has been with the City whether they are a Truck Driver or an Administrator, if they have been with the City for 15 years it seems to us that there ought to be some uniformity in that and that ought to be worth the same amount for a Truck Driver as it is for an Administrator.

Mr. Hobson stated so again if you have been with the company for 15 years, then your longevity is based on that amount of time you have spent. Under the old system or the current system, employees basically start all over again if they transfer to another system so we want to bifurcate that. Longevity is based on your date of hire. Performance is based on the date of the position.

Mr. Decker stated if you notice on Page 11, under Part-Time Employees, you currently have a policy that basically authorizes rates of pay for part-time work. In class pay grades 20 and above, the rate of pay that you mandate there is greater than the number of hours actually worked. So we recommend that paragraph be changed to read as shown below, that "any employee occupying a position designated as FLSA Exempt who is regularly employed on a continuing work schedule of less than 40 hours per week shall be compensated by multiplying the base rate times the number of hours worked." That would be no basically different than an employee who is non-exempt and they work the number of hours that they get and that is what they get paid for. So we are trying there to bring some equity between both the exempt and the non-exempt employees. The other changes basically are to implement either pieces of that or supporting those changes or supporting the implementation of the pay plan as we previously described. I would say that in putting this whole plan together for your consideration, understand that change sometimes disturbs, often disturbs, but what we have tried to do in working with the bargaining units and the non-affiliated

employees and everybody else is to provide you with a plan that makes you more competitive and makes you more able to attract and retain good, qualified employees. Some of your suggestions have been very helpful to us and we appreciate everything you have done, as well. Any other questions or comments?

Alderman Shea stated I think the original intent of the study and the work was to place people on the same level so as to remove the City from any lawsuits that might tend to be developed because of an inadequacy in terms of treatment and I hope that is really what one of the accomplishments of this has been. I am assuming it has been that, but I think that was a major consideration and concern when the study was developed, that there were certain people, who by reason of the fact that certain departments were able to promote different people to higher positions and the same person doing the same job in another department wasn't given the same compensation. I think there was concern on the part of certain department heads that unless something were done in that regard, that the City would be liable for lawsuits.

Mr. Decker replied well we found some of that but I think it wasn't anything deliberately done. I think it is something that evolves and emerges over a period of time just like whether you pay overtime for some and don't pay it for others. It has just been a long time since you have had an opportunity to really review this in detail and I think we have caught most of them. I think one thing that is excellent is that your current and past Personnel Departments and yourselves have done is that there was only one employee, just one that should have been getting overtime that was not. That is amazing out of 1,800.

Chairman Sysyn stated my big thing with this study that there were a lot of people making more at one time than the people that supervise them and I never could fathom that.

Mr. Decker replied, Madame Chairman, you will find that sometimes particularly when overtime is involved and one is exempt and one is non-exempt, but we did find a couple of examples of that where you have relatively new people coming on board to a position as supervisor but I think we corrected most all of that.

Alderman Shea stated there was a lot of that in the Police Department. Quite a bit because of the overtime they were given.

Mr. Hobson replied yes.

Mr. Decker stated let me say one other thing too and that is at this stage in a study like this, you and the other members of the Board of Mayor and Aldermen, will be

contacted I am sure by employees who felt that they didn't get out of the study what they should have gotten. I think it is important, as we have said to some of these employees, that this is not the Holy Grail. I mean this is not something that once it is adopted it is never opened again. This is a document that changes all the time and you as members of the Human Resources and Insurance Committee will be dealing with this document for many years to come. So if there are some employees who felt that they didn't get what they thought they should get, this topic can be reopened periodically by yourselves to consider things that have changed or injustices maybe that people feel they have suffered. No project like this is ever perfect. We make mistakes from time to time and we try to correct those mistakes. I know that you are going to be, as you always are in studies at this stage, you will be hit by people who say it is no good, I should have gotten more and blah, blah, blah. I would just ask you to look carefully at the report as a whole, discuss any concerns you have with Mark or Frank Thomas, the Chairman of the Committee. We are going to meet with them on Thursday. Hopefully on Thursday with any changes they might have we will be ready to go to the full Board.

Mr. Hobson stated two quick items. Floyd, in July and August, was given about 10-14 to do's, tasks that had to be done coming from the Oversight Committee and from individual departments, etc. where we found mistakes or other issues and he has addressed all of them. So when he walks into the Committee on Thursday, he has gone through and rewritten policy or addressed some specifics that had to be fixed and he has addressed them all. Some people will not like his answer. That is what we are paying him for. We are paying him for his consultative approach and we might not like everything he has to say and that is our job to discern and make decisions. The second thing that is a critical issue and I know that some of you heard, is that as Floyd said there were people who were non-exempt and then moved into exempt categories. In other words, people who were 35 hours a week and on the clock and Mr. Decker found that these positions really need to be exempt. My own department, we are embracing the fact that we need to move to 40 hours a week, all of us. Every one of our employees need to move into that category. In fact, the new position, the ADA Training Coordinator positions that we advertised for, we advertised that job at 40 hours week. There is a lot of work to be done and our department is ready for that and I think a lot of people are ready for change. They accept the fact that we have to move towards more standards and Floyd has certainly done an exceptional job of trying to work with everybody but the truth is not everybody liked his answers. I mean that is reality but I think he has really done an exceptional job.

Chairman Sysyn stated yes, I think you did a lot of work.

TABLED ITEM

Communication from Alderman Hirschmann regarding a Sidewalk
Action Team proposal.

This item remained on the table.

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

A True Record. Attest.

Clerk of Committee