

## COMMITTEE ON HUMAN RESOURCES/INSURANCE

**March 23, 1999**

**6:00 PM**

Chairman Sysyn called the meeting to order.

The Clerk called the roll.

**Present:** Aldermen Sysyn, Klock, Pinard, Shea (late), O'Neil

**Messrs:** F. Testa, M. Hobson, Deputy Chief Beaudoin, R. Ludwig,  
J. Gardner, L. LaFreniere, Chief Kane, H. Tawney,

Chairman Sysyn addressed Item 3 of the agenda:

Communication from the Airport Director requesting an additional four (4) positions be added to the airport complement due to increase in use and operations, and to assure compliance with increasing Federal requirements.

Mr. Testa stated I have a table that shows the growth of the airport from 1984 when we had a total of 108,000 people to last year at 1.94 million people and the Year 2000 project is 3.2 million. That is the growth of passenger use. We had a 20,000 square foot terminal. We built a 160,000 square foot terminal adding 70,000 square feet to that terminal today. We have added about 40 acres of pavement and ramps. The numbers below our badges is an indication of how many people are working or utilizing the airport itself. In 1991 when I came on board, there were 423 badges. Today there are 2,150 badges, which means that the numbers of people working at the airport have quintupled and should be 2,500 or 3,000 badges by the Year 2000. The reason I am giving you those numbers is to show you how much the airport has grown and you know from some of the other things that are happening around here. However, with that growth we have managed to hold down the number of employees pretty well. When I came here I think there were 36 or 37 in the complement. There are now 48. What I am asking for is one of the things they used to handle badges. In 1991, with 423 badges, there as an Airport Security Specialist. This person would be the badging person, would take all the pictures, and would do all the background checks. The Federal government requires a 5-10 year, depending on your security access, check on your background. You have to go through all sorts of hoops, which I won't mention but you have to check the background pretty thoroughly. That person also has to give security briefings on the airport. They take care of all the driving. On the back of your i.d. there is a magnetic strip which allows you to

drive on the airport. You have to know certain rules, regulations and radios. You have to have certain security precautions on how to do that. Right now, three people are taking part of their own jobs to do this and it is becoming very difficult to do with these three people, only because we now set two briefings a month. People turnover at the airport so much and I think it is two badging days a week. We are using a part-time operators guy and a part-time secretary, part of their time and a sheriff taking them off the front curb. This person would also have some maintaining the security. The FAA requires a security system. They would give security briefings to new hires and patrol the currently congested ramp. We have 21 overnight aircraft there now. When I came, there were 5 or 6 overnight aircraft. Any breakdown in the system can result and has in the past a \$10,000 fine from the FAA. We have 40 entry points into the airport, all with security access and they are all hooked up into the security office and the alarms have to be responded to and all of those have to be coordinated.

Alderman O'Neil asked what is he or she going to do that the sheriffs are not doing.

Mr. Testa answered they are going to take care of the badging system. The sheriffs do not take care of the badging system.

Alderman O'Neil stated but you talk about patrol the currently congested ramp.

Mr. Testa replied the sheriffs don't patrol the ramp, they patrol the front roads, the inside of the terminal building, all of the doors that lead to jet ways. There are 40 points of entry. Every time an alarm goes off, we have to respond within 5 minutes by Federal law with an armed law enforcement agent and even if it is across the field, they have to jump in their car and they have 5 minutes to get over to that gate. They also patrol our perimeter fencing because that is the thing that the FAA tries to breach all the time. The ramp itself is where people who drive baggage carts and try to speed to the plane and cut corners and do damage, that is the kind of patrol we are talking about.

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

Chairman Sysyn addressed Item 4 of the agenda:

Communication from the Health Officer seeking authorization to hire a temporary school nurse to replace Michelle Leclerc (Central High School) who will be on maternity leave from approximately March 15 to May 15, 1999.

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

Chairman Sysyn addressed Item 5 of the agenda:

Communication from the Health Officer seeking authorization to restructure the school nursing staff due to a pending resignation and seeking to replace the 35 hour position with a 25 hour per week part-time school nurse to service the Manchester Development Preschool and also to use 5 of the 10 hour balance by expanding the hours of the school nurse at Wilson School from 30 to 35 hours.

Alderman Shea moved the item for discussion. Alderman Klock duly seconded the motion.

Alderman O'Neil asked, Mark, before they come on the agenda are all the positions reviewed to make sure they meet what Decker recommended.

Mr. Hobson replied yes. To be very honest, this agenda was pretty jam packed because we had all the Decker appeals going on at the same time.

Alderman O'Neil asked so everything on here, I take it that when we get it, you have reviewed it.

Mr. Hobson answered yes, including Fred's positions.

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

Chairman Sysyn addressed Item 6 of the agenda:

Communication from the Chief of Police requesting re-classification of two vacant Switchboard Operations (Grade 10) to Police Communications Dispatchers (Grade 15) and permission to hire qualified candidates for the Police Communications Dispatchers up to the B-4 Step in Salary Schedule II(D) Grade 15.

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

Alderman Shea asked is this going to be included in your budget. Do you need any extra money for these two positions?

Deputy Chief Beaudoin answered for this year we have already been before the Committee to try to do it under the Yarger Decker guidelines. We brought that to the union and the union rejected it. They wanted to have us upgrade everybody in the PDSS union or nobody. Being that this is a public safety issue, we are just going to do a regular reorganization taking these two vacant positions out and filling them with dispatchers. When Yarger Decker takes effect, eventually they will be brought in along with the other positions.

Chairman Sysyn addressed Item 7 of the agenda:

Communication from John Rist, Principal of the Manchester School of Technology requesting that the position being vacated by Ann Allen (Educational Assistant) be upgraded to that of a beginning School Secretary I noting the position is clearly clerical in nature rather than instructional.

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

Chairman Sysyn addressed Item 8 of the agenda:

Vacancy, new hire and termination reports from the Human Resources Director submitted for informational purposes.

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

Chairman Sysyn addressed Item 9 of the agenda:

Communication from the Human Resources Director advising that information regarding proposed employee classification and compensation study appeals and proposed ordinance revisions will be distributed at the meeting.

Mr. Hobson asked do you want me to walk through any pieces. I know that you are getting this cold. These are items that have been discussed and rehashed in the past and I am prepared to walk through everything if you would like. Whatever you want me to do.

Alderman O'Neil asked, Mark, what do we do if we don't approve this tonight. I know that last time we did appeals we had three or four and we got it on a Friday and we had a chance to read it over the weekend. Do we bog down the system if we don't approve these?

Mr. Hobson answered no. What we could do is we could table this until the next time you meet which I hope will be April 6 because Mr. Decker is in town on that day. Would you mind if I spent a few minutes walking through it?

Alderman O'Neil stated the last time we did this, I liked it better.

Mr. Hobson replied I changed it to make it easier to read on a spreadsheet but I can go back to word processing. Is it all right if we look at the vacation ordinance first. We will work with the City Solicitor's Office to put this in a nice package that you are used to seeing on an ordinance, but I want you to understand the gist of what Mr. Decker has proposed. First of all, we are looking at a system that awards employees after the six-month probationary period and up to their full five years of employment, 10 regular work days for the 12-month time that they are here. In the past, we used to accrue that on like 5/6 or 4/5, etc. These are full work days. So whether it is a 7 hour work day or a 6 hour work day or an 8 hour work day, your work day is your work day and that is what you get for a vacation. You get that work day. We pretty much carried that through. The difference, which is an addition that we did not have before, is Item 5 and that is to basically reward people who are in a super longevity concept here and they would have 28 or more years of service, 30 vacation days accrued at an additional soft cost to the City and I will explain soft cost in a minute, of \$45,845. The bulk of the hard costs are for those employees between 8 and 20 years with Fire, Police and Highway. You see that cost. We have to make-up for time. If a firefighter has an extra weeks vacation period, we have to cover it and that has a direct impact somehow, someway into the City's bottom line budget. Most of the cost, not most, but a larger percentage of the cost is soft cost. If you give Mark Hobson an extra five days a year, then he won't be there doing his job so you are paying me for not being there, but someone else will pick up my work and you won't hire a temporary for me. If I were working on the back of a refuse truck, then you might have to reschedule time. The original proposal that Mr. Decker came in with was double this amount of money. It was \$251,000. That was a combination of hard and soft costs. The Oversight Committee felt that it wasn't prudent. We sent it back to Mr. Decker and Human Resources. We came back with this new number and the Oversight Committee met this morning and we feel that this is a valid, legitimate plan for the Human Resources Committee. There is a point that needs to be discussed and that is at the bottom of the page. We have school related employees that are nurses, education assistants and secretaries, etc. and we still have some details that have to be worked out. First of all, as all of you know in February the School Department invited Human Resources in to work with the School Board on the Decker Study. The Superintendent wants to meet with Mr. Decker when he comes in next week to talk about how this vacation time might impact his school nurses, etc. and the mentality on the Committee that was

discussed is we said that all City employees who are classified, regardless of where they work, will have the same type of vacation concept proposed. While I agree with that theory, I also know that schools have to run, secretaries have to be there. There are February vacations and April vacations, etc. and the Superintendent needs some time to digest this with Mr. Decker. I think he and the Health Officer and Mr. Decker should be allotted that time. That is my opinion as a Human Resources Director. The last piece is that in moving to a work day is a work day is a work day, the Oversight Committee voted on the fact that we are now looking at accruing on an operational basis...I am exempt so my vacation time accrues at an 8 hour day and not a 7 hour day because in the old days I was a "35 hour employee" so I am now accruing at 40 but my day is still my day. If I take a vacation day, I am off that whole day. The reason why this is a concern is because the people who went from non-exempt to exempt could find themselves at suddenly the last five hours of their vacation they run out of time because of the way it has been accrued. We checked with the City Solicitor's office and legally it is kosher for us to bump up that accrual rate based on the work day. That is not a problem. I want you to be aware that we are doing that. The oversight committee including Alderman Klock and Alderman Pinard realize that. What I would like from you is will accept the proposal on the vacation concept and then let me go back and put this in the proper format to be sent back to Aldermen which then brings it to Bills that you on Second Reading. I will put it in the right format with the City Clerk's Office and the City Solicitor's Office.

On motion of Alderman O'Neil, duly seconded by Alderman Klock, it was voted to approve the vacation ordinance.

Alderman O'Neil asked could I make a recommendation on the appeals. I think we do have some department heads that showed up and as a courtesy to them we should take up their items. They took the time to come down and some of the other ones don't even take the time.

Mr. Hobson stated lets go through the whole piece right now. We had some people that worked on the Special Appeals Committee that really went above and beyond and gave a great deal of their time and effort and the process helped to unify us as a team that is labor and management and you can see the representation that was there. We didn't always agree and the end result was that we developed a system that was fairer than what we had in the past. As I explained last time around, we had three categories. Yes, no and frozen or hold. Those were Floyd Decker's recommendation and the frozen was that if you remember in his original regulations he said that there might be a situation where someone might be presenting a good case and there might be something that needs to be reviewed but it may not have been anything that was overlooked, it just might be something that you as a City are going to have to look at down the road.

A good case in point is the Customer Service Representatives across the City. You have CSR I's, CSR II's, and CSR III's in multiple departments. Mr. Decker thinks there might be a good case, but he doesn't recommend doing anything right now, that you may need to look at how your Customer Service Representatives are structured going forward. You may need to have fewer levels or maybe some kind of super level where if a Customer Service Rep ascribes to learn a variety of things regarding tax law then maybe they need to be put in a different category but as he says you just got this process of the ground and you don't know all of these items yet. Give it some time and let it simmer. If he made a mistake or he felt he really didn't clearly understand something or it was an oversight, then he recommended that we change it. In the vast majority, the Appeals Committee agreed with the recommendations of Mr. Decker. In some cases thought, we didn't and we found that either the employee or the department head supplied something for us and we differed from that. What I can tell you quickly, are the cases that we differed if that is okay. Then I would also like to bring up one other point that I think we need to deal with as a group in April. Mr. Przybyla who is the fourth person down on Page 1 brought up an issue about the concept of the exempt process longevity steps and how people get to those AL steps and he has written you letters in the past. He seriously feels that this part of the study is flawed and he would like an opportunity to sit down with Mr. Decker and me with some other people who could be affiliated or non-affiliated to really has this out and discuss it and perhaps bring you some direction in April. I don't think this part of the structure is flawed, I just think it is different that in the past. I don't think we are discriminating against anyone. Again, I just think it is different. Mr. Decker said no and the Committee said no with the asterisk that we will meet with Mr. Przybyla and Mr. Decker and possibly Steve Tierney and Mike Roache representing the affiliated groups and we will meet and talk about it. Where we disagreed with Mr. Decker was in the Admin. Services Manager I under Tax, which is about 2/3 of the way down the page. Mr. Decker wanted to freeze that position because he felt he might have classed it right but there could be some other things growing. We denied it so the employee can then come to us and make a case. There may be something about that employee's job that we need to hear from that employee and we are going to do that on April 1. That is the next time that the Appeals Committee meets.

Alderman O'Neil asked are you saying that if it gets frozen there can be no discussion.

Mr. Hobson answered correct, for one year. That is his regulation and we agreed to it.

Chairman Sysyn stated but if it is not frozen, there can be some discussion.

Mr. Hobson replied right, if it is frozen it is put on the shelf until January 2000, but if it is denied the employee has the right to come back. As a point of clarification, the school food people were an item of discussion last time and we looked at it and agreed. That should make some people happy, we hope. The Fire Instructor position. Last time that was tabled. Do we want to deal with that tonight? In the Water Department where the name Gary Sandstrom starts, Mr. Decker recommended some changes. He recommended yes to Mr. Sandstrom, yes to Mr. Adams, no to Mr. Robinson and yes to Mr. Duhaime. We froze those top three because we felt, as a Committee, that there could be some problems within the department and within fairness of the positions if we voted the way Mr. Decker recommended. We felt that we had good information from the employees and from the department and we felt that those three items should be frozen for one year and then addressed in January 2000. The item with Mr. Duhaime is a much more detailed issue over the Civil Engineering Exam portion of the class specification. You have to be a civil engineer and licensed to hold that I stature or the II stature and apparently there are some issues with Mr. Duhaime and I am meeting with he and Mr. Bowen tomorrow and we are going to look at that. I will bring that one back to you in April. We had a lot of discussion about it today and Mr. Duhaime is happy with the fact that we will meet tomorrow to talk about it. The next group where we differed from Mr. Decker was in the Parks Department. Mr. Decker thought that we should freeze these administrative positions up at the top. Charlotte, Judy, Linda and Carol. Mr. Ludwig prepared what I thought was a well-written and articulate summary of what these people did. He invited me up to the department. I sat with him. I talked with the employees and I told the Committee that I disagree with Mr. Decker on the basis of fairness. I have people in the Parks Department and people in the Cemetery Department and they basically are doing the same job yet Mr. Decker graded them differently. I just felt that that wasn't fair or right for the employees. We talked about that at the Committee and what we did was we said yes to Charlotte, Judy and Linda. We said no to Carol, which gives her an opportunity to come in with her department head and talk to us about her job. It appears that her job may be more accounting driven than administrative driven and if that is so, then perhaps her title should be an Accountant I. The department head and she will come in and meet with us. The rest of the positions in Parks, Mr. Decker said no to and we said that they should be frozen or put on hold until we have a chance to meet with the department head and the employees because we just felt that was fair.

Alderman Klock asked what is the difference between freezing and holding.

Mr. Hobson answered the freezing issue with Mr. Sowa, is basically that we will say that his position will be reviewed in January 2000 and it stays the same. The holding concept is that, these are all union positions down here, and frankly we

weren't sure that we had a grasp on these and we needed to talk with Mr. Ludwig about what these positions actually do. They are sort of specialized for his department.

Alderman Shea asked some of these are Enterprise is that correct.

Mr. Hobson answered yes some of them are Enterprise and some are general fund.

Alderman Shea asked could you tell us which ones are which.

Mr. Hobson answered yes, I can tell you that but I don't know off the top of my head. We will designate which is Enterprise in the future.

Alderman Pinard asked could you clarify Mr. Sowa's job. Is he classified as part of the management team?

Mr. Ludwig answered that position is right now a non-affiliated position. It is not an exempt position. He is a second line supervisor. The reason that I appealed that position is because I have five second line supervisors. I have a Cemetery Supervisor that works at the Cemetery, a Recreation Supervisor who is in charge of JFK and the West Side Arena; I have a Ski and Aquatic Supervisor who manages the pools. These people are all on the same level basically in management positions supervising their particular divisions as Mr. Sowa is. They were all graded at 18 and he was graded at 17.

Alderman O'Neil moved to change Mr. Sowa's appeal status to hold. Alderman Pinard duly seconded the motion. Chairman Sysyn called for a vote on the motion. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Mr. Hobson stated I would like to skip the building regulations. The Deputy Finance Director submitted an appeal and Mr. Decker recommended that you table that until he has a chance to review the documentation. He has not had an opportunity to read Mr. Sherman's appeal and discuss it with him yet. He doesn't recommend that you freeze it and delay it, he is just saying that he hasn't had a chance to really look at it yet and he would like an opportunity to do that. The last time where we disagreed with Mr. Decker was in the Aviation Department. We approved a position within the Aviation Department that was affiliated last time we met. We had about four more positions that came through. Some were affiliated with the Teamsters and some were not. They were in the supervision lower level management. Mr. Testa wanted these positions changed and brought up one grade. Mr. Decker said freeze and the Committee agreed to give them the grade. The five Assistant Airport Directors, Mr. Testa originally wanted them raised two grades and then he dropped it down to one grade. Mr. Decker said

freeze and the Committee said freeze. We did not feel that it was prudent at this time to change the Assistant Airport Director's salary grade.

Alderman Pinard asked about Deborah Tessier.

Mr. Hobson answered she is exempt and she wants to continue to receive overtime because she works sometimes after 5 PM and on Saturdays.

Alderman Pinard asked do you think that is fair. I don't think it is fair. I think that with her kind of job, she should get overtime. She does the public relations with Brian O'Neill. When people come in to visit the airport at night, she is the one who shows them around. I think we should look at this.

Alderman Klock answered but then we are opening up a can of worms. Anybody can say that they work on Saturdays.

Alderman Shea asked what is her labor grade.

Mr. Hobson answered she is a 17. I guess the thought process is that in the industry people in marketing, public relations, human resources, those types of positions where you are in an administrative support function if they work on Saturday they can take Monday off. If they work Thursday night they can come in late Friday morning. What she wants to do is continue to work but be paid the overtime. I said no. Mr. Decker said no and the Airport Director said no. Obviously you can overturn our direction, but I think if you do you will have a very long line out that door. I think Alderman Pinard makes a good case. As an individual, she is certainly a very hard worker and she is certainly well thought of but in the industry, her job is exempt.

Alderman O'Neil asked is there a general grade that the cut-off is for exempt.

Mr. Hobson answered we can't do that. It is against Federal law.

Alderman O'Neil asked what is our highest non-exempt grade.

Mr. Tawney answered I think you have some 18's that are non-exempt and you have some 17's that are exempt.

Mr. Hobson stated the break is between what we would see the professional level positions begin to move away from the hourly positions and that is between 16 and 19. You have Superintendents at the airport that are non-exempt. They have very small crews and they basically do the same exact things as their crew members but they oversee them. It is illegal though for us to say that Grade 20 and above are

exempt and Grade 19 and below are non-exempt. That is the report and Leon LaFreniere is here to talk a little bit more in detail about his and Chief Kane is here and Mr. Ludwig is still here.

### **TABLED ITEM**

On motion of Alderman O'Neil, duly seconded by Alderman Klock it was voted to remove this item from the table.

1. (*Appeal*) – Gary Simpson, Fire, Training Officer  
Supervisor requests change in position from Grade 21 to Grade 22.  
Position must pass the Fire Captain test in order to achieve position.  
Fire Captain positions are proposed as a Grade 22.
  - YDA recommends approval based on parity with Fire Captain positions, the department's organization and the examination process within the Fire Department.  
1/15/99 Committee accepts YDA recommendation.

Alderman O'Neil stated I was the one that raised some concerns at the last meeting. I had the opportunity to meet with the Chief and Jean Broussard and they are going to get together with Mark Hobson and work on some career development things at the Fire Department. We will kind of bog it down if we don't move on this position.

Mr. Hobson stated what happened was we had some information that said the job was basically similar to a Fire Captain and it was a testing process for that training instructor but the training instructor's testing process and the Fire Captain's testing process are similar but not identical and so because of that information we were a little concerned so we froze it because we said well wait a minute lets look at this later and then what the group decided to do was table the whole thing because Alderman O'Neil had some questions that he wanted answered. I think we got them answered. He wanted two grades originally and we in Human Resources said if it does go through it is probably worth one grade only and we need to look at that closely with the Chief. So it would be one grade. What you are actually approving is a 21 to 22, not a 21 to 23.

Chief Kane stated as I understand the process and how we got here, Mr. Decker came through and said freeze the position. It came to the Committee and Alderman O'Neil had some questions regarding testing, etc. We met with him and clarified some issues and he brought up some issues that we need to work on internally.

On motion of Alderman O'Neil, duly seconded by Alderman Klock, it was voted to grant the appeal and change the Grade from 21 to 22.

Mr. Hobson stated Leon is here and the Tax Collector is here if you want to talk to them about their appeals.

Alderman O'Neil moved on the Parks & Recreation appeals. Alderman Pinard duly seconded the motion. Chairman Sysyn called for a vote. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Alderman O'Neil stated I think it is pretty good that the department heads take the time to show up to take care of these things. You deserve a pat on the back for that.

Alderman Klock stated if this is a process where department heads have to be more involved, I mean we are all working together as a group. I don't think it is right to the employees if the department heads don't show up for their specific appeal. If we are going to do this as a whole unit and we are getting department heads involved and we are trying to make the relationship with employees better, we have to find some way to get department heads in here. It is great that these department heads are here, but I think we need to set some kind of a standard or something. The Water Department has a lot of appeals where the Committee doesn't agree with the Decker study.

Mr. Hobson stated I will take that burden on myself. If you absolutely want them to be here, then I will just tell them and they will.

Alderman O'Neil asked can they appeal without the department head knowing.

Mr. Hobson answered the employee may appeal themselves or to their union representative through the process or through their department head. I always tell the department head of the appeal. Some employee can right their own appeal and send it in but I give the department head a copy and let them know about it.

Alderman O'Neil asked could we hold department heads responsible for all appeals then.

Mr. Hobson answered I think your department head always wants to feel like they are being consulted and they have responsibility and accountability. On the other hand, this is a process where Sheila Quinlan who is a Receptionist can say hey wait a minute. She filled out her own appeal. She sent it in herself. I told her

department head that we denied it but that was the process. We told the employees that they could step up to the plate and some of them did.

Alderman Klock stated I just think that if there is a discrepancy between what Yarger Decker recommends and what the Committee recommends, then the department head should be here to answer questions as to what is going on.

Chairman Sysyn stated and if they come in it shows that they are interested in their employees.

Alderman Shea stated one of the problems that I have is that I don't really know what these people do. In other words, are they doing and I don't mean this in the wrong sense, but are they doing what they are putting down on the paper. How do we know? I can sit down and write an elaborate, detailed concept of what an Alderman should do but whether I do that or not is another thing. That is the point.

Chairman Sysyn stated if the department head showed up they could answer our questions.

Mr. Hobson replied well the department head sees every appeal and Mr. Decker sees every appeal. Mr. Decker is the guy we are paying \$200,000 to for the study.

Alderman Shea asked when you say that he sees the appeal, what do you mean.

Mr. Hobson answered it is a form or in the case of Leon LaFreniere as many other departments did, put little charts together and memos and Mr. Decker got all of that. The Deputy Finance Director put together a five-page appeal.

Alderman Shea stated but his appeal is what he says he does. Is that correct?

Mr. Hobson replied that is correct and in that case his department head signs off on it and some department heads did not sign-off on the appeals. If there were discrepancies, I would go to the department head and say how do you feel about this.

Alderman Shea asked did everyone get a letter from the woman from Elderly Services. If she did everything on that list, she wouldn't have time to do too much more.

Chairman Sysyn stated she is supposed to go to the Oversight Committee and Mr. Decker.

Mr. Hobson replied she will be showing up on the April list. She was denied.

Alderman Klock stated I am not comfortable with voting for things tonight if there are no department heads here.

Alderman O'Neil replied well we should try to address the concerns of the department heads who did show up.

Alderman Klock asked what is going to happen to the rest though. Are we going to wait another month?

Alderman O'Neil stated you are on the Oversight Committee. What do you think? I am not trying to buck the work that the oversight committee does but I find it interesting that some departments take an interest in this and some don't. I mean there are 17 appeals from Water Works but there isn't a representative from Water Works here.

Alderman Pinard stated why don't we put the Water Works appeals on hold.

Alderman Klock replied if you put the appeal on hold, you are hurting the employee.

Mr. Tawney stated on these appeals, if the appeal is granted, because this was the appeal from the initial January 3 date of implementation of Decker, what we have done is go back retroactively to January so that the employee did not lose any money. We have not done anything to harm the employee. They have had to wait for it but we have gone back retroactively.

Chairman Sysyn stated you have some at PBS where Mr. Decker recommended yes and the Committee recommended yes. Why shouldn't you let those go through?

Mr. Hobson stated I think the Appeals Committee has done a great deal of work and I think we have tried, I think one thing you have to trust in is that we have tried to go through a process with that department head and with those employees or their bargaining unit if there are issues up to this point.

Alderman Klock stated I don't mind voting for something where the Appeals Committee agrees with Yarger Decker. What I mind is when I see some kind of a discrepancy between the two groups and the department head doesn't show up. That bothers me and if we don't do something about it now, we are going to set a

standard for when we do run into some major problems, which could arise in the future.

Mr. Hobson stated I think that makes a lot of sense.

Chairman Sysyn stated so all of the appeals that are agreed upon by both the Committee and YDA should go through, except Joe Przybyla who you are going to meet with in April.

Alderman O'Neil moved to accept the first page of the appeals report with the exception of the Administrative Services Manager in Tax. Alderman Klock duly seconded the motion. Chairman Sysyn called for a vote. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Chairman Sysyn moved to page two of the report.

Alderman Shea stated where are we getting the money for all of this. Is it in the budget?

Chairman Sysyn replied I thought we set aside money for this.

Mr. Hobson stated yes, all of this is coming from the same Decker funds. The Water Department is an Enterprise account, EPD is Enterprise, Aviation is Enterprise, School Food is Enterprise, Highway is general fund, PBS is general fund, Police is general fund and Tax would be general fund.

Alderman O'Neil moved to accept the second page of the appeals report with the exception of Gary Sandstrom, Michael Adams, Jeffrey Robinson and Donald Duhaime of Water Works. Alderman Shea duly seconded the motion. Chairman Sysyn called for a vote. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Alderman Klock asked how are we going to make the department heads come in so that we can get these off the table.

Chairman Sysyn answered Mark can send them a letter and say that the Committee requests that they be here because their people are coming up.

Ms. Gardner stated on the Administrative Services Manager I and II she was given a no so that on April 1 she has the right to come before the Appeals Committee to discuss her appeal. Obviously, I would prefer it if the Committee tonight just said put her as a II and then she doesn't have to come in on April 1. I think that Mr. Decker has, and I will take the blame, but I don't think he has totally gotten what her job is. I tried to get him to come in and spend a day with her or a couple of

hours with her and understand. This girl, when we were on a 35 hour week she was paid for a 40 hour week because she opens the office and she closes the office. She handles all the cash drawers. She handles all of the State decals, which have to be inventoried and taken care of. She inventories all of the plates. She is the liaison with the State on all plate issues and all vehicle issues. She is the counter person who every single teller that has a problem with a customer goes to for help. She handles whenever they are in, whenever they are out, whatever the work detail is. She assigns them all of their duties for the day. In addition, she has a workstation where she waits on customers herself in addition to all of the other things that she does. Presently, she is probably putting in 45 hours a week. She opens the office and she closes the office. She is a very dedicated person and as much as we have told here that she doesn't have to do all of this stuff alone, she wants to do it and she wants to do it right. She started out as a L/G 14 and we inched her up to a L/G 16. In actuality, her title was Second Deputy Tax Collector. She was a Senior Clerk, but she became a Second Deputy Tax Collector and when Connie and I are both at a conference, she is the Tax Collector. She speaks for the office and she will sign anything that the Tax Collector has to sign that day. Really in an ideal world I would prefer to see her called the Second Deputy Tax Collector. That is what she is and that is where I would rather see her. If we have to accept the Administrative Services Manager II, I have come to tolerate it but the difference being the Second Deputy Tax Collector is appointed by the Tax Collector. The Administrative Services Manager is not. There is a change in the way that position is hired as well.

Mr. Hobson stated I have gone up and down with Mr. Decker on this one. My person feeling is that we do have, in other places in the City, Administrative Services Manager II's that have similar scope and duties as what Joan has described.

Alderman Pinard moved to grant the request for an upgrade to an Administrative Services Manager II, L/G 18. There was no second.

Alderman O'Neil stated I am not disagreeing with what Joan said, but we are trying to have a process.

Alderman Klock asked how about waiting until after April 1.

Alderman Pinard withdrew his motion.

Alderman O'Neil asked if it was a Second Deputy would the grade still be a L/G 18.

Mr. Hobson answered if it was a Second Deputy position; it would definitely be higher than a L/G 16.

Chairman Sysyn asked but you will look at that.

Mr. Hobson answered the guy I paid \$200,000 for will look at it.

Alderman Shea asked right now her salary is what, \$39,161. A L/G 18 would be how much?

Mr. Hobson answered her new pay would be \$39,835 so she would get about \$700 more a year.

Ms. Gardner stated it also would take care of the exempt, non-exempt issue. Any time that she is putting in extra time, she should be getting overtime.

Alderman Klock replied I agree with the decision but I think we should stick to the process.

Chairman Sysyn recognized Leon LaFreniere to discuss the appeals for the Building Department.

Mr. LaFreniere stated what I have done here is try to give you a one page memo with some back up information. I am sure that others will make a case that their requests are unique, but I really feel that ours is unique because of the way events transpired. It was during the closing days, hours and minutes of the Yarger Decker Compensation Study before it became voted on by the Board of Mayor and Aldermen. We went through the appeals process for a variety of positions and felt that those appeals had been viewed in a manner that was consistent with the way that we thought that things ought to track and we were comfortable with the way things turned out. Not everybody got exactly what they wanted, including myself, but it was a fair procedure and things went according to a process. There were some appeals made that went outside the process and those were the Housing Inspector positions and what happened was they came in late and I feel that it is important that everybody understand that I had tried to bring them into the procedure during this process and on several occasions requested information from them to try to determine whether they had any questions or wanted to forward any appeals and because at the end of the process, at literally 3:30PM the day of the vote, they had successfully negotiated the process and heard that they should be upgraded.

Mr. Hobson interjected they successfully formed a political action committee on the day of the vote and they went around the recommendation of Mr. Decker and in doing so we created a problem which is what he is saying. I have agreed with him that we have created a problem.

Mr. LaFreniere stated essentially we were in a position where Mark presented this to me at 3:30PM and said do you have a problem with this and I really didn't have a problem with the grade in terms of where they ended up but I pointed out that it had a cascade effect. It had an effect on some other positions within the department.

Mr. Hobson stated he wanted the whole department shifted in different ways and of course they came in with their shifts.

Mr. LaFreniere stated so these positions that we are talking about tonight were identified on that day as positions that we would look at and, in fact, we realized that there was not time to bring these positions into an additional level of review within the time that was left so I agreed that it would be appropriate to run it through the appeals process and we would take a look at it. As you are all painfully aware, the number of appeals, I think, exceeded the number anticipated. I was taken a bit by surprise when I was notified that all of the positions that I had appealed were considered frozen because of the Inspection Supervisors. I point that out because I don't know if there is any discrepancy there. When I was talking to one of the Alderman today he thought that the information he had indicated that that position was also recommended as frozen. I do need to address that, but essentially what we have here is there are eight positions that I am asking for consideration to change the grade and one position, that being the Housing Inspector, where I just want a minor adjustment to the class specification that reflects an additional duty that it is anticipated that they will do and, in fact, have been doing right along. Very quickly, if I can go through the list the Housing Inspector Supervisor, when the Housing Inspectors went from a L/G 16 to 17 they bumped right up against the Housing Inspector Supervisor who is a L/G 18. I asked for that position to be considered a L/G 19 and my information was that the Committee had made a favorable decision on that position. The Plans Examiner position is currently a vacant position although we are very close to tendering an offer to someone if we can make things work. That position is currently at a L/G 20 and frankly I am having some difficulty recruiting at that level and I am asking for that to be considered at a L/G 21. That is a result of, again, this compression and the fact that the positions underneath that Plans Examiner position are an individual who acts as a director of the structural division in our department and is required to have a substantially higher degree of technical ability than the people he is supervising as well as the people in the housing standards division.

Associated with that are the Building Electrical, Mechanical, and Plumbing Inspectors that are currently all L/G 18 and again this request really stems from the fact that there is only one grade differential between those positions and the Housing Inspector positions. It does not reflect the different technical experience and knowledge that they really need to bring to the table. Having more than one grade differential there is problematic. If we are successful in making our case that those positions should go to a L/G 19 then that ties in directly with the Plans Examiner position. Again, it is a cascade effect. We pushed on the envelope at the bottom so things are coming up through the whole process and each one is pushing along. The Building Regulations Director is the next position that feels that pressure because at a L/G 22 and again because these were stacked pretty tightly in the first go round, that position should have an adequate differential between its role and the Plans Examiner role who is supervised by this position. One other note on the Building Mechanical, Electrical, and Plumbing Inspection positions is it happens that these are all long-term employees and the way that they have been classified in the existing format at a L/G 18, they are all at the top of the scale now. They have nowhere to go and there is not a lot we can offer them within the limits of the standard scale in terms of potential for growth within the organization. That is an additional consideration. The last position is the Zoning Inspector. It is not so much affected by the change in the Housing Inspector classification, but actually this is a true change in class specification and change in job duties and responsibilities that we are looking to put on this position. Basically, we are trying to make use of the fact that we have, with the 40-hour work week, some additional resources that we can use, especially in the housing standards division. So we have some field operatives now that can go out and handle a lot of the fieldwork associated with zoning complaints. This is an area where we have had considerable pressure for a long time. We have been trying to do the job with one person, that being the Zoning Inspector. We are looking to change that position to be the Zoning Administrator who would handle the site plan reviews in our office, the zoning compliance reviews, coordinate the court actions that we have to initiate as a result of the field work and really take a more proactive role in terms of administering zoning functions. We anticipate that with the adoption of the zoning ordinance that role will be a critical one for our department. What I have done also is attach an organizational chart proposed. It includes both existing under the Yarger Decker plan that was adopted, as well as the requested grades for the positions involved so you can take a look down and see the specific positions that are involved and what the costs are. One final thing, I have also taken a look at what the financial implications of what this request is and I haven't had an opportunity to confirm my basis for these numbers with the Human Resources Director, however, the net effect ranges from a zero cost to a high end of \$3,047. I believe that the actual implementation cost to make these changes will be \$1,610.90 on an annual basis based on the implementation rates. Now what happens, of course, is that those rates change over the course of the

year as position reviews come up and that number is somewhat fluid as a result and will be more difficult to define. Just to give you a sense of what the range of this request is, it is not big in dollars. The original request that went before the Appeals Committee was more comprehensive. It requested some different grades for positions, including my own. I have not included those requests this evening. I am only really centering on those positions that I feel were directly affected by this change and also the additional position as a result of the appeals process.

Alderman O'Neil stated I think we have several different issues here. I was probably one of the people that pushed hard for the Housing Inspectors to be looked at. I think if Mr. Decker had a fault with anything it was positions where he couldn't get a real handle on what other communities were doing. Some he agreed on when he took a second or third look at them. This was one of them. I think the Traffic Signal guys were very unique to NH and he couldn't get a handle and didn't change that. I do think that we have created a problem there in that the Housing Inspection Supervisor, that position should probably be at a L/G 19. Now I guess my concern, Leon, with you saying that the rest of the structure gets thrown out, when I look at the numbers, every one of the Building Electrical, Mechanical, Plumbing and Zoning Inspectors got over \$1,000 adjustment in their pay with the Housing Inspectors, even going to a L/G 17, got less than \$1,000. I am basing this on the numbers in front of me. I don't think we did the trades inspectors any injustice by keeping them at a L/G 18.

Mr. LaFreniere replied I am not suggesting that from a purely financial standpoint just going on the pay. Rather, I am pointing out the fact that before the study the Housing Inspectors were a L/G 19 and the Trades Inspectors were a L/G 22 so that is a three labor grade differential. As a result, both from the standpoint of the longevity service of the trades inspectors, it just happens that these people have been in their positions for a long time as well as the fact that the Housing Inspectors hadn't been in their positions as long and were starting from a lower base. That is really what drove the increases.

Alderman O'Neil stated but that is an issue citywide. The longevity is an issue citywide. The intent of this was to bring some method to the madness, but certainly the newer employees make out the best on this study and that is citywide. I think I am correct in saying that.

Mr. Hobson stated the two points I wanted to make are one of the things that Leon pointed out was yes, you did have a situation where you had some people that ended up at the top of their scale but on the other side what we did was before the process began we said that there were three grade differences before this study between an inspector on the housing side and an inspector on the trades side. Mr. Decker brought that down to two grades and he had a parody of two, two and two

almost throughout his entire department. We made it a parody of one or a change of one grade, which is part of what Leon is calling that compression. That does not mean that before the study those inspectors should have been three grades different. That could have been wrong. That is why you paid Mr. Decker to do the study.

Alderman O'Neil stated even if we move Del Cooler's position to a L/G 19 that still gives three grades between he and Max, correct.

Mr. LaFreniere replied that is correct but the problem becomes the Plans Examiner position. There is only a one grade differential with the Plans Examiner who we expect to come in with a degree in architectural engineering and expect to come in with multiple years experience.

Alderman O'Neil responded yes, but wouldn't the justification be not that we have a one, two or three grade difference but more importantly what are we requiring for the job. What you brought up with the Zoning Inspector is a legitimate discussion and something that we need to take a look at. I guess what I am saying is that I don't think we can look at this thing solely if there is a one, two or three. I think we have to look at maybe we are requiring more from a Plans Examiner and maybe it is worth more than a L/G 20.

Mr. Hobson stated one other thing that has taken place that we haven't had a chance to talk about is that the Mayor has recently brought Leon in to the discussion about Public Building Services and whether or not there are some customer service issues in PBS that can come under his group that his group can then take on. So literally we may move some functions and duties from PBS to Building. That is also part of this discussion but I have to tell you that it is not finite. We haven't listed that out. Leon and I have had some discussions about it. The Mayor talked about it and thought that Leon's plan had credence which is why he is sitting here tonight.

Alderman O'Neil stated my point is that we have three or four different issues within the department and we should look at them individually.

Mr. LaFreniere replied I don't disagree. I am coming in and making a case from the perspective of how we got here. One of the things that I took upon myself and what I think should have been the role of the department head in this process was to try to make an evaluation of how accurately the class specifications reflected the job that we expected to be done and also how those positions were compensated from the basis of our knowledge of the competition if you will as well as trying to maintain parity. The way this tracked, the problem with it was that we didn't have a chance to do that with these positions and I guess that is why

I have been in a reactionary position since that time. That is why I stress that I do understand your point, but that is really why I stress that because as it was urgently configured, I think that the grade differentials were appropriate. While I had some issues with where some of those grades were I thought that maybe over the scheme of the organization chart they should be higher, for parity I thought it was pretty well established and reflective of the nature of responsibilities and knowledge base that these individuals need to bring to the table in those positions. That is what I feel has gotten kind of skewed here.

Mr. Hobson stated I have an idea. What if we, for tonight, considered going with the fact that we are going to change the Zoning Inspector job description and class specification to add more duties so that the Zoning Inspector will become a Zoning Administrator which would mean that it would go to a L/G 19. I think we all agree that the Housing Inspector Supervisor position needs some kind of difference between the people they supervise. Then what if you sent me and Leon back to the table with the Mayor and this other piece that is going on with Public Building Services and if we bring something to you that shows how these class specifications are changed, upgraded, have more duties to do, more defined, then he can bring those things in. The Plans Examiner, truly we are giving that person more work to do than the old Plans Examiner position. Without a doubt, we are going to do that. Would that be fair if we just approved those two for tonight and then send the rest to Leon and me.

Alderman Shea asked will someone pick up the enforcement.

Mr. LaFreniere answered yes essentially that is what we are trying to do is give the enforcement to the housing standards division because of the additional resources we gained by going to 40 hours there. Granted they have a big job to do, but we don't have a huge influx of new housing units coming in so I have a resource that I can use and that is how I want to use it.

Alderman Shea stated one of the things that I find when I attend the Zoning meetings is that people appeal or get special exceptions or variances and then nobody checks to see whether the conditions of these things are enforced. You can't expect one person to do all of this. You really have to do some enforcement.

Mr. LaFreniere stated we do recognize that.

Alderman O'Neil asked before we could approve that, wouldn't we need to accept those changes or can we put this all together and accept the change in grade with the changes in job description to come.

Mr. Hobson answered if you do that; you should direct us on a time schedule to get the classification specification changes to you. I would think that 30 days would be reasonable for us to make those classification specification changes. However, I think that Leon has a problem with my suggestion.

Mr. LaFreniere stated my only reservation to that direction and I find myself in an awkward position, my goal has been to put the Zoning Inspector in parity with the Structural Trades Inspectors and if we move ahead in this fashion, he will actually be higher before we have had a chance to react to the Trades Inspectors. I would like to have that position on parity. I don't think that position should be higher. If we want to bump up one and then take a look at that as we look at the other positions, I would be more comfortable with that.

Alderman O'Neil moved to change the labor grade of the Zoning Inspector to a labor grade 18 with the new job classification specification to be brought to us within 30 days from this date, to change the Housing Inspector Supervisor labor grade to 19, and to change the Plans Examiner labor grade to 21 with the new job classification specification to be brought to us within 30 days. Alderman Klock duly seconded the motion. Chairman Sysyn called for a vote. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Mr. Hobson stated we are in the process of hiring a Plans Examiner right now and we are really trying to bring in somebody that has a very high level of knowledge with an advanced degree and advanced experience.

Mr. Tawney stated if this particular individual has so much background, education, experience and skills, the system does allow for the A step for that individual which would be another 3.5% to play with.

Alderman O'Neil moved to table the balance of the appeals report. Alderman Shea duly seconded the motion. Chairman Sysyn called for a vote on the motion. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

### NEW BUSINESS

Communication from the Library Director requesting an additional month of leave time for Library Accounts Clerk Susan Auger to care for her twins and see to family issues such as daycare.

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

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