

COMMITTEE ON HUMAN RESOURCES/INSURANCE

January 7, 2003

5:15 PM

Chairman Lopez called the meeting to order.

The Clerk called the roll.

Present: Aldermen Lopez, Sysyn, Pinard, Shea, DeVries (late)

Chairman Lopez stated before I get into Item 3, the Committee made a motion last time to have the Assessors be here at this meeting. As you know, this is not on the agenda but if the HR Director would like to bring the Committee up-to-date, I would appreciate it.

Ms. Lamberton stated as you know the Committee voted for the Assessors to get me the questionnaires within nine days of the last meeting. They did not. They got me the questionnaires on Friday afternoon, December 27. The way you answer the questionnaires is you put in your duties and what you are currently responsible for doing. What happened was not the Chairman but the other person just completely copied the Chairman's questionnaire. The questionnaire said that he was the administrator of the department, which he is not. I had to go and tell him that the purpose of the questionnaire was what he is doing, not what he wants to do. Anyway after we went around a few times, I got them back again and finally I had Christine Martinsen from my office go and do a desk audit today. She spent the whole day going over what their duties are. When you go out and do a desk audit you say you do this, show me. If you go and measure houses, take me and show me how you measure houses. It is verifying duties and it is also trying to determine the level of responsibility and complexity of what the actual duty is. So I saw Christine come back in around 4:15 PM but I didn't get a chance to talk with her. What she will do now is right a report for me and make some recommendations to me and I will review the report and either agree or disagree with her and then I will write a letter to you telling you what my recommendations would be on those two positions.

Alderman Shea stated I have a question in terms of...you mentioned that the person that is the Chairman listed his responsibilities but the second person listed the same responsibilities with no differentiation.

Ms. Lamberton replied they were identical.

Alderman Shea asked and then when the person went back today or whenever she sat down with both of them or just one of them.

Ms. Lamberton answered she sat down with both of them and she also talked to the Chairperson to discuss the position that presumably will be the commercial appraiser.

Alderman Shea replied my thought on the matter is it is too bad that we didn't have that information a while back. That is to say all of this information if you know what I am trying to get at.

Ms. Lamberton stated I think probably it would have been helpful.

Chairman Lopez asked so what date are we shooting at now for completion.

Ms. Lamberton answered I would say I could have the letter by the end of the week or the end of next week.

Chairman Lopez addressed Item 3 of the agenda:

Communication from Human Resources Director, Virginia Lamberton, recommending the approval of an ordinance amendment to Section 33.011 (Retired Employees; Policy on Rehiring).

Alderman Shea moved to approve the ordinance and refer it to the Committee on Bills on Second Reading for technical review. Alderman Sysyn duly seconded the motion.

Chairman Lopez stated I would like to...I agree with the ordinance but I just want to talk about at this time temporary and part-time employees. Maybe we should take it separate or do you want to explain that, Ginny.

Ms. Lamberton replied that is a separate discussion.

Alderman Smith stated I just think that this is a form of double dipping on the retirement system of the City. I think there are a lot of people out there who are out of work and some work 20 or 30 hours and I hate to see be instituted for the simple reason that somebody who retires at 62 say in Finance and he switches over to another department and works 29 hours and his former work was 35 hours then he gets a second paycheck. I don't think this should occur.

Ms. Lamberton replied every position is basically 40 hours a week and the reason it went from 35 hours to 40 was Yarger Decker. This doesn't require the City to

hire anybody. What it says is, for example, you may have a full-time school nurse who wants to retire and is willing to work for 29 hours a week forever. Now based on the ordinance that person cannot do that because the ordinance says they can only do it for a very limited period of time. We lose somebody, especially in that instance. We can't hire them. If you can find two or three people who want to fill in and just work 29 hours or 20 hours a week as nurses, that saves us money because we can avoid hiring a full-time person frankly. The other thing is you have a double standard here. Your City employees who retire in the NH State Retirement System, Group 2, which is the Fire and Police, are able now to come back and work for the City and obtain a full-time permanent position, not even part-time and then contribute to the retirement and pick up their social security and benefits, etc. What we have now is a double standard.

Alderman Smith stated we all know that the State retirement system is quite different from the municipal retirement system. It is like comparing apples to eggs. You can't mix them together. In other words the State pension plan is a much better pension plan than the City has and that is why Police, Fire and the school teachers are in that plan. I don't think you can compare that plan to the pension plan we have here. I think you might want to talk to Maurice Daneault on the pension plan and see what he says about this situation.

Ms. Lamberton replied I did talk to Maurice Daneault about this and one of the reasons why...well this is a little more complicated than that because you have some part-time employees who are only working for the City right now 20 hours a week who are members of the retirement system so they are contributing to the system and the City is contributing to the system. I don't know why we are doing that. To me that is a waste of money because presumably they have a job someplace else and are just supplementing their income by working for us. You have a bunch of complications and inconsistencies in how you run human resources.

Alderman Smith stated right now we can just take the Highway Department. We have people who are temporary part-time workers and work 40 hours. Am I correct?

Ms. Lamberton replied we have some.

Alderman Pinard stated I work at the State and I have been there for 13 years on a part-time basis and there are a lot of part-time workers for the State. I don't think there is anything wrong with it.

Ms. Lamberton replied usually there are 2,500 to 3,000 part-timers who come and go. The State retirement system, though, only allows for full-time employees to

participate in the retirement system. The City system says that both part-time and full-time employees may, however, they don't discuss how many hours a week a person has to work or is not allowed to work in order to participate in the program. As far as Maurice was concerned, that is up to the City to decide. The City should decide what the minimum number hours you want somebody to work before you let them participate in the retirement system.

Chairman Lopez stated the Finance Officer has asked to speak.

Mr. Clougherty stated I agree with what Ginny says. There is an inequity in the current system. I think this is your chance to fix it. It doesn't go far enough. As she said if you retire from the Information Systems department and you are a member of the City system, you can't work for the City right now. You can't come back and work. I am not sure that coming back and working for the City is a good thing but right now you can't. If you retire as a police officer, you can come back and work full-time and get full benefits. So not only have we paid the State for your retirement and given you final benefits, now we are giving you a full salary. I don't get it. If you want to try and make this equitable, my recommendation to you would be to take this and put in there "from any City or State retirement system". When this was originally written years ago, I think the intent of the Board then was any City system, whether it is a State system or whatever. The City is paying for it. We are paying into the State system. Somewhere along the line somebody interpreted that this doesn't apply to the State system. Well to my way of thinking if you want to get on even ground, fix it once and for all and say okay nobody is going to come back full-time and if you retire from the City or State retirement system...I know there are people out there who have done it and what is done is done but going forward everybody is the same no matter what system you retire from; whether is it the State system, the old pension system, the new contributory system, etc. It should all be the same for all of your employees. If it is sensible to do it, it should apply to everybody and that would be my recommendation to you. I would also say that we haven't done any cost analysis on this to come back to you and report whether there are actual savings in that regard. If that is something that you are looking for, then I need time to do that but my main concern would be to level the playing field. If you are going to do it, do it right because just saying because the Police and Fire can do it now full-time we are going to let everybody else do it half time...again you are cutting and pasting. Fix it. Fix it right and make it the same for everybody. It should be the old what is good for the goose is good for the gander law. If it is good for one, it is good for all of them.

Alderman DeVries stated I have a question for Kevin pertaining to that thought process. You mentioned that we vested out a full-time prior employee at Police or Fire or whatever and it cost the City and now it is costing us again to pay them a

salary. It is not additional savings in what it would cost for us to be hiring somebody other than that retired police officer or firefighter. We are still going to have to pay for the retiree, his vesting out cost, and we are still going to have to pay the salary. It is not like it is costing us extra than it would if we hired a non-retiree.

Mr. Clougherty replied you are right, Alderman and if you do the analysis that might be but there is the perception. At the State, for example, they took a number of their department heads and said you know what we are going to let you retire and then we are going to pay you on top of that to stay in your same job. In a way that is the same thing here because we are allowing people to retire from this job over here and then they slide across the aisle and do the same thing and there is a public perception, I think, as Alderman Smith was saying, of double dipping which just doesn't lend a good persona to the City. I think once somebody has worked for a period of time, you move them on. If you are going to let people come back, you should be letting everybody come back fairly and address it that way and I would ask you to consider that.

Alderman DeVries responded the only additional thing I would say is that public perception should not preclude us from considering that if we have a valuable that we know is going to represent a cost savings because of the known skills and the known work attributes that he is bringing to the job...I mean we would be cutting off our nose to spite our face if we decided because of a perception that we were not going to capitalize on a savings of having a particular employee.

Mr. Clougherty stated again I think if you are going to do it on a full-time basis for some employees that is wrong.

Alderman DeVries replied I understand what you are saying about equalizing the field but I think to dummy it down to half-time actually is probably taking us in the wrong direction.

Mr. Clougherty asked on which side.

Alderman DeVries answered that if you say that no City employee can work a full-time position I think we are headed in the wrong direction. If we have a prior retiree who is eligible and we feel he is most qualified why would we want to preclude him? I just don't understand that thought process and nobody has shown me where that is representing additional costs to the City.

Chairman Lopez stated well there are a lot of good points. A person who retires, regardless of where he retires from, the City has contributed and paid him for the retirement and it is no more like when I retired from the Post Office they offered

me a job the next day for 30 hours a week. You get the same amount of work out of me and you don't have to hire somebody new as a full-time employee. That is where this 29 hours does come in. If a person is working full-time, 40 hours, and he is retiring now maybe that position after being reviewed doesn't require full-time but it only requires 20 hours a week to get that job done. There are benefits to this. I sort of agree with Kevin and Ginny that if we are going to do it, maybe we should do it for everybody. What gives a police officer or anybody else the right to come on the City side and get the retirement? That is the system that has been used. It is not their fault. It is up to us to make some type of recommendation as to whether we want to continue this practice of allowing other people to come in and retire one day from the Police Department and then get hired the next day as a City employee. Your point is very valid, Alderman DeVries. It might be that it is very important to get that person because of their qualifications. I think the motion that has been accepted is for City employees to be able to work 29 hours a week for the City after they retire. Now do we want to continue with that or do we want to change it?

Alderman DeVries asked when we are saying they are not eligible for any benefits that includes a pension, correct.

Ms. Lamberton answered right. It is just actual labor, time worked, payment made.

Alderman Shea asked if a person were retired in Group 2 and is then rehired by the City can they retire under Group 1 if they put in the necessary time.

Ms. Lamberton answered yes. Under normal circumstances, the minimum age for retirement from Group 2 is 45 and 20 years with the department. Let's say a 45-year-old retires from the Police Department and then comes to work in Human Resources full-time, now they are a brand new employee as if they never worked in the City before. They have a new longevity date and anniversary date and they start to accrue leave just like any other new employee. They also do contribute to the retirement system. If that is long enough, then eventually they can get a check from the City retirement system and the State retirement system.

Mr. Clougherty stated plus another round of severance and all of those other benefits.

Ms. Lamberton replied well that is for time worked. People earn their time and get paid it. That is the way the world works like it or not.

Mr. Clougherty responded as long as it is full-time.

Ms. Lamberton stated I don't think we can fuss over somebody working and earning that money and paying that money and then saying well because you got paid that money we don't want to deal with you.

Mr. Clougherty responded my point was to try and be mature in my thinking and say that if you were to go to the 29 hour for everybody, that is not a problem anymore because now somebody is not going to join the pension system and they are not going to get those benefits. They will be able to do in 29 hours what...if they are experienced what they were able to do beforehand and it is a level playing field. I would ask that you consider leveling the playing field for everybody. Now I am not suggesting that you go back and change...I know we have some people as Ginny mentioned that are already working and you are not going to go back and change that but going forward our policy, I think, should be to treat everybody the same. If you are going to say we are going to let the retirees from the State system have full-time employee and full benefits but the retirees from the City system have up to 29 hours and no benefits, how do you defend that?

Alderman DeVries stated I can attempt to defend it. I think the reason that we are looking at this ordinance limiting it to 29 hours is because it would have an adverse affect on the pension system should somebody be collecting from the pension system at the same time that they are eligible to pay back into it...that is the City pension that I am referencing. I think there is a distinction to be made when we are looking at Group 2 versus the City.

Mr. Clougherty replied you may have that problem and you may want to do some more research on it. There might be a question with the old system and the new system. They are both set by State law. The City's pension system is set by a State law. Is that a State system?

Alderman DeVries asked has that already been researched. Is there any conflict with the State pension system? Kevin was suggesting that we need to do some more research into the pension system.

Mr. Clougherty stated what my point was is that the Board of Mayor and Aldermen have the ability to decide who as a City employee can belong to the City retirement system. Is that correct, Ginny?

Ms. Lamberton replied the law provides for the City to pay into the State system for police and fire officers. The system is there. The system has definitions and criteria. In order for a position to participate in Group 2 that position has to have certain responsibilities. If they don't, they can't participate in the system. All of the municipalities do not participate in Group 2 for their police officers because it

is more expensive but the City decided to participate for that group of employees. The City also decided to have our own system. There is a law attached to that and there is language that provides for part-time and full-time employees and what the standards of the system will be.

Alderman Shea withdrew his motion and moved to table the item and ask Ginny and Kevin to get together and come back with further information on “leveling the playing field.”

Alderman Sysyn withdrew her second.

Chairman Lopez asked do we want to include everybody in this. We need some guidelines for Ginny.

Alderman Shea stated I am saying that we should level the playing field.

Chairman Lopez stated why don't we just put it in the form of a motion.

Ms. Lamberton stated I really don't have anything else to research. You can send it back to me and Kevin and I can talk and we can either agree or disagree. I think this Committee may choose that they either want to go with this language or they want to put language in there to say that individuals who retire from City service and are receiving payments from any City retirement pension plan or State pension plan can only work 29 hours or less a week. You can do that or go with the language that is here and say from this day forward that is the way it is going to be.

Alderman Sysyn stated so that would go for the firemen and policemen too. You would be changing...would you grandfather these people in?

Chairman Lopez replied yes.

Alderman DeVries stated I don't agree with bringing police and fire into it. I move to approve this ordinance and refer it to the Committee on Bills on Second Reading for technical review. The reason being that we are going into a very tight budget year next year and if there is an opportunity for us to make some savings and capitalize on it we would be foolish to prolong this any further. We should have the ability to hire at the 29 hours and let's look separately if you feel you need to level the playing field. Let's not hold this up.

Chairman Lopez stated but let me remind you that we already do have this happening in the Police Department. Ginny, do you want to talk about that? We do have part-time police officers that receive no benefits.

Ms. Lamberton stated the Police Department has auxiliary police working part-time. They come in and can only work a certain number of hours a week and they get no benefits. They get paid by the hour.

Alderman DeVries replied at a savings to the City and that is what I am looking for.

Ms. Lamberton stated they are saving us money.

Alderman Sysyn duly seconded the motion to approve the ordinance and refer it to the Committee on Bills on Second Reading for technical review.

Alderman Shea asked Ginny what is the urgency of going with this tonight.

Ms. Lamberton answered there is no urgency but if you look at the next ordinance on the agenda you have a...obviously looking at it as if it were my company and how would I run this company and where am I spending money where I don't need to spend money, that is what I am doing. You have a list of people who are currently in the City retirement system contributing and we are contributing and they only work 20 hours a week. I don't know of any company in the world that does that. It doesn't make any sense to me.

Chairman Lopez stated I am going to allow a little more discussion on this because I think it is important. As you can see on the handout, you have part-time employees who get benefits and then you have, as Alderman Smith mentioned, people in the Highway Department who work 40 hours a week as a temporary employee who don't receive anything.

Ms. Lamberton replied right. This list of employees who are temporary, they have been temporary for quite awhile and they don't get anything. We have these contradictions all over the place.

Mr. Clougherty stated I might add that when they did allow for those 20-hour employees to join the retirement system that is what spiked your contributions. You are adding more and more people to the system for less and less hours. That is contributing to the liability of the system and that is what is causing a problem. The second thing I would ask is the amendment as Ginny stated it, I think you would want to have the Solicitor look at it. If we just put in City retirement or State pension plan that would prohibit anybody who worked for the State who wanted to come and work for you. What you probably want is any individual who has received payments from a City funded or City sponsored retirement or State pension plan. There is some language that has to happen there to get what you

want to accomplish. I can't do it on the spur of the moment for you but there is something there that has to happen. I agree with Ginny. Again, it is not equitable the way we are treating people from the top to the bottom by different classes and you should try to fix the whole thing.

Chairman Lopez stated I agree with you because somebody working at the Highway Department 40 hours a week compared to somebody who is working part-time and getting benefits just doesn't make sense to me. I think what we I would like to do if it is okay with the Committee is ask Ginny, Kevin and the Solicitor to get together and come back with the correct language to make this level. If the Committee wants to vote on 29 hours a week and doesn't want to include police officers and schoolteachers and firemen, I will allow that to in order to move something forward here. I don't think it is fair to the other employees of the City. We have had retirees come in and ask for a job who have worked for the City and we cannot hire them. If a police officer comes in after he retires he can get a full-time job. It is not fair. As the City Clerk mentioned, we can bring more information to the Committee on Bills on Second Reading and change the ordinance if we want.

Chairman Lopez called for a vote on the motion to pass the ordinance and refer it to the Committee on Bills on Second Reading for technical review. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Chairman Lopez addressed Item 4 of the agenda:

Communication from Human Resources Director, Virginia Lamberton, recommending the approval of an ordinance amendment to Section 33.062 (Part-Time Employees).

Ms. Lamberton stated again there is a law and enabling legislation that says that part-timers as well as full-timers may participate in the City retirement plan. However, how many hours that part-timer works is not defined. I think we should define it. How many hours do you think a person should be working before you want to give them retirement benefits at some point? Is it 30? It might be 32. That might be the magic number. I picked 30 because people start getting health insurance prorated...excuse me they don't get health insurance but the start getting leave time and other stuff after 30 hours. It is almost four days a week. Again, I am just asking you to think about it by bringing this to you. How many hours a week do you think people should have to work before getting retirement, vacation time, sick leave, holidays, etc? What do you want to have happen? You have to decide at some level how many hours you want the part-timers to work in order to be in the retirement system because it is not defined right now.

Chairman Lopez asked and we are defining it by 30 hours or more.

Ms. Lamberton answered I am proposing that.

Alderman DeVries asked, Ginny, with your experience at the State did they have any kind of definition for a part-time employee versus a temporary employee.

Ms. Lamberton answered the part-time employee is one who works less than the basic work week. Here the basic workweek is 40 hours so you could have a part-time worker 39 or less hours and not be eligible for benefits. As far as the State is concerned what they do by law is a part-time employee if their position is going to last six months or more they may participate in health insurance and dental insurance at a prorated rate. The more hours you work, the more the employer pays. We don't do that here. We don't have any health or dental benefits for part-time employees. We have all of these different columns where you are doing for this but you are not doing for this and you are doing for this but you are not doing for that. Part-timers who work for the State do not get vacation time. It is kind of a bizarre system. It is a look back system from anniversary date to anniversary date if you log in so many hours you get a payment for vacation time. You don't get to take vacation time off because why do you hire part-timers to begin with? Remember that. You hire part-timers to supplement your regular work force. To fill in the holes and finish the job for you.

Alderman DeVries stated the other thing that I think needs to be better defined...if I understand it eligibility for benefits starts at Day 1 for the City.

Ms. Lamberton replied you start accruing leave time and after the first month you have been hired you can pick up health insurance. Dental insurance is 90 days I think.

Alderman DeVries asked but health insurance is Day 1 eligibility.

Ms. Lamberton answered health is the first of the month following the date of hire. If your date of hire is July 15, as of August 1 you are on health insurance.

Alderman DeVries asked is that not generous by industry standards.

Ms. Lamberton answered no. It is normal.

Alderman Shea stated Ginny you didn't really go into temporary. What is a temporary employee?

Ms. Lamberton replied temporary to me defines that there is an amount of money to get a job done or a function and you have a beginning date and an end date. It is for jobs that are temporary in nature.

Alderman Shea asked so all of these temporary people have...

Ms. Lamberton interjected they have been working for awhile. Their funding is defined as temporary.

Alderman Shea asked did they go through some agency.

Ms. Lamberton answered no they are on our payroll. They are our employees.

Alderman Shea stated I don't understand. These guys are working 40 hours and they are taking their life in their hands working on the highways sometimes...

Ms. Lamberton interjected they would be eligible for worker's compensation.

Alderman Shea stated but anyway they are getting no benefits at all and somebody else working 20 hours a week...

Ms. Lamberton interjected they are getting leave time. The leave time ordinance says that once they work from 30 hours or more they start to accrue vacation and sick time. They get some stuff. I get concerned when you have somebody working for the City for 40 hours a week for five years and they haven't gotten any retirement. That is not fair either.

Chairman Lopez stated my recommendation would be to pass this and move it along to Bills on Second Reading.

Alderman Smith stated I just want to go back to the other motion. If you have somebody working 20 hours are you going to let them work 29 hours? I am looking at the sheet. You have 29 employees on this list. Sixteen of them come from two departments, the Health Department and the Highway Department.

Chairman Lopez replied the 29 hours doesn't necessarily mean the department head will hire them for 29 hours.

Alderman Smith responded I am just saying. Let's take the first one. He is working 20 hours. He can work 29 hours right?

Chairman Lopez stated no.

Alderman Smith asked why can't he.

Ms. Lamberton stated they can do that now. This is saying that you can hire a part-timer up to 29 hours without putting them into the retirement system. A part-timer, year round, year after year after year. People who are part-timers that we are putting in the retirement system are here considered permanent employees. The Health Department person, I am sure whatever their rate is this won't have any affect on that person but when that person left if they replace that person for 20 hours a week that new person would not be eligible to participate in the City retirement system.

Alderman DeVries stated I thought we had a suggestion that there might be a language conflict with the City Retirement system and that it should be researched by the City Solicitor. It seems that we should have that checked before we forward this to Bills on Second Reading.

Mr. Clougherty stated I also ask that you look at the cost implications. If you go back and look at over time for the last five years all of these people in these different categories and what that would have been and show the unfairness issue, if we could do that analysis I think it would be helpful to you.

On motion of Alderman Shea, duly seconded by Alderman DeVries, it was voted to table this item and have the Finance Director, Human Resources Director and City Solicitor review the ordinance and come back to the Committee with any changes.

Chairman Lopez addressed Item 5 of the agenda:

New hire/termination reports submitted for informational purposes only.

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

NEW BUSINESS

Reclassification of Position – Computer Operator I to Web Services Administrator, Grade 21.

Chairman Lopez stated you all should have received a communication. This request is being made by Diane Prew of Information Systems. The HR Director has recommended approval.

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

Alderman Shea asked, Diane, do you have that money in your budget.

Ms. Prew answered yes.

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

Chairman Lopez stated in other new business I talked a little bit at our last meeting and I just want to make sure that the Committee wishes to discuss these items that I would like to bring to your attention. One is whether or not the payroll should be in the HR Department or go back to Finance. I think we need some type of dialogue between the Finance Officer and the HR Director as to whether or not this is the best solution. As you are well aware, we wanted everything to go to Finance. Past history is that Mark Hobson when he was the HR Director asked that it be taken out of the Finance Department and be put in HR. So, as it stands now the HR Director is responsible for answering the questions on how much money and what unfilled positions there are and she can't do that. She can't do that fully to the extent that the numbers are verified. There is a lot of time delay. Believe me I have been through it for about six weeks now. The last communication is that the numbers have to be verified again. If the HR Director would like to comment on that, fine. I would like to have some direction from the Committee.

Ms. Lamberton stated I don't have any strong emotion one way or the other, however, I will tell you that no matter who does the payroll the way the City is set-up you won't know how much money is in the personnel budget for each department unless you go and meet with that department head individually and have them account for every dollar that is in their personnel budget. The way it is set-up is like at the Fire Department in their personnel line they have uniforms and they have this and they have that. In the Police Department they have something else. If you just run a vacancy report, they may have that much money left in those positions and they may not. You need to go and say well how many uniforms are you going to buy because they may be keeping a position vacant to buy new uniforms. It is all lumped into one line. You may want to think about separating out that kind of stuff from the personnel line and having a separate line in the budget for uniforms, special duty, or whatever the items are. That would be simple. It still wouldn't make any difference who is running the payroll. At least you would be able to push a button and say 25 positions are vacant as of this date and that money is only intended to pay salary and it is not being paid for salary so,

therefore, that is how much money is left. Then you have so many dollars for uniforms and so many dollars for this and so many dollars for that.

Chairman Lopez stated the only reason I bring it up to the Committee is because we have to get a handle on this whole situation if we are ever going to move ahead. Right now, it just doesn't work. I think the Finance Officer tried to a degree. The system is just not the right system. It is not right for the HR Director to be responsible for something yet not be able to give me or an Alderman an answer.

Alderman Shea stated when the payroll is made out and I am kind of making a distinction. A payroll meaning somebody is paid for their service. When somebody is paid do you then have to verify the figures, the financial figures, with the Finance Office? In other words, do they have the final control over it? By sending it back to them what does that do? In other words does that free your department from you doing less financial work and more other kinds of work?

Ms. Lamberton replied I am not sure that it will free us up at all because our job is to audit to make sure all the transactions that are going through are consistent with the collective bargaining agreements and the ordinances. Each time a check is changing, somebody in HR has to verify it, which is normal. That is normal wherever you go. As far as somebody else...now that you have issued the paychecks somebody has to put the money in Employment Security and you have to put money in Social Security. We do that now. Somebody in Finance could do that. We would still have a function to do in processing payroll.

Alderman Shea stated there are people now doing the payroll at your office. If the responsibility were transferred to Kevin's department would those people then who know how to do it go to his office?

Ms. Lamberton replied not necessarily because I would still have the auditing responsibility. Right now you have two people doing the auditing. You have Finance doing some of the same things we are doing. We are checking each other.

Alderman Shea asked, Kevin, if it were to go back to you do you have the personnel at hand now to do that or would that necessitate you saying I need two more people or three more people.

Mr. Clougherty answered right now we are down several positions so we couldn't do it.

Alderman Shea asked so you are saying that you would have to have people.

Chairman Lopez replied I think that is the dialogue that we need to have. We need to find out if it does go back to him exactly what it needs because one of his people now does the payroll three days a week in HR. We need to have some type of dialogue to see if is better to keep it where it is at or better to move it back to Finance. We are not going to get the answer tonight. This is where both parties have to sit down and give the pluses and minuses. If it remains the way it is, fine. We have to have some minuses or pluses somewhere.

Mr. Clougherty stated again you know that my position is that you can consolidate it on a bigger system like Cronis or something else and make it more streamlined. That would be my recommendation – to take a bigger look rather than a smaller look.

Alderman DeVries asked do you need a motion.

Chairman Lopez answered no. I just want the Committee to be aware of what is happening. The second thing I would like is to ask the Committee if we can get the dialogue going with HR to bring back the Youth Services Director for an update. We are paying that person as a Grade 26 right now. Maybe this Committee can make a recommendation to the Mayor that maybe he should make her a department head so we can save some money in that area. We can't make him. That is his choice but I am just looking at the fact that it is a Grade 23 and we are paying a Grade 26 right now and we have a Grade 20 in that position. All of these little things are falling through the cracks here and we have to address them. It has been stated many times that we are a Committee and if we have items to address then we should address them. These are items that need to be addressed. It hurts the personnel in the entire City when they see something like this going on. The Board has the final authority but if this Committee wants to continue paying somebody a Grade 26 that is fine. If we have another recommendation that we would like to send to the Mayor then we should send to the Mayor some type of recommendation so that it can be solved by the Board to be fair and equal.

Ms. Lamberton stated the last time the Mayor and I discussed that position he didn't want to do anything one way or the other until such time as the Board of Mayor and Aldermen made a determination as to whether or not they were going to reorganize Youth Services and Elderly into the Health Department. If it goes into the Health Department then the Director of the Health Department should have something to say about who the director of Youth Services is.

Chairman Lopez replied that is coming up at Bills on Second Reading. Maybe we will just hold off and see what Bills on Second Reading does with that. We can let them decide if they are going to go along with that and then we can take that step

when we come across it but we are paying somebody a Grade 26 for a Grade 23 job.

There being no further business, on motion of Alderman Pinard, duly seconded by Alderman DeVries, it was voted to adjourn.

A True Record. Attest.

Clerk of Committee