

COMMITTEE ON HUMAN RESOURCES/INSURANCE

January 4, 2005

5:30 PM

Chairman Shea calls the meeting to order.

The Clerk called the roll.

Present: Aldermen Shea, Sysyn, DeVries, Garrity, Forest

Messrs.: R. MacKenzie, V. Lamberton, Deputy Solicitor Arnold, J. Porter

Chairman Shea addressed Item 3 of the agenda:

Communication from Virginia Lamberton, HR Director, on behalf of the Planning Director recommending that an Administrative Assistant position, salary grade 13, be reclassified to a Planning Technician, salary grade 14.

Alderman DeVries asked Mr. MacKenzie to come forward to address the Committee.

Robert MacKenzie, Planning Director, stated just briefly this is a position, Administrative Assistant, who is the main assistant to the CIP Program in our office. This position at various times in the past has been a Planning Technician job and because of the number of projects that we have ongoing right now, we have had to reallocate some assignments that would normally be done by a Planner II or in some cases a Planner III and that includes such things as monitoring Davis Bacon Wage Rates. This person has to go out to a site to satisfy all of the HUD requirements for the money that we get. In essence we have had, we have been forced because of the amount of work that we have had to require this person to do tasks which are beyond an Administrative Assistant position. We felt it fair and appropriate in this case to request that HR look at the position and see if they qualified based upon the workload.

Alderman DeVries stated I guess my confusion would probably be looking at the administration of the CIP in a larger role and understanding who performs what and where the overlap is. Have you prepared anything for us to tell us beyond this one position where you have described their duties who the other personnel might be or even by grade...maybe we don't need to know the names but what they are performing?

Mr. MacKenzie responded we did not bring it but this actually stemmed from a proposal that we made to a joint session of HR and another committee that talked about our workload and how we had to reassign things so we do have basically four and a half people who concentrate on the CIP Program. The program is handling certainly the HUD programs, which is \$3 million a year as well as administering CIP projects, which is roughly \$50 million a year. So, relatively speaking we have a small staff assigned to that function but the number of special projects in particular we have kind of had to push down projects to administrative employees. I apologize that I did not...I can talk about the four and a half staff people if you would like.

Alderman DeVries replied I would like to see something a little more graphically to try to understand it and put it all into perspective. I guess your second statement or second sentence of the letter that you prepared for us addresses positions such as Planner I and II have had to assume the leadership roles and you are talking about the administration of million dollar grant programs, as well as some community programs that they are involved in and then later on you discuss the \$3 million, which would be the CDBG program. It is probably clarification as to who is working on what portions of the CIP budget that I would find helpful. Also a better understanding as to how the duties that were previously carried by the Administrative Assistant...I mean who will be doing that if this person is assuming something different from their job description who is replacing them and is that going to lead us to a new position or an additional need for personnel.

Mr. MacKenzie responded not at this point. We did again at that joint meeting we presented the amount of work that we had. We did talk about the need for potentially two employees. The Board did say that we could hire a Special Projects Planner using HUD funds, not City money and we have been in the process of trying to hire that person. That person would be focused primarily on the Community Master Plan that we have to update for probably 12-18 months but we have not filled that spot yet.

Alderman Forest stated I have a couple of questions and one for Ginny also. Bob, would this be a salaried position that you are asking for?

Mr. MacKenzie responded no this is a non-exempt position, not a salaried position.

Alderman Forest asked do you have money in your budget if we agree to allow this.

Mr. MacKenzie answered yes. We do not have money for general raises but we had money available for this upgrade, which is fairly modest. It is a one grade step and I think it is about \$1,600 a year.

Alderman Forest asked, Ginny, are you recommending this upgrade.

Virginia Lamberton, HR Director, answered yes I am. The incumbent is fulfilling higher level responsibilities and our system says that when that happens they are entitled to be graded at the level of their duties and responsibilities.

Alderman DeVries stated I guess you raised or you touched on the second half of my line of questioning which was...I thought it was two CDBG grant funded positions that we had authorized in your department, both of which were Planners. Would this person be assuming one of those...would a portion or all of her salary be underwritten by CDBG?

Mr. MacKenzie replied this particular position, what we do is we actually fund it with City monies but then we get reimbursement for most of her salary from HUD. That reimbursement actually goes back into the general fund as a revenue. So it is probably 90-95% reimbursable by HUD.

Alderman DeVries asked and that would continue with the upgrade.

Mr. MacKenzie answered yes.

Alderman DeVries asked would you lose any portion of that 95% reimbursement if she was not upgraded.

Mr. MacKenzie answered no.

Alderman DeVries asked so with the 95% reimbursement that is why you have the money in your budget today. Your budget is being reimbursed by Federal dollars?

Mr. MacKenzie answered yes it is being reimbursed although that money comes back to the City as revenues. It does not come directly to our department.

Alderman DeVries stated I would ask when you prepare something graphically for me to help me understand the different CDBG or CIP personnel and what they are responsible for and maybe just give me a little bit of detail as to what portion of the CIP budget they are responsible for. Could you also reference which ones are CDBG funded? I think it would be helpful for overall knowledge for me to understand that portion. I would ask that we table this pending that information.

Alderman DeVries moved to table the item. Alderman Garrity duly seconded the motion. The motion carried with Alderman Sysyn being duly recorded in opposition.

Chairman Shea addressed Item 4 of the agenda:

Communication from Virginia Lamberton, HR Director, recommending the City authorize her to contract with Boston Mutual Insurance Company for the term life and accidental death and dismemberment insurance and with CIGNA for the long-term disability insurance.

Alderman Garrity moved to approve the request. Alderman Sysyn duly seconded the motion.

Alderman DeVries stated what I think I want to clarify with Ginny is this is a result of our consultant who has been working on our behalf and has found us some additional savings. It looks like it has going from \$106,000 to \$74,000.

Ms. Lamberton responded the short answer is yes. Jack Sherry from Group Benefit Strategies is here and Ginger Hastings who works with us. This was done through an RFP. We had lots of responses to our RFP's for both plans, both policies, and we worked with Group Benefit Strategies to come up with a final proposal.

Alderman DeVries stated it appears that not only is it a reduction in the cost to the City but there is some minor tweaking or improvements to the policies is that correct.

Ms. Lamberton responded first of all it is a major savings from what we are paying now to begin with and even...well what we would be paying in the future obviously. The other thing is there was one concern with the elective insurances the employees were really paying a lot – the City wasn't because the employees elected to buy that. So this is a win-win situation. The City saves money and the employees save money on both of these plans when they elect to insure their spouses or elected to have more disability insurance.

Alderman Gatsas asked Ginny can you tell me how many...what has been the total expenditure by the insurance companies on the death benefit.

Ms. Lamberton answered I don't have that type of information with me.

Alderman Gatsas stated I believe that I had asked these questions probably four years ago when this was before Administration and my understanding was that

there were approximately two employees per year on average that were passing away and it was about a \$50,000 payment in claims. I am looking at just the portion of life and accidental death and dismemberment and why we wouldn't self-insure that portion.

Ms. Lamberton responded I was not here four years ago, however, I have heard you talk about that and I remember inquiring about that through our current broker and it was determined that, in fact, we had more deaths and we paid out more money than we did pay in premiums.

Alderman Gatsas asked do we have an idea of what that is.

Ms. Lamberton answered that is like two years old I believe. I really don't remember off the top of my head.

Alderman Gatsas asked Jack did you do any...

Chairman Shea interjected can we have Jack and Ginger come forward please and identify yourselves.

Mr. Jack Sherry stated I am President of Group Benefit Strategies.

Ms. Ginger Hastings stated I am Assistant Vice President of GBS Insurance Agency.

Alderman Gatsas asked was there any analysis done where most of the insurance products in the City, vis a vie liability and vis a vie worker's compensation, partially self-insured on health insurance...did anybody take a look at being self-insured on accidental death and dismemberment and the death benefit portion.

Ms. Hastings answered we did not ask for a self-insured life or AD&D. We felt that based on the premium and what the City was paying it really didn't make sense. The premiums are so low in comparison to what you see out there. Additionally, all of the carriers that quoted did have loss ratio information from the prior carrier so they could make that judgement as far as whether or not to rate it.

Mr. Sherry stated based on the quotes and the savings that were quoted, the loss ratio was pretty good.

Alderman Gatsas responded I would say by looking at that rate that it should be something that we should be entertaining to be self-insured because it looks like the loss ratio is extremely good.

Mr. Sherry replied based on the responses that we got you would have to draw that conclusion.

Ms. Hastings stated if two people were to die and let's say they were to get the \$50,000 you are talking \$100,000 and you are paying \$74,000 so that is \$25,000 that you don't have that is on the insurance company.

Alderman Gatsas responded right but I don't think the insurance company would be giving you a quote of \$71,000 if the average death per year was \$100,000 because they would be losing somewhere in the vicinity of \$29,000 giving you that quote. I agree with what Jack is saying. Probably the loss ratio must be less than \$100,000 for them to be quoting you at \$71,000 I would think.

Ms. Lamberton stated I have a couple of things. One is you may be right and you may not be right. We weren't prepared to discuss that tonight. The second thing is remember that our workforce is aging. We have a lot of baby boomers, people in their 50's and 60's now and the odds are starting to work against us on who is going to live and who isn't going to live. Group Benefit Strategies, we beat them down. If you look at the original proposals that came in, they are quite different than the end result. That was our role to get these insurance companies to want to have business with us so bad that they would reduce their rates and we feel we were successful at that.

Mr. Sherry stated the other side of the question is if the loss ratio wasn't that great then you would draw the conclusion that one or more of them might be attempting to buy the business for the first year but then they backed it up with guarantees so we felt that whatever the motive was that we achieved a savings but as has been said we weren't asked to look at it on a self-funded basis. Based on what we got your experience was either good and the rates were too high or the experience wasn't good and somebody wanted to step in and "buy" the business and back it up with rate guarantees, which was always a suspect when you see somebody come in low. The theory is somebody is going to buy the business and we are going to get whacked next year but we have a four-year rate guarantee.

Alderman Gatsas asked if everybody is coming up at a pretty close number there aren't a lot of people looking to buy the business because if it is showing \$100,000 a year in payout there is no reason why somebody is buying a four year guarantee at \$71,000. You being the expert in the field.

Mr. Sherry answered sometimes they have other motives. I don't know what drove them to put the guarantees on the table and I don't have the answer other than the fact that obviously the process ended up with significantly lower rates.

Alderman Gatsas stated I have one last question. With you being the expert though looking at those numbers you have to believe that the loss ratio is very, very, very good being the expert.

Mr. Sherry responded I don't know how many verys I would put in it.

Alderman Gatsas replied I put in four because I think you are very, very good at what you do.

Mr. Sherry responded thank you and I think you are probably very right.

Alderman Gatsas asked what is your answer.

Mr. Sherry replied I didn't know I was asked a question.

Alderman Gatsas stated the question was that with you being the expert if somebody was locking in a four-year guarantee at a \$71,000 number what do the losses look like.

Mr. Sherry responded the conclusion would be that the loss ratio is pretty good.

Alderman DeVries asked so of the amount of the policy what is the cost share between employee...

Ms. Lamberton interjected the basic term life insurance is paid for in full by the City up to a benefit of \$50,000 if there is a death of a City employee. The employee may opt to purchase life insurance for their spouse or their children and that is at the employee's expense 100%.

Alderman DeVries asked so the risk factor in your mind is a judgement of the aging workforce.

Ms. Lamberton answered well that is a very serious consideration and the other thing is again as Jack said all we need is two people to unfortunately pass away and we are in the red already just in paying the pay out, not to mention the administrative fees that we would be paying to a third party administrator.

Alderman Gatsas stated I have to jump in just one more time Mr. Chairman. I certainly respect the Human Resources Director's opinion but I think that the insurance companies probably took that aging workforce into consideration. My

understanding is that two years ago the average was about 1.5 deaths per year. So when an insurance company gives you a quote Jack, correct me if I am wrong but they are not looking for a loss leader because they are not doing health insurance. So when they are giving you a four year quote and if we are talking about two lives at \$100,000 there is something wrong with this quote or we have a less than \$100,000 average in losses because they are taking \$100,000 worth of hits over four years. Would you agree?

Mr. Sherry responded well one would think that they wouldn't be. They had all of the information needed to quote the case. They had everything and they ended up with from the City's standpoint some significant savings. Now the question about could we have taken the risk, we being the City rather than the carrier, that is possibly something that could be looked at for next time I think. We would have to look at the loss ratio from Boston Mutual, which we will get.

Chairman Shea called for a vote on the motion to recommend authorizing the Human Resources Director to contract with CIGNA for the long term disability insurance and Boston Mutual for the term life and accidental death and dismemberment insurance. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Chairman Shea addressed Item 5 of the agenda:

Communication from Mayor Baines relating to formulation of an RFP seeking review of existing compensation system, existing points system, and detailed recommendations for improvements or alternatives to be considered.

Ms. Lamberton stated I don't know if you have the Mayor's letter in front of you but the essence of the letter was that myself, Kevin Clougherty and David Hodgen would get together and we would review the Mayor's letter and come up with, I think the letter said and RFP. However, when we met we felt we really weren't in a position to develop an RFP because we didn't have enough information and frankly we didn't have any funds if somebody were to bid on it. So what we decided to do was develop a Request for Information from different vendors and ask them as you can see from the handout. We asked tell us how much you would charge us to do the following bullets and give us some estimates and then we would put out an RFP assuming we had funding for that to have this accomplished.

Alderman DeVries asked, Ginny, do you have any idea if this was an RFP what sort of funds we might be seeking to accomplish this.

Ms. Lamberton answered I would say \$200,000 to \$300,000.

Chairman Shea asked how much did you say.

Ms. Lambertson answered I would say to do all of these things probably about \$200,000 or \$300,000.

Alderman DeVries asked how does this compare to the study that was done for the City about four years ago.

Ms. Lambertson answered it was 1999 or 1998 actually. That study was a little bit different because you had so many pay matrixes and that study included developing a point factor system rather than looking at the point factor system. So in order to validate the current system, a consultant would really need to come in and do some job analysis and have people fill out questionnaires and do position reviews to determine whether or not the system is appropriate and legitimate frankly.

Alderman DeVries stated but we also did an additional study maybe in 2000.

Ms. Lambertson responded yes in 2001 or early 2002 a mini salary survey was done by a consultant.

Alderman DeVries asked so how does...why are we not going in that direction today to repeat that where we are checking with other cities to see...

Ms. Lambertson interjected because that wasn't the instruction in the Mayor's letter. If I remember correctly and I don't believe I have the letter with me but the Mayor was responding or reacting to the criticisms of the current Yarger Decker system and the Yarger Decker system has many components to it. The point factor system, the number of salary grades, the number of steps we get, etc. and that is what we were trying to respond to in this Request for Information.

Alderman Lopez stated the Mayor's correspondence was sent to this Committee so if the Committee wants to add things to it I think it is important to review this whole process. When you say \$200,000 or \$300,000 I think that already puts something out there to the individual who is going to be looking at it. Whether or not there are some other items that the Committee wishes to put on here, looking at the original Yarger Decker report should be available as to what the grades are and some of the other reports that we have paid for should be available to this party and maybe that would save some money in order to find out exactly...I think if you go to the job descriptions that were previously made by and I can't think of the name of the individual but he picked out certain aspects of the Yarger Decker report supposedly to correspond with it but I think in that particular report there

wasn't any management type of individuals or deputy type of individuals. I would just pass that on to the Committee.

Alderman Garrity asked Ginny this RFI is no cost to the City correct.

Ms. Lamberton answered no. When you do an RFI you are just requesting information from people to determine whether or not you even want to go forward or you can afford to go forward. Alderman Lopez's comments are well taken and we would provide them with that kind of information.

Alderman Garrity stated I think it was about two years ago that we got that report about surrounding communities and such and I would like to see that at the next Human Resources Committee. Maybe we could have it as part of the agenda.

Ms. Lamberton responded I believe that was forwarded to all of you at the request of Alderman Gatsas about a month or so ago. Maybe in November. The other thing I would say about that particular analysis was yes it was done but it was only half done in my opinion. The questions that were asked were how much do you pay your computer operator. An easy example would be how much do you pay your Highway Director. There wasn't any follow-up to questions like that like how many programs is that Director responsible for, what is the capital budget of that person, how many employees do they have.

Alderman Garrity replied it is a start. It is something that we have already. I understand that it is not everything we need but I would like to see it.

Alderman Forest asked Ginny this is strictly for information purposes for this Committee right now correct.

Ms. Lamberton answered I bring it to you per the instructions of the Mayor to do as you see fit.

Alderman Forest stated why don't we just let Ginny or whoever do this, get the information back to us and then we can make a reasonable decision when it is all in. The other thing is I don't know how long this is going to take but we should set a time limit.

Ms. Lamberton responded we would. The first paragraph says you have to get this to us by a certain date.

Alderman Forest stated once we get the information then we can tweak it to what we want.

Ms. Lamberton replied right that is why it also says please give us prices in components.

Alderman Forest moved to recommend that the Human Resources Director be allowed to send out a Request for Information regarding review of the existing compensation system and report back to the Committee. Alderman Sysyn duly seconded the motion. Chairman Shea called for a vote. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Chairman Shea addressed Item 6 of the agenda:

Tuition reimbursement policy referred back to Committee by Board on December 21, 2004.

Alderman Forest stated I think the only reason this is back in Committee is that we had an error last time.

Alderman Forest moved to approve the tuition reimbursement policy. Alderman Sysyn duly seconded the motion. Chairman Shea called for a vote. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Alderman Garrity stated I would like to have Mrs. Porter address some concerns that she has and update the Committee.

Joan Porter, Tax Collector, stated at the last meeting when we discussed staff development and tuition reimbursement I had sent a letter in then addressing that part-time employees were removed from this tuition reimbursement policy this time. They have always been in it. I had asked in that letter if you would consider leaving them in because they have always been there and then I did just send a letter last week to each of you asking if you would consider putting the part-time employees back into the tuition reimbursement policy. I had spoken to Ginny about it and she said originally when she drafted the tuition reimbursement policy it was in there but she was out voted in her committee.

Alderman Garrity asked what committee was that.

Ms. Lamberton answered you may or may not recall about two or three months ago I had proposed a tuition reimbursement policy and Kevin Clougherty came and asked that it be taken off the agenda and tabled and that he have an opportunity to review it with me and the City Solicitor so we did meet and it was the City Solicitor and myself and Seth Wall from the Mayor's Office. The majority of people in the room felt that the part-timers should not be included in the tuition reimbursement policy. My role was to get it back here and that is what

I did. However, I would just like to qualify something. Formerly because we really didn't have a City policy, that is why we are here, on tuition reimbursement or staff development, part-timers I believe had to work at least half time and then the reimbursement would be prorated based on the number of hours they worked upward. So if you are going to put part-timers in my advice would be to make sure that we put in a minimum of 20 hours a week and have it prorated based on the number of hours they work so that we don't have somebody work one day a week and then pay their whole tuition.

Mrs. Porter responded that is what the handbook says.

On motion of Alderman Sysyn, duly seconded by Alderman Garrity it was voted to add part-time employees who work a minimum of 20 hours into the tuition reimbursement policy and that the amount of reimbursement shall be prorated based on the number of hours worked.

TABLED ITEM

Communication from Joan Porter, Tax Collector, relative to part-time employees.

On motion of Alderman Garrity, duly seconded by Alderman Sysyn it was voted to remove the item from the table.

Alderman Garrity asked didn't we take care of this already.

Chairman Shea answered no this is Item 7.

Alderman Sysyn stated it says pending legal opinion from City Solicitor. Do we have that?

Thomas Arnold, Deputy City Solicitor, stated after reviewing the minutes of the last meeting I believe what the question was was whether ordinance 33.062 and 33.063 would apply to the situation at hand, namely Mrs. Porter's employee in the Tax Office and I came to the conclusion that it does clearly, in fact, apply to that employee. So those ordinances do apply in that under 33.063 a part-time employee would have to work 2,080 hours before they would be come eligible for a step.

Alderman Garrity asked so they fall under the temporary/seasonal employees. Is that your opinion?

Deputy Solicitor Arnold answered no. If you look at 33.062 it says, “an employee occupying a position designated as FLSA Non-Exempt and who is employed on a part-time basis shall be paid on an hourly basis according to the provisions of 33.063.” So they treat the employees similarly but it is a part-time employee, not a temporary/seasonal employee.

Chairman Shea asked Ginny do you have any comments or explanations to help the Committee here.

Ms. Lamberton answered well obviously I agree with Tom Arnold. Often times in ordinances or laws you have a standard for compensation and if you have other groups of people you can reference a standard that is already written and that is what I did when I did this. It was very deliberate what I did in 2002 that part-timers should be required to work the same number of hours as full-time employees to receive a step increase.

Chairman Shea asked how many part-time employees do we have.

Ms. Lamberton answered we currently have 40 part-time employees outside of the Police Department and then we have 47 part-time employees in the Police Department who are crossing guards but they are part-time employees.

Chairman Shea asked so any change in the ordinance would affect them as well as anyone...

Ms. Lamberton interjected it would affect any part-time employee.

Alderman Forest asked wouldn't crossing guards come under seasonal.

Ms. Lamberton answered no. I think attached to your agenda is a list of all of the part-time employees that tells you their position and how many hours they work.

Alderman DeVries stated I think I brought this up the last time this item was brought before us. What I have difficulty with is it seems to be there is overlap. We have an employee review that is part of our wage...a yearly wage review that a department head or supervisor would fill out on an individual. It would seem to me that that would be the litmus test that would measure whether or not an individual was performing comparable to another individual if they were in the same job specification. Where I am heading with this is if a department head or supervisor said that their growth is equal to a full-time employee the fact that they are only working half time to me shouldn't be a disqualifier for a step if they are putting forth the work. I really think that the annual performance review needs to be strictly enforced if you will to determine whether or not they have met that test.

To say that they are not eligible and I think Joan Porter in her letter to us made it pretty clear that a part-time employee to be eligible for their first step needs to work three years. Now if they have been working at the same standard...

Chairman Shea interjected excuse me but you say no, Ginny.

Ms. Lamberton responded if they are half time then they would have to work two years but in the meantime they are getting the cost of living increases assuming they are half time.

Alderman DeVries asked so it would be the beginning of the third year that they would be eligible for their increase. I guess my point is if they are performing...if they have been an exceptionally sharp individual that in half the time was able to grasp the scope and perform the same as a 40 hour a week employee I don't see why we wouldn't want to reward them for that.

Ms. Lamberton answered first of all the level of compensation that any employee gets is based on your point factor system, which establishes the level of responsibilities for the duties and the education and all of that stuff. A grade is assigned to that so an employee is put in that labor grade. That is the equality right there. Then the City is generous enough to have 13 steps and it says that you have to do this, this and that to get from one step to the next. You can also have employees that are maxed out. Is that fair? You can have employees that have steps withheld. There are all kinds of complicating factors but the fact is that they are still at the same grade. I don't think it is appropriate to pay a part-time steps at the same pace as you are paying a full-timer. You are not providing them with all of the other equal benefits. You are not providing health or dental insurance. You are not providing life insurance. You are not providing anything else so why would you do that to part-timers? That is a choice. Again, you see part-timers who are good who get hired for the full-time jobs when they come open. It is a way people get in the system too to work part-time.

Alderman DeVries stated we have a difference of opinion.

Chairman Shea asked what would the Committee like to do.

Alderman Forest stated I just need an explanation. If we vote to accept this that would mean the part-time employees would be getting their steps at a faster rate?

Ms. Lamberton responded Tom Arnold can correct me if I am wrong but the ordinance is the ordinance so the ordinance would actually have to be changed to reflect anything different, whatever that is.

Deputy Solicitor Arnold stated that is correct.

Alderman Forest asked so if we vote yes we are changing the ordinance.

Deputy Solicitor Arnold answered no. You would need to have an ordinance prepared and presented for consideration or make a recommendation that the ordinance be changed.

Alderman Forest responded that is what I am asking. So if we vote yes it would be a recommendation to change the ordinance. I agree that a part-time should work the same amount of hours. If they are only working 20 hours a week I agree that it should take them twice as long to get whatever they get.

Deputy Solicitor Arnold stated what I would suggest is if the Committee's inclination is to change the ordinance perhaps what you ought to do is ask that an ordinance be prepared and brought back to this Committee for consideration.

Alderman Garrity stated Tom you said an ordinance change. Which ordinance should be changed?

Deputy Solicitor Arnold responded in the context of what we are discussing if you do not want to include temporary and seasonal employees what you would have to do is change 33.062(b) either to amend it so that it is on a time basis or perhaps refer to another section. We obviously could not refer to 33.063 without changing that section also. I am not clear if that is your intent.

Alderman Garrity asked so if we were to receive and file you would still recommend an ordinance change. Is that what you are saying?

Deputy Solicitor Arnold answered no. If you receive and file I wouldn't think that that is a request that somebody report back to you with an ordinance. I would think that is received and filed.

Chairman Shea stated the only implication is and Ginny if the ordinance were changed what would be the financial implication here.

Ms. Lamberton responded I don't really have any numbers for that to be honest with you. I would have to go back and figure that out. I don't know what the impact would be. I am not talking about financial impact now, I am talking about equity. Does the City want to start giving crossing guards step increases...crossing guards work two or three hours a day so after six months are we going to start giving them step increases and then after twelve months another

step, etc. The Police Chief isn't here but I don't think that would go too well in his budget.

Chairman Shea stated we are kind of going into every budget in the City here by...

Ms. Lamberton interjected all of the departments with part-time people.

Chairman Shea stated so all of the departments would come in with a higher amount of money for budgetary concerns. I don't know where we are leading here.

Alderman Garrity moved to table pending a report on the fiscal impact from Human Resources.

Alderman Forest stated why don't we just receive and file it.

Alderman DeVries stated I am not sure if this would be a question for you, Ginny, or legal but if we wish to address this and have a cut off on part-time employees and say they must work 20 hours a week in order to be eligible for a faster pace step increase would that be legal. Can we do that?

Ms. Lamberton responded you can do it. An ordinance would have to be proposed and passed.

Chairman Shea stated one of the problems that I see here is the fact that we really haven't clearly defined at least in our minds what a part-time worker really is. In other words my thoughts run along the lines before we do anything we should find out what we truly believe a part-time worker is. In other words can we get a definition that we can agree on. In other words can we separate part-time workers and call them something different than people who only work two hours a week or four hours a week and say there is a distinction between those working twenty hours a week and those only working five or ten hours a week because many people on this list work twenty hours. We just don't have one person working twenty hours in the Tax Collector's office. We have people working in your office, Ginny, working twenty hours. We also have other people working like you say four hours a day that may be crossing guards or other people who work in different types of areas. What we are trying to do is grapple with the fact that we have part-time workers who under a different situation are paying retirement benefits and things like that I believe or doing certain things and other part-time workers who aren't and it is kind of all over the lot.

Ms. Lamberton responded just for starters if I may a full-time employee is one who works 40 hours or more a week. A part-timer is one who works less than that. Then you have other categories of employees. You may have a temporary

employee who works full-time but only works to fill in for Mary who is out sick. It is a temporary full-time employee. You could have a temporary part-time employee because they are working less than 40 and then you have seasonal employees who work 40 hours but they only work for a season like the summer season or winter season. So a part-timer very simply is one who works less than 40 hours.

Chairman Shea replied I think we have defined temporary workers but I don't think we have figured out how we can break down and categorize part-time workers.

Ms. Lamberton responded it is less than 40.

Alderman DeVries stated I think there is a whole other part to this that the Committee needs to consider in that as we work through some very difficult budgets many of our departments have become innovative in trying to employ part-time people because they don't have to pay them the same level of benefits to fill the gap. I, for one, really don't think that we should be doing something that is working against that. If a department head has come through and said these are highly qualified individuals, they are lucky to get them at a lesser expense to the City to fill these positions why wouldn't we want to try to be supportive of that. I agree with Alderman Shea that we do need some more information. I wonder if we should reconsider the Request for Information we just looked at since we are going to be dealing with our wage classifications if you will and maybe add to that a piece that would help us understand how other communities have dealt with a less than 40 hour per week employee. That might be a simple way for us to devise some standards. Are other communities treating them with increases more frequently than the City of Manchester does? It is definitely a cost savings tool that we don't want to discourage. It is advantageous to the City and the budget.

Ms. Lamberton responded I would be happy to add that into the Request for Information.

Alderman DeVries duly seconded the motion to. Chairman Shea called for a vote. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

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

A True Record. Attest.

Clerk of Committee