COMMITTEE ON HUMAN RESOURCES/INSURANCE

January 23, 2008 **5:00 PM**
Aldermen Gatsas, Lopez, **Aldermanic Chambers**
Pinard, Shea, Garrity **City Hall (3rd Floor)**

Chairman Gatsas called the meeting to order.

The Clerk called the roll.

Present: Aldermen Gatsas, Lopez, Pinard, Garrity

Absent: Alderman Shea

Messrs: D. Van Zanten, P. Martineau, V. Lamberton

Chairman Gatsas addressed item 3 of the agenda:

3. Communication from Virginia Lamberton, Human Resources Director, submitting an ordinance amendment providing for changes in title and salary grades pursuant to recent union contracts for Police and Fire positions.

On motion of Alderman Garrity, duly seconded by Alderman Lopez, it was voted to discuss this item.

Alderman Garrity stated I assume this has all been negotiated and approved by the Board. Is that correct?

Ms. Virginia Lamberton, Human Resources Director, stated if you remember, in the Police and Fire contracts it was one grade up, two steps back. And then we had talked about…it would have an impact on positions in other departments. In the computer system you can't have two separate grades for one job title, so what we're doing here is, the ones that got the one grade up will have a job title of Custodial Services Supervisor, Police, Salary Grade 18. The other Custodial Services Supervisor will be a 17. May I just ask another question too? I didn't realize until after I read this letter that the Parking Control Officers and the Police, what we call Reserve Officers, who are actually paid as patrolmen, did not get the

grade because they're not in the contracts because they're part-time people. Do you want to give them the same grade as the full-timers? Or do you want to continue to pay them at a lesser grade? Are you with me?

Chairman Gatsas asked what's the financial impact?

Ms. Lamberton responded I don't know because they're very part-time, as needed. Reserve Officers are totally separate beasts. They get called in to fill in the holes for when our regular force can't work.

Alderman Lopez stated I don't believe that the Reserve Officers apply to that because the Reserve Officers are the ones that we pay separately, except for one day a month that they use them as Reserve Officers. But otherwise they're paid out of a separate account.

Ms. Lamberton stated they are paid in different ways. You're right. But when they're actually functioning as a patrolman for the day, they get a grade less than the regular patrolmen.

Alderman Garrity asked the Parking Control Officers, they were in the Patrolmen's Union, right?

Ms. Lamberton responded I believe so.

Alderman Garrity stated so it worked out just like the firefighter…

Ms. Lamberton stated mechanic or something.

Alderman Garrity asked did they go one grade up? Two steps back and a grade up?

Ms. Lamberton stated the full time Parking Control Officers went up one grade, back two steps, yes. But we have a few part-timers that supplement the full-timers.

Alderman Garrity asked are the part-timers members of the Patrolmen's Union?

Ms. Lamberton responded no, they are not. Okay, I just wanted to check.

Chairman Gatsas asked do I have a motion on Ms. Lamberton's position?

Alderman Garrity made a motion to approve this ordinance amendment. Alderman Pinard duly seconded the motion.

Chairman Gatsas asked and that's saying that there is no one step forward, two steps back?

Ms. Lamberton stated for the part-timers.

There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Alderman Lopez stated just to make sure that I'm very clear, Mrs. Lamberton, in reference to the Reserve Officers, because they're going to stay the same, because X number of dollars goes into that special account. Do we agree on that?

Ms. Lamberton responded yes.

Chairman Gatsas addressed item 4 of the agenda:

4. Communication from Virginia Lamberton, Human Resources Director, advising of a recent audit of positions at the Library, and submitting an ordinance amendment providing for increases in salary grades for Library Clerk I and Library Clerk II positions.

On motion of Alderman Lopez, duly seconded by Alderman Garrity, it was voted to discuss this item.

Alderman Lopez asked can I have the Library Director up, please? I read over this and it sort of…everything's pushed together here. Could you maybe give us a little synopsis of what we're really doing here and what savings we have so I completely understand it?

Ms. Denise Van Zanten, Library Director, stated there's no savings per se, because it's going to be an increase in their salary and benefits with this upgrade. The positions, when they were first classified by Yarger Decker about ten years ago, we were not using the computer system that we're currently using. It's an automated, integrated library system, so they're not being compensated based on what other library clerks are being compensated at other libraries in the state. So there is going to be an increase in their salary and benefits because there would be a two pay grade jump for each of these positions.

Alderman Garrity asked do you have the money in your budget to cover the cost this year?

Ms. Van Zanten responded currently I do. We do have a surplus in our salary line due to some turnover.

Alderman Garrity stated and the justification is because it's not the same grade as other library clerks in the state. Is that what you stated?

Ms. Van Zanten explained well the thing is, they are not compensated at the same level as their colleagues at other libraries. When Yarger Decker classified them, it didn't take into account the computer skills that are required of the job, the customer service skills. What we're trying to do is upgrade their job descriptions to reflect the jobs that they do every single day.

Alderman Garrity asked are these personnel members of the bargaining unit?

Ms. Van Zanten responded yes.

Alderman Garrity asked are other libraries in the state…do they have bargaining units?

Ms. Van Zanten responded yes.

Alderman Garrity asked Ms. Lamberton, is there a reason why we're doing this in…that it wasn't negotiated in the recent negotiations?

Ms. Lamberton explained we do not negotiate classifications.

Ms. Van Zanten stated they asked us about it during negotiations and we said that if they came forward with their information, the library would support them in their effort, but it would not be part of their contract.

Ms. Lamberton stated just so you know, all employees are told that, that we don't negotiate classifications.

Alderman Lopez asked Ms. Lamberton, could you elaborate a little the statement in reference to 'these types of duties are performed on a full time basis by other City employees.' Library clerks versus other employees?

Ms. Lamberton responded can you tell me what paragraph you're referring to?

Alderman Lopez stated the seventh paragraph.

Ms. Lamberton stated what I'm trying to say is that in addition to having the technical knowledge that they have to work in a library, they also…a very important, integral part of their job is customer service and dealing with the public. That's what they do, okay? And so if you go to other departments around

the City and you go into Ordinance Violations, you go into the Tax office, etceteras, those employees are making higher grades than the library clerks are making, and yet the large percentage of their job is dealing with the same clientele, the public. And so, it's just a double standard that we're applying here unless we recognize that they are dealing with the public. Their specialty is library science, versus tax laws and motor vehicle laws and parking laws and City Clerk laws, okay? And so that's the variance in their level of pay that I'm recommending. But they still have a lot of responsibility in dealing with the public, and the public does complain if they don't get instant satisfaction. And they are rude. They deal with a lot of street people. I've heard stories that are funny but they're scary too, at the library.

Alderman Lopez asked this year is going to cost you $14,928 in addition?

Ms. Van Zanten responded that's what we're roughly estimating, between $12,000 and $14,000.

Alderman Lopez asked what's that going to transform into in 2009, do you know?

Ms. Van Zanten responded it's going to be roughly a $43,000 increase in salary and benefits for these positions.

Chairman Gatsas asked can I get an explanation first of how much those positions currently are and what the increases go to?

Ms. Van Zanten responded right now the full complement for fiscal year 2008 is…

Chairman Gatsas stated I'm just looking for these two positions and what they're being paid today.

Ms. Van Zanten asked their starting salaries?

Chairman Gatsas stated no. Whatever…you're looking for a $14,000 increase for this year for two people.

Ms. Van Zanten clarified it's not two people; it's twelve people. There are twelve people in this classification between both libraries.

Chairman Gatsas asked and those twelve people are currently earning, what's the total amount? I want to see what the percentage amount increase is for next year.

Ms. Van Zanten responded okay, currently on fiscal year 2008 their salaries would be roughly $303,000. And we're estimating $337,164 for 2009.

Chairman Gatsas stated well then it's not a $43,000 increase.

Ms. Van Zanten explained that's just salaries. And then benefits are another $10,000.

Ms. Lamberton explained because your retirement increases and your Social Security match increases, okay?

Chairman Gatsas stated so the number is $303,000 and that goes to $337,164 in the salary line. So that's $34,000 in wages and the other $9,000 is in benefits?

Ms. Van Zanten responded yes.

Chairman Gatsas stated so that's an increase of almost 11%, a wage increase.

Ms. Lamberton explained it's not an increase of 11%, because it's an increase in a budget amount of money. When you move them from one classification to another, you give them the equivalent of one step. So for the individuals it's a three percent increase.

Chairman Gatsas stated I'm looking at a gross number and it says that it's eleven percent. So if we're only giving people a three percent increase what happens to the other eight percent?

Ms. Lamberton explained well people…when you're calculating this stuff, you're calculating if they're due for a step increase. Somebody may actually end up with a six percent increase because…you have to understand, it's just from…say it's approved March 1st, just for the heck of it. So on March 1st they all get a three percent increase based on the ordinance, the reclassifications. But on March 15th somebody is due a longevity step, which is another three and a half percent, and so that person…that's how it just keeps getting complicated. Do you see what I mean?

Chairman Gatsas stated well then my suggestion is that what we need to get is a list of all the employees and how those steps work, because my concern is that it's an 11% increase in the budget.

Ms. Lamberton stated it's not 11%.

Ms. Van Zanten stated my calculations are including step increases where they are entitled to them and longevity for those two years. It's not just the promotional increase.

Alderman Garrity asked what would the budget line item be…let's say they don't…I'd like to know what your budget line item for salary for these folks at their current grade is versus what it will be when they get their grade up one.

Ms. Van Zanten stated currently it's $298,000…

Alderman Garrity interjected asking but does that include all the steps? Ginny just said that some of them could be getting steps next year. Does that include some people getting steps next year?

Ms. Van Zanten responded that's based on where they are right now. Next year, yes, some of them are at the top of their pay scale right now, and when they jump over with the increases they'll still be at the top of their pay scales.

Ms. Lamberton added and some of them won't be. Some of them will now be entitled to steps again because of where they fall out on the new grade.

Alderman Garrity asked so there is an impact? It's not just a one grade increase? It's a step increase too?

Ms. Lamberton stated well what you do is…what the ordinance says is…let's just say for the heck of it, the person is making two dollars an hour at grade eight. And one step is three dollars an hour. So you look at grade 10 and see what step is three dollars an hour in grade 10, and that's where they go to in the new grade.

Alderman Garrity stated my concern is the numbers aren't lying, and it's going to be a very challenging budget next year. That's my concern.

Ms. Lamberton stated but it still doesn't…you have to remember these people are performing work at that level and…

Alderman Garrity asked can they grieve it?

Ms. Lamberton responded they cannot grieve it but they could sue you. I mean, you have an HR director telling you that they're not being paid properly, and I based it on an evaluation of their job in comparison to other jobs around the City that are around the same pay level, and they're just not being paid properly.

Alderman Garrity asked who requested the desk audit?

Ms. Van Zanten responded I did, based on the staff's request to their direct supervisor. And they filled out all their paperwork and did all due diligence for me to bring forward to Ginny.

Alderman Lopez stated I agree with the desk audit and I agree with what you're saying, but as you're well aware of, the cost of employees is getting deeper and deeper, and with the union contracts and everything else, and we, the Aldermen have approved all that. But we don't know where the budget is going to go, so if this thing goes forward, you know, then the decision, whatever your bottom line budget is, it's your decision as to what happens in order to take care of ten employees or twelve employees or eleven employees. Those are the decisions that are going to have to come upon you as a department head. So for fairness with the employees, I don't mind being fair, and I'm satisfied that we're taking and looking at this stuff and being fair, but the cost is going up and up and up, and as you're well aware of. I just wanted to make that comment.

Chairman Gatsas asked Ms. Lamberton, let's assume this desk audit…and I understand it, but you're basing it on other positions in the City.

Ms. Lamberton stated a desk audit isn't that simple.

Chairman Gatsas stated let me just finish and then you can give me an answer. The question was a little longer than what you wanted to give me an answer to. Based on the positions that these people have, a desk audit was requested, and that desk audit was done on comparables to other positions that do the same level of work as these people. So the desk audit obviously created…you looked at the desk audit and said, yes, they qualify for the person in the Clerk's office that does clerk duties; they qualify for the same level as the person that's in the Tax Collector's office for collecting taxes. But what if we did it the opposite way and said the people that are doing the jobs in those other departments come down to this salary grade?

Ms. Lamberton responded well, whenever a position review takes place, it can go up, it can go down, or it can stay the same. And I come here recommending positions go down and it gets tabled for a month, due to friends and family. This is my last night so I get a little freedom! They are not equal to the positions in the City Clerk's office or the Tax office, frankly.

Chairman Gatsas asked are you saying they are above or below?

Ms. Lamberton responded I'm saying they're below. And nobody had asked me to review the positions in the City Clerk's office or the Tax office or Ordinance Violations, or any other departments that have customer service type people. We

also have office assistants that perform these type of duties. I'm trying to think, right off the top of my head I think, Youth Services…I think Youth Services has an office assistant that answers the phones and stuff, and I think these jobs are a little more complex than that. I mean, I don't know. I haven't done a desk audit, the minimal amount of information that I have but…typically employees or department heads or both come forward requesting position reviews. And these employees have been asking for it for a couple of years actually.

Chairman Gatsas asked a desk audit? Why hasn't it been done sooner then?

Ms. Lamberton responded I think because they are really busy, and to do that, you have to sit down, you have to be organized; they often times will…unless somebody has unique duties, they do a group questionnaire or a couple of group questionnaires to demonstrate the responsibilities in different parts of the library. Then there a couple…there's one in here anyway that has totally unique duties and so we took her out of the pile. She did her own questionnaire. It takes time, and when you're really busy, do you go and take care of the customers or do you go out back and fill out a questionnaire. And I find that over the years, that's what happens. The busier people are, the longer it takes them to get the paperwork done.

Alderman Pinard asked would it be proper to table this item seeing that we're going into the budget process and they just got a raise from the union? And I think it's pretty quick, and then looking at what's going on around us from today and tomorrow and the stock market and the country, maybe this would be the time to start looking at some of this stuff, because in the long run, the taxpayers in the community and elsewhere are going to get hurt by what's going on. My recommendation is a motion to table.

Chairman Gatsas responded I won't accept that motion until we finish discussion. I don't think it's fair to employees that certainly have just found the time to do desk audits and they've found that they are under-positioned, that we should… just because we're probably six months away from, or four months away from getting a final budget. Certainly the Mayor will have the opportunity to go back to the department head and she's going to have to deal with what she wants to deal with, and if it's twelve bodies in there and there's only enough funding for eleven then she's going to have to make the tough choice. So those are the choices that we're going to have to make during the budget cycle.

Alderman Lopez stated I agree, Mr. Chairman. That's why I brought that particular point up. She does have the surplus to take care of 2008, and my recommendation is that we approve it and see where the budget goes in 2009, and as a department head, she'll have to make a decision.

Alderman Lopez made a motion to approve this ordinance amendment. The motion was duly seconded by Chairman Gatsas.

Chairman Gatsas called for a vote. The motion failed. Alderman Lopez and Chairman Gatsas voted yea; Aldermen Garrity and Pinard voted nay.

Alderman Lopez asked Mr. Chairman, would it be permissible to send this to the full Board?

Chairman Gatsas stated I've got a real problem. We just did salary increases in item 3, and because it was Police and Fire, is that what kind of moved us around?

Alderman Garrity stated Mr. Chairman, that was negotiated.

Chairman Gatsas stated well, I don't think the part-timers were negotiated.

Alderman Garrity stated we didn't do the part-timers.

Chairman Gatsas stated right, we moved the contracts because they were simultaneously the same as other people in the City.

Alderman Garrity stated I believe it was under the advice of the Human Resources director that it was recommended because it was a negotiated item, was it not?

Ms. Lamberton asked what's that? I'm sorry.

Alderman Garrity stated Police and Fire.

Ms. Lamberton stated I did not agree with the recommendation to move the Police and Fire up one grade and back two steps.

Alderman Garrity stated but the reason why item 3 on the agenda had to move forward was because it was a negotiated item, was it not?

Ms. Lamberton explained but the ramifications of doing what you did…

Alderman Garrity interrupted correct and that was a negotiated item, agreed by this Board.

Ms. Lamberton stated this is different.

Alderman Garrity stated I know this one's different.

Ms. Lamberton stated negotiations are typically about cost of living. This is not. This is about compensating people equally for their level of duties and responsibilities.

Chairman Gatsas stated my suggestion, Ms. Lamberton, was that item 3…we just made changes in positions to get them out of a comparable position that wasn't a negotiated change, to other positions that have a new code of 5001. You made the new code because there was a comparable position in the City that was a lesser, two step up and one step down.

Ms. Lamberton added at a lower grade.

Chairman Gatsas stated so what you did is create these new positions.

Ms. Lamberton explained I created new class title codes for payroll purposes.

Chairman Gatsas stated I certainly have no problem sending it to the full Board.

On motion of Alderman Lopez, duly seconded by Alderman Pinard, it was voted to sent this item to the full Board. Alderman Garrity voted in opposition.

Chairman Gatsas addressed item 5 of the agenda:

5. Communication from Virginia Lamberton, Human Resources Director, requesting the establishment of two new part time security officer positions in the Welfare Department.

Alderman Garrity made a motion to approve this request because it's a public safety issue. Alderman Pinard seconded the motion.

Mr. Paul Martineau, Welfare Commissioner, stated I sent you a letter on November 15th. I don't know if everybody got that. But basically what I'm saying is we have clients…that we're dealing with people with criminal backgrounds, mental health problems, drug addiction. And so what's happening is we have two secure rooms but I have eight caseworkers. One is a caseworker receptionist. But I have seven caseworkers that have to deal with the clients that come in. And those that are belligerent or abusive that we know of, we see them in the secure rooms, but there's only two of those. Other clients have to come into our offices in the back, and obviously we have no way of knowing what the temperament is of some of these people. So when we deny them, some of these people, their language, I think they'd make truck drivers blush. My caseworkers have developed a higher tolerance for verbal abuse, but that's not good, because

once you start raising your voice or getting abusive, that's a sign that things are escalating. And we're seeing more and more of that. I've had caseworkers on my staff tell me they're concerned; they're afraid; they're all women. You know, you have a gentleman in there, he can be intimidating. And so, it's a safety factor, and I just think by getting these part-time security officers it's going to be an added deterrent to the situation we have now. We've been able to take care of things by saying we were going to call the police or I've interjected myself in situations. It's come back to me that somebody is going to blow my head off. It doesn't concern me too much, but if somebody is threatened as far as a caseworker, that does disturb me, so this is why I feel it's required. Now it's not budgeted, but I know that in my line items I'll be having some overages. Also, up to this point in revenues I've had over $18,000. So between now and the end of the year, you're only talking about $11,000. And it would be budgeted in, obviously, for next year.

Chairman Gatsas asked can you explain to me why you need two part-time people?

Mr. Martineau responded I had initially requested one full-time person, but this way, by getting part-time people, what happens is you save because they don't have all the benefits, and so forth, so it doesn't cost as much. I think that you have more flexibility also. If you add just one person and he's sick or he takes a vacation, you're not covered. This way, by having two part-time people, it's less of a cost and you've got complete coverage.

Chairman Gatsas asked are you looking to man the Welfare office for the full thirty-seven and a half hours?

Mr. Martineau responded we work about 35 hours. That's what we're dealing with. So one will probably be 18 and the other one 17, depending. But they wouldn't work over 20 hours.

Chairman Gatsas asked what's the additional cost in next year's budget?

Mr. Martineau responded about $26,000, some odd.

Alderman Garrity stated the reason why I'm in favor of this is I believe the safety of our employees is paramount over anything else, and I urge my colleagues to accept.

Chairman Gatsas stated I guess if you don't get enough in your budget, you're going to have to cut next year.

Mr. Martineau stated the way I look at it, in the last six years, I've returned over $1.1 million back to the City, either budget or revenue. So we're certainly not squandering. I've got caseworkers there…

Chairman Gatsas interrupted I just want…I don't have control over your budget. All I'm saying to you is we just told the Library that if they get the funding and they don't get it in their budget, they're going to have to cut, so you can add the two part-timers, and if the funding doesn't come in the budget, then you're going to have to cut.

Alderman Lopez stated I commend the Commissioner for the revenue that he has given back to the City. Let me just remind everybody that in Welfare, if they need money, by law we've got to give them the money, regardless of where it comes from. If we don't follow the rules over there like we have in the past, it could cost us $100,000 just for hotel rooms, to put people up in hotel rooms. I think those things have been eliminated. But the point I want to make is, under the law, if the Welfare Commissioner came to us and said I need $50,000 to put people up in hotels, we have to give it to him.

Chairman Gatsas stated I don't disagree, but you don't have to give it to him for payroll.

Alderman Lopez stated no, but the safety of the employees…

Chairman Gatsas interrupted I don't disagree with that.

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

Chairman Gatsas addressed item 6 of the agenda:

6. Communication from Virginia Lamberton, Human Resources Director, regarding a reorganization of the City Clerk's office, to be submitted at the meeting if available.

Alderman Garrity stated because I'm a stickler for stuff at our desk when we sit down, can we take a short recess? That way we can review this. I haven't had a chance to peruse through it yet. It was on our desk when we walked in.

On motion of Alderman Garrity, duly seconded by Alderman Pinard, it was voted to recess the meeting.

On motion of Alderman Garrity, duly seconded by Alderman Lopez, it was voted to come out of recess.

Ms. Lamberton stated as you know, Carol Johnson was appointed the City Clerk on December 31st at noontime, and she has worked in that office for a very long time. She has decided that as City Clerk she would like to run the office in a way that she thinks…and correct me if I'm wrong…is more efficient and will hold people more accountable. It will be clearer what the lines of authority are and who is responsible for what. And so the other thing was that the Board has made it very clear, both the Mayor and the Board, their opinion was that the City Clerk's office had too many titles of deputy in the office. And so the combination of those two factors sent Carol and Matt Normand to the drawing board, and they developed a proposed reorganization, and they worked with me, and the product you see in front of you is the end result of our joint work and efforts. And so, do you want me to walk you through it?

Chairman Gatsas asked so your recommendation is to move this forward?

Ms. Lamberton responded yes.

Chairman Gatsas stated the savings looks like it's $12,000 for the balance of this year and $13,000 for the balance of this year. What is it for next year?

Ms. Carol Johnson, City Clerk, responded as near as I can tell, and I do ask for some indulgence on this, I looked at the FY '09 budget and looked at the current numbers that we're putting together. I believe it's about a $40,000 savings, or a little more, for next year.

Alderman Garrity asked what's the savings for next fiscal year?

Ms. Johnson responded approximately $44,000.

Alderman Garrity asked will there be just yourself and your deputy, or is there going to be another deputy?

Ms. Johnson stated I'll walk through this a little bit if you'd like. There is only, under the proposed program before you, one Deputy City Clerk. We're at least going to attempt to do that and see how it works out. We may end up coming back and saying we'd like to assign some deputy assignments to another position at a later date if it does not work out well for the customers. But we believe that we can do that at this time. It takes the former Licensing Deputy, which is way over at the left, and changes that to the Licensing Compliance and Facilities Coordinator. We had originally asked for that at a grade 18 and Ginny feels that

it's a 17. And that is what is attached to your agenda. That position basically would be handling ultimately the Neighborhood Enhancement Team (NET) stuff that Matthew was formerly performing, along with licensing direction and supervision within that general area of compliance. The second column under that position is still the License Enforcement Inspector, and under this plan we hope to get him out of the data entry business and get him out on the road doing enforcement, which is not occurring at this time. In the second column we're talking about mostly the election staff and the receptionist. It's all current positions except for the first one you see listed. It's an Administrative Assistant II position. We're looking for that to do the payroll, process bills, do portions of the job that the former Deputy of Financial Administration was doing. We have to get our payroll done and we have to pay our bills. In the third column we have a Vital and Legislative Records Supervisor position. That was following the Deputy of Administration, which was the position that coordinated all of the Board agendas and scheduling of buildings and those type of things. We're asking for that not to be a deputy position, but we still need the technical skills of somebody that can do Board agendas and records and those sorts of things that Paula used to do for us. Under that position would be an Administrative Assistant III position, which would also help with some of the Committee stuff and the correspondence. We have records that have to be recorded and those types of things. The Courier, we would start training that person to come in and do some office assistance. We did that through the election; we asked him to come in and answer phones part-time. An office assistant is at the same level as the Courier. We think that we can enhance what goes on in the office and not utilize upper staff to be photocopying when we could have somebody else doing that. And the other four positions are current positions that are at the counter. They would be reporting also under that position, which initially at one time we were doing that. We just sort of switched it back. And the final column is the Archives and Records Management Officer. That is a current position. You probably are all somewhat familiar with our Archivist Sally Fellows. She does a great job doing our Archives and handling the Records Center, and trying to find a place to put everything and keep things recorded in a proper fashion. And that would just continue to stay the same as it is under the current plan. I do have a breakout also that I could distribute that shows all the functions and activities of the department that breaks it out probably even more clearly.

Alderman Lopez stated the number of people you'll end up with, would be what?

Ms. Johnson responded on this plan there's 15 full time positions, which is in essence the same number of positions that the office has held since 1994; in '94 you had about 20 FTE's; this puts forward 15.5 I think. So it's the same level that we've had all along, other than this last year, and I'm not really sure where we were at last year. You're taking one position and splitting it into two, but we had

lost a couple in the last round, which basically puts it at 15, which is where the office has been for years.

Alderman Lopez asked how many people do you have now, Carol?

Ms. Johnson responded we're working at about 50% staff. I think I have seven people in the office now. We've lost a few people to retirements and to other cities at this point. We're hurting. We need to get something done.

Alderman Lopez stated and the NET team that the Aldermen always are looking at very carefully, Matt was doing that and now I presume he's a deputy. Who is going to do that?

Ms. Johnson explained that would be taken over by the Licensing and Compliance and Facilities Coordinator, but it's something that Matthew would have to train someone for. Obviously, we're going to be in a training mode for some time, because we've lost a lot of senior staff in the office.

Alderman Lopez asked did the NET team originally…Matt, was that in the Building Department at one time?

Mr. Matthew Normand, Deputy City Clerk, responded I think years ago it might have been…I know the Police Department had an influence on that, and they may have coordinated that back in the '80's. But it's been dormant for some time.

Alderman Lopez stated not tonight, but you might want to look at that and bring forth maybe to this Committee and see…I know the Aldermen are concerned with the NET team, but as you create the plusses and the minuses of it still staying in City Clerk versus in another department…It took a lot of your time. I know you worked many hours without compensation. If that's going to continue, or what's the sort of prognosis of the NET team as we move into the future, and you can think about that and maybe at some point give it to either this Committee or something so that we know where we're going, especially with the springtime coming up. That's when we really get into this. Okay? Otherwise I think you did an excellent job.

Ms. Johnson stated can I just ask a question about that because I'm really not clear what you're asking Matt to do. Maybe he's clear but I'm not. In the proposal I'm putting before you, we believe that we can handle the duties that were assigned to the NET team, if that's part of the question being raised. My understanding from Matthew, and he was volunteering a lot of his hours, is that it was taking him about 20 hours a week in order to perform those tasks. That's the reality of it to do it properly. The office does already work with pretty much all of the people

that are involved in that team anyway. You do need somebody coordinating that. It's an important thing to do.

Alderman Lopez stated I agree with you. I just want to throw that out here.

Ms. Johnson stated I have no ownership if somebody wants to take over that task.

Alderman Lopez stated the Aldermen want a NET team and…

Ms. Johnson stated we considered that to be an important function that has been going on in the Clerk's office and so we have maintained it in our plan.

Alderman Lopez stated right. I just wanted to make sure that everybody understands that it's additional work for the City Clerk's office, the NET team, so we should know what those plusses and minuses are so that we know what's going on. And that's all I'm pointing out. It will probably still stay there, but at least the Aldermen will know…

Ms. Johnson stated I have no ownership, as I said.

Alderman Lopez stated that's okay.

Alderman Garrity stated Carol, you stated that the Licensing Enforcement Inspector was doing data entry. Is it because you're short staffed? Who is that person? Is that Shawn?

Ms. Johnson responded yes, it is. That position should be spending more time on the road. Don't misunderstand that he's doing all data entry, but there are some of the things that he is doing that could be done by clerical personnel and get him out on the road doing more enforcement for revenues.

Alderman Garrity asked do you have a proposed staff person here that's going to strictly do transcribing?

Ms. Johnson responded the transcription under this plan, part of it is the part time clerical that is presently doing it. It's all under Vital and Legislative Records Supervisor. The Supervisor would probably be doing transcription a couple of hours here and there. The Administrative Assistant III is also going to spend some time doing transcription, and the balance of that is going to be picked up by the part-time clerical that is presently doing that.

Alderman Garrity asked Ms. Lamberton, do you think it's appropriate for a grade 16 to do transcribing or could somebody be found at a lower grade to do that?

Ms. Lamberton responded in general I would say no, but I think that if you look at all the specs and if you had a chance to read my letter in detail, you would see in there that transcription comes into several different paragraphs in my letter. And so…because I was thinking along the same lines that you're thinking. And so I think that once you get that Supervisor intact there, and then you have that Administrative Assistant, which is the new position, working at transcribing, grade 14, then you have a part-timer transcribing, you've got really one and a half people transcribing, so I'm not sure that there's a need for the Supervisor to be really doing that, except under exceptional circumstances when you have a very complex meeting that you really need someone who seems into it to transcribe that. There's going to be times like that. You just can't give that to the everyday transcriber. So I would say that that's probably what will end up happening.

Chairman Gatsas stated I applaud you for bringing this forward as soon as you have. My suggestion is you get the full complement before you take those seven people and make them awfully weary in that department.

Ms. Lamberton stated when Carol and I were speaking earlier today, we were talking about how long this will take, because as you know, the rules of the Board, which we talked about before, and so I happened to have to call Alderman Osborne on another matter and I asked him if he would mind if he would waive the B2R review on these specs, because it's just timing. They really don't do anything to them usually, the B2R, in my experience, and so if we could get this to the full Board in the beginning of February, then have final approval at the second meeting in February, she can post those jobs before the end of February, and hopefully be able to get some people in here and get rolling in training, etceteras, etceteras, etceteras, so they can be up and running.

Chairman Gatsas stated she's certainly in the mood of cooperation.

Alderman Lopez stated absolutely.

Chairman Gatsas stated I wanted to changed that rule a few weeks ago, and I certainly had a pushback from most of the Board members. Why wouldn't we make the rule change instead of suspending rules on a willy-nilly basis?

Alderman Lopez stated thank you, Mr. Chairman, and I said I would work with you on it. The question I had about the B2R though…certain things have to go there. We can suspend the rules but there are some things that have to go there. Do you want to explain that, Carol?

Ms. Johnson stated I can explain to you what the rules are now.

Chairman Gatsas stated I guess this would be Ms. Lamberton's question because anything we do comes out of HR to move for reclassification, and I guess, why does the reclassification have to take that route?

Ms. Lamberton explained well, when I proposed a rule change, twice, that meant changing the rules which took the language out of the rules that required reclassifications and reallocations to go to B2R. The only thing that's ever happened to B2R in my time here has been, as far as change goes, the Deputy Airport Director went from a 27 to a 29, back to a 27. And that was kind of silly, but that really wasn't what the B2R was supposed to be doing. They're supposed to be looking at technical things, like is the language in this spec correct and everything. And I think probably if the HR director or the department head are satisfied with the language and the spec, that should probably be okay to keep moving along to the full Board.

Alderman Lopez stated I think in some cases probably you're absolutely correct, but in some cases it's the option of the full Board. I can see taking some items, but there has been occasions where things have been cut in B2R.

Ms. Lamberton asked but is that their function, Alderman Lopez? Their function is technical review, not…

Alderman Lopez interrupted right, it's a technical review, but I think past presence is always looking at something that might be wrong and it's been proven that.

Chairman Gatsas stated that may be just in a disagreement.

Ms. Lamberton stated I think it's a political disagreement…I don't agree with that position getting upgraded or I don't like that department head.

Alderman Lopez stated I guess your position and the Aldermen's position is that anything on reclassification of personnel should not go to Bills on Second Reading; it should go directly to the full Board, on a technical basis.

Ms. Lamberton stated that's correct.

Alderman Lopez asked are you talking about technical or are you talking about new positions or reclassifications?

Ms. Lamberton responded I don't know what technical means in the concept of reclassifications and reallocations.

Alderman Lopez asked are you talking about reclassifications of employees or new positions?

Ms. Lamberton explained first of all, we don't reclassify employees. We reclassify positions and we reallocate positions, which means taking it from one grade to another. And we establish new class specifications, and we eliminate class specifications, and I'm not sure what B2R, what…when you say technical, I think of the HR Committee being more technical because we have greater discussions about and you have more knowledge about what's going on in the B2R Committee, who is getting fed every single thing that's changing in the City. And so we've seen some of the consequences to that. I just don't know if that's the best use of that committee's time or the full Board's time.

Alderman Lopez stated maybe what we should do then is to review Bills on Second Reading with the City Solicitor to see what the terminology is there that we can eliminate or maybe go along and say that things from HR on reclassification, we'll just send to the full Board from the HR Committee. I'm really going to look at that, like I told the Alderman. And on this particular issue, because this is a vital department that needs the people, I agree with you that we should suspend the rules, and if the Chairman is willing to do that, I'm fine with that, and move it to the full Board.

Chairman Gatsas stated I don't have a problem with that, but we obviously should change the rules so that this doesn't come before us, because there are…I think that you will note that there's another one on our desk that's going to be talking about reclassification, or reorganization. So, if we're going to do it, let's do it and do it right so that it makes sense so that every time we're not suspending rules when we want to suspend them, and because it's vital in the Clerk's office. It's not a rule that makes sense to me, that when you send something to Bills on Second Reading, it's supposed to be, not for changes to a position that this Committee has taken. That can be done at the full Board, because once it comes out of there, the full Board can change whatever Bills on Second Reading has done, so I think that to eliminate a step when people are looking for it, because it could be three or four weeks, doesn't make sense in the process of how we do it.

Ms. Lamberton asked may I make another observation too? You know, it's really important to keep the class specifications up to date, so that when we're hiring people they understand what their job is and they understand what we're going to hold them accountable for. And if they don't do it that we terminate them, to put it bluntly. When department heads call me and say, I need to change three or four words or add a new duty or sentence into a job spec, how long is it going to take me? Unfortunately, my answer is probably two months, and more often than not, they don't make the changes because they haven't got the time because they need the staff. And so that's another reason just to have it go before this Committee, which you have the expertise in HR, and then just move it to the full Board, and I think you'll see things more up to date, and frankly it's just less bureaucracy.

Chairman Gatsas stated and certainly the HR director has come before the full Board twice and asked for that change, and for some reason we always like to adhere to what department heads tell us, but for some reason we don't want to make a simple change. I don't think that that takes any authority or any power away from Bills on Second Reading. I certainly will move to suspend, Mr. Chairman, if you come in with an amendment that gets rid of that situation that it goes to Bills on Second Reading, because as you just heard, department heads aren't making small changes when we talk about two months for that to move through.

Alderman Lopez stated well, like I said at the beginning when we made the rules, that I would speak to you and we're having that conversation now, so I agree to do that and come in with a rule of change in reference to the HR and making technical changes or classifications, but I just want to caution, it's up to every member of the Board to review these things, because sometimes things are in there, and if they don't read what's in there, they can be passed very clearly in reclassification. I'm not saying unintentionally or intentionally; it doesn't make a

difference. If the rest of the Board members don't read what the classification is, then it's too late once it's passed.

Chairman Gatsas stated I'm sure that the good work that the HR Committee does, Mr. Chairman, you and the other members can feel very satisfied that there is a definite eye cleansing in this Committee.

On motion of Alderman Lopez, duly seconded by Alderman Garrity it was voted to approve this item, suspend the rules, and move it on to the full Board.

Chairman Gatsas stated Ms. Lamberton, if you will bring me a copy of the rule change that you would like to see so that the Chairman can have a chance to look at it and we can bring it forward to the next meeting…

Ms. Johnson stated Mr. Chairman, the Clerk will be happy to work on that also.

Ms. Lamberton stated I meant to say something in the security officer one. I put in the wrong grade in the cover letter. I put Security Officer, Labor Grade 16; it should be Labor Grade 12, and just want that to be on record.

Chairman Gatsas stated we have an item under New Business. Proposal of New Department of Facilities, Grounds & Recreation.

Alderman Garrity asked did that come in our packet?

Chairman Gatsas responded that came on your desk, separate.

Ms. Johnson stated as the Clerk I wanted to just mention that we referred that also to the Committee on Administration.

Chairman Gatsas asked do I have a motion that we table this so that Administration…because we should only be involved in the so-called technical changes?

On motion of Alderman Garrity, duly seconded by Alderman Pinard, it was voted to table this item.

Ms. Lamberton stated may I just…I have a letter all prepared to establish a new job classification, because I'm not going to be here by the time the Committee on Administration and everything works. At least you'll have something on record that whoever can play with or say yes or no or whatever.

Chairman Gatsas stated I would hope that in your absence somebody in your department will be coming forward.

Ms. Lamberton stated I did the work for you. I'll just send it now and maybe the City Clerk's office can hang onto it until you need it.

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

A True Record. Attest.

Clerk of Committee