

CIP SUB-COMMITTEE (RE: MTA)

**March 3, 1999
PM**

6:00

Chairman Pariseau called the meeting to order.

The Clerk called the roll.

Present: Aldermen Pariseau, Clancy, Girard, M. McCarthy (for Mark Hobson)

Messrs: H. Tawney, Mayor Wieczorek

Chairman Pariseau addressed Item 3 of the agenda:

Continuing discussions regarding relations between MTA employees and management.

Ms. McCarthy stated I met last Wednesday with Don Clay, John Webster, and Phil Cantwell on the management side. Jack Mahoney and Roz Trisciani on the union side. We met on Wednesday afternoon for about three and a half-hours. As we outlined in the memo, basically we initially started with reiterating what their common areas and common ground were and that was to resolve the issues, to work together to do it, to provide good service, customer service, to treat each other with respect, to improve morale and then I went around the table and asked what their individual goals were. I think the problems, as you have all heard from the employees and from management's perspective are, I think, really rooted in communications issues. They do have...I think there are sort of two tracks. One is the contract itself and the problem that the union has with the way that management is interpreting it, especially John Webster. I think that stems from the fact that John was in the union and is now on the other side and there are some personal resentments as to that and personality issues. Those are things that to some extent will always be there and I don't think they really need to be focused on too much to try to improve other than to acknowledge that is the situation and to tell people to grow up, they can't do it and there is no room for that in the workplace. On the other hand, as to that, as to the contract, because I think John was, by his own admission, was the one who challenged it the most when he was

3/3/99 CIP Sub-Committee (Re: MTA)

2

on the union side and was one of the biggest “troublemakers” in his words, and knows the contract, he wrote the book, I think that now that he is in management

he is working very hard from the management perspective as he should to insure that the union doesn't get away with anything. So that results in two problems. One is that it sort of increases the resentment and the other is that there are times when he may go to extremes to insure that the management side is covered. One example that several employees gave was that in every letter that goes out from his desk, the sentence and this is a paraphrase, but essentially it states further infractions may lead to termination and that could be for a very serious offense of a really minor offense and that is the kind of thing that people are saying is they are constantly being reminded that we are going to be fired. It is really doing a number on the morale.

Alderman Clancy stated it is more like a threat.

Ms. McCarthy replied exactly. They are saying it sounds threatening; it sounds like we are getting beat up. At this meeting on Wednesday, Roz or Jack brought that out and John explained at that point that it is a cover. In other words, if management doesn't advise the union members that they eventually could be terminated for this as part of the discipline then, I guess, that is an issue that the union could take to arbitration that they didn't get notice of termination. In discussion, the solution basically was that they will change the wording. That if there is a situation where an individual has done something and he is on his last straw and the next time he does it he will be terminated, that sentence will be in the letter that he is at the end of his rope, but for all of the rest of the situations, there will be a sentence that is something like "this can result in progressive discipline" so it is getting the message across but it is kinder and gentler. These are small examples but there are a lot of things like that going on so it builds up and makes a domino effect in terms of morale. It was mentioned at the meeting Wednesday, but they really didn't agree to it, but tomorrow we are meeting again and I will see if we can get an agreement from them. One recommendation was that they have weekly meetings, sort of an open door policy and I talked this over with Howard last weekend. He sort of refined the idea and I think it was better, to have what he called a "Coffee with Bob" which was an experience that he had in a previous position. Basically, management sets up shop in the conference room for that day, does their work there, has coffee and donuts there and people can come in and out and talk. I think that was a good idea and I will present it in that light tomorrow and see if I can get them to agree to that because I think it is really necessary that they show the union that they want to work together.

Alderman Girard asked is that something that would take place with Don Clay and John Webster or just John Webster or just Don Clay.

3/3/99 CIP Sub-Committee (Re: MTA)

4

Ms. McCarthy answered I think either or. I am going to recommend that they do it once a week for the next five or six weeks or six to eight weeks actually.

Alderman Clancy asked for maybe an hour or so or two hours.

Mr. McCarthy answered actually the day. Just bring their work into the conference room because there are drivers on all kinds of staggered schedules. The first week do it on Monday and the next week do it on Wednesday so that every day is covered.

Alderman Girard stated at the risk of asking a really painfully obvious and stupid question, the purpose of the "Coffee with Bob" deal would be to what.

Ms. McCarthy replied part of it is public relations, just to show the employees that they want to work together and it is a good faith effort to get the lines of communication open. Part of it is, and I did say this, and everybody acknowledged it on Wednesday, that a lot of it is trust. There is a huge lack of trust right now between management and labor. Part of that, I think, is the natural process of management and labor.

Alderman Clancy asked are you going to get that because you got three new guys down there working.

Ms. McCarthy answered well that is part of it too and that is not anyone's fault because they are new so that is just a function of where they are at. This way, if they can consistently do it on a week by week basis, in that first week they might get one person the entire day in there but hopefully it would grow and progress and there would be more and more people there. What it would basically do is, as I said, show the employees that they are willing to open their doors to talk and to listen to them and it will provide them an opportunity to sort of hear what is going on as to the employees. Not as to union grievance kind of issues per say, but like can we have a water bubbler, you know those kinds of things. Can we make some changes and try to get a Coke machine in?

Alderman Girard stated that is why I asked that question because it seemed that they have individual employees that have taken it upon themselves to work outside the labor/management that was established in the contract and I think that created a heck of a lot of trouble for everybody involved and if the purpose of this "Coffee with Bob" thing was to enable employees to bring these grievances and such directly to manage outside of the process laid out in the collective bargaining agreement, I wouldn't think that that would be constructive.

Ms. McCarthy replied I agree and it would not be for grievance issues and that was something that we did talk about on Wednesday and I also said this the very first day that I was there to both labor and management that I was not there as a

function of the union or a function of the contract and that whole process, but that it was more employee relations versus the contract situation.

Chairman Pariseau asked is there a chance where management would be willing to wipe the slate clean with past infractions and start over.

Ms. McCarthy answered I haven't asked that question. My sense is probably not at this point because a lot of those are contractual things and I think that they would be not willing to...and I shouldn't speak for them but my sense is that they would not be willing to do that at this point.

Alderman Pariseau stated I am concerned with Mr. Stephens.

Ms. McCarthy replied I think right now, and one of the recommendations that I have is that management gets training on communication skills on learning how to talk to the employees. I recommended that union leaders should do that as well. I think that would be beneficial to both sides. I think that also they should get some training on conflict resolution, which is just learning how to talk to each other in certain situations. Right now, I think that management and John particularly because he was the union man and is really concerned about insuring that management isn't compromised by any of the union tricks which he knows because as he said he wrote most of them, I think they would be very leery to do something like that. I think they are very protective of their stance as management. I think they are protective of the contract and I think they would almost be afraid to do that.

Chairman Pariseau can we recommend that the commissioners be brought in to the situation or at least made aware of the grievances being filed. I know that in the Police Department there is a section there where they, at times, go into executive section to discuss grievances and there is nothing, in going through the MTA minutes for the last few months, there is not one issue addressed by the commissioners relative to grievances.

Alderman Clancy stated I asked that question with the people head on and they said when they get a grievance they just keep it to themselves and when they get ready for arbitration then they inform the commissioners. They should inform the commissioners as soon as they get a grievance. They are on the phone with these guys maybe at least once a week. If they get a grievance they should call the commissioners. To have these grievances not brought up until the last minute and say we are going to arbitration, that is not right. That is lack of communication between management and the commissioners.

Ms. McCarthy replied one of the things that I want to do with this process, with the meeting process, is to bring the commissioners in but I wanted to do that maybe in a couple of weeks. I am holding off on that first because I really wanted to have a chance for management and the union leaders to work together and leave it limited to them for at least two or three weeks.

Alderman Girard stated I intend to agree with everybody that the I think the commission needs to be better informed to the degree that they are capable maybe they can do something, but I don't think the commission is there to manage. If there is a role that they can play to facilitate a resolution or something if it is coming to an impasse, I think that is great but I think we want to be careful that we are not putting them in the role of management. I have a question for you about Alderman Pariseau's question on wiping the slate clean, and Howard, feel free to jump in here because I know I have spoken to you a little bit about this, but is it your sense that with the exception of some of the extremes, like Mr. Stephens, is it your thought or your perception that the marks on the slate have been unwarranted. I mean there was something that was brought out about people having time cards punched by other people which I think are fairly serious offenses and there are a lot of people complaining about getting tagged. It just seems to me that when you are in a service industry like that where the buses have got to run on time to be effective, that is a fairly serious concern. Are you sensing that management is way sensitive in their marking or is there legitimacy in what they have done here?

Ms. McCarthy replied it is kind of a yes and no answer. I think that for the most part they have been interpreting the contract...in their eyes I think they have been fair. I think they are reading it really to the letter of the law, the contract, and they are interpreting it as such so they think they are doing the right thing. I don't think their intent is to be evil. I do think, though, that because of, I think there is misperceptions because the way in which things were done. In the past, if people were able to slide by without getting an infraction, they are feeling like they should still be able to. I don't see it as a problem as the new management introducing change or even a stricter interpretation of the contract, but I think what they need to do first of all is communicate why they are doing what they are doing. I think they should also have had, and I know they have been there awhile so it is sort of a barn close the door before the horse thing, but they should have had an ease into it period. I think they went from black to white and I think I said this last week but there is absolutely no gray and they are dealing with human beings and there is a natural responses for people to say what is going on. I think part of it was that, that there was just this abrupt change and nobody knew why or what was happening. There are some times when...one of the things they brought up in Wednesday's meeting was as to the business they said that certain people or

3/3/99 CIP Sub-Committee (Re: MTA)

8

certain and I forget whether it was maintenance people or certain full-time drivers or whatever group it was but at any rate that certain people were allowed to have a

miss or to be later or that it was a common practice for someone else to either punch the time clock and then go park their car or something and they had some time and it was okay and they weren't going to be...the time clock wouldn't record their time until the time they were supposed to start working. I am not sure if I am saying this correctly, but in other words they could run in, punch the clock at 6AM but they could park their car and get their bus and their paycheck wouldn't start until their scheduled time but other people aren't and they have to punch in at the minute they are supposed to be there. So for those people, it would be an infraction for them to have somebody else punch in for them or to punch in at 6AM and go park their car. They would be getting paid essentially for time they were not working. I am not sure and I don't know but my sense is there is some confusion among the employees as to who can do this and who can't do this. There may be some confusion as to the fact that well, Joe can do it but Bill can't so Bill is doing it without realizing that Joe can't.

Alderman Clancy stated they have two sets of rules down there.

Ms. McCarthy replied yes, but I don't think it is one rule for Joe and one rule for Bill. I think it is determined by the job.

Mr. Tawney stated I think that what happened, as I see it, is for years they were doing it on paper and everybody marked in that they were here on time and then they went to a time clock system and when they did that they negotiated or there were pre-existing parameters for what this was and what your discipline is for one miss and for two misses and they brought in those, by mutual agreement, into the contract. Now they have someone actually sitting there and telling them you were late, you know you missed it you were six minutes late and so forth.

Alderman Clancy stated and before that wasn't picked up.

Mr. Tawney replied that is right. So that is something that they both agreed to, labor and management, and they are in a bind now. In some of these other things, I have not gotten into the entire contract. I am well aware of time clocks, we use them here and I have used them in other jobs. The parameters can be arranged. We set ours up for a seven minute limit then it docked the pay, but they could punch in an hour early, come in do their thing, and their actual time when the clock recorded it did not start until 7AM.

Alderman Clancy stated the thing of it is here these are buses and they have to be at certain places at certain times. That is the problem. The schedule. In other words if a bus is supposed to be at Lake Avenue and Maple Street at 6:30AM and it gets there at 6:45AM, a person gets a little antsy.

Mr. Tawney replied I understand that. I am not saying that. What we were talking about was the other problem of they couldn't punch in earlier and that was causing some hits on the employees' part because they had to do it 15 minutes before and seven minutes afterwards. You can adjust those things and make it easier.

Chairman Pariseau asked so why don't they just dock them instead of accumulating misses for more severe disciplinary actions. I mean if a guy is seven minutes late, fine, he doesn't get paid from 7AM if he starts at 7:15AM.

Mr. Tawney answered the reason is because the situation is that the bus has to be there at 20 minutes after.

Chairman Pariseau replied I am not talking a half-hour.

Mr. Tawney stated in talking with management previous to this incident blowing up, it was that they had talked about that and it was well don't count it. If they are anything over an hour late then you discipline them.

Chairman Pariseau stated if they didn't call, then it would be a miss.

Mr. Tawney replied well management didn't particularly like the hour time frame. I have informally talked or called their attorney and left voicemail and said maybe and not wanting to get in to this to disturb anybody, but I said I think it would be a good idea to talk about that issue and develop a memorandum of agreement that either party could opt out of in 10 days like they did with the vacation and see if they could work on this number of offenses, say two and then you get a letter or something like that. If it did not work out and it impacted adversely the operations or anything like that, then there was an escape clause that either party in 10 days could get out of it and go back to what the contract stipulated.

Mayor Wieczorek stated when I talked with Mr. Clay and Mr. Webster, one of the problems I said you know planes, trains, and buses don't have to run on time. I had an incident where a lady was waiting for the bus and she missed it because it came 15 minutes early and it left so the next day the lady was talking to the driver and she was saying gee I missed the bus and I have to go wherever I have to go and she said you came too early. The bus driver said well get up earlier and be out there 15 minutes early. That is not the idea. When you get to a stop, they should be at that stop until it is time to leave because people are making their plans based on the schedule. If the scheduled doesn't mean anything, don't have a schedule. That is one of the problems that they have. I think that one of the major problems that they have here is that when the union negotiated the contract, they thought

3/3/99 CIP Sub-Committee (Re: MTA)

11

that they didn't have to abide by the rules in the contract because that is the way it was done before. Now all of the sudden, they agreed to the contract, but now

somebody is trying to enforce it and they don't like it. I think the union steward has a responsibility in this thing. He has to be working with the union members. Somebody had to negotiate that thing.

Mr. Tawney stated in the contract, by the way, it does not specify...some contracts specify that it goes to the governing board prior to going to arbitration. In this instance, it is department head, general manager and arbitration. It does not require that, as a courtesy obviously, they are mentioning it to the Board that this is a labor issue but they are not required.

Alderman Girard stated but the commission approves the contract, right.

Mr. Tawney replied right.

Alderman Girard asked so if the commission approved a document that did not have it in the grievance, we should not necessarily be critical of the management for not passing that information on.

Mr. Tawney replied I think you can recommend a greater dialogue between the general management and the commission to keep they apprised of labor/management issues that were before them.

Alderman Clancy stated they can somehow get a hold of management and union personnel to go down there unannounced and see how the clock is working in the morning. Just two guys who could say listen this guys is 14 minutes late and stuff like that and call people in and say look we are working on a schedule and we need you here at a certain time.

Alderman Girard asked, Howard, the contract right now does not allow what Alderman Pariseau was suggesting. In other words, if it is seven minutes late dock them 15 minutes of pay and then if it happens a second or third time you hit them with a miss. The contract, as I understand it, is pretty specific correct?

Ms. McCarthy answered that is correct.

Chairman Pariseau asked what do we want, the group, as recommendations to send back to the full CIP Committee to ultimately be adopted by them.

Mayor Wieczorek answered I think probably what Maureen is doing is what we should continue doing. Stay with it until such time as it looks like it is clearing up and there is some direction. There are some people there that I don't think you are going to be able to please.

Alderman Clancy stated let me say one thing. Howard, do any of these people down there, Mr. Clay, Mr. Webster or Mr. Cantwell had any kind of a seminar or training for communication skills or anything whatsoever.

Mr. Tawney replied neither has the union President or Secretary/Treasurer. I had recommended to Mark and he thought it was a good idea, there is a seminar coming up a three-day one out of Hartford and it is partially funded by grants. We were thinking about sending on of the union people and someone from management to the same course.

Chairman Pariseau stated I would send Mr. Webster first.

Mr. Tawney stated there is also, and I believe they have or I talked to them before about Compensation Funds who I believe is their workers compensation carrier, who offers free courses to the members and supervisor training, communications training, all of that is available to them and they can send their union members also. The supervisory course, I know, is very good and everybody who has gone to it has talked about how good it was. In fact, they set aside money to come and run a course down here in the City for us. It is a three-day affair type of thing. We will probably send 25 to 30 people to it at a time when we have it next fiscal year.

Ms. McCarthy stated I have a folder full of upcoming seminars and trainings including the one that Howard just mentioned that I will be bringing tomorrow to the MTA and they can choose. There are some that are one-day seminars for as low as \$80. I do agree in terms of continuing these meetings. I think that...I should point out that both sides have stated that they understand that they signed a contract. Jack Mahoney said that the very first thing when we went around the table. He said we know we signed the contract, we know what is in it and we will live with the contract. Then he went on to say that we would like management to lighten up. That is almost a contradiction in terms. Roz did say that the problem that she saw was not what management was doing but how they were doing it. That they were sort of forgetting that they were dealing with human beings. She was more reasonable or rationale in terms of the contract. She said we know that we have to abide by the contract but we are just being beaten up as we are trying to do our jobs. My focus with this has really been on the communications. It has been on the, as I said, employee relations issues aspects of this. It may all be lip service, both sides have said that they want to talk and they are obviously doing it but they very quickly have to show and I will tell them this tomorrow, that they have to put their money where their mouth is at this point. I need to see some changes. I am still getting phone calls from people on a daily basis, one or two

3/3/99 CIP Sub-Committee (Re: MTA)

14

calls a day from employees and I have said to all of them we are just starting. This is a process that will take some time. You have to be patient and let me know if

there is continued problems or if there is any retaliation or if there are any new issues that come up but understand that it is not going to change overnight.

Chairman Pariseau stated aside from the agreed upon contract, they also made reference to sidebars. I guess the way I understand it is, it is an agreement that they reached after the agreement had already been signed. Are those valid?

Mr. Tawney replied yes.

Chairman Pariseau stated well they could come up with other sidebar issues that would lessen what is in here, right.

Ms. McCarthy replied yes.

Alderman Clancy stated like the time clock. I think both parties can get together and try to work out something.

Chairman Pariseau replied to correct interpretation that someone has whether it is right or wrong. I don't think both of them agree.

Ms. McCarthy responded management's concern with the time clock was they were allowed to use their discretion. At what point does discretion become a grievance? John said if I say it is okay for this guy to not get the miss and then I say that this guy does get the miss, this guy is going to grieve it.

Alderman Girard stated I have got to believe that that is a real valid concern and I have got to believe that John, being the former union guy that he was, would know exactly how he could push it from the other side of the table that perhaps leads to his defensiveness. I personally think that the sidebar agreements are a bad idea and I think that one of the sources of friction that take place here are the fact that management and labor were operating under some sidebar agreements that the union, for whatever reason, chose to grieve so management said fine you want to grieve your own agreement, no more agreement. It seems to me that the more you start fiddling around the edges, the more you are asking for a problem. If they don't like what they have in the contract, I don't think a sidebar is going to clarify a contract. If they don't like what they have in the contract then they should renegotiate the contract. They expire every so often.

Ms. McCarthy replied that is one thing that we also said very clearly, that this isn't about renegotiating a contract. That would happen next year.

Alderman Girard stated something tells me that they really don't disagree on the interpretation because Jack Mahoney, at the hearing where he spoke in response to some questions that were asked, when I asked him whether or not he thought that the John Webster had the ability to interpret the contract what he said was, if I recall correctly, was something to the effect of well he could always not enforce it. Now that to me is not a guy who has got a different interpretation of the contract. That, to me, is a guy who agrees with the interpretation but knows he is in a box.

Chairman Pariseau asked what action do we want to take.

Alderman Clancy answered what they should do is they shouldn't have any sidebars. What they should do is once they sign that contract they should abide by it. Don't make these deals on the side. If they want to do that, the next contract, renegotiate it.

Mr. Tawney stated the sidebar is to serve a purpose and sometimes the union will, there are sidebar agreements, and it is part of the contract and they just let it go.

Chairman Pariseau stated I think the whole issue, as the Mayor stated, is that they entered into this agreement knowing that it is not going to be enforced, but it is. That is what they don't like. It should have been done gradually instead of coming down on them.

Alderman Girard asked but do we have any other contracts in the City with sidebar agreements.

Mr. Tawney answered yes.

Alderman Girard stated this is the first I ever heard of sidebars.

Mr. Tawney stated I can't imagine that there are 16 or 17 contracts out there without sidebar letters that are attached to them and they are part of the contract.

Alderman Girard stated but in a case where it is a City contract, who agrees to the sidebar. If the union and the City go and they sign a contract and management and labor went into a sidebar beyond that, wouldn't the Board of Aldermen have to approve that.

Mr. Tawney replied technically, yes. It would also have to be approved, to be technically correct, it has to be approved by the rank and file too. I have seen a lot that have not.

Alderman Girard stated what came across to me loud and clear at the Committee we had is that there are, and we have talked about them here, there are clearly some things that are well out of order and I think, probably perhaps on both sides, and I wonder, Maureen, if we don't come up with some kind of findings that sort of isolate where we, as objective viewers of this spectacle say this is evident and this is evident and try to point out some of the so called areas where we see problems, whether or not we are inviting them back. I have always had difficulty just sort of saying okay lets all forget what caused us to get to where we are and deal with where we are and try to move forward.

Ms. McCarthy replied no, I don't think you can ignore what happened. That is the reason why we are here. I am not suggesting that or to wipe any slates clean by any means.

Chairman Pariseau stated I would like to get a formal thing together outlining the committee's findings and recommendations. Now I know that I have findings from your office and also Alderman Girard made up a list. I don't know if we want to include all of this in the findings. I don't know what the normal thing is. This one is short and sweet and I think that the only one that I would like to add is that the MTA Commission has not been fully advised of labor/management issues. That is important. It appears that the commission is just there as figureheads and they don't know which end is up.

Alderman Clancy replied they should be more well informed of the workings of the MTA on a daily basis.

Chairman Pariseau asked does everybody want that one. Okay, then we can add it on to Maureen and Howard's findings. The Committee finds that there are serious morale problems at the Manchester Transit Authority. This stems from actions by both Management and Labor. I think we all agree to that. Poor communication by all parties, we agree to that. Both sides have expressed common goals for resolving the problems and have agreed to meet to work together on the issues. We want to add that the MTA Commission has not been fully advised of labor/management issues. Somebody else pick one.

Alderman Clancy stated how about the sidebars.

Chairman Pariseau asked how about Item 9 that some discord is a result from the use and termination of so-called sidebar agreements signed outside of the collective bargaining agreement. Would that be a finding? Is that part of the problem?

Ms. McCarthy answered well I don't know that it is a specific part because it is...you can sort of lump it in there with the entire contract and that brings the contract into the issue.

Chairman Pariseau said well these are agreed to by both sides. The sidebars aren't an issue? It is an issue to us because we don't understand it, I guess.

Ms. McCarthy replied right but I am saying that the contract, in and of itself, the way in which it is being interpreted is also causing some of these morale problems. What I have stated really clearly is that I am not there to renegotiate their contract. They have to live with that contract until it is time to renegotiate.

Alderman Girard stated I understand that, but I would have to disagree that the sidebars haven't, in and of themselves, not created problems because one of the things that people really squawked about in their letters or whatnot to us were the unilateral changes by management in how they could take their vacation days. Well if that unilateral change was made because management revoked the sidebar as a result of the union grieving that that the sidebar was being enacted or was being implemented.

Mr. Tawney replied it was being used right along.

Alderman Girard responded that's right, it was being used right along and then the union filed a grievance according to management and I got letters from Don Clay after the fact that the union complained about the fact that an employee was allowed to break up his days and take them off and he grieved it so Don basically said well if you grieve with your own arrangement, it is gone. That might have been an over reaction by them. To say that the sidebars haven't caused a problem, I think, right there is an area where the sidebar could have caused a problem.

Chairman Pariseau asked would it be a problem to take, from Alderman Girard's submission here, numbers 3, 4 and 4A.

Alderman Clancy answered 3 maybe for sure.

Chairman Pariseau stated well they are all related, 3, 4 and 4A. Could that be part of the findings?

On motion of Alderman Clancy, duly seconded by Alderman Girard, it was voted to approve findings 1, 2 and 3 of the Howard Tawney and Maureen McCarthy's memo and also items 1, 3, 4, 4A and 9 of Alderman Girard's memo; and

3/3/99 CIP Sub-Committee (Re: MTA)

19

recommendations 1, 2 and 3 as submitted by Howard Tawney and Maureen McCarthy and recommendation 2, 4, 5, 5A and 9 from Alderman Girard's memo.

Mr. Tawney stated I have a question on 5A. I haven't read the other sidebar agreements that exist and I don't know that we should...

Alderman Girard interjected my intent there was not to say that any existing sidebar agreements are nullified but that they should not enter into any more sidebar agreements. I don't know how many they have.

Chairman Pariseau stated they should just live with the agreement the way it is now and renegotiate.

Mr. Tawney replied I hear what you are saying, but sometimes it does serve a constructive purpose and if it is mutually agreed to and ratified by the respective parties, it becomes actually part of the contract.

Chairman Pariseau asked could we say that the use of sidebar agreements should be limited rather than discontinued. In other words it is up to their discretion.

Alderman Girard asked on the letter that Maureen McCarthy put together dated February 26, the last part of the letter there are five recommendations. Were those intended to be recommendations for the Committee to adopt?

Ms. McCarthy answered those are actually suggestions and they were preliminary. Those were just preliminary recommendations after the meetings and actually as with the last one I think that the hiring of a Human Resources Director was also something that the MTA has hired an independent consultant to do a human resources study. I am not sure exactly when she was there but that is something that she also recommended to them. John Webster told me that they were looking into the possibility of hiring someone as a HR person.

Chairman Pariseau asked would there be an opportunity where someone at the MTA could act as a Human Resources officer.

Alderman Clancy asked what about Maureen Nagle down there.

Chairman Pariseau asked what does she do down there.

Alderman Girard answered she is a contract employee who is supposed to be doing marketing work.

Chairman Pariseau stated the Fire Department is looking for a human resource person and I don't want to create another...

Ms. McCarthy replied I know what you are saying and the reason I had also included that is I was also thinking about it in terms of whether or not this was just...I am not sure what their plans are in terms of their expansion and if they have a need for expansion given where the City is moving forward and with the Riverwalk and the civic center and the airport expansion and so on so I was sort of looking at the big picture as to whether or not the MTA can meet the needs of the City and factor in if they had an HR person in there that would be someone who could also help recruit.

Alderman Clancy asked what does Mr. Cantwell do down there.

Ms. McCarthy answered he is an accountant. He hasn't had any formal HR training. He is their in-house accountant.

Alderman Girard stated because the budget is always a concern over there, instead of hiring a human resources person, I don't understand and I don't know exactly what all of them are supposed to be doing but is there a possibility that an existing management position, say the general manager, because it is really not a terribly big operation down there. I mean the numbers look big when you start talking about part-time, but I don't know if the operation is such that an existing management employee could also be trained in handling the HR function. I don't know what that entails.

Ms. McCarthy replied I think right now that would be difficult for any one of the three given the current situation.

Chairman Pariseau stated see what happens is if we accept that recommendation to hire an HR person then it will go to the Committee and then to the full Board and within an hour after the Board meeting, management will be coming back to the Aldermen saying you said we needed a human resources person and then we create a problem. I don't want to mislead them.

Mr. Tawney replied the problem is unless you hire someone off the street with experience and background and everything like that to do it, yes you could train someone to do it but I have been doing this for a long, long time and it is not something you learn just out of the box.

Alderman Clancy stated but the thing is, Howard, if you do it for them you are opening up a can of worms and every department in the City is going to want one.

3/3/99 CIP Sub-Committee (Re: MTA)

22

Mr. Tawney replied but this isn't a City department and every department has us and we advise each department head on the issues that they are having problems on.

Alderman Clancy responded but still the City gives them \$900,000 a year.

Mr. Tawney stated it is because of the arrangement that they don't have us.

Alderman Girard stated so what you are saying is there needs to be an HR function down there. Do you know whether or not the MTA could access federal funds, perhaps? I mean it is a weird entity. They are funded almost entirely by federal and City dollars.

Mr. Tawney asked do they get CIP money.

Alderman Girard answered well the Mayor is proposing that they get a whole lot of it this year. The City gives them a \$900,000 a year subsidy. The federal government gives them two or three times that anyway in operations. I mean what they collect at the fare box is a ridiculous amount of money. I just wondered whether or not you knew if there was any federal aid.

Mr. Tawney answered I think we can talk to Planning or CIP and see if they have access to those types of funds.

Chairman Pariseau asked in your discussions with the MTA, could you make that suggestion and lead them through the CIP Department and work with Bob MacKenzie or Bill Jabjiniak.

Alderman Girard stated or through their own Department of Transportation because they have their own federal funds that don't come through the City.

Ms. McCarthy stated Mr. Cantwell may have information on that. He is their money man and I will talk to him about it.

Chairman Pariseau stated I want to thank both Howard and Maureen for their patience with the Chairman of this sub-Committee. It has been a pleasure working with you.

Alderman Clancy stated now you are going to be doing this for the next four or five weeks, right and hopefully something will come out of these meetings down there. Lets say by the middle of April we can probably get together and get both sides, management and union, and get them in here and ask them which direction they are going in.

Ms. McCarthy replied yes, that is a good idea.

Alderman Clancy stated that way it will give them plenty of time to clear the air and we can also ask them how many grievances they have and how many have been cleared up since we started this. That way, we will know what direction we are going in.

Ms. McCarthy replied that is something that I also said to them in last week's meeting and in my initial meeting with them, that my expectation was that some changes would happen.

Alderman Clancy responded the morale. The big concern down there is the morale.

Chairman Pariseau stated and it reflects poorly on the service.

Alderman Girard stated there are some drivers that could be better to passengers. I have heard those complaints frequently.

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

A True Record. Attest.

Clerk of Committee