

COMMITTEE ON ADMINISTRATION/INFORMATION SYSTEMS

February 20, 2024 at 6:00 PM

Chairman Long called the meeting to order.

The Clerk called the roll.

Present: Aldermen Long, Levasseur, Thomas, E. Sapienza, Fajardo

Chairman Long advised that the first purpose of the meeting is organizational in nature, and requested the Clerk to provide a brief overview regarding typical issues addressed by the Committee.

Matthew Normand, City Clerk, stated this committee shall have jurisdiction over policy regarding licensing, information systems and the general administrative affairs of the city and such other matters as may be referred by the BMA. This committee shall review all such referrals and where required, after due and careful consideration, shall report back to the BMA.

2. Proposed change to Rule 3 of the Board of Mayor and Aldermen to remove the sentence "The session shall be a period of time not to exceed thirty minutes during which any member of the public may have two minutes to address any single topic".

(Note: Referred to committee by the BMA at their 1/16/24 meeting)

Chairman Long stated my understanding is that the public participation session will exceed 30 minutes, however, if it is under 30 minutes he will ask if anybody else wants to speak. If it is over 30 minutes, just those that are signed up can speak. Is that how that is going to work?

City Clerk Normand stated it is my understanding from talking to the mayor that if a resident does not sign the sheet, he will move on to the regular business of the meeting. Essentially, people that want to speak need to sign-up ahead of time.

Chairman Long stated correct and if it exceeds 30 minutes, it exceeds 30 minutes. As for the two minutes, he has been giving three minutes. Will that continue? There is no two minutes but it is three minutes correct?

Alderman Levasseur replied correct.

Chairman Long stated so we want to keep two minutes in the rule and not to exceed 30 minutes.

Alderman Levasseur moved to receive and file. Alderman E. Sapienza duly seconded the motion.

Chairman Long asked so we are going to keep rules that we don't follow.

Alderman Levasseur responded we are following this rule.

Alderman Fajardo asked are we going to change it to two minutes instead of three.

Alderman Levasseur stated the second part of that rule says that it is within the discretion of the mayor to allow three minutes, and I haven't seen a mayor change it to two minutes in 25 years.

Chairman Long replied but this will still give him that option.

Chairman Long called for a vote. *The motion carried with Chairman Long being duly recorded in opposition.*

3. Ordinance Amendment:

“Amending Chapter 38: Procurement Code of the Code of Ordinances of the City of Manchester by adding additional requirements during the prequalification of bidders associated with the procurement of City construction contracts.”
(Note: This amendment was rescinded at the 1/16/24 BMA meeting and referred back to committee.)

Alderman Fajardo moved to approve. There was no second.

Alderman Levasseur moved to receive and file. **Alderman E. Sapienza** duly seconded the motion.

Alderman Levasseur stated what people I have talked to prefer is to get rid of the changes that were presented and any changes that are going to be done can come back through the committee because there were agreements on some changes but it would be nitpicky for us to say we are going to change language in this line or that line. More work can be done on it and then it can come back again. We can just receive and file this ordinance amendment. I believe there is one particular issue that Alderman Burkush wants added in so that change can be made in a new draft.

Alderman Fajardo asked and that will come back to the committee.

Alderman Levasseur replied it can come forward through the aldermen to the committee. I don't remember who created this in the first place.

City Clerk Normand stated it was DPW.

Chairman Long stated I want to state that this is a worker protection ordinance and receiving and filing it is saying that maybe at a later date we will be thinking about protecting workers. I am opposed to that. This is worker protection again. I don't believe there is anything we do with worker protection except for our city employees. This is for worker protection. We want contractors to know that whatever we contract them for we are protecting the workers.

Alderman Levasseur asked and you don't think we have enough to do in our lives that we have to worry about what other companies are doing with their workers.

Chairman Long answered absolutely. If it is coming from tax payer dollars, I am responsible for that and I absolutely want workers protected.

Alderman Levasseur stated that is micromanagement.

Chairman Long responded that is worker protection.

Alderman Levasseur stated it is still micromanaging other people's businesses.

Chairman Long replied again if it is tax dollars I would be more than happy to micromanage and make sure that those companies are doing their workers right.

Alderman E. Sapienza stated I am looking at Item 14 of the ordinance and it states "whether the applicant has a record of compliance or non-compliance with employment discrimination laws or labor laws." What exactly is a record of compliance? If you are just going about and doing your business, let's say you have been doing it for years, is that in itself a record of compliance or do you actually have to produce a record of compliance?

Chairman Long answered there is a record of compliance; there is through the state and federal government. They have gone after companies for non-classification or classifying their employees incorrectly or not paying workers compensation or time and a half or overtime, which is time and a half, or not paying their workers to work on a Saturday to assure them they have a job on Monday. There absolutely is...

Alderman E. Sapienza interjected that is my point. You used the words "gone after" employers. Like I said, what if the employer has been conducting business fairly for 10, 20 or 30 years and they don't have any complaints? Is that a record of compliance?

Chairman Long responded yes. He has no record of non-compliance so that is a record of compliance.

Alderman E. Sapienza asked so no record of non-compliance equals a record of compliance. I don't want to overregulate. There are plenty of regulations out there. Let's enforce the rules that are already on the books.

Chairman Long replied that is what this ordinance intends on doing.

Alderman T. Sapienza stated this isn't just worker protection. This is to protect the city right? There are a lot of city contracts that we don't want unscrupulous contractors bidding on. This is a way to weed out unscrupulous contractors that have had troubles in other communities. There is a contractor that is working in the city now, he is working on private projects, but he has a whole litany of court cases against him and if he wants to bid on a city project we should be able to exclude him.

Alderman E. Sapienza asked can't we do that currently. It doesn't just go to the lowest bidder. It goes to the lowest responsible bidder. Am I right?

Alderman Levasseur replied yes.

Alderman E. Sapienza stated okay well if they are not a responsible bidder we don't have to give it to them.

Chairman Long stated that is what this ordinance would do. Without this ordinance, they won't do that. That is what this ordinance does. Without this ordinance, the departments don't have to do that and why would they do that if it is not required? That is why this ordinance requires it.

Alderman Levasseur responded the ordinance is in place. You added a bunch of other items to it. The additions are what we don't want.

Alderman Fajardo asked who is "we".

Alderman Levasseur answered me and him. Is that close enough for you?

Alderman Fajardo responded I am just curious.

Chairman Long asked is Mr. Clougherty here. I guess he isn't.

Alderman Levasseur stated when this report is on the BMA consent agenda in two weeks, you will be able to have him in front of you to ask questions.

Chairman Long called for a vote. *The motion carried with Aldermen Long and Fajardo duly recorded in opposition.*

4. Communication from Senator D'Allesandro regarding forming a Sister City relationship with Ville de Sherbrooke in Canada.

Chairman Long stated I would ask that MEDO come up with a policy regarding Sister Cities. I guess the City of Manchester has no policy with respect to Sister Cities. After receiving an email from City Clerk Normand, it seems we have no Sister Cities which I thought we did. We have no record of an aldermanic vote. I would entertain a motion to approve this and have MEDO come back to the committee with a policy that we can have for any future requests.

Chairman Long moved to approve the Sister City relationship with Ville de Sherbrooke in Canada and request the Economic Development Department to draft a policy on Sister Cities and bring it back to committee at a later date. **Alderman Fajardo** duly seconded the motion.

Alderman Fajardo asked so we are talking about creating some sort of documentation to formalize the agreement and not necessarily...well is the expectation that we will also lay out the specific requirements for Sister Cities.

City Clerk Normand stated I can tell you that in 2012 the former MEDO Director had presented a proposed policy to this committee on how to engage in a Sister City relationship with another community. A lot of that is already in template format from the

International Sister City Organization. It was received and filed in 2012 so there is nothing on the books with the city currently on how to do this.

Chairman Long called for a vote. *There being none opposed, the motion carried.*

*There being no further business, on motion of **Alderman E. Sapienza**, duly seconded by **Alderman Thomas**, it was voted to adjourn.*

A True Record. Attest.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Matthew Normand". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a long horizontal stroke at the end.

Clerk of Committee