

BOARD OF MAYOR AND ALDERMEN

May 21, 2024 at 7:00 PM

Mayor Ruais called the meeting to order.

Mayor Ruais called on Alderman Morgan to lead the Pledge of Allegiance.

A moment of silence was observed.

The Clerk called the roll.

Present: Aldermen Morgan, Goonan, Long, Fajardo, T. Sapienza, Kantor, O'Neil, Levasseur, Terrio, E. Sapienza, Burkush, Barry, Vincent,

Absent: Alderman Thomas

PUBLIC COMMENT

Mayor Ruais advised that the purpose of the public comment session is to give residents of Manchester the opportunity to address the Board. All people wishing to speak must sign up with their name, address and topic prior to 7 PM. Once called, they will have up to three minutes to speak and any comments must be directed to the chair and concluded when their time is up. If the Clerk calls their name and they are not present to speak, they will not be given a second opportunity. Any resident wishing to speak will come forward to the nearest microphone, clearly state their name and address when recognized and give their comments.

Richard Girard, 283 Orange Street, stated:

Not only was I a member of this Board when Yarger Decker was adopted, I made the motion to adopt it. It is a vote that I wish I could take back as Yarger Decker has been a vice grip on the city's finances ever since. The complaints from the department heads, the HR Department, and the city unions were no different then than they are today. The result is not likely to be any different either. What was that result? In short, in the name of making the city competitive with communities in other states that had a much higher cost of living and smaller, much wealthier communities in terms of tax base and median income than in our own state, personnel costs exploded depriving the city of the tools,

raw materials and ironically employees needed to do the work. It wasn't until the tax cap was implemented that spending on employees started to slow and the unions haven't liked it. Evidence of that can be seen in their requirement that candidates for office oppose the tax cap if they are to be endorsed. The Police Patrolmen's union filing a right-to-know request against a handful of aldermen is further evidence of how desperately the unions want this study to be completed. They know from their Yarger Decker experience that it will provide ammunition to push for higher pay, the tax cap be damned. I hope the Board won't reward this intimidation tactic by continuing the study. While Chairman of the School Board's negotiation committee, I had to deal directly with a similar study which determined that while some positions allegedly weren't competitive with those in other districts, others were paid more and some much more. Negotiations broke down because the union, in demanding that underpaid positions immediately be increased, refused to consider even redlining those employees who made more no matter how much more and I am sure Alderman Terrio who sat on that committee with me will remember that. This is proof positive that the way these things work is that no matter how much more they already make, the unions will always want more and will never take less or even the same for any of its members. I urge the Board to cut its losses. Take whatever information you are entitled to based on the invoices paid and the work completed and bring this review in-house if it must continue, which I don't think it does. You have very highly paid department heads who should know what job descriptions they need to run their department. They should also have an idea of the compensation needed to attract qualified people. Many of the changes to Yarger Decker since have been in response to those needs. Working with HR, a department head should be able to put those needs into writing and bring it to this Board for approval, which clearly has been done over the years. This is a sign of a system adapting to meet the needs of the times, not a sign of dysfunction in the system. In closing, I want to challenge the idea that what Manchester pays isn't competitive. On June 4, 2022, after the Board overrode the tax cap for union pay raises, I published a list of what every city employee made in 2021. It was eye-opening. Two-hundred and fifty-five city employees, not counting the schools, made more than \$100,000 a year. I posted that article on the front page of Girard at Large.com for those who want more details. My guess is that number has only grown. Thank you.

Bryce Kaw-uh, 639 N. Bay Street, stated:

I came here tonight in my own personal capacity this time to talk about the city-wide classification and total compensation study. This is Item 23 on your agenda and it has proven surprisingly contentious. At the core of this controversy is a simple pair of questions. Do we want our city workers to be fairly compensated for their labor and if so, what is fair compensation? The answer to the first question is unequivocally yes. All of us here tonight want our city workers to be fairly compensated. The hard-working folks who keep Manchester moving and keep us safe deserve nothing less and the residents of Manchester deserve the best people we can hire. As for the second question, what is fair compensation, we don't really know what that looks like in today's economic environment for the City of Manchester yet. So many things have changed since the original Yarger Decker classification and pay system was introduced in the late 1990's. I know some of us were here when that was introduced, but it has been quite a while. That is why the city-wide study is critical. Anyone in the private sector can tell you that the labor market of 2024 is vastly different from the labor market of 25+ years ago. For that matter, any city department head, as was referenced earlier, can tell you that the same is true in the public sector if you are willing to ask them or check out the large number of vacancies the city has struggled to fill over the years. At the very least, please listen with open ears to the city's own HR Director, Lisa Drabik, when she provides an update on the compensation study after public comment ends tonight. Director Drabik is an expert in her field with the city's best interest at heart and I am confident that she will be able to answer any remaining questions that you have after her presentation. Mayor Ruais, you recently started at the last meeting a Mayoral Challenge Coin program to celebrate the contributions of hard-working city employees. That program is a token of your appreciation for the staff members serving our community under your care as Mayor. This evening, the extent of your appreciation for those same employees may be put to the test. You will have a voice regarding whether the city-wide compensation and classification study can continue and I hope that you have the courage and conviction to encourage the aldermen here to vote yes. In the case of a tie, cast the deciding vote in favor of supporting our city workers. Let's not bury our collective heads in the sand and cancel a worthwhile study before it is completed. Let's find out what we don't know. That way, hopefully, we can act wisely and make more informed decisions for the city we love. Thank you for your time.

Alex Hawk, 195 McGregor Street, stated:

I am a five-year resident of Ward 11 and am here tonight to hopefully break the 12-day streak of accidents on Elm Street and to speak about the state of our roads and crosswalk infrastructure. I would first like to start off by thanking the aldermen and city staff who have been responsive and have acknowledged my concerns so far. My first concern is regarding crosswalk signage in the downtown, particularly on Elm Street. There is currently no permanent year-round signage installed for these crosswalks in the most walkable district in our city. I have requested this multiple times unsuccessfully and I hope tonight that the Board can in the future work to get this common sense safety improvement taken care of. This is well within federal regulations and furthermore there are several other guidelines that strongly encourage this signage to be in place. My second concern is regarding the current state, in general, of our roads and the lack of action on implementing complete street guidelines called for within our master plan, particularly page 94. Complete streets are a refined process and approach to road design which improves accessibility and safety for all including vehicles, pedestrians and bicyclists alike. Complete streets consider the needs and safety of all road users and help to address problems with streets that result from our historical under investment in infrastructure. It is something I hope we can all agree is a problem in this city. To summarize, adopting and implementing a complete streets policy not only improves safety for all but will open other potential opportunities for street reconstruction funding which may have otherwise not existed. My third and final concern is regarding the poor funding of sidewalks and particularly ADA compliance in our downtown area, as well as the rest of the city. This upcoming budget simply does not adequately address our crumbling infrastructure let alone our sidewalk infrastructure. Unfortunately, it has been touted that we are making historical investments and I do thank you for making investments but I believe the opposite is true. Unfortunately, our upcoming budget only allocates \$1 million in funding towards sidewalk improvements which falls short of the \$2 million originally requested. Furthermore, additional CIP funding to my understanding of \$5 million or more could be used to address this. DPW data of sidewalk assessments indicates over \$20 million to bring our downtown into a good state. 2024 also marks the impending adoption of PROWAG or the pedestrian right-of-way access guidelines. I did have a couple of

documents outlining this and I won't go too far over but I just want to say that I have tried to request that the little funding that we have in infrastructure for this ADA equipment be repaired and I have been denied. This is extremely important to our city and I hope that you all take the opportunity to consider this.

Glenn RJ Ouellette, 112 Auburn Street, stated:

I will have been at 112 Auburn Street 24 years come December 7. I have never been homeless in my life and I never should have to be. I work. I pay my rent. I am not a problem yet for the last six months they have been trying to evict me for non-payment of rent when I have the receipts for my rent. They say I didn't sign the forms that they gave me. They didn't give me those forms and until they give them to me, I can't sign them. I have had enough. Now I am going to court on June 6. There are too many seniors downtown that are losing their rents because the landlords see the upgrades and the new rent prices coming in and they want to have that money. You are going to see a lot of seniors thrown out so they can just paint the apartment and say I have made an update. The city itself is in violation. You have no kitchen at 39 Beech Street yet you feed people there. You have people in wheelchairs that can't get up. They are in their 80's and 90's yet there are no services to bring them to the bathroom or to give them a bath. Why are we not calling the state and asking the Senior Department...there is a Senior Citizen Department in Concord that would take care of that. They would find them a place of dignity to finish living their lives. These are citizens from here in those wheelchairs that have worked all their lives and this is how we treat them. There are 794 kids that are homeless. What are we doing about that? We hear a lot about homelessness but I don't hear any programs dealing with that other than one shelter that takes care of 14 or 15 kids. We can do a better job. It is not all about money because some money is definitely going to waste. Thank you, Your Honor. I believe you were partially responsible for lighting up the tree on the corner of Chestnut and Canal Street where the public access station is. It is beautiful. That is how the downtown should look. The price of that is so inexpensive but it will brighten the downtown and bring more people downtown. It is dark on Elm Street. You go to other cities and they are much better lit. These are small problems but they are so important that if you fix them, it is like fixing the broken window. I understand that this is the last second meeting of the month until September. Enjoy your summer and I want

to leave you with this. Not this Saturday but next Saturday is the city's 178th birthday. I was told when we reached 172 we had to wait until 175. Well 175 has gone by yet this Board or the previous Board set aside \$10,000 in an account but we never celebrated it. In this city, we don't celebrate enough of the good stuff. We should be proud of our city and proud of our history and celebrate it. I wish this Board, and I wish this city a very happy birthday on its 178th birthday come June 1. Thank you.

Bradley Conway, 236 Boutwell Street, stated:

Mayor Ruais, I saw you stumbling over yourself to shake Biden's hand on the tarmac today and I wanted to take the time to say you must be so proud. Look at you now; how far you have come. You are so important. Your suit is expensive. You are the mayor of NH's biggest city. You shook the President's hand today but Mr. Mayor, I want to start by saying I think you are a disgrace to the City of Manchester. When I look at you, I see an empty man who stands only for himself, who adores not just power but the power of cruelty and who today sought so desperately to suck up to the President who butchers and starves humans of breakfast every day. I saw you look into Biden's eyes and ask to be a part of that club. I think about how you refuse to meet with your constituents about their draft ceasefire resolution and how on some level you must relate to Biden. You are both willing to take hits politically to stand up for cruelty and fascism around the world against the will of a clear majority of your constituents. Mayor Ruais, you have been shouting since Day 1 I am willing to look the other way, my values are for sale, my self-interest could be an asset to you. Again, I hope you are really proud of the person you have become. I would like to address now both the Mayor and the Board of Aldermen. We are here again to hold you all accountable for your inaction to stop the genocide in Gaza. More than one million people are being starved. Starvation is a form of torture. Citizens of Manchester are being forced to pay for it and you are doing nothing to stop it despite weeks of appeal. You have power and you are not using it. You know, as well as we do, that your inaction is unleashing the suffering into this world that endangers the lives of every resident of Manchester. Empires and colonizers of the world see themselves in Israel. Colonized people see themselves in Palestinians. Take a position on this issue and stand against cruelty. Residents of Manchester demand that this council make a strong statement in solidarity with Palestine by passing a divestment resolution. We demand that you establish a

committee to insure that Manchester's finances are separate from the companies whose business models necessitate genocide and global conflict. After so much suffering, residents of Manchester feel that it would be entirely inappropriate for the City of Manchester's investments to be tethered in any way to the U.S.-Israeli military industrial complex. You on the Board need to know that the ongoing genocide in Gaza is your responsibility to stop. I am saying that because you and your inaction are sitting right here in front of me but I really think that all of NH's leaders who Mayor Ruais was laughing with on the tarmac today, bring great shame to the state of NH and should resign immediately. Of course, I am talking not just about Mayor Ruais but Governor Sununu, Chris Pappas, Annie Kuster, Jeanne Shaheen and Maggie Hassan who consciously promote anti-Semitism by arming the secular state of Israel for its explicitly stated purpose of indiscriminately murdering and ethnically cleansing the native Semitic Palestinians for their real estate. No person is fit for leadership at any level of government who fails to protect children and I hope you take that all to heart.

Sebastian Rowan, Falcon Court, stated:

I am here tonight to once again ask this Board to pass a resolution calling for an immediate ceasefire in Gaza and an end to all U.S. aid to Israel. I ask the Board to do this not only for myself but also on behalf of the hundreds of people who have signed our petition calling on this Board to act. Our federal government sends billions of dollars per year to Israel to fund their military. \$1.7 million comes from Manchester taxpayers. This money is being used to carry out a genocide against the Palestinian people and support an apartheid regime that exports its technologies of war and surveillance across the world. The money we send to Israel would be much better spent in our local communities through programs like the Community Development Block Grant, a federal program which gets less funding each year than we send to Israel; a program that could provide funding to Manchester to help us address our housing crisis, support services for people from drug addiction, or even to address the problems the city has with traffic safety. As a PhD student in civil engineering, I can confidently say that the pedestrian crossing at the intersection of Bridge Street and Elm are not up to standards. In fact, two people were killed at this intersection this week and I would very much prefer that my tax dollars be used to fix our unsafe intersections than for bombs to be dropped on hospitals and schools. Some members on this Board do not believe that it is their job to

listen to their constituents; a belief shared by our federal representatives who refuse to even respond to our emails and our Governor who sends state police to violently put down peaceful protests on our college campuses. I hope there are at least a few members of this Board who don't share this opinion and who believe that it is their job to enact the will of their constituents and more importantly believe that they have a moral obligation to do whatever they can in their power to stop an ongoing genocide. If such a member exists on this Board, I hope they will speak up. For those who stay silent, know that you are complicit in this genocide and history will remember you accordingly.

Thank you.

Salaam Odeh, Manchester, stated:

Greetings to humanity and whoever is a human here in this room. I am not here to talk about the famine or the genocide or even the ceasefire even though I am holding a ceasefire sign. We were attacked two weeks ago and we were accused of bringing guns or the possibility of bringing guns even though we are holding this sign that says ceasefire. Ceasefire means no violence. Ceasefire means to stop the fighting and stop the killing and stop the genocide. That is what ceasefire means. We are all educated and we are all smart people so we did not show up in this room...the first time I came here, we came and we had every good intention. I did not know any of you, especially your chairperson who has been attacking me and Chrissy who has been attacking me and bashing me on her Facebook page and also putting me in harms' way on his Facebook page. However, I saw you today on the news Mayor and you were there to welcome the President of the United States of America. Your chairperson and I don't know if he would like me to call him Kelly but this is his Facebook page. He has the President, Joe Biden, on his profile saying Biden is a disgrace and he has the flag of Israel. Then he wants to complain about us and we are just asking for the genocide to stop. You also have shouted at me using my first name. Would you like for me to use your first name and call you by your first name? I show respect and I would like to be shown respect. If any of you would like to provoke us, we would like to be able to respond. If we aren't able to respond, this is really abuse and we will not take it. If we are sitting here and listening and a few of them choose to provoke us, we will talk back and you will not call me by my first name. You will have respect for me because I have been respecting you. Anyone who is not respecting me, I will not respect them. This is

a double-standard. I did not come here to create enemies. We only come here because we have the right to come here. By coming here and asking for a ceasefire resolution, we are making history because this has never happened in the history of Manchester, NH. Free Palestine.

*On motion of **Alderman Terrio**, duly seconded by **Alderman E. Sapienza**, it was voted to take all comments under advisement and further to receive and file any written documentation presented.*

PRESENTATION

2. Update on City-wide Classification and Total Compensation Study from Lisa Drabik, HR Director.

Lisa Drabik, HR Director, stated first thank you for the opportunity to present an update tonight on the city-wide classification and total compensation study. In advance of my presentation, and given that many of the current Board members were not in office when the compensation study was initiated in the fall of 2022, I have provided several pages of written materials in the agenda that are related to the study for the Board and public's review. Tonight, I intend to provide a brief synopsis of the study as follows: how and why it came into being, what has been spent and accomplished thus far, and what still remains to be done including projected costs to finish the study itself, the timing of the final report and what that would mean to this Board. First, to set the stage the discussion about doing a city-wide compensation study actually began long before my tenure. I am told it was raised by the then acting HR Director as earlier as 2020. I, myself, started with the city on August 29, 2022, just five days later at my first BMA meeting, the Board voted to appropriate \$750,000 in one-time funds to do a city-wide compensation study. Given that I was so new and still trying to get my bearings, the Mayor's Office assisted with the steps necessary to create a CIP project and they put in a projected end date for the project of June 30, 2024. Thus began this journey in which I have simply been effectuating the will of the Board. I am going to provide a review of the timeline of the study in a few minutes but before I do, I wanted to provide the Board with a snapshot of the reasons as they were explained to me both during my interviews for the job and in my first few weeks on the job and which I have now confirmed over the almost 21 months that I have been with the city as to why the then mayor and the

Board believed a city-wide compensation study was in order. As I am sure you are all well aware, the city's current classification and pay system called Yarger Decker, named after the consultant who drafted it, was implemented over 25 years ago. In those 25 years, the system has evolved in quite a number of ways. First, due to differing bargained for COLA's and as the result of other topics of union negotiations, one master wage scale that we started with has morphed into six wage scales; all with varying pay rates for the same grade of positions. By way of example, as of now, the Airport union employees and Police Department support staff are on one of the six scales together while the firefighters and all of the AFSCME units to include DPW, Fleet and Health employees, are on another scale. What is the problem with this? Well aside from quite frankly being a logistically nightmare to administer our pay plan, it has created internal equity issues. Just one example of this is differing wage scales sometimes prompt or even prevent employees from taking positions in other departments across the city based on the applicable union wage scale. In other words, we often have city departments swapping employees who are in search of higher wages for performing essentially the same duties. We are just moving players around on the team. Second, when Yarger Decker was implemented, we had about 300 job titles. Now we have over 450. It may surprise you to learn that we do have several classifications across departments which may be called different things but they are doing substantially the same work and may be paid at different grades. Third, and to that end, we need to rebalance internal equity. Over the years, some departments have been more aggressive than others in seeking to reclassify certain roles into higher grades or in doing complete reorganizations resulting, again, in internal equity issues. Moreover, all over the city we have wage compression problems. Some employees in lower grades are making more than those in higher grades, often their supervisors, based on tenure or the number of times each has changed positions within the city. Fourth, unlike some of our surrounding communities, we have not done any city-wide comparison of where we stand to market, at least in the last several years and likely not since 1999 when Yarger Decker was implemented. Coincidentally, just this afternoon, I got an email from the Nashua HR Director that Nashua will be kicking off their own study and Manchester will be asked to be a comparison community. This email went to myself and the HR Director in Concord who replied that Concord will also soon be starting their own wage study. Finally, both recruitment of new employees and retention

of existing employees, has become challenging. I would like to give you just a quick snapshot of some stats on that. With regard to vacancies, as of May 1, and we wo our accounts at the first of every month, we had 239 vacancies. With regard to salaries, we are consistently losing external candidates and current employees due to salary related concerns. We have been unable to fill certain positions and we have also lost employees that we have spent the time and money training only for them to be hired away by other municipal employers at a higher base pay than what the city currently provides. With regard to our turnover rate, I provided data back to FY17. The turnover rate has gone up consistently. It is not abnormal for it to have increased after Covid, however, our numbers have gone up substantially and if I put you to just this current fiscal year, those numbers are only through April and we are already over 18% and have two more months to go. I am projecting that number will end up in excess of 20%. Finally, as of this July 1, 282 of our current employees are eligible for retirement. That constitutes almost 24% of our workforce. On average, the city has had about 40 retirements per year. Should we experience even greater turnover in the next fiscal year due to retirements, that of course would have a major impact on the city's budget with regard to the severance line. That brings me to the study itself. These are the three expressed goals in the original RFP document which I provided to the Board as tonight's packet. Let me summarize them quickly. 1) retain and attract talent by determining the market value of each job and providing a compensation package which is fair, equitable and competitive; 2) do the study with an eye towards fiscal responsibility to the taxpayers of this city; and 3) come out of all of this with some sort of recommendation, which if adopted, would renew our focus on performance metrics to insure a closer alignment between pay and performance. Next, I would like to take you through the project timeline. I want to brief you about what has happened thus far with regard to the study, which quite frankly has proven to be a mammoth project; much more involved than I ever anticipated. As I said, it was in early September 2022 that the Board voted to fund the study and the CIP project for \$750,000 was created with an end date projection of June 30, 2024. After that, it took several months to draft an RFP and go through the bid and interview process. As part of that, an internal working group was created. I used some funding from the HR budget, not the CIP project, to hire a consultant who was well-versed in the compensation world to help us craft the RFP. She met with several stakeholders and drafted the RFP which we then revised and

nailed down in our working group. We issued the RFP, collected bids, and interviewed the bidders. I conducted reference checks on the top bidders with HR Directors who had engaged their services all over the country and by mid-May 2023, we had chosen Evergreen Solutions to do the study. Let me tell you just a little bit about Evergreen. They are a national firm based in Florida and they have conducted over 1,100 similar studies for public sector clients across the nation. Many of their own employees are former local government employees or elected officials. Our project manager, Rob, is a former elected official in Florida. Importantly, their work is focused exclusively on local government and public sector clients. As an aside, during the course of my conversations with these HR Directors, and I talked to 16 of them across the country who had recently undergone their own compensation study, I took the opportunity to ask for their advice. Every single one of them stressed the importance of having someone internally to be our project manager, our internal project manager and someone who wasn't me quite frankly given the workload demands required to keep the study moving and provide the data necessary to the outside consultant; the city data, policy information, to review the data and handle logistics, follow-up with the consultants, communicate with employees, etc. So I went through the HRIC process to create a limited term HR Project Coordinator position and we were lucky enough to bring someone on rather quickly in early August 2023. I am mentioning this only as you will see a line item for the cost of this position in the budget that I will go over in a few minutes. Also, from the get go and throughout the course of the study, I have pledged to be as transparent as possible with city employees, department heads and the BMA providing frequent updates via email and responding to every email I got with regard to hey what is going on with the study. Before we even issued the RFP, the contents went before the Board for approval and as you can see from the written materials in your packet, I provided several updates on the RFP and bid process to the Board prior to hiring Evergreen. Back to the timeline. Starting in June 2023, we had our kick-off meetings with Evergreen and prepared for them to come on-site and do almost a week's worth of on-site meetings, orientation sessions and focus groups. That on-site visit occurred in mid-August 2023. I want to show you a couple of slides here. I know this is difficult to read but this was essentially the schedule that we put together for Evergreen when they came on-site. The three different colors at the top are three different members of their team. We had them going all over the city starting at 8:15 AM

and ending at 5 PM for three and a half days. These were days one and two and these were days three and four. Over the course of those four days, they conducted over 80 sessions with employees, department heads, union representatives, supervisors and specifically crafted focus groups. The sessions were extremely well attended and they took place in City Hall as well as the Police Department, Fire Department, Public Works, Health, the Airport and Water Works. Returning to our timeline, the next step was the JAT process, the Job Assessment Tool. This involved Evergreen sending a JAT to every employee via a unique idea for their completion online. The JAT itself asked a series of questions about an employee's job duties, level of responsibilities, complexity of tasks, analytical requirements, physical requirements, etc. Employees were given two weeks to complete the process. Our departments mounted a massive effort to get it done and I am proud to say that over 85% of our employees went online and completed their JAT. Next, supervisors and department heads began their review of employee JAT responses. They weren't allowed to change anything submitted by the employees but they could comment and add additional context and fill in gaps where necessary via a separate form called the MIT, the Management Issues Tool. Those supervisors were given two more weeks to complete that and we had over 98% completion. Per Evergreen, these participation rates are among the highest rates of employee engagement they have ever seen when doing a compensation study. So everything I have told you about so far relates to internal data. The next step in the process was for Evergreen to gather the external meaning market data. To that end, Evergreen sent out data requests for both pay and benefits information to 21 designated comparable municipalities. Here is that list. How did Evergreen come up with this list? In one word, collaboratively. It was largely borne from the 80+ sessions they did in the city asking department heads, supervisors, and union members who are we losing people to and who would you consider to be our comps. Then they took that list that they gathered and did an analysis which compared population, per capita income and cost of living. Before we went with this list, we gave everyone, including department heads and union reps, one last chance to opine. What you are seeing here is the final list. As you can see, many of these communities are in NH and most are in New England. Only two are outside New England and were included to give us some additional comps given that their stats matched so closely to Manchester's. That would be Dayton, Ohio and Albany, New York. Returning to the project timeline, then began the data crunching.

While waiting on the external data, Evergreen did its analysis and synthesis of the JAT's and MIT's. Once Evergreen finished their initial analysis, the project manager came on-site to meet with us to do a preliminary review and that kicked off a series of meetings over the next few months in which we reviewed, department by department, job by job, the JAT results to make sure nothing seemed out of whack. If it needed further clarification, we followed-up and checked in with the appropriate departments. We were also very intentional about fixing some of the internal equity issues I discussed earlier and we worked to group jobs together appropriately and to create an internal naming structure and job ladders that make sense from now into the future. It was a tedious process but absolutely necessary to do this right. At the same time, I did quite a bit of outreach to our external comps, fellow HR Director to fellow HR Director, pleading with them to participate in our data survey. Finally, Evergreen received enough data from those comps to form a defensible dataset. Evergreen continues to crunch that market data and that brings us up to today in the timeline. What still remains to be done? In the CIP meeting a couple of weeks ago, I estimated that we were about 65% done and I stand by that number. Here is what remains to be done and the projected timeline. Starting this month and continuing through the summer, Evergreen will present the external market results to HR. Evergreen will then layer those external results over the internal JAT results and we will discuss what they refer to as a solution file meaning what could a new pay plan with market appropriate ranges look like? Moreover, how and where would our employees fit within that plan. There are several industry standard methods for moving employees into any new pay plan. We will evaluate those and present scenarios to this Board with projected total implementation costs as well as possible strategies for phasing in any plan as necessary. All of that work will be synthesized and put into a written final report, as well as a presentation by Evergreen to the Board. We have targeted the September 3 BMA meeting for that presentation. After that there would still remain much work to be done. Evergreen will be using the data they compiled during the JAT process to update our job descriptions and HR will, of course, review them. Evergreen will review the FLSA status, exempt versus non-exempt, of each of our job classifications and HR will then review those, likely with the aid of counsel. Evergreen will provide training to our HR staff to use their proprietary tools so that we can keep up the system internally, long after we wrap up our work with Evergreen. In the context of this future work still to be done, I want to address directly

why I made the request to extend the funding in the CIP project to June 30, 2026. For me, it was a simple thought process. The final report will be presented this fall and then if there was an adoption of a new pay plan, that would trigger a whole bunch of work to be implemented like revising our payroll system, perhaps ordinances, etc. not to mention the work that HR and Evergreen still have to do to finish this out as I just outlined. All of that could run into FY26. Put simply, I was just trying to extend the date that the project monies would be available so I wouldn't have to bother the CIP Committee again. In other words, I reviewed it as a simple administrative detail. There was no intent to delay the study, the results or anything associated with this project. In fact, I can assure you that there is likely nobody in this city who wants this project to be done and behind us more than me. Turning quickly to the budget for this project, this slide breaks down the very simple budget for the project. I realize that it is difficult to read but let me just outline the highlights. As you can see, there are really only four categories of expenses related to this project – 1) the contract with Evergreen. The total contract is \$105,500 of which we have paid just over \$79,000 thus far; 2) the salary and benefits for the internal HR project coordinator that I mentioned I hired; 3) projected costs for continued utilization of the consultant that helped us draft the RFP, which then began wholly unnecessary as I was able to quickly recruit and hire the internal project coordinator; and 4) contingency costs or any other costs related to the project to include additional on-site consultant time, legal services, etc. Along the way, the BMA voted to approve certain organizational changes proposed by the Library pursuant to a previously executed MOU with the Library Union. In order to fund those changes, the Board voted to use monies from the comp study CIP project, which is why I have included the \$83,843 that such changes cost in the budget for the comp study. Let me simplify and provide you with some bottom line numbers. To date, we have spent \$137,409 on the study itself. The projected additional cost to finish the study are just over \$88,000. This includes the \$26,375 still due to Evergreen at the conclusion of their work, plus the salary cost of our internal employee and \$25,000 in contingency. If you include the Library changes I referenced, then the expected spend out of the CIP is \$309,323. If you back out the Library changes, the total projected study costs are equivalent to only 30% of the original \$750,000 set aside for the study which I would submit we have conducted in a fiscally responsible manner. Finally, let me say a quick word about the final report which we expect to present in late summer or early fall as I

said and it is this. The data is simply the data. Affordability is another matter and as always, wages and benefits are part of union negotiations. The bottom line is any implementation scenario would require the support of the Board. Having said all of that, I am happy to take questions but let me preface that with the proposition that I can't answer any substantive questions about results such as the city's position relative to market, etc. First, because they have not yet been finalized and secondly because that is what Evergreen will present to the Board during its final report. Thank you.

Alderman Terrio stated I have two questions. The retention rate going up was very concerning.

Ms. Drabik asked do you mean the turnover rate.

Alderman Terrio answered yes. Post Covid, have you looked at other industries or other municipalities to see...are we alone in that or is everybody experiencing that?

Ms. Drabik replied everyone has experienced an uptick in turnover as people reassess their lives, I think, after Covid with some just not going back to work. I would submit that ours is higher than most others that I have seen. They are usually in the low teens but ours are in the high teens and sometimes even over 20%.

Alderman Terrio stated that leads me to my second question. I agree with most of the municipalities on the list but I do have concerns with a few of them. Not that I am an expert in statistics but I have studied it and I am concerned that we are going to create some outliers because of housing costs and taxation. For instance, I have a friend that lives in Albany, NH. He came to NH to work and he loved it here because housing was cheap and the cost of living was cheap but went back to Albany for family. I keep in touch with him and he says it is outrageously expensive in New York. It is my understanding that some municipalities have an income tax and some counties have an income tax and those resulting higher costs lead to higher salaries. I am concerned that we are going to create some false outliers here that skew it. Here at the specific municipalities I have concerns with – Albany, NH, Cambridge, MA which I am very familiar with, Hartford, CT, New Haven, CT and Quincy, MA because I am also very

familiar with them and those are municipalities that have higher housing costs and higher taxation resulting in higher salaries. I will give you an example. I have relatives that live in Boston. They live in a three-family and that is well over \$1.5 million. You could take that same house and plunk it down in Manchester and it would be \$600,000 or \$700,000. They also have an income tax and things like that. My concern with including these municipalities is we are going to skew the numbers higher.

Ms. Drabik replied that is a good point and I understand the concern. What I can tell you is when they do the statistical analysis, Evergreen adjusts for cost-of-living. Also, we are putting together an average and they are going to throw out outliers. We are looking at the average at the low, mid and high point of each salary range.

Alderman Barry stated Lisa thank you very much for the presentation. We are certainly lucky to have you as our HR Director and your service to the city is reflected in this presentation. The hard work, dedication and commitment to our city that you put into this is awesome. A few weeks ago, you were asked if you could guarantee with this compensation study that there would be a decrease in wages to our employees and your answer was no.

Ms. Drabik responded right. We are certainly not looking to decrease anyone's wages although I will tell you that I anticipate there will be many employees who would not be recommended for an increase depending on where they fall relative to the market.

Alderman Barry asked on the other hand, can you guarantee that there are going to be wage increases to our city employees.

Ms. Drabik answered not to all.

Alderman Barry stated you can't.

Ms. Drabik replied no.

Alderman Barry stated that is the whole purpose of this compensation study; to see where we are compared to other jurisdictions. As far as us losing many employees to outside agencies, I have seen that in law enforcement. It happens a lot. We see it now with DPW. The last I heard, we are short 53 people. When you are down over 200 employees, something has to be done. There will be some employees that won't be happy with the study. Like you said in your presentation, some employees may not get an increase and some may be overpaid. We understand that. There are quite a few flaws with Yarger Decker. Again, thank you for your hard work. You went above and beyond with this presentation.

Alderman E. Sapienza stated thank you Lisa for the presentation. I am all for accurate and objective data. I think we all are. Accurate and objective data is a good thing and we shouldn't shy away from it. I think the date of 2026 was a little eye-popping to some folks but we can work on that. Believe it or not, I am going to ask you for a little bit more data if I could. I am going to ask if you could possibly look into the compensation packages for the Hillsborough County Sheriff's Department, Hillsborough County Department of Corrections, Hillsborough County Nursing Home, the Administrative Office of the Court for the State of NH, and the good folks at AMR. The reason I am asking for that is I want to get a good idea of what the other folks right here in Manchester and surrounding communities are making and what their pay scales are like if they even have a pay scale. Believe it or not, I am going to ask for a little bit more data and if you could do that, it would be terrific. I just want to say it is important for all of us to realize that a lot of the issues surrounding recruitment and retention are actually beyond our control. There is only so much we can do. We could talk for hours on that but we won't. Thank you for the presentation and thanks for your continued efforts.

Alderman Fajardo stated my question is tied to the proprietary tools you mentioned that your staff will need to be trained on and continue to use. I am just wondering what the terms of the use of those tools are and if there is some kind of contract or ongoing licensing. How does that work?

Ms. Drabik responded that is a very good question. That was one of the most important things we put into our RFP quite frankly. We wanted to make sure that whatever

consultant we chose would be able to give us the tools we needed to keep up the system on our own. Every single one of them has their own proprietary tools. As part of our contract with Evergreen, we will have lifelong use of those tools and they will provide every update that comes up to us at no ongoing cost.

Alderman Levasseur stated my understanding when this was voted on was that we were going to be doing a study of Yarger Decker. After reading the package, we are not doing any kind of a study on Yarger Decker. We are just looking for a brand-new compensation package. Is that correct or not correct?

Ms. Drabik answered I guess I would characterize it is we are using Yarger Decker as the basis and looking to update it because of course we have to use the existing pay plan that we have, the existing ranges etc., to compare those to market.

Alderman Levasseur responded that is not what I read in what you gave us so I want to make sure because I have you on the record right now. There have been a lot of things stated to me in the last couple of years by certain department heads. They have said things to me and six months or a year later I get a completely different story. This is not to put you...I want to make sure I understand this. The people that the city hired went back and brought the history of Yarger Decker and the purpose of the Yarger Decker system and how it worked in the beginning and how it has increased salaries, benefits, etc. and we are just going to be...I want to make sure because my whole thought process and I didn't vote for the compensation study because I always thought if it is just Yarger Decker than we have the talent of department heads and plenty of aldermen and a few ex department heads on our Board that could have easily gone through and fixed any issues. My understanding is that there have been 3,000 changes to Yarger Decker so it is quite malleable and flexible. I think out of the 3,000 requests, we probably passed 2,998 of them. There has not been a Board that hasn't listened to department heads and made the changes. The master of it is Mr. Croasdale who came in two weeks ago and brought a grade 11 to a 14. He gave a great argument. He said we have people going to your house and we want good people going to your house. He made a great argument and the Board passed it without any problem. So we are not

creating a brand-new compensation system but we are staying within the system we have and we are going to tailor it or are we changing the system?

Ms. Drabik replied I don't know that I can provide an answer to that yet because a lot of it will be dependent on the next step.

Alderman Levasseur stated okay but this is important because if you don't know whether we are doing a new system or we are staying with the old system, that is not good because what are we spending our money for.

Ms. Drabik responded here is how I would frame it. We have to start with the system we have to study it. We have people placed in certain grades and with the problems that I have mentioned and the multiple scales that have morphed out of it they have certain wage ranges for certain positions and we have to start with Yarger Decker. That is what I am calling the Yarger Decker. It is basically the job classifications and the salary ranges. Then we took that and looked at everybody's job title and duties, etc. through the JAT process and are resetting the internal hierarchy because I would argue that it is like a tree now with branches everywhere jutting out. We are trying to put it all back together into a package that makes sense; a new classification system if you will and then you layer over the external market data. There will likely be perhaps more grades proposed because of the market salary ranges that match up to the positions. It is hard for me to put it into a box and say we are just taking Yarger Decker and updating it. We are taking the existing system that we have, relooking at the internal hierarchy and then laying over external wage data. The consultant may make new recommendations like we should not have X% between steps if we want to maintain market competitiveness or between grades or more grades or less grades and that sort of thing. So I don't know that I can answer that question.

Alderman Levasseur stated it sounds to me like you have a pretty good foundation on what the data is already showing.

Ms. Drabik replied no I am providing to you the bevy of options that may come with it once they layer the data together.

Alderman Levasseur stated you came from Londonderry. What system did they have? Did they have a 13 step system?

Ms. Drabik answered it varies by union contract. Some are just open range positions meaning there is a salary range from \$35,000 to \$55,000 for some positions in some unions and some have a step system like Police, Fire and DPW.

Alderman Levasseur asked do they have a COLA every year?

Ms. Drabik responded that is dependent on the union negotiations.

Alderman Levasseur asked why did you come to Manchester. Was it a better job opportunity or a higher salary?

Ms. Drabik answered I liked the challenge.

Alderman Levasseur asked did you get an increase in salary from your previous job. It is public information.

Ms. Drabik replied at the time I took the job, no.

Alderman Levasseur stated I don't mean to be rude. You say salaries are why...I don't mean to be...you came from Londonderry and I was just wondering if it was a better system or a different system.

Ms. Drabik stated also in Londonderry I was the Assistant Town Manager so I was hearing two hats and it became untenable.

Alderman Levasseur stated a lot of people don't take jobs in the City of Manchester just based on the starting salary right.

Ms. Drabik stated I knew what the potential was based on the way that the compensation system was explained to me at the time but really I was looking for a new challenge and it was right next door.

Alderman Levasseur asked when you started, did you start at step 1.

Ms. Drabik asked are you asking me or generally.

Alderman Levasseur stated well there are 13 steps so do you get those 13 steps if you start at a different step.

Ms. Drabik replied right now, department heads are given the latitude to hire between steps 1 and 5 as a starting salary to account for experience and that sort of thing. The ordinance provides that if you would like to offer a higher starting salary you need to go to the HR Director who needs to bless it and if the HR Director blesses it, it goes to the Mayor.

Alderman Levasseur stated I don't know the answer but if you start at a step 5 do you get 13 more increases or if you are at a 5 you only go to 13.

Ms. Drabik responded right now the way the system works is there are steps 1-3. If you start at 5, you only move to 13 and then you are stuck unless and until you hit a longevity which is at 5, 10, 15, 20 years, etc. where you would move an additional step. Let's say you were at step 13 and you have been here 20 years. Then you would move to the next step which is 14.

Alderman Levasseur asked so if you start at a step 5, you still have to wait until you are here five years before you get the longevity.

Ms. Drabik answered correct.

Alderman Levasseur stated it is just every five years no matter where you start on the system.

Ms. Drabik replied right and different unions have bargained for different longevity steps. Not everyone has the same five-year interval.

Alderman Levasseur stated forgetting department heads, if someone comes in to work at the City Clerk front counter, does the department head have the flexibility to start that person at a higher step or is there only certain jobs where you can start at a higher step.

Ms. Drabik responded right now a department head has the flexibility to go between 1 and 5 for any position and beyond that if they want to start someone higher than step 5 they would have to ask for dispensation.

Alderman Levasseur asked so it is not something where you have to start at the bottom of the grade itself.

Ms. Drabik answered correct.

Alderman Levasseur asked so what is the purpose going to be of this compensation study. It is going to be to raise the entry salaries or is it going to be to raise salaries at the mid-range or at the higher range or all ranges?

Ms. Drabik replied I think to properly answer that question again we are going to do an analysis of the low point of each range, the midpoint and the high point. When I say the high point, I mean step 13. I am not talking about the longevity steps because what we consider our range is 1-3. I think that the data will tell us how we are performing in a certain class of jobs. Let's say we are very behind the market at the low point, the starting salary but not so behind at the midpoint and not really far behind at all at the high point. That could be the case for some positions. Then it becomes a question of where are our existing employees compared to that new, if you will, recommended market range and how do we fit them into that range? Are they already in that range or are some nowhere near the range? Then it becomes a question of how would you move them into the range.

Alderman Levasseur stated on the issue of thinking you may now bring in a performance metric type compensation package, are you aware that originally Yarger Decker was a metric performance system. It was not meant to be an automatic 3% every year for showing up. It was meant that only 5% of all employees would receive a 3% increase. How is that going to change from 2003 when they made...it was done behind closed doors by the aldermen. After the cameras were off, they changed it from a metric system where people who did really well and did a great job, 5% of them would get 3%. That has now turned into an automatic 3% depending on whether you start off at step 1. How are you going to change that? The rationale to changing it to 3% was department heads didn't have the time nor the inclination to have to evaluate their own employees, especially in a small department of five people. Is that something you don't know yet?

Ms. Drabik responded that is something I don't know yet. That is one of the very end tasks if you will; for them to recommend some alternatives to us and how we could build it into the plan and come up with a mechanism to reward high performers. A lot of this is policy determinations so the idea is to bring options to the Board.

Alderman Levasseur asked does Londonderry offer a pension if you stay for 30 years or whatever the time period is.

Ms. Drabik answered all Londonderry employees are in the NH Retirement System.

Alderman Levasseur stated some of our employees are in that system but some are not right.

Ms. Drabik replied correct.

Alderman Levasseur asked so all of the comparison communities we saw all have a pension plan. They are not 401K plans?

Ms. Drabik responded if you mean the list that I presented, yes they all are either participating in a state plan like NHRS or they may have their own pension plan. We

also offer in the city a 457 plan which is the equivalent of a 401K. The city does not put any money in that. That is just a savings vehicle for employees but I imagine all of them offer that as well. That will be part of the benefit survey. We will also find out how we are doing with regard to our benefit offerings relative to other municipalities because that is a part of total compensation.

Alderman Levasseur asked so when we are doing comparisons we are doing comparisons based on everything which is salary, benefits, severance and pension.

Ms. Drabik replied yes those were all included in the data request.

Alderman Levasseur stated I appreciate it. I hope I wasn't too tough. I don't mean to be rude but you did come from Londonderry and I was curious as to why you came here. I am glad you did.

Alderman Long stated thank you Lisa for this presentation. What I heard is you didn't come to Manchester for the money. Is that correct?

Ms. Drabik answered I came for the challenge.

Alderman Long asked with respect to this compensation study, we will be able to articulate entry level low, medium and high so we will be able to get a grasp on recruitment and see clearly where our current recruitment number is at...

Ms. Drabik interjected where our deficiencies are if you will.

Alderman Long stated so it might be \$20,000 where the median is at \$50,000 and we will be able to adjust that to whatever this Board decides correct.

Ms. Drabik replied yes.

Alderman Long stated and this is for recruitment and retention so if we see that five years is where we are losing the most...will we be able to see that data like the average for our entry level people is 5-8 years before they leave.

Ms. Drabik responded I don't have that data but that is something we can look at. I think that the data will...obviously because we are looking at where we are versus the average low, mid and high, it is going to tell us are we really far behind in the mid or are we really far behind at the low and I think together with some data I can pull probably from our internal HR metrics we will be able to tell where we are really losing people. Right now, we are having trouble getting people in the door and I think we are losing the most people in that mid-range.

Alderman Long stated my understanding when this was voted on was that Yarger Decker would be the comparison. That is what we have now.

Ms. Drabik stated well that is where we had to start if you will. That is the data that we have.

Alderman Long stated and we can be presented with any compensation study but the bottom line is it comes to the BMA for approval and we can have a committee or whatever to make adjustments if we want. I liked Alderman E. Sapienza's request to get county data.

Ms. Drabik stated if I could just make a comment on that. I am happy to ask for that additional data but if we go through Evergreen to do it, it is likely going to come at an additional cost.

Alderman E. Sapienza stated I will tell you what. I will do it okay.

Alderman Long stated I was going to ask if it was an added cost for more data because I think you and I had a discussion that you needed \$150,000 to complete this.

Ms. Drabik replied yes and it may add to the time too.

Alderman Long asked you are saying you need \$88,071. I am thinking that \$100,000 will be enough.

Ms. Drabik answered likely. I would have to talk to them about it. We did discuss doing some county data as well but a lot of the positions don't match up to what we have in the city in terms of like the nursing home, corrections, and that sort of thing. That is why we abandoned that at the time. My concern in adding more entities now is not only the additional cost but perhaps the additional time. I just wanted to raise that as a concern.

Alderman Long asked so would \$125,000 be a good number if the Board decides to move this forward.

Ms. Drabik replied sure.

Alderman Long asked regarding the job assessment tool, is longevity and years of work considered. We may have somebody with three years at \$80,000 which is the max and someone with 20 years at \$105,000.

Ms. Drabik replied tenure will come into it when we look at how we would move employees into a new pay plan if you will. The JAT was simply...it is not employee specific but job specific. What are the job tasks?

Alderman T. Sapienza stated from your presentation, it looks like your total cost is going to be somewhere around \$338,000.

Ms. Drabik responded right if you include the Library cost.

Alderman T. Sapienza asked so you are looking to return about \$400,000 from the \$750,000 that was approved.

Ms. Drabik answered yes.

Alderman T. Sapienza stated you should be commended for that. Thank you. That is wonderful. Everybody involved should be commended for that but you are the leader. I think it is important for us to recognize that. The report is going to come around September 2024 correct?

Ms. Drabik replied correct.

Alderman T. Sapienza asked so future actions will depend on the Board so whether it is going to replace Yarger Decker or whatever we are going to do with the report is going to take Board action.

Ms. Drabik responded right.

Alderman T. Sapienza stated so there is really no decision that has been made whether Yarger Decker is going to be dismantled or adjusted or refined.

Ms. Drabik stated any implementation scenario would require BMA approval.

Alderman T. Sapienza stated so there is no answer to that question at this time. As far as looking at the counties, Hillsborough county is in worse shape than we are. If you want to know how to do it wrong, that is a great place to go look. They are closing facilities because they can't staff them. That is my two cents regarding the county. Thank you very much for all of your hard work and for being so fiscally responsible.

Alderman O'Neil stated Lisa this is a great presentation and you put a lot of effort into it. There is a lot of great information. What does JAT stand for again?

Ms. Drabik answered job assessment tool.

Alderman O'Neil asked and you mentioned MIT.

Ms. Drabik stated that is management issues tool. The managers use that format, if you will, to comment on the JAT's that the employees filled out.

Alderman O'Neil stated I think I am very surprised by the percentages. It shows the importance of this work to the employees. The fact that 85% did the JAT and 98% did the MIT I think shows the importance of this work to the employees. Am I correct that this report will be coming forward hopefully in September? What happens then? Does the BMA need to accept it?

Ms. Drabik responded absolutely. The report is going to be very extensive.

Alderman O'Neil asked but a vote to continue the work...if we stop it we still have to accept the report. We could end up stopping it and there would be no report to accept but there is a check there. Am I correct that all of the bargaining units will have to negotiate this?

Ms. Drabik replied obviously pay is always a part of any union negotiation; it is the lynchpin.

Alderman O'Neil asked what percentage of our employees are unionized.

Ms. Drabik answered 75%. If I could just add to that, 10 of the 13 union contracts expire June 30, 2025 so we will be starting union negotiations this fall.

Alderman O'Neil stated the retirement concerns me greatly. If we average 40...Sharon that is about \$1.5 million a year in severance correct?

Ms. Wickens replied it is an average of \$40,000 for each retiree.

Alderman O'Neil asked so if we have 282 that could be eligible, that would be a significant financial hit to the city. I think it is something that we really need to consider because I believe some employees have one foot out the door retirement wise. They are not going to stay if they don't think they are being treated right. That is my opinion. That could be \$4 million+. That is \$4 million that we don't have. Finally, I will talk about the three large departments and I am not trying to single them out but with Fire it is my

opinion that many of the firefighters Chief Cashin has hired he has had to go recruit from other towns. They come with high skills, especially on the medical side, and they are in demand. They could leave Manchester. My belief is they didn't come to Manchester for pay. They came because of the challenge. This is where the work is. I think the Chief might agree that he has less homegrown employees then when he came on the job. That is an important item. I think with Police, you come to Manchester because you want to work. You don't come because you want to hand out one speeding ticket a month or something like that. You come here because you want to work. There are great career opportunities for our employees in investigative units and specialty units. We have some very unique units and divisions that not every other community has but I don't think everybody has exactly what Manchester has. If you put Fire and Police together, we have to keep in mind that they are in the state retirement system and they can leave the city with 5, 10 or 15 years and go work in another community and it doesn't hurt them in the retirement system. We need to take that into consideration. I don't know what the number is but do you know of the 282 how many are Police and Fire?

Ms. Drabik replied I do have that here. There are 83 from Fire and 14 Police.

Alderman O'Neil stated I don't want to say the department with the greatest challenge but the department that is up close and personal with our citizens is Public Works in their various divisions. I never thought that we would lose, and Tim can shake his head, but we lose employees to seasonal jobs like paving companies, etc. I never thought I would see that in my life. He has a great challenge to deliver the quality services that his department does with 54 vacancies. I don't know how many it is now but I think it is something we have to recognize. If we don't continue with this and give some potential hope for the employees, I think Tim is going to be greatly challenged to deliver services in this city as well as the people that dial 911 to get a cop or a firefighter. Along with that, people call to get their garbage picked up or their streets plowed and I think he is going to have a great challenge. We have to have his back. His people are up close and personal with the citizens. You hope they don't have to call police or fire in their lifetime but they certainly like getting their garbage picked up once a week and making sure their streets are plowed and potholes are filled and sidewalks are improved. It is

very important to our citizens. I think this is a very important study to complete and then decisions have to be made. Let's complete the study. I hope we can overturn the action of the committee and support your original request. Thank you for your efforts.

Alderman Vincent stated thank you Director Drabik for coming tonight. I have a few quick questions and promise not to take up too much time. The anticipation date is to finish sometime this fall so say September. Has Evergreen expressed any concerns of any possible roadblocks between now and then or any obstacles that might prolong this? I know we are not getting the extra data but do they anticipate anything holding it up?

Ms. Drabik answered now that they have received all of the data that they need to have for the defensible dataset... like I said there are industry standards about how many comps they have for each benchmark position, we should be good to go for them to compile the report.

Alderman Vincent asked in that timeframe.

Ms. Drabik replied yes.

Alderman Vincent stated you mentioned in the slide September and beyond. Beyond includes Evergreen in the process correct?

Ms. Drabik responded it does.

Alderman Vincent asked so with them going beyond that date, do we know any projected costs past September to incorporate them into our process should we roll any of these into play.

Ms. Drabik replied right now the additional tasks that they are going to do per the contract with the job descriptions and FLSA designations, that is all part of the \$105,500. Should we like to engage them further to help us with other things like

drafting ordinances to accommodate the pay plan and that sort of thing, that would likely be at an additional cost. Everything else is already in the contract.

Alderman Vincent asked so anything extra and above has to come before the BMA anyway to get the money correct.

Ms. Drabik answered well it could be part of the contingency money that I put in.

Alderman Vincent asked in closing, the HR Project Coordinator, that is being paid currently for two years.

Ms. Drabik responded yes. It was originally budgeted for two years. She is still with the HR Department but just recently transitioned to a different position. However, because she has been with me from the start it doesn't make sense to hire somebody else and get them up and going. She is going to continue to assist me with the study. I just budgeted eight hours of her time per week in my projected costs going forward.

Alderman Vincent asked so when the project ends then the eight hours will go away.

Ms. Drabik replied yes.

Alderman E. Sapienza stated briefly, Lisa we hear often about how complex the current system is correct.

Ms. Drabik answered correct.

Alderman E. Sapienza stated I am hoping that we don't go from the current complexity to a new set of complexities.

Ms. Drabik responded so am I.

Alderman E. Sapienza stated I am hoping that we can keep it as simple as possible without losing the effectiveness. To me, merit raises add to the complexity. I am not in

favor of merit raises for a whole host of reasons that we won't go into now. Beyond that, the reason I asked for the information about Hillsborough County is data is a good thing like I said. We are getting data from New Haven, CT. Connecticut is a basket case. It is the east coast version of California. They have a state sales tax and a state income tax. I don't want to be like them. I think it is a good idea for us to know what those who work in the public sector who are working right here in the City of Manchester, not necessarily for the city, but what those folks are earning and what their overall compensation is. Again, that is to have accurate and objective data. That is all it is. I don't think we need to go through Evergreen to get it. If they don't cooperate with you...I am sure they will.

Ms. Drabik stated the only thing I would caution and I think Evergreen would be fine with incorporating it but we have to match up the positions. Do you see what I mean?

Alderman E. Sapienza replied well a Hillsborough County sheriff's deputy to me is very similar to a police officer. They go to the same academy. I think those are comparable. A clerk working for the courts is comparable to a clerk working for the city. I won't go on and on about it but you get the general idea. Thank you.

Alderman Levasseur stated on the issue of the \$750,000, was any other money allocated towards anything to do with the compensation study.

Ms. Drabik responded no. Well this was the study cost itself. As far as implementation costs, that was...

Alderman Levasseur interjected I heard there was \$2 million put aside or \$1.5 million put aside.

Ms. Drabik stated that is not anything I had anything to do with. It would be a question for Sharon. I don't believe it was set aside specifically for the compensation study but rather for some projects that could then be used for the compensation study depending on how quickly the study could come to fruition.

Alderman Levasseur asked how much was that Sharon and where was that money put.

Ms. Wickens answered in Mayor Craig's budget for the fiscal year that we are in now, she had funded one-time projects for a total of \$2 million. When FY24 ends, those one-time projects are paid for and the next year you would have \$2 million to either put in the budget elsewhere or if the compensation study was done and there was some funding that was needed for departments for salary adjustments, we would have the \$2 million. When the aldermen got the budget, that was reduced by \$660,000 and it went to like \$1,440,000. Then in Mayor Ruais' budget I think it was \$423,000.

Mayor Ruais stated I put some money in special projects and the balance we used to pay down the rate.

Ms. Wickens responded that is correct because the compensation study wasn't ready.

Alderman Levasseur asked so the original \$2 million is gone and there is an additional \$400,000 left over from the \$750,000.

Mayor Ruais stated those are two different projects.

Ms. Wickens stated one-time projects are being funded with it in the Mayor's budget.

Alderman Levasseur stated my understanding was that the \$2 million was for whatever the results of the compensation study were going to be. When I heard it was now going to be pushed out to 2026, I think that shocked a lot of people, especially the committee that originally voted to receive and file it. I think it was a communication issue. So because there are a lot of people curious about how that number went from 2024 to 2026, will we as an aldermanic board get something in September? I don't care if it is September but maybe by December?

Ms. Drabik replied yes in this next fiscal year absolutely.

Alderman Levasseur asked will that have an actual recommendation in it by somebody whether it is Evergreen or your department or whoever is making the decision.

Ms. Drabik responded yes. There will be different scenarios presented.

Alderman Levasseur asked and once those scenarios are presented, we don't necessarily vote on what one we are going to deal with but it would be more of a negotiation with the unions because the unions are the ones that get to make the final decision right. We don't get to say we are going to give you Option 1 and then they can vote for it or not. It is going to be these are your three options and what do you want to do?

Ms. Drabik answered I don't want to put the cart before the horse of course with regard to union negotiations but it is my understanding that we would want the sense of the Board on what they would be willing to support so we can go into union negotiations with that. Obviously, we want to end up with one system. I think that is the best answer I can give.

Alderman Levasseur stated I am not sure if anyone on this Board was here when Yarger Decker got passed but maybe Alderman O'Neil was. Did the Board pass it first and then it was voted on by the unions? Did the unions get an option for what they wanted? I am curious because Yarger Decker had to be approved by the unions first. I think Fire jumped on it first but there was a lot of hesitation with it. Going into negotiations...you said in the fall we are going to start negotiating for next June. Do their contracts expire on June 30?

Ms. Drabik replied 10 of the 13 union contracts expire June 30, 2025.

Alderman Levasseur stated that is coming quick. We could start negotiations with them at any time but they are going to obviously wait for the results of this compensation study.

Ms. Drabik stated I would think so and that is why we are trying to time it so that it works.

Alderman Levasseur stated thanks for the clarification. That makes a lot more sense.

Alderman Long stated it was articulated well in committee that in the fall this report would come forward. It was articulated well in committee.

Alderman Morgan stated with all due respect I will give you a little push back on that. It was not articulated correctly and I wish I had this information at that meeting because maybe it would have been a little different. I apologize for that.

Mayor Ruais stated thank you very much Director Drabik. We appreciate the presentation.

CONSENT AGENDA

Information to be Received and Filed

3. Communication from Patriot Hydro regarding a drawdown for the Merrimack River Hydroelectric Project.
4. April OYS Report.

REFERRALS TO COMMITTEES

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

5. Resolutions:

“Amending the FY2024 Community Improvement Program, authorizing and appropriating funds in the amount of Thirty Nine Thousand Two Hundred and Three Dollars and ninety-six cents (\$39,203.96) for the FY2024 CIP 212124 Oral Health Program.”

“Amending the FY2023 Community Improvement Program, authorizing and appropriating funds in the amount of One Million Seven Thousand Seven Hundred Thirty-One Dollars (\$1,007,731) for the FY2023 CIP 210623 Public Health Preparedness.”

“Amending the FY2023 Community Improvement Program, authorizing and appropriating funds in the amount of One Thousand Two Hundred Eighty-Two

Dollars and Thirty-Five Cents (\$1,282.35) for the FY 2023 CIP 211623 NACCHO Implementing Overdose Strategies at the Local Level.”

“Amending the FY2024 Community Improvement Program, authorizing and appropriating funds in the amount of Six Hundred Thirty-One Thousand Four Hundred Dollars (\$631,400) for FY 2024 CIP 212524 TB Prevention, CIP 212624 Immunization Grant and CIP 213024 Workforce Development - Public Health Crisis RSP-ARP.”

“Amending the FY2022 Community Improvement Program, authorizing and appropriating funds in the amount of One Hundred Eighty-Two Thousand Three Hundred Twenty-Eight Dollars and 75/100 (\$182,328.75) for the FY 2022 CIP 213122 Primary Care Services for the Homeless.”

“Amending the FY2024 Community Improvement Program, authorizing and appropriating funds in the amount of One Million Six Hundred Forty-Two Thousand Three Hundred Twenty- Five Dollars (\$1,642,325) for the FY2024 CIP 213124 Homeless Healthcare.”

“Amending the FY2022 and FY2024 Community Improvement Program, authorizing, appropriating and transferring funds in the amount of One Hundred Twenty Thousand Dollars (\$120,000) for the FY2024 CIP 510624 - Bass Island Park Erosion Mitigation.”

“Amending the FY2023 and FY2024 Community Improvement Program, authorizing, appropriating and transferring funds in the amount of One Hundred Eighty-Four Thousand Six Hundred Thirty Dollars and Twenty Cents (\$184,630.20) for the FY2024 CIP 610024 Winter Emergency Shelter.”

“Amending the FY2024 Community Improvement Program, authorizing and appropriating funds in the amount of Twelve Thousand Dollars (\$12,000) for the FY2024 CIP 611424 Gaslight District Historic Resource Survey.”

“Amending the FY2022, FY2023 and FY2024 Community Improvement Program, authorizing, appropriating and transferring funds in the amount of One Hundred Twenty Four Thousand Five Hundred Ninety Two Dollars and Three Cents (\$124,592.03) for the FY2024 CIP 710024-Annual Street Reconstruction (CDBG).”

“Amending the FY2021 and FY2024 Community Improvement Program, authorizing, appropriating and transferring funds in the amount of One Million Five Hundred Thousand Dollars (\$1,500,000) for the FY2021 CIP 710121 - Road Construction: S. Commercial to Elm.”

“Amending the FY2019, FY2020, FY2021 and FY2024 Community Improvement Program, authorizing, appropriating and transferring funds in the amount of Nine Thousand One Hundred Twenty Nine Dollars and Eighty Cents (\$9129.80) for FY 2024 CIP 710124 FY24 Roadway Program.”

“Amending the FY2020 and FY2024 Community Improvement Program, authorizing, appropriating and transferring funds in the amount of Two Hundred Seventy-Four Thousand Seven Hundred Fifty-Eight Dollars and Forty Cents (\$274,758.40) for the FY2020 CIP 712720-South Manchester Rail Trail.”

“Amending the FY2021 and FY2023 Community Improvement Program, authorizing, appropriating and transferring funds in the amount of Seventy Six Thousand Five Hundred Dollars (\$76,500) for the FY2021 CIP 713221 - Weston Road & S. Willow Street Intersection Improvements.”

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

COMMITTEE ON BILLS ON SECOND READING

6. Recommending that the following Ordinance Amendment:

"Amending Section 33.081 by adding paragraph (l) regarding Preventative Health Care Hours."

ought to pass and be referred to the Committee on Accounts, Enrollment & Revenue Administration.
(*Unanimous vote*)

COMMITTEE ON COMMUNITY IMPROVEMENT

7. Recommending that the summary of abatement requests submitted by the Chief Engineer be approved.
(*Unanimous vote*)
8. Recommending that the request from the Chief Engineer to update the sewer abatement policy be approved.
(*Unanimous vote*)
9. Recommending that the Amending Resolution and Budget Authorization providing for the acceptance and expenditure of funds in the amount of \$1,007,731 for CIP 210623 Public Health Preparedness be approved.
(*Unanimous vote*)
10. Recommending that the Amending Resolution and Budget Authorization providing for the acceptance and expenditure of funds in the amount of \$1,282.35 for CIP 211623 NACCHO Implementing Overdose Strategies at the Local Level be approved.
(*Unanimous vote*)
11. Recommending that the Amending Resolution and Budget Authorization providing for the acceptance and expenditure of funds in the amount of \$39,203.96 for CIP 212124 Oral Health Program be approved.
(*Unanimous vote*)

12. Recommending that the Amending Resolution and Budget Authorization providing for the acceptance and expenditure of funds in the amount of \$631,400 for CIP 212524 TB Prevention, CIP 212624 Immunization Grant, and CIP 213024 Workforce Development - Public Health Crisis RSP-ARP be approved.
(Unanimous vote)
13. Recommending that the Amending Resolution and Budget Authorization providing for the acceptance and expenditure of funds in the amount of \$182,328.75 for CIP 213122 Primary Care Services for the Homeless be approved.
(Unanimous vote)
14. Recommending that the Amending Resolution and Budget Authorization providing for the acceptance and expenditure of funds in the amount of \$1,642,325 for CIP 213124 Homeless Healthcare be approved.
(Unanimous vote)
15. Recommending that the Amending Resolution and Budget Authorization providing for the transfer and expenditure of funds in the amount of \$120,000 for CIP 510624 - Bass Island Park Erosion Mitigation be approved.
(Unanimous vote)
16. Recommending that the Amending Resolution and Budget Authorization providing for the acceptance and expenditure of funds in the amount of \$12,000 for CIP 611424 Gaslight District Historic Resource Survey be approved.
(Unanimous vote)
17. Recommending that the Amending Resolution and Budget Authorization providing for the transfer and expenditure of funds in the amount of \$124,592.03 for CIP 710024 Annual Street Reconstruction (CDBG) be approved.
(Unanimous vote)
18. Recommending that the Amending Resolution and Budget Authorization providing for the transfer and expenditure of funds in the amount of \$1,500,000 for CIP 710121 Road Construction: S. Commercial to Elm be approved.
(Unanimous vote)
19. Recommending that the Amending Resolution and Budget Authorization providing for the transfer and expenditure of funds in the amount of \$9,129.80 for CIP 710124 FY24 Roadway Program be approved.
(Unanimous vote)
20. Recommending that the Amending Resolution and Budget Authorization providing for the transfer and expenditure of funds in the amount of \$274,758.40 for CIP 712720 South Manchester Rail Trail be approved.
(Unanimous vote)
21. Recommending that the Amending Resolution and Budget Authorization providing for the transfer and expenditure of funds in the amount of \$76,500 for

CIP 713221 Weston Road & S. Willow Street Intersection Improvements be approved.
(Unanimous vote)

- 22.** Recommending that the request from the Planning & Community Development Director regarding the subordination of city liens for three properties:

- 462 Lake Avenue
- 665 Second Street
- 260 Central Street

be received and filed.
(Unanimous vote)

- 24.** Recommending that the request from the Highway Chief Engineer for approval of the FY25 Roadway Program in the amount of \$5,300,000 and the School Parking Lot Rehabilitation in the amount of \$1,000,000 be approved.
(Unanimous vote)

COMMITTEE ON HUMAN RESOURCES/INSURANCE

- 25.** Recommending that the request from the Water Works Director for the following changes to the department's complement:

- Eliminate one (1) vacant Meter Reader II position, grade 12
- Add two (2) Water Meter Technician positions, grade 14
- Upon the promotion of an existing Meter Reader I to the role of Water Meter Technician, eliminate one (1) Meter Reader I position, grade 11

be approved.
(Unanimous vote)

- 26.** Recommending that the request from the Human Resources Director for the following changes to the department's complement:

- Eliminate one (1) vacant Human Resources Associate position, grade 13
- Add one (1) Human Resources Generalist position, grade 15
- Adopt the new classification for Human Resources Generalist position

be approved.
(Unanimous vote)

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC SAFETY, HEALTH AND TRAFFIC

27. Recommending that the following traffic regulations be approved:
NO PARKING ANYTIME
On Harvard Street, north side, from Rogers Street to a point 250 feet west
Alderman Terrio
STOP SIGN
On Avon Street at Sylvester Street, southeast corner
Alderman Barry
RESCIND CROSSWALK
On Kennard Road, south of Smyth Road (ORD 2242)
Alderman Goonan
(Unanimous vote)
28. Recommending that the request from the Deputy Public Works Director to formalize the Street Sweeping Program be approved.
(Unanimous vote)
29. Recommending that the request from the Highway Chief Engineer to change the traffic pattern on Reservoir Avenue, from Circular Drive to a point approximately 150 feet east of Belmont Street be approved.
(Unanimous vote)

*HAVING READ THE CONSENT AGENDA, ON MOTION OF **ALDERMAN O'NEIL**,
DULY SECONDED BY **ALDERMAN LONG**, THE CONSENT AGENDA WAS
APPROVED.*

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

COMMITTEE ON COMMUNITY IMPROVEMENT

23. Recommending that the request from the Human Resources Director for an extension of the completion date for CIP 810924 Compensation Study to June 30, 2026, be received and filed.
(Aldermen Morgan, Terrio, and Kantor voted yea; Aldermen Long and Burkush voted nay)

Alderman Terrio stated obviously we just had the presentation and I think the majority of the Board wants to have a chance to discuss this and vote on it.

Mayor Ruais stated we have to deal with the report in front of us first.

Alderman O'Neil moved to receive and file the report. **Alderman Terrio** duly seconded the motion. Mayor Ruais called for a vote. Alderman O'Neil requested a roll call vote. Aldermen O'Neil, Levasseur, Terrio, E. Sapienza, Burkush, Barry, Vincent, Morgan, Goonan, Long, Fajardo, T. Sapienza and Kantor voted yea. The motion carried.

Alderman Terrio moved to approve the compensation study.

Mayor Ruais stated I think we want to attach a date.

Alderman Long asked June 2025.

Mayor Ruais stated okay the end of the fiscal year. The funding we can take about.

Alderman Levasseur stated the report was to receive and file and stop the compensation study. How about we vote to continue with the compensation study?

Alderman Levasseur moved to continue with the compensation study in its original form.

Alderman Terrio stated we have to figure out a date.

Mayor Ruais asked so FY25.

Alderman Levasseur replied no later than December 31, 2024 because we have negotiations starting in December. She said she would have a recommendation for us by September. December should help.

Ms. Drabik stated the report will be presented, the written report, and thereafter there will still be work to be done on the job classifications, the FLSA status, etc. If the project monies could continue so that I could tap into those should I need to have Evergreen come back or use outside counsel at least through the end of FY2025 I think that would get us there. Then if I need to come back before the CIP Committee and ask...I don't

know. Again I am a novice at this but I want to make sure that I am able to finish out what we need to related just to the study itself and all the logistics.

Alderman Terrio responded but we are trying to figure out when you are going to be done.

Ms. Drabik stated the end of FY25 would be safe. So June 30, 2025.

Alderman Terrio stated that is fine with me.

Alderman Levasseur stated I just want to clarify. The motion to receive and file was to receive and file the actual plan and study that had been voted on by a previous Board.

Mayor Ruais replied no.

Alderman O'Neil stated the motion was to receive and file the committee report.

Alderman Levasseur stated I mean when the committee voted they received and filed the compensation study. I am just saying that it is null and void and we are just continuing with the original study when the Board voted it in. It doesn't matter if it is September or whatever. The financing stays in place for the compensation study. I am just trying to not make it more complicated than it is. We are just going back to the original plan.

Mayor Ruais stated that is correct. We are continuing with the study and need to put a timeframe on it to complete. Let's get a motion on the floor and then we can discuss. Alderman Terrio do you have a motion?

Alderman Terrio replied yes but are we good with the date.

Alderman Terrio moved to continue the compensation study and extend the CIP project end date to June 30, 2025.

Alderman T. Sapienza asked this is to extend the CIP project right.

Mayor Ruais answered yes to extend the CIP project through June 30, 2025.

Alderman E. Sapienza duly seconded the motion.

Alderman Barry asked and this is to continue the funding correct.

Mayor Ruais responded yes they go hand in hand.

Mayor Ruais called for a vote. *Alderman Long* requested a roll call vote.

Alderman Levasseur stated we don't need a roll call. It is going to pass.

Aldermen Long, Fajardo, T. Sapienza, Kantor, O'Neil, Levasseur, Terrio, E. Sapienza, Burkush, Barry, Vincent, Morgan and Goonan voted yea. *The motion carried.*

Alderman Long stated having voted in the majority, I would like to make a motion to reconsider and ask my colleagues to vote no. ***Alderman T. Sapienza*** duly seconded the motion.

Alderman Levasseur asked why.

Alderman Long stated we are allowed to reconsider once. This could be reconsidered in future meetings. This ends it here today.

Mayor Ruais asked why do you foresee problems with this in the future.

Alderman Long answered I wake up at 2 AM foreseeing a lot of issues. Where have you been in the last five months?

Mayor Ruais asked Clerk Normand to explain the motion.

City Clerk Normand stated my understanding is that Alderman Long is requesting to reconsider the previous vote to extend the project until 6/30/2025. Only one reconsideration can be had on a topic or an issue. I think that is Alderman Long's intent.

Mayor Ruais called for a vote. **Alderman Long** requested a roll call vote. **Aldermen Long, Fajardo, T. Sapienza, Kantor, O'Neil, Terrio, Burkush, Barry, Vincent, Morgan and Goonan** voted no. **Aldermen Levasseur and E. Sapienza** voted yea. The motion failed.

REGULAR BUSINESS

- 30.** Confirmations:
Manchester Transit Authority
- Marlana Trombley to succeed herself, term to expire May 1, 2029
 - Elyza Agosta to fill a vacancy, term to expire May 1, 2026

*On motion of **Alderman O'Neil**, duly seconded by **Alderman T. Sapienza**, it was voted to confirm the nominations as presented.*

- 31.** Communication from Robert Gagne, Assessor, advising the Board of his retirement effective July 31, 2024.

*On motion of **Alderman O'Neil**, duly seconded by **Alderman T. Sapienza**, it was voted to accept with regret.*

- 32.** Budget projections to be submitted by Sharon Wickens, Finance Officer.

Ms. Wickens stated the FY24 general fund expenditure and revenue forecast as of May 21 based on department head estimates is as follows. The current projected general fund operating surplus is \$1,032,000. The operating surplus is comprised of an expenditure surplus of \$339,000 and a revenue surplus of \$693,000. April was another good month for health insurance claims. Total claims came in less than the monthly budget expectation bringing the year-end projected over plan estimate down to \$1.1 million. CGL insurance continues to run over budget with a current overage of approximately \$400,000. This overage is expected to increase between \$200,000 and \$300,000 by fiscal year-end. Departmental expenditure surplus will continue to

increase as vacancies remain open coupled with the city's hiring freeze. On the revenue side, there has been an increase in elderly deferral pay-offs, building permits, fire alarm fees, drop off revenue and golf and ice rentals. Offsetting these revenue increases is a steep drop in Comcast franchise fee revenue and a lag in auto registrations. While auto registrations have lagged through most of FY24, April was a very good month. It reduced the anticipated year-end shortfall to \$400,000. The forecasted surplus does include \$275,000 from the contingency account. There were 35 retirements through May 17 compared with 16 a year ago. Severance paid through May 17 amounts to \$1,346,470 compared to \$728,149 a year ago. The severance reserve account is anticipated to have a balance of \$1,033,894 after all related entries have been posted. I have also included a departmental overtime report as of May 11 and a summary by department of severance paid through May 17. There are two big things that helped us on this projection if you look at the second page. One is building permits. Jeff had been saying right along that they will probably just make budget but he did get a lot of building permits in last month, more than he anticipated, and he is now projecting a \$400,000 surplus. I am also predicting a \$400,000 decrease in auto registrations after talking with the Tax Collector. However, if they can beat budget in May and June, they could meet budget. Health insurance...I can't help to think that we finally hit the dip. It was \$1.6 million back in December but we keep holding our own and chipping away. Fingers crossed that we may be even with this.

*On motion of **Alderman Terrio**, duly seconded by **Alderman Barry**, it was voted to recess the meeting to allow the Committee on Finance to meet.*

Mayor Ruais called the meeting back to order.

35. Report(s) of the Committee on Finance, if available.

The Committee on Finance respectfully recommends, after due and careful consideration, that Resolutions:

“Amending the FY2024 Community Improvement Program, authorizing and appropriating funds in the amount of Thirty Nine Thousand Two Hundred and Three Dollars and ninety-six cents (\$39,203.96) for the FY2024 CIP 212124 Oral Health Program.”

“Amending the FY2023 Community Improvement Program, authorizing and appropriating funds in the amount of One Million Seven Thousand Seven Hundred Thirty-One Dollars (\$1,007,731) for the FY2023 CIP 210623 Public Health Preparedness.”

“Amending the FY2023 Community Improvement Program, authorizing and appropriating funds in the amount of One Thousand Two Hundred Eighty-Two Dollars and Thirty-Five Cents (\$1,282.35) for the FY 2023 CIP 211623 NACCHO Implementing Overdose Strategies at the Local Level.”

“Amending the FY2024 Community Improvement Program, authorizing and appropriating funds in the amount of Six Hundred Thirty-One Thousand Four Hundred Dollars (\$631,400) for FY 2024 CIP 212524 TB Prevention, CIP 212624 Immunization Grant and CIP 213024 Workforce Development - Public Health Crisis RSP-ARP.”

“Amending the FY2022 Community Improvement Program, authorizing and appropriating funds in the amount of One Hundred Eighty-Two Thousand Three Hundred Twenty-Eight Dollars and 75/100 (\$182,328.75) for the FY 2022 CIP 213122 Primary Care Services for the Homeless.”

“Amending the FY2024 Community Improvement Program, authorizing and appropriating funds in the amount of One Million Six Hundred Forty-Two Thousand Three Hundred Twenty- Five Dollars (\$1,642,325) for the FY2024 CIP 213124 Homeless Healthcare.”

“Amending the FY2022 and FY2024 Community Improvement Program, authorizing, appropriating and transferring funds in the amount of One Hundred Twenty Thousand Dollars (\$120,000) for the FY2024 CIP 510624 - Bass Island Park Erosion Mitigation.”

“Amending the FY2023 and FY2024 Community Improvement Program, authorizing, appropriating and transferring funds in the amount of One Hundred Eighty-Four Thousand Six Hundred Thirty Dollars and Twenty Cents (\$184,630.20) for the FY2024 CIP 610024 Winter Emergency Shelter.”

“Amending the FY2024 Community Improvement Program, authorizing and appropriating funds in the amount of Twelve Thousand Dollars (\$12,000) for the FY2024 CIP 611424 Gaslight District Historic Resource Survey.”

“Amending the FY2022, FY2023 and FY2024 Community Improvement Program, authorizing, appropriating and transferring funds in the amount of One Hundred Twenty Four Thousand Five Hundred Ninety Two Dollars and Three Cents (\$124,592.03) for the FY2024 CIP 710024-Annual Street Reconstruction (CDBG).”

“Amending the FY2021 and FY2024 Community Improvement Program, authorizing, appropriating and transferring funds in the amount of One Million Five Hundred Thousand Dollars (\$1,500,000) for the FY2021 CIP 710121 - Road Construction: S. Commercial to Elm.”

“Amending the FY2019, FY2020, FY2021 and FY2024 Community Improvement Program, authorizing, appropriating and transferring funds in the amount of Nine Thousand One Hundred Twenty Nine Dollars and Eighty Cents (\$9129.80) for FY 2024 CIP 710124 FY24 Roadway Program.”

“Amending the FY2020 and FY2024 Community Improvement Program, authorizing, appropriating and transferring funds in the amount of Two Hundred Seventy-Four Thousand Seven Hundred Fifty-Eight Dollars and Forty Cents (\$274,758.40) for the FY2020 CIP 712720-South Manchester Rail Trail.”

“Amending the FY2021 and FY2023 Community Improvement Program, authorizing, appropriating and transferring funds in the amount of Seventy Six Thousand Five Hundred Dollars (\$76,500) for the FY2021 CIP 713221 - Weston Road & S. Willow Street Intersection Improvements.”

ought to pass and be Enrolled.

*On motion of **Alderman Long**, duly seconded by **Alderman Burkush**, it was voted to accept the report and adopt its recommendations.*

36. Resolutions:

“Amending the FY2024 Community Improvement Program, authorizing and appropriating funds in the amount of Thirty Nine Thousand Two Hundred and Three Dollars and ninety-six cents (\$39,203.96) for the FY2024 CIP 212124 Oral Health Program.”

“Amending the FY2023 Community Improvement Program, authorizing and appropriating funds in the amount of One Million Seven Thousand Seven Hundred Thirty-One Dollars (\$1,007,731) for the FY2023 CIP 210623 Public Health Preparedness.”

“Amending the FY2023 Community Improvement Program, authorizing and appropriating funds in the amount of One Thousand Two Hundred Eighty-Two Dollars and Thirty-Five Cents (\$1,282.35) for the FY 2023 CIP 211623 NACCHO Implementing Overdose Strategies at the Local Level.”

“Amending the FY2024 Community Improvement Program, authorizing and appropriating funds in the amount of Six Hundred Thirty-One Thousand Four Hundred Dollars (\$631,400) for FY 2024 CIP 212524 TB Prevention, CIP 212624 Immunization Grant and CIP 213024 Workforce Development - Public Health Crisis RSP-ARP.”

“Amending the FY2022 Community Improvement Program, authorizing and appropriating funds in the amount of One Hundred Eighty-Two Thousand Three Hundred Twenty-Eight Dollars and 75/100 (\$182,328.75) for the FY 2022 CIP 213122 Primary Care Services for the Homeless.”

“Amending the FY2024 Community Improvement Program, authorizing and appropriating funds in the amount of One Million Six Hundred Forty-Two Thousand Three Hundred Twenty- Five Dollars (\$1,642,325) for the FY2024 CIP 213124 Homeless Healthcare.”

“Amending the FY2022 and FY2024 Community Improvement Program, authorizing, appropriating and transferring funds in the amount of One Hundred Twenty Thousand Dollars (\$120,000) for the FY2024 CIP 510624 - Bass Island Park Erosion Mitigation.”

“Amending the FY2023 and FY2024 Community Improvement Program, authorizing, appropriating and transferring funds in the amount of One Hundred Eighty-Four Thousand Six Hundred Thirty Dollars and Twenty Cents (\$184,630.20) for the FY2024 CIP 610024 Winter Emergency Shelter.”

“Amending the FY2024 Community Improvement Program, authorizing and appropriating funds in the amount of Twelve Thousand Dollars (\$12,000) for the FY2024 CIP 611424 Gaslight District Historic Resource Survey.”

“Amending the FY2022, FY2023 and FY2024 Community Improvement Program, authorizing, appropriating and transferring funds in the amount of One Hundred Twenty Four Thousand Five Hundred Ninety Two Dollars and Three Cents (\$124,592.03) for the FY2024 CIP 710024-Annual Street Reconstruction (CDBG).”

“Amending the FY2021 and FY2024 Community Improvement Program, authorizing, appropriating and transferring funds in the amount of One Million Five Hundred Thousand Dollars (\$1,500,000) for the FY2021 CIP 710121 - Road Construction: S. Commercial to Elm.”

“Amending the FY2019, FY2020, FY2021 and FY2024 Community Improvement Program, authorizing, appropriating and transferring funds in the amount of Nine Thousand One Hundred Twenty Nine Dollars and Eighty Cents (\$9129.80) for FY 2024 CIP 710124 FY24 Roadway Program.”

“Amending the FY2020 and FY2024 Community Improvement Program, authorizing, appropriating and transferring funds in the amount of Two Hundred Seventy-Four Thousand Seven Hundred Fifty-Eight Dollars and Forty Cents (\$274,758.40) for the FY2020 CIP 712720-South Manchester Rail Trail.”

“Amending the FY2021 and FY2023 Community Improvement Program, authorizing, appropriating and transferring funds in the amount of Seventy Six Thousand Five Hundred Dollars (\$76,500) for the FY2021 CIP 713221 - Weston Road & S. Willow Street Intersection Improvements.”

*On motion of **Alderman Long**, duly seconded by **Alderman Terrio**, it was voted to waive the reading by titles only.*

*On motion of **Alderman Long**, duly seconded by **Alderman Terrio**, it was voted that the Resolutions be Enrolled.*

37. Ordinance:

“Amending Section 33.024, 33.025, & 33.026 (Human Resources Generalist) of the Code of Ordinances of the City of Manchester.”

*On motion of **Alderman Terrio**, duly seconded by **Alderman Long**, it was voted to read by title only.*

*On motion of **Alderman Long**, duly seconded by **Alderman Terrio**, it was voted to Ordain.*

NEW BUSINESS

Alderman O’Neil stated I have some thank you’s. I would like to single out the great Tim Clougherty. There was an issue with graffiti in one of our youth parks and it was taken care of within two days just in time for opening day so thank you Tim, and your folks for that. Park construction helped North Little League by moving a boulder that was messing up getting out of these conex boxes. Parks went over because they were working a few blocks away. They came over with a big loader and moved the boulder. They deserve some credit for helping out the community. Finally, this just came up recently. I would like to thank Chief Aldenberg and Sgt. Rob McGowan for their help with one of the craziest, and I am not going to go into any details, situations with a constituent that I have ever been involved with. It was hard to understand the constituent and Chief Aldenberg took the time to meet with that person and today Sgt. McGowan went down and took care of the issue. I appreciate the Chief taking the time

to meet with the gentleman. He was pretty worked up. I would also like to thank Sgt. McGowan for addressing it with some officers today.

Alderman Barry stated a few weeks ago I met with a gentleman by the name of Seth Allen. Seth went to West High School. He didn't graduate but he decided to join the armed services. We had a long conversation and part of the conversation was the fact that he has been in other jurisdictions where Veterans don't have to pay for parking. I came up with an idea and met with Chris Goodnow from Parking and Nick Pappas. We went over the pros and cons on what we could do as a city to show our respect and gratitude to the Veterans. One of the thoughts that I had was for the month of November, which includes Veteran's Day, as a pilot program we would waive parking fees for Veterans in our downtown area. We can then see how it works. Chris Goodnow said he would talk to his parking control officers so they can monitor how many Veteran's plates have expired meters, etc. so we have data on what the actual impact is.

Alderman Barry moved that a pilot program be implemented in the month of November to waive parking fees for Veteran's who have a Veteran's plate in the downtown area with the exception being if they are parking illegally in a fire lane or a handicapped spot. **Alderman Long** duly seconded the motion. Mayor Ruais called for a vote. There being none opposed, the motion carried.

Alderman Morgan stated this is in regards to department heads. I would like to make a motion to exempt all department heads and/or their representatives from attending all future Board meetings unless they have an item on the agenda. We all know that they work hard and we all know these are long meetings. Additionally, I would like to also set the expectation that should one of us here on the Board have a non-agenda related question of department personnel, that we would call the department head and ask them directly or request their attendance at the next meeting. **Alderman Long** duly seconded the motion.

Alderman O'Neil stated as one of the people with some years here, I think this may have been tried before. I can tell you what may happen although I can't say for sure.

There is going to be an item of business that comes up and the department head or a representative won't be here and the item gets tabled and now we are going into a period where we are only meeting once a month. I know it is a pain for them to be here but over the years things will come up and if they aren't here to provide answers it is going to bring whatever the issue may be to a halt. It may be funding or approvals. I can't support this based on my experience here.

Alderman T. Sapienza stated that input from Alderman O'Neil seems pretty serious but my question is does this motion require a department head to show up if one alderman requests that they be here. Is that what I am hearing?

Alderman Morgan responded if they have an item on the agenda then they have to be here but if an alderman wants them to be here, they can request them to be here.

Alderman T. Sapienza asked and then they are required to be here.

Alderman Morgan answered correct.

Alderman Long stated so if there is an item on an agenda the department head or their representative will be here. If an alderman has a non-agenda related matter, they can request the department to be here. I know that I used to get calls from some department heads saying I am not on the agenda but are you going to need me there whether it was a committee or BMA meeting and I would say yes or no. This is leaving the onus on them to check the agenda and if there is nothing there, they don't have to be here. A lot of them will call us up like DPW will call about a Lands & Buildings meeting and say I don't see anything on the agenda but do you need me for anything. I think it is a good idea. We have Library here and OYS and some departments that we just don't need here because we maybe call on them once a year. That is why I am supporting this.

Alderman Levasseur stated as a reminder, if the department head happens to be on an agenda for a committee, you can be here for that committee but we don't generally report out the same night to the Board. It has been the practice of this new Mayor not to

do that so if you are here at 5 PM, you don't have to stay all night unless you find out that it was an urgent issue that needs to be reported out the same night. If it is going to be pushed up that night, then obviously you would have to say. Just keep that in mind. If you are here for like Bills on Second Reading or something, once the meeting is over and the item isn't getting reported out and you are not on the BMA agenda, please don't sit here. I have been doing this a really long time and I can only imagine what you poor people have to sit through.

Alderman Barry stated I understand Alderman O'Neil's point of view as well as Alderman Long's. When I was the Chairman of a Committee, a specific department head would call me up and ask if they thought I should go to the meeting. One of the gripes that I have always had being on this Board is the fact that some of the aldermen should reach out to department heads prior to the meetings. It only makes sense instead of calling them up here for questions that could be answered privately like simple parking questions or police questions or fire questions. I understand that if they are here and someone has a question for them, that is great.

Mayor Ruais called for a vote. *The motion carried with Alderman O'Neil being duly recorded in opposition.*

Alderman Kantor stated I would like to find out a little bit more about the illegal immigrants that are coming across the border and how they are affecting our healthcare and if they can be housed and sheltered at 39 Beech Street or anywhere else. I know that Director Thomas gave me a lot of great information which I really appreciate and an illegal immigrant is considered unhoused, therefore, they can receive healthcare at our facilities and that does affect the people that need healthcare that aren't receiving it. I guess my question, and I am not sure who to direct it to, is are illegal immigrants who are considered unhoused allowed to shelter at 39 Beech Street or anywhere else in the city.

Mayor Ruais responded my understanding from what Anna said last time was that federal rules apply to hospitals and they can't deny care and because Beech Street receives federal dollars, we can't deny somebody access to the shelter. My

understanding from talking to folks down there is there has not been an instance where that has occurred. We are bound by the federal regulations while we are receiving federal dollars. If it comes to a point where, as I suggested in the past, federal dollars are not the funding mechanism for it, there wouldn't be a requirement that we had to follow.

Alderman Kantor stated my concern is that 7,000 people have crossed the border since October from 70 different countries so how is that going to impact Manchester.

Alderman Fajardo stated I wanted to acknowledge the chair of the Heritage Commission, Stan Garrity. He led a really informative and engaging walking tour of the Janesville neighborhood, which encompasses Corey Square. It was really informative and I learned a ton. His brain is nuts with how much he can hold in there but I wanted to make a plug for an upcoming walking tour that he is going to be giving about black history here in Manchester. That is going to be on July 26 and it starts at 10 AM from the Library. I think our tour was about 90 minutes and I am guessing he would be planning for something similar duration wise so wear comfy shoes and be prepared to learn a lot.

Alderman Levasseur stated pursuant to Section 3.08 of the City Charter and the policy that was adopted on 10/17/2006, please be advised that I am appointing Aldermen Morgan, Goonan and myself to be on the screening committee to interview applicants to replace the really irreplaceable Robert Gagne who is retiring. Once our committee chooses a candidate, we will bring that name forward to the full Board for nomination.

TABLED ITEMS

38. Budget Resolutions:

"Appropriating to the Parking Fund the sum of \$5,068,749 from parking revenues for the Fiscal Year 2025."

"Appropriating the sum of \$25,255,603 from Sewer User Rental Charges to the Environmental Protection Division for the Fiscal Year 2025."

"Appropriating to the Manchester Airport Authority the sum of \$40,558,119 from Special Airport Revenue Funds for the Fiscal Year 2025."

“Appropriating to the Manchester Transit Authority the sum of \$1,657,544 for the Fiscal Year 2025.”

“Appropriating to the Manchester School District the sum of \$227,982,610 for the Fiscal Year 2025.”

“Appropriating all Incremental Meals and Rooms Tax Revenue Received by the City in the Fiscal Year 2025 and held in the Civic Center Fund, for the payment of the City’s Obligations in Said Fiscal Year under the Financing Agreement.”

“Appropriating to the Manchester School Food and Nutrition Services Program the sum of \$5,819,971 from School Food and Nutrition Services Revenues for the Fiscal Year 2025.”

“Raising Monies and Making Appropriations of \$185,401,207 for the Fiscal Year 2025.”

“Appropriating to the Central Business Service District the sum of \$258,000 from Central Business Service District Funds for the Fiscal Year 2025.”

“Resolution ‘Approving the Community Improvement Program for Fiscal Year 2025, Raising and Appropriating Monies Therefore, and Authorizing Implementation of Said Program’.”

These items remained on the table.

*There being no further business, on motion of **Alderman O'Neil**, duly seconded by **Alderman Terrio**, it was voted to adjourn.*

A True Record. Attest.

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

City Clerk