

**MINUTES OF THE CHESHIRE TOWN COUNCIL PERSONNEL COMMITTEE
MEETING HELD ON MONDAY, SEPTEMBER 17, 2018 AT 6:30 P.M. IN ROOM 210,
TOWN HALL, 84 SOUTH MAIN STREET, CHESHIRE CT 06410**

Present

Thomas Ruocco, Chairman; Sylvia Nichols and Peter Talbot; absent
Staff: Sean M. Kimball, Town Manager; Louis Zullo, Personnel Director.

1. ROLL CALL

The clerk called the roll and a quorum was determined to be present.

2. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The group Pledged Allegiance to the Flag.

**3. RECLASSIFICATION OF UNSAFE PREMISES ENFORCEMENT
OFFICER DUTIES**

Town Manager Kimball reported the Council adopted the Unsafe Structures and Premised Ordinance on August 14, 2018, and it goes into effect on October 1, 2018. The ordinance identifies the Enforcement Officer as the "Town Manager or his/her designee". A copy of the Ordinance and job description were in the committee packets.

Mr. Kimball noted that Fire Chief Casner is appointed as the Town's "Emergency Management Director", which is a second job description with a stipend. This is a similar model for the "Premises Safety Enforcement Officer" position and job description. Mr. Kimball recommends the appointment of Fire Marshal John Andrews as "Premises Safety Enforcement Officer" with a \$3,000 annual stipend. The ordinance has a one year sunset clause, and will be reviewed by the Council in one year.

In February 2018 the Personnel Committee approved amending the Fire Marshal job description, and Mr. Zullo explained the Fire Marshal would also act as the "Blight Enforcement Officer." There have been changes in the ordinance and the subject job description reflects the current status of the ordinance and the Fire Marshal.

Councilor Talbot stated this all makes perfect sense...having a stand-alone job description for the Enforcement Officer. With the one year review of the ordinance, there can also be review of Fire Marshal Andrews in the position, and how everything is working out. He also questioned excess demand on the Fire Marshal with the extra duties.

According to Mr. Kimball, there is expectation of a surge in complaints under the ordinance, and 5 or 6 have already been received. He expects a few complaints a month, and there will, probably, be multiple complaints for the same property. If the Enforcement Officer job becomes more involved, Mr. Kimball stated the work could be shared by the Zoning Enforcement Officer (ZEO) working more hours. Between the Building Department, Fire Marshal and ZEO, they all have a natural role to work within the ordinance.

Committee Chairman Ruocco stated his uncertainty about supporting the blight ordinance and an enforcement officer.

It was noted by Ms. Nichols that the Town has this ordinance in place and needs a staff person to enforce it. Council can review and determine whether everything is working in one year.

MOTION by Mr. Talbot; seconded by Ms. Nichols.

MOVED that the Personnel Committee approve the job description of the "Premises Safety Enforcement Officer", appointment of Fire Marshal Andrews to this position, with a \$3,000 annual stipend.

VOTE The motion passed 2-1; Mr. Ruocco opposed.

4. DISCUSSION RE: NON-UNION PAY PLANS

Town Manager Kimball explained this is the annual review of the salary plans, and the packet contains proposed adjustments for classifications E 1-5 and N 1-5. There are no proposed changes to the "L" (Library) positions.

With these classification ranges, Mr. Kimball explained there are a few employees exceeding the current range maximum. The recommended changes prevent this from happening again in the next two year cycle. With people working outside their range it challenges the credibility of the range, and the ranges are broad.

Mr. Zullo reviewed the "history" of the salary ranges FY10 to FY 19.

E-5 – over 9 years the maximum increase is 15.85%; N-5 increase is 18.55%; over these years the maximum annual increase was +2%.

Current Maximum and Proposed Maximum for "E" and "N" classifications – Mr. Zullo pointed out that the percentages show what must be done this year and next year in order to not repeat the past. This is a two-year solution for 40 hour and 35 hour employees. Without adjustment of the maximums, there will be people working outside of their maximum, and receiving a lump sum payment as an adjustment. This lump sum payment is based on the annual salary percentage increase, i.e. 2.2%; the base salary, paid bi-weekly remains the same, and the payout amount is credited towards the pension.

Mr. Ruocco said this is strictly salary growth with a cash payout, which is not built in each year. Without raising the pay plan the person would have the same bi-weekly salary and receive a lump sum payout.

The committee discussed the proposed two year plan, moving a few positions from "N" (non-exempt/get overtime) to E" (exempt, no overtime) classifications. For the N-1 pay group, most people come in close to minimum.

One E-3 classification was reviewed (a 28 year employee) who reached maximum in each of the last 4 years. With an 11.1% there will be no adjustments for the next 2 or 3 years.

Mr. Ruocco stated the proposed increases follow the union contract which does not require a performance review. The subject classifications/positions do have performance reviews and then raises. He said in the past some brackets have had more disparities, and a 2 or 3 year pay plan is a good idea.

The committee discussed a salary survey, and Mr. Zullo advised the last survey was done in 2015. Mr. Kimball explained that in Simsbury CT there is no longer a non-union pay plan. The town uses "Market Reference Ranges (MRR)"; goes into the market every two years to 13 identified towns; and gets information on like positions and salary ranges. The town uses a competitive pay plan, based on a combination of tenure, performance and where the position falls in the MRR; and each position has its own pay class.

Mr. Ruocco said he would not support the proposal, and there must be assurance to the Council that a person is not getting an 11% increase in the two year pay plan.

For a person at the maximum with a 2% to 3% increase next year, Mr. Zullo said they would be at the maximum. Some N-5 positions are in the Finance Department. The committee and staff discussed moving these positions into "E" classification. Mr. Zullo noted that some of the employees in the N and E positions are nearing retirement in the next two years. Their replacements will be in the mid-point range.

Ms. Nichols stated support for the proposed two year plan, which will provide time to reclassify some positions. She commented on the need to take out the "person" and decide on what is the best plan for the non-union "position". She supports bringing the two year plan to the Council.

Instead of changing the E-3 ranges by a drastic amount, Mr. Talbot suggested reclassifying them to E-4. He cited an example...changing the title of "Economic Development Coordinator" to "Director of Economic Development"...and moving it to E-4, along with Deputy Finance Director and Collector of Revenue.

Mr. Talbot talked about the E position classifications and maximum range. E-5, \$140,000; E-4, \$120,000 E-3, \$111,000, E-2, \$100,000, E-1, \$90,000.

Mr. Talbot wants to keep relativity between the ranges. He said that the largest increase in one year will be 3.5%. In looking at the E and N ranges, Mr. Talbot is comfortable with the E, and has issues with the N-5 ranges. He noted the N positions can get overtime payments, and E positions do not get overtime. It is possible people in the N classifications may not want to move to an E and lose potential overtime, which can increase their pension benefits.

Following the lengthy discussion, the committee and staff reviewed the proposed maximum ranges and percentages in the two year plan.

<u>Grade</u>	<u>Proposed Maximum</u>	<u>Percentage</u>
E5	\$140,000	6.00%
E4	\$120,000	7.00%
E3	\$111,000 (35 hours) \$126,800 (40 hours)	3.7% 3.7%
E2	\$100,000	4.76%
E1	\$90,000	3.71%
N5	\$88,200 (35 hours) \$100,800 (40 hours)	6.5% 6.5%
N4	\$74,543 (35 hours) \$84,872 (40 hours)	3.00% 3.00%
N3	\$70,000	6.39%
N2	\$59,211 (35 hours) \$67,667 (40 hours)	0% 0%
N1	\$53,816 (35 hours) \$61,526 (40 hours)	0% 0%

Mr. Ruocco said he would not support the proposed two year plan as the percentage ranges are too high.

Ms. Nichols stated this plan give time for reconsideration of these ranges going forward.

MOTION by Mr. Talbot; seconded by Ms. Nichols.

MOVED that the Personnel Committee forwards the proposed Two-Year Non-Union Pay Plan, recommended by the Personnel Committee, to the full Town Council for review and approval.

VOTE The motion passed 2-1; Mr. Ruocco opposed.

5. DISCUSSION RE: NON-UNION PERSONNEL RULES AND REGULATIONS

9-4.4 Use of Vacation Leave – this is a housekeeping change; deletion of second sentence.

9-5 Sick Leave – proposed increase in the maximum accumulation/cash out cap of sick leave hours from 1050 to **1120 hours** for 35 per week employees and adjusted accordingly for forty, thirty, twenty-eight, twenty-five and twenty hour per week employees.

It was explained by Mr. Zullo that many employees are at the maximum sick leave time of 1050 hours. Unless employees contribute to the sick bank, their extra sick time does not receive credit.

Mr. Ruocco pointed out that the new cap on maximum accumulation is 1120 hours, which is 70+ more hours.

The committee members discussed the proposed increase in maximum accumulation of sick leave from 1050 hours to 1120 hours, and did not recommend or support this change.

9-5.2 Use of Sick Leave (f) – Mr. Zullo explained that an employee may exchange accrued vacation leave, in groups of twenty-five hours, and get an additional year of service credit. Section (f) allows exchange of 75 days of sick leave for one additional credited service in the pension formula. This is in lieu of payment for the days exchanged. In the CPD contract there is allowance for a combination of vacation and sick leave in exchange for additional credit years. The proposed plan mirrors the CPD contract. The proposal is for someone with 1050 sick hours to exchange 75 days for an additional service credit.

Pension eligibility has the “rule of 80”, which is combination of a person’s age and years of employment. For example, a 55 year old person with 23 years of service would equal 78, and this person would need two (2) additional years of sick leave credit to reach the rule of 80.

The committee discussed the variables and costs to the Town with an employee, at retirement eligibility or using sick leave time to reach the rule of 80, taking the credit years or cash payout.

9-5.8 Reward for Perfect Attendance – For clarity, Mr. Zullo recommended deleting the last sentence in this section. The committee concurred with this deletion.

Mr. Ruocco stated his opinion that employees should not get rewarded for perfect attendance.

Stating her agreement, Ms. Nichols said people have a job and are expected to come to work. With regard to people taking sick leave and being disqualified for the award, Ms.

Nichols cited an example. If a person has a wellness/medical doctor's appointment and comes to work after the appointment, this person should not be disqualified from the perfect attendance award program.

Ms. Nichols recommended the following wording be added..."if employee works at least one-half of a regularly scheduled day."

10-4 Medical and Life Insurance – delete Preferred Provider Organization; only two retirees living out of state are in the PPO.

10-4.1 Health Savings Accounts – the premium share increases to 8.5% effective January 1, 2019; and 15% of the premium cost share effective changed to October 1, 2018.

10-7 Performance Awards – new wording "exceeds requirements".

11-3 Education Assistance – Para. #2, line # 4, change to "C".

Mr. Zullo explained that employees are reimbursed for courses and books costs up to \$2,400 per fiscal year. Before enrollment, employee must have form signed by department head and town manager for approval of education assistance.

Mr. Talbot noted this is in line with the CPD contract for education assistance.

When a person completes a course, they submit a receipt from the college bursar's office for reimbursement. Mr. Zullo carries a total for each employee's education costs, and in July the person receives a \$2,400 payment, which is deducted from their total. If an employee leaves Town employment, no education cost payout is received.

MOTION by Mr. Talbot; seconded by Ms. Nichols

MOVED that the Personnel Committee forwards the Non-Union Personnel Rules and Regulations, as amended, to the full Town Council for approval. Sections 9-4.4, 9-5.2, 9-5.8, 10-4, 10-4.1 (pages 1 and 2), 10-7, 11-3; each section to be reviewed and deliberated individually.

Discussion

Mr. Ruocco stated he would support this motion with individual sections of the Rules and Regulations being deliberated by the Council.

VOTE The motion passed unanimously by those present.

6. APPOINTMENT OF TOWN HISTORIAN

MOTION by Mr. Talbot; seconded by Ms. Nichols.

MOVED that the Personnel Committee recommends and approves the appointment of Jeanne Chesanow as the Town Historian.

Discussion

Mr. Talbot commented on the excellent job performed by Ms Chesanow as Town Historian.

Ms. Nichols agreed, and talked about the many successful historic programs and events which Ms. Chesanow has developed in Cheshire.

VOTE The motion passed unanimously by those present.

7. **ADJOURNMENT**

MOTION by Mr. Talbot; seconded by Ms. Nichols.

MOVED to adjourn the meeting at 8:28 p.m.

VOTE The motion passed unanimously by those present.

Attest:

Marilyn W. Milton, Clerk