



Personnel Committee - Board of Representatives

Susan Nabel, Chair

Mary Fedeli, Vice Chair

Committee Report

Date: Monday, September 21, 2015

Time: 6:00 p.m.

Place: Republican Caucus Room, 4th Floor Government Center, 888 Washington Boulevard, Stamford, CT

The Personnel Committee met at the above date and time. In attendance were Chair Nabel, Vice Chair Fedeli and Committee Member Reps. DePina, Figueroa, McMullen, McNeil, Okun and Savage. Absent or excused was Committee Member Rep. Fountain. Also present were Rep. de la Cruz; Anne Fountain and Dierdre Anspitch, Health Department; Kathy Emmett, Corporation Counsel; and Clemon Williams, HR Director.

Chair Nabel called the meeting to order at 6:04 p.m.

Item No.	Description	Committee Action
2. P29.035	ORDINANCE for publication; Requirements Needed for Job Applicants to receive Residency points. 12/03/14 – Submitted by Reps. Mitchell and de la Cruz 12/10/14 – Report Made 12/21/14 – Report Made & Held in Committee 01/21/15 – Report Made & Held in Committee 02/18/15 - Report Made & Held in Committee 03/25/15 – Held in Committee 04/22/15 – Held in Committee 06/24/15 – Held in Committee 07/13/15 – Held at Steering 08/26/15 – Held in Committee	No Action Taken

A motion to take up Item No. 2 first was made, seconded and approved by unanimous vote (Reps. Nabel, Fedeli, Figueroa, McMullen, McNeil, Okun and Savage in favor).

Ms. Emmett explained that awarding residency points is a very complicated issue:

- Residency requirements are often found to be illegal or unconstitutional

- If you need to be a resident to hold a job, a municipality must have a reasonable justification for the requirement
- There is a CT statute which states that a municipality may not impose a residency requirement for any employee in a collective bargaining unit unless the requirement is contained in a collective bargaining agreement
- The downside of a residency requirement or residency point is that it may result in the hiring of people who are not the best qualified
- If only residents can be hired, it would be unconstitutional
- Residency points are in violation of the merit system rules unless residency relates to fitness for the job
- A residency requirement may also impair the privileges and immunity clause because it impairs the right to travel
- Residency points could have a disparate impact on a racial or ethnic group, although this is most likely not a problem in Stamford
- She is not aware of any city which has effectively awarded residency points for any position other than emergency service workers, where proximity is a benefit to the community

The Committee took no action on this item.

1. [P29.058](#) APPROVAL; Agreement with Miriam Seelig, M.D., **Approved 7-0-1** for Medical Consulting Services.
08/12/15 – Submitted by Mayor Martin
09/10/15 – Approved by Board of Finance

Ms. Fountain stated that

- the City issued an RFP and Dr. Seelig was the only respondent
- Dr. Seelig has held this position for the past 6 years
- This is a clinical position
- The salary for this position has not been increased
- No hours are specified in the contract because it is a consulting position, although Dr. Seelig needs to be available 24/7, works in the school clinics for 58 hours per month, works in the shelter and is available to the schools 9 hours per day
- Dr. Seelig has worked a minimum of 1740 hours/year

A motion to approve this agreement was made, seconded and approved by a vote of 7-0-1 (Reps. Nabel, Fedeli, DePina, McMullen, McNeil, Okun and Savage in favor; Rep. Figueroa abstaining).

3. P29.059 REVIEW; dependent eligibility verification survey **Report Mad** currently being conducted by Human Resources.
09/11/15 – Submitted by Rep. Fedeli

Mr. Williams stated that

- the City has completed the first phase of this audit, an amnesty period which was concurrent with the open enrollment period
- 21 spouses and 2 children were dropped from coverage during the open enrollment period

- This saves the City approximately \$184,000 per year
- Notifications went out all employees that they are required to reenroll their spouses
- This should be completed by the end of October
- Employees were told that the City will prosecute if their covered spouses are not truly eligible for coverage.
- The cost of the audit is \$32,000
- Employees were given email blasts to expect this information
- They met with all of the union heads to have them tell their memberships

Chair Nabel adjourned the meeting at 7:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Susan Nabel, Chair

This meeting is on [video](#).