

#6  
Citizens Forum

**JANUARY 14<sup>TH</sup>, 07 CITY COUNCIL MEETING**

**I DO NOT APPRECIATE THE MAYOR, THE CITY MANAGER OR ANY OTHER PERSON TO ACUSE ME OF LYING OR SPREADING MISINFORMATION WHEN I AM NOT ALLOWED THE LUXURY TO RESPOND IN KIND.**

**4 WEEKS AGO AT THE COUNCIL MEETING I MADE A STATEMENT REGARDING A RESOLUTION PASSED BY A PREVIOUS COUNCIL TO SEPARATE THE WATERFRONT UPPER BLUFFS PARCEL FROM THE LOWER 28 ACRE PARCEL, I ALSO STATED THAT THE COUNCIL VOTED AGAIN AT A LATER DATE TO MOVE FORWARD WITH THE PLAN TO DO JUST THAT. THE MAYOR STATED, MR. MEDBERY IS WRONG, THAT HE (THE MAYOR) WAS THERE AS A MEMBER OF THE DOVER ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION , HE STATED THE COUNCIL VOTED AGAINST MOVING AHEAD WITH THE INTENT TO SECURE THE PARCEL FOR THE CITY TO OFFER UP TO THE HIGHEST BIDDER TO BE DEVELOPED AS A SEPARATE PARCEL, NOT JOINED AT THE HIP WITH THE LOWER WATERFRONT PARCEL. TO BE GIVEN AS A GOLDEN BONUS TO A BOSTON AREA DEVELOPER WHO COINCIDENTLY APPEARS TO HAVE BEEN THE ONLY BIDDING FINALIST AND AFTER SOME SECRET MEETINGS AND FIVE TRIES TO REDESIGN THE ASSIGNED CHARRETTE FINALLY GETS IT AND OFFERS ONE SOMEWHAT SIMILAR TO THE ORIGINAL.**

**THAT VOTE WAS A NEGATIVE 4-3 WHICH IN ESSENCE MEANT THE COUNCIL VOTED TO PERSUE THE DEVELOPING OF THE UPPER PARCEL AS A SEPARATE ENTITY. THIS WAS THE WILL OF THE PEOPLE THROUGH THEIR ELECTED REPRESENTATIVES! THE MAYOR MAY HAVE BEEN SLEEPING ON THIS ONE; HE SHOULD BE ABSOLUTELY ACCURATE WITH THE FACTS BEFORE PUBLICLY DECLARING CITIZENS ARE MISINFORMED. I HAD THE FACTS, THE MAYOR, ONCE AGAIN, DISTORTED THEM WHEN HE COULD NOT BE REBUTTED; THIS IS A RULE WHICH MUST BE SCRUTINIZED FOR MORE REASONS THAN ONE.**

**ANOTHER SUBJECT.**

**FOR APPROXIMATELY TWO YEARS NOW THERE HAS'NT BEEN ANY PUBLIC STATEMENTS I AM AWARE OF OR IN THE LOCAL NEWS ABOUT THIS CITY MANAGER'S LABOR NEGOTIATIONS METHOD TO BRING FORTH AN AGREEMENT WITH THE LOWEST PAID CITY EMPLOYEES INCLUDING THOSE AT CITY HALL. IT IS MY UNDERSTANDING MR. JOYAL OR HIS ATTORNEY HAD TO APPEAR BEFORE THE PUBLIC EMPLOYEES LABOR RELATIONS BOARD RECENTLY TO JUSTIFY HIS WITHHOLDING OF THESE EMPLOYEES EARNED PAY STEP INCREASES OVER THE PAST TWO YEARS, STEP INCREASES THAT A CONDITION OF EMPLOYMENT AND AGREED UPON BY THE CITY IN PAST NEGOTIATED**

CONTRACTS. IT IS ALSO MY UNDERSTANDING THE FUNDS WERE APPROPRIATED IN THE BUDGET FOR THE STEP INCREASES AND MORE LIKELY THAN NOT, EVENTUALLY AFTER A NEW CONTRACT IS SIGNED WILL BE PAID IN A LUMP SUM INCREASING THE EMPLOYEES FAMILY TAX BURDEN. FROM MY OBSERVATIONS, THIS METHOD OF A HIGHLY PAID MANAGER ALIENATING A WORK FORCE BY WITHHOLDING PAY STEP INCREASES TO FORCE A CONTRACT AGREEMENT HAS ACCOMPLISHED NOTHING TO BRING THEM TO THE TABLE OVER THE PAST TWO YEARS EXCEPT CONTEMPT AND ALIENATION ON THE EMPLOYEE'S PART. I WAS TOLD THAT ONE WORKER HAS HAD TWO CHILDREN BORN DURING THIS TIME PERIOD, IT BRINGS TO MIND ALL THE FUNDS PAID TO THE UPPER LEVEL PRESENT AND DEPARTED MANAGERS. THEY GOT THEIRS AT THE EXPENSE OF THE LOWER ECHELON AND THE COMMUNITY.

WE MUST ALWAYS BARGAIN IN GOOD FAITH AND LEAVE THE DOOR OPEN, WHEN A DEAD END IS REACHED, WE ALL KNOW SOONER OR LATER A SETTLEMENT IS INEVITABLE. TWO YEARS FROM BOTH SIDES SEEMS TO BE A REVELATION THAT EITHER SIDE OR BOTH ARE NOT BARGAINING IN GOOD FAITH. BARGAINING MEANS "TO REACH AN AGREEMENT OR CONTRACT". TO NEGOTIATE IS "TO ARRANGE OR SETTLE BY CONFERRING OR DISCUSSING".

I QUOTE SAMUEL JOHNSON "IT IS DIFFICULT TO NEGOTIATE WHERE NEITHER WILL TRUST". IS THIS WHERE OUR CITY LABOR NEGOTIATIONS ARE WITH THE LOWEST PAID EMPLOYEES? NEITHER SIDE TRUSTS THE OTHER?

I HAVE TO ASK THE QUESTION, HOW MANY TAX PAYERS KNEW THAT OUR CITY HALL WORKERS HAVE WORKED SO LONG WITHOUT A CONTRACT OR A PAY INCREASE. I DO NOT RECALL READING OR HEARING ABOUT.

THIS CITY ADMINISTRATION LOVES OPERATING IN SECRECY AS HAS BEEN EVIDENCED SINCE LOSING THE RIGHT TO KNOW LAW SUIT.