

effectively in this area and he further stated that the IDFA board was already working on this problem and is developing a policy to deal with it.

In terms of job training, Councillor David Sullivan suggested that Ms. Seltzer should coordinate her job placement program with the School Department in order to provide the necessary training for people who lack the skills required to find work. Ms. Seltzer agreed and stated that by the time the committee meets again in the fall she will have a report on this.

At this time, Attorney Berge Albright from the Law Department recapitulated for those present the decision of the U.S. Supreme Court which essentially upheld but narrowed a previous decision of the Supreme Judicial Court relative to hiring local residents for construction jobs. He further stated that the decision held that such a provision could only be implemented when a construction job is funded with municipal or other government funds.

City Manager Robert Healy stated that such a provision a year ago could have made jobs available for Cantabridgians when the \$10.2 million school renovation program began. He further stated that he could not foresee that given the current financial condition of the city, it is highly unlikely that a major construction project under the aegis of the city would occur. He further stated he had concerns as to whether or not you artificially drive up the price of a construction job by placing hiring constraints on the contractor. He also questioned how such a job placement program (local hiring based on the court decision) would be monitored and what penalties would be in place if in fact a company refused.

Attorney Wallace Sherwood, affirmative action coordinator for Cambridge construction jobs stated he believed such a hiring provision would be difficult to implement in Cambridge.

Councillor David Sullivan suggested that the committee and the City Manager should consider, if Cambridge adopts such a hiring provision pursuant to the Supreme Court decision, how it should be done: Executive order by the City Manager, a vote of the City Council or by virtue of other ancillary arrangements with future development projects. Ms. Sletzer stated that she and her staff will meet during the summer with Just-A-Start, Inc. and with the various unions to identify what the issues are in this regard and will report back to the committee at its next meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 7:05 PM.

For the Committee,

Councillor David E. Sullivan
Chairperson

DES/smc

City of Cambridge

In City Council May 23, 1983

The Committee on Economic Development, Manpower and Employment conducted a public meeting on Tuesday, May 10, 1983 beginning at 5:30 PM in the Mayor's Conference Room. The purpose of the meeting was to 1) discuss a report by EMHRDA on the status of the Cambridge Employment Program and 2) to discuss the implications of the February 28, 1983 United States Supreme Court decision in White v. Massachusetts Council of Construction Employers, Inc., particularly as it relates to public construction jobs for Cambridge residents.

Councillor David Sullivan began the meeting by welcoming all those present and stated that he felt it was important for the Committee to meet since it is in receipt of the first progress report on the Cambridge Employment Program as well as to discuss jobs for Cambridge people in general.

Marlene Seltzer, Executive Director of the Eastern Middlesex Human Resource Development Authority outlined the success of the program so far concerning the period February 16, 1983 to April 22, 1983. She further stated that so far one hundred residents have registered for the EMHRDA job placement service and they currently have some 121 jobs openings. However, she stated that since the match between skills and the job requirements is extremely limited, consequently only twenty individuals have actually been placed.

She further stated that as of yet no construction jobs have been listed as available. She believed this was essentially due to the fact that most major construction jobs are union. She did state however, that construction companies, when contacted by her staff, are willing to list clerical positions which may be vacant.

Councillor Duehay questioned whether people who are already working are given an opportunity to apply for a promotional position within a given company. Ms. Sletzer responded by stating that her agency is solely limited to assisting the unemployed. Councillor David Sullivan stated that possibly if it came down to a question of establishing priorities at EMHRDA, upward mobility of presently employed people could be given a lower priority than of placing unemployed Cambridge residents.

In response to other questions regarding data collection, Ms. Seltzer stated that her agency will be in a better position to determine how successful or unsuccessful the employment program has been in about six months when they have a better data base.

Councillor David Sullivan questioned why money provided to businesses from the Industrial Development Financing Authority (IDFA) could not be contingent on job placement, where possible, of Cambridge residents. Mr. Russell Linquist, Executive Director of IDFA, responded by stating that current Urban Development Action Grant (UDAG) guidelines will now allow cities to deal more

3.

U-312

REPORT

Committee on Economic Development,
Manpower and Employment Re: report from EMHRDA
on the status of the Cambridge Employment Plan
& implications of Supreme Court decision in the
case of White v. Mass. Council of Construction
Employers, Inc. as it relates to public construc-
tion jobs for Cambridge residents.

In City Council,

May 23, 1983

Placed

on

File -