

Summarized Employee Feedback
Re: Sick/Vacation and Health Insurance Benefits
June 2017

<u>Sick Leave (24 total comments*)</u>	
Option 1 (implement a graduated plan; 0-5 years = 96 hrs/yr; 5+ - 10 years = 108 hrs/yr; 10+ = 120 hrs/yr)	4
Option 2 (change accruals from 96 hrs per year to 120 hrs per year; this would match Civil Service employees of 15 days per year)	5
Payout Sick Upon Termination	12
Develop incentives not to use	2
Increase accruals	2
Eliminate the cap on accruals	3
Base accrual on years of service	3
<u>Vacation Leave (37 total comments*)</u>	
Grandfather existing employees	12
Accrual Option 1 (no change in accruals but cap bonus time at 20 years)	10
Accrual Option 2 (0 - 10 years = 3 weeks; 10+ - 20 years = 4 weeks; 20+ years = 5 weeks)	5
Cap accrual at 240 hrs	1
Reduce bonus time from 4 hrs to 3 hrs	1
Carryover & Payout Option 1 (leave carryover at 320 (480 for Fire CS), but maximum payout would be 240 hours (360 for Fire CS))	3
Carryover & Payout Option 2 (change carryover to 240 hour (360 for Fire CS); maximum payout would reflect carryover)	3
Carryover & Payout Option 3 (Implement a graduated carryover plan based on years of service as follows: Less than 10 years = 240 hours; 10+ years = 320 hours; maximum payout would reflect carryover)	5
No changes to vacation	2
Reduce payout but don't change accruals	1
Develop a vacation buy-back program	1
<u>Health Benefits (34 total comments*)</u>	
Support plan changes over premium increases	3
Agree with EIC recommendations	9
Widen benefit/premium gap between Gold plan and Silver plan	2
Base premiums on # of family members	2
Discounts for not using the health plan	2
Encourage more use of clinic	2
Re-evaluate the need for the clinic	2
Lower prescription drug copayments	1
Reduce bariatric surgery benefit	1
More training/education on cost of plan/how to best utilize the plan	4
<u>General Comments (19 comments*)</u>	
Good benefits attract & retain good employees	7
Reward longevity	2
If comparing benefits with other cities we also need to raise those where we are lacking	2
Bring back Compensatory Time	1
Add Maternity/Paternity Leave	1
*Many of these comments are a summary of an employee group	

Full Employee Comments – Sick/Vacation Leave and Health Benefits

Sick Leave

- Pay employees a percentage of their sick leave based on years of service when employee leaves. The City of Denton sick leave policy provides absolutely no incentive to employees to stay well or not use up all of their sick leave before they terminate. It sends the wrong message to employees.
- Non Civil Service Sick Benefits: Option 2
- Sick accrual Change Option 2
- I believe adopting additional sick time whose balance remains uncompensated at retirement/departure will result in additional use it or lose it practices among non-police/fire employees.
- I think a flat-rate plan is more efficient to administer than a graduated plan. I vote for option 2 because operationally I think it is better choice. And if the goal is to attract better employees by offering more in terms of sick-time benefits (to better compete with those other Cities), than I think it's obvious that Option 2 does that more effectively than Option 1.
- Prefer current vacation and sick policies do not change. However, 7 of the 10 cities surveyed paid out some sick.
- Sick Leave- Option 2, but there needs to be a payout of some sick based on years of service.
- Sick Accrual Change Options – option 1
- The EIC rep polled the group and Option 1 (24 in favor of) was preferred over Option 2 (16 in favor of).
- Agree to additional sick time, but would like to see a pay incentive for those that don't use it.
- Option 1 for sick leave, with payout of accrued hours upon separation for employees with more than 5 years of service.
- The sick time payout is an incentive for employees to use good judgement on how much time they use.
- Why was adding a payout for sick time not considered when 6 out of the other 10 city have some sort of payout for sick time
- Our limit on sick time is 720 hours when 9 out of the 10 other cities surveyed have either a higher accrual limit (2 cities) or no limit at all on sick time accrual (7 cities). Why are we not falling in line with the majority of other cities surveyed and eliminating a sick time accrual cap? People generally like to have a large number of hours banked in case something catastrophic happens to them. This does not mean the city has to pay all of those hours when a person leaves the city.
- Denton has a cap on sick time, majority don't. Denton does not pay out for any sick time, majority do. Hmmm... I wonder why they want to up the sick time?
- Many of the North Texas municipalities polled offered some sort of cash-out upon termination of accrued sick leave.
- Most of the North Texas municipalities polled did not have a cap on the number of hours that could be accrued for sick time.
- If the spirit of the initiative in revisiting the City of Denton's employee benefit package is to work toward the mean of North Texas cities, then it seems reasonable that a sick-leave cash-out option for long term employees and the elimination or at least increasing the present 720 hour sick leave accrual cap would both be part of the policy-making discussion.

- Option 2 for sick leave with payout of accrued hours upon separation for employees with more than 5 years of service.
- Start new employees at a 96 hrs of sick , then increase and cap at 120
- Look into some sick payout
- Start employees off with 96 hours, then increase 4 hours per year until 120 hours are reach and cap off at that point. Starting with new employees, lower the maximum amount of sick time one can accrue.
- Sick leave:
 - 96 hours up to 5 years of employment
 - 120 hours over 5 years
 - Police and fire appear to be in line with other City's already
- Regarding the Sick Leave, Option 1 with a modification that new employees would not accrue sick leave until 6 months of being hired.

Vacation Leave

- On vacation options-Comment need to grandfather in employees that currently have the maximum amount of vacation hours and pay them for any difference if one of the new plans takes effect- these are valuable long term employees that deserve this benefit.
- Prefer Option 1-leave the maximum at 320 hours. As a long term employee, prefer Grandfather Option B- to be paid out for any vacation time that exceeds the maximum yearly amount.
- Vacation Benefits: Option 2
- Carry-over and payout: Option 3
- Vacation Benefits Change Option 2
- Vacation Carryover & Payout Change Option 3
- I would like those of us carrying the current 320 hours of vacation to either be grandfathered in at that number or paid out versus required to take extensive time out to reduce our hours.
- I prefer Option 1 under Vacation Benefits. This option would probably have little-to-no impact on morale and turnover. I think most employees have the 20 year time frame in their heads. This is in line with how long most of us expect to be working before we collect retirement (and maybe move on to a new job). Of course some of us will stay beyond that, but by then I don't think a few hours of vacation here or there will make much difference.
- Option 2 under Vacation Benefits encourages turnover in my opinion. There are enough Cities in the Metroplex that grant extra vacation time after 5 years, not 10. Couple this with a negative work environment here (for some) and better pay elsewhere (for some), and turnover will probably increase. Turnover comes with its own costs (sometimes as much as 200% of the employee's salary). It would be cheaper to just leave the benefits as they are than to go down that road.
- Vacation payout - Grandfathering existing employees (Option 1.A) is always a good idea versus taking something away from existing employees. Let new employees come in under the new rules. As existing employees leave the organization the old system is "sunsetting" and phased out. Morale is unaffected. Turnover is unaffected. The City starts to see savings as soon as one existing employee leaves and a new employee is hired on. It just compounds after that until the old system is gone.
- Please do not reduce our vacation benefits.
- Vacation Accrual: Option 2 with no change in carryover
- Vacation Carry-Over and Payout: Option 1 but grandfather in existing employees
- Vacation Accrual Change Options – option 1

- Vacation Carry-Over and Payout Change Options – option 1A
- The EIC rep polled the group and Option 1 was preferred (11 in favor of). Most were in favor of Option 1A, Grandfather existing employees at 320 and 240 on future employees for vacation carryover
- The EIC rep polled the group and Option 3 was preferred (29 in favor of)
- No change to monthly accrual, and carryover, agree to a 20 year cap.
- Option 1 for vacation changes, with a cap of 200 hr.
- Option 1A, Grandfather existing employees at 320 and 240 on future employees for vacation carryover.
- When looking at reducing vacation time, was the number of holidays other cities receive considered? Some cities may give less vacation time but more holidays.
- Was an option of changing the bonus ours accrued after 5 years from 4 hours to 3 hours discussed?
- I personally do not mind reducing the total number of vacation hours paid out by the city upon separation. So long as the total accrual is not reduced.
- The bonus time that we pay to keep seasoned, loyal employees to serve our citizens here in Denton should be kept.
- If there has to be a cap on number of vacation hours allotted annually, then make it 200 hours.
- The number of hours of vacation carry-over was not a big concern, 240 hours a year maximum carry-over seems reasonable.
- Option 1 for vacation changes, with a cap of 200 hr.
- Option 3 on vacation carryover.
- Start new employees at the same vacation as of now, but do not add bonus 4 hrs until they are vested at 5 yrs. Then continue to add bonus hours until 25 yrs and cap at 200 hrs vac.
- Possibly look into vacation payout earlier in career at a lower cost than when they retire at a higher payout cost
- Grandfather existing employees in with the current policy.
- Offer Vacation Buy-Back - Lower the maximum amount accrued and that can be saved as well as allow employees to cash out some of their vacation time. Most companies allow a max of 1-2 weeks per year to be cashed out if not taken. This saves money in the long run because they will get the time paid out at their current pay (which is often lower than it would be in the future). It also prevents employees from saving up so much time, as many people would like to have the cash in hand now.
- Start employees at a lower rate - Start new employees with 2 weeks paid vacation for year 1, earning 4 hours each year until 5 years where they bump to 3 weeks. Employees then earn an additional 4 hours per year until 10 years, when they bump up to 4 weeks. Employees then earn 4 hours more per year until 20 years, where they max out at 5 weeks. Graphically demonstrated below:

Years of Employment	Vacation Hours Earned
1	80
2	84
3	88
4	92
5	120
6	124
7	128
8	132
9	136
10	160
11	164
12	168
13	172
14	176
15	180
16	184
17	188
18	192
19	196
20 +	200

- Vacations:
 - 2 weeks up to 5 years
 - 3 weeks 5 to 15 years
 - 4 weeks 15-20 years
 - 5 weeks over 20 years
- Use Option 1 for carry overs and payouts and grandfather in existing employees and start new vacation and sick with new hires October 1, 2017
- Regarding Vacation Time, Option 1 with a modification that new employees (new physical year) would not accrue vacation time until 6 months of being hired. Current employees would be grandfathered in.
- Option 3 on carryover hours seems very logical based on the # of employees outlined.

Health Plan Changes

- Specific to Health Care, I'd like to see more documentation distribution. I suspect that that lowering our benefits through higher employee contributions and higher deductibles will not lead to better health outcomes but we never see anything related to how anything the city does in health care benefits, policy, and activities that leads to better health outcomes. If the City wants more buy-in to improve our health outcomes then let employees see/interact with more of what is happening in employee health. Knowledge is empowerment. The only thing we do get to see is punitive strategies for all based on actions of a few. So, for example, now that they are charging for Clinic no-shows has the no-show issue been reduced? Better still, why didn't they choose to try strategies that were positive reinforcement instead of punitive that would have also reduced no-shows? It feels like they did not choose the second options because they are problem focused and do not hold employees in high-esteem.
- If the proposed changes keep the premiums down, then they may be acceptable.
- The Employee and Family plan comparisons needs to take into account the \$50/month addition if the spouse is offered insurance.
- Be in favor of the Silver Plan increasing in price if the following items are addressed to be consistent with the other cities surveyed.
 - A decrease in Out of Pocket Maximums
 - Adding Out of Network Benefits back
 - Decreasing the copayments of physician, specialist, urgent care and ER
 - Removing the RX deductible
- We agree with the insurance changes that were most favored by the EIC Committee, PCP/SPC Co-Pay increase and deductible increase for Tier2 & Tier 3 prescriptions.
- I think there needs to be a more drastic difference between the Gold & Silver plans. Many employees choose Silver to lessen the amounts taken from their checks in hope to not have to use it. Some choose the Gold to make sure they're better represented as needed. If there isn't much difference between the two, why have two options? Suggested Options:
 - Premiums: Increase Gold 5% & Silver 10%
 - Co-Pays: Gold: \$25/\$40
Silver: \$35/\$55
 - ER: Gold: \$350
Silver: \$450
 - Co-Insurance: Gold: 85%/80%
Silver: 75%/70%
 - Deductibles: Gold: \$1000/\$2000
Silver: \$2000/\$3250
- I use the health clinic for myself and my children whenever possible. It allows me convenience, no charge and familiarity with the personnel. Seeing how it is City owned/run, I don't think there should be ANY charges for any reason regarding this clinic. Its purpose was not to make money, but to save money. I do wish they would issue more shots in the office and not always prescribe pills (to have to go to the pharmacy) when possible.
- If you want to cut costs, do away with the Health Clinic, the paper says it costs \$1million.
- Look at what it costs to run the Health Clinic and compare the cost to what it saves in insurance savings to see if it is still viable.
- The Health Clinic doesn't seem to get the diagnosis right the majority of the time. They would rather give prescriptions, than a shot to help get you well quicker.

- The Healthies Incentive Program has become a joke, it takes way too much time to enter everything you have to now, so most people I have talked to in our department do not do it anymore.
- Why do we need two different plans (Gold and Silver) when they are not all that different, either widen the gap between the two or only offer one.
- The Water Meter Shop is on board with the four options for health insurance benefits increases, but express a short term fix.
- We agree with the insurance changes that were most favored by the EIC Committee, PCP/SPC Co-Pay increase and deductible increase for Tier2& Tier 3 prescriptions
- Premiums should be based on number of family members on the plans such as Employee only, E+1, E+2, E+3, etc.
- It's bad enough that insurance rates continue to deplete our paychecks. Do we really want to take away benefits that make Denton shine above other cities?
- The preference is to have the copays/deductible amounts increased rather than an across the board increase in insurance premiums to cover the projected 2018 short-fall of funding.
- The EIC insurance changes favored were the PCP/SCP copay increase and the Tier 2 & Tier3 prescription deductible increase in order to help achieve the 6% reduction.
- If there are going to be increases to our benefits package I hope there's a discussion for a cost of living increase too. As it stands for some employees our annual salary review/increase is only enough to cover the cost of the annual insurance increase(s). I think it's important for EIC to remember a lot of employees (new and current) consider the benefits package, salary, distance and cost of living before accepting/leaving positions with the City of Denton.
- Increase the Prescription Drug Annual Deductible
- Increase Emergency Room Copayment
- Increase Copays
- Also, it would be nice to have a discounts for employees who do not have a claim. I'm sure there are employees who have our health plan and have not had a claim for years, however they are paying health insurance for their family as a precaution.
- Do not increase premiums
- Personally, I think our co-pays for medications are too high. Most of my generics cost the exact same without any insurance, or may even cost less if I don't use my insurance. Another prescription I use isn't on the covered list and despite a letter from my doctor stating I have side effects from the generic and need this specific brand for one, I am denied coverage at all and am having to seek coupons from the manufacturer. I again have to file outside of insurance to save money. I think our insurance is not as good as most private companies, though I am not sure how it compares to other cities exactly. I just got on it a month ago and am seriously regretting it. I can't wait until open enrollment to get off of it and go on my husband's so I can have something that really benefits me. The cost of one prescription is so high without any coverage from our plan that I can afford to lose my healthy incentive discount I would have next year and afford the increase in premium to my husband's plan and as long as the prescription is less than \$90 (which I have paid \$4 per month for this med with both Aetna and BCBS), I still come out saving money to get off of our plan.
- Insurance:
 - Gold Plan:
 - Ee only-\$110.00
 - Ee-Spouse-\$242.00
 - Ee+child up to 2-\$308.00
 - Ee + children 3 or more-\$374.00

- Ee+Family up to 2 children-\$448.00
 - Ee+Family up to 3 or more children-\$514.00
- Silver Plan
 - Ee only-\$42.00
 - Ee+Spouse-\$138.00
 - Ee+child up to 2-\$170.00
 - Ec+child 3 or more-\$236.00
 - Ee+Family up to 2 children-\$248.00
 - Ee+Family 3 or more children-\$294.00
- Reduce benefits for Bariatric Surgery and instead have employee use nutrition and fitness coaches
- Increase drug deductible from \$50.00 to \$75.00
- Set up a required HR class for all employees to attend throughout the year that covers our costs in more details with direction on how to find the lowest costs for medical tests; don't use another provider referred to by your physician or our clinic until you have UHC confirm they are in-network or have Compass check or who to contact for assistance; what after hours doctor facilities are our best cost savings and their locations and hours; etc. Any topic that can save employees and the City money.
- Or send an email out to all employees covering the above topics so we can have this information saved on our phones when something does arise at night or on the weekend.
- Or a wallet sized card to carry with our insurance card that lists phone numbers for Compass or the clinics around town that offer the most cost effective services and lowest co-pays.
- I'm in agreeance with the following potential savings plan:
 - Increase the Prescription Drug Annual Deductible
 - Increase Emergency Room Copayment
 - Increase Copays
- If this plan does goes in affect, HR can provide a training class to educate our employees on when to use the ER and how to locate in network physicians and specialist.
- Also, it would be nice to have a discounts for employees who do not have a claim. I'm sure there are employees who have our health plan and have not had a claim for years, however they are paying health insurance for their family as a precaution.

General

- The City of Denton attracts exemplary employees partly due to their benefit. As a recently rated non-exempt employee I have lost the ability to gain discretionary time. Pair this fact with the possibility of reducing vacation days effects my moral negatively.
- Preference on vacation/sick benefits would be no change at all but if a change has to be made the option should promote longevity. There are benefits to having employees staying committed to the City of Denton which include enhanced experience and knowledge of Denton's programs and operations. As we have seen recently, when there is a constant turnover in employees, City staff and the citizens have to deal with learning curves, additional hiring and training costs, and policy/procedural changes. Public service is not known for competitive pay when compared to the private sector but the City can make up the void by offering good benefits and therefore, allow us to compete with other cities, public entities, and the private sector.

- As a hardworking, dedicated person with a strong work ethic the idea of adding extra sick hours and reducing vacation hours sends a mixed message that degrades the principal of a strong work ethic and a job well done.
- If the goal is to save money then a graduated increase for sick and vacation in 5 year increments (0-4, 5-9, 10-14...) seems to be most common.
- Is the City's goal for our Health Insurance plan to promote good health? If that is a correct, then making changes that promote good health and reward individuals by considering a percentage of the sick benefits to be paid out upon separation. This would work well with a graduated plan and could still save money.
- In general, I would like to advocate that any decisions are based on how the change is an asset to the City **and** to the employee rather than how employees will take advantage of the benefit. Cost savings cannot be the only consideration. 1. If adjustments are made to bring us in alignment with other Cities benefits then that should be equitable across both benefit. Don't reduce vacation and then not increase sick leave. 2. If there must be a change, I would prefer that it be grandfathered option so that you are not removing benefits from existing employees who are already committed to the organization regardless of current tenure.
- I am not trying to lump everyone into the same perceptions and I am aware that this assumption would not apply to all but right or wrong my perception is that there are too many people in that room making decisions based on the assumptions of the worst of employees rather than seeing the best of employees with a commitment to supporting and honoring employee contribution. Honestly, it feels like some important leaders have forgotten that their role is build up the workforce, make us better: better performers, better leaders, better employees, better in service to our clients, the citizens.
- I think current staff should be Grand-fathered in on any changes made to leave benefits. A lot of people accepted the position with the City of Denton due the benefit package that was offered at the time of their start date. I understand the need for adjustments in insurance premiums, deductibles etc. from time to time, but I don't agree with some of the amounts on the attached documents. We have a lot of staff members that are uncertain of the future they may have with the City of Denton due to all the current changes taking place, I do know that a lot of these changes will be beneficial down the road but sometimes that's hard to see right away. It's a time of unrest and I think throwing this in the mix may be too much at one time.
- In looking at the vacation and sick time accrual, carryover, and payout options from the ten other cities here are my observations;
 - 1) Denton has the best accrual, 4th best carryover and we are tied for 5th best payout programs when it comes to vacation.
 - 2) Denton has the worst (tied for 10th) accrual, 10th best carryover and we are tied for worst (with three other cities) for payout program when it comes to sick.

To achieve what the council has stated as the goal in this study, to bring Denton to an average of these other cities we would have to be between the 5th and 6th ranked cities in each category. Taking an average of what each city offers is not a true average because of the wide difference between the cities at the bottom, who choose to be there, and the top performing cities, who also choose to be where they are.

VACATION-

- Accrual #5 is Irving who has a graduated plan from 96 to 176 hours depending on years of service.
- Carryover #5 is Lewisville who has a graduated plan from 160, 240, or 320 hours depending on years of service.
- Payout #5 is Grand Prairie who allow up 320 hours as does Denton.

SICK-

- Accrual #5 is a tie from #2-#7 (Arlington, Grand Prairie, Irving, Lewisville, Mesquite and Plano) each with 120 hours.
- Carryover #5 is a tie from #1-#7 (Carrollton, Frisco, Grand Prairie, Irving, McKinney, Mesquite and Plano) each with no limit.
- Payout #5 is Mesquite who has a graduated plan of 0-3 yrs none, 3-5 yrs 1/3 of unused, 5-6yrs 2/3 of unused and 6+yrs up to 90 days or 720hrs.

If the council truly wants to ensure our benefits are better aligned with other DFW metroplex cities this would be what needs to be done. I am sure that some employees would be upset, others would be indifferent and still others would be happy. This would only make Denton's employees' compensation "Average" and not Leading. As you can see this would cost the city more \$ in payout and actually not save any hard \$ with the reduction in vacation hrs accrued.

Take that just a little further, and if the council would like to make Denton a true Leader among DFW Metroplex Cities, move these benefits into the top 3 in each category (top 25%). This would go a long way in proving that our council is concerned about the city's employees and wants to continue to attract and retain the best employees in the future. This would also be a cost but should also be viewed as an offset in production. It is proven if you have a happy work force you gain productivity through employees taking less time off, improved morale, more attention to detail, and safer work habits. The biggest increase that I think the council would see is in each employee's attention to SAFETY due to a decrease in distractions and an increase in morale. It's always nice when an employee can take off on vacation for several weeks to relax and unwind.

But if the council is actually only worried about the bottom line and cutting costs and all we as employees have to choose from is the options sent out by the EIC, I would choose Option #2 of the Vacation Benefits Change Options/ Option #3 of the Vacation Carry-Over and Payout Change Options with Option A Grandfather Existing Employees and implement the change October 1, 2017. The easiest and less controversial option is to leave them as they are.

- When considering changes to vacation time, did the committee ask if the other cities on the list allow accrual or use of "comp" time for exempt and/or nonexempt employees? Some of these cities do, which may be why they have less vacation accrual. For example, Garland allows accrual of 90 hours of comp time for nonexempt employees and 160 hours for exempt employees. Some City of Denton employees have to work over 40 hours per week due to the nature of their jobs, staff shortages, a special project or event, weather event, etc, or regularly take calls after hours and on weekends yet don't accrue comp time for this. We do have the vague "discretionary" time policy, but since that is up to the supervisor's discretion the time off given varies from supervisor to supervisor. There's no consistent policy.
- I haven't had a ton of time to review. I think that it would be dreadful for people who have time accumulated such as at the 320/720 and those hours depleted due to a new policy is terrible for morale and disrespectful to employees who have worked extremely hard and count on those

hours in case of a life crisis, medical emergency, etc. I understand the need for policy changes, but I think strong consideration should be given to long term employees who have accumulated those hours in their bank, to not remove hours earned.

- I am sending this email in concern to the newly proposed health care, vacation, and sick plans. I have currently been with the City of Denton three and a half years. I really enjoy working for the city as well as working with all the current city employees. I left my current job in 2013 to come to the City of Denton strictly because of the great benefits the city had to offer. Since I have been here, the health insurance has went up in some form or fashion every year. I completely understand that today's healthcare costs are constantly changing. Is it changing drastically enough to change our rates every year? As for comparing Denton to all the other cities listed in the documentation, I don't feel it is necessary to compare. Ever since I have been here whether it's been in meetings or new employee orientation, all I have heard is how the City of Denton strives to be the best and offer the best for their employees among all the other surrounding cities. I think there are plenty of other areas among the city that they can cut cost from, rather than cutting it from their own people. As for the vacation and sick time, is there a city wide problem with the way it is now? If they want to talk about other towns, it is clearly shown in the comparisons of the other cities that there are some drastic changes from town to town. It's clear that the majority of the other cities pay their employees for their accrued sick time when they leave. I did not see that in any of these proposals to get on the same playing field as the other towns. There are a lot of questions that I have, along with others that I'm sure have them as well. It is shown that Denton has better benefits than most in the majority of areas. There are some that clearly have better benefits in areas other than Denton's. Why can't Denton set the precedent and uphold the reputation of being a city that everyone around would love to work for?
- Leave everything as is, the sick increase will result in employees using sick in lieu of the vacation that is lost.
- The benefit package is what lures potential employees to work for the City of Denton, we have hard time filling jobs with the current marketplace and economy already.
- I had a little round table with my team this morning and we find these options unacceptable. If you are looking for average employees then you have average benefits. Denton has always tried to be a leader of cities and now we are wanting to go back to average?
- I'm not a fan of continuing to raise our insurance costs. I understand that it's expensive so I can live with it for now. But, it really disturbs me that bonus vacation time will be capped at 25 years. I don't understand why the city would want to do this. I don't care to hear about unfunded liability—if it's unfunded then fund it instead. One of the reasons people work for municipalities is because of benefits such as this. If you start to cut these benefits, you'll lose some well-qualified workers who'll decide to work in the private sector where they can make more money. Or, as I suspect is the case, the council wants senior employees to just go ahead and retire so that their higher salaries will be gone. Either way, the city isn't trying to take care of their employees. You get what you pay for.
- Minimal to no changes to be made to Vacation/ Sick
- Grandfather in existing options before making changes to Vacation/Sick
- Start offering some sort of maternity/paternity leave

Full Email from one employee:

Scott, I have several concerns about the Council looking into changing our benefits. With this being said I do realize some change is coming but I just hope the Council will take into consideration that every

employee that works for the City of Denton is a person not just a number. Here is a little bit about myself:

Years of Service: 28 years
Born and raised: Denton TX
High School: Denton High

As you can see above I know a little bit about Denton Texas. I've seen changes over the years here at the City of Denton both as an employee and citizen, some good, some not so good. Here are a couple of questions for the Council before they make their decisions on our benefits.

1. As a Denton Citizen and Employee I would like for Denton to be a leader not a follower among Cities, is the Council ok with Denton just being average?
2. As a supervisor I am responsible for hiring, the positions I hire in most cases are very technical positions, I can't stick just anyone in those positions. With this being said the pay for those positions are competitive but not above market. So I need these benefits as a selling point to get good quality personnel. Finding technical technicians is very difficult now, if we just have average benefits then hiring just got more difficult. I would think the Council would want the best possible employee we could get, not just an average Joe?
3. The Potential Benefit Change Talking Points states that the four (4) changes generate \$1,025,914 in potential savings. I would like to know what this potential savings would go to, just curious?
4. Anytime you take benefits away from the work force you affect the morale of that work force. Since these possible changes have come to light I know my team has been affected, and not in a positive way. There are even a couple mentioned bringing in a Union, I know I don't want this and surely the Council doesn't want this? I think it is just talk but what bothers me is I haven't heard that talk before.
5. When looking at the different options on Vacation and Sick, it does look like we get more vacation then most but not as much sick. I would rather my guys get more vacation for one simple reason, SAFETY! What I mean by this, Substations is very busy (and so are all the other departments), I want my guys to be able to take off and relax, rest, clear their heads, spend time with their families, then come back and be focused and work SAFE! This job is very demanding on each team member, they need and deserve their down time. If you take vacation away and increase sick time, this could create another problem, some might take off sick when vacation is really what they should be using. Council just keep in mind these team members need their down time for themselves, other team members and most important their families.
6. If the Ad Hoc Committee wants to better align our benefits with those offered by other cities then let's align all the benefits, not just the ones Denton is more generous in. Denton does not pay for any Sick when you leave but 7 out of 11 Cities do pay for Sick time. So where in the Options does it say what the City of Denton plan to pay for Sick?
7. Insurance is always going to go up, I just don't think we should increase it because other cities have. If we can afford better insurance for the employees then they should have it. Again lets be a leader among Cities!

I have always bragged on working for the City of Denton and one major reason has always been the benefits. I do appreciate all that the City of Denton has done for its employees over the years, I just don't want to be just another Municipal.