

Career Service Authority Board Meeting #2078
MINUTES
Thursday, August 2, 2007
5:00 P.M.
Webb Municipal Building
201 West Colfax, Fourth Floor, Room 4.F.6 and 4.G.2

Board Members: Co-Chair Ashley Kilroy
Co-Chair Nita Henry
Tom Bonner
Luis Toro
Kit Williams (*absent*)

I. The Board opened the meeting at 5:05 pm

A. Approval of Agenda for the August 2, 2007 Board Meeting.

The Board approved unanimously the agenda for the August 2, 2007 Board meeting.

B. Approval of Minutes for the July 19, 2007 Board Meeting.

The Board approved unanimously the minutes for the July 19, 2007 Board meeting. Board Member Henry abstains because she was not present at the meeting.

C. Approval of Minutes for the June 21, 2007 Board Meeting.

The Board approved unanimously the minutes for the June 21, 2007 Board meeting. Board Member Kilroy abstains because she was not present at the meeting.

II. Board Comments: None.

III. Director's Briefing:

- Metrics Report (CSA Analyst Mark Rothman) - Mark reported that these are the results for the 2nd quarter Metric Report for Career service Authority which consists of metrics such as turnover, eligibility for retirement and number of forced performance evaluations. Board member Kilroy wanted to clarify that this is the bench mark report. Board member Kilroy was curious as to what type of feedback we have received. Mr. Rothman stated that overall city wide voluntary turnover has been stable throughout the second quarter. In addition, overall turnover within CSA has been voluntary. Board member Toro was curious as to the type of employee who is voluntarily leaving. Mr. Rothman commented that eligible retirees within the city are decreasing while CSA's turnover is increasing. Eligible retirees are opting to stay in their positions past their dates of retirement. Mr. Rothman commented that forced PEPR's in CSA last quarter were at 14% improving this quarter to 4% and city wide PEPR truancy rate between 4-6%. Average sick days city wide have fluctuated but that is considered normal because of workforce demographics. Mr. Rothman stated that this report is for a four month period instead of a three month period. Mr. Rothman commented that compiling data quarterly for some measurements is difficult and at times not an accurate reflection of the overall results and recommended that a new time frame be used. The Attitude Survey within the city resulted an 80% satisfaction rating. Mr. Rothman commented that the demographics within the city and those within CSA parallel each other. As of now Department of Human Services, Parks and Recreation, and Office of Economic Development have all participated in the demographics study. Board member Henry commented that this metric is a valuable tool and asset to the city and is curious to its feedback and acceptance from employees. Board member Bonner feels the same about the metrics value and wishes we had the staff to branch it out to other agencies. Co-Director Backer commented that if certain trends are seen within the metrics that upon request, CSA will send staff to that agency to help with the inconsistencies. Board member Bonner agrees with Co-Director Backer and commented that if the agencies knew how to use the metrics as a tool it would

be beneficial to both the agency and the city. Co-Director Backer stated that we will initiate a process to examine when and why employees are retiring or opting to continue working and create a new metric. Board member Bonner is concerned that CSA does not have the personnel at this time to fully exploit the metrics to all of the city agencies.

- Whistleblower ordinance- Co-Director Brown commented that this ordinance will go to City Council on Monday for its first reading. The following Monday, the ordinance will be read a second time., Pete Garritt of Career Service Authority Employee Relations will present a rules proposal to the CSA Board at its next meeting that incorporates provisions of the Whistleblower ordinance.
- Readiness for change assessment update- Co-Director Backer commented that he and Co-Director Brown are meeting with small teams within CSA to gauge overall agency morale and job satisfaction to determine readiness for implementing the five strategic objectives. At this time they are about half way through meeting each work group. Initial themes coming to the forefront are: accountability to team and peers, stability in leadership, communication and interaction between work teams, and management needing to be more supportive and inclusive. After the meetings are complete the senior team will meet and discuss what themes are important and repetitive and in need of attention, and a strategy will be developed as to how to address them. After the Senior Staff has met to discuss these issues a presentation will be made to the CSA Board on the findings and recommendations.

IV. Public Comments: None

The Board voted to have an Executive Session from 5:20 p.m., and to reopen the Board meeting in 15 minutes for the Public Hearing, which was scheduled for 5:30 p.m.

V. Items for Public Hearing opened at 5:40 p.m.

A. Public Hearing No. 351 – Benefits - 2008 Design Changes was presented by Heather Britton, Career Service Benefits Supervisor.

In compliance with the Revised Municipal Code of the City and County of Denver, Section 18-2, subsection (a), part (3), the Career Service Board gives notice for the public hearing on the Plan Design and Premium changes to the benefits for the 2008 plan year.

[View Public Hearing Notice 351 – 2008 Plan Design Changes](#)

Ms. Britton stated that there will be a 12% premium increase in medical benefits for 2008. The 12% increase is due to the health care providers increasing their rates, to assist employees the rate increases will be divided equally by the city and the employee. There was a 1.5% increase in premiums because the city has chosen Aetna as a carrier and they have also increased their rates. There was a feeling from the Benefits Division and the Health Insurance Advisory Committee that Aetna came in and bought its clients business. During bargaining Benefits was able to get a renewal guarantee keeping premiums stable for upcoming years. Ms. Britton presented that if PacifiCare would have been chosen there would have been a 29% increase instead of the 19% increase employees will experience. What this means monetarily is the city will be responsible for 7.7 million dollars annually and 1 million dollars annually for the employee. The plan design change form shows that Aetna has made no changes to its existing plan but Denver Health has made some changes. Kaiser has proposed not to

make changes to its plans but will increase their rates. Those needing injections may have to pay 20% of the cost which is not beneficial to certain employees. Heather commented that if Kaiser did decide to not make the changes then their rates would have increased. Board member Toro was curious about the dialysis usage and its cost as represented in the Plan Design handout. Heather stated that it is because of the amount of employees that currently require this procedure. Heather reported that the Dental plan will not change its plan nor its cost to the city or the employee. Supplemental plans went into a competitive bid which is paid for by the city. Both Short Term Disability and Long Term Disability are funded by the employee which is no change from the previous year. Life Insurance premiums have been decreased by 25% which is incurred by the city. The lower rates are a result of CCing the rates with Standard, bidding was a useful tool in accomplishing this result. Heather commented that Short Term Disability was the tough bid because the market was tough and Standard still had the lowest cost. **(NOTE: As of August 8, 2007 Denver Health contacted Heather Britton concerning the proposed changes to co-pays for Hemodialysis sessions and Peritoneal dialysis. Denver Health has decided not to make said changes to these treatments or co-pays at this time. This new information will be formally presented to the Board at its August 16, 2007 meeting.)**

-Steve Esses with Public Works is speaking on behalf of Street Maintenance employees who are unsure how and why health benefits premiums keep increasing. These employees are concerned because it is real dollars that are coming out of their PEP rate. These employees feel that these increases are immeasurable and continue to rise each year. Many of these employees see an unfair distribution or balance because a family pays 1/3 but a single employee receives 85% input. Esses commented that they are also concerned that their PEP does not allow them to benefit monetarily, any increase is just spent on health premiums. Board member Kilroy asked what the trends are in health insurance that contributes to the increases. Co-Director Backer commented that the factors that contribute to the increase are numerous. Co-Director Backer stated that we will put on a city wide wellness program to help educate employees on living a healthier life, partly due to our aging work force. Another example given was the number of claims by employees is rising. One factor that might help premiums decrease is retirees switching to Medicare instead of city supported coverage. Co-Director Backer also commented that the government is looking into the drug companies and their relationships with the doctors and how it affects premiums. Co-Director Backer stated that we are looking for the most cost effective carriers to the employees which at this time are Kaiser and Aetna. Within four to six weeks the benefits group will present the trends that increase premiums and concerns of employees to the Board. Board member Kilroy commented that the committee members are doing their best and do understand employees concerns with rising premiums. Ess also feels that because of these increases that it might start to affect the long term commitment by employees to city employment. Board member Toro commented that the private sector is incurring these same costs and that everyone with health insurance is concerned.

-Janity Blea from the Denver Police Department is concerned with the cost increasing for those with chronic illnesses. At this point Aetna pays \$318,000 per year for her chronic health condition. Blea has been in contact with Heather Britton about her situation and what options she has. Blea uses ten medications that she and doctors

have attributed to her weight problem. Blea pays \$7,000 per year on just medication not counting doctor visits and specialists accompanied with their co-pays. Blea also commented that Gastric Bypass surgery may not only help herself but others yet Kaiser excludes this procedure. Blea is concerned that other employees that do not require constant treatment do not care about the rising costs. Board member Kilroy wants to send this matter over to the General Government about the increase and how it will eliminate their PEP premium. Co-Director Backer states this will be prior to first reading and both he and Board member Kilroy want to encourage Esses and Blea to give testimony. Board member Kilroy states that this might help for next years pay study. Co-Director Backer stated that this is not a classification issue but the Board will need to approve the issue because it notifies employees of changes

The Board approved unanimously Public Hearing Notice 351.

- B. Classification Notice 1243** – The proposed change amends the Classification and Pay Plan by changing the pay grades of Real Estate Agent from 809-V to 809-A, and Senior Real Estate Agent from 811-V to 811-A. Bruce Backer, Classification and Compensation Analyst present information to the Board.

The Executive Manager of Facilities Planning and Management, Department of General Services, requested that CSA review the occupational group designation of the Real Estate Agent and Senior Real Estate Agent classes. Currently, both classes are in the Fiscal Occupational Group. Board member Toro wanted to know why this position is more Fiscal than Professional. When the classes were originally created they were placed in the Professional Occupational Group as that group was deemed the best fit. When pay was established for the new classes, they were compared for internal equity purposes with the Financial Management Specialist class as all three classes have city-wide responsibilities. At that time, there were not many classes that described city-wide responsibilities so the comparison was appropriate. When the new occupational groups were added to the Class Plan, the real estate agent classes were moved to the Fiscal Occupational Group as was the Financial Management Specialist class. It is recommended that the Senior Real Estate Agent be compensated at 811 A. The Senior Real Estate Agent class can be compared to the Human Resources Specialist class which is also compensated at 811 A. Both classes have city-wide responsibilities and act as specialist in their respective fields. Additionally, both positions provided leadership and expertise, serve as a consultant to resolve exceptionally sensitive and/or controversial issues, provide technical assistance in the specialist area, and analyze information in order to provide advice to city managers. It is recommended that the Senior Real Estate Agent be moved to the Professional Occupational Group and pay grade 811 A, and it is recommended that the Real Estate Agent be compensated at 809 A. This is based on CSA practice of allowing a two pay grade difference between professional level classes in a series where duties and responsibilities build upon each other such as staff to associate, associate to senior. The employees will go pay to pay so there is no budget impact.

Section 7-37 A states that “If it is determined, as a result of an audit or a maintenance study, that change to the classification and pay plan are necessary, the effective date of any resulting re-allocations shall be the beginning of the first work week following approval by the Board.”

The Board approved unanimously Classification Notice 1243.

VI. Pending Cases: 5:20

A. Andre Ray, Appellant vs. Department of Safety, Appeal No. 57-06.

In the case of Andre Ray the Board has decided to reverse in part and remand to the hearing officer to determine if the victim was “similarly situated” to a spouse for purposes of section 922(g)(9) with opinion to follow.

B. Cathryn Diaz, Appellant vs. Denver Zoological Foundation, Appeal No. 72-06A.

Case held for the August 16, 2007 board meeting for review

VII. Executive Session: 6:10p.m. to 6:55 p.m.

VIII. Adjournment: 6:56