COMMITTEE ON HUMAN RESOURCES/INSURANCE
April 7, 2026 at 5:00 PM

Chairman Goonan called the meeting to order.

The Clerk called the roll.

Present: Aldermen Goonan, O'Neil, Burkush, Vincent

Absent: Alderman Sapienza

Messrs.: V. Prestejohn, S. Wickens, B. Duryee, T. Kastrinelis

1. HR Reports submitted by Victoria Prestejohn, Human Resources Director:
- Position Summary Report
- Vacancy Requisition Requests and Approvals
- Summary of Arbitrations/Grievances

(Note: Provided for informational purposes only; no action is required.)

2. Communication from the Human Resources Director regarding updates to the Dress Code Policy and Inclement Weather Policy.
(Note: Provided for informational purposes only; no action is required.)

Alderman O'Neil: Victoria, why do why do we need to do this? Or where did this come from?

Victoria Prestejohn, Human Resources Director: For which one? The weather or the dress code?

Alderman O'Neil: Both of them.

V. Prestejohn: With the inclement weather, of course, coming out of the winter season, departments were handling closures or early releases or late starts differently. So, this is to offer some more clarity and standardization for how to handle inclement weather events as it relates to early release.

Alderman O'Neil: Give me give me a couple of examples with the inconsistencies.

V. Prestejohn: For example, if city offices are closed for non-essential employees, what does that look like in terms of if they were scheduled to work? Would that time be paid or not paid? If they were scheduled to work and the city closes, that would be paid time. As opposed to if somebody was already out on a pre-planned vacation and the city closes, there wouldn't be any intent to come to work or report to work that day.

Alderman O'Neil: So, so if the mayor shuts down City Hall at noontime, employees are paid for the day.

V. Prestejohn: They would be paid, yes. If they are here and working, they would be paid for their time.

Alderman O'Neil: So, this is just to make sure there's no conflict with vacation time or sick time previously. And how about the dress code?

V. Prestejohn: That's always a hot topic. Just making sure that we're presenting a professional appearance and representing the city in a professional light. And again, making sure that that's clear across all departments while still recognizing that certain positions within certain departments may have different expectations. So, whether that's uniforms or whether that's hands on maintenance type of work that would require some differences and we would defer to the departments for that.

Alderman O'Neil: We don't expect there's going to be any disciplinary actions down the road?

V. Prestejohn: I don't, and I did circulate both policies with the department heads for their review and input, too.

Alderman O'Neil: Very good. Thank you.

3. Discussion regarding FY27 benefit renewals.
(Note: Supporting documentation will be attached to the agenda once it is submitted to the Office of the City Clerk.)

Alderman Burkush: If you could explain how we got here, that would be great.

V. Prestejohn: With respect to the rate increase, I'd also like to invite USI up.

Burr Duryee, USI, introduced himself.

Tim Kastrinelis, USI, introduced himself.

V. Prestejohn: So, with regards to the plan, the plan was running pretty on par with the projections from last year. So that certainly aids in the single digit increase. You know, we do have conditions that are driving spending. Chronic conditions some of which are listed here, high cholesterol, cardiovascular conditions. We do also have specialty drugs that are driving pharmacy costs as well and spending, mainly for inflammatory conditions. And so, there are three medications there that are top utilized when we look at total annual spending. Some good points as well, we noticed that there is an increase in employees going for preventative health care appointments, which that in of itself helps to potentially eliminate higher cost claims if people are taking care of themselves proactively. And we do also see an increase in utilization for members seeking mental health care. Which again, can aid in lowering potential long-term claims, costly claims.

Alderman Burkush: So, you anticipate a rate increase of 6.8%. And the employees will share in the cost ratio?

V. Prestejohn: Yes. So, to give it some context, weekly cost to employees, depending on the plan that they're on, whether it's a single, two-person, or family, the weekly rate increase would be anywhere from roughly $3 to $12 a week.

Alderman O'Neil: I saw in your in your memo that Sharon was involved with this. And in past years, based on Sharon's information, we've gone with a lower rate increase than what was recommended more than one year. Sharon's involvement with this year, based on the actual spend this year, that's a good number?

V. Prestejohn: Yes. I can let Sharon speak to that, too.

Sharon Wickens, Finance Officer: It is.

Alderman O'Neil: That is all we need from you, Sharon. Thank you.

Chairman Goonan: For GLP-1s, we had the discussion today about the calculation and how we got to 13% or whatever it was. How did we get to that number?

V. Prestejohn: So with the plan increase being 6.8%, we're looking at $1.8 million. If we were to cover GLP-1 we're looking at an additional $1.7 million. So. $3.5 million increase to cover that and to add that to the plan. So instead of a 6.8% increase, we're looking at a 13.1% increase.

Chairman Goonan: You said that's if it was used at 8%?

V. Prestejohn: That's assuming an 8% utilization, which is about 148 employees. Now, if we were to cover that, the likelihood of additional employees beyond that 148 is extremely likely. So that $1.7 million number could quickly double up. If we assume 300 employees now are going to be utilizing that prescription.

Alderman O'Neil: There's no intent to change people that are type two diabetics?

V. Prestejohn: Correct. So, if folks have a primary diagnosis of diabetes and are prescribed the medication based on that diagnosis, that does not change.

Alderman O'Neil: This is one of the things I'd have to imagine there is data out there. We talk about an increase of $1.7 million. There has to be a savings to some people. There's got to be some industry standard on that. Do we know what that number is? When people lose weight, they're less likely to have other comorbidities. There's got to be some number. We can't just say it's going to cost $1.7 million. When the success of it, GLP-1 for people helps with other illnesses or medical conditions.

B. Duryee: I think we'd expect to see some savings. I think the question is when would you incur those savings? And most likely when an individual is losing weight and reducing the comorbidities, it would be a planned savings in future years, not in the existing policy.

Alderman O'Neil: But this has been around; it was covered for a year for the employees.

B. Duryee: It was covered partially for part of the year for some of the employees incorrectly, if you recall, by Anthem. It was not covered for all employees.

Alderman O'Neil: I understand that, but it was covered, and then it was taken away as a benefit from people that were having success. So, can we get some data on those savings with heart disease, prediabetes, orthopedic treatment? There has to be some data out there on it.

B. Duryee: I think we can get you some. Are you asking for specific to those members or just general data about industry savings?

Alderman O'Neil: There's got to be some industry standard.

B. Duryee: We can get that. I don't have that in front of me today, but we can certainly get that.

Alderman O'Neil: Get that next month?

B. Duryee: Absolutely.

Alderman O'Neil: There may be other diseases that are impacted by this.

Alderman Burkush: I see in the mayor's budget that there is no number for health care. So, can you just explain the process going forward with that?

S. Wickens: So, with the mayor's budget, we were at a point where he could decide if he was going to put any money into health care. If you recall, last year the increase to health care was about $400,000. It could have been this year, too. We were still working through numbers. Now we know it's 6.8%. And that's about, I'm going to say about a million and a half to the budget that is not in there.

4. Communication from Sharon Wickens, Finance Officer, requesting the addition of one (1) Purchasing Manager position, grade 124, to the department's complement.

Alderman O'Neil: Mr. Chairman, on your recommendation, I will move to table pending the budget.

*On motion of **Alderman O'Neil**, duly seconded by **Alderman Burkush**, it was voted to table.*

5. Communication from Faye Morrison, Parking Manager, requesting the following changes to the division's complement:

- Eliminate one (1) vacant part-time Customer Service Representative I position, grade 105
- Add one (1) part-time Parking Control Officer position, grade 104

Alderman O'Neil: There was a concern and I don't know if this predated you coming on board, about a job description for the PCOs, and it was determined it needed to be negotiated. I didn't see the job description for the part-time.

V. Prestejohn: Does this have to do with snow removal?

Alderman O'Neil: Snow removal, yes. That shouldn't be in there, right?

V. Prestejohn: So, it is part of the PCO class specification, but only on an as needed basis. And when you look at the class spec for the PCO, that duty is pretty far down the list, which indicates that it's not a core function.

Alderman O'Neil: It can't even be that because they are unionized. It has to be negotiated.

V. Prestejohn: That was part of the class spec that was approved and became effective 7/1/25 from the compensation study, it does remain as a primary duty in the downtown maintenance worker one and two positions. It is their responsibility. And so the PCOs would only be back up if it was ever needed.

Alderman O'Neil: The Police Patrolman's Association did not vote on that compensation study. We have contracts coming up that are going to expire in a few months. So that has to be negotiated. I don't know how we can have it in there if it's not negotiated. They're covered by collective bargaining agreement, the PCOs. I just hope we're not hiring somebody with expectation they're going to do snow removal when we're going to get ourselves jammed up with the unions and get grievances on it. I thought that was discussed previously.

V. Prestejohn: It's something I can certainly look into.

Alderman O'Neil: The Police Patrolmen's union, although they were in the study, because the contract wasn't up they never voted on it. We had to negotiate. So, that never made it in. I don't want us to get jammed up.

*On motion of **Alderman O’Neil**, duly seconded by **Alderman Vincent**, it was voted to approve.*

*There being no further business, on motion of **Alderman Vincent**, duly seconded by **Alderman Burkush**, it was voted to adjourn.*

A True Record. Attest.

Matthew Normand

Clerk of Committee

Meeting Start Time: 5:00PM
Meeting End Time: 5:14PM
Minutes Prepared By: Michael Intranuovo