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Title: Substitute resolution authorizing the Department of Employee Relations to change the plan design of the City's health insurance benefits program, and to set health insurance premium contribution rates for City employees and retirees.

## Introduction

This resolution authorizes the Department of Employee Relations (DER) to:

1) Change the City's health insurance benefits plan design for employees and retirees. Highlights are provided below:
A. Self-insured EPO - Replaces insured HMO:
2) $\$ 500 /$ deductible
3) $10 \%$ employee/retiree co-pay
4) $\$ 1,000$ max. out-of-pocket ( $\$ 2,000$ per family)
5) $\$ 150 /$ Emergency Room visit after deductible
6) Prescriptions - $\$ 5 / \$ 25 / \$ 50$
7) No coverage out-of-network
B. Self-insured Basic Plan
8) $\$ 750 /$ deductible
9) $10 \%$ employee/retiree co-pay
10) $\$ 1,500$ max. out-of-pocket ( $\$ 3,000$ per family)
11) $\$ 150 /$ Emergency Room visit after deductible
12) Prescriptions - 20\% employee/retiree co-pay
13) $30 \%$ employee/retiree co-pay out-of-network
14) Require all active general City employees, excluding Police and Fire except civilian employees of these departments, to pay $12 \%$ of their total 2012 health premium cost.
15) Stipulate general City employees, including civilian employees of the Police and Fire departments, retiring after December 31, 2011, will make the same health insurance premium contribution as active general City employees.

These plan design changes will affect approximately 4,300 retirees plus 6,000 active employees including Police and Fire personnel.

## Plan Design Change Process

The following ad hoc committee was convened to consider health insurance benefit plan design changes:

| Mike Brady | DER - Benefits |
| :--- | :--- |
| Maria Monteagudo | DER |
| Troy Hamblin | DER - Labor Relations |
| Mark Nicolini | Budget Office |
| Dennis Yaccarino | Budget Office |
| Renee Joos | Budget Office |

The Mayor's Office provided regular input to this committee.
This committee asked UnitedHaelthcare, the City's current insured HMO provider, to calculate the potential savings for the City as a percentage of 2011 HMO costs for 24 plan design alternatives if the City continued to offer its insured HMO plan. A list of these alternative plan designs, and a summary of changes and the associated cost savings is attached to this analysis.

The general range of alternatives reviewed was as follows:

|  | From: | To: |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Deductibles |  |  |
| Individual | $\$ 350$ | $\$ 1,000$ |
| Family | $\$ 700$ | $\$ 2,000$ |
| Participant Co-pays | $0 \%$ | $20 \%$ |
| Out-of-Pocket Caps |  |  |
| Individual | $\$ 500$ | $\$ 3,000$ |
| Family | $\$ 1,000$ | $\$ 6,000$ |
| Potential Savings | $7.4 \%$ | $22.22 \%$ |

Based on the 2011 insured HMO rates for the 2011 plan design and current enrollment, HMO premium costs would total $\$ 120,880,322$, so for each percentage point of potential savings resulting in plan design
changes, the City might expect to save $\$ 1,208,803$ - a savings of $7.4 \%$ could potentially save the City $\$ 8,945,144$ while a $22.22 \%$ savings would mean a $\$ 26,859,608$ savings. These savings are from plan design changes alone, and do not include City savings from health insurance premium contributions made by active employees and retirees.

UnitedHealthcare estimated the plan design recommended by DER would have saved the City $15.6 \%$, or $\$ 18,857,327$ using the above formula, if the City had chosen to continue to offer its insured HMO.

It is unknown what process the ad hoc committee used in arriving at the plan design recommended.

## Premium Contributions - Employees \& Retirees

The ad hoc committee recommends that non-safety employees be required to pay $12 \%$ of their health insurance premiums even though, in the opinion if the City Attorney, state law limiting to $88 \%$ the amount public entities can contribute to employee health insurance premium benefits, do not apply to the City.

The State maintains this limitation was designed to allow local public entities to recoup state aid cuts - $\$ 10$ million cut from shared revenue plus cuts in street repair and recycling funding to total approximately $\$ 14$ million in cuts for the City - although the logical link between general aid cuts and employee benefits is not clear.

DER is projecting the City will save $\$ 4$ million by charging employees $12 \%$ for their health insurance premium. This falls short of the $\$ 14$ million in state aid cuts in part because only 3,774 of the City's 6,040 active employees are required to make contributions. The City's 2,266 Police and Fire, non-civilian personnel are exempted by union contract.

## Projected Savings - Recommended Plan Design

DER projects the following savings:

| Projected Savings |  |
| :--- | ---: |
| Plan Design Changes | $\$ 15,000,000$ |
| Switch to Self-insured HMO | $\$ 6,000,000$ |
| Employee Contribution to Premiums | $\$ 4,000,000$ |
| Total | $\$ 25,000,000$ |

These projected savings exceed the $\$ 14$ million cut in state aid by $79 \%$ or $\$ 11,000,000$. DER indicates its goal was never to simply cut costs. DER believes the total package of changes - the plan design changes, the switch to a self-insured HMO-style program and premium contributions - create a "sustainable" and "logical" healthcare benefit package that will stabilize the City's healthcare benefit costs in the future.

DER suggests this additional \$11,000,000 in savings might somehow help address the need for pension contributions in the future. It is unknown whether is savings would be reserved for future pension contributions or any other purpose, used to fund other City programs or ratchet down overall City spending in 2012.

List of Plan Design Alternatives, Summary of Changes \& Associated Potential Savings Provided by UnitedHaelthcare as Requested by the Ad Hoc Committee Reviewing Health Insurance Plan Design Options:

|  | Deductible |  |  |  | Co-Pay | Out-of-Pocket |  |  |  | Potential <br> Savings |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Individual |  | Family |  |  | Individual |  | Family |  |  |
| Alt. 1 | \$ | 500 | \$ | 1,000 | 0.00\% | \$ | 500 | \$ | 1,000 | 7.40\% |
| Alt. 2 | \$ | 500 | \$ | 1,000 | 10.00\% | \$ | 2,000 | \$ | 4,000 | 12.06\% |
| Alt. 3 | \$ | 500 | \$ | 1,000 | 20.00\% | \$ | 3,000 | \$ | 6,000 | 15.86\% |
| Alt. 4 | \$ | 500 | \$ | 1,000 | 0.00\% | \$ | 500 | \$ | 1,000 | 10.04\% |
| Alt. 5 | \$ | 625 | \$ | 1,250 | 0.00\% | \$ | 625 | \$ | 1,250 | 9.37\% |
| Alt. 6 | \$ | 625 | S | 1,250 | 0.00\% | \$ | 625 | \$ | 1,250 | 10.04\% |
| Alt. 7 | \$ | 650 | \$ | 1,300 | 0.00\% | \$ | 650 | \$ | 1,300 | 9.66\% |
| Alt. 8 | \$ | 675 | \$ | 1,350 | 0.00\% | \$ | 675 | \$ | 1,350 | 9.94\% |
| Alt. 9 | \$ | 350 | \$ | 700 | 10.00\% | \$ | 2,000 | \$ | 4,000 | 10.33\% |
| Alt. 10 | \$ | 500 | \$ | 1,000 | 10.00\% | \$ | 2,000 | \$ | 4,000 | 13.19\% |
| Alt. 11 | \$ | 1,000 | \$ | 2,000 | 10.00\% | \$ | 2,000 | \$ | 4,000 | 16.57\% |
| Alt. 12 | \$ | - | \$ | - | 0.00\% | \$ | - | \$ |  | 1.89\% |
| Alt. 13 | \$ | 500 | \$ | 1,000 | 0.00\% | \$ | 500 | \$ | 1,000 | 9.80\% |
| Alt. 14 | \$ | 500 | \$ | 1,000 | 10.00\% | \$ | 1,000 | \$ | 2,000 | 13.08\% |
| Alt. 15 | \$ | 500 | \$ | 1,000 | 10.00\% | \$ | 2,000 | \$ | 4,000 | 14.45\% |
| Alt. 16 | \$ | 500 | \$ | 1,000 | 10.00\% | \$ | 3,000 | \$ | 6,000 | 14.98\% |
| Alt. 17 | \$ | 500 | \$ | 1,000 | 20.00\% | \$ | 1,000 | \$ | 2,000 | 14.03\% |
| Alt. 18 | \$ | 500 | \$ | 1,000 | 20.00\% | \$ | 2,000 | \$ | 4,000 | 17.04\% |
| Alt. 19 | \$ | 500 | \$ | 1,000 | 20.00\% | \$ | 3,000 | \$ | 6,000 | 18.26\% |
| Alt. 20 | \$ | 1,000 | \$ | 2,000 | 0.00\% | \$ | 1,000 | \$ | 2,000 | 15.31\% |
| Alt. 21 | \$ | 1,000 | \$ | 2,000 | 10.00\% | \$ | 2,000 | \$ | 4,000 | 18.96\% |
| Alt. 22 | \$ | 1,000 | \$ | 2,000 | 10.00\% | \$ | 3,000 | \$ | 6,000 | 19.20\% |
| Alt. 23 | \$ | 1,000 | \$ | 2,000 | 20.00\% | \$ | 2,000 | \$ | 4,000 | 20.54\% |
| Alt. 24 | \$ | 1,000 | \$ | 2,000 | 20.00\% | \$ | 3,000 | \$ | 6,000 | 22.22\% |

