

Royalton Unused Sick Leave Request

Adam Gunderson | Response to Point 5

Mr. Broden describes my request for payment of unused sick leave in a way that makes an unresolved employee-benefits matter sound like an ongoing conflict with Royalton. The council minutes and meeting discussion provide important context.

During my service in Royalton, I regularly responded to calls and worked beyond my scheduled hours. When I was sick or had a medical appointment, I often adjusted my work schedule rather than using accrued sick leave. When I left, I asked whether the city would pay out that accumulated leave.

At the June 10, 2019, Royalton City Council meeting, the council discussed my request in detail. Several council members expressed support for paying me, and a participant acknowledged a consensus during the discussion. Participants also discussed resolving my situation separately from the broader personnel-policy review, including accepting a different interpretation of retirement and bringing forward a motion to override the policy's intent. That discussion helps explain why I understood the council was considering payment and why I returned for formal action. No formal vote was taken in June; a motion was discussed as needing to be placed on a future agenda.

At the July 2 meeting, I explained that the request was supposed to have been placed on the agenda for council action but had not been. Council member Verley also raised the request. The minutes explicitly state that no action was taken.

The council addressed the matter on August 6. The city attorney stated that leaving for another civilian position did not qualify as retirement under the personnel policy. Council member Verley moved to pay my sick leave according to the policy formula, but the motion failed for lack of a second.

My return in August was not an attempt to pursue a new claim or pressure the city into paying me. It was a continuation of a request first discussed on June 10. During that meeting, council members expressed support for considering payment, and the July 2 minutes confirm that I returned because the matter had not been placed on the agenda for formal action.

Mr. Broden references the August meeting but leaves out these earlier discussions. We have reviewed the June meeting transcript along with the June, July, and August council minutes. Those records provide important context missing from his account. Although no payment was ultimately approved, the records show why I reasonably believed the council was considering my request. Presenting only the final outcome without explaining what led to it gives readers an incomplete picture.

The August minutes also reference my military retirement paperwork. My recollection is that the city asked me to bring documentation showing retirement eligibility or an established retirement status. That is why I brought my military retirement papers. The city attorney's position was that I had not retired from my civilian employment under the city's policy. I acknowledge that the city's personnel policy governed the request.

Asking the council to consider payment, returning for a decision, and providing retirement documentation at the city's request do not establish dishonesty or misconduct. Mr. Broden's description of my military retirement as a "crutch" leaves out my explanation of why I brought those documents and is not evidence that I acted in bad faith.

Sources: Royalton council minutes, June 10, July 2 and August 6, 2019; supplied automated transcript of June 10 meeting audio, especially Part 2 at 8:28-10:31 (supporting packet p. 8). Work scheduling and the request for military documentation reflect Adam's account. The transcript has not been independently verified against the audio, and individual speakers have not been reliably identified. It records discussion and support, not an adopted payout vote.