

**JOINT LABOR RELATIONS & EMPLOYEE SERVICES (LRES),
ADMINISTRATION, AGING & DISABILITY RESOURCE CENTER (ADRC),
SOCIAL SERVICES (SS), BOARD OF HEALTH, CONSERVATION UW-EX
EDUCATION AND PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEES MINUTES
County Board Room, Oneida County Courthouse
September 10, 2020, 1:00 p.m.**

LRES COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Ted Cushing/Chairman
Billy Fried/Vice-Chairman
Dave Hintz
Scott Holewinski
Sonny Paszak

LRES COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:

None

ADRC COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Steven Schreier/Chairman
Carol Pederson/Vice-Chairman (*arrived at 1:19 p.m.*)
Russ Fisher
Dr. Walt Gager (*arrived at 1:12 p.m.*)
Joan Hauer
Dawn Winquist
Nancy Watry

ADRC COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:

None

DSS COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

Alan VanRaalte/Chairman
Jim Winkler
Stephanie Sowatzka

DSS COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT VIA ZOOM:

Bob Thome Jr.

DSS COMMITTEE MEMBERS ABSENT:

None

COUNTY STAFF PRESENT:

Lisa Charbarneau (LRES)
Lindsey Kennedy (LRES)
Mary Rideout (DSS)
Heidi Chavez (DSS)
Megan Mode (DSS)
Beth Hoerchler (DSS)
Joel Gottsacker (ADRC)
Jennifer Sackett (ADRC)

GUESTS PRESENT: See sign in sheet

GUESTS PRESENT VIA ZOOM:

Nick Musson
Emily Gilbertson
Tom Jerow
Richard Moore (Lakeland Times)
Jennifer Speckien
Rebecca Wetter

CALL TO ORDER AND CHAIRMAN'S ANNOUNCEMENTS

Chairman Cushing called the Joint Labor Relations & Employee Services (LRES), Administration, Aging & Disability Resource Center (ADRC), Social Services (SS), Board of Health, Conservation UW-Ex Education and Public Works Committees to order at 1:00 p.m. in the County Board Room of the Oneida County Courthouse. The meeting has been properly posted in accordance with the Wisconsin Open Meeting Law, and complies with the Americans with Disabilities Act. Chairman Cushing asked that all speakers use the sign-in sheets.

- **LRES COMMITTEE:** Chairman Cushing called the LRES Committee to order at 1:02 p.m. in the County Board Room of the Oneida County Courthouse.
- **ADRC COMMITTEE:** Chairman Schreier called the ADRC Committee to order at 1:03 p.m. in the County Board Room of the Oneida County Courthouse.
- **DSS COMMITTEE:** Chairman VanRaalte called the Social Services Committee to order at 1:04 p.m. in the County Board Room of the Oneida County Courthouse.

APPROVAL OF AGENDA

- **LRES COMMITTEE:** Motion by Fried to approve the amended agenda. Second by Paszak. All Committee members voting 'Aye'. Motion carried.
- **ADRC COMMITTEE:** Motion by Winquist to approve the amended agenda. Second by Watry. All Committee members voting 'Aye'. Motion carried.
- **DSS COMMITTEE:** Motion by Winkler to approve the amended agenda. Second by Sowatzka. All Committee members voting 'Aye'. Motion carried.

***Chairman Cushing announced a break until 1:30 p.m. to allow for more people to join the meeting; the original agenda listed the meeting start time as 1:30 p.m.**

Chairman Cushing resumed the meeting at 1:30 p.m.

AGING DISABILITY RESOURCE CENTER AND DEPARTMENT ON SOCIAL SERVICES ALLIANCE PRESENTATION

- ***DURING THIS PRESENTATION, ANYONE WILL BE ALLOWED TO ASK QUESTIONS AND RECEIVE ANSWERS FROM THE COMMITTEES OR STAFF.***
Social Services Director, Mary Rideout, provided a brief background on the ADRC/DSS Alliance. A handout outlining the ADRC/DSS Alliance was provided and Rideout presented the information. The handout provides an overview of the services/programs that both departments have in common. Also covered in the handout are staffing considerations and the benefits/efficiencies that could be gained by the alliance; along with challenges and required steps to complete the alliance.

The Services/Programs in Common:

- Intake- Both departments have a common intake function and often have to transfer calls back and forth because the public doesn't always know which department to contact for their needed services. As a combined department, they would work towards a single intake functions.
- Information & Assistance
- Adult Protective Services- This is an area that would benefit greatly from the alliance by establishing a streamline system for assisting with this sort of crisis situation.
- Guardianships and Protective Placements- This is a function currently being done by the Social Services Department and Court System; ADRC makes referrals to Social Services for this service. It is felt that staff could be cross-trained so that there would be additional staff that could do this function.
- Supportive Home Care- This is a program provided by Social Services that works to keep individuals in their home and out of more restrictive settings. Usually these are individuals that do not meet the requirements for Family Care.
- Elder Abuse Services- Funding for this service is received through the Department of Social Services. Social Services works with the ADRC when their funding runs out to see if they have additional funds to assist with this service.
- Alzheimer's and National Family Caregiver Support Programs- This program is administered by the ADRC; this program is also utilized in the Social Services department. A growing number of grandparents are caring for their grandchild and the Caregiver Support Program provides assistance.
- Elder Nutrition Program- This program is administered by the ADRC; Social Services works closely with the ADRC for this program to help support their clients on Supportive Home Care.
- Economic Support- This is an important part of the ADRC's Family Care eligibility determination process; Social Services Economic Support Specialists work closely with the ADRC to determine that eligibility.
- Family Care- This is a large program area and provides many services to the elderly and disabled individuals in Oneida County. This program is run by an outside organization but the ADRC does determine eligibility.
- Administrative Services
- Other smaller program areas

Staffing Considerations:

- ADRC Specialists with social work certification could perform APS, guardianship, and protective placement duties as back-up to current DSS staff. Appropriate pay grade would need to be evaluated.
- To eliminate a full time Social Work position, we may need to increase ADRC Specialists to 40 hours work week (2080 per year).
- Adult Services workers could become certified screeners for Family Care as back-up to current ADRC staff.
- Adult Services workers could provide information & assistance as back-up to current ADRC staff. Additional Federal match for allowable activities may be available. This could increase efficiencies and maximize funding.

- Financial services staff will have to adjust some procedures to integrate into the larger organizational structure. The supervision structure will be reviewed to determine the best structure for the whole organization.
- Alignment of missions between the department.

Benefits/Efficiencies:

- NO change in services provided by either agency. Allows ADRC and Social Services to continue to provide all current services. (Not all services are mandate and could be eliminated if funds are not available in the budget).
- Single point of entry for adult services through the ADRC.
- Rapid and coordinated response to identified needs in vulnerable adult population.
- Increase knowledge by staff of both departments for all services available.
- Elimination of a social worker position at DSS and possible elimination of the unfilled 60% ADRC Specialist position.
- Potential reduction in staff through attrition in both departments.
- Joint financial management between the departments.
- Supervisory backup for the ADRC. Social Services currently has 5 supervisors besides the Director. The supervisors rely on each other as backup for vacations and illnesses.
- Enhanced Federal match using AMSO (Agency Management, Support and Overhead).
- Volunteer programs – Developing a volunteer program is in Social Services long range plan. Being combined it would be beneficial.
- How the committee would be structured would need to be determined by the County Board. There is a possibility of having one committee that governs the whole organization but the restructure would needs to meet the requirements of the ADRC and have the citizen members. Rideout stated that she is also in support of having citizen members on the board and feels it would be of value for the both ADRC and Social Services.

Challenges:

- Staff integration and acceptance of change – the departments would continue to be in two separate buildings.
- Effective communication of aligned mission.
- Management of public perception.
- This will take a lot of effort to be done successfully.
- Perception that a large bureaucracy may delay services

Required steps:

- Committee approvals.
- Public input period.
- Public hearing.
- Submission of amended aging plan GWAAR. Approval required.
- LRES committee approval.
- County Board approval.

***At 1:45 p.m. Chairman Cushing announced the postponement of the Public Hearing/Comment portion of the meeting until the presentation and question/answer session is completed.**

Q: Carol Pederson – Under staffing considerations; ADRC Specialists with Social Work Certification, what is it, do they already have it and is there a cost involved?

A: Two of the ADRC Specialists are certified. The cost is up to \$80.00 per year to renew. Those staff have to get 30 hours of training, which is what the County provides. Most Social Workers maintain their certification even after their career.

Q: Carol Pederson – Is the policy still in place that employees who resign before two years have to pay back their training costs?

A: Yes, for those who have signed the pre-employment agreement and are in specific positions with the County. Currently does not apply to ADRC specialists; however, would need to be discussed if we would want it to for new hires, in Social Services this policy currently applied to Social Workers and Economic Support Specialists due to the amount of training needed for those positions.

Q: Nancy Watry – Under services/programs in common; has there been a great concern that services either in the ADRC or Social Services have not been effective or efficient to date and is that what is prompting this?

A: There is no great concern. There is frustration with who/where a call came from, but that is not what prompted this. The alliance started with the Funding Opportunities Committee.

Q: Nancy Watry – Looking at staffing and adding 25% headcount under the Social Services Director; are you confident that this isn't going to cause burnout or overload on your behalf; or if someone is to replace you down the line, it's not going to warrant additional staff to cover duties?

A: No, it will cause some shifting of work, though. The Director's job is to make sure you have supervisors and managers in place and staff able to work efficiently. The job fluctuates every day depending on priorities. Bringing the ADRC on board would take more time the first year, but all programs and services fluctuate in Social Services and you have to make sure you're prioritizing things right, at the right time.

Q: Dawn Winquist – Do you anticipate any software costs with the two separate systems, and do you plan to merge?

A: The departments would start out as status quo. There may be some software costs integrating the County network, though those should be minimal.

Q: Dawn Winquist – Under required steps; is BADR (Bureau of Aging and Disability Resources) approval required to change structure?

A: No; the County chooses how it structures all departments.

Q. Dave Hintz – Regarding the alliance concept starting with the Funding Opportunities Committee; describe the process on where it went from that initial idea.

A. After that committee, Lisa Charbarneau, Dianne Jacobson, Linda Colon and Mary Rideout were initially tasked with that discussion and it started talking about what combining the ADRC/Health Department/Social Services Departments looked it and pros/cons. When Dianne announced retirement, it was thought they could narrow that scope and look at just ADRC/Social Services combining, pros/cons and developing the documents presented at this meeting. Conversations were

had with Shawano and Pierce Counties who have these departments combined, and those were helpful. Both counties stated it was not perfect, but really saw no negative parts of being the same organization and the public did not necessarily know they were combined. The County Board then chose not to remove some funding from the ADRC's budget for a merger, but discussions continued. Due to the pandemic, meetings resumed in May 2020 as there was a Social Worker vacancy and we looked at how we could do it differently and combining departments came to mind and how we could make it work.

Q. Dr. Walt Gager – By absorbing ADRC in the Department of Social Services, does the County Board realize that they will be responsible for all expenses, as most are specific grants and grants will dry up, so County Board will have to find money to support these services?

A. Most grants received by the ADRC are State grants that go to all counties, regardless of structure. If the departments were to combine, the ADRC still receives those grants. The ADRC has a large contract with the State and will still comply with that.

Q. Dr. Walt Gager – This will not interrupt anything in the ADRC organization?

A. If it's done correctly, it shouldn't.

Q. Carol Pederson – Having a hard time seeing the supervisory backup as a benefit, if both departments are well-managed and well-directed separately?

A. The benefit comes in if a manager needs an extended period of time off and there are evaluations, budgets, etc. that need to be done, as well as having conversations with your colleagues about any issues you may encounter.

Nancy Watry reiterated Carol's question.

Rideout presented the organizational chart and asked if anyone has any questions. None to note.

Rideout reviewed the budget handout; the handout used both department's 2020 budget numbers for the calculations. The decrease in expenditures if the ADRC/DSS alliance took place would be an annual cost saving of \$112,103. This decrease would include: reducing 1 FTE (full time employee) in Social Services, reducing .6 FTE in ADRC, increasing ADRC Specialist to 2080 (40 hours per week), ADRC Specialist increase for grade increase if covering Adult Protective Services duties and funds saved from the elimination of the Assistant ADRC Director position. The total Levy Reduction is \$138,351.

Q. Nancy Watry – Asked to explain the \$55,000.00 expenditure increase for the ADRC.

A. AMSO (Agency Management, Support, and Overhead) costs were looked at and how they were allocated to the ADRC. These are costs currently being paid by the County in the ADRC budget. It was just a different way of reporting costs that maximizes grant funding.

Q. Dianne Jacobsen – Questions on where the ADRC tax levy is noted in the document, as Social Services is listed on one line.

A. The way the ADRC budgets, they include tax levy in all accounts, instead of just one line, which is what Social Services does.

Q. Dawn Winqvist – Would it be accurate to summarize and say, you bill more AMSO than the ADRC for most of the savings?

A. Yes. Joel also clarified the ADRC bills directly to the grants, not under AMSO.

Q. Nancy Watry – The Social Worker position is currently not filled, so the County is experiencing savings of not paying for that?

A. Partially, as Social Services is still having to hire LTEs (Limited Term Employees) to cover Social Worker caseloads.

The last handout that Rideout presented was a list of comparable counties that have similar alliances in place already.

Q. Nancy Watry – Has Oneida County looked at a Social Services/Human Services merger?

A. Yes, a number of studies have been done on the merger but nothing has occurred so far.

Q. Dianne Jacobson – Most of the counties listed have had this structure in place for a long time, is that accurate?

A. Yes, unaware of any counties in recent history that have combined.

2:24 P.M. – PUBLIC HEARING ON AGING DISABILITY RESOURCE CENTER AND DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL SERVICES ALLIANCE

Purpose of this public hearing: oneida county is considering a reorganization of the aging & disability resource center (ADRC) and the department of social services into a single department. this proposed change will not affect the name, location or services of the ADRC, however may enhance services in the future. as the county aging unit, the ADRC must solicit input of the community on the proposed change.

- *during the public hearing the public is allowed to voice their concerns, however the committee and staff members are not able to respond.*

CALL TO ORDER

- **LRES COMMITTEE:** Motion by Fried to call the LRES Committee Public Hearing to order. Second by Hintz. All Committee members voting ‘Aye’. Motion carried.
- **ADRC COMMITTEE:** Motion by Winquist to call the ADRC Committee Public Hearing to order. Second by Fisher. All Committee members voting ‘Aye’. Motion carried.
- **DSS COMMITTEE:** Motion by Winkler to call the Social Services Committee Public Hearing to order. Second by Sowatzka. All Committee members voting ‘Aye’. Motion carried.

OPEN PUBLIC HEARING – CALL FOR PUBLIC COMMENT-THREE-MINUTE TIME LIMIT ON SPEAKERS

Jennifer Sackett spoke in opposition to the alliance. Jennifer is a currently employee and is concerned not just with the merger, but also the decrease in 0.6 ADRC FTE and the inability for the staff to be able to do all of the work that they are required to do, making it harder to work efficiently and get services in place in a timely manner. Also, there is a concern of increased workload to ADRC Specialists as a backup for APS.

Mary Boyer spoke in opposition to the alliance. Mary has been retired from the ADRC for two years and advised to be cautious due to making sure everyone has adequate time to complete all tasks as required by state mandates and the many requirements of doing reevaluations on an annual basis after clients are signed up for programs.

Mary Martin spoke in opposition to the alliance. Mary is concerned that, even though it's been reported the merger will not advocate change and no current programs or services will be cut, there is no way of knowing or predicting what the future will be. Also, Mary is concerned that, even with incorporation citizen members, the ADRC will become only an advisory committee under the Social Services Committee, with no policy making power.

Mary Fortier spoke in opposition to the alliance. Mary stated the ADRC provides many volunteer work opportunities, as well as programs of importance and activities to keep people active and socialize. Growing adults deserve a standalone department, not to become part of a bigger department. Mary feels both departments should stand as independent agencies with their own Directors and staff.

Betty Eckardt spoke in opposition to the alliance. Betty would like to see both departments remain as they are, two separate departments. During the presentation, it was confirmed both departments are running efficiently, so why try to fix it and make it better.

Dianne Jacobsen spoke in opposition to the alliance. Dianne stated she was the ADRC Director for almost 23 years. Dianne explained in more detail the ADRC Tax Levy, stating if merged with higher administrative costs, an additional \$26,000.00 can be claimed, even though it does nothing to improve the ADRC and only serves Social Services. The staffing proposed does in fact reduce access to services to ADRC clients.

CLOSE PUBLIC HEARING

Chairman Cushing closed the public hearing at 2:41 p.m.

RECONVENE THE JOINT MEETING FOR THE REMAINING ITEMS ON THE AGENDA

Chairman Cushing reconvened the joint meeting.

NEXT STEPS

Rideout stated Megan Mode has recorded the public comments and a summary will provide to the committee members for review. The proposed alliance will go back to the LRES committee for consideration. If approved by the LRES committee, a resolution will be forwarded to the full County Board for approval.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Watry stated that every one of the ADRC committee members, including herself, are fiscally responsible to the County and it is extremely disheartening how County Board has viewed the ADRC committee opinion. The ADRC committee has voted numerous times that they do not support the alliance; they understand the ADRC can gain some efficiencies and save some tax dollars but overall it's a great run department, as is Social Services. So why would you disrupt this for the amount of savings to be gained. She advised the LRES committee to listen to the recommendation of the ADRC committee and to not risk harming the services that are currently being provided.

FUTURE MEETING DATES

None at this time.

ADJOURNMENT

- **LRES COMMITTEE:** Chairman Cushing announced the adjournment of the LRES Committee meeting at 2:45 p.m.
- **ADRC COMMITTEE:** Chairman Schreier announced the adjournment of the ADRC Committee meeting at 2:45 p.m.
- **DSS COMMITTEE:** Chairman VanRaalte announced the adjournment of the DSS Committee meeting at 2:45 p.m.

Ted Cushing, LRES Chairman

Date

Steven Schreier, ADRC Chairman

Date

Alan VanRaalte, DSS Chairman

Date

Lindsey Kennedy, Committee Secretary

Date

