

Minutes of the Combined Health and Human Services Board and Committee Meeting

Thursday, November 29, 2007

Chairs Farrell and Behrend called the meeting to order at 1:02 p.m.

Committee Members Present: County Board Supervisors Jim Behrend (Chair), Sandy Wolff, Rodell Singert, Tom Schellinger. **Absent:** Pete Gundrum, Jim Jeskewitz, Joe Vitale

Board Members Present: County Board Supervisors Dennis Farrell (Chair), Jim Behrend, Duane Paulson, Vera Stroud (arrived at 1:29 p.m.), and Citizen Members JoAnn Weidmann, Mike O'Brien, Dick Wutt, Dr. Peter Parthum. **Absent:** Jim Jeskewitz

Also Present: Chief of Staff Lee Esler, Director of Senior Services Cathy Bellovary, Director of Health and Human Services Peter Schuler, Deputy Director of Health and Human Services Don Maurer, Health and Human Services Administrative Manager Russ Kutz, Human Services Supervisor Don Daniels and Senior Financial Analyst Clara Daniels.

Committee Items

Approve Minutes of September 27, 2007

MOTION: Wolff moved, Schellinger second, to approve the minutes of September 27, 2007. Motion carried 4-0.

Approve Minutes of October 4, 2007

MOTION: Schellinger moved, Wolff second, to approve the minutes of October 4, 2007. Motion carried 4-0.

Approve Minutes of October 5, 2007

MOTION: Wolff moved, Schellinger second, to approve the minutes of October 5, 2007. Motion carried 4-0.

Board Items

Announcements

Wutt reported that NAMI is having its annual Christmas party at St. Mary's Church in Hartland on December 5th.

If time permits, Behrend, Farrell and Schuler will meet at the end of the meeting to schedule future Board and Joint meetings through April 2008.

Future Agenda Items

Weidmann asked that the Human Health Hazard be put on a future agenda.

Committee Items

Ordinance 162-O-086: Appropriate \$234,766 Additional State of Wisconsin Revenue to the Waukesha County Department of Health and Human Services' 2007 Budget

Schuler stated that this ordinance is to add revenues to the budget for 2007. The first source of revenue is from the Wisconsin Home Energy Assistance Program (WHEAP) in the amount of \$95,575. The second source of funds is \$139,201 which is parental fees for Children's Long Term Support Services through the State Department of Health and Family Services. The \$139,291 is just a modification of how the funding is collected and paid to the State. Kutz explained that parents pay for services based on a state formula. We make this payment to the state as an expense, but when we collect, it is reported as revenue. It was not budgeted this way in 2007, but it will be in 2008. Behrend stated that the Waiver money is a modification, more of an accounting adjustment, but asked if the WHEAP money is a new program. Maurer stated this is an existing program and although we do the budgeting, we don't know what the next year's allocation will be and so almost every year we have to do an ordinance for this adjustment. This does not affect tax levy.

Maurer introduced Don Daniels who is in charge of the Waiver Program. Daniels explained the situation of a family with an autistic child and how being able to help them with the expense of a fence for their yard out of parental fee money, it enables this family to keep their child in the own home and not be placed in a residential treatment center which would cost over \$100,000 per year.

Lee stated that one of the estimates for the 2007 budget anticipated these amounts because we had an estimate that was over the \$100,000+ higher than the budget. He asked which of these two programs was that \$100,000+ for. Russ stated that the energy assistance budget was \$150,000 and this extra \$95,000 would bring it to \$245,000. The fees piece of \$139,000 is where is was strictly an accounting practice. We send the money to the state as an expense and we receive it back as revenue. In Long Term Support a higher estimate was listed than the budget, but in looks like in '08 we budgeted for the higher amount now anticipating that the higher level will be obtained in the future.

MOTION: Singert moved, Wolff second to approve the ordinance. Motion carried 4-0.

Joint Board and Committee Items

Review Modifications to the 2008 Budget

Everyone received handouts on the items restored to the 2008 HHS budget by the County Executive and 2008 proposed amendments. Schuler started out by reviewing the Items Restored to the 2008 HHS Budget by the County Executive, and noted that a number of them were responsive to Board recommendations. A total of \$30,000 from the Community Development Block Grant program assisted in the restoration of some of these funds. Some of these restoration funds were to help the agencies transition to coping with the full reduction next year. For example, the ARCh socials is a service that would come under the new Long Term Care Reform Care Management Organizations as the redesign occurs, but there are no guarantees that the CMO's will be in a position to offer such contributions for non-mandated programs. Wutt

asked about the Women's Center and why the HHS Department original reduction suggested was \$18,670 and yet the County Executive restored \$20,000. Maurer explained that in addition to the \$18,670 reduction, there was another \$3,000 reduction for sexual abuse staffing coordination by the Women's Center and the \$20,000 partially assist with that. The following three pages were 2008 Proposed Amendments. The first being an increase of \$15,000 to restore child abuse and prevention funding and that money came from a decrease of \$15,000 in the Mental Health Outpatient Clinic medication program expenditures. The second amendment was to increase the CJCC program budget by \$62,730 which is to be used by the pretrial program for the intoxicated driver and for consulting services for pretrial supervision and screening programs. These dollars were added to the budget, but without this funding client service capacity would have been reduced. The third amendment was the capital budget amendment designed to help designate the dollars to carry out the space and design implementation to create the ADRC space.

Vera Stroud arrived at 1:29 p.m.

Review 2007 Offers for Shadowing

Schuler stated this is in preparation for changes after the first of the year with changes in Health and Human Services board and committee member changes. Shadowing is the ability to tour and visit programs down to the level as staff and see programs and operations, see facilities that no one else in the county can do or see and he asked members to think about making some choices from those ideas given as to what would be of interest. It has been a very positive experience for those who have done it in the past. You don't normally get to see much of our professional staff, supervisors, clientele or vendor partners we work with, and this provides that opportunity. Farrell stated he feels this has been a very good experience for him – it's like working in the trenches. Peter provided some examples, such as going to the Treatment Court and see how that operates, possibly going with a screening worker and see them screen into the jail for a day, or visiting the upcoming ADRC to be part of a future screening review. We are in the midst of putting a new list together and will be distributing it after completion.

Potential Board/Committee Meetings

Peter stated we are presently working on educational information for next year and trying to focus on issues members might want to hear and learn about besides those areas where there may be stresses and strains as well as program areas that are important to be kept current on. Schuler stated he saw a report last week talking about juvenile services and the corrections issues and the report showed that the Department currently has six kids in correctional institutions and when you look at the list, our percentage of the statewide total was 1.06%. Our six kids in corrections represented totals lower than almost every medium size county and we weren't even close to the larger counties because they had numbers 6 to 8 times higher than ours. This area continues to experience a low juvenile crime wave and a lot of this has to do with the community and intervention programs, and our past investments in prevention and early intervention programming. We want to encourage people and congratulate people for their good work. Sheboygan County has 19 kids in corrections and the cost of that would simply destroy our Adolescent and Family Services budget. Maurer stated the cost involved in those corrections is about 1.3 million dollars. Maurer stated our recidivism rate is less than 25%. Paulson stated we need to have these figures available and a barometer to measure the success of the programs

every time a discussion for making cuts or building new jails becomes an issue. Schuler stated that the CJCC reports to you and in the process brings you some more of the statistical information. Maurer stated that we do have some of these key outcomes in the budget book every year including the recidivism and placement rates.

At this point Singert stated he felt that in enforcing the work of the CJCC duplicates what this board and committee does or should be doing. He objects to the expansion of the Council's work that duplicates what is being done here and that we have gone from a \$500,000 projected budget to a \$900,000 budget and soon it will be a million. Presentations are being made to the Council that are also being presented to this combined board and committee and he thinks this is a duplication that should be changed because now you've got two committees that are listening to the same thing – what's being done and how it's being done. Those conversations might be requested by the council but the work should be done here and that the council can ask questions and receive information. The CJCC is supposed to be a policy making group and not an administrative group. Schuler stated that the Council's relationship to this board and committee is complicated and its complicated by the fact that the budget was put into this Department's budget. The reason for that was well stated by Dan Finley that this is an administratively appointed department so therefore unlike the elected officials where things are put into their budget and they sometimes may do other things with the resources, is why it never went into any other budgets and why it's been consolidated. The Council's role is almost like the Human Services Board's role – they have the responsibility to form a budget proposal as it is created now and they have also been told they are responsible to make sure the programs are operating responsibly. There are times when similar information is being discussed with multiple parties and Peter's committee, the Programs Committee, has the responsibility to summarize the information of what other committees have been working on and put it all together as a package. The Health and Human Services Committee has the ultimate authority of approving and reviewing those budgets so the Council is still an advisory to basically both the County Board and the County Executive just as the Human Services Board is.

Weidmann stated that Supervisor Singert brought up an interesting point because this is not the only place where there is duplication of reporting. However, the Council is working with those departments that are not represented on this committee such as the D.A. and Sheriff's Department so it does have a different perspective and they may be able to delve a little deeper into some of the things that we do not do here. She too would like to find a more streamlined way to do it which in government is tough to do sometimes which may be the rationale for a separate group that does this whole thing. Paulson stated that they are singly focused on what they do. We have a successful juvenile program which is the emphasis he's prefer to start with because of the successful intervention programs in that section which prevent offenders from repeating or becoming adult criminals. Schuler stated that even though there is an area of the CJCC that talks about juvenile services issues, they bring those issues back to our division and they get enacted here. The Council really has done nothing with juvenile services, it's all adult criminal justice focused. The workgroup has made some nice suggestions to work with our division and our programs about simplifying things and the relationship with Juvenile Court and some other entities in the community that have actually been helpful, but that's the only area where there could have been some direct duplication with the role exactly here in our budgets, etc. Supervisor Behrend somewhat agrees with Supervisor Singert in that he sees the Council as

a taskforce, but when it comes to operating a program on a long term basis, it should be back under Peter. He's concerned that the focus gets too confused. He thinks it should be something to think about in the future. Once they come up with a program it should go back to the department. He feels the CJCC shouldn't be an operating entity. Schuler stated it's been a struggle as to whether certain programs shouldn't be consolidated into a single budget to aid in coordination vs. the Clerk of Courts having a program and the District Attorney having others and potential lack of coordination in purposes and programs. It's important to note that you have State officials, elected officials, appointed officials and then you have the Executive, all of whom have distinct identities and there can be competing priorities. However, the reality is that we don't have enough staff to oversee all the different programs whereas there was someone to oversee the ABE (Adult Basic Education) program in the jail, and jail staff are in the best position to observe and monitor the performance, so we arrived at some agreements. You have the authority to ask Peter anything you want to know about it, and he has brought those folks here to present those programs because they know much more about it than others do. Peter stated that to some degree some of what you stated has happened, but for the department to actually run and operate those programs as directly as you see with the other ones would require actually having management people or supervisors assigned to them and that may not work quite as well. Maybe what we can do better if you want to see more of how that works is to bring those folks here as part of those presentations. Peter stated that Meg Schnabl can tell you much better than I how that Adult Basic Education program runs. Peter is more than happy to listen to any suggestions anyone might have to make this work better.

Supervisor Singert reiterated that the Council's suggestions should run by the Boards and Committees and that in turn would make our suggestions back to the Council. The Council could then ask the HHS Department to make those changes. He doesn't think it takes a million dollars to do that. It should come under the Judiciary or Health and Human Services Committee. He feels the growth in government here is excessive and unnecessary. He pointed out that he does not object to the existence of the Council.

Schuler stated that the Taskforce was designed to study what you could do with the adult justice system, partly driven by Dan Finley and the County Board Chair's perception that we had just built a new jail and that jail was quickly filling and we needed to find other alternatives. The Kimme report suggested that other alternatives should be looked into as a result of building the jail and we could get out ahead of this thing and by the time that taskforce could even move forward, the plans were already in the process to already build the newest jail. The taskforce was to look into the justice system policies, procedures, all the entities operating in it and see if we can operate the most effective justice system change for adults and the other piece is what do you do just keep building more jails. Dan Finley instructed the taskforce to find solutions to avoid building yet another jail. There are several missions the council has and all focused around the adult justice population.

Weidmann asked if we could have an agenda item of one page doubled spaced bold letters spelling out what the original intent was for the Council, what has transpired in the process and how it relates to the committee and board and maybe continue the dialog before the next budget session so we have some clarification.

Esler gave a brief background and said that back in 1987 based on the National Institute of Corrections, consulting work took place here in the county for planning new institutions. One of the outcomes was to create the Jail Alternatives and Population Control Panel. That was instituted much like CJCC for the purpose of reporting to decision makers alternatives to corrections be sought rather than locking up more people in jail. What was formed back in '87 was the same type of group that formed the Criminal Justice Taskforce. The purpose was to get those group of administrators that had the wherewithal to control population would constantly scrutinize their system and would report that to the larger group for recommendations. This is still the same purpose of the CJCC. One of the things advocated by the National Institute of Corrections is that group should be primarily citizens. If that were the case with the CJCC then the DA, County Executive, County Board Chairman, etc. would be functioning as staff to the citizen committee. The CJCC is functioning as a recommending body and it just so happens that you and the County Board and Executive park their money for the ongoing programs in that niche. The direction is for the analysis and oversight and the vigilance over the system and not to run programs.

Review ADRC Space Plan – Tour Building

Maurer thought it would be a good idea to talk about the ADRC before the tour to give everyone a view of the framework. There was a City Planning Commission meeting last night and they did approve the permit for one year and approved that future renewals would be administrative rather than planning commission. Esler stated that this was discussed at an earlier meeting this morning as well. We have been through this before with the IT trailers that were attached to the west end of the courthouse. He stated that we didn't need the permit, but we did seek their permission for intergovernmental relations. Schuler reported that the staff of the planning commission worked with Dennis Cerreta to get a diagram, an aerial view. The Commission had a number of questions as to why this was occurring, what they were going to be used for, the condition of the trailers, the ADRC, the timeframe, the landscaping, etc. Cerreta was completely clear about the capital project for the new building – the years out when it would be planned and when construction would begin. There was no vagueness about how long these trailers would be there. There was some discussion as to the fate of the existing Human Services Center and the site of the proposed new building, but the commission was advised that no such decisions have been made yet. In the end the vote was unanimous. When asked about who's going to cover the cost of moving the trailers here, Maurer stated that Russ will be very aggressive about the state covering costs, and while we don't expect argument with remodeling the area of the ADRC itself, we anticipate some question regarding expenditures related to the moving of files and the records department to make room for the ADRC.

Weidmann asked if these records being moved to the trailers are one of a kind. Maurer stated that some of what's in these records are the only copy, but eventually we will go to electronic case records and this should reduce the number of records going into that area and obviously out on the horizon we would like to look at scanning these documents. He noted that it would be far preferable to have most records electronic by the time of the new building to reduce building costs. Maurer stated that about a year and a half ago, in coordination with the state, department staff started scanning economic support records and we have not yet completed it. Even though scanning sounds easy, everything has to be carefully indexed in order to be able to retrieve the scanned documents from within a record, and we have so many different programs. Human

Services Department records are much more complicated than single service agencies. It took 2½ years for Waukesha Memorial to scan all their records and their scope was just medical.

Behrend asked why couldn't we run the program in the two spaces we have now. Cathy Bellovary stated the fact that we would be going back and forth because the ADRC needs the long term care staff and the senior services staff to work together as well as the economic support staff. Cathy stated it would be very inefficient and difficult for the clients as well. Esler asked about the possible recovery of the ADRC costs – can we recover from the State new building costs or is it just a one time pay back so we could only recover the MMB costs? Is it possible to build a whole new building comparable to Workforce Development Center and bill that to the State? The answer was that's not a possibility. Schuler stated that some counties have actually done the whole thing without getting any money because they were so anxious to get it up and running. Sheboygan and Washington have already done this. Maurer went over the drawing prior to the tour of where the MMB's will be placed and where the ADRC will be situated as well as staff from Senior Services.

Board Items

Review Modified By-laws

The revised by-laws were approved with the following changes: 1) insert under membership that a nurse and doctor should be on the board and cite the statute; 2) naming Article IX as Attendance and modify the following article numbers.

MOTION: Paulson made a motion to approve the by-laws with the above stated changes seconded by Weidmann. The motion was voted on and passed 8-0.

Committee Items

Future Agenda Items

Esler stated that in regards to the article that came out in the paper on the ethical question of the Child Health Study, he was contacted by Katie Miller who is the community liaison for the health study committee. She wanted to make a presentation to the County Board, but he said it would be better to make it to the Committee, so this will be a future agenda topic. She did make a presentation to the Joint Advisory Committee when they met in September.

Board and Committee Items

The HHS Board will not be meeting in December, and Behrend stated that unless there is an ordinance, there will not be a Committee meeting either.

Weidmann asked that the Human Health Hazard be a topic on the agenda at the second meeting of the year as she is not available until the end of January. Stroud asked that the Board not schedule meetings on the second Thursday of the month.

Committee Items

Adjournment

The Committee will adjourn following the tour of the building where the MMB's will be placed and the ADRC will be located.

MOTION: Singert made a motion seconded by Schellinger to adjourn the committee meeting following the tour which should end about 3:00 p.m. The motion was voted on and passed 4-0.

Singert left at 2:40 p.m.

Behrend and Schellinger left at 2:52 p.m.

Board Items

Elicit Topics for 2008 Presentations January - March

There will be a joint meeting on January 31, 2008. The Board will have a holiday lunch prior to the meeting and all committee members will be invited.

The following meetings have been scheduled: On February 28, 2008 will be a joint meeting and the first of the advisory committee presentations. The next two meetings will be on March 13, 2008 and March 27, 2008 which will both be joint meetings and will also include advisory committee presentations. April is still left open because of elections.

A drawing was held to determine which advisory committees will present at the three meetings named above. DDAD will present on February 28th, AODA and Mental Health will present on March 13th and CAFSAC and Public Health will present on March 27th. We are looking at a date the first week of May to hold the Public Hearing. Mike O'Brien stated he would be gone in February and March but will be returning in late April.

MOTION: Weidmann made a motion seconded by Dr. Parthum to adjourn the meeting. The motion passed 8-0.

Minutes recorded by Kathy Leach

Approved on _____
Date