

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE BROWN COUNTY
ADMINISTRATION COMMITTEE**

Pursuant to Section 19.84 Wis. Stats., a budget meeting of the **Brown County Administration Committee** was held on Thursday, October 10, 2019 in Room 200, Northern Building, 305 E. Walnut Street, Green Bay, WI

Present: Chair Sieber, Supervisor Schadewald, Supervisor Kneiszel, Supervisor Deneys, Supervisor Vander Leest
Also Present: Supervisors Borchardt, Lefebvre, Tran and Brusky; Executive Streckenbach, Deputy Executive Jeff Flynt, Corporation Counsel David Hemery, Finance Director Bradley Klingsporn, Senior Accountant – Budget Coordinator David Diedrick, HR Generalist Ashley Morrow, Benefits Manager Jill Bomkamp, Internal Auditor Dan Process, Director of Administration Chad Weininger, Treasurer Paul Zeller, Child Support Director Maria Lasecki, Child Support Supervisor Natalie Poupore, County Clerk Sandy Juno, Technology Services Director August Neverman, and other interested parties.

I. Call to Order.

This meeting was called to order by Chair Tom Sieber at 5:00 pm.

II. Approve/Modify Agenda.

Motion made by Supervisor Vander Leest, seconded by Supervisor Kneiszel to approve. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

III. Approve/Modify Minutes of September 5, 2019.

Motion made by Supervisor Kneiszel, seconded by Supervisor Vander Leest to approve. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

****BUDGET REVIEW****

Comments from the Public on Budget Items – None.

REVIEW OF 2020 DEPARTMENT BUDGET

1. COUNTY TREASURER – Review of 2020 Department Budget.

a. Resolution Approving New or Deleted Positions During the 2020 Budget Process in the Treasurer Department Table of Organization.

Motion made by Supervisor Vander Leest, seconded by Supervisor Deneys to approve the resolution. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Treasurer Zeller informed the budget represented an additional \$100,000 in revenue than the County Executive asked for in 2020. The expense side was up 1%.

Zeller stated he wanted the committee to be forward-looking and provided a spreadsheet (attached). He explained this was a representation of 10-years of delinquent amounts by month within each year from 2009-2019. These delinquent balances were what they derive the interest revenue line item. Referring to 2009, at this time of the year, delinquent amounts were \$12 million dollars. In 2019 at this time of the year, it was \$4,208,000, a third of the balance of 2009. The trend had been fewer delinquent taxes year after year. But comparing Sept 2019 to 2018, it had gone up for the first time in 10-years. He did not know what that meant but it was a change in course that he didn't expect. Year after year he been telling them that delinquent balances were declining and mortgage companies were requiring escrow and they were getting timely payment but the last two months there had been a 14% increase in delinquent tax balances.

Sieber referred to pg. 62 and questioned the Tax Deed expense line. Zeller responded that amount was expended on Class 3 notice advertising when they start their foreclosure notices and filing in the Press Gazette. They were required

to publish it and it occurred in November and December. The bill was \$24,000-\$25,000 and will show up later in the year. The reason he didn't increase the amount from \$50,000-\$60,000 two years ago was to handle unexpected events. Earlier this month they had three evictions and one had cost over \$10,000. The account was used for maintaining the properties.

**Motion made by Supervisor Schadewald, seconded by Supervisor Vander Leest to approve the Treasurer's budget.
Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

2. CHILD SUPPORT – Review of 2020 Department Budget.

Child Support Director Maria Lasecki introduced Child Support Supervisor Natalie Poupore. Poupore had worked in the office for a number of years but had been promoted to Supervisor and Lasecki believed a great deal in succession planning and showing people the ropes and invited her along.

Lasecki provided a verbal budget overview of the Child Support Department, a copy of the review is attached.

Kneiszel questioned how imperative it was to bring the caseload down? Lasecki stated she had contributed to the volume because they specialize and when you specialize, numbers go to a smaller amount of people. Staff appreciated it because they don't have to be divided or be monitoring or an expert in so many different fields, the Child Support world was so complex. Ideally she would love to be able to do that but it took money and levy but she understood restrictions through her department and on a countywide basis and she was respectful of that. Using LEAN principles, they were doing what they could and she really believed if they rewarded who they had and recognized and acknowledged the contributions and compensate them accordingly and get those people who weren't at market to market and find a way to reward outstanding performance, they will keep who they have and they were doing a great job. Kneiszel stated he trusted her and suggested she let them know if there was a serious issue.

Sieber questioned if she could elaborate more on the partnership with UW Extension. Lasecki stated they enjoyed their collaborated relationship with Family Services from the beginning of Supporting Parents Supporting Kids up until Terry Wolfram retired. This position was a part-time position, a challenging position to fill and as Family Services attempted to recruit they found it to be even more challenging in the robust economy they were seeing right now. When she talked with Extension Director Judy Knudsen, she was working directly with UW-Madison to find a way to fill that position and have it be something attractive in terms of salary and benefit. Knudsen had been very instrumental in creating a survey to ensure they were not just pushing out what they thought non-custodial parents wanted but seeking input and guidance from them to determine what they needed. UW-Extension was not new to parenting, they had just stepped away from it in this community because of Family Services role. The state was really excited to see how the UW Extensions across the state might be able to help the other four counties who were coming on board. She was on regular workgroup calls with Poupore, they were lucky enough to be part of the developing workgroup team for this program and they were looking to see if they can't utilize services, there was a robust program that had already existed through UW Extension that they would like to tap into. Working with Knudsen in LEAN endeavors in the past had been nothing but rewarding, enlightening and challenging and she was amazing and she was looking forward to working with her and maximizing what they can accomplish.

**Motion made by Supervisor Schadewald, seconded by Supervisor Kneiszel to approve the Child Support budget.
Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

3. COUNTY CLERK – Review of 2020 Department Budget.

a. Resolution Approving New or Deleted Positions During the 2020 Budget Process County Clerk and County Board Tables of Organization.

County Clerk Sandy Juno provided a written summary (attached) and briefly spoke to it. She informed they were able to come in a little under what they were given for a levy by Administration, they were proud of that. Other than that, business as usual and a presidential election cycle.

With the number of election ballots cast, Sieber questioned if they tried to project what the election turnout would be. Juno informed it would go up or down as it got closer to the election depending on some of the goings on and public interest. They pretty much relied on their past statistics to project what turnout was for Brown County and their expenses that went along with it.

Supervisor Borchardt questioned the move of Administrative staff from the County Board office to the Clerk's office? Weinger interjected that Corporation Counsel Hemery had more to say about it. Hemery informed by statute, taking minutes and preparing agendas, those duties were duties of the County Clerk's office and in this county, the personnel that did those functions were in the County Board office. This would be a good time with the current County Clerk not running for reelection and a having a new County Clerk coming in to right that. The County Clerk can designate individuals to take on certain tasks but there will be a new County Clerk elected so it would make sense to move that Administrative staff from the Board office to the Clerk's office.

Borchardt questioned why it was moved out? Hemery stated it had been that way for quite some time but did not know the history. Juno didn't do anything to pursue this during her tenure but she felt it was important to change it for the next County Clerk and Board Chairman who would both be new. Schadewald felt it was more historical than anything else.

Schadewald questioned, now that they were making the change, what was the envisionment of the Board staff's job duties under the County Clerk? Would that then negate research for County Board members? Where did they see this or how were they writing the job description? Juno stated their job descriptions wouldn't change but this would allow them to work together, allow cross-training and assisting each other during times that were really busy and it would be a pathway for staff in the County Board office, if they were interested, in a Deputy position to gain the skills along the way to move into that position.

Schadewald questioned the job classification, was the pay equivalent with moving under one department head to another? Juno stated the wages would stay as they were. Schadewald questioned if they end up doing the same job were they being paid less, he was looking more toward the future? Weinger was fond of saying they can't talk about the people but the position, so if they take the position and they have more duties with cross training. Juno stated that would be the ultimate goal. For the next year it would be good to put an organizational format together on how they would work together and see the timeline of how they can absorb some duties in their office. There probably would be a job description change at some point.

Juno stated as far as their physical location and all the things that went with it, it would remain as they were so the County Board would be free to work with the staff as they did now. It would just provide a clear path for working together as herself right now overseeing staff there as opposed to coming in as a non-supervisor and trying to make requests of the staff and they may have other priorities coming from whoever was their direct supervisor now.

Schadewald envisioned they wanted to follow the state law with minutes, etc. but the real work would be in the transition and the responsibilities and the job description, the board will oversee that. That's where he felt the County Board had to be aware that giving it to a constitutional officer, the County Clerk, was one part, a legal part, but the Table of Organization and the job descriptions was under their preview. Juno stated she hadn't thought that far ahead, it was out of her control but looked forward to trying to figure out ways they could work more efficiently together and felt it would be very beneficial. Schadewald questioned if she envisioned her staff taking minutes, Juno stated it was a possibility. Schadewald felt it would be a reality if they were looking at overtime for whatever reason. Juno felt by joining efforts it would allow everyone a better working environment and more flexibility. Schadewald stated he would support the change only from the standpoint that he saw how legally, under state law, they pretty much had to do it but he would be very observant of whatever job description changes and that physically they won't move locations, however that wasn't a certainty with the next Clerk, so that's what he'll be watching.

Hemery added the ordinance pretty much put into the code exactly how minutes should be taken and what must be included and those were constitutional officer determinations as well. Don't be shocked if there are minor changes in that going forward, it was certainly under the prevue of the County Clerk as far as deciding on the form of the minutes that will be taken. There were minimal requirements in the statute as discussed before. Should minutes be transcribed, should they be word for word, those type of decisions were typically County Clerk decisions by statute 59.23 as well.

Borchardt's concern was that if whoever comes in next as Clerk and then decides to change up how minutes or notes were taken and distributed out to the public because the county doesn't do video or audio unless requested, to hear what happened throughout the whole meeting. Schadewald believed Hemery's answer was the Clerk could give some direction but he didn't hear the Clerk could tell the County Board what they wanted to do with their own minutes.

Sieber felt the information provided was conflicting. Hemery stated with regard to distribution there were statutory requirements, there were open meetings laws, post notices that had certain specificity, the minutes had to be made available that he certain specificity but as far as the manner of taking the minutes. His opinion was the statutes were pretty clear that it was County Clerk's responsibility. Schadewald's point was if they decided to spend the money and have a video system and people could access it, it was the board's decision. Hemery added, there could only be one official record of a proceeding and the statutes give that duty and responsibility to the County Clerk.

In regard to actual minutes, Borchardt reiterated because they don't do video or audio that was released to the public, if it was just votes up and down in that, the public was not necessarily getting the full picture, in her personal opinion, of what actually took place in the meeting and that discussion that can be so vitality important of why people voted the way they did. For clarification, Sieber questioned, if the County Board stated they wanted minutes like they were doing now, pretty much word for word minutes and the next County Clerk came in and says we are not taking minutes like that anymore, I just want votes recorded, the votes recorded would what would rule. Hemery's opinion was that it would be up to the County Clerk to decide whether they were summary minutes or whether how intensive those minutes were. Sieber stated, the County Board would have no say in it whatsoever. Hemery stated the County Board could always keep its own minutes but the official record of the proceeding was determined by the County Clerk and that was in their purview as an elected official. Schadewald understood where Borchardt was coming from but if there was a battle to be fought, it was not tonight. Borchardt wanted to make it clear on the record.

Motion made by Supervisor Deneys, seconded by Supervisor Schadewald to approve the resolution. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Motion made by Supervisor Schadewald, seconded by Supervisor Vander Leest to approve the County Clerk's budget. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

4. TECHNOLOGY SERVICES – Review of 2020 Department Budget.

Technology Services Director August Neverman stated they continued to see a migration from Capital Investment, a subscription based funding which was a challenge. In the past they might have bonded or capitalized purchases and those were now turning into something where they pay X amount per year, so they were continuing to adjust their budget. It wasn't increasing hugely every year but it was increasing.

Vander Leest questioned the 911 project process. Neverman informed it was kicking off right now. They were running on the old Motorola system and meeting with the new Motorola system. They were in the process of building out the servers and expecting to be live in December to do configurations to the CAD system to get it available to go live next fall.

The UPS was completed and they had a complete bypass. One whole side of the UPS can be up and completely shut down the other half to do electrical work or replace batteries, etc. It was a big deal.

Deneys stated he was looking at their number of work orders and how it continued to rise. Neverman stated they were going to do the absolute best with the resources they had available. They had a 98.6 customer satisfaction rating but they weren't able to get stuff done quickly and that was their number one complaint from everyone. When they did get it done they have positive feedback. Some areas were waiting 4 years for projects and they were focusing on core services. Deneys thanked Neverman and his staff but reiterated their staffing level was his personal concern.

Motion made by Supervisor Schadewald, seconded by Supervisor Vander Leest to approve. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

5. HUMAN RESOURCES – Review of 2020 Department Budget.

Weininger informed the HR budget, starting on pg. 40, the only real change, which wasn't really a change anymore, and the budget reflected it, was the splitting up of HR placing Payroll under Finance, Workers Comp person under Risk. Another thing of note was under the \$69,500 for the wellness program. They took EAP, a third of the nurse and flu shots out of the health insurance fund and will expense it in the HR budget because it was available to all employees, expensed through the levy and not have cost share.

Sieber questioned the elimination of cellphone line, Weininger informed they eliminated the HR Director's phone and the Workers comp person needed a cellphone because they took pictures and did a lot of work out of their office and that expense was transferred to the Admin budget.

a. Resolution Authorizing Full Time Employee Wage Adjustments.

Something different this year, Weininger was asking for authority to sign off on contracts and not bring them back to the board as it was a timing thing. Other than the Sheriff's union, all the other unions that were certified had given him the ability to basically sign them off on those contracts up to the 2.07%, the same as last year based on positive pay for performance. The goal was to try and get it done before the end of the year. If they don't do it before then, it made employees angry and cost more money as WRS would come back and charge a fine as they were losing interest on the money that would have been paid in.

There was money set aside for class adjustments and they were continuing that also, it was off the A33 policy that they had seen and approved. The policy hadn't changed and the updated compensation schedule with the adjusted 2.07% cost of living was in the back of the budget book.

Motion made by Supervisor Schadewald, seconded by Supervisor Vander Leest to suspend the rules to take Items 5, 5a & 5b together. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

b. Resolution Approving Changes to the Brown County Employee Benefits Plan.

Weininger referred to the resolution and briefly went over the requested changes under 'Now, Therefore be it Resolved.' Jan Stage from Associated Benefits and Risk Consultation (ABRC) was present to give examples of stop loss insurance for the health plan. Weininger informed long term they needed to start figuring out a good wellness plan and potentially an onsite clinic, which would save a lot of money. The Benefit Advisory Committee had been involved and they were getting ideas from them.

Responding to Schadewald, with regard to spouses taking the HRA, it was the same exact thing the employees take. If they do not take it, they can get coverage but they will go to the non-participation rate. Both spouses had to take it but their rate was based on the employee's results. The goal was to get employees engaged and spouses played a role in health insurance.

Motion made by Supervisor Schadewald, seconded by Supervisor Vander Leest to approve 5, 5a, and 5b. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

6. DEPT. OF ADMINISTRATION – Review of 2020 Department Budget.

Referring to page 25, Sieber asked Weininger to elaborate on the document storage initiative. Weininger stated one of the biggest issues was there hadn't been a coordinated effort to figure out how to digitize documents. He wasn't saying go backwards but in moving forward the goal was, if cost effective, to digitize and cut down on storage space. Based off of state statute those were going to drop off, they will get rid of them and it will free up space. The reality was right now some things had to be stored, such as court items. Neverman added that on top of it, they were focusing on things where they were going to get secondary value. They weren't just getting rid of boxes, they were going to be able to get digital access to things as there would be a copy of record, which also solved other problems. Above and beyond saving money, the ones they were focusing on would get them extra intangible values.

Motion made by Supervisor Schadewald, seconded by Supervisor Kneizel to approve. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Year 2020 Non-Division Budgets Review

7. Capital Projects.

Weininger referred to page 263, every year the board passed a 5-year CIP which was automatically added to the budget. Page 267 was the 2020 proposed sales tax projects. The only difference, they added one project (#17) with regard to flooding on Beach Rd. They set aside matching funds for the City of Green Bay to take care of the issue.

Weininger noted outstanding requests that the board had to weigh through such as courthouse security, a juvenile justice center, potentially a new tower system with some fiber and a number of other request coming through. There was a limited amount of money that they will have to prioritize and figure out over the next several months.

Schadewald pointed out Donations on page 265 and asked Weininger to explain to the committee. The \$1 million through UWGB was a part of their donation of private dollars towards the STEM Center project to fund it.

Schadewald questioned if the committee would get quarterly reports with regard to county sales tax? Weininger stated he felt it was an important conversation to have but under the advisement of Corporation Counsel he would defer questions until the lawsuit was settled. Schadewald questioned if 5 months from now and the lawsuit was going on, could they go into closed session to explain cash flow? Hemery was asking at least until the decision came out. He was not worried about the appeal of this decision.

Motion made by Supervisor Schadewald, seconded by Supervisor Kneizel to approve Capital Projects. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

8. Debt Service.

Weininger referred to pages 306-312 and briefly spoke to it. With the rates going down, they may be able to fit one more refunding in.

Motion made by Supervisor Vander Leest, seconded by Supervisor Deneys to approve Debt Service. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

9. Taxes, Special Revenues, Certain Internal Service & Fiduciary Funds.

Referring to page 314 under Revenues, Shared revenue Utility, Weininger noted utility payments were going down and will go down the next several years with the Pulliam plant being shut down, they don't pay property taxes as it was a formula.

Personal property also went down. He had to talk to DOR, their report was through the roof yet there was a reduction, which concerned him.

Under Expenses, Regular earnings General wage included the 2.07 and the Class & Comp line item will be rolled up in the salary portion next year.

The \$637,207 under Salaries reimbursement Retirement & sick leave was mis-recorded and should be in Casual Payout.

They were keeping Contingency in, it was this committees funds to fund any shortfalls or emergencies or anything anticipated throughout the year.

Transfer out was an amount that he set aside because of the Georgia Pacific tax appeal that had been ongoing for some time. If they settle or win a case, they could go back 3-years and make some substantially large payments. This was also transferred to the Health Insurance fund, an accounting thing they had to do.

Page 315 was all the different funds and the ending balance. Causality Insurance was a little misleading as the county had a very sizeable and healthy reserve that they had to set aside for insurance. Over the last several years they had been increasing it and they were at the point where they could potentially maintain it. This was also where the Health and Dental insurance fund was, they had about \$740,000 unrestricted unassigned and will have an additional significant portion at the end of the year because they were trending really well.

Motion made by Supervisor Schadewald, seconded by Supervisor Kneizel to approve Taxes, Special Revenues, Certain Internal Service & Fiduciary Funds. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

Budget Resolution

10. Resolution Establishing Salaries of Certain Elective Officials - County Board Chair, Vice-Chair and Supervisors.

Sieber informed this was at the Executive Committee meeting, Chair Moynihan was going to make a motion to up salaries. Weininger informed by ordinance it was this committee that made the recommendation and the County Board set it. Hemery noted Chapter 2 Administrative Committee does have the duty and responsibility under 2.066 to consider and make recommendations to the full board on a compensation package for the County Board Supervisors to be elected at the succeeding spring election.

Supervisor Tran questioned if there were any deductions for supervisors that don't show up to meetings. Sieber responded, not as proposed. Hemery would want to look it up before opening. It was his understanding if they set it up as a salary, that's the salary they got paid. If they set up compensation per meeting, then it was per meeting. Although then they would possibly look at excused absences, etc. Weininger informed that Tran would have to ask the committee to make the recommendation to have Corporation Counsel look at it. Sieber stated he knew other counties paid per meeting. Tran felt it was something worth looking into.

Motion made by Supervisor Schadewald, seconded by Supervisor Vander Leest to refer the resolution to Executive Committee. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY

CHILD SUPPORT

Brown County

305 E. WALNUT STREET
P.O. BOX 23600
GREEN BAY, WI 54305-3600
PHONE (920) 448-4090 FAX (920) 448-4101

MARIA A. LASECKI, M.S.
DIRECTOR

TO: Administration Committee

FROM: Maria Lasecki

DATE: October 10, 2019

RE: 2020 Budget Overview

Agency Overview

As you consider the department's budget before you, I'd like to provide a quick agency overview to refresh you on the nature, scope and relevance of the work that child support performs.

Our agency handles just over 14,400 cases although this does NOT include roughly 5,000 cases which do not have an application on file but we are required to maintain on our statewide system. We are responsible for: **establishing paternity, child support and medical support orders**, and, of course, for **enforcing those orders** thru the child's date of emancipation and even 20 years beyond when debt exists on a case.

Our agency consists of 39 full time staff members, including 3 attorneys, and we have cooperative agreements with the FCC and Clerk of Courts for services provided to ensure that our mission is met.

As you contemplate the Child Support Agency budget it is important to remember that most of our expenditures are reimbursed at a rate of 66%, by way of a federal match received as part of our state contract. Additionally, we receive revenue through performance incentives which further assists in offsetting the total amount required from levy funds.

We put that revenue to good use! In terms of our effectiveness, the Brown County Child Support Agency collected approximately **\$21.8M** in current Child Support and **\$4.9M** in Arrears in FFY19 on IVD cases. This money comes directly back into our community and the homes of children, in an effort to reduce poverty in those HH as well as to mitigate the need for reliance on public assistance.

To ensure our continued effectiveness and maximize our efficiencies in doing so, the department incorporated a number of initiatives in the 2020 budget:

Increase in State Grant Funding for Five County Demonstration Project (FCDP) now called ELEVATE!

As of July 2019, our contract with BCS ended and a new contract was issued which increases our grant funding. The 18 month contract was awarded in the amount of \$240,000; for 2020, \$160,000 has been budgeted to cover the costs of:

- Our Employment Specialist
- Work Supports
- Miscellaneous operational expenses, travel & training necessary throughout the year

New Partnership with UW Extension

And, on a separate but related note, we'll continue to receive grant funds to avail Access & Visitation services but as of June our long term parenting partnership with Family Services concluded. I saw this as unique opportunity to collaborate the UW Extension. In 2020, you'll note that we are embarking upon an inter-departmental partnership with the UW Extension to deliver parenting services. In the interim, we've rebranded the program *Collaborative Co-Parenting* to better represent the services provided not only to our ELEVATE NCPs but really any custodial or noncustodial parents receiving services through our agency.

Birth Cost Recovery Changes

Next, I'd like to discuss Birth Cost Recovery, both in terms of federal funding as well as in household circumstances involving Intact *and* Non-Intact Families. These changes will impact the operational revenue we have the ability to earn.

Why is this relevant? As you may recall, birth cost recovery is an important revenue source for child support agencies. Counties are reimbursed at the rate of 15% on birth cost collections with the remaining 85% returned to the DHS to reimburse Medicaid. To keep it simple, \$.15 on every dollar we collect is reimbursed to us to fund our program & services. And, again, we only assign to the adjudicated father up to half the regional HMO average the state expended on the birth. That amount is \$2,673 which is typically ordered in \$25/month repayments.

Last year, at budget, I informed the committee about a significant change in policy related to recovery. Midyear 2018, DCF 150.05(2)(a) was amended, establishing that the recovery of birth costs was inappropriate when the alleged father resides with the mother *and* their child in common (at the time paternity or support is established) and his income was used to support the HH. Subsequently, the department's 2019 budget projected a corresponding reduction in this revenue source. As expected, this inability has resulted in a reduction of revenue in 2019, and beyond.

Efforts to address the policy have been ongoing throughout 2019 and I'm happy to inform you that an Amended version of SB 350 is now working its way through the Senate and Assembly.

For the 2020 Budget, the Amendment to SB 350 is particularly relevant to child support funding as it addresses two issues:

- * Regardless of living arrangement: intact or non-intact HH status, child support will be able to recover birth costs from fathers UNLESS his income is below 150% of the FPL (\$18,210/single NCP). It's a win in one sense, and a limitation in another. Regardless it will continue to reduce child support reimbursement revenue in comparison to how it has previously been determined. Variance as to 'what extent' exists amongst CSA leadership across the state. Brown County is projecting 20% for 2020 although many other counties are budgeting for much higher losses, by percentage). My estimate is based upon the fact that existing debt will remain collectable however newly assigned debt will likely decrease. To what degree is not only a variable but an unknown contingent upon many economic factors.

- * **SB 350** also provides a temporary funding fix which is desperately needed based upon a recent federal announcement stating that birth cost expenses are no longer eligible to receive federal matching funds. This fix would hold counties harmless through the biennial year. BCS had also contemplated ways to ensure counties weren't negatively impacted by allocating state funds for this purpose if necessary.

Lastly, something not included but a 2020 challenge none the less...

Caseworkers have caseloads reaching 1200 cases/worker and that number is not expected to decrease. While, admittedly, specialization of duties has resulted in an increase in caseloads, typical caseload sizes in other counties are *less than half*. We have mitigated attrition for the time being, but managing workload, retaining staff & creating a workplace which demonstrates the value we place on the high caliber service provision they render is essential. I have been working with HR over the past few months and look forward to continuing to do so in an effort to identify and implement a progressive class/comp plan which applies to all staff in a fair & equitable way. My goal is to move staff not at **market to that point** and to also have an **incentivized plan to compensate outstanding performance incorporated into our evaluation process**. It would have been ideal to find a suitable means to use the increased GPR (\$58K) we were eligible to pull down based upon the increase in the biennial budget for this purpose. Throughout 2020, I'll continue to explore feasible options to accomplish this as retaining our valuable team members who are trained, dedicated and extremely competent at performing their duties is my number one priority for the upcoming year.

In conclusion, our 2020 budget is conservative as always, responsible, and apart for the aforementioned is largely status quo from 2019. I'm happy to address questions the committee has regarding any aspect of it as presented.

COUNTY CLERK

BROWN COUNTY

305 E. WALNUT STREET, ROOM 120
P.O. BOX 23600
GREEN BAY, WI 54305-3600

SANDRA L. JUNO
COUNTY CLERK

PHONE (920) 448-4021 FAX (920) 448-4498

juno_sl@co.brown.wi.us

2020 Budget Presentation
Oct. 10, 2019

I. A. New Initiatives. None

B. Capital Projects. None

C. Revenues

1. Levy trend

We were able to come in under the levy target of \$404,493 by over \$10,000. The projected total budget levy is \$393,895. Typically in a 4 election year, rates and fees need to be increased in order to offset increased costs and meet the levy target; however, we were able to achieve the levy goal while maintaining fees for the public.

2. State and Federal Aids (Intergovernmental)

We receive revenue from 24 municipalities and 12 school districts for election reimbursement costs. Eight municipalities are provided WisVote relier services on behalf of the County, so that portion of revenue will continue.

3. Other Grants – NONE

4. Rates and Fees

There will be no increase in County Clerk fees beside Federal postage fees and WisVote Relier fees.

5. Other - NONE

D. Expenses

1. Staffing

We are currently fully staffed with no intended staffing needs. Budget reflects the expected merging of Clerk and Board offices, with savings from the removal of the .4 Board Admin Assistant position.

2. Operations

Most of the 2020 operations and maintenance accounts increased from 2019 as a result of the budget year having 4 expected elections. Accounts particularly affected include supplies, printing, advertising, intra county expense copy center, and indirect costs. For those accounts that reflect an increase in expenses, factors include increasing costs for paper, ordering of ballot stock for fall and following year, ink cartridges, and attendance for election related meetings and training.

3. Chargebacks

The County Clerk's Office will have an increase in Intergovernmental Revenue as compared to 2019, due to 4 elections being held in 2020, offsetting some expenses. Additional ballot items such as municipal referenda could potentially increase this revenue as well.

4. Contracted Services – NONE

5. Outlay – NONE

In summary, the 2020 Budget (in comparison to the 2019 Budget) increase relates primarily to the absorption of the County Board staff and expenses, coupled with a 4 election cycle year versus a 2 election cycle year previously. Whenever possible, I look for ways to share costs with municipalities and school districts to help reduce the County levy.