

**PROCEEDINGS OF THE BROWN COUNTY**  
**HUMAN SERVICES COMMITTEE**

Pursuant to Section 19.84 Wis. Stats., a regular meeting of the **Brown County Human Services Committee** was held on Wednesday, May 28, 2014 in Room 200 of the Northern Building, 305 E. Walnut Street, Green Bay, Wisconsin.

---

---

**Present:** Chair Evans, Supervisor La Violette, Supervisor Hoyer, Supervisor Haefs

**Excused:** Supervisor Robinson

**Also Present:** Barb Natelle, Dale Schmit, Chad Weininger, Tim Schmitt, Dani Young, Rob Gollman, Judy Friederichs, Jeremy Kral, Nancy Fennema

---

---

**I. Call Meeting to Order.**

The meeting was called to order by Chair Pat Evans at 5:31 p.m.

**II. Approve/Modify Agenda.**

**Motion made by Supervisor La Violette, seconded by Supervisor Hoyer to approve. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

**III. Approve/Modify Minutes of April 30, 2014.**

**Motion made by Supervisor Hoyer, seconded by Supervisor La Violette to approve. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

**Comments from the Public.** None.

**Report from Human Services Chair, Patrick Evans.** None.

**1. Review Minutes of:**

- a. **Aging & Disability Resource Center Board Meeting (April 24, 2014).**
- b. **Aging & Disability Resource Center Nominations and Human Resource Committee (April 22, 2014).**
- c. **Children With Disabilities Education Board (April 29, 2014 and May 14, 2014 – Special).**
- d. **Human Services Board (May 8, 2014).**
- e. **Veterans Recognition Subcommittee (April 15, 2014).**

**Motion made by Supervisor Hoyer, seconded by Supervisor Haefs to suspend the rules and take Items 1 a – e together. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

**Motion made by Supervisor Hoyer, seconded by Supervisor Haefs to receive and place on file Items 1 a – e. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

**Syble Hopp School**

**2. Syble Hopp School 2014-2015 Budget.**

Syble Hopp School Administrator Barb Natelle informed the Committee that Sybil Hopp's budget year is from July 1 through June 30. This allows the school to get summer maintenance issues budgeted for and completed and also allows staff to be lined up so they are set to go when school starts in the fall.

Natelle continued that things are going very well at Syble Hopp. The student population has changed dramatically over the years and they are seeing more children with more extensive needs as well as different types of syndromes. They deal with children who suffer all the way from seizure disorders to brilliancy. She encouraged Committee members to visit the school at any time. Evans also encouraged the Committee to

visit the school if they have not already done so as the school and their staff is very impressive. Supervisor La Violette thanked Natelle for all of the work she does for the students and their families.

Supervisor Haefs brought up the subject of the pay raises that were authorized in the last budget. He is concerned that the employees are treated well and that these merit raises be given to the employees. Natelle responded that there was a 2% merit pay increase built into the budget, but she noted that not everyone will get the full 2%. There is a criteria as to how the merit pay is allocated based on how an employee produces and performs. Haefs continued that it seemed like none of the other departments know if the merit raises are being given and he was happy to hear that Syble Hopp had a method in place to decide and disburse the raises. He did note, however, that the system for giving the merit raises seems to be very subjective and he felt that if someone was deemed to be not eligible for the merit raise based on their job performance, they probably should not be in the job. La Violette thanked Haefs for bringing up the issue of merit raises and echoed what he said with regard to an employee who was not deemed to be eligible for a merit raise. Haefs also asked Natelle if her budget included a raise for herself and Natelle indicated that it did not but she thanked him for his concern in this regard.

**Motion made by Supervisor La Violette, seconded by Supervisor Hoyer to approve the Sybil Hopp budget. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

### Health Department

3. **Discussion and approval of First Amendment to Lease between Brown County and First Merit Bank, NA to Kim P. Kramer.**

Health Department Director Judy Friederichs indicated that this lease is for their current building. Evans stated that he had heard that the Planning, Development and Transportation Committee was looking at options for a different location for the Health Department. Friederichs indicated that the lease being discussed at this time has a 30 day opt out provision.

Evans asked Friederichs what she liked about their current location. Friederichs responded that she likes the location as it seems to be very accessible for their clients. She also felt that the building has a good layout that works well for their needs as well as the needs of the partners they serve that come to the building. Friederichs acknowledged that she is aware that PD & T is looking at another building and also acknowledged that the building they are in now is an older building and with that comes some flaws. The concern Friederichs has with regard to relocating is that if PD & T is looking at renting something on only a short-term basis, it would be very disruptive to go through the moving process only to have to move again when a short-term lease was up. For that reason Friederichs would rather stay where they are as their current location works for them.

Haefs asked Friederichs when she felt a department head should be in attendance at a County Board meeting. He indicated that at the last meeting there were some good conversations on a few different issues but there were not many department heads in attendance. Friederichs indicated that she would always be at the meetings when she has agenda items.

**Motion made by Supervisor La Violette, seconded by Supervisor Haefs to approve. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

4. **Discussion re: Mileage reimbursement rate for sanitarians.**

Public Health Sanitarian Dale Schmit provided the Committee with mileage information, a copy of which is attached. Schmit went over the handout with the Committee and explained his thought process. He indicated that the group of sanitarians had asked him to attend this meeting and speak for all of them and Schmit thanked Evans for getting this on the agenda.

The first section of the information Schmit provided shows a breakdown of the financial impact between the IRS mileage rate and the County mileage rate for each inspector. The second part of the handout includes

what several other counties similar in size to Brown County pay their employees for mileage. The third section outlines internal comparables while the fourth portion is a description of Chapter 3 which relates to out-of-county travel. Finally, the fifth section of the handout contains information on claiming mileage on personal tax returns.

Schmit continued that in terms of the mileage for 2013 shown on the table he provided, his mileage was lower than the others because his area is more compact and he does not have to travel as far as some of the other inspectors do. He also noted that all of the license fees that have been set are in part based on the IRS mileage rate which can fluctuate from year to year and he noted that their license fees remain constant. Further, he noted that the Health Department has one inspector position vacant and he felt that salary savings from that open position could be used to pay the remaining inspectors the full IRS rate for mileage.

Schmit stated that the Health Department employees are just looking to be treated equally to other employees who receive 100% of the IRS rate. He also noted that Human Resources Director Brent Miller had called him before the County Board meeting and asked about other departments that need to travel. Schmit advised Miller the Human Services as well as Zoning travel in their jobs but noted that these departments have the use of County vehicles for their travel. Schmit stated that the Health Department would not be opposed to having the use of County vehicles when traveling and this may be another way to handle this situation.

Schmit continued that Chapter 3 pertains to out-of-county travel, however, all of the travel that the sanitarians do is within the County. The other thing that people seem to be focusing on in Schmit's opinion is the use of the word "optimal" which should really be "optional". The second point is when it talks about the option in the IRS policy, it says that if you choose not to use the IRS rate, that is your option, but then you would have to calculate the repair, wear and tear, insurance and proportionate cost of gas.

Next Schmit addressed the issue of claiming mileage on personal tax returns. He explained that the only way you can get the taxes back is by exceeding 2% of the gross income which would be approximately \$1,200 per inspector and this is unlikely.

What Schmit is proposing is that the inspectors be paid 100% of the IRS rate until a decision is made as to them using County vehicles for their work and also that they be treated the same as other internals that have inspectors using County vehicles. He would also like to see Health Department employees treated comparably to other departments that have contracts and/or comparably to what is being done in other area counties. He would also like to see revisions made to Chapter 3 to make it more of a sound policy and lastly he would like to clear up the misconception of some of the supervisors regarding claiming mileage on personal taxes. Schmit also felt it was important to point out that they have had a lot of turnover in inspectors and he felt that this mileage issue is a factor in employee retention.

Director of Administration Chad Weininger was aware that Brent Miller has been working at addressing this situation. He noted that it has been the position of the County Board to pay 80% of the IRS rate. At this time they are looking at the possibility of inspectors using County vehicles to make their calls which may save money in the long run. Evans asked if there was a timeline for this and Weininger responded that they would try to put something in the 2015 budget. Weininger continued that everyone in the County is paid 80% of the IRS rate with the exception of those under contract.

La Violette asked what other departments ask their employees to use their personal vehicles for County business. Weininger said he would be happy to look this information up and provide it at the next meeting. Evans also asked if Weininger could provide a breakdown of what expenses each department incurs for mileage.

Evans stated that he appreciates what the sanitarians and inspectors do and the amount of the difference for 2013 is less than \$1,800 and he felt that the County should be able to absorb this. He does agree with Schmit in that he felt that Brown County should be comparable with other counties and he would like to support giving the inspectors an increase but he would also like to see the information requested above before any

decisions are made. Evans further noted that there are a number of private organizations that do not pay their employees anything to use their own vehicles for business purposes.

Haefs understood that the Sheriff's Department pays their mileage differently than the rest of the County because it is negotiated through their contract; however, he wants to be sure that the rates charged for the rest of the County are done correctly and not just for the sanitarians. He asked if this Committee could make a recommendation for the County for all departments and if this should be referred to the Executive Committee. Evans responded that this Committee would look at all departments that fall under its purview and look at it all encompassing. This would then go to the Administration Committee and then on to the Executive Committee before going to the full County Board.

**Motion made by Supervisor La Violette, seconded by Supervisor Haefs to have information brought back to this Committee at the next meeting and that this item be put on the Administration Committee agenda.**

**Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

#### **Human Services Department**

5. **Resolution re: On helping families move from homelessness to self-sufficiency. *Motion at April meeting: Hold for one month.***

**Motion made by Supervisor Hoyer, seconded by Supervisor La Violette to hold for one month. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

6. **Resolution re: Change in Table of Organization for the Human Services Department Social Worker/Case Manager.**

**Motion made by Supervisor La Violette, seconded by Supervisor Hoyer to approve. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

7. **Budget Adjustment Request (14-49): Reallocation of up to 10% of the originally appropriated funds between any levels of appropriation (based on lesser of originally appropriated amounts).**

**Motion made by Supervisor La Violette, seconded by Supervisor Hoyer to approve. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

8. **Executive Director's Report.**

Human Services Director Jeremy Kral provided a Director's Report in the agenda packet. Haefs asked Kral how many County Board meetings he attends and Kral responded that he makes a point of attending all of them. Haefs indicated that he appreciated that as he does not believe it is good practice for department heads to not attend the Board meetings.

**Motion made by Supervisor La Violette, seconded by Supervisor Haefs to receive and place on file. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

9. **Detox Update. *Motion at April meeting: To keep this item as an agenda item until some resolution is met.***

Kral indicated that he had spoken with Supervisor Robinson on this issue and they agreed that they would bring this forward again at the next meeting.

**Motion made by Supervisor Hoyer, seconded by Supervisor La Violette to hold for one month. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

10. **Approval to publish RFP for Human Services Enterprise Software – Project 1841.**

Technology Services Project Manager Dani Young stated that she will be managing this project. It is a project intended to replace an aging software platform in all of Human Services except the CTC as they replaced their software several years ago. This update will allow Technology Services to stop supporting and maintaining a system that is no longer well supported and will also allow streamlining of some of the functions.

**Motion made by Supervisor La Violette, seconded by Supervisor Hoyer to approve. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

11. **Financial Report for Community Treatment Center and Community Programs.**

Finance Manager Tim Schmitt provided a financial report in the agenda packet. The report included figures through March 31, 2014 and Schmitt noted that there are no anomalies or other concerns at this time; however, he noted that it is still early in the year.

**Motion made by Supervisor Hoyer, seconded by Supervisor La Violette to receive and place on file. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

12. **Statistical Reports.**

- a. **Monthly CTC Data – Bay Haven Crisis Diversion/Nicolet Psychiatric Hospital.**
- b. **Monthly Inpatient Data – Bellin Psychiatric Center.**
- c. **Child Protection – Child Abuse/Neglect Report.**
- d. **Monthly Contract Update.**

**Motion made by Supervisor La Violette, seconded by Supervisor Hoyer to receive and place on file Items 12 a – d. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

13. **Request for New Non-Continuous Vendor.**

**Motion made by Supervisor La Violette, seconded by Supervisor Haefs to approve. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

14. **Request for New Vendor Contract.**

**Motion made by Supervisor Hoyer, seconded by Supervisor La Violette to approve. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

**Aging & Disability Resource – No agenda items.**

**Veterans Services – No agenda items.**

**Other**

15. **Audit of bills.**

**Motion made by Supervisor Haefs, seconded by Supervisor Hoyer to pay the bills. Vote taken. MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

16. **Such other Matters as Authorized by Law.**

Haefs indicated that at last month's meeting he requested information as to how the 1% merit pay that was authorized by the County Board was being disbursed, however, this was not on the agenda nor was it addressed at this meeting. He felt an update was in order. Kral noted that he did have information on this with him. Weinger indicated that this issue would also be discussed at the Administration Committee meeting on May 29. The presentation at Admin will include guidelines for implementing the 1% and will outline what each department's needs to do in order to go through the process. The discussion will include

things such as working with employees to have buy in on the proposal as well as putting plans in place for improvement for employees who do not receive the full merit. After the framework is laid the merit pay will start to be implemented. One department will go early as a test and then the rest of the departments will follow and the merit pay will be disbursed to employees in a lump sum in the October and November timeframe. The payments will be handled as an additional payroll and each employee will have their supervisors sit down with them and go over performance. Weininger noted that this process is not to be intended as punitive, but rather as a way to help each department achieve their goals and reward their employees for achieving these goals.

Kral added that research on retention shows that once you pay your employees adequately for the work they perform, what is important next is to provide valuable recognition and show that the work the employees do is appreciated.

La Violette stated that she has never really been a proponent of merit raises. She felt like employees should be paid for the work they do at a fair rate. She wondered if anyone has ever done a cost benefit analysis of what it truly costs to put systems such as this in place as she knows that it will cost dollars to implement the merit pay system. She is also very cognizant of not making more work for department heads.

Hoyer felt that we were looking at things that fall within the overall goals of the departments, however, there is sort of an intangible benefit from that and we are buying into the process. He felt that this was not something that was necessarily quantifiable but ultimately would result in more effective employees and once the system is set up there will not be much of a cost to maintaining the system.

Haefs stated he was glad this was being thought out and worked on as until this meeting he was not aware of what was being done for the employees. He felt that in an organization such as Brown County to slight someone causes problems. He felt that all employees should probably receive some part of the merit pay and if the department heads did not feel that an employee deserved it, he felt that the employee should not be employed at Brown County.

La Violette indicated that what bothers her about merit raises within government is that unlike the private sector, government employees' wages are public and therefore it would be easy to see which department heads are excelling and receive the merit pay and which ones are not. She is a supporter of team building and morale building and wanted to make sure that this new system does not make any employees feel badly.

**Motion made by Supervisor Hoyer, seconded by Supervisor La Violette to adjourn at 6:32 p.m. Vote taken.**  
**MOTION CARRIED UNANIMOUSLY**

Respectfully submitted,

Therese Giannunzio  
Recording Secretary

- 3) Financial impact request involved other Brown County Departments mileage paid to employees.
  - a. See February 19, 2014 County Board of Supervisor's minutes for approved Sheriff's Department Contract mileage language.
  - b. Financial impact study for other Brown County departments. Examples: Zoning-provided vehicles; Human Services-mileage &/or vehicles provided.
- 4) Review Brown County Code of Ordinances Chapter 3: County Administration.
  - a. Section 3.11 title "Out of County Travel"
    - i. Daily mileage for work is "In the County"
    - ii. When travel out of county policy is to use county vehicle unless reserved by different department.
  - b. Section 3.11(3)(g)2. states "optimal" is incorrect based on IRS language.
    - i. IRS terminology, where chapter 3 ordinance language derived, states optional.
    - ii. If choose to exercise option of not using IRS rate, then shall use specified formula to calculate actual cost of vehicle use.
    - iii. Specified formula developed by Private/Independent Contractor.
- 5) Claiming as refund on personal taxes
  - a. Only allowed to receive refund of taxes paid on the amount of money spent on gas for work usage miles.
  - b. The amount of money spent on gas for work usage miles claimed shall exceed 2% of total income to claim/receive refund described in point a.
  - c. As an example the financial information table above, for the first inspector difference of 20% below IRS rate of \$266. In order to exceed the 2% of total income one would have to exceed \$1,160.00/year. Thus, the \$266 does not exceed the \$1,160.00/year. If did exceed and a person fell in the 10% tax bracket, the amount would be \$2.66/year taxes paid to be credited or refunded. As apparent, this does not amount to the \$266/year that county supervisors may be under the impression the IRS will refund inspectors for unpaid IRS rate mileage (20%), even if able to be claimed.

## Mileage Information

1) Financial impact information request.

<u>Inspector</u>	<u>2013 Mileage Total</u>	<u>IRS Rate</u>	<u>80% IRS Rate</u>	<u>Difference (\$)</u>
Schmit :	2,360 miles	\$1,333.47	\$1,066.73	-\$266.74
Adams:	3,423 miles	\$1,917.08	\$1,533.67	-\$383.41
Bladow:	3,008 miles	\$1,684.00	\$1,354.00	-\$330.00
Kratcha:	3,143 miles	\$1,776.00	\$1, 420.00	-\$356.00
<u>Hodgins:</u>	<u>3,902 miles</u>	<u>\$2,204.63</u>	<u>\$1,763.70</u>	<u>-\$440.93</u>
Total:	15,836 miles	\$8,915.18	\$7,138.10	-\$1,777.08

2) What are other counties paying for employee mileage?

a. Outagamie → see below

Outagamie County Administrative Rule 04-01 states the county mileage reimbursement rate will be 56.0 cents per mile effective for all mileage beginning January 1, 2014. Not available on website. Contact: Natalie Vandeveld, Environmental Health Supervisor. Email: Natalie.Vandeveld@outagamie.org

b. Manitowoc → see below

Manitowoc County employee policy manual states \$0.56 per mile, the IRS rate is used for reimbursement. Not available on website. Contact: Jessica Wanserski, Environmental Health Supervisor. Email: jessicawanserski@co.manitowoc.wi.us

c. Winnebago → see below

Reimbursed at IRS rate of \$0.56 per mile. Environmental supervisor stated policy but not aware of where in county policy. Not available on website. Contact: Ann Boyce, Environmental Health Supervisor. Email: aboyce@co.winnebago.wi.us

d. Marathon → see below

[http://www.co.marathon.wi.us/Portals/0/Departments/PER/Documents/PP\\_Chap6.pdf](http://www.co.marathon.wi.us/Portals/0/Departments/PER/Documents/PP_Chap6.pdf)

Reimbursed at IRS rate of \$0.56 per mile.