

**AGING & DISABILITY RESOURCE CENTER OF THE NORTHWOODS  
BOARD OF DIRECTORS**

**Monday, October 24, 2016 – 1:00 P.M.**

**100 West Keenan Street, Rhinelander, WI 54451**

**Members Present:** Bix, Cushing, Hammer, Kortenhof, Kressin, Krug, Millan, Platner, Tuckwell

**Members Absent:** Gresser (excused), Price (excused), Troyk (excused). (NOTE: There are three vacancies on the Board of Directors.)

**Call to Order:** Chair Millan called the meeting to order at 1:00 P.M. Also present were Janell Schroeder, Regional Manager, Aging & Disability Resource Center of the Northwoods (ADRC-NW); Julie Boettge, ADRC-NW Eagle River Satellite Office; Terese Poe, Janet Weber, and Jody Jensen, ADRC-NW Crandon Satellite Office; Tammy Queen, Director, Forest County Department of Aging; Chuck Sekel, Director, Forest County Department of Social Services; Sue Breneman, Chair, Taylor County Commission on Aging; Nathanael Brown, Director, Taylor County Commission on Aging; Wendell Holt, Great Lakes Inter-Tribal Council; Angela Beauchaine, ADRC-NW Fiscal Agent; Mary Rideout, Director, Oneida County Department of Social Services; Chris and Pete McGeshick, Sokaogon Community – Mole Lake; Dianne Jacobson, Director, Oneida County Department of Aging; Sue Richmond, Director, Vilas County Commission on Aging; Erv Teichmiller, Vilas County Board; Sue Piazza, Oneida County Department of Aging; Sherry Schuelke, Office of Resource Center Development; Bob Mott, Oneida County Board; Jason Hilger, Vilas County Finance Director; Marge Saari and Carol Pederson, Oneida County Commission on Aging. Andy Phillips was also present via telephone.

**Public Comment & Introductions:** Introductions were made. Comments are listed in the “Questions & Concerns Expressed by Partners” section below.

**Approval of Agenda:** Cushing moved to approve the agenda with seven items; Bix seconded. All Ayes. Motion Carried.

**Questions & Concerns Expressed by Partners:**

**McGeshick:** *How does this change affect the Mole Lake Tribe?* Attorney Phillips says that all the employees currently employed by the counties or tribes will become employees of the ADRC-NW. The monies going to the tribes and counties for wages and benefits will stay with the ADRC-NW after the change. However, since that money is basically a pass-through, it will not affect the bottom lines of either the tribes or counties.

**Mott:** *Will the employees remain in the Wisconsin Retirement System after the changeover?* Attorney Phillips felt that the ADRC-NW is in the Wisconsin Retirement System (WRS) as the employer of the current ADRC-NW employees, and this will remain so. However, he will check again with WRS to make absolutely certain of this. *Can the counties continue to get the drawdown for the Elder Benefit Specialists?* Schuelke stated that there will be a contractual agreement between the counties and the ADRC-NW, and once that is in place the EBS drawdown will continue as it does now. Anne Olson, Office of Resource Center Development (ORCD), who is Schuelke’s immediate supervisor, has told Schroeder the same thing. *What will be the cost to Oneida County once the changeover is effected?* The supervisor portion of the monies paid to the counties would be eliminated because the ADRC-NW will be providing the supervision. This is about \$23,000 for Oneida County and \$21,000 for Vilas County. Millan stated that one of the reasons for the proposed change was the varying pay scales among the

various counties. This would eliminate that. Schroeder stated that with the proposed change everyone would be on the same wage matrix, some higher than others because of experience, longevity, and education.

**Brown:** *Regarding the wage scale.* This would result in a different wage scale between the county employees and the ADRC-NW employees who may be working side-by-side. He feels this could be a real problem.

**Schroeder:** The ADRC-NW needs consistent policies, supervision, and customer service throughout the district; and we do not have that now.

**Brown:** He does not feel we could work out the same policies and procedures throughout the district even if the ADRC-NW were the employer of record.

**Hammer:** *How are the other ADRCs in the state set up? What the best way for us?* Attorney Phillips only has anecdotal evidence from a number of counties that he has worked with. Some of them use the 66.03.01 organization. One county changed to having a lead county employ everyone. That option is not available to us because Oneida County will not be the employer-of-record for all the employees. Some of the other ADRCs have something similar to what we have now. However, working with Managed Care Organizations (MCOs), this has led to problems.

**Teichmiller:** Initially the ADRC Board talked about being the employer of all the ADRC Specialists and Disability Benefit Specialists (DBS). He stated that he believes the Board was told we could not use that model of employment, and that was why the ADRC-NW shifted to having the counties as the employers. Schuelke stated that was not the case. Since Taylor County chose not to employ the ADRC Specialists, we were obligated to employ those people. *Won't there be inequities if we pay people based on experience and education?* He feels that if there are inequities under the present system, the ADRC needs to work with each county to make adjustments to eliminate them. Schroeder stated that this has not worked in the past because the counties do not want people working in the same office area getting different rates of pay. *Can we get it in writing that the counties will be able to continue getting drawdown for their EBS workers?* Attorney Phillips feels that this is entirely possible. Teichmiller also stated that if Vilas County doesn't get the \$21,000 that they currently get for supervision, they will have a problem because they already have a deficit budget for 2017. *What will happen to the idea of integrating the ADRCs and the Aging Departments that the State has been encouraging?* He feels this would move the two entities farther apart. This is troubling because there is a very positive relationship between the two. Schroeder states that she has talked with the State people and Anne Olson of ORCD, and no one thinks this would be a problem.

**Jacobson:** She believes that all departments of aging will have to leave their counties and go with the ADRCs in order to effect integration if this change takes place.

**Mott:** The initial model was approved by the counties and tribes. *Does the new model have to be approved by them as well?* Attorney Phillips says that will not be necessary because this is just a modification of the employment relationship. This is not a model change. A relationship between the counties (and tribes) and the ADRC-NW will need to be established, and this can be done through a contract.

**McGeshick:** *Where are the administrative dollars going? Can we see the reasons for making the change in writing?* Schroeder says we will provide this information.

**Hammer:** *Can we get the long-term impact on the counties?*

**Teichmiller:** *Are you going to hold the employees who come over from the counties harmless for benefits they may have accrued?* This will have to be worked out when the time comes.

**McGeshick:** *What is your timeline?* Millan stated that we do not have a date certain for the changeover.

**McGeshick:** The tribal members are not going to be happy with having to get the services and providers replaced when this change takes place. Schroeder stated that that is what is happening now on a regular basis, and the situation will not change once the ADRC-NW becomes the employer-of-record.

**Sekel:** *Will there be a reduction in services to the counties with this change?* Schroeder stated that expenses are going up all the time, and that will always be a problem. Attorney Phillips has expressed the opinion that if we have more centralized control over expenses, we would be better able to continue to provide sustainable, consistent services to our customers.

**Teichmiller:** When I was on the Board, we asked for a county time study to determine what the cost for services would be. If the ADRC makes this change, we (the counties) may have to charge more. We might be providing free services to the ADRC, and that would have to stop if this change goes into effect. *Are you looking at the financial impact for the ADRC over the long run and not just for the counties.* Schroeder stated that we are looking at the long-term budget ramifications for the ADRC, and that is one of the driving forces for the change proposed.

**Sherry:** The State is concerned about what is in the AMSO (Agency Management Support Overhead) line item; they want more information.

**Jacobson:** She believes only one county uses AMSO in its budget; the others do not. (NOTE: One county uses AMSO, but also one tribe.)

**Holt:** The tribes don't use AMSO; instead, they use indirect costs. This could have a different impact on each of the partners.

**Krug:** We want more consistency throughout the district and are working on getting it. One issue is rent. Taylor County charges on a square footage basis, but the other counties charge differently for rent.

**Andy:** State Statutes give us certain powers, and we are not exceeding them. We are not changing the model, just the internal structure.

**Jacobson:** It took us 2½ years to get this organization put together, and she doesn't believe we should change it. We took our time to make it work, and now everybody is working to make this as good as it can be.

**Cushing:** He was not part of the initial study group that worked on this. However, he has been on the ADRC-NW Board of Directors since its inception. Rumors are flying around, and we need to get answers to all your questions to dispel the rumors. He is not in favor of anything that diminishes our services to our customers. We will only proceed if we feel this is in the best interests of our customers.

**Mott:** *Will the decision on this issue be made on November 11, 2016?* He does not think that all the questions can be worked out by the date. He would appreciate answers in writing so everyone can look them over.

**Brown:** Taylor County does not get the drawdown for the EBS. He would certainly not want to see more counties in his situation where they want to do more for their customers but cannot because of the lack of funds from the EBS drawdown.

**Cushing:** In any change, there will be winners and there will be losers. If the goal is to provide better service for our customers, and this change does that, then we have to make the change. We have to have passion for our people.

**Millan:** We are looking for input from you, our partners. Our main concern is how much funding we can put into service for our customers.

**Holt:** He thinks the 16-month withdrawal provision listed in the ADRC-NW bylaws may be onerous for some. Maybe we could change this also. Schroeder stated that we will consider that.

**ADRC Employer-of-Record Structure:** Attorney Phillips gave a brief history of the ADRC-NW. It was organized as a Long-Term Care District and is a completely separate entity from the counties and tribes. A 66.03.01 organization is an entity of the partner counties and tribes. The ADRC-NW elected not to go that route. At this time, the ADRC-NW Board of Directors is considering consolidating the employment relationship throughout the district. The ADRC as a long-term care district can employ all the employees, but a 66.03.01 cannot. The Board hopes to make its decision on November 11, 2016 and is looking for all the questions and concerns that the partners have. Then the questions and concerns can be answered immediately or researched if necessary.

**2016 Carryover Funding/LTE Request:** This item was not addressed.

**Economic Impact:** Discussion of this item was included in the section "Questions & Concerns Expressed By Partners" above.

**Adjournment:** With no further business, Cushing moved to adjourn; Hammer seconded. All Ayes. The meeting was adjourned at 2:13 P.M.

**Handouts:** There were none.