

**LONG TERM CARE REDESIGN MEETING
MINUTES
Wednesday, November 15, 2006**

The following minutes are from the LTC Redesign meeting, held at Dodge County DH&HS. The meeting was called to order at 9:30 a.m. by Paul Soczynski, of Community Care, Inc. Minutes were taken by Gretchen Halvorsen, Columbia County DH&HS

Present:

Attendees:

Columbia County:

- Sandra Roberts
- Dennis Wittig
- Cathy Karlo

Dodge County

- Kathryn Ryan
- David Titus
- Gary Galbraith

Green Lake County

- Linda Van Ness
- Suzi Giesen

Jefferson County

- Tom Schleitwiler
- Sue Torum
- Dan Gebuner

Marquette County

- Carol Wright
- Molli Huling
- Sylvia Phillis

Ozaukee County

- Robert Haupt
- Frank Peterson
- Anne Conners

Sauk County

- Sue Hebel
- William Orth
- Dan Brattset

Sheboygan County

- Joan Ketterman
- Ann Wondergem

Walworth County

- Lori Muzatko
- Etty Wilberding

Washington County

- Michael Bloedorn
- Jim Strachota
- Mary Knoeck

Waukesha County

- Jack Bodien
- Russ Kutz
- Don Maurer
- Peter Schuler
- Mary Smith

Waushara County

- Glenn Johnson
- Jim Surprise
- Kate Surprise
- John Timmerman

Community Care, Inc.

- Paul F. Soczynski

Community Living Alliance

- Todd Costello
- David Sievert

Elder Care of WI

- Ken Eimers
- Wayne Hagenbuch
- Craig DuPont

Lutheran Social Services

- Ed Kohl
- Elaine Reis

The Management Group

- Peter Tropman

DHFS

- Gail Propsom
- Secretary Nelson
- Judith Frye
- Diane Waller

SEWAAA

- John Schnabl

ARC of Columbia

- Anita Ostergard
- Jim Hoegemeier

County Creatonomy

- Priya Barnes

Solaris Management

- Michael Schumacker
- Michelle Jetzer

Citizens

- Ken Ramming

ARC of Columbia Co.

- Anita Ostergard

Rainbow Hospice Care:

- Karen Locke Carrig

1. Approval of Minutes

Minutes from the Wednesday, November 8, 2006 meeting were reviewed and approved. Motion: Haupt/Kohl to approve the minutes. Carried.

2. Public Comments

None.

3. Proposal to have professional minutes taken at each meeting

Dodge County DH&HS Director Dave Titus reported that no one has yet been identified. He is hoping to have someone in place by the next meeting, scheduled for December 6, 2006. The group discussed whether or not the services should be paid for out of the grant money. No decision was made. There will be no charge for today's services.

4. Update from Wisconsin Counties Association's (WCA) Meeting of 11/9/06

Those present expressed that the meeting was beneficial. Directors felt that their boards gained a level of understanding about the redesign topic. It was felt that additional education will be necessary in order for county boards to decide whether or not to operate in a consortium or "go it alone". Those in attendance were reminded that WCA has pledged to visit and present to individual county boards in order to help them understand all the issues around the redesign concept. It was felt that WCA should be contacted in order to proceed with meetings with the counties.

5. Review of Governance Recommendation Document and Flowchart

Paul Soczynski distributed a flowchart, fleshing out the ideas listed with the Governance Recommendation Document, for review. It was agreed upon that a FPCI foundation model was favorable. The flowchart shows 3 clusters of providers and counties, with a FPCMC Care Management Steering Committee as oversight. The idea behind the model is to allow counties and providers to belong to any of the clusters, thereby allowing for consumer choice, flexibility, quality control, and the sharing of resources and ideas. CCI, Elder Care, and CLA would be the CMOs for the clusters and/or Family Care counties, and the model would allow for counties to contract back separately if necessary. The idea of belonging to more than one cluster needs to be discussed further.

Ed Kohl, from Lutheran Social Services (LSS) expressed that they are interested in providing services, not repeating them. LSS feels that they have a good working history with counties so that they will be able to fill in the gaps.

The group discussed the need to provide choice in rural counties, just as it would be provided in more metropolitan areas. Other areas of concern expressed were:

- * the group needs to talk through the idea that counties can't just take their money and walk away;
- * need to verify that Family Care counties can be involved without additional changes to current legislation;
- * balancing the level of influence of providers vs. risk potential vs. what's allowable by statute, and trying to minimize the risk knowing that some is unavoidable;
- * does cluster arrangement create multiple rates; are regions the same but each county different; and how do we keep the rate methodology the same though it might be impacted by different regions;

* must demonstrate to the State that the model assures a basic level of service, assures oversight, assures that the entities involved have managed care experience, and to remind the State that counties have always shared a level of risk

LONG TERM CARE REDESIGN MEETING

November 15, 2006 Page 3.

The group walked through a hypothetical contract situation, to discuss different levels of risk and how a subcapitated rate would work, keeping in mind that any rate must be set weighing fairness, accountability, and administrative costs. The group discussed the level of risk associated with networking services and case management vs. just case management. The group also discussed the value of customer satisfaction from the client knowing his/her social worker and having intimate knowledge of the community and services available.

Decision: The group agreed on the flowchart model and Governance Recommendation Document as presented, and recommended that the group meeting later in the day with Craig Thompson from WCA, proceed with fleshing out the details of this plan, along with the plan from last week, in order to determine the best choice for the group. The group agreed that time is of the essence in making decisions, moving ahead, planning and scheduling of whichever plan has the most merit. Secretary Nelson can then be updated on the progress of the group. The group was reminded that a base RFP is already available to work with and that ADRC applications for the region can then go out right away.

6. Update on Communication/Stakeholder Workgroup

Joan Ketterman reported that Elder Care has agreed to host the website. The site is being designed by Webstix and the cost of the site is estimated at \$8,000-\$9,000. Joan indicated that it was her understanding that the cost of the website would be paid for by the grant. Motion: Van Ness/Orth to approve the cost of the website, up to \$9,000 by Webstix. Carried. Ken Eimers, Elder Care of WI abstained.

Joan also reported that the group is still working to develop the philosophy of the message on the website. Joan will bring a draft to the next meeting for review and approval. The workgroup has also developed several surveys, one being an inventory survey, and the second is a training survey, which counties should receive in the mail. She asked that each county compile the answers and return one survey.

7. Update on the IT Workgroup

Ken Eimers announced that the group is on track with their project. Minutes for their last meeting will be sent out today or tomorrow. Ken reported that resources to the ADRCs was part of the discussion in their last meeting.

8. Public Comment: Karen, from Rainbow Hospice, was present to observe the meeting. She announced that her agency has had experience with Family Care counties.

9. The next meeting of the FPCMC Planning Committee will be held on Wednesday, December 6, 2006.

10. Meeting adjourned at 11:50 am