

**MINUTES**  
**FAMILY PARTNERSHIP CARE MANAGEMENT COALITION**  
**7/5/06**

Attendees:

Columbia County: [X] Dennis Wittig	Dodge County [X] Kathryn Ryan [X] David Titus	Green Lake County [X] Linda Van Ness
Jefferson County [X] Tom Schleitwiler [X] Sue Torum	Juneau County [ ] Steve Ruff	Marquette County [ ] Carol Wright
Ozaukee County [ ] Robert Haupt [X] Frank Peterson	Sauk County [ ] Sue Hebel [X] William Orth	Sheboygan County [X] Joan Ketterman [ ] Ann Wndergem
Washington County [X] Michael Bloedorn	Waukesha County [ ] Jack Bodien [ ] Russ Kutz [X] Don Maurer	Waushara County [X] Glenn Johnson [ ] Jim Surprise
Community Care, Inc. [X] Paul F. Soczynski	Community Living Alliance [X] Todd Costello [X] David Sievert	Elder Care of WI [X] Ken Eimers [X] Wayne Hagenbuch
Lutheran Social Services [X] Ed Kohl [X] Elaine Reis	The Management Group [ ] Peter Tropman	

**CALL TO ORDER:**

The meeting was called to order at 9:30 by Project Manager Paul Soczynski.

- 1. Review agenda for the day.**
- 2. Humor for the day.**
- 3. Determine who is taking minutes – Linda Van Ness.**
- 4. Review potential models of governance and risk/reward sharing.**

Bill Orth, Sauk County, reported on the Governance Workgroup meeting held 6/29/06. The workgroup consists of Bill Orth, Sauk; Dave Titus, Dodge; David Sievert, Community Living Alliance; Todd Costello, Community Living Alliance; Ken Eimers, Elder Care of Wisconsin; Ed Kohl, LSS; Glenn Johnson, Waushara; and Paul Soczynski, Community Care, Inc.

The objectives of the workgroup were as follows:

1. Find the most flexible and effective ways to preserve county presence in the system while giving counties choices and options.
2. Find the most effective ways to forge a public-private partnership.
3. Find the most effective ways to forge a public-private partnership involving the Partnership Organizations.

Paul reviewed the 5 potential option discussed at the meeting. Discussion followed with the following additional questions raised:

- \* Do we know how county system costs compare to costs in the Partnerships?

A financial analysis to compare costs was suggested.

- \* How will the issue of risk be dealt with by individual counties?

Would counties bear risks equally?

- \* How would the partnerships deal with staffing issues? Would they be able to hire enough staff quickly enough to meet the needs?

- \* Could counties such as Kenosha and Racine opt back into the system at a future date?

- \* Will the state contract with a consortium if not a legal entity?

A 6<sup>th</sup> option (Option F) was distributed by Dennis Wittig, Columbia County and discussed.

Option F:

“The consortium forms a CMO and subcontracts with counties for staff to provide services. Further, the CMO would subcontract with a Partnership in each of the counties of the consortia to provide services to that require a higher level of medical intervention. (This would presume that there would be some form of Partnership available in all consortia counties.)

Description:

Counties would form a CMO to receive per capita funding for all eligible consumers in the consortia region. Upon eligibility determination, the CMO would subcontract with either a county (preferably the county of residence for the consumer) or a Partnership, depending on three elements. First, the degree of medical intervention; second, the location of the consumer; and third, the choice of the consumer.

If a consumer has a high level of medical intervention, where the partnership could access Medicare funding and the consumer agreed then the Partnership would handle the case. If the consumer had a low degree of medical intervention the county would handle the case if agreeable to the consumer.

The CMO would subcontract with either provider for the cost of the services, taking advantage

of any funding available from other sources, i.e., Medicare or private insurance. All counties in the consortium would share any risk.”

Discussion followed. Option F would require creation of a new legal entity vs. using an existing one. The entity would take on fiscal and administrative duties. It was noted that the option was similar to an early Eau Claire model that the State did not approve.

Following discussion, it was decided that all partners review the options for discussion at the July 19, 2006 FPCMC meeting. The need to narrow the number of options considered was discussed.

**5. Update on Contracting with TMG.**

Bill Orth, Sauk County, reported that he spoke to Peter Tropman who indicated that he will further refine his proposal and get this out to the partners for review. Peter identified 3 possible areas for consultation:

- Governance
- Local Impact analysis
- Communication

Peter proposed a revised cost range through EOY 2006 for \$42,655 to \$45,702 with an estimated 420-450 hours.

It was decided that it may be easier to decide how TMG could be most beneficial once a governance model is decided upon.

It was noted that some tasks could also be completed by the Project Manager and Workgroups.

**6. Consideration to form an Executive Council per the MOU to provider leadership to Paul Soczynski as the Project Manager and IMG or other consultants.**

Following discussion, it was decided that the Executive Council would be the same group as the Governance Committee with the addition of Carol Wright, Marquette County.

**7. Review Exhibit I – Requirements with Budget Considerations – Ed Kohl.**

It was decided that this will be discussed when the updated TMG proposal is received.

**8. Update by ADRC Workgroup.**

Sue Torum reported that members of the workgroup will be visiting existing ADRC’s in July:

Jefferson County	Portage County ADRC
Waukesha County & LSS	Kenosha County ADRC
Green Lake County	Richland County ADRC

**9. Update by Communication/Stakeholder Workgroup.**

Joan Ketterman gave a report on the 7/3/06 workgroup meeting.

A survey requesting input from counties regarding number of staff who would be attending was distributed with 8 counties responding and 141 staff anticipated to attend. A full day session was recommended with two weeks targeted – July 24-28, 2006 and August 21-25, 2006.

Dodge County was suggested as the training site as it is the most centrally located.

Objectives of the Educational Meeting were reviewed:

The overarching principle of the meeting is to emphasize the positives and the strengths that the Redesign can bring to the participants and the stakeholders.

1. Defining the issue that leads to a need to redesign
2. Overview of the process and timeline
  - a. Planning grant
  - b. RFP process for Implementation
3. What is available in Wisconsin now to build on?  
(The focus would be on Family Care and Partnership: the philosophy and values of the program; how does managed care work; choices for the participant)
  - a. Waivers
  - b. Family Care
  - c. Partnership
  - d. ADRC's
4. FAQ (NW-LTCO Frequently Asked Questions (Handout))
5. Who are the stakeholders in your county?
6. Who will volunteer for ad hoc committees?
7. Models
8. Websites

Some of these topics might need to be addressed through handouts.

Questions for our 7/5/06 FPCMC Meeting

1. Ideas for location. - Dodge County was discussed.
2. Some counties suggested including board members. What do you think? – It was decided that a different forum might be better.
3. Suggestions for presenters. – Family Care Counties.
4. Suggestions on handouts we would like to use.

**10. Report from Other Planning Consortia – None.**

The possibility of a monthly meeting where all the consortium Project Managers get together was discussed. It was suggested that State support staff assigned to the consortia also be included. Paul will contact Kathleen Luedke. Ken Eimers also offered to assist.

**11. Confirm next meeting dates.**

- a. July 19, 2006 (Paul will be absent – Dave Titus offered to run the meeting.)
- b. August 2, 2006

c. August 16, 2006

**12. Evaluate the meeting.**

**13. Adjourn.**

**Next meeting: July 19, 2006.**