

**FAMILY PARTNERSHIP CARE MANAGEMENT COALITION  
MINUTES AUGUST 2, 2006**

**Present:**

Attendees:

Columbia County:  
 Sandra Roberts  
 Dennis Wittig

Dodge County  
 Kathryn Ryan  
 David Titus

Green Lake County  
 Linda Van Ness

Jefferson County  
 Tom Schleitwiler  
 Sue Torum

Marquette County  
 Carol Wright

Ozaukee County  
 Robert Haupt  
 Frank Peterson

Sauk County  
 Sue Hebel  
 William Orth

Sheboygan County  
 Joan Ketterman  
 Ann Wndergem

Walworth County  
 Lori Muzatko

Washington County  
 Michael Bloedorn  
 Jim Strachota

Waukesha County  
 Jack Bodien  
 Russ Kutz  
 Don Maurer

Waushara County  
 Glenn Johnson  
 Jim Surprise

Community Care, Inc.  
 Paul F. Soczynski

Community Living Alliance  
 Todd Costello  
 David Sievert

Elder Care of WI  
 Ken Eimers  
 Wayne Hagenbuch

Lutheran Social Services  
 Ed Kohl  
 Elaine Reis

The Management Group  
 Peter Tropman

DHFS  
 Gail Propsom

**Report from last meeting on guiding principles** After discussion there was group consensus that the guiding principles as written by Dave Titus represent our values and how we intend to govern FPCMO. The principles also provide a clear statement of our operating principles for the State.

**Review Potential Organizational Models** Paul provided a handout in diagram form, "Family Partnership Care Management Organization Public/Private Model". The model begins to describe how our governance would work with the Partnerships, and potentially LSS, as our lead entity, and what the various functions of a Family Partnership Care Management Organization would be. On the governance piece more discussion and detailing is needed to describe:

- Level(s) of county participation in terms of financial risk/gain and what this means in a governance structure. How can this be demonstrated on the model diagram?
- LSS participation in lead functions
- Relationships between/among Partnerships as lead entity

Ken pointed out that what is desired in terms of the Partnerships is figuring out how all of the Partnerships can function in a non-competitive environment, while covering all population target groups, in providing acute/primary and long term care. Group members are asked to continue to think about our governance structure and provide additional feedback to Paul. With regard to the CMO functional piece the following points were discussed or raised:

- Can counties opt to participate in Long Term Care but not Primary and Acute Medical? Titus replies yes. It was also pointed out that the primary savings will come from acute and primary and that this will financially support LTC.

- What Partnership(s) serve particular regional or county areas?
- Choice and consumer self directed care issues will be significant. Family Care and Partnership needs to be available region wide.

Gail Propsom indicated that the State is currently working on the renewal process for the Partnership Programs, which takes advantage of Medicare dollars. She also indicated that the State can, will? determine capitated rates for the Partnerships and Family Care.

The Governance Committee will meet with the Partnerships to continue discussion on discussion of shared risk models and relationships among the Partnerships in terms of lead entity functions.

**WCHSA Report from DHFS Meeting regarding County tax levy** Ann Wondergem referenced a draft document which was e-mailed to members, “Draft: CY 05 Preliminary County Obligation for the Long Term Care Redesigned Managed Care System”. The chart provides a DHFS long term care cost estimation for each county base on 2005 expenditures. This is regarded as a “best guess” at this point and does not take into account county changes in 2006 or 2007 budgets. Questions that need discussion include:

- How to counties differing philosophies in terms of amount of overmatch in the current system get reflected in a consistent statewide county contribution methodology?
- What are the possibilities for counties in terms of negotiations with the state? What dollars are used for the county contribution? Community aides, tax levy, what combinations?
- What do county departments look like, what dollars do we have to work with to support other programs after LTS dollars are out of our budgets?

The State is working on describing models to address these questions in future meetings. The questions of how to handle counties that opt out, how to unbundled Community Aides, and how to handle counties with disproportionate contributions will be addressed.

**Update on ADRC** Tom Schleitwiler reported that Aging Directors are needed at the ADRC meetings. This is essential as Aging Units are preparing 2007 Plans which must include plans for ADRC operations. The next scheduled meetings are August 22 and September 12, both in Juneau from 9-11AM. Several groups have now toured functioning ADRCs are will discuss observations and implications for our partnership. It is clear that some functions or operations can be planned on a region-wide basis, IT and marketing for example. Under that concept Counties should be thinking about partnering in smaller configurations, and then finally each county needs to be thinking about what linkages, partner, program, provider, integrations that can be done in single or multiple county locations. The ADRC group will outline this for the larger group.

**Review of Project Director’s Quarterly Report** Paul Soczynski reported that the report is due August 15. Group members approved the report in its current form by consensus. Members who have any suggestions for changes should contact Paul prior to August 15.

**Update on Contracting with TMG and Status Report on Invoices** Group consensus at this point remains that a long term contract with a monthly fee retaining TMG is not needed. Peter Tropman has indicated by e-mail to Paul that TMG remains a partner in FPCMC. Several members indicated that there are avenues to pursue in obtaining financial data including the State, Family Care County experience such as Richland, and internal group resources, the Partnerships. Members are comfortable with pursuing these options as opposed to spending our grant funds and local match on consultation.

Ed Kohl reported that county invoices have been mailed, no revenues received as of yet.

**Update for Communications/Stakeholder Workgroup** Joan Ketterman reported the following:

- Overall positive comments were received from attendees
- More input is needed in the future on what information to provide as to what county jobs and functions may look like in the future. Group consensus on this point is that this is very hard to predict at this point and honest focus on the system changes we are working on and describing possibilities is the best that can be done right now.
- Staff appreciated getting an understanding of the Partnerships and how they have operated.

The next step is planning for County Board, Human Services Board information. Discussion points included:

- Our plans need to be synchronized with informational work currently being done by Wisconsin Counties Association. Information needs to be consistent. Any partners who have developed or know of Board information that has been developed should provide this to the Communications Group by October. WCA is planning a session on this at the September conference.
- By the first quarter of 2007 we will need to have our governance structure completed.
- Paul suggested that the group consider using a consultant, who would develop a comprehensive informational program and provide this for our Boards, and potentially other groups including consumers. Group consensus was in favor of looking into this. Gail Propsom offered to forward some information on this to the group.

A concern was raised as to how to plan for consumers who may wish to attend our planning meetings. Elaine Reiss suggested a ‘public comment’ item be added to our agendas for this purpose. Another possibility would be to link our planning information to existing County Government web sites. Dave Sievert will forward a link as an example. Paul noted that information that is provided needs to be consistent across sites and methods.

**Draft Letter to DHFS Regarding Acute and Primary Medical Care** A draft letter to Helene Nelson regarding inclusion of acute and primary care in the service and benefit plan was approved by consensus.

**Procedure for Adding New Members—Walworth County** The group agreed by consensus to welcome Walworth County into FPCMO. Walworth has reviewed our MOU, understands and agrees with the expectations. Paul will draft an amendment to the MOU, which he will bring to our next meeting for partner signatures.

**Review Work Plan Draft** Tabled until next meeting.

**Other**

- Next meetings August 16 and September 6, September 20 meeting changed to September 21
- Paul will forward notice of a September 20<sup>th</sup> meeting, “County Governance of Care Management Organizations” at the Radison in La Crosse. At least one group member from each County partner should plan to attend this.

Submitted by Tom Schleitwiler, Jefferson County HSD