

**Planning For Change in Long Term Care
Steering Committee Meeting Minutes
Thursday, July 13, 2006
8:30 a.m. - 12:30 p.m.**

*Community Living Alliance, Inc.
1414 McArthur Rd, Madison, WI 53708
Conference Room 142*

Present: Linda Baldwin, Todd Costello, Craig Dupont, Ken Eimers, Theresa Fishler, G. P. Foster, Fran Genter, Ginny Graves, Lynn Green, Ken Hobbs, Charmian Klyve, Jean Kuehn, Mike Linak, Owen McCusker, Karen Musser, David Sievert, Jennifer Thompson, Kim Turner, Barb Thoni,

Jean Kuehn called the meeting to order at 8:35 a.m. The meeting agenda was distributed and reviewed.

1. DHFS Updates

- **Mike Linak** introduced himself to new members of the steering committee as liaison to the Dane – Rock Planning for Long-Term Care planning consortium. Mike is also the Developmental Disabilities Services Director at DHFS.

DHFS will likely be sponsoring bi-weekly teleconferences by topics of interest to the planning consortia. This is an effort to communicate, share information, and seek consistency across the planning groups.

- **Fall Conference** - DHFS is holding a fall conference on long-term care focusing on the reform planning efforts. Planning consortia are requested to give DHFS request for topic areas that are of interest. Mike Linak mentioned that Marion Brandt from South County may be presenting the Minnesota County-Based Purchaser (CBP) model. UCare may also be presenting on MSHO and other related products.
- **Local Share** – Mike Linak reports that DHFS is still analyzing several aspects of the reform initiative related to legal or statutory changes including base authorities needed from CMS or changes to Wisconsin statute and/or Medicaid Plan, Chapters 51 and 55 responsibilities of counties, and county participation/local share options. More information is expected over the coming weeks. Lynn Green is in contact with Gerry Huber/WCHSA and reports they are still working on providing DHFS feedback about county share options.
- **Quarterly Report Format** – The recently released quarterly report template was reviewed noting that the first report is due 8/15. It was later clarified that the Dane – Rock Regional Consortium's first report will be due in October due to the delay in the release of the Grant Agreement with DHFS. Jean Kuehn mentioned that she will be gathering information from the sub-committees to include in the report.
- **DHFS Data Release** – Ginny Graves gave an update that TMG under direction from DHFS will be providing a summary of the data release that will include general demographics, utilization, cost, and functional status information. The intent is to organize the data into a "Phase One"

series of reports that will go to all planning consortia and counties. Target date is mid-to-late July. "Phase Two" will be up to each planning consortium and TMG is available for further data studies. Ginny reviewed a past handout describing the data release and report possibilities.

Questions were asked about the data: 1) Date range - the data are 2005; 2) Do the data include 0-3 and school age – No, the data are 18-64, comment was noted about the importance of these data to inform futures planning.

It was noted that the data are in the public domain and they can/will be released upon request. It was requested that DHFS make public any individual or organization who has requested the data that are not part of the planning consortia.

- **Other Statewide Updates** – Ginny Graves gave updates from other consortia efforts including West Central WI CMC and West Central Consortium for Long-Term Support and Health Care Reform.
- **DHFS Expectations** – The 7/7/2006 DHFS Informational Memo #2 Managed Care Benefit Options – DHFS Expectations was distributed and reviewed. Mike Linak mentioned that the memo reinforced that DHFS early-on stated that Family Care is the "floor" minimum benefit that must be included in reform, but they are also interested in models that integrate primary and acute health care. The memo notes that DHFS does not have authority in-hand to provide an integrated benefit and needs to know from consortia if planning will include integrated healthcare so they can seek appropriate authorities. It was noted that new federal guidelines may make it easier for states to obtain more flexible authorities for reform efforts.

Owen McCusker called the question if this planning consortium should submit a statement to DHFS about intent to plan for integrated benefits. A variety of opinions were then expressed about the concern that counties cannot be a CMO under an integrated program, county staffing, local share, OCI regulations, target populations, risk-sharing, and the existing competencies of ECW and CLA.

It was noted by Dane County that they are interested in exploring a regional county-based CMO model to operate Family Care. Lynn Green commented that early discussions with policy makers indicate they are not in favor of turning any county share to a private organization. Opinions were then expressed about the amount of county share across the various target populations. It was further noted, that the planning group's goal statement does state that the new system may include integration of acute and primary care. Dane County's current interest is to begin with Family Care and that does not prohibit us from building from there, integrating acute and primary care at a later date.

It was noted by Rock County that decision around model is somewhat premature given that not all relevant information is available. Charmian Klyve noted that Rock has concern about who and how services will be delivered along with needing more information about Chapters 51/55, risk sharing, county share, and input from various Boards.

Lynn Green commented that the landscape has changed significantly from the start of planning including a DHFS budget model that includes county share, that an integrated model would require HMO licensure which eliminates counties from being that CMO, and that county management cannot recommend to policy makers the loss of control of the county's share. Further, DHFS clarified that Dane – Rock must be a region with a single CMO. Discussion about

what constitutes “single CMO” vs “contract.” It became clear that this was a question that needed clarification from DHFS and further discussion.

No action was taken on informing DHFS about the consortium’s interest in pursuing an integrated model.

2. Governance Discussion

- **County Co-Purchasing Model** – Owen McCusker reviewed the County DHFS Co-Purchasing Model submitted earlier, followed by discussion from the group about various pros/cons. It was agreed that the model should be presented to DHFS to see if it could be a viable option to pursue in planning. Mike Linak stated he would bring it back to DHFS for consideration/feedback.
- **Further Discussion of other models** – It was decided that the planning group would focus on two models for further, more detailed information: 1) County as CMO; 2) Co-Purchasing model. Next discussion will focus on detailing how the model would actually work among partnering organizations and identifying any barriers to implementation. It was further agreed that only one model would be considered during each of upcoming meetings to insure adequate time is devoted to all models.

3. Discussion of MOU among Planning Partners

- This item was tabled for future discussion.

4. New subcommittee request – MCO infrastructure

- There was discussion about a request from ECW and CLA to form a new subcommittee to examine key functions of a CMO and meeting related grant deliverables and readiness as part of planning. It was agreed that a group comprised of Karen Musser, Ken Eimers, Todd Costello, David Sievert, Jean Kuehn and the full IT subcommittee would meet to develop a proposed purpose and scope for the CMO committee. The proposed purpose/scope would then be presented at the next steering committee meeting for discussion and final decision about committee formation.

- **Other business** – Jean Kuehn asked the steering committee if they were interested in training from UWEX on stakeholder participation, tentatively scheduled for the 8/24/2006 meeting. It was agreed this would be good and the training will be confirmed.