

West Central Wisconsin - Care Management Collaborative
Governing Board Meeting Minutes

June 20, 2006 --- 12:00-4:00 PM

EC Room G034 Human Services

1. Call to Order

Chairperson Reggie Bicha called meeting to order at 12:11 p.m.

2. Approve Agenda

Approved

3. Public Comment

Tim Sheehan---supports the work of the WCW-CMC. Here on behalf of the Center for Independent Living for Western Wisconsin to support the work to provide improved services for people with disabilities.

4. Introductions – Announcements

- Laurel Kieffer introduced as project coordinator.
- CHP – Steve Landkamer –current project manager. Starting July 19 as CHP Director of Project Management.
- Those present: *Governing Board* --Chuck Balzer, Joan Benson, Reggie Bicha, Karen Bullock, Carroll Carlson, Dennis Ciesielski, Judy Demers, Margaret Hanson, Cheryl Huenink, Fred Johnson, Ron Lockwood, Dorothy Moen, Charlene Oftedahl, Jeanette Reitzel, Roy Sargeant, Brent Shoup, Peter Tropman, Tom Wirth. *Project Coordinator* – Laurel Kieffer. *Public*- Tim Sheehan.

5. Approve minutes

No additions or corrections. Approved May 9. Approved May 23.

6. Sub-Committee and Other Reports

a. Steering: Rich Kammerud

Report: Report on budget work. Steering committee has committed to allocate 65% of budget to be expended by EOY 2006. Expenditures are anticipated to focus on:

- Building governance and committee infrastructure
- Implementation infrastructure
- Legal managed care law
- Data analysis

Budget will be reviewed and updated quarterly.

WCW-CMC work plan will be reviewed during next month and updated and implementation for intentional direction.

Action: 1-Work plan template to be sent to Governing Board for review prior to 6/27/06 steering committee teleconference. 2- Steering Committee to develop a revised budget consistent with the work plan.

b. Implementation: Paul Cook

Report: Last met 6/15/06. Survey developed regarding human resource information and sent to the 9 counties. Currently gathering the information. Gail N. will compile the information. Hope to have preliminary feedback for July 12 meeting.

Discussion: Some counties concerned about who has access to what information being gathered. It was suggested that the implementation committee set up two working groups which will include all counties to explore two possible implementation models. Discussed the need to pace and balance information gathering and developing concepts and ideas with planning and implementation. Also emphasized the need to be consumer focused.

Action: Focus on implementation process as key focus of next governing board meeting.

c. ADRC: Judy Demers

Report: Concerns over funding. Counties are working on their own projects. Barron County will be a resource for others. Expect to have contract and level of funding information from the State mid-July. Eau Claire, Chippewa, Dunn and Pepin counties are working together to gather information. Other counties are working independently. Aging directors were invited to be active participants in the process. There has been some discussion on which aspects of ADRC can be shared regionally: marketing-shared logo, PR tools. Is a regional ADRC feasible? Need to discuss full range of options available to counties in forming ADRC. The committee would like to bring in some expert assistance to assist with exploring options and beginning the planning. This may require some funds.

Action: M: Tom Wirth requests up to \$1000 of grant funds to support consultative assistance in ADRC implementation. 2nd: Karen Bullock. MC

d. DD: Dennis Cielielski, Ron Lockwood

Report: May 17 meeting attended by Mary Faherty & Gerry Born. Created chart on designs and models for serving DD consumers. All counties are invited to participate in the process.

Next DD meeting: July 12, 1-3 pm CHP Eau Claire. Meeting focus: explore differences in providing case management services to DD compared to frail elderly and disabled.

Action: Governing Board requested copies of the chart be distributed to all board members.

e. Consumer Communication: Karen Bullock

i. Review of Vision, Mission, Guiding Principles: add flexibility & choice; remove end quote.
Action: Revisions to be made. Document to be approved at July 11 meeting.

ii. Review required response to state for WCW-CMC's plan to involve consumers and other stakeholders. **Action:** Final letter to be copied to all Governing Board members.

iii. Web-site development update –

Discussion: counties expressed concern that to not put energy or information into establishing a website at this time. Uncertain as to current need for the website. Joan

Benson offered to design/create website. Communication committee could take a leadership role in creating documents for counties to post on their websites.

Noted some caution in what is posted –not too high of expectations of services. How to monitor the content – need someone designated to monitor and to publicize ways to access information. Downside of using another organization’s website --we have less control over content and layout. Yet, a good relationship is developing with North West Disabilities Coalition that can be mutually beneficial to the process of redesign.

Tim Sheehan advocated for the widest dialog and inclusiveness of information.

Peter Tropman suggested there may be an option for a statewide webpage on long-term care reform where each collaborative has space for specific information.

Action: Postpone website development for now. Committee charged with creating copy for the counties to incorporate into their websites.

iv. Introduction to Base Camp Project Management software.

Laurel Kieffer and Peter Tropman indicated it as a means to post messages, meeting notes, calendar of events for those “invited” to the list. Concern was expressed on how to regulate access to the information. Base Camp has the capacity to set up separate “tents” where entrance can be regulated from the software manager.

Action: Laurel and TMG staff will continue work with software in making it useful to the board and committees.

f. June 6 – County Partners Meeting: Reggie Bicha

Report –reaffirmed varied levels of interest among the counties. Two tracks: those interested in analyzing data for private/public CMO partnership; those interested in analyzing CHP managed care project. All counties are interested in participating in the initial data collection. Concerns expressed over need **to establish information sharing parameters:** media, public, the State, within the governing board and committee structure.

Action: Added to new business for further discussion.

Interface with DHFS: Consensus from the counties is to develop a stronger ongoing relationship with DHFS. Request that Mr. Charles Jones, DHFS representative, become an ongoing attendee of WCW-CMC.

Action: TMG made request for his presence. Mr Jones has indicated an interest in participating.

Helene Nelson Response: Concerns about reporting care dollars, ADRC funding, and about ability to meet implementation goals. Counties do not see implementing by October 1st. No anticipated implementation date was identified. Other questions: How does ADRC implementation impact the implementation of the CMO? How will county funds be impacted?

Action: Draft of the letter will be reviewed by Governing Bd. before mailing.

Legal Analysis and Counsel on Structural Change Options: Reaffirmed a desire to link with other collaboratives to hire legal counsel and analysis on options and challenges for counties in

creating multi-county or public/private care management and provider partnerships. Other questions include: What governance options exist? What are the consequences of choosing to not participate? What are the risk-bearing concerns?

Action: Peter Tropman will continue to work with the collaboratives to make this happen.

7. Old Business

a. Draft Governance Board Policy- Reggie Bicha

Discussion: Clarification: each county/entity has one vote. Each organization will designate their voting member. Add: Simple majority of those present constitutes consensus. Suggestions: separate steering committee and governing board meeting dates to allow for work to be done. Include Governing Board chair on the steering committee. Other suggestions were made and will be reflected in the revised document. Steering committee has option to modify section on their roles and responsibilities.

Action: Motion to accept with amended changes: Rich Kammerud, 2nd Dennis Ciesielski, MC

b. Governance and program structure work plans – Peter Tropman

Discussion: Need to determine how to organize and share information. Who should be working on which components of the project? What kind of pre-work needs to be done? Information is available from MN and other places.

Peter has been working with other collaboratives on legal issues and has contacts with attorneys with expertise in analyzing the legal implications of the various structures: legislative implications; interface of obligations of DHS SS 51/42 responsibilities when care is shared; issues for counties re interface between counties, health care, state insurances code —do state statutes need to change? Secretary’s letter...to what degree of the action proposed is legal under the current statutes?

Action: Peter will create a list of the questions and challenges to implementing any of the models, identify resources and additional information, and identify concerns to be addressed by the state. **M** Peter proposed to organize a collaborative of counties and organizations to conduct a legal analysis of structural issues identified by the counties and collaboratives. 2nd – Cheryl Huenink, MC

c. Local impact analysis: status and next steps – Peter Tropman

Discussion: What can be derived out of the state data release? Local data is being collected. Peter affirmed the core group of counties who wish to get started in this region: Pierce, Eau Claire, Dunn, St. Croix. He intends to connect the implementation counties throughout the state for information gathering. Questions were asked about how the information will be analyzed with meaning for all interests? Concern was expressed about not delaying in getting this moving. Also, county representatives want assurances that the data analysis will have meaning for all counties, regardless of their choices on how to proceed in the reform movement.

Action: Governing Board encourages TMG to create a sample data analysis and schedule a conference call so counties can begin to gain insights into the data (state and local).

8. New Business

- a. **Information sharing parameters ---Tabled**

9. Next Meeting Date:

July 11, 2006

Agenda Items

- Implementation strategies and the structure surrounding those strategies
- Information sharing parameters
- Committee reports to be suspended except for urgent action.

Adjournment

M: Paul Cook; 2nd Cheryl; MC

Adjourned: 4:10 p.m.

Minutes respectfully submitted

Laurel Kieffer, Project Coordinator