

West Central Wisconsin – Care Management Collaborative			
Committee	Governing Council		
Date/Time	July 25, 2006; 12:00 – 4:00 p.m.		
Location	EC Human Services Room G034		
Chair/Facilitator	Reggie Bicha		
Minutes Scribe	Laurel Kieffer		
Agenda Item	Time	Discussion	Action
1. Call to Order	12:05	Chair Reggie Bicha	
2. Introductions – roll call		Present: Dave Rynders (Chippewa), Peter Tropman (TMG), Jane Schmitz, Brent Shoup, Gary Laehn (Clark), Phil Wicktor (Pepin), Reggie Bicha, Chuck Balzer (Pierce), Jeanette Reitzel (Barron), Joan Benson, Tom Thorsness (GHC), Rich Kammerud (Polk), Ron Lockwood (St. Croix), Karen Bullock, Steve Landkamer (CHP), Roy Sargeant, Margaret Hanson, Tom Wirth, Dorothy Moen (Eau Claire), Cheryl Huenink, Dennis Ciesielski (Dunn) Guests: Tim Sheehan (CILWW), Charles Jones (WI-DHFS)	
3. Announcements	12:15	None	
4. Public Comment	12:20	Tim Sheehan comment: sensing a frustration by counties on how to move forward. Consumers feeling a frustration at perception of lack of forward movement. Wants to encourage governing council to continue to move forward to provide the services and supports that allow people to realize their dreams.	
5. Approve Agenda	12:25	Address the <i>New Business</i> items prior to <i>Old Business</i>	
6. Approve Minutes	12:30	Motion: T Wirth., 2 nd P Wicktor	
7. Financial Update	12:35	R Bicha reminded everyone to be sure to submit the in-kind contribution to include telephone, printing & duplication, travel, etc. Rich K. highlighted budget changes made by the steering committee.	Reggie proposed to bring back final operating budget for approval at next meeting. Budget format was approved.
New Business	Time	Discussion	Action
1. State Information memo # 2 clarification and discussion	12:54	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Overview of meeting with Secretary Nelson. • She acknowledged the difficulty and challenges. Encourages us to be flexible, explore options. • Need to keep in mind that DD services must closely follow elderly services. • Bipartisan support for the initiative. 	None

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some concerns on the projected savings for the DD group. • Charles Jones encouraged the consortium to move forward because of the State's eagerness to obtain Federal waivers for models. • Discussed differences between Medicaid and Medicare, family care, fee-for-services options, what levels of choice are mandated. • We took a stand on implementing a fully integrated model. 	
2. Letter to state regarding intent to explore Acute and Primary Managed Care Model	1:20	<p>Paul drafted a letter, Reggie edited it. Letter was mailed.</p> <p>WI goals for reform are very consistent with the Federal vision and have funded the planning and exploration.</p>	Paul to forward the letter to governing council members.
3. WCHSA meeting with Secretary Nelson on County Levy use in reformed system - update and discussion	1:25	<p>Cheryl H. reported. WCHSA's business to help counties negotiate with the state on the funding. If it is county money, counties need to be involved. Trying to talk about total county revenues.</p> <p>Need to define 51/55 responsibilities. Discussion included impact on all human services, changing populations, new populations identified.</p> <p>Intent is for the State to NOT take money from the counties but to assure that current \$ continue to serve county people in more effective manner without waiting lists.</p>	
4. Governing Board Meeting schedule	1:55		Tabled to August 1 agenda.
Break	2:05		
Old Business	Time	Discussion	Action
1. Governing and Data Analysis Committees work <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Private model b. Public/private managed care model 	2:15	<p>D Rynders opened discussion on moving forward with implementation with a CMO partnership model (EC, St. Croix, Dunn, Chippewa). Looking at counties as a subcontracted role with varying degrees of risk. This group feels an urgency to move forward.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clarification on how this differs from the July 11 conclusion: there are some counties who are ready to begin working toward implementing a CMO/CHP model now and do not want to wait for further data analysis. They desire to lock into the model at this time and begin analysis of implementation strategies. • Want to start talking with the state about real dollars for implementation. 	<p>Motion: D Rynders. 2nd C Huenink - Governing Council to reinstate implementation committee activities surrounding the private CMO model.</p> <p>Motion carried.</p>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Want to reestablish the implementation committee with directive to invest time and energy into the CMO program design. • Want to begin operational planning for the RFP. Working on the CMO model does not mean these counties are locked into the model. • County budget deficits and state directive encourages movement on this. • Desire to get into the work and figure out what will or won't work and bring the information back to the collaborative. <p>Concern was expressed about the four larger counties moving forward in privatization (CMO) it doesn't provide much option of choice for the smaller counties.</p> <p>P Tropman interjected his perception that the organization that has the contract with the state will be making the decisions. The big decision is <i>who will sign the contract</i>. This is who will hold the risk and essentially control the organization.</p> <p>Is CHP willing to work equally with the other counties in exploring a public & private partnership? K Bullock sees the shared partnership model to be so far out (2-3 years) in serving people, her heart is in the CMO. However, CHP is will work with developing the shared governance model.</p> <p>P Tropman believes capacity is available to create an effective public/private shared governance model in the region within a year.</p> <p>How does this model impact county provision of services, county as provider and as contractor of services?</p> <p>Need to assure that consumers can continue relationships with current providers.</p>	Continue discussion on August 1
<p>2. Information sharing update</p> <p>a. MOU</p> <p>b. Consumer communications committee presentation</p>		<p>MOU - TMG needs to know what ground rules the consortium wants TMG to abide by regarding information sharing and data analysis, sharing of information between counties and partners, and define proprietary information. Basic information from counties is public, what is done with it, to it may not be public.</p>	<p>MOU deferred to August 1 meeting.</p> <p>Communications committee presentation tabled.</p>
<p>3. Initial work plan draft review</p>		<p>R Kammerud asked Laurel to review and compare the TMG work plan to local draft work plan.</p>	<p>Tabled to August 1 agenda</p>

Committee Reports	Time	Discussion		Action
1. Steering Committee: R Kammerud		Approve budget template		Template Approved
2. Implementation Committee: P Cook		None		
3. ADRC: J Demers		None		
4. DD: D Ciesielski, R Lockwood		Next meeting September 13, 2006		
5. Communication: P Wickter, K Bullock		<p>Recommended following action items to Governing Council:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • County and private partners to use base camp for primary exchange of information and project management • Prepared articles to be posted to county websites before end of Quarter 1 • Each county to host a provider awareness meeting before end of quarter 2. • Develop protocols for access and permission to base camp and collaborative committees. 		None
Next Meeting Date	Time	Location	Agenda	
August 1, 2006	Noon	ECHS G034	Operating budget approval Status of county responses to action items MOU discussion Base camp overview Work plan review GHC vision for their participation	
Adjournment	3:47			