

**MINUTES
NEW LTC DISTRICT
ELECTED AND APPOINTED OFFICIALS PLANNING MEETING
February 17, 2009**

Present: Robin Elsner (Marinette County); Mike Reimer, Craig Johnson, Loretta Shellman, and Lois Trever (Oconto County); Mark Quam, Tom Eggebrecht, Tom Hinz, Rich Langan, and Julie Knier (Brown County); Rick Kane, Kim Wolfmeyer, Barbara Larson-Herber, John Gallagher, June Erdmann, and Steve Gueths (Shawano County); Bill Kelsey, Janice Swoboda, and Jim Abrahamsen (Kewaunee County); Joe Krebsbach, Roger Tepe, and Mark Moeller (Door County), Mary Kennedy (Project Manager)

Mary Kennedy called the meeting to order. Introductions were made.

Changes or Additions to the Agenda

None.

Update on February 16, 2009 Meeting with State Representatives

Mary reported on yesterday's meeting with Judith Frye from the Department of Health Services. No updates were offered on the state budget by Judith other than to say that Family Care start-up for the northeast region is unlikely to occur over the next two years. The group's original April 2010 timeline was also felt too ambitious. At the same time, a positive response to the region's planning interest was received. There is state desire to encourage and support continued development with the NEW consortium. An allocation for planning assistance using program reserves from the current state budget may still be possible. Next steps will include revising the original timeline, reviewing the revision at the next directors' meeting on April 13, and resubmitting a new plan to Madison thereafter.

Discussion was held. The importance of keeping elected representatives engaged and informed through the process was underscored in order to secure full county board support when needed. A suggestion was offered that it may be beneficial to enlist legal assistance to help with board education as well as with district planning. Mary indicated that it may be possible to obtain the services of Attorney Andy Phillips who is working under retainer with the Wisconsin Counties Association and who has provided district planning assistance elsewhere. Representatives agreed and requested that efforts be extended to have Mr. Phillips appear at an upcoming meeting of this group for further discussion.

Other Updates on Family Care Planning

An update was offered on tribal status. A tribal/state workgroup has been working on redesign and a state paper on tribal options has been drafted. The tribes are not in agreement, however, with all the recommendations/options included in the paper. Further review and discussion will occur at the tribal level before additional action is taken.

A question was asked as to whether a state Request for Proposal for program expansion has been issued. Clarification was offered that RFP's are timed to respond to vendors' expressions of readiness to receive.

A report was provided that Menominee County will require county board approval to formally participate in NEW District planning; approval is anticipated in March.

Discussion of District Board Composition

Discussion moved to options for district board governance and membership. Inequities that would arise through proportional versus equal representation given the size discrepancies between participating NEW counties were acknowledged to be at issue. Optimal board size was suggested to range from 9 to 15 members. The NW Wisconsin District currently has the largest board membership at 18 though was acknowledged to also be representing the current largest number of counties. The Lakeland (Fond du Lac, Winnebago, and Manitowoc) and Central Wisconsin (Portage, Marathon and Wood) Districts are represented by 9 member boards; each county holding 3 seats.

A May 2008 WCHSA panel discussion paper on the development of a governance model for Central Wisconsin and information as prepared by Mary were reviewed (attached). Fully proportional models were viewed to be impractical given population variances between the NEW counties.

Brown County representatives expressed concern that, while a one county/one vote model may be the most viable for district purposes, it could also be difficult to support given the population differential that exists for Brown County along with the anticipated added responsibility of operating the county's new Community Treatment (Mental Health) Center. A request was made for the group to assist in identifying any benefits that may help in countering the concerns.

Several observations followed:

- All constituencies served under Family Care are expected to want equal treatment, irrespective of their county of residence;
- All partner counties will be relinquishing equal and total control of their current service systems, turning that responsibility over to the district instead;
- All partners are likely to wish to sell services under contract; a district model may make that more likely than a private corporate management model;
- All may be reasonably expected to want a district based on “common good;” such a model would allow for natural consumer movement toward the best and closest services;
- All will contribute financially toward the effort at the same percentage and local levy issues will no longer exist following state buy-down of current county contributions thereby resulting in a leveled playing field;
- An equal representation model would allow for easier district growth should additional counties wish to join the NEW effort; a recalculation of proportional representation would not be required;
- The district will insulate partner counties from risk, thereby eliminating any liability differentials that would arise through population size; the state will assume safety net responsibility;
- The counties in the Northeastern area need each other to provide Family Care. Neither Brown County alone nor the other counties combined would be large enough to be allowed to operate a Long Term Care District. If the counties in the Northeast are not able to work together to form their own Long Term Care District, the State could open up the Northeast area to Family Care operation by a private, non profit managed care organization.
- It does not and would not behoove any partner to own or exert greater influence or control; the district will only succeed through the interdependence and cooperation of its partners.

Discussion closed with a preference for equal representation reiterated, but also an acknowledgement to consider a slightly larger number of representatives for Brown County if such a move were essential to help the district plan move forward as long as the

differential did not render smaller counties voiceless. One suggested model for accomplishing that could allow Brown to have a larger representation at the outset, to be reduced down to equal representation over 5 years in line with the state levy buy-out. A recommendation was made to seek the consult of La Crosse board member in the matter as the La Crosse program struggled with the same issues and arrived at an equal representational model in the end.

Updates on ADRC Planning

Brown remains the only the county in the group with an operational ADRC. Shawano, Oconto and Menominee are working on a Tribal-County collaborative model with a June application planned. Kewaunee is awaiting word on what the state budget might allow for expansion.

Other Items

Mary reported on a recent Appleton Post Crescent request for regional consortia agendas and minutes, citing open records laws. Discussion followed with members expressing the view that the current NEW group is not a formal legal or policy making body nor does it have levels of elected representation sufficient to constitute a quorum of any individual county boards or committees. At the same time, it was acknowledged that public interest in Family Care is high and every effort should be made to invite public participation in the planning process. A suggestion was made to consider future development of a website that could provide linkages to documents and planning information. A recommendation was made for each county to consider posting future meeting notices in accordance with the opinions of their Corporations Counsel in the interim.

Future Meetings

Future meetings will continue to be slated for the fourth Monday of the month when held with the next scheduled for April 27th.

Respectfully submitted,

Tom Eggebrecht