

MINUTES
BROWN, DOOR, KEWAUNEE, OCONTO, SHAWANO AND MARINETTE
(NEW DISTRICT) PLANNING MEETING
December 16, 2008

Present: Joe Krebsbach, Roger Tepe, Craig Johnson, Mike Reimer, Bill Kelsey, Jack Schad, Barbara Larson-Herber, Mark Quam, Mary Kennedy, Kim Wolfmeyer, Rick Kane, Tom Eggebrecht, Judy Drier, Glenn Sartorelli, Stacy Strasler, Barb Nelson, Cheryl Buist

Additions and Modifications to the Agenda

None.

Updates from Members

Shawano County held a meeting on December 2 to discuss Family Care development and district formation. ~~The full DCP board and~~ Members of the DCP, Social Services and County Board, as well as attorney Andy Phillips and the County Administrator, were in attendance. Interest in district participation was expressed contingent on sufficient governance representation. ADRC planning efforts continue.

Marinette expects confirmation of Robin Elsner as department director today. The county is interested in joining the district initiative also contingent on governance decisions. No formal motions have been requested from the county board at this point.

Menominee is still awaiting word on 100 percent federal funding for LTC; no firm direction for Family Care in the interim.

Oconto County has the support of its HS Board to plan.

Mary reported approaching the Lakeland District about possible technical assistance. Jim Meissenger indicated that any requests would be considered.

Review of Paper Outlining NEW District

Members were asked to verify and approve the district talking points update compiled by Mary. Article 8, regarding concurrent start-up of Partnership with district formation, was clarified to be directed at allowing consumer choice for management of medical benefits

and LTC under Community Care, versus LTC alone with the district. Discussion ensued as to the practicalities of Community Care pursuing network development prior to the NEW District Minutes

December 16, 2008

Page 2

end of February. Members felt that any approach made to providers by the organization in the compressed timeframe may lead to confusion and result in less than ideal results. Agreement was reached to endorse Community Care's inclusion of the partner counties in its expansion planning, but to defer network development until a clearer plan and timeframe for district formation can be finalized.

Enrollment projections for the current proposed counties were reviewed. Figures are based on 2007 numbers. The year three projection addresses the program's "woodwork" effect and is built on an 18 percent calculation derived from Community Care's experience.

No further questions or issues with the talking points were raised.

Review of Proposed Budget for Phase I Planning

Mary noted the budget to be somewhat generic and flexible in light of limited firm decisions to date. It assumes a February 09 funding award and March 09 start-up. Management positions would be on board in mid-April. Community Care's consulting fee was noted to net out at approximately \$40K once a \$25K sub-contracting fee for actuarial assistance is deducted. Line items as currently proposed are believed to be negotiable. Questions were raised as to whether estimates of time for line item activities may be low.

Barb Moore was phoned for discussion. Times noted represent a best guess. Flexibility is desired – there may be some need to move deliverables around within the proposal in relationship to actual needs. Barb was informed of the group's endorsement of their inclusion in the organization's upcoming special needs expansion application as a "placeholder" without network development. She agreed in concept with that position and indicated that no formal approvals or notices would have to be forwarded from the counties but that a final list of which counties to include would be needed.

Following the call, the group agreed that approximately \$15 to \$20K should be added to the budget (e.g., under miscellaneous consultation) to allow for contingencies.

Brown indicated tentative agreement to serve as fiscal agent for the application and prospective planning grant.

A question was raised as to whether staff should be pursued under contract versus employment status. A contract could prove a more difficult arrangement given no
NEW District Minutes

December 16, 2008

Page 3

opportunity for participation in an employee health plan. The group felt that determination on this front would have to consider the certainty of start-up funding within the state budget. Mary suggested that Community Care may be willing to consider serving as employer.

A request for county hosting of a web site and site development was made. Door will consider. A private contracted arrangement could be pursued as a back-up plan.

Options for office space were considered. Curative Rehab Center was noted to have upcoming office vacancies following the departure of the Bay Area Agency on Aging in January. The group felt that a number of options should be available with the budget allowance.

A question was raised as to whether the group would choose to continue to plan should the state not make a funding award. Agreement was reached to seek a smaller award for continued low level planning (Mary @ an estimated 20 hours per week and Community Care @ a reduced level for general TA) should the full funding application be rejected.

Discussion on Authorization for Community Care to Submit Partnership Application

Covered in prior discussion.

Ideas for Governance Structure

An equal representation approach was generally endorsed given the absence of financial risk for counties. LaCrosse was noted to have equal representation in its district though no counties there are providing ~~direct~~ care management services. A conflict of interest clause in this district's by-laws, preventing a participating county from voting on matters involving its performance under the program, could be considered. Agreement was reached to hold general discussion with elected representatives on options this afternoon, to follow-up with written materials on options, and to seek a formal decision at a subsequent meeting with the group.

Application Timeline and Submittal

Mary expected to complete an application draft within a week. That draft will be e-mailed with feedback requested by the first week in January. Mark will be listed as contact for state purposes.

NEW District Minutes

December 16, 2008

Page 4

Future Meetings

The next meeting anticipated will be with state staff. February 9, 16, 23 (PM) and 24 (PM) were noted as options. Mary will confirm a date and will plan to return from Florida to attend that meeting.

Respectfully submitted: Tom Eggebrecht

TE:te