Wisconsin Council on Long Term Care
Meeting of March 3, 2009

Approved Minutes

Members present: Beth Anderson, Pat Anderson, Judy Braun, Lynn Breedlove, Heather Bruemmer, Devon Christianson, Paul Cook, Carol Eschner, Tom Frazier, Bob Kellerman, Jennifer Ondrejka, Michelle Pike, Chris Sarbacker, John Sauer

Members absent: Dana Cyra, Todd Romenesko, Stephanie Stein

Others present: Lorraine Barniskis, Karen Timberlake, Fredi Bove, Donna McDowell, Carrie Molke, Rebecca Murray, Sabrina Fox, Karen Musser, Michael Blumenfeld, Janice Smith, Rebecca Underwood, Maurine Strickland, Wendy Fearnside, Karen McKim, Rebecca Murray

Chair Heather Bruemmer called the meeting to order at 9:30 AM.

Budget updates from DHS

Fredi Bove presented a PowerPoint presentation on the Governor's biennial budget proposal (see handout for details). There was a question about new risk reserve requirements for MCOs related to the restructured oversight by OCI and DHS. Information will be provided through a follow-up mailing or as a topic at the next Council meeting. John Sauer said that nursing homes are not sure they want the proposed rate increase, which is premised totally on a bed tax increase. The tax will benefit the overall Medicaid shortfall more than nursing homes, and private pay residents will pay the full cost. County homes will be most negatively impacted.

Updates from DHS

Fredi provided a handout describing new CIPII nursing home diversion funding for 2009. Up to 150 slots will be available. She reported that as of January, 276 people had been referred for IRIS, and 139 people were enrolled. (See handout emailed prior to meeting for details.) Determination of the personal budget allocation in IRIS uses approximately the same methodology as for MCO rate-setting. About 10-15% of enrollees have gotten exceptional increases. On average, the actual cost of care plans is less than the budget allocation. Paul Cook asked for a county-by-county breakdown of referrals and enrollments.

Discussion with Secretary Karen Timberlake

Secretary Timberlake reported that the Governor remains committed to maintaining forward progress on Family Care. Given the current fiscal climate, we all need to figure out how to cope with no increases, or even decreases, in some areas. The question is how we can do things differently to meet these challenges. Council discussion included the following questions and concerns:

- An unspecified $150 million savings in Medicaid is required under the budget proposal. The plan for achieving this will be developed over time, starting soon with a series of conversations with stakeholders to get their input. Some ideas that are already on the table include reducing the amount that MA pays for brand name drugs, and reducing rates for primary care in hospital emergency rooms, but increasing rates for such care in more appropriate settings.

- Citizens need to be involved in discussions about better stewardship of public funding and sustainability of health and long-term care systems. We should be looking for broader revenue sources for long-term care.
- The budget will have significant effects on county human service systems. The Governor looked across the budgets of all state departments and the effects of various cuts, trying to make the net changes bearable for counties. DHS is working with counties to figure out ways to do things differently in ways that will assist counties to cope. One strategy is new technologies related to income maintenance processes.

Budget recommendations from the Council

On unanimous votes, the Council made the following recommendations regarding the 2009-11 biennial budget:

- The Governor's proposal would provide no increase in funding for existing Aging and Disability Resource Centers to recognize the actual costs of providing required functions as estimated under a recent DHS cost model for the funding formula. The full cost of implementing the new cost model is estimated to be about an 18% increase. Recognizing the fiscal constraints of this budget, the Council recommends that progress toward this goal be made by increasing ADRC funding by 10% in the second year of the biennium.
- The Governor's proposal would slow implementation of Family Care for people under age 60 in Milwaukee County by delaying enrollment of people on waiting lists for one year. The Council recommends that sufficient funding be provided to allow at least ten percent of these wait listed people to be enrolled, if they are in crisis or have immediate and urgent needs.
- The Governor proposes to cut the entire base of GPR funding for Independent Living Centers; for this biennium, the cut is less than federal funding expected from the Economic Recovery Package. However, given that this federal funding is not permanent, the Council recommends that the GPR base funding be restored in the 2011-13 budget if replacement funds are not available to ILCs.
- The Governor's budget would cut all funding ($100,000 per year) for the Guardianship Support Center. Given that many parts of the long-term care system serving vulnerable adults (including ADRCs, County adult protective service systems, nursing home and hospital staff, and consumers) depend on assistance from the center, the Council recommends that this funding be restored.

As a future cost-saving measure, Beth Anderson suggested that DHS undertake a project to identify overlapping requirements for assessment, care planning and care management, especially by nurses and social workers, and eliminate overlaps as possible.

Tour of Care Wisconsin facilities

Many members and guests were provided a tour of Care Wisconsin facilities. There were a number of positive comments about what they observed.

Comments from the public

There were no public comments.

Consumer information needs during ADRC options counseling

Donna McDowell introduced staff members of the Office of Resource Center Development (ORCD): Janice Smith, Maurine Strickland, Carrie Molke and Wendy Fearnside. She asked for Council input on what information consumers need from ADRCs during options counseling,

especially when more than one MCO is available in the ADRC's area. Discussion included the following suggestions:

- There are differences in room and board rates for assisted living between MCOs. People need to know what, if any, differences will result in costs to consumers.
- People need to know about provider networks, since there are significant differences among MCOs.
- ADRCs should try to get an idea of each person's desired outcomes, and then tailor information to fit. They should try to use similar language as MCOs regarding outcomes, to better prepare consumers to be good participants in care planning. Perhaps a checklist could be used, asking people to prioritize what outcomes are more important to them.
- A guidebook could be prepared, along the lines of the current "How to Choose a Nursing Home" used by BOALTC. A question-answer format might be more useful than an comparative table.

Challenges in bringing counties into regional ADRCs

Donna McDowell described the struggles that many counties have in coming together to form a new joint organization as a regional ADRC and asked for Council suggestions about how counties might be encouraged and helped to establish a unified regional identity. There was considerable discussion, without much concrete advice, except that time and effort should be directed at county leadership, who need to be convinced of the benefits of a regional approach. It was suggested that the Council spend time developing information about the benefits of a regional approach to ADRCs and expectations of them. This could be put on the Council's and/or the DHS web site or developed further by DHS and then distributed.

Council business

Approval of 1/6/09 meeting minutes. The minutes were unanimously approved, on a motion by Paul Cook, seconded by Pat Anderson.

Report from the Family Care Quality Committee. Carol Eschner reported that the committee membership includes many interesting perspectives. Much time has been spent on education about the various quality oversight mechanisms in place. At the last committee meeting, there was a brainstorming session on the quality indicators of most importance to members; this discussion will be continued at the next meeting, with the goal of distilling the list down to a manageable number. Karen McKim reported on the 2007 Family Care Annual Report, which the committee provided a great deal of assistance with. The report will be mailed to Council and Committee members. She noted that the report is a prototype, and is possibly not 100% accurate. Future versions will be improved, and comments are welcome. She also noted that this report is meant to supplement the MetaStar annual quality review. The report deals only with MCOs, and does not include information about ADRCs.

Announcements. Heather Bruemmer said that she gets many positive comments from consumers and others about the Council. People do use the Council's web site, which is at www.wcltc.state.wi.us.

Future agenda items. Members suggested that the following items be included in future agendas:

- Information about proposed shared risk reserve requirements for MCOs as financial oversight is moved to OCI.
- Ask regional ADRCs to talk about the challenges of forming a regional ADRC.

- Council development of a summary of the benefits of regional ADRCs and specific expectations of them to be truly regional.
- Council development of suggestions for improving the understanding of consumers and providers about the need for stewardship of public funds and the need to develop a sustainable system.
- Information about self-directed supports options within Family Care (and compared to IRIS).
- Information about IRIS enrollments by county and by target group

Meeting adjourned at 3:00 PM.