

## **Committee on Comprehensive System Change**

Council on Long Term Care Reform

**Meeting of June 3, 2005**

### **Minutes**

**Members present:** Lynn Breedlove, Paul Cook, Carol Eschner, Tom Frazier, Rich Kammerud, George Potaracke, John Sauer, and Craig Thompson

**Members absent:** Gerry Born, Jerry Huber and Tim Sheehan

**Others present:** Chuck Wilhelm, Judith Frye, Lorraine Barniskis, Kathleen Luedtke, Theresa Sanders, Bill Jensen, Mark Stein, Dan Hayes, Janice Smith, Deb Menacher

Chair George Potaracke called the meeting to order at 9:10 AM.

#### **Information and analysis needs**

Chuck Wilhelm distributed updated information on nursing home relocations in 2002 and new information about recent nursing home relocations under Family Care. He noted that staff are working on a new summary of information about Family Care, dubbed the “dashboard.” This will be reviewed at a future committee meeting.

There was some discussion about what information is available about quality. It was agreed that presentations/discussions would be scheduled for future meetings on the Quality Close to Home project, an expected report evaluating various outcome measurement tools and making recommendations, and information about quality in various LTC programs, including Partnership. There will be considerable information about cost-effectiveness in the independent assessment of Family Care expected in September. In response to a question, it was noted that between July 2003 and July 2004, 83 people of a total of over 9000 Family Care members had entered a nursing home and disenrolled from Family Care into the MA fee-for-service system.

#### **Counties’ Roles in a LTC Managed Care System**

Rich Kammerud presented two versions of a paper on county roles. In the discussion, a number of questions emerged that need further discussion, including:

- What decisions do counties want to be involved in? How? Why?
- What questions should be included in the RFI regarding the whole human services system in a county or counties?
- To what extent is it the county’s decision about what level of involvement they will take on?
- How do Local Long Term Care Councils fit into the various levels of county involvement?
- What is the nature of regional affiliation of counties? Family Care District or some variation; i.e. a new entity? A loose affiliation?
  - In either of these scenarios or others, what are roles for local councils/committees, including do they have a role in consumer protection?
  - What happens if there are overlapping geographic areas?
- What happens with other county functions if the county does not want or cannot take on a major role in managed LTC?

- APS
- Children's LTC
- Other

### **Parameters for local planning grant RFI and longer-range models for LTC reform**

The committee continued discussion of the paper titled "Principles to guide long term care reform, including criteria for local planning grants under the Comprehensive System Change project," which had been revised to reflect discussion at the May meeting. A revised version will be provided for the next meeting, reflecting today's discussion

### **Comments from the public**

Deb Menacher reported on a recent meeting of existing and newly funded ADRCs. There was lots of positive energy, although the extent of the cultural change required for those who do not already have a Resource Center was a bit overwhelming for some. The Joint Finance Committee (JFC) has recommended the statutory change needed to allow funding of additional ADRCs beyond those already announced. Wood and Marathon Counties are planning to create a Family Care District to operate their joint ADRC.

### **Updates from DHFS**

Kathleen Luedtke updated the committee on current activities of the Comprehensive System Change project. The Council's Committee on Resource Center Expansion has been asked to serve as an advisory group for the multimedia campaign on prevention, personal responsibility and planning for LTC, understanding LTC options. Training on Alzheimer's disease screening and early intervention has been completed in Richland County; all physicians and all intake workers and care managers attended. The training will be replicated in other counties soon. Contract negotiations for several staff positions under the project are underway. Division of Health Care Financing staff assignments are being made to bring them more closely into the project.

Judith Frye reported that JFC adopted the Community Relocation Initiative, with amendments to require that eligibility be restricted to people who have resided in a nursing home for at least 100 days and to require DHFS to report on the cost-effectiveness of the initiative. Another JFC action increased, without explanation, the savings expectation on administrative changes in MA personal care from \$10 million to \$18 million. JFC also recommended that DHFS not use the functional screen either for determining nursing home level of care or for payment purposes.

DHFS is forming four teams to help build community capacity for ICF-MR and Center relocations. Each team will serve a quadrant of the state. Twenty-five people remain in the LTC program at Northern Center; relocation plans for most of these will be completed by the end of this month.

Chuck Wilhelm reported that about 80 people will relocate under the ICF-MR Restructuring Initiative by the end of June. The cost of community care plans are running higher than estimated, but fewer people are staying in institutional settings than anticipated; costs may balance. Six facilities with about 250 residents are currently closing or significantly downsizing, most in the northern part of the state. The use of 5 to 8 bed CBRFs continues to be an issue. Further updates on this topic will be included in the agenda for future committee meetings.

### **Committee business**

- The minutes of the meeting of May 6, 2005 were approved unanimously with one minor correction.
- The July meeting is rescheduled to July 7, from 2:00 to 5:00 PM at the Southern Regional Office building.
- George reported on a meeting he and Carol Eschner had with Secretary Nelson to update her on the committee's and the Council's progress and to solicit guidance from her on parameters for planning. Secretary Nelson has agreed to meet with the Committee soon, probably at its August meeting.
- Suggested items for future agendas (cumulative list):
  - Continued discussion of long-range reform models and criteria for local planning grants under the CSC project.
  - Continued discussion of county roles in a reformed system (revised version of paper by Kammerud and others)
  - Review revised draft of consumer brochure on ADA rights
  - Discussion of Medicare Modernization Act, especially Special Needs Plans, and its effect on LTC (Paul Cook to assist with this item)
  - Briefing on Family Care "dashboard"
  - Presentation on Quality Close to Home project
  - Information on quality from various programs, including Family Care and Partnership
  - Report from consultant evaluating various outcome measurement tools and making recommendations
  - Independent assessment of Family Care from APS Healthcare, including cost-effectiveness information (September)
  - Update on ICF-MR Restructuring Initiative
  - Update on the CSC project.
  - County panel on nursing home relocation experience (or include on agenda of full Council instead)
  - Consider asking EverCare to present their model.

**Meeting adjourned** at approximately 3:00 PM.