

MINUTES
RICHLAND COUNTY HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES
July 8, 2010

The monthly meeting of the Richland County Health and Human Services Board was called to order at 9:30 a.m. on July 8, 2010 by Jeanetta Kirkpatrick in the Main Conference Room of the Community Services Building, 221 West Seminary Street, Richland Center, Wisconsin.

Members Present: Betty Havlik, Dr. Richard Edwards, Fred Clary, Jeanetta Kirkpatrick, Marilyn Rinehart, Paul Kinney, Ray Schmitz, Robert Holets, and Walter Gust.

Others Present: Angie Rizner, Cheryl Ketelhut, Christy Duhr, Linda Symons, Lori Thuli, Marianne Stanek, Patrick Metz, Randy Jacquet, Windy Goodman, Kasey Banker, and Jill Faulkner.

Approve Agenda and Posting: Motion by Robert Holets, seconded by Paul Kinney to approve the agenda and proper posting. Motion carried.

Approve June 10, 2010 Health and Human Services Board Minutes: Motion by Dr. Richard Edwards, seconded by Walter Gust to approve the Board Minutes. Motion carried.

Citizen Comments: None.

Approval of Health and Human Services Vouchers: The Richland County Health and Human Services 2010 Voucher Report was distributed and reviewed by Paul Kinney. Paul Kinney noted that there are various invoices related to the recruitment advertising for the vacant Regional Aging & Disability Resource Center (ADRC) Manager position, including a credit card charge for a two month Internet listing that we are trying for the first time since it is reasonably priced. It was noted that the Town and Country Presbyterian Church payment was for food prepared for the Senior Nutrition Program and the UW-Extension payment was for Regional ADRC's participation in a WisLine telephone conference. Marianne Stanek reported on the payment made to the Dane County Sheriff's Office, noting it was for costs associated with serving orders on an individual who was thought to be living in Dane County for an abatement property located in Richland County. It was noted that the efforts made by Dane County were unsuccessful. Motion made by Paul Kinney, seconded by Betty Havlik to approve the 2010 Richland County Health and Human Services vouchers including prepaid vouchers listed below. Motion carried.

2010 Vouchers

Unit	No. of Vouchers	Amount
Richland County Health and Human Services – 2010 Expense Reports	58	\$14,208.08
Richland County Health and Human Services – 2010 Vouchers	30	\$22,935.95
Richland County Health and Human Services – 2010 Prepaid Vouchers	25	\$6,652.59
TOTAL	113	\$43,796.62

Discuss Voucher Approval Process: Patrick Metz announced that mailing the voucher report to Health and Human Services Board members one week before the Health and Human Services Board meeting is just not realistic. Patrick Metz noted that he routinely receives the completed voucher packet just 1-2 days before the Health and Human Services Board meeting and this meeting's packet was just finalized and given to him late yesterday. It was noted that the agency usually receives their routine vendor bills within the first week of each month and we are not able to prepare and mail the report in that same week. Fred Clary stated that having the packet in the Board Room ½ hour before the meeting gives those Board members who arrive early time to review the vouchers prior to the meeting.

2010 Budget Update: Patrick Metz distributed a handout that reflected the 2010 Health and Human Services budget as of May 31, 2010, noting an overage of \$20,329.

Linda Symons stated that the ADRC is right on target even though it is reflecting an overage of \$8,803. Linda Symons noted that caregiver support funds have been exhausted early and the Transportation Program has \$4,500 in invoices that have not been collected at this time.

Randy Jacquet reported that the Regional ADRC budget is healthy largely due to the fact that the Regional ADRC Manager position has been vacant since January 2010.

Marianne Stanek noted that Public Health Unit is under budget due to grant funding that is being utilized to purchase needed supplies and the close monitoring of Senior Nutrition Program expenses.

Christy Duhr stated that the Economic Support Unit is historically over budget at this time of year due to a lag in revenues.

Cheryl Ketelhut reported that the Long Term Support Unit Program Assistants line item is over budget \$3,750 which the Southwest Family Care Alliance assured us they would cover.

Lori Thuli stated that the Children's Services Unit budget is running pretty much on track. Fred Clary questioned how the loss of Mendota Mental Health Institute's Medicaid certification would affect our agency. Randy Jacquet stated that this would seriously affect the placement of clients under the age of 22 and he has advised staff not to use the facility if possible. Randy Jacquet noted that the only other facilities that have locked psychiatric units with restraints are Winnebago Mental Health Institute and Gundersen Lutheran Health System. Discussion was held regarding who determines the location for treatment. Randy Jacquet stated that these emergency placements are court ordered, but the judge does not determine the placement because his action is usually after the placement has already been made by our staff.

Randy Jacquet noted that the Clinical Services Unit budget remains over budget due to the Mental Health Inpatient Services that has been over budget through most of the year. Discussion was held regarding the Mental Health Inpatient Services line item and how some payments were posted into 2010 which should have been posted into 2009. Patrick Metz reviewed his budgetary process and the uncertainty of some projections. Discussion was held regarding the process of tracking mental health placements.

Patrick Metz reported on the unbudgeted institutional costs noting that the Adult Institutional Fund has a remaining balance of \$123,315 and the Children's Institutional Fund has a remaining balance of \$104,609. Patrick Metz noted that it is likely that the Children's Institutional Fund will be fully utilized by the end of the year.

Personnel Updates: Randy Jacquet noted that there are no personnel announcements other than the application deadline for the Regional ADRC Manager position is this Friday.

Approval of Contracts, Agreements, and Amendments: Randy Jacquet reported that there are no contract, agreement, or amendment requests this month.

Abatement of Human Health Hazards on One Property in Richland County

Nancy Kisting, 33003 Center Street, Byrds Creek: Marianne Stanek reported on the abatement process regarding the Nancy Kisting property and our inability to successfully serve notification papers to Ms. Kisting. Marianne Stanek stated that she would recommend moving forward in the abatement process. It was noted that the township is aware of the expenses that would be necessary to clean up the property which would be reimbursed to the township once the property is sold and any back taxes are paid. Motion made by Robert Holets, seconded by Paul Kinney to approve the continuation of the abatement process on the Nancy Kisting property. Motion carried.

Richland County Senior Nutrition Program Update: Marianne Stanek offered an update on the previous discussion regarding Moms Meals. At this time, only 2 Family Care members are receiving Moms Meals and it doesn't seem to be affecting our overall Senior Nutrition Program. Marianne Stanek reported that our cost is \$7.54 per meal for those under 65 years of age and Moms Meals cost per meal is \$7.41.

Cheryl Ketelhut noted that Family Care members can choose between our program and Moms Meals, and the SFCA approved providers could be utilized by all eight SFCA counties. Discussion was held regarding Family Care being an overall program of choice.

Update on Afterhours Crisis Intervention Services Request for Proposals: Randy Jacquet reported that the agency has been discussing our afterhours crisis system with various community partners over the last 2 years. In April 2010, a Request for Proposals (RFP) was announced and 3 proposals were received with 1 of the proposals not meeting the deadline for submission. The remaining 2 afterhours crisis intervention service proposals were reviewed and scored and 1 proposal was selected to move forward for further discussions – Northwest Connections of Eau Claire. Northwest Connections currently provides afterhours crisis intervention services to 11 counties around the Eau Claire area. Further meetings are scheduled to finalize the cost and determine whether or not we can afford this option. Randy Jacquet noted that after these discussions are finalized we would come before the Health and Human Services Board next month to possibly enter into a contract with Northwest Connections.

Fred Clary questioned if the agency plans to discuss the pros and cons of Northwest Connections with the 11 counties they currently provide service to. Randy Jacquet stated that Northwest Connections has already submitted letters of reference from a few of the counties they are

currently working with and Randy Jacquet has already spoken with a few of the other counties, but he will speak with them all before the next meeting.

Discussion was held regarding our current on-call afterhours crisis process and how this proposal will reduce our Mental Health Inpatient costs. It was noted that the main office for Northwest Connections is in Eau Claire, but a local presence would need to be established in this area. Discussion was held regarding the closing of the Boscobel Hospital's Psychiatric Unit having an impact on our afterhours crisis needs. It was noted that mental health and AODA afterhours crisis issues would be included with this proposal; however, children's afterhours crisis issues would still be addressed through the Children's Services Unit.

Family Care Enrollment Presentation: Linda Symons, Aging & Disability Resource Center (ADRC) Manager, Christy Duhr, Economic Support Manager, and Cheryl Ketelhut, Long Term Support Manager, offered a presentation on the Family Care Program. It was noted that Family Care operates with a three legged stool – the ADRC, the Economic Support Unit, and the Long Term Support Unit.

Linda Symons noted that the ADRC begins the initial process of enrolling an individual into the Family Care Program. A typical scenario would be an elderly farming couple; the man is offering care to his wife and they are seeking additional services to help relieve his stress. Linda Symons stated that a home visit is completed, financial eligibility reviewed, and case management is offered. A functional screen is performed and program options are offered – Family Care or IRIS. If it is determined that there is a functional and financial need, the enrollment process begins. The ADRC will continue case management until the couple enrolls into a program. Discussion was held regarding the content of the functional screen form which is created by the State. Fred Clary noted that financial information is highly confidential and releases are necessary before financial information is offered. Linda Symons distributed brochures from the ADRC, the Family Care Program, and IRIS (Include, Respect, I Self-Direct). Linda Symons also distributed a copy of the Wisconsin Adult Long Term Care Functional Screen – Version 3.

Christy Duhr stated that when the Economic Support Unit receives a referral, a prescreening application is necessary to determine program eligibility. Eligibility determination is based upon both assets of the individuals and Economic Support Specialists have 30 days to complete the eligibility process. Christy Duhr noted that at times this has been a difficult task to accomplish given our current reduction in staff. Christy Duhr distributed a copy of the prescreening application packet. Once the prescreening application is finalized, the ADRC is notified whether or not the family is eligible. The ADRC completes the enrollment process and transfers the paperwork onto the program the couple has decided upon.

Cheryl Ketelhut reported that the Long Term Support Unit reviews the incoming enrollee paperwork and assigns a case management team based on need, geography, and caseload sizes. There are currently 388 members enrolled in the Family Care Program and 16 Case Managers (8 social workers, 7 registered nurses, and 1 licensed practical nurse) take care of these members. Cheryl Ketelhut noted that there are 25 teams currently, as one social worker may team with 3 registered nurses to address the needs of one member.

Cheryl Ketelhut stated that case managers present members with a Member Packet which includes a member handbook, SFCA provider list, and a variety of other documents. Case managers visit with their Family Care members at least quarterly and members must meet functional and financial eligibility annually. A member centered plan is also completed every six months with each Family Care member, and this establishes outcomes for each member. Another functional screen is completed at least annually. Ray Schmitz stated that the SFCA receives State reimbursement based on acuity and the paperwork completed by the care managers is very necessary and directly linked to financial reimbursement. Cheryl Ketelhut noted that Richland County receives an annual acuity reimbursement review compared to the other seven counties which receive a quarterly review. It was noted that the three units meet weekly to discuss the enrollment of future Family Care Program members.

Lori Thuli introduced Kasey Banker and Jill Faulkner, Children's Services Social Workers. Jill Faulkner noted that she was an Intern with the agency for about one year while completing her education. Kasey Banker stated that she is returning to the agency and the county to do what she loves. The Board introduced themselves to the new hires.

Review the Care Management Unit's Service Level Agreement with Southwest Family Care Alliance (SFCA) and Current Contract Status: Randy Jacquet distributed the current SFCA Service Level Agreement noting that this agreement essentially requires us to do various tasks to make Richland County's Care Management Unit similar to the other seven SFCA counties. Randy Jacquet reviewed the Service Level Agreement, including program implementation, branding, personnel and leadership, and cost effectiveness. It was noted that this agreement was developed locally by the SFCA with involvement from the State. Fred Clary stated that he has issues with other entities being involved with the hiring of a Richland County employee.

Randy Jacquet stated that the State also requested the SFCA do a complete financial review of the program to ensure that the current model is fiscally responsible. The SFCA found that they could operate the program themselves and achieve a cost savings of \$250,000 annually. Various models are being considered and the SFCA Board will be deciding upon the models during their July 19, 2010 meeting. Randy Jacquet reviewed the following models:

Model A – current model.

Model B – This model increases the registered nurse per client ratio. SFCA would require more control over the operations, and would attempt to remove the county lines between the eight counties for both care managers and supervisors.

Model C – SFCA would completely takeover the program. This would mean that all Long Term Support Unit/Care Management Unit (CMU) employees would be laid off and potentially employed by the SFCA.

Randy Jacquet noted that the Health and Human Services Directors in the eight counties plan to meet next Thursday to determine how Model B could work. Ray Schmitz stated that the complication is that the SFCA has to work currently with eight county boards, eight county Directors, eight unions, etc. Ray Schmitz announced that Model A is projecting a potential

deficit of over \$1.8 million next year, Model B is projecting an \$118,000 deficit, and Model C is projecting a potential savings of \$124,000 for 2011.

Jeanetta Kirkpatrick stated that she feels moving to Model C is too premature since two counties have only been included in the SFCA current model for two months, and Model C was not the intention of the counties when they entered into the Family Care Program. Jeanetta Kirkpatrick reported that her allegiance has been questioned - whether she is looking out for Richland County or the SFCA. Jeanetta Kirkpatrick stated that she is looking out for the constituents and keeping the care local. Fred Clary questioned if Richland County is able to pull out off the SFCA. It was noted that Richland County could remove themselves, but they could not operate the program independently.

Patrick Metz distributed a handout that captured the Richland County costs if SFCA takes over the Richland County Case Management Unit – Model C. The following costs were reviewed:

Loss of indirect staff allocation	\$41,941
Loss of indirect operational costs	\$84,768
Loss of Representative Payee Program	<u>\$25,000</u>
Total Potential Loss:	\$151,709

Additionally, the current CMU staff have accrued benefits, comp time, and vacation time that would need to be paid out and there is also the potential for unemployment.

Randy Jacquet commented that a SFCA takeover would be very harmful to the agency and the potential for bumping could be devastating. It is possible that not all CMU staff would receive offers from the SFCA or CMU staff could choose to stay with Richland County and exercise their right to bump within their union.

Robert Holets stated that the SFCA has evolved into something different than was originally presented to the eight County Boards. Ray Schmitz noted that the State is directing the SFCA. Fred Clary stated that the Health and Human Services Board should be able to make a recommendation to the two representatives, Jeanetta Kirkpatrick and Ray Schmitz as to how we would like them to represent us. It was noted that Ray Schmitz is no longer considered an appointment of Richland County; rather he has been appointed by the SFCA Board.

Patrick Metz noted that if Model B is chosen, Richland County Health and Human Services would have to spend approximately \$7,000 in additional technology purchases that are being required by the SFCA. It was noted that the SFCA technology requirements would be a significant cost to the other seven counties

It was noted that the SFCA Board meeting is scheduled for July 19th and it is nearly impossible for the counties to join forces and educate each other prior to the meeting. Ray Schmitz stated that each one of the eight counties is a “provider” and they do not really have a say in what is going to happen. Fred Clary noted that the other SFCA providers have the choice to be an SFCA provider or not, and the eight counties have had no choice in this negotiation.

Convene in Closed Session Per Wis. Statutes 19.85 (1) (c) + (f) to Discuss Management Performance/Evaluation Relating to the Fiscal Management of the Agency: Jeanetta Kirkpatrick stated that this agenda item was included because it was the direction given to Randy Jacquet during the closed session in March 2010. Motion by Robert Holets, seconded by Walter Gust to not enter into Closed Session at this time. Motion carried.

Fred Clary stated that the County Clerk's audited report for 2009 was reviewed yesterday and there was a deficit listed for the Transportation Program and another Commission on Aging Program, rather than these being zeroed out. Patrick Metz stated that he would look into that more closely.

Fred Clary questioned why there is still a \$20,000 deficit for 2010. Patrick Metz stated that the layoff days and further reductions continue to offer a positive impact to the budget.

The Public Hearing is scheduled for next Thursday, July 15, 2010 at 5:30pm at the Community Services Building. The next regular Board meeting is scheduled for Thursday, August 12, 2010 at 9:30 a.m. at the Community Services Building. The Finance Sub-Committee will meet at 9:00 a.m.

Adjourn: Motion by Dr. Richard Edwards, seconded by Ray Schmitz to adjourn the meeting. Motion carried.

Respectfully Submitted,

Angie Rizner
Office Supervisor