

Policy Issues Discussion and Committee Determination to the County Board for its Consideration

A. Next Steps

1. Policy Issues that Need to be Discussed Resolved
2. Administrative Actions
 - Discussion
 - A need was identified to update information on the number of protective placements and the cost of placing them in some other facility. The County must assure their placement, but they do not have to be placed in a County facility. Past estimates had that number at just over 30, we may be on track to double that number at 60.
 - Committee members discussed the importance of providing human services that are not provided by others. Also, understanding the current market and how the market may shift in the next five years may be a key to charting the future of MVCC.
 - Bill Miller suggested that committee members may want to reach out to representatives of Counties that no longer provide skilled nursing care. Are they satisfied? How did they handle the transition? What happened to those protectively placed? What was the impact of the County budget?
 - Others said that information from the Marathon County Partnership for Active Aging (Amanda Ostrowski) might help us better understand the community context.
 - Jack Hoogendyk asked for greater clarity about what the County is required to do under the Chapter 55 and what it means when the statute says – within available resources.
 - Action
 - No action requested.
 - Follow through
 - Staff and the consultants were asked to develop some more information about protective placement, market conditions, and legal requirements.

B. What are the Policy Questions the Committee Needs to Address Regarding the Future of MVCC?

- Discussion
 - Discussion moved to the proposed 16 million dollar renovation. Committee members learned that part of the cost can be recovered within the Medicaid rates. Facility upgrade will also help attract private pay and Medicare clients by improving “curb appeal” to a facility already located on a beautiful site. This will help “right size” the census to help financially.
 - The question was posed: Does Marathon County choose to stay in the skilled nursing facility business? Closure may be difficult, family members may be hurt, but it has been done elsewhere. Each client must have a discharge plan. Admissions would stop.
 - The status quo seems like a poor option to many as the facility needs reinvestment and the financial woes will do nothing but get worse.
 - Selling the facilities where it would be operated on site by private sector employees is an option. The level of control the County would have will depend on the Agreement. A private operation will not receive IGT funds.
 - Right sizing the census and upgrading the facility is an option. Reducing traditional long-term care beds is a start to improving financial performance and distinguishing our program/services from those provided elsewhere in the County.

- Jack Hoogendyk said that the policy question is more than financial:
 - Legal, in what the County is required to do.
 - Social, impact on people, families, and other agencies in the care network.
 - Financial, what can the County afford, what are the other funding opportunities?
- A decision was made for the two committees to continue to meet jointly.
- Action
 - No action requested.
- Follow through
 - The committee will continue to work toward understanding the options available and the implications of each at subsequent meetings.

Scheduling of Future Meetings and Identifying Agenda Topics

- The committee will meet next as follows:
 - September 5, 2017, 6:30 p.m.
 - September 21, 2017, 6:30 p.m.
- Both meetings will be in the Board Room at NCHC.

Announcements

- None

Adjournment

- **Motion**/second, Metter/Miller, to adjourn the Nursing Home Operations Committee meeting. Motion carried.
- **Motion**/second, Rosenberg/Drabek, to adjourn the Mount View Care Center Committee meeting. Motion carried.

Meeting adjourned at 9:10 p.m.

*Minutes Prepared
By Brad Karger
On August 3, 2017*