

## Parsons, Ken V (DHS)

---

**From:** Zimmerman, Marie L (DHS)  
**Sent:** Tuesday, July 09, 2013 7:29 PM  
**To:** Hudson, Mark J (DHS)  
**Cc:** Leitz, Scott D (DHS); Golden, James I (DHS)  
**Subject:** RE: MN MC Study Report Draft 062613  
**Attachments:** MCO report mz.docx

Mark,

Thanks for the the word version so I could provide edits and comments. They are all targeted only to the sections on HCDS/payment reform/SIM.

In general, I would say that SIM should stay out of it. There's not a lot in here about it, but there's nothing that speaks to it's relevance to MCOs and they make some pretty big ascertains about the role of managed care that I don't think align.

As it relates to HCDS, I made some factual and other corrections, but the section feels extremely weak and it's relevance is questionable given they did not attempt to understand what we are doing and why we have chosen that path and what that says about and implies for managed care. You can see my comments. If they had done that, then I think the relevance would be clear. This seems also seems very one-sided. For example, there is a paragraph that essentially says that the state needs to build all of this contracting and analytic capacity that may be better delegated to payers. There is absolutely no recognition of what we have already built. And also speaks nothing to the limits of dealing with multiple plans and their own data and analytic capacity.

I'm happy to talk to them, but it reads as though they just read about HCDS in an article somewhere and don't really know what we are doing and how it relates to managed care. I'm not sure why we would want that in this report. I would suggest paring it down if we are more concerned with getting this to the legislature faster.

Thanks,  
Marie

---

**From:** Hudson, Mark J (DHS)  
**Sent:** Wednesday, July 03, 2013 9:48 AM  
**To:** Zimmerman, Marie L (DHS)  
**Subject:** MN MC Study Report Draft 062613

Took some time to get a word version. Here is the attached. You were on the list and they should have talked to you. I talked with PCG and they may well follow up. I ended up having to sit in on some calls to get them to take place and they never indicated that they had not talked to you.. I did not realize until now that they had not talked with you. I have the feeling that they may have confused you with a person at HP. I will make sure that you can make the call on the report with PCG

**Caution:** This e-mail and attached documents, if any, may contain information that is protected by state or federal law. E-mail containing private or protected information should not be sent over a public (nonsecure) Internet unless it is encrypted pursuant to DHS standards. This e-mail should be forwarded only on a strictly need-to-know basis. If you are not the intended recipient, please: (1) notify the sender immediately, (2) do not forward the message, (3) do not print the message and (4) erase the message from your system.