October 24, 1972

TO   :   Dick Berman

FROM   :   Dan Zwick

SUBJECT: RMP Paper

ISSUE I

It seems there should be 2 other options:

1. RMP's should increase attention to categorical diseases

2. RMP should be included in revenue sharing but with separate earmark for the designated RMP organization.

You might wish to include another:

3. RMP should be included in revenue sharing but with separate earmark for designated RMP functions.

ISSUE II

I thought Marguelis was for the option of Federal certification of thellocal review process with moderate Federal program direction.

ISSUE III

I still believe the paper should deal with
"core staff" issue - perhaps by emphasizing % of
funds to be used for demonstrations and other
local activiries.

TAB B

I - Page 6 - Multi-categorical and compre-
hensive are not the same. -
Need breakdown of activities by
region, i.e. how many regions
doing things in demonstrations,
manpower, etc., by sub-activity.

Page 8 - Column 2 is confusing - it is
% of $35 million, I guess - it
would be good to indicate also
% of $111 million.

Page 9 - What do we know about "incor-
poration" results?

Page 11- Need information on fund allo-
cation by region, including
per capita.

II - Criticism and Response

For the purposes of analysis, the
criticisms need to be more fully presented.

1. What relationship to national goals?
Can more data be presented in
relation to 3 missions?

2. What about other regions?

3. How much is actually spent?

3B. How does manpower bit relate to
BHME reorganization plans?

4. Some of concern is reported high
staff salaries.

5. Need data on how many regions are
doing so.

6. Why so many "No Comments".

10. Confusion on "comprehensive" again.

11. Criticism that RMP supports largely
what would happen anyway - not
meaningful or effective changes,
individual whims.

Criticism that RMP adds to patient
care costs by developing extra
and costly resources.

III - Strengths

1. Major HEW "contact" with providers
is Medicare, not RMP. Statement re-
quires revision. Is it "provider
revenue sharing" or not?

2. Whose "reform"?

3. Note January conference. Why only
half?

4. What happens ~~often~~ "decremental" funding?

5. But are they becoming tools of medical society?

IV - Federal Needs

These ideas should be at least introduced much earlier in the paper. They relate closely to discussions of mission and related decision options.

Appendix

1. A simple table summarizing major legislative changes, by year, would be helpful.

3. Need information on fund distribution by region, including per capita.

5. Needs title

8. Wonder what makes New Jersey so good? Should ~~Bold~~ Missouri.

Ratings might be related to per capita figures.

9. Are there regulations?

Need more specific information on regional variations - for example, % of funds for demonstrations and core staff by region.

GROUNDWATER ACTION PLAN
ACTIVITIES PROGRAM

GLOBAL ACTIVITIES	1994	1995	1996	1997
MAYO - YAQUI				
Groundwater model				
Optimization model				
Suplementary data				
Aquifer action plan				
AGUASCALIENTES				
Groundwater model				
Optimization model				
Suplementary data				
Aquifer action plan				
MEXICALI				
Groundwater model				
Optimization model				
Suplementary data				
Aquifer action plan				
DELICIAS				
Groundwater model				
Optimization model				
Suplementary data				
Aquifer action plan				