



**JBH EXECUTIVE BOARD
MEETING MINUTES**

MEETING DATE: March 22, 2010

MEETING TIME: 1:00 – 4:00

MEETING LOCATION: JBH Conference Room

BOARD PRESENT: Dave Toler – Josephine County; Dave Gilmour – Jackson County
BY TELEPHONE: John Elliott – Klamath County; George Rhodes – Curry County

JBH STAFF: Dave Bast, Bob Furlow, Mike Sewitsky; Ann Ford, Heather Hartman, Patty Terhune

CMHP DIRECTORS: Ann Lynn – Klamath County; Ginger Swan – Coos County; Jan Kaplan – Curry County; Kim Miller – Options; Maureen Graham – Jackson County

Commissioner Elliott called the meeting to order at 1:05 p.m. and asked for introductions.

CONSENT CALENDAR

Board Meeting Minutes of 02/22/10
Commissioner Elliott asked if there were any questions or corrections to the meeting minutes for, of which there were none.
Motion: Commissioner Toler motioned to approve the minutes as presented and Commissioner Gilmour seconded. Motion approved by all.
AMHI Teleconference Minutes of 03/16/10
Commissioner Elliott noted that the date at the top of the minutes should show 03/16/10 not 02/22/10. He asked if the questions that Jan Kaplan indicated in an email to the Board were answered.
Jan Kaplan stated it wasn't really a question but it was his understanding, and he has spoken with Commissioner Rhodes about this, was what we had put forward as the CMHP Directors was the notion that we saw this as a real opportunity but at the same time a significant risk if we didn't manage it well. The CMHP Directors were asking for a Care Coordination committee that would consist of the Directors, chaired by a Director, which would report to the Board to manage this project; working with JBH. Jan Kaplan explained that this was his marching orders from Commissioner Rhodes in terms of his agreement in being supportive of this. Jan Kaplan stated that the actual motion at the meeting of 03/16/10 didn't include that but his sense of the discussion was that that seemed to be acknowledged by the other Commissioners present. His concern is that is not reflected in those minutes.

Commissioner Gilmour agreed that it was discussed at length and not reflected in the minutes and that perhaps they should not be approved until they are rewritten and presented again to the Board.

Commissioner Elliott cautioned against selective memory. He stated that he did not recall that this project would be put under the CMHP Directors and bypassing JBH. Commissioner Toler added that the Board is seeking clarification from Jan Kaplan's email of March 19th. Commissioner Elliott commented that what is in that email is not what the discussion was on March 16th. He added that if it is necessary, we can ask for an informal transcription of that meeting. Commissioner Elliott stated that the idea in the email was that they (CMHP Directors) would be a higher level advisory committee with the Board of Directors just receiving a report from the CMHP Directors. He wants it to be a collaborative effort between the CMHP Directors, JBH Executives and the Executive Board. Jan Kaplan stated that was his intent in the email but perhaps his wording didn't capture it. Ann Lynn agreed and stated that everyone in the room was nodding in agreement with what Commissioner Elliott just stated.

Commissioner Toler commented that it appears that there is agreement on the concept; that it be managed collaboratively. Commissioner Elliott added he has no problem in points two or three of Jan Kaplan's email.

The group discussed in detail how the wording should be changed in the first key point of the email. Following discussion, it was agreed that the first point should state that the Project be under the review of a Long Term Care Committee consisting of the CMHP Directors and JBH staff with the committee making recommendations to the Board of Directors.

Commissioner Elliott asked with that understanding and clarification of the three points if the Board was prepared to approve the rest of the minutes. Jan Kaplan added that he would like to see that this committee also facilitates the money getting to the "street".

Commissioner Elliott asked for Dave Bast's feedback as to any pitfalls he sees right off the start. Dave Bast expressed concern over adding another level of reporting between the Executive Director of JBH and the Board of Directors. One of the significant changes that JBH has made, which led to improvement, was to change the administrative structure so that the Commissioners were the Board of Directors and not the CMHP Directors. He stated that his concern is that this would be a step backwards of putting JBH back in the position of the fox guarding the hen house. The intent of the movement from the State is to put the MHO into a regional position of making regional decisions on what is in the best interest of what services need to be developed in the region. He stated that he fully supports the involvement of the CMHP Directors but he would be reluctant, not for his sake, but the sake of future Executive Directors to put another line of reporting between him/her and the Board of Directors. Commissioner Elliott stated he doesn't think this is creating another level of bureaucracy. He is hoping that what we will see is a very thoughtful professional evaluation of the proposals based on on-the-ground affects of alternative decisions that could be made. Those are then to be weighed in the context of both what the CMHP Directors are saying and what the JBH Executive staff is saying for the consideration of the Board of Directors. Commissioner Elliott stated that he does not see it as giving line of authority over that program being given to the CMHP Directors. Commissioner Gilmour added that he agreed and that the structure we are trying to set up here is not much different from what is being done at the county level. It's basically having a collection of input and making recommendations to the Board and generalizing it from a county level to a regional level.

Commissioner Toler suggested the following wording for point number one of the email – "That a Long Term Care Advisory Committee be established that is comprised of all County Directors and JBH Staff with the expected outcome that there will be recommendations for the Executive Board of JBH on all pertinent matters." Commissioner Toller stated there was agreement in the room and

asked Commissioner Elliott for his thoughts. He stated he had no problem with that. Commissioner Toler reiterated that no one had any problems with key points two and three of the email.

Commissioner Elliott added that if there are problems then let's get them ironed out and not start an email war. The focus needs to be on the people in each county in the region; 58,000 people who are our clients.

Motion: Commissioner Toler motioned to approve the minutes for 3/16/10 and those minutes to include the three points as discussed at this meeting, with number one being as stated in quotes above. Commissioner Gilmour seconded. Motion approved by all.

REPORTS

AMH Data Discussion

Dave Bast explained that Jan Kaplan requested at this morning's CMHP Director's meeting that there be a discussion on this March 3rd report from AMH.

Jan Kaplan stated that the report provided is the State's report which reflects a legislative concern that the dollars being capitated to JBH for children's services are actually being spent on children's services. He provided numbers from the report of the percentage of capitation being encountered and stated that should be of concern with those numbers and that the goal should be at least 100%, which some of the MHOs are doing; if not higher. Jan Kaplan stated that one of the reasons for raising this is that on a monthly basis a portion of that capitation is put into reserves rather than going into services. He commented that there is a differing opinion between the CMHP Directors and JBH staff on how those monies should be sent to the Counties; after it is encountered versus being sent to the counties prior to encounter. The CMHP Directors view this as a managed care strategy that in order to encounter services we have to provide more services and in order to provide more services we need to get the money into the county budgets so that we can hire additional staff in order to provide that. The JBH staff's view it is to have a prudent reserve and a concern that if those dollars flow there needs to be accountability. He added that this report is from a year ago and since then we have added additional reserves thus more dollars not spent on services.

Commissioner Toler stated for clarification purposes. and in fairness to JBH Staff, the building of reserves is not just from JBH Staff but from direction of the Executive Board; given what the next biennium looks like. The Board is concerned about the future so we are trying to do is have some stability for mental health services come the next biennium. He added that he is open to hearing about new options.

Maureen Graham commented that they understand the need for reserves and they have been a part of those discussions. She stated that what is concerning from the AMH report is seeing how the figures are low for our region, which means in two years from now whatever money is available from the State for those services, more money will go to the other MHOs that are up near or at 100% and shrink our revenue thereby having a negative impact down the road. There needs to be a balance of how much reserve to keep and how much to use to generate encounters. Some of the proposals that came out of the discussion this morning is that there needs to be a decision on what is a reasonable reserve given the risk we take for down the road if we don't have the encounters and also having a joint commitment to increasing our encounters in a range of different strategies and looking some of our processes that may inhibit more encounters. She agreed that there is a need for reserves but we should also consider the need for additional monies to increase encounters.

Commissioner Gilmour added that you could view that those MHO's that are at 100% as being irresponsible for not putting money into their own reserves. We all expect the next biennium to be worse than this one with no federal stimulus money to pad the State budget. He commented that he feels that JBH is doing the responsible thing by building its reserves and we should continue to

be conservative.

Commissioner Rhodes joined the meeting at 1:30 and stated he would be available for approximately 10 minutes.

Commissioner Toler asked how the formula works in terms of encounters. Dave Bast explained that it is not clear cut. The pie is getting smaller so the issue now is how you slice the pie between the nine MHO's. If you are not at 100% you are at risk of getting less money the next go around. The other issue is if JBH just passes out the money and does not get the encounters you are going to lose even more money. He stated that with a new budget year coming up it is good time to decide as a group what those reserves should be.

Commissioner Toler asked if it was an average of encounters over a certain period of time. Dave Bast explained that it used to be they would look back three years but it appears that the current movement is to look at paid claims. Many of the MHOs are moving away from capitation and getting into fee for service which means you've got to earn it. One of the things that JBH has been doing, and has been reporting to the Board, is paying out of its Administrative costs to the counties additional monies with no strings attached to begin to develop services so that they can get more encounters.

Bob Furlow added that there has been an attempt to try to provide some averaging or weighting over an extended certain period of time. They want to see that services are at a certain level and average out the peaks and valleys of service. But over time, when you look at that, salaries and costs go up, so they want to try to weight some of the more recent events and the cost of those because if you were to take an average of a certain period of time and fund that, you wouldn't be anywhere near what today's costs would be and projecting that off into the future. That is why they are trying to do a hybrid but they are going to move to this paid claims scenario. The point is that there is a fulcrum to try and identify; how much money do you put out in advance and how much do you get back in encounter. We want to try to seed services. There also needs to be balance between outpatient services and inpatient services; how much should we set aside for acute care for both children and adults.

Commissioner Toler suggested that maybe we try to determine where that equilibrium is in order to determine how much is an optimal point to put towards increasing encounters while also maintaining adequate reserves. Commissioner Gilmour added is that what we don't really know what the reserves really are for the other MHO's or really what an optimum reserve would be.

Jan Kaplan added around the children's intensive services, JBH had a balance of over \$1m in reserves the beginning of this fiscal year; that was enough money to pay the average quarter. Over the course of this year to date we have received \$4.4m for services to children of which \$2.7m has made it to the street; \$1.4m that has not gotten out on the street. He commented that JBH now has enough money in reserves to cover two quarters but in two years from now, if the formula worked right, we would lose that \$1.4 million because we are not demonstrating that we are using it. The only way the counties can provide those encounters is if you put general fund into the counties so that they can hire staff to provide those services. He added that Dave Bast's point is well taken that if we just give the counties the money and they don't use it for services is no good either.

Commissioner Gilmour asked Jan Kaplan how he would get the encounters up. Jan Kaplan added that he needs to hire more staff to take the load off of the current staff and provide the services that are needed. Because the overhead is already paid, dollars that come to the counties do result in the addition of services.

Dave Bast added that part of the way the reserves were built is that JBH finally got into place the Utilization Management. Instead of long term placements in residential services we were able to cut that back. Dave Bast added that he has no problem with giving the counties more money but

the problem is that right now we are not getting the encounters for the services that are being provided. If we could see the good faith, quick reporting of the encounters he would be more encouraging of giving more money to the counties to hire more staff and develop more services; that makes sense in the long run. But if we aren't getting the encounters on the money we are giving now that creates a bigger problem. The more money we give that's not encountered the more problems we have.

Ann Ford explained that she recently came from the BCN system at which she was a Provider. She explained that the way BCN has their system set up is that you get 90% of your capitation rate on all sides, and then you get an extra 5% if your encounters are in on time; then you get another 5% if you reached your encounter level (they set up criteria for what you have to have in encounters). So across the board, BCN is not handing out the adult money like JBH is and if you look at their utilization management it is much better than JBH's. She stated there is something to be said for JBH at this point setting what is expected for encounters and then incentivizing those that get there.

Commissioner Toler commented that he thinks that is a great place to go and asked if we couldn't try to ensure that the encounters get there and if they don't then you wouldn't get all of those dollars. It leaves a little bit of risk for the counties but he believes the risk should be shared.

Bob Furlow commented that he thinks it would be helpful for the Board to see a report on encounters. He explained that JBH and the CMHP Directors receive a report on a monthly basis and explained how those reports could be used in generating a report for the Board. Maureen Graham pointed out that the encounters need to be costed with the County figures rather than the JBH fee schedule as it would give a more accurate picture. She added that we also need to look at the process of how those encounters get in. Maureen Graham commented that because of the convoluted authorization process whereas if an authorization is not in, the County doesn't get paid and therefore no encounter. She believes we need to look at that way things are set up through PHTech.

Karen Cady asked why there is a difference in how it looks on the children's side versus the adult side when you look at the AMH Report. Jan Kaplan explained that some of the difference is that the County receives a capitation and that money is broken out, but because of the way the children's system is set up we sometimes spend adult money on children's services because that is all the money we get. If we serve kids and we don't designate them as intensive it can almost have a perverse effect.

Commissioner Rhodes added that Curry County is not in a position to provide additional funds for those services and so it does put a county between a rock and a hard place. We want to provide those services to the community but we are not in a position to fund it. The County feels that if we have some additional funding from those reserves we can improve this encounter aspect.

Commissioner Elliott asked if there is any structural impediment to Curry County getting more money visa-vi the contact with JBH. Commissioner Rhodes stated not that he was aware of. Commissioner Elliott asked if you had the encounters you would be getting the money. Commissioner Rhodes added that if we able to fund the positions necessary we could get the encounters. Commissioner Elliott commented that he does not see anywhere in this report that we are billing more that we are getting. Jan Kaplan commented that it's because of the dollars actually received by the counties. The county can't provide 100% of the encounters if they don't receive 100% of the capitation.

Commissioner Elliott said its one thing to build up reserves for offset against future decreases in funding. It's another thing to utilize all of the money we have right now and have no reserves but we are fully maxed. The question is what happens if the State demands that the unused money be returned to them for allocation to other MHO's and the capitation is reduced. Dave Bast stated that the reserves could not be taken back per say. Commissioner Elliott commented that we should

then address the question that was raised, which was why not increase the monies to the counties out of the current year money? The Board discussed in detail where the balance should be between reserves and monies going back to the counties. There was agreement among the CMHP Directors that there is there a need for more staff in each of the county offices in order to get more encounters. Commissioner Gilmour suggested that we identify what is an optimal reserve and give the remainder back to the counties. Commissioner Elliott agreed so long as we get the encounters in; there needs to be some accountability. Consensus of the Board was to determine the optimal amount for reserves and then give additional funds to counties with some accountability for creating those encounters.

Commissioner Rhodes left the meeting at 1:55.

Commissioner Elliott asked if we have a handle on the average length of treatment plans for the clients. Karen Cady provided details on the length of stay in residential services and added that currently there more kids in residential services than usual. She explained that kids in ICTS could go on indefinitely. She also explained what we are seeing for kids in Day treatment services. Ann Ford added that there currently isn't good data on the adult side for average lengths of stay. She informed the Board that one of the things the State is pushing is Access to Services. The problem we will get on the quality side is that what we are reporting in the region is that clients are not getting access to services in the required length of time. She added that what she is seeing in these reports is that the County doesn't have a back log of people. The CMHP Directors provided some examples of some the issues of meeting the requirements of access and the resources it takes to meet that.

Commissioner Elliott commented that he is not seeing the work product that justifies dipping into reserves to give back to the counties. Commissioner Gilmour commented that it's a matter of how much should be in reserves. Commissioner Elliott commented that whatever the reserve level is if we are not operationally using the money we are getting, what that says.

Ann Lynn added that she realizes that there is a need for improvement in encountering the data. If the work was not being done we would see an increase in hospitalization. We need to get better at showing that the work is actually getting done while also improving some of the processes currently in place.

Commissioner Toler commented that what we don't have is what is the encounter rate to the dollars the counties are currently getting? Ann Ford suggested that we also have an average encounter per Provider.

Commissioner Toler commented that he thinks that we are all in agreement that we need to look at where that pendulum should be and suggested that we look at an analysis of what the ratio is with the dollars going out; then we can decide that. Commissioner Elliott commented that we can almost guarantee that when other MHOs see those percentages there will be lobbying to get those dollars back. Commissioner Gilmour added that you have to look at how efficiently the staff is being used. You have to make sure the systems in place are also efficient. Commissioner Elliott asked if everyone was in agreement. Commissioner Toler stated that folks in the room were nodding in agreement. Commissioner Elliott stated that would like to see that initial information be developed so that when we look at this it isn't just a county portion without seeing how that county is doing it. Maureen Graham added that we should also look at how at the counties encounter data versus what is at PHTech and what are some of the reasons for the differences between the two. Commissioner Elliott suggested that Dave Bast schedule a review of PHTech to see if there is slippage with some of that data and if so why.

Regional Reinvestment Grants – Quarterly Report

Heather Hartman provided a detailed report of the two current grants. She explained that report does reflect the outcomes that the Executive Board had requested at the last quarterly report.

Commissioner Elliott asked if the measurements shown reflect against a measurement standard. Heather stated that it is actually what their proposed outcomes were and that she is working with them on the new policy as these grants were approved prior to the new policy. Future grants would be more in line with the new policy and its defined outcomes.

Dave Gilmour commented that the way it is stated it appears the measurements are the outcomes.

David Fischer Financial Training

Mike Sewitsky explained that David Fischer from OHP is coming down on April 1st from 10:30 – 12:30 and that all county financial staff and CMHP Directors have been invited. David Fischer will be going over the quarterly financial reports that are due to AMH in detail and will also go over what future reporting requirements the State may have such as a balance sheet to show the financial solvency of the CMHP Program.

The CMHP Directors stated that they would be in attendance for this training as well as Financial Staff from the county.

Budget Committee Citizen Members Update

Patty Terhune reported that since the last Board Meeting one additional nominee has been presented for the Budget Committee for Josephine County. Commissioner Elliott asked if anything from Coos County has been received. Patty Terhune indicated that she had not heard from Coos County directly.

Retreat Update?

Dave explained that at the last meeting wizard we had all of the Board and were missing one CMHP Director and as of this afternoon the facilitator has indicated her availability for April 26th. The Board discussed the hours of the retreat. It was agreed upon 10:00 – 4:00 with a break for lunch. Commissioner Toler agreed to find a location for the retreat. The agenda for the meeting was discussed. Commissioner Toler suggested that everyone share items they feel should be on the agenda. Bob Furlow stated that Gina Nikkel, who is acting as the facilitator, indicated she would be creating a list from her various discussions and suggested we start with her. Kim Miller stated he would get a list of those items from Gina Nikkel and send them to Patty Terhune.

JBH Board Update Report

Dave Bast added to the report that as of last Thursday, eight of the nine MHOs have signed up for the AMHI projected. At this point the State has not indicated how the planning will proceed. The MHO Director's have generated their own list of questions regarding the project.

ACTION ITEMS

KCMH Request for ICTS extra funds

Dave Bast explained that the proposal from Klamath County is for additional funds to begin county-wide services for ICTS.

Ann Lynn stated KCMH is requesting support for up to six months to hire and support for a care coordinator. She explained that this will allow KCMH to begin encountering for those services. She explained that they intend to use a model similar to Benton county. It will give KCMH the ability to determine who will deliver those services, get more money out and more ICTS services delivered. It will take at least a couple of months to get things moving and begin establishing a children's system in the county, setting up for those services and billing.

Dave Bast added that JBH staff feels it is in the best interest of JBH to have the counties providing care coordination. He stated that in this morning's CMHP Director's meeting they unanimously supported the proposal. JBH staff is recommending that the money come out of the interest in the Utilization Management dollars that have built up rather than taking it out of reserves of which do need to show encounters.

Commissioner Gilmour requested an update at the end of the six months as to the progress in the development of the system.

Motion: Commissioner Toler motioned to approve appropriations of \$43,000 to come out of Utilization Management Funds and Commissioner Gilmour seconded. Commissioner Elliott asked if the \$4167/mo for the QMHA was fully loaded, which Ann stated it was. Motion approved by all.

PUBLIC COMMENT

None.

ADJOURNMENT

Meeting adjourned at 2:42 p.m.