



**JBH Regional CMHP Director's Advisory Committee Meeting  
Monday, January 20, 2009 – 10:00 – 11:45 a.m.  
JBH Conference Room**

**Committee Members:** Ann Lynn, Klamath County; Maureen Graham, Jackson County;

**JBH Staff:** Dave Bast, Bob Furlow, Mike Sewitsky, Patty Terhune

**Other:** Jeff Krolick, Options, David Geels, Coos County

**Ann Lynn called the meeting to order at 10:00.**

Topic	Key Discussion Points	Action/Task/Decision	Responsible Person	Due Date
<b>Approval of 11/17/08 Meeting Minutes</b>	<p>Ann Lynn asked there were any changes or corrections to the minutes, of which there were none.</p> <p>Mike Sewitsky stated a correction on page 3 should be "8% more than what is being reimbursed" rather than "8% than what is being reimbursed".</p> <p>Maureen Graham motioned to approve the minutes as with the noted change and Jeff Krolick seconded. Motion approved by all.</p>	Minutes approved by consensus with one correction.	N/A	N/A
<b>JBH Update Report</b>	<p>Dave Bast stated that with this Advisory committee he is still fine tuning how to communicate what is the best way to share information with the committee as well as get advice. He explained that the report is a summary of what JBH staff is doing over the last month. He stated that unless there are any questions he is providing it as an update.</p> <p>Ann Lynn asked if anyone had questions from the report.</p> <p>Maureen Graham asked if this committee was going to see anything on the 2009 MHO Contract because she knows from the QA level there will be some discussions on what is in that contract.</p> <p>Dave Bast explained that with the new contract come new regulations particularly in the Fraud and Abuse and Grievance and Appeals process. He stated that JBH will be communicating through its committees the details of the changes in order to make sure that JBH remains in compliance with the contract requirements. Bob Furlow added that in addition to the new MHO contract that JBH will be coupling that with the review by Acumentra. He explained that the CMHP's were copied on a letter sent to AMH stating what activities JBH delegates to the counties. Bob Furlow and Maureen Graham suggested that the list of delegated activities be review by this committee.</p> <p>Maureen Graham stated she appreciates that JBH is communicating to its committees the</p>	Add to February Agenda the list of delegated activities for a detailed discussion.	Patty Terhune	02/17/09

	<p>requirements in the MHO Contract but would like to see this committee actively involved as an oversight. Dave Bast and Bob Furlow agreed that it would be good to open the lines of communication on the MHO Contract requirements and how it affects not only JBH but its partners.</p> <p>Bob Furlow pointed out the ISA Review Reports in the Update Report and explained that this is a new requirement by the State in 2009. He stated that Karen Cady at JBH will be spearheading this requirement with the counties and providers.</p>			
<b>REPORTS</b>				
<b>ITS/ICTS Financial Report</b>	<p>Mike Sewitsky explained the report highlight the first six months of the fiscal year in terms of each of the counties ITS/ICTS expenditures. He explained the deficit and how it differed from prior years. He explained that the trending shows a decrease in expenditures in Klamath County which puts it more in line with other counties.</p> <p>He explained that JBH received approximately a 10% capitations increase and explained the breakdown in detail. He cautioned that with this capitation increase JBH is keeping in mind that the State is still looking at ways to deal with the budget deficit. Dave Bast commented that he still believes that the impact of the deficit will still fall on the Counties. He stated that burden will be how to deal with any cuts.</p> <p>The committee discussed the potential cut of 50% in the MHS24 Indigent Care funds and the increased risk that would come with it. They also discussed the impact in the loss of those funds along with a likely increase in the number of indigent citizens.</p> <p>Mike Sewitsky explained that with the current surplus in indigent funds that JBH will be able to sustain those cuts for a short while.</p>	None	N/A	N/A
<b>Acute Care Financial Report</b>	<p>Mike Sewitsky explained that the report reflects the six months of the fiscal year and showed that all the counties are in positive shape.</p> <p>Maureen Graham asked why Jackson County indigent pay was so high compared to OHP. Mike explained that it's based on the information based on numbers from PHTech as well as vouchers received. He offered to go back and double check the figures.</p> <p>Jeff Krolick asked if Mike Sewitsky if he anticipated any lag in billings. Mike Sewitsky said there is certainly some lag and pointed out that this is a cash basis report; that JBH does not have any accruals in the report at this point.</p> <p>Mike Sewitsky explained the report on the history of Acute Care since JBH took it over in July 2007.</p> <p>Bob Furlow explained to the committee that JBH is working on the creation of reports for the Mental Health Directors in the area of adult and hospital utilization.</p> <p>Nancy Firth explained that there are reports that are distributed to the counties through the SFSTP site and stated that if they have not received copies of those to check with their MMIS staff. Nancy Firth provided a copy of a hospital utilization management report for</p>	None	N/A	N/A

	<p>each county. Nancy explained that she was able to find data that had been used in the past to create the acute care report and is working with PHTech on replicating that report.</p> <p>Maureen Graham asked if the reports on the SFSTP site included specific claims data. Nancy Firth stated she didn't recall seeing it in the last report and would check with PHTech as to shy.</p> <p>Maureen Graham asked the committee if the cuts begin to become more obvious would the Director's want to discuss with their Commissioners whether or not JBH should sign a contract with the State on the MHS24 monies. The committee discussed some of the pros and cons of having the monies going back to the counties versus keeping at JBH as a shared risk.</p> <p>Dave Bast commented that the issue comes down to the concept of whether a county is better of on its own is it better to share the risk. The short time that JBH has administered the SE24 funds it has been able to maintain a surplus and have worked out relationships with hospitals. What's being talked about at the State level for 2010 on the money available from the State is that would be regionalized. He agreed there needs to be discussion on what comes out of the budget and the possibility of a regional rate for these services.</p> <p>Jeff Krolick commented that in due diligence Options is looking at what options are available for the CRC if funding is in fact cut. He informed the committee that Options may continue to have discussions with the State on alternatives for the CRC and would relay those discussions those in the region.</p>			
DISCUSSION				
<p><b>Review of Board Agenda for 01/26/09</b></p>	<p>Dave Bast explained that he wanted to walk through what JBH is bringing in front of the Board this month so if the Mental Health Directors have a discussion with their Commissioner they would be familiar with the topics. He explained the agenda items in detail to the committee.</p> <p>Dave Bast and Bob Furlow explained to the committee how it would be wise to have a facilitator come in to deal wit some of the mandates in front of the region, e.g. wrap around services, and how to strategize around those and many other issues facing the Counties and JBH with the potential budget cuts.</p> <p>Ann Lynn agreed with Bob but asked if we shouldn't wait until what the actual loss in funding will be. Dave Bast agreed and commented that one thing to consider is would it be more wise for JBH to take on some of the county tasks in this area to help relieve the need and lack of funding at the county level.</p> <p>The committee discussed the various ways to go through the changes on the horizon and the timing of what happens and when it happens; be it strategic planning or how to implement wrap around services, etc.</p> <p>Jeff Krolick commented that he would like to see JBH do more utilization and case review;</p>	None	N/A	N/A

	<p>who is coming in significantly under budget, how that's being achieved and can it be duplicated in other counties.</p> <p>Maureen Graham commented that she would like to see JBH out in the counties so that it really has an understanding of the processes in place at the county level. Dave Bast thanked Maureen for his comments and explained that after being in his position for over one year and with a new COO in place he does plan on getting out to the region on a more regular basis.</p> <p>Dave Bast wrapped his detailed explanation of the remaining items on the Board Agenda.</p>			
<b>2009 Meeting Dates &amp; Times for Advisory and Work Group Meetings</b>	To be discussed in conjunction with the 01/26/09 Board Meeting and their decision on their schedule.	None	N/A	N/A
<b>Update on Cross County Billing</b>	<p>Bob Furlow explained how the form provided was created. He explained that in reviewing the past discussions on this policy it appears that the one thing missing is the implementation plan. He asked the committee to review this form with their staff and provide feedback to him within the next two weeks. JBH will thing run a beta test on the form and if all goes well JBH would fully implement the policy.</p> <p>Maureen Graham suggested that it be tested with all counties because of the unique processes by each county. Jeff Krollick agreed it would be difficult to test it with only one county and added that the question of how far back the billing goes still remains unanswered. Bob Furlow asked that those kinds of comments and questions be added to the feedback.</p>			
<b>Public Comment</b>	Bob Furlow asked Mike Sewitsky if there was an update on the cost study report. Mike Sewitsky explained that they are still working on the template and when JBH receives that it will be forward to the counties.	None	N/A	N/A

Ann Lynn motioned to adjourn. Meeting adjourned at 11:35 a.m.