



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

JBH Staff: Dave Bast, Bob Furlow, Mike Sewitsky, Ann Ford, Heather Hartman, Karen Cady, Patty Terhune

Ann Lynn called the meeting to order at 10:05 a.m.

Consent Calendar				
Approval of 02/22/10 Meeting Minutes	Ann Lynn asked if there were any questions or changes for the meeting minutes of 02/22/10, of which there were none. Maureen Graham asked about the minutes stating for the TPA Delegation and Oversight Policy being stated as an email format for the discussion on the policy because she did not recall that as part of the discussion. Ann Ford stated that her recollection was that everyone was going to take a look at the policy and send back comments through an email so we didn't have to bring it back. Bob Furlow added that this was his recollection as well. Ann Ford stated she would put out a new request asking for feedback by email. Kim Miller motioned to approve the minutes as presented and Maureen Graham seconded. Motion approved by all.	None	N/A	N/A
Discussion Items				
AMH Data Discussion	<p>Jan Kaplan expressed concern in relation to children's capitation and what the report shows for the percentage of capitation as well as the amount of money in reserves for children's services that could be spent on services. His concern is that there is money that is not getting out to the counties to provide services and thereby encounters could increase our risk in a decrease in future capitation dollars.</p> <p>Dave Bast stated that he is in agreement with Jan Kaplan is saying. The issue is that JBH is providing capitation but the encounters are not coming in. He explained some of the history behind JBH's issues with getting encounters in and that when JBH started getting their encounters in, there was an increase in the capitation rates. But all that did was lessen the amount of the existing pie being divided among the MHO because the pie itself did not get any larger. When the other MHO's see the amount of capitation going to JBH, combined with the low number of encounters, they are going to want some of that money back.</p> <p>Jan Kaplan stressed that if more money were given to the counties it would</p>	None	N/A	N/A

allow them to hire the additional staff needed to deliver the services and therefore increase encounters. Mike Sewitsky explained that there is additional money already going to the counties. He stated that those reserves are what helped fund the large deficit JBH experienced in ITS services by \$600k in 2007. He added that we don't know what the 2011 budget looks like and suggested we wait until January 2011 when we know what the new rates will be.

Maureen Graham asked Mike Sewitsky about his question to the State around the ICTS funds that come in and that whether or not we had to have a Fee For Services system or whether JBH could sub-capitate the payments for residential. Mike Sewitsky explained that Bill Bouska preferred to have a phone conference with us so we can get clarification on if it could be used for non-encountered services. Maureen Graham clarified by stating that there is a difference between encounter and whether or not the money can come to the counties. The question is why are we doing it differently on the ITS side to where we get the money after they deliver the services. Ann Lynn added that she too does not understand why the ITS capitation is treated differently than the ICTS capitation. We should be able to manage those dollars to billed dollars.

Dave Bast suggested that rather than the Counties and JBH asking the State these kinds of questions which has resulted in varying answers perhaps the region should jointly address the State with questions to see if we can get more definitive answers.

Bob Furlow shared that the risk pool that JBH should maintain should be negotiable but ultimately is up to the Executive Board. If that pool gets below the risk pool it would put JBH at risk being able to pay its bills which will ultimately impact the counties. Dave Bast added that when JBH finances were in poor shape, that the directive of the Executive Board was to build up those reserves.

Maureen Graham commented that she strongly believes that the way ITS dollars are distributed needs to be revisited. She summed up by saying that the region needs to agree to focus on ways to increase encounters, have that joint conversation with the State, and discuss if the reserves we have now are big enough or do we want to keep building on that or do we want to distribute some of those funds. Bob Furlow asked if when the Directors are talking about resetting those ITS Funds are they talking about outpatient side and/or the residential and day treatment side. Maureen stated she believes it would be the same as the county's outpatient capitation.

Ann Lynn commented that a question that remains is that what we are hearing from JBH is that counties do need to bill to those dollars for ITS. She stated that in her conversation with the State regarding this, they stated it does but was also politically correct in its answer as to MHO's doing it

	<p>differently. She does agree that we need to look forward on how we can manage those dollars in the region.</p> <p>Mike Sewitsky added that JBH is doing a budget supplement in April and in that budget it will project out what those funds balances are. Bob Furlow added caution in that with those administrative dollars that go out, the State will expect to see services tied to those dollars.</p> <p>Maureen Graham suggested that JBH look at preparing data within the region so we can look at how many encounters were getting per county, a breakdown of the costs so we can look that on a monthly basis and provide feedback to the State.</p> <p>The group agreed that we need to take on the task to increase encounters but there is difficulty in doing that when the State changes the rules. It is going to take a concerted effort to how to build up those encounters and also making the State aware of those issues.</p>			
KCMH Request for ICTS extra funds	<p>Ann Lynn explained that the request by Klamath County is to put money on the floor to hire additional staff. She explained that she has to find the funds within their current budget for that second staff person. Ann Lynn stated that this would change the way KCMH would do business by being a mini children’s system and being more involved in the children services being provided throughout the county.</p> <p>Dave Bast explained that he has consistently told Ann Lynn that it is in the best interest of the counties to do care coordination. He explained the unique situation in KCMH with KYDC. He explained that part of the issue is the proposed amount exceeds his authorization. Another issue is that KCMH is asking for money that other counties did not get when they developed their services. He does not want to see the money coming out of the ICTS funds but rather through monies earned through interest. He also explained that this would be given as a reward to the county with any encounters resulting out of those funds going to Klamath County.</p> <p>Maureen Graham asked why that cannot come out of KCMH reserves. Mike Sewitsky stated until we get clarification from Bill Bouska he believes it would be better to go into the Utilization Management Reserves interest earned and explained what other ways that fund has been used. He is more comfortable with that until clarification is received from Bill Bouska.</p> <p>Jan Kaplan moved to support the funding in KCMH’s Proposal and recommend so to the Executive Board. Consensus of the Committee was to move this forward for Board approval.</p>	None	N/A	N/A
Regional Reinvestment Grant Review and Appeal Process	<p>Heather Hartman explained that there are currently two grant recipients, provided in detail what the report included. She also explained how she is working with grant recipients on the outcome piece.</p>	None	N/A	N/A

	<p>Heather Hartman explained that there is currently one applicant for the next cycle as well as some of the issues of bringing the committees together for the approval process. She explained that she would like to revisit part of the policy around the approval timelines as well as the makeup of the committee.</p> <p>Maureen Graham suggested that there be two grant cycles rather than four to allow more time for the application process.</p> <p>Jan Kaplan put forth a recommendation that with all the meetings that involve CMHP Directors that a full day meeting be considered for them rather than a half day. This would allow more time to cover all the various business matters.</p> <p>Heather Hartman stated she will put together a proposal of changes to be presented at the next CMHP Director’s meeting.</p> <p>Maureen Graham suggested that some funds from the regional reinvestment grants be used toward a local peer training program and that maybe someone put together a project that could be funded. Heather Hartman explained that she is working with the drop in centers on helping them understand that process and then develop such a program. Bob Furlow agreed with this idea and that they pay off for the counties would be very positive.</p>			
<p>David Fischer Financial Training</p>	<p>Mike explained that David Fischer will be at JBH on April 1st from 10:30 – 12:30 to review the quarterly reports required by AMH. David Fischer will go over those reports page by page as well as discuss future reporting cycles. DHS is getting pressure from CMS to see balance sheets from the counties each quarter.</p> <p>Kim Miller asked who should attend outside of the CFO. Mike Sewitsky explained that it should be the financial staff of the Counties.</p> <p>The group discussed that the Balance Sheet David Fischer is referring to is a carve out for the OHP funds.</p> <p>Dave Bast encouraged the CMHP Directors to attend as well so that they can hear directly what the State is explaining about the reports as well as what is coming down the road in financial reporting requirements.</p>	<p>None</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p>Financial Report</p>	<p>Mike provided a report to explain why ICTS reporting is done by projection rather than actual. He explained that actual does not show care coordination for the past three months, the delay in ICTS reporting and in residential treatment costs. It is prudent for JBH to forecast those numbers knowing that there have been actual costs incurred but not reported.</p> <p>Mike warned in reporting actual vs. projected because it does not accurately</p>			

	reflect the costs that JBH knows will in fact occur.			
Aim High	<p>Dave Bast explained that eight of the nine MHO's have filed letters of intent for the AMHI project. At this point all of the planning for AMHI has been internal with the State. The MHO's directors met last week and came up with a list of questions for the State, which Dave provided copies of to the group. He explained that the planning committee is supposed to meet and April at which point the planning process should be defined. Dave Bast added that with eight of the nine MHO's expressing interest the money available will decrease.</p> <p>Kim Miller asked what this issue was with the original stated amount of \$40m. Dave Bast stated that Jane-Ellen Weidanz apologized and stated she had mis-spoke when giving that amount. Jan Kaplan commented that a fair amount of the \$40m was tied up in PSRB.</p> <p>Jan Kaplan commented on the minutes from the AMHI meeting minutes and that they do not adequately reflect some of the. Dave Bast explained that the minutes do not reflect every detail of the discussion and the motion itself does not reflect every part of the discussion. Dave explained that this will have to be properly noted at this afternoon's meeting with the Board.</p>	None	N/A	N/A
Policy Development	<p>Dave Bast explained that Ann Ford had suggested earlier that more time is needed in policy development. Ann Ford explained that there are currently some policies in the development phase and that they will go through a 60 day review process. She also explained that she is going to suggest to the QA Committee that definitions be removed from all of the policies. Maureen Graham suggested that a standard set of definitions be available from JBH which Ann Ford agreed there would be.</p> <p>Bob Furlow explained that some suggestions of the have been presented on the Cross County Billing and Authorization policy and that there was a joint meeting with some county staff, JBH and PHTech about the procedural piece. A copy of some proposed changes to the policy was provided. It was agreed that Josephine and Jackson counties would review the proposed changes and come back with feedback so we can finalize the process with PHTech. Maureen Graham asked Kim Miller if they could agree today that we are fine with number three of PHTech generating that report, which Kim Miller agreed to. Mike Sewitsky will call PHTech to inform them of that decision.</p>	None	N/A	N/A
Retreat Update?	Dave Bast explained that at the request of the Board a new request was put out with proposed dates with the only agreeable date for the Board is April 26. The committee discussed the issue of not having the facilitator present for that date. Kim Miller will contact the facilitator to see if there is any chance she can make the April 26 th date seeing that all other participants are available.	None	N/A	N/A

Items added by CMHP Directors				
--------------------------------------	--	--	--	--

	Dave Bast requested that for future meetings that the CMHP Directors get to Patty Terhune two Fridays prior the meeting.			
--	--	--	--	--

Public Comment	<p>Dave Bast shared copies of the proposed changes in the 2011 MHO contract. He pointed out that one of the proposals is to add language in the MHO contract to have MHOs contract with FQHC and that JBH is being perceived as uncooperative. Maureen Graham reported that Jackson county has met with the two FQHC's in the county on how the two might contract through JBH. She believes it is likely that this will in fact happen. Ann Lynn reported that KCMH is in the process of putting together a contract with its FQHC. Kim Miller reported that Options is meeting with FQHC next week.</p> <p>Dave provided a report by Acumentra passed out at the MHO Directors meeting showing survey results from consumers in our Region. Ann Ford will take this report to the QA Committee to begin reviewing and discussing ways to come up with improvements.</p>		N/A	N/A
-----------------------	---	--	-----	-----

Meeting adjourned at 12:20 p.m.