



**JBH Regional CMHP Director's Advisory Committee Meeting  
Monday, June 22, 2009 – 10:30 – 12:00 a.m.  
Anne Basker Auditorium – Grants Pass**

**Committee Members:** Ann Lynn – Klamath County; Maureen Graham – Jackson County; Kim Miller – Options; Joe Adair – Curry County (11:20); Ginger Swan – Coos County

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

**Other:** Tamera Rose, Klamath County

**Ann Lynn called the meeting to order at 10:40.**

Topic	Key Discussion Points	Action/Task/Decision	Responsible Person	Due Date
<b>Approval of 05/26/09 Meeting Minutes</b>	Ann Lynn asked if there were any changes or corrections to the minutes, of which there were none. Ginger Swan motioned to approve the minutes as presented and Maureen Graham seconded. Motion approved by all.	None	N/A	N/A
<b>Action Items</b>				
<b>Cross County Billing Policy</b>	Ann Lynn commented that this policy was previously discussed with some recommended changes and from speaking with Patty Terhune understood that changes were made but asked confirmation. Bob Furlow stated that the changes had been made. Maureen Graham asked if there was an implementation date. Bob Furlow stated that as soon as possible and that if the committee is comfortable with the changes to the policy and the form it could begin the first of July; assuming the Board approves the policy today. He also commented that he appreciated the feedback from this group on the policy.	Consensus of the Committee was to move the Policy forward for approval by the Board of Director's with a July 1, 2009 implementation date.	N/A	N/A
<b>Claims Processing Policy</b>	Bob Furlow explained that this policy was a result of recommendations made during JBH's last audit and that after it was implemented by the Board, JBH received more feedback from the Counties and Providers around the 90-day timeline on submission of claims. As a result of that feedback that timeline was changed to 120 days while maintaining the overall timeframe of 180 days. Kim Miller asked if Bob Furlow could again explain the reasoning behind the 180 day timeframe. Bob Furlow explained that this keeps the claims submissions in line with the timing stated in the OAR's. Ann Lynn expressed thanks for making those changes and asked if there were any other questions. Dave Bast added the reason this policy was revisited was because there are some children's providers that are still irregular in the way they submit claims and not having that data in on a timely manner. He stated that this policy, while allowing some leniency, will not only help get claims processed in the appropriate time frames but also get the encounter data to the State in the required timeframe. Bob Furlow commented that CMHP Directors may hear some feedback even after this in affect and asked that when they provide feedback to Providers understand that there are and will be extenuating circumstances, which is covered in the policy, and secondly that JBH is mandated by the State to get a certain percentage of	Consensus of the Committee was to move the policy forward for approval by the Board of Director's; leaving the implementaiton date at May 1, 2009.	N/A	N/A

	claims processed within the given timeframe. Ann Lynn asked if this needed to go to the Board of Directors for approval. Bob Furlow explained that it had been approved by the Board but after receiving additional feedback on the policy some changes were made and therefore needs to back to the Board for approval. Dave Bast explained that some of the feedback was from the Hospitals regarding the dual eligibility claims and needing more time to process. The other was a concern from Providers on being paid for old bills already submitted. He explained that the position he took was that those claims would fall under the extenuating circumstances but that for new claims JBH would not pay for claims that go as far back as 2005, 2006, 2007 or 2008. Kim Miller asked if the implementation date was going to stay at 05/01/09 or does it need to be moved out. Bob Furlow explained that he did not feel it was necessary to change the 05/01/09 implementation date, especially given the extended 30 days in the policy.			
<b>Topics of Discussion</b>				
<b>Encounter Data Deadline</b>	Dave Bast explained that with the issues in the MMIS systems it appears that AMH is not going to be using current encounters but are going back to 2008. Bob Furlow further explained that the last discussion was to use data through March 31, 2008 instead of December 31, 2008. Dave Bast stated that it is still important to get current encounters in because eventually they will be counted.			
<b>MMIS System</b>	Bob Furlow provided an update on what is happening at the AMH level on the issues surrounding the implementation of the new MMIS system. He explained that there are approximately 750,000 encounters being sat on by PHTech until the issues are resolved and that until everything is settled, the State is only paying out approximately 90% of the capitation. Maureen Graham asked why they were limiting the capitation payment. Bob Furlow explained that it is because it could affect the number of eligible's and covered lives. The CMHP Directors explained some of the issues happening at the County level.			
<b>Cost Study Deadline</b>	<p>Mike Sewitsky explained that Dale Jarvis has stated that July 1<sup>st</sup> is the deadline but that July 15<sup>th</sup> is the absolute deadline that all data must be received. Dave Bast explained that positive feedback has been received from those that have already used the system and that JBH also received positive back for the system already being used.</p> <p>Maureen Graham asked Mike Sewitsky if any help is needed, could staff contact him. Mike Sewitsky explained that he has been in contact with staff from counties and stated that following the adoption of the budget he could devote time to helping anyone that needs help with the cost study tool. Dave Bast also explained that if anyone needs help to contact Mike Sewitsky first rather than Dale Jarvis as the turnaround will be much quicker given the amount of people potentially trying to get a hold of Dale Jarvis. Bob Furlow asked if Mike Sewitsky has heard from any of the Providers about the cost study which Mike stated he has not but is already working with one on how to complete the Study.</p>			
<b>Integration Update</b>	Dave Bast provided the latest update on the discussions taking place at the State level on Integration and provided a copy of the latest draft on the position statement put together by the MHO Directors. Bob Furlow explained some of the discussions taking place in the federally qualified health care organizations, who are looking for a way to partner with mental health, and that in order for this to really move in any direction the State is going to need to invite the MHO's to the table in order to get a real idea as to how this is going to work. Dave Bast explained that JBH has expressed their willingness to a part of these	None	N/A	N/A

	<p>discussions and that there is nothing going on behind the scenes to work any kind of special deal. Both Dave Bast and Bob Furlow stated that in order for Integration to go anywhere there needs to be some real sit down discussions between the MHOs and the Health Care clinics. The CMHP Directors provided an update on some of the discussions taking place in each county in and around Integration.</p> <p>Bob Furlow commented that one of the things that has come up is what data information does JBH have available that would reflect in a way that could be shared with some of the physical health partners. He explained that JBH has started working with some of its staff to prepare a set of data that Dave Bast can use to share when he is meeting with the physical health partners.</p> <p>Dave Bast encouraged the CMHP Directors to talk with the Federally Qualified Health Centers in their counties to see what their position is on integration.</p> <p>Bob Furlow stated that with the coming amendment to the MHO Contract around the Indian Health Service issue, that this might be a good opportunity to open up some dialogue with those organizations and offered assistance on how to comply with this new requirement.</p> <p>The committee discussed the timelines within the current Senate Bill and how it could be affected by what's going on at the federal level with Healthcare Reform.</p> <p>The committee also discussed ideas around the physical health and mental health sharing in the cost of a position that could help facilitate with some of the high needs clients.</p>			
<p><b>Wraparound Update and Discussion of Codes</b></p>	<p>Dave Bast explained that during earlier discussions around wraparound it was decided to wait until the budget was finalized before making any significant moves and that more recently there have been some questions around the use of an already existing wraparound code.</p> <p>Maureen Graham stated that she was surprised to see that a price had never been set for the wraparound code that is already defined. Regardless of what happens with the wraparound initiative the use of this could be used and begin getting in encounter data in on the wraparound services that have and are already in place.</p> <p>Bob Furlow suggested that a group be organized to discuss the code and a setting of a rate for that code. Once that group has come up with a plan it can be presented to the Board of Directors for approval.</p>	<p>CMHP Director's to provide a name to Bob Furlow for participation in a group to set a rate for the wraparound code.</p>	<p>CMHP Directors</p>	<p>N/A</p>
<p><b>Rates</b></p>	<p>Dave Bast explained that when JBH met with the Children's Providers this past spring regarding the rates in their contracts it was agreed that the rates would remain the same but that JBH would have further discussions once the budget cuts were known. He stated that JBH still does not know what those cuts will be and provided some comparisons of where JBH stood on rates. He explained that he and Mike Sewitsky had discussed what the ranges were as well as what options were available for the residential treatment rates and bringing them more in line with other organizations. Mike Sewitsky explained that the current rate was \$9100/month and that with the implementation of the Utilization Management plans and the current surplus it has created, JBH will be increasing the Full</p>	<p>None</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>N/A</p>

	Residential rate effective July 1, 2009 to \$10,000/month. This will put the region more in line with what other MHOs are paying in the State.			
<b>Discussion of topics on afternoon agendas</b>	<p>Dave Bast explained the two policies on the agenda have already been discussed. He also explained what would be presented in the Budget. Dave Bast asked the committee if they had a preference for holding of July meetings. Maureen Graham stated she would be fine with no meeting but would like to see the discussion on the wraparound rate continue during that time.</p> <p>Maureen Graham asked about the acute care indigent funds Board Order. Dave Bast explained that this was placed on the agenda because of a question on if the Board Order needed to be renewed. However, since the time it was placed on the agenda JBH received word from both its counsel as well as the State that the Board Order did not need to be renewed. A new Board Order would only be needed if a decision was made to change the management of those funds. Dave Bast added that with the reserves in the acute care funds some ideas of how some of those reserves could be used in bringing down the costs in other areas; e.g. the development of alternative services, case management, etc.</p> <p>Maureen Graham suggested that Frank Kennedy, JBH Acute Care Manager, present at a future meeting showing data on the use of the CRC's. Bob Furlow explained that he already has him working on that kind of data.</p> <p>Dave Bast explained that there is momentum building up in one of the MHO programs to petition the State to take over having county be responsible for long term care. He explained that from past experience he is not overly optimistic that this will work, as the money does not always flow back to the counties and it only takes one or two high risk cases to have a big impact on a small county. He stated that he would welcome input from this committee but that his current position is to not volunteer JBH for this kind of program. Maureen Graham asked if the idea would be something like JBH having a 16-bed secure long term facility; as an example. Dave Bast explained the idea is that there will be charge backs to a county for anyone in a State facility. So the incentive is to keep them out of the State hospitals and in a long term facility.</p>	None	N/A	N/A

<b>Public Comment</b>	None.	None	N/A	N/A
-----------------------	-------	------	-----	-----

Maureen Graham motioned to adjourn and Ginger Swan seconded. Meeting adjourned at 12:00 p.m.