



**JBH Regional CMHP Director's Advisory Committee Meeting
Monday, August 24 2009 – 10:30 – 12:00 a.m.
JBH Conference Room**

Committee Members: Ann Lynn – Klamath County; Maureen Graham – Jackson County; Kim Miller – Options

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

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

| Topic | Key Discussion Points | Action/Task/Decision | Responsible Person | Due Date |
|---|--|---|--------------------|----------|
| Approval of 06/22/09 Meeting Minutes | Ann Lynn asked for approval of the minutes for 06/22/09. Kim Miller motioned to approve the minutes of 06/22/09 and Maureen Graham seconded. Motion approved by all. | None | N/A | N/A |
| Action Items | | | | |
| Regional Reinvestment Grants | <p>Dave Bast explained that on the afternoon Board agenda, JBH is asking them to approve the Regional Reinvestment Grants and reiterated the review and approval process for the grants.</p> <p>Bob Furlow provided a detailed explanation of the discussions that took place with the Regional Reinvestment Grant Committee which covered three areas; training grants, base funding for Drop-In Centers and applications from more than one Drop-In Center within one county.</p> <p>The CMHP Directors discussed the continuance of the \$20,000 base funding to the counties to fund the Drop-In Center programs. They discussed the idea of the centers being consumer-run and volunteers versus paid staff and/or consumers. Following discussion, the Directors agreed with the Regional Reinvestment Grant Committee recommendations to recommend to the Board that this be ongoing until the balance in the Regional Reinvestment Grant fund needed to be reviewed. The Directors also agreed with the reporting requirement of an annual summary report that would include a fiscal reporting of the operations. If approved by the Board of Directors, base funding would start on July 1, 2009.</p> <p>The CMHP Directors discussed in detail how applications from multiple Drop-In Centers would be handled; is it for a true reinvestment project that is time limited, outcome based, etc. or is additional monies for existing operations. Following the discussion, it was agreed that it should be up to the County Mental Health Director to determine how to utilize those funds. Once the Director determined how to utilize those funds, JBH would disburse them accordingly.</p> | <p>The CMHP Directors agreed to recommend to the Board the continuation of the base funding of \$20,000 for the drop-in centers on an ongoing basis and until the balance in the Regional Reinvestment Grant Fund needed to be reviewed. If more than one Drop-In Center applied for a grant, the decision would be left to the CMHP Directors on how that \$20,000 base funding should be disbursed between one or multiple drop-in centers.</p> <p>The CMHP Directors endorsed the Regional Reinvestment Grant Committee's recommendations on the grant applications.</p> | N/A | N/A |

| | | | | |
|--|--|--|-----|-----|
| | <p>Bob Furlow informed the Directors that training was scheduled for August 26th at JBH from 1:00 – 3:00 p.m. on the Grant Application process and the new Regional Reinvestment Grant Policy.</p> <p>The CMHP Directors discussed the grant application from Jackson County in detail and the reasons it was denied. Questions were raised about whether or not grant funds could be used for a county-related program or if county staff could be part of a project. The group agreed that clarification was needed on the areas.</p> | | | |
| Warmline | <p>Bob Furlow explained that during a meeting with some of the CMHP Directors and MHO Directors it was voted to approve funding of \$115,000 to the Warmline with the bill being split between the MHO's and the Counties. He explained that the first JBH had heard of this was by receiving a bill from Coos County with an amount due. He explained that this bill has not been paid partly because JBH was not aware of this being the wish of the CMHP Directors. He also explained that JBH did not budget for this expenditure.</p> <p>Ann Lynn explained that Klamath County did get a bill as well and then came to realized that AOCMHP did vote on this without them knowing. She explained that they did receive a call and explained to them that Klamath County already had its own Warmline-type set up but in not knowing what to do; paid the bill.</p> <p>Maureen Graham explained that Jackson County did in fact talk to Angel about participating in the Warmline but after finding out that the price had gone way up and the support in setting it up had gone down they had decided not to do anything with Warmline. Maureen was also not aware of the vote at AOCMHP.</p> <p>Bob Furlow asked of the committee their advice on how they would like JBH to handle the bills being received. Do they want JBH to pay the bills and take it out of the County capitation?</p> <p>Kim Miller stated that Option had also received a bill and has paid it. Kim Miller explained that he did attend the AOCMHP meeting and that this was to be a one year trial basis with some tracking of usage available.</p> | The committee agreed that the Counties will pay the bills directly rather than having JBH pay the bill. | N/A | N/A |
| Klamath/Deschutes County Zip Code Realignment | <p>Dave Bast explained that he and Ann Lynn have had several discussions about the transfer of four zip codes from northern Klamath County transferred to Accountable Behavioral Health Alliance (ABHA) and that the Klamath County Commissioners have approved this.</p> <p>Dave explained that one of the issues that need to be clarified is that original discussions was only around OHP members but from speaking with ABHA it appears they want it to include funding for indigent citizens. Ann Lynn explained that it was only for OHP members and never included indigent. Ann Lynn explained some of the financial figures for doing this as well as some of the issues around the idea of Klamath County hiring staff in LaPine to see the members. She explained several of the issues in working with St. Charles hospital.</p> | Recommendation of the committee, with Ann Lynn abstaining, is that the County be allowed to decide with JBH being comfortable with the decision. | N/A | N/A |

| | | | | |
|---|--|--|------------|------------|
| | <p>Dave Bast stated that it really is up to Klamath County and explained that from the JBH side we are neutral but has to be a collective decision. He commented that another issue is that this is the first of what could be many in having counties decide to do the same with areas of their county that are closer to other regions. Kim Miller commented that he can see why from a consumer perspective Klamath County would want to make this change but does not believe that this is something as a region that can be reversed.</p> <p>Bob Furlow explained some reasons it might be good to give some consideration to ABHA's interest in the MHS24.</p> <p>Dave Bast explained that currently JBH's administrative cost is the lowest of the nine MHOs. If this change does increase the administrative costs it's not going to be taking major money out of the service dollars.</p> <p>Maureen Graham commented that the actual terms and the indigent piece make it look a little different so seems like there needs to be a little more discussion about how that would actually look and to have a little more details on the table. Dave Bast commented that by having additional discussions, this would allow JBH to begin their discussions with AMH, and also protects Ann Lynn in some way as the Klamath board has made their decision and JBH is prepared to support that. Maureen Graham stated that the recommendation is that the county be able to decide if that makes sense for them with JBH's approval but that it not be imposed on any other county.</p> <p>Ann Lynn commented that the BOCC did struggle with the decision but after careful consideration felt it was a good decision on behalf of the consumers.</p> | | | |
| <p>Integration</p> | <p>Dave Bast explained that there appears to be confusion between JBH and Jefferson County. He explained that as this is unrolling as to what is a pilot project nobody wants to assume the whole load. For meetings that have been held in other regions, there is not a full fledged project that has come in. It's actually now the converse of wanting to meet and see what can be sold. He explained the reason for the Integration meeting this afternoon is to clear up the confusion between JBH and Jefferson County and the misconception of the JBH region not being willing to look at the projects. Maureen Graham asked if any funding was available for the projects. Dave Bast explained that it appears there some hidden monies but this too changes daily.</p> <p>Ann Lynn explained some of the meetings that have taken place in Klamath County of some of the issues experienced between KCMH and the physical health players.</p> | | <p>N/A</p> | <p>N/A</p> |
| <p>Topics of Discussion</p> | | | | |
| <p>Curry County Site Review and Corrective Action Plan</p> | <p>Dave Bast explained what took place at the site review by the State for Curry County and that they were sited on several findings. He explained ways that JBH is looking at helping Curry County improve some of the issues around services. Ann Lynn asked who the interim director was at Curry County. Dave and Bob explained it was Carol Raper and that Jan Kaplan has been hired as the new Director. Dave Bast explained that he does not see a request for money from Curry County but there is potential for that in the near future. He asked that Mental Health Directors help Jan Kaplan understand how JBH operates. Bob Furlow explained some of the technical assistance being given by JBH.</p> | | | |

| | | | | |
|--|---|--|--|--|
| <p>Wraparound</p> | <p>Dave Bast explained what other MHO's are doing terms of rates for wraparound. The group discussed rates; flat, PE&O. Bob Furlow explained that after many attempts, JBH has scheduled a meeting for next week with County staff to discuss codes and rates. The meeting will be for the purpose of the code rate, how it fits on the B1 schedule, a definition for the code book, etc. Ann Lynn asked if the flat rate was in reference to care coordination. She commented that this is a challenge for Klamath County but PE&O might work.</p> <p>Commissioner Rhodes joined the meeting and introduced Jan Kaplan as the new CMHP Director and Carol Raper as the now interim director and Clinical Director for Curry County. The group then provided introductions.</p> | | | |
| <p>Future Board Meeting Items</p> | <p>Not discussed.</p> | | | |
| <p>Cross-County Billing</p> | <p>Maureen Graham asked what the hold up was with PHTech on Cross County Billing. Mike Sewitsky explained that JBH held a meeting with PHTech and they are in the process of generating a report that will show what services were provided by the County of Origin for the members. PHTech will retro that back to July 1st and then JBH will make adjustments hopefully in September, back to July 1, 2009.</p> <p>Maureen asked about the authorizations and getting those in; if that was still being done. Mike Sewitsky explained what forms had been received for authorizations and commented that some of them are a little vague in terms of what services are being provided; which is why the report is needed from PHTech to explain what those services are. Maureen Graham asked if JBH was just going back to July 1st of this year whether or not there was an authorization. Dave Bast stated the authorization has to be into PHTech for the payment to occur. Bob Furlow added that JBH will continue to work with the counties and to make sure the reports have what they want on the report.</p> <p>The group discussed some of the issues around care coordination rates and the variances in understanding Care Coordination. It was agreed that all parties should be involved in the discussions on this. JBH will schedule a meeting with all county staff to cover this topic.</p> | | | |
| <p>Capitation Rates</p> | <p>Mike Sewitsky explained that JBH budgeted a drop of 14% in capitation rates effective October 1, 2009. He explained that JBH received information from the State that beginning October 2009 rates will drop 4.6% and that during an actuarial services committee meeting last week it was being projected that the 2010 rates would increase 2.5%. He then explained that JBH received word over the weekend that there was an error in actuarial figures and that rates would actually drop in 2010 by 6%. The question is, is the decrease of 6% in addition to what we are receiving now or is it on top of the announced 4.6% decrease in October. Mike Sewitsky informed the group that there will be an increase in the Admin. from 8% to 8.1%. The group discussed in detail some of the issues with the fluctuating information from the State.</p> <p>Mike Sewitsky stated explained the number of payor codes and depending on what happens in October to determine what the impact will be to the County Mental Health Directors because some of the money that will be lost is for children inpatient services. Dave Bast commented that another factor is that the State is trying to go to a state-wide</p> | | | |

| | | | | |
|--|---|--|--|--|
| | <p>rate rather than one urban and one rural rate which could also have a big impact.</p> <p>Mike Sewitsky explained that JBH budgeted for a 30% decrease on indigent funds and that level of funding is staying the same. Bob Furlow commented that JBH will need to discuss what we do for hospitals because if the OHP monies drop and the indigent doesn't we may have to freeze or even roll the hospital rate back.</p> <p>The group discussed what might be going on at the legislative level and the possibility of the tax increases making it onto the voters.</p> | | | |
|--|---|--|--|--|

| | | | | |
|-----------------------|-------|------|-----|-----|
| Public Comment | None. | None | N/A | N/A |
|-----------------------|-------|------|-----|-----|

Meeting adjourned at 12:24 p.m.