



Medical Facilities Planning

Long-Term and Behavioral Health Committee Minutes

**May 14, 2010
Council Bldg. Room 201
10:00 am**

MEMBERS PRESENT: Dr. T.J. Pulliam –Chair (via phone) Jerry Parks, Vice-Chair, Don Beaver, Johnnie R. Farmer, Senator Anthony Foriest, Ted Griffin, Zach Miller, Pam Tidwell
MEMBERS ABSENT:
STAFF PRESENT: Gene DePorter, Patrick Baker Victoria McClanahan, Dr. Carol Potter, Kelli Fisk
DHSR STAFF PRESENT: Craig Smith, Angie Matthes

Standing Agenda	Discussion	Motion/ Seconded	Recommendations/ Actions
Welcome & Announcements	Mr. Parks welcomed members and guests. Mr. Parks stated that Dr. Pulliam was unable to attend the meeting in person but was joining us via phone and asked that he chair this meeting. Mr. Parks stated the purpose of this meeting was to review the policies assumptions and methodologies of Chapters of the State Medical Facilities Plan for which this Committee is responsible for, and to review Petitions. Mr. Parks gave future meeting dates and times and gave direction on meeting all present and future deadlines. Mr. Parks stated the meeting was open to the public, but the meeting did not include a Public Hearing; therefore, discussion would be limited to members of the Committee and staff, unless questions were directed specifically to someone in the audience.		
Review of Executive Order No. 10: Ethical Standards for the State Health Coordinating Council	Mr. Parks reviewed Executive Order No.10, "Ethical Standards for the State Health Coordinating Council" Guide, asking all members that as they introduce themselves to include if they would be recusing themselves from any items on today's agenda.		
Introductions	Mr. Parks inquired if anyone had a conflict or needed to declare that they would derive a benefit from any matter on the agenda or intended to recuse themselves from voting on the matter. Mr. Parks asked members to declare conflicts as agenda items come up. At this time, all members introduced themselves, stating their workplace, position on Council and any financial benefits they or members of their families may have with any item on today's agenda. None of the members indicated having a financial benefit that would be derived		

Standing Agenda	Discussion	Motion/ Seconded	Recommendations/ Actions
	from any matter coming before the Committee for action. Therefore, no member recused themselves from voting on any matter coming before the Committee at the meeting.		
Approval of minutes from the September 25, 2009 meeting	A motion was made to accept the September 25, 2009 meeting minutes.	Dr. Pulliam Senator Foriest	The motion was unanimously approved
<p>Review of Nursing Care Facility Petition(s) and/or Comment(s).</p> <p>Review of Nursing Care Facility Policies, Assumptions and Methodology. Projected Nursing Care Facility Bed Need Determinations.</p> <p>Discussion/Recommendations for the Proposed 2011 Plan</p>	<p>Mr. DePorter stated that for all Chapters of the State Medical Facilities Plan, at this point of the year, the data is in preliminary stage of review concerning inventory, need projections and need determinations. Additionally, staff is in process of still gathering and receiving additional data for analysis and all data is subject to change, via multiple reviews per normal review process over the upcoming months.</p> <p>Mr. DePorter discussed the petition filed by the North Carolina Health Care Facilities Association and discussed the Agency's recommendation to approve the petition, and initiate the Nursing Facilities Work Group to review policies, methodology and assumptions for this Chapter of the State Medical Facilities Plan. The Work Group is recommended to begin in late fall and carry into 2011, with the goal of completing work prior to posting the 2012 Proposed Plan. Committee members discussed the history of the Chapter, and the potential membership of this proposed Work Group.</p> <p>A motion was made to accept the Agency's recommendation to approve the petition from the North Carolina Health Care Facilities Association, and recommend to the State Health Coordinating Council the establishment of this Work Group.</p> <p>Mr. DePorter reviewed the nursing facility policies, assumptions, sources of data and methodology. Mr. DePorter stated there had been no changes in policies, assumptions and methodology from the previous year. Mr. DePorter then reviewed the draft inventory and draft need determinations. Mr. DePorter indicated that all data are preliminary and subject to change.</p> <p>A motion was made and seconded to recommend acceptance of the Nursing Care Facility policies, assumptions and methodology for the Proposed 2011 State Medical Facilities Plan.</p>	<p>Senator Foriest Ms. Tidwell</p> <p>Dr. Pulliam Senator Foriest</p>	<p>The motion was unanimously approved.</p> <p>The motion was unanimously approved.</p>
Review of Adult Care Home Policies, Assumptions and Methodology.	Mr. Baker stated no petitions or comments were filed for this Chapter. Mr. Baker then reviewed the Adult Care Home policies, assumptions, sources of data and methodology. As part of this review, Mr. Baker stated there had been no changes in policies, assumptions and methodology from the previous year.		

Standing Agenda	Discussion	Motion/ Seconded	Recommendations/ Actions
<p>Projected Adult Care Home Bed Need Determinations</p> <p>Discussion/Recommendations for the Proposed 2011 Plan</p>	<p>Mr. Baker then reviewed the draft inventory and draft need determinations. Mr. Baker indicated that all data is preliminary, subject to change and updated on a day-by-day basis as necessary.</p> <p>A motion was made and seconded to recommend acceptance of the Adult Care Home policies, assumptions and methodology for the Proposed 2011 State Medical Facilities Plan.</p>	<p>Mr. Griffin Dr. Pulliam</p>	<p>The motion was unanimously approved.</p>
<p>Review of Home Health Services Policy, Assumptions and Methodology.</p> <p>Projected Home Health Need Determinations</p> <p>Discussion/Recommendations for the Proposed 2011 Plan</p>	<p>Mr. DePorter reviewed the Home Health policy, assumptions, sources of data and methodology. Mr. DePorter stated there had been no changes in policy, assumptions and methodology from the previous year. Mr. Parks noted no petitions were filed for this Chapter.</p> <p>Mr. DePorter then reviewed the draft inventory and draft need determinations. Mr. DePorter indicated that all data are preliminary and subject to change.</p> <p>A motion was made and seconded to recommend acceptance of the Home Health policy, assumptions and methodology, for the Proposed 2011 State Medical Facilities Plan.</p>	<p>Mr. Beaver Ms. Tidwell</p>	<p>The motion was unanimously approved.</p>
<p>Review of Hospice Services Petition(s) and/or Comment(s).</p> <p>Hospice Services Assumptions and Methodology.</p> <p>Projected Hospice Need Determinations</p>	<p>Mr. DePorter discussed the petition filed by Health Planning Source to add an additional step to the recently revised (2010 SMFP) hospice inpatient methodology, by applying a 60 percent cap for the hospice inpatient bed penetration for each county. The Agency recommendation was to deny the petition since the methodology was new, and there had not been enough time to measure the impact(s) of the new methodology.</p> <p>Committee members discussed the history of the Chapter and the recent changes to the Methodology. Senator Foriest asked if the petitioner was present. Petitioner was not present, however, a representative attending on behalf of petitioner discussed the petition. Committee members discussed the petition and asked questions of the petitioner's representative. Committee members further discussed the petition, the new methodology recently applied to this Chapter, and the Agency recommendation.</p> <p>A motion was made to accept the Agency's recommendation regarding the petition from the Health Planning Source, and recommend to the State Health Coordinating Council the petition be denied.</p> <p>Mr. DePorter reviewed the Hospice Services assumptions, sources of data and methodology. Mr. DePorter stated there had been changes in assumptions and methodology from the previous year, as discussed with the petition filed with this Chapter.</p> <p>Mr. DePorter then reviewed the draft inventory and draft need determinations. Mr. DePorter indicated that all data are preliminary and subject to change.</p>	<p>Senator Foriest Mr. Farmer</p>	<p>The motion was unanimously approved.</p>

Standing Agenda	Discussion	Motion/ Seconded	Recommendations/ Actions
Discussion/Recommendations for the Proposed 2011 Plan	A motion was made and seconded to recommend acceptance of the Hospice Services, assumptions and methodology, for the Proposed 2011 State Medical Facilities Plan.	Mr. Griffin Senator Foriest	The motion was unanimously approved.
<p>End-Stage Renal Disease Dialysis Facilities</p> <p>Overview of up-dated Narrative and ESRD Policy</p> <p>Discussion/Recommendations for Proposed 2011 SMFP</p>	<p>Mr. Baker stated no Petitions or Comments were filed for this Chapter.</p> <p>Mr. Baker reviewed the End-Stage Renal Disease Dialysis Facilities narrative, sources of data and policy.</p> <p>A motion was made to accept the materials provided by staff regarding dialysis services for the Proposed 2011 State Medical Facilities Plan.</p>	<p>Mr. Beaver Senator Foriest</p>	<p>The motion was unanimously approved.</p>
<p>Review of Psychiatric Inpatient Services Policy, Assumptions and Methodology.</p> <p>Projected Psychiatric Bed Need Determinations</p> <p>Discussion/Recommendations for the Proposed 2011 Plan</p>	<p>Mr. Baker stated no Petitions or Comments were filed for this Chapter. Mr. Baker then reviewed the Psychiatric Inpatient Services policy, assumptions, sources of data and methodology. As part of this review, Mr. Baker stated there had been no changes in policy, assumptions and methodology from the previous year.</p> <p>Mr. Baker then reviewed the draft inventory and draft need determinations. Mr. Baker indicated that all data is preliminary, subject to change and updated on a day-by-day basis as necessary.</p> <p>A motion was made to recommend acceptance of the Psychiatric Inpatient Services policy, assumptions and methodology, for the Proposed 2011 State Medical Facilities Plan.</p>	<p>Mr. Griffin Senator Foriest</p>	<p>The motion was unanimously approved.</p>
<p>Review of Substance Abuse Inpatient and Residential Services Policy, Assumptions and Methodology.</p> <p>Projected Substance Abuse Treatment Bed Need Determinations</p> <p>Discussion/Recommendations for the Proposed 2011 Plan</p>	<p>Mr. Baker stated no Petitions or Comments were filed for this Chapter. Mr. Baker then reviewed the Substance Abuse Inpatient and Residential Services policy, assumptions, sources of data and methodology. As part of this review, Mr. Baker stated there had been no changes in policy, assumptions, sources of data and methodology from the previous year.</p> <p>Mr. Baker then reviewed the draft inventory and draft need determinations. Mr. Baker indicated that all data is preliminary, subject to change and updated on a day-by-day basis.</p> <p>A motion was made to recommend acceptance of the Substance Abuse Inpatient and Residential Services policy, assumptions and methodology, for the Proposed 2011 State Medical Facilities Plan.</p>	<p>Mr. Beaver Mr. Miller</p>	<p>The motion was unanimously approved.</p>
Review of Intermediate Care Facilities (ICF-MR) for the Mentally Retarded Policies, Assumptions and Methodology.	Mr. Baker stated no Petitions or Comments were filed for this Chapter. Mr. Baker reviewed the Intermediate Care Facilities for the Mentally Retarded (ICF-MR) policies, assumptions, sources of data and methodology. As part of this review, Mr. Baker stated there had been no changes in policy, assumptions, sources of data and methodology from the previous		

Standing Agenda	Discussion	Motion/ Seconded	Recommendations/ Actions
<p>Projected ICF-MR Bed Need Determinations</p> <p>Discussion/Recommendations for the Proposed 2011 Plan</p>	<p>year.</p> <p>Mr. Baker reported that the standard methodology, data and information currently available resulted in no need determinations for ICF-MR beds anywhere in the state.</p> <p>A motion was made to recommend acceptance of the Intermediate Care Facilities policies, assumptions and methodology for the Proposed 2011 State Medical Facilities Plan.</p>	<p>Mr. Farmer Senator Foriest</p>	<p>The motion was unanimously approved.</p>
<p>Update Narratives, Tables and Need Determinations for the Proposed 2011 State Medical Facilities Plan.</p>	<p>Mr. Parks entertained a motion to allow staff to update narratives, tables and need determinations for the Proposed 2011 Plan as new and corrected data is received.</p> <p>After motion was approved, Senator Foriest asked how North Carolina compares to other states concerning the State Health Coordinating Council. Mr. DePorter explained the CON process, State Medical Facilities Plan and State Health Coordinating Council process versus other States. Dr. Pulliam then spoke of process here in planning as compared to market forces, management and Federal initiatives.</p>	<p>Dr. Pulliam Mr. Farmer</p>	<p>The motion was unanimously approved.</p>
<p>Other Business</p>	<p>Mr. Parks indicated that the Council will meet on May 26 and the Committee will meet on September 24. There was no other business at this time.</p>		
<p>Adjournment</p>	<p>There being no further business, a motion was made to adjourn the meeting.</p>		<p>Meeting adjourned.</p>