



Medical Facilities Planning

Long-Term Care Nursing Home Beds Work Group

Minutes

September 10, 2010
 10:00 am – 12:00 Noon
 Council Bldg. Room 201

MEMBERS PRESENT: Jerry Parks, Donald Beaver, Connie Bonebrake, Dr. Gordon DeFriese, Johnnie Farmer, Senator Anthony Foriest, Dr. Brenda Latham-Sadler, Travis Tomlinson, Jr.

MEMBERS ABSENT:

Medical Facilities Planning Section Staff Present: Patrick Baker, Kelli Fisk

DHSR Staff Present: Elizabeth Brown, Martha Frisone, Drexdal Pratt, Craig Smith

Standing Agenda	Discussion	Motions	Recommendations/ Actions
Welcome & Announcements	Mr. Parks welcomed members, staff and visitors to the meeting. Mr. Parks stated this meeting is open to the public, but that the meeting did not include a Public Hearing; therefore, discussion would be limited to members of the Work Group and staff, but, asked members to feel free to call on anyone in the audience that could give insight and expertise to the workgroup. At this time, Mr. Parks asked that visitors introduce themselves.		
Review of Executive Order No. 10	Mr. Parks gave an overview of the procedures to observe before taking action at the meeting. 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. None of the members indicated having a financial benefit that would be derived from any matter coming before the Council for action. Therefore, no member recused from voting on any matter coming before the Council at the meeting.		
Introductions	At this time, Mr. Parks asked all members to introduce themselves and give some background information regarding their experience and current position.		
Review of the Charge Statement & Meeting Schedule and Exhibit 1	<p>Mr. Parks reviewed the Work Group Charge.</p> <p>The Long Term Care Nursing Home Beds Work Group is charged with the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To review and recommend changes to the nursing home bed need methodology. 		

Standing Agenda	Discussion	Motions	Recommendations/ Actions
	<p>At this time, Mr. Parks announced the upcoming scheduled meetings for this work group, which are October 1, 2010, November 16, 2010 and December 17, 2010.</p> <p>Mr. Parks stated that he had two goals for today, with the first being that all members leave with a full understanding of where the methodology is today and to chart a course of direction of the upcoming meetings.</p>		
<p>Exhibit 2 Work Group Request Letter & Review of Exhibit 3, Chapter 10 Changes from 1990 SMFP to 2011 Proposed SMFP</p>	<p>Mr. Baker noted the Work Group request letter from Mr. Craig Souza that was received January 7, 2010. Mr. Baker reviewed with members Exhibit 3, changes in methodology, assumptions, application of method and policy history of nursing home beds from the North Carolina State Medical Facilities Plan from 1990 – 2011 N.C. Proposed State Medical Facilities Plan. Mr. Baker stated that there have been no major changes since 2004.</p>		
<p>Review of Exhibit 4, Chapter 10 Statewide Utilization of Nursing Home Beds by Age Group, from the N.C. SMFP 2000 – 2011 N.C. Proposed Plan</p> <p>Review of Exhibit 5, Chapter 10 Basic Assumptions of the Method</p>	<p>Mr. Baker reviewed historical to current/draft utilization rates for nursing home beds, per age group, statewide for the last 11 years.</p> <p>Dr. Gordon DeFrise asked Mr. Baker if the actual rates used were based on the population data? Mr. Baker stated yes, and based on number of patients utilizing beds as reported via LRA's (License Renewal Applications), per each county, per each Age Group.</p> <p>Ms. Brown asked Mr. Baker to review exhibit 5, Basic Assumptions of the Method with the work group members. Mr. Baker reviewed exhibit 5 at this time with members. Mr. Parks stated that these two pages are the meat of the basic assumptions of the method and would like to open this area for discussion so each member would fully understand the method.</p> <p>Dr. DeFrise asked Mr. Baker to explain the formula used to determine the utilization rates. Mr. Baker stated it was from a excel spreadsheet, with established formulae. The formulae is based on utilization of beds by county by age group, per population of age group via population numbers provided from OSBM. Includes previous individual 4 years of overall utilization rate calculations, then current year, then all 5 years are averaged out, in order to come up with a average growth rate, which is then projected out 30 months. The result is a statewide utilization rate per 1,000 general population, per each age group.</p> <p>Dr. DeFrise asked what is the formula and how does it work? Mr. Baker re-iterated above situation and emphasized is based on utilization of beds by age group per county that is then totaled state wide per year, then take four years back , then take current year in calculating this year's rate, which is then projected forward 30 months. Mr. Baker re-emphasized the utilization rate is a statewide utilization rate equally applied to all counties.</p> <p>The Work Group discussed the exemptions, primarily concerning Continuing Care Retirement Community Beds (CCRC). Mr. Baker explained the methodology is two-fold in determining</p>		

Standing Agenda	Discussion	Motions	Recommendations/ Actions
	<p>need, first by bed deficit (if any), then county average occupancy of 90%. Only half of CCRC beds are counted for Planning Inventory, and CCRC patient days are not counted in determining county average occupancy rate.</p> <p>Mr. Tomlinson asked staff to look at Table 10 B and ways of SMSA, COG's for better insight for statewide basics. (SMSA = Standard Metropolitan Statistical Area)</p> <p>Ms. Connie Bonebrake stated if the work group were to choose one methodology Home Health would be the one to partner with.</p> <p>Senator Foriest asked all members to keep in mind that at some point this is going to get political. Senator Foriest stated the goal is good, the concern is if this is cut into much smaller regions and making a determination based on what's happening in that particular region, then you have a rural county that is now combined with a much larger county, which may lead them to the point they have no say in anything that is occurring, they are not able to grow due to everything being dictated by things going on in the much larger county. Senator Foriest stated that the work group should also focus on keeping from more segregation, i.e.: large/small and rich/poor.</p> <p>Mr. Parks stated hopefully this would be avoided due to using the region rate and apply it by the county.</p> <p>Mr. Parks recommended that staff be given leeway to develop alternatives in developing utilization rate alternatives for display to the Work Group; such as Council of Governments and Metropolitan Statistical Areas.</p> <p>Mr. Parks stated that he had three points to chart the course for the next meeting:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) One rate fits all – regional use rate 2) Exemptions 3) Real life example – per county – compare the county now/then regionalization it – Counties to include are Wake, Granville, Vance, Warren, Currituck, Pasquotank, Alamance and Caswell. 		
Adjournment	ing.		