

North Dakota Department of Health
Division of Health Facilities

Business Process Re-engineering
Committee Meeting Minutes

June 19, 2009

Committee Members Present:

Darleen Bartz, Chief, Health Resource Section, ND Department of Health
Bruce Pritschet, Director, Division of Health Facilities, ND Department of Health
Monte Engel, LSC Manager, Division of Health Facilities, ND Department of Health
Kevin Drader, Vice-President of the North Dakota Environmental Service Association
Shelly Peterson, Executive Director, ND Long Term Care Association
Wade Peterson, Administrator, MC1 Living Center
Pete Antonson, Administrator, Northwood Deaconess Health Center
Darrold Bertsch, Administrator, Southwest Healthcare Services
Tim Blasl, Vice-President, North Dakota Health Care Association
Don Marty, Executive Partner, Meritcare Health Systems
Craig Helenske, Architect, Helenske Design Group

Committee Members Absent:

Lucille Torpen, Manager, Division of Health Facilities, ND Department of Health
Curt Fogel, LSC Surveyor, Division of Health Facilities, ND Department of Health
Bridget Weidner, Manager, Division of Health Facilities, ND Department of Health
Karissa Olson, Administrator, Heartland Care Center

Facilitator:

Bruce Pritschet, Director, Division of Health Facilities

Introduction of Participants:

Introductions of committee members were made. Kevin Drader, Good Samaritan Society - Arthur joins the committee as the new representative of the NDESA. Welcome Kevin.

Plans Review and Construction Inspections

- a) History: Darleen gave a brief overview of the purpose of the BPR committee and spoke on the history of the LSC program, plans review and the FTE's that were allotted. She also talked about the increased workload regarding plans review and the need for onsite construction visits which were lacking in our state. The onsite construction visits will identify deficiencies prior to completion of a project. SB 2046 will provide the department with the resources necessary to implement construction inspections for new construction and remodeling projects. With the work load as it is; it became necessary to realign some of the duties within the division. Darleen also mentioned that Monte Engel will be chairing the BPR meetings after today's meeting.
- b) Legislative Actions: Darleen, Bruce and Monte gave an overview of the bills and legislative actions that took place regarding the demonstration project, onsite construction visits, and adding FTEs.

Bruce had provided testimony numerous times regarding the SB 2046 and the demonstration project. (See report.) Wade felt the construction visits were instrumental in getting his building constructed and opened in a timely manner.

The DoH appropriation bill (Senate Bill 2004) includes the authority to add two FTEs, as well as \$215,680 from the general fund and \$106,203 of special funds (fees collected for plans review) for a total of \$321,910 for the biennium.

- c) **Current Status:** Monte provided a synopsis of the memo from the attorney general's office. The attorney general stated that the department could collect a fee from facilities for plans reviewed after the bill went into effect (April 22, 2009).
- d) **Hiring New Staff:** Monte gave an update regarding the new positions that will be available July 1, 2009. (See application in information packet.) The vacancy announcements were posted at Job Service and on the ND Jobs website. The department will be accepting applications until July 8, 2009. All applications will be submitted to the HR department and then forwarded to Health Facilities. Monte will also be sending out notification of the positions to environmental service people; hospitals, LTC, etc. as well. Monte spoke about the interview process and thought he could possibly have staff hired by the middle of August at the earliest. The two positions will not be required to attend CMS LSC training. It was suggested to check with CMS to see if they would allow the new hires to go through training even though they will not be doing a LSC survey for certification purposes. It was suggested to post the positions in the Minneapolis area.
- e) **Sequencing of Plans Review:** Monte spoke about the concerns of the sequencing of plans review. The department has had a number of projects come in at different phases and times. Currently the plans are reviewed in the order of when they are received. Darleen spoke about the time commitment to reviewing the plans and the shifting of the workload so Monte can review plans and concentrate on LSC. The department is trying to make every effort to make sure the plans are reviewed in a timely manner and the fairest possible way. There are approximately 10 – 20 projects that need to be reviewed at this time.

There was a group discussion regarding the sequence in which the plans are reviewed. The committee felt they are handled appropriately. There was also a discussion regarding a timeline as when the plans review could be caught up and if it would be beneficial to bring in a consultant or hire a temporary person. It was felt that a timeline could not be determined nor would it be beneficial to bring in a consultant as it would take time to bring them up to speed on the requirements. Hiring a consultant could probably delay the process. The department has a staff member that is willing to put in extra time in July to help with reviewing the plans in a timely manner.

The group also discussed the best ways to handle plans that come in at different times and phases. One recommendation was to set a date (i.e. 30 days) for submitting subsequent plans (phases) after the first set was submitted and have them reviewed at the same time. Another recommendation was to have the administrator and/or the architect call Monte to see what the timeline would be to have the plans reviewed and implement that timeline into the schedule for the project. If a facility has multiple phases, they should submit them at one time. It was also suggested that a facility be charged for reviewing the subsequent submittal plans if they are submitted at a later date. The group felt this may help with facilities that expect to be bumped to the front of the review list just because they added another phase to the project. It is a requirement to have all sprinkler systems, mechanical, electrical, remodels, etc. and changes to plans approved before a facility can move forward with the implementation of the changes/project.

Darleen reviewed a memo that was sent out to hospitals, LTC, basic care facilities and architects regarding construction approvals. The group recommended resending the memo based on the conversation at today's meeting. Craig recommended having the AG's office review the memo prior to sending it out. He feels that there needs to be clarification regarding the review of change orders and getting approval before implementation of the changes.

The group discussed how deficiency-related projects are handled. The consensus is that this does not happen that often. If it does, Monte tries to get to the projects as soon as possible. Depending on the size of the correction, a fee may be applied.

- f) Review of Draft Provider Memo: The group reviewed the draft of a memo regarding fees for construction plans review and onsite construction visits to health care facilities subject to licensure by the Division of Health Facilities. The group recommended applying a review fee for each additional phase of the project. It was recommended that the department establish a date when a plan could be reviewed by once they were caught up on plans review and to encourage facilities to submit complete plans for review rather than having them come in piecemeal. It was also recommended adding verbiage regarding not being charged for change orders and that they have to be approved before implementing the change. It was suggested that payment for reviewing plans be made prior to plan approval rather than plan review. It was recommended to add an exception statement regarding a deficiency project as a result of a LSC certification survey, as compliance needs to be done by a certain date. It would have to be a small project and anything larger would be subject to the fee. Darleen will make changes to the draft and send to committee members for review and feedback.
- g) Other

Next Steps: The plan is to meet again in three months and in 5-6 months to review the current licensing and construction standards.

Next Meeting Date: September BTWAN

Meeting Adjourned:

Meeting adjourned at 11:40 a.m.