

2654

RECEIVED

2008 JUL 17 AM 10: 56

INDEPENDENT REGULATORY
REVIEW COMMISSION

-----Original Message-----

From: Help
Sent: Thursday, July 17, 2008 10:45 AM
To: Schalles, Scott R.; IRRC; Wilmarth, Fiona E.
Cc: Kaufman, Kim
Subject: FW: IRRC Website - New Message

FYI – Comment letter on ANFR

-----Original Message-----

From: Independent Regulatory Review Commission [mailto:No-Reply@irrc.state.pa.us]
Sent: Wednesday, July 16, 2008 4:08 PM
To: Help
Subject: IRRC Website - New Message



IRRC

Independent Regulatory Review Commission

A new message has arrived from the IRRC Website

First Name: J. Todd

Last Name: Barlow

Company: Penn Foundation Inc.

Email: Tbarlow@pennfoundation.org

Subject: Confidentiality of Patient Records and Information

Message:

As the Director of Drug and Alcohol Services at Penn Foundation and being in the field for over 20 years, I support the proposed changes and would like to comment on the nature of the discussions at hand. 1. Good policy asks "how does this policy encourages recovery and seeking treatment?" We at PFRC suggest that it will only help access. Critics suggest that these small regulation changes may deter persons from seeking treatment. That is difficult for many of us in the field to grasp. Most potential clients of no understanding of confidentiality law until it is explained to them in treatment...and for those that do, they use it more as a vehicle to continue in their addiction then they do to use it to protect their privacy. 2. It is vital that we distinguish this matter from the matter of Act 106 and the control of managed care over the provision of client care. These are two topics are not

the same. Not everyone in the field is against managed care. Granted there have been many ups and downs with managed care, but in principal it is a concept that makes sense. The concept of Checks and Balances has been built into our system of government for a reason; we need to accept that checks and balances are needed in virtually businesses even health related ones. Many who argue against confidentiality regs revisions could be arguing their position from whether or not it might impact Act 106. I have concerns about that motive if these impressions are true. I can only hope that the fear of losing Act 106 is not impacting on the judgement over this topic of updating the confidentiality regulations. Our concern must be for the the overall good of the client, not to the preservation of Act 106. Managed Care is not the death of good addiction treatment. These small changes in the regulations do have a big effect..but for whom? Is it truly an effect on the client or is it an effect on Act 106and those agencies who benefit from it? 3. A pre-Hippa era vs a post-Hippa era When confidentiality law was written we did not have Hippa. We do now. It makes little sense to have overlapping regulations. Hippa is sufficient. I can only hope that we can remember the true purpose of confidentiality regulations which is for the good of the client, not for the good of the potential provider.