

CMS Waiver Steering Committee Minutes – Final

Date: September 28, 2006		Location: 1575 Sherman St. Conference 8 th floor	
Present:			
Kathy Athens, Denver Options		Jay Kauffman, DD	X
John Bartholomew		Cami Learned, CCB Partners	X
Josh Block, HCPF		Viki Manley, HCPF	
LeeAnn Bellum, Denver Options		Kate MacLeod, Governor’s Office	X
Claire Brockbank, Segue Consulting	X	Mike Monkman, Governor’s Office	
Judy Brown, DHS		John Nevins, Alliance/Imagine	
Chris Collins, Alliance	X	Al Orlofsky	X
Mike Crane, DHS/DDD	X	Michele Patarino, Segue Consulting	X
John Daurio		Roxanne Pinneo, CCB Partners	X
Fred DeCrescentis, DDD	X	Barb Prehmus, HCPF	
Marta Fyffe, HCPF	X	Barb Ramsey, HCPF	X
Ted Hernandez, Denver Options	X	John Taylor, Alliance/Imagine	X
Luke Huwar, Governor’s Office		Christine Thomas, DHS	X
Roger Jensen, Alliance/Starpoint	X	Lisa Vallejo, DDD	
Matthew Solano		John Miles	

Agenda Item	Status/Decisions Made	Assignments
Administrative tasks	The review of minutes and work plan update were deferred in the interest of time.	Please e-mail Michele with comments on the draft minutes from 9/14.
Status reports	<p>John Taylor asked for a description of the changes to the 3-way contract, and was assured that they had to do with definitions and clarifications, which should not impact CCB contract review.</p> <p>Roger asked for more detail about the issues on the waiver amendment. This will be addressed at next week’s meeting.</p>	

Agenda Item	Status/Decisions Made	Assignments
BUS users group	Kim from HCPF and Amy from DDD will serve as facilitators.	Barb will call Jeremy at the Alliance to confirm names of participants. This afternoon, she will send out a communication with names for the BUS user's group as well as a meeting schedule.
Process for distributing hold harmless	<p>Mike presented a draft plan for distributing hold harmless funds. The last page gives the history of data analysis approaches considered. Originally, DDD intended to compare the Interim Rates Survey data to the new detailed PAR data, but this did not provide an accurate hold harmless analysis (especially the units data). The Rates Committee believed that actual payment data would provide the best information, but they are unable to pull data by provider from MMIS when the CCBs are acting as the OHCDS. The current proposal is to collect data from CCBs and providers that believe they have been adversely affected, rather than from all CCBs and providers. \$1.8 million dollars has been set aside for this reconciliation. If it is not enough, DDD can pursue a supplemental later.</p> <p>Christine clarified that this hold harmless adjustment is for the rate change only, and does not account for a change in the mix of clients, change of services, etc.</p> <p>Mike asked that providers submit first quarter data to CCBs by November 10, and CCBs should submit data to DDD by November 20. After the second quarter, payments can be tweaked if necessary, and then that amount will be extrapolated for the rest of the year. Hold</p>	

Agenda Item	Status/Decisions Made	Assignments
	<p>Harmless payments must go through CCBs; they need to collect data on last year's payments even for those providers who are now billing direct with HCPF.</p> <p>John Taylor thanked DDD for their great job in trying to come up with a way to analyze the data.</p> <p>Jay reiterated the need to clarify the purpose of this hold harmless vs. a cash advance. Christine suggested providing a table that gives examples of each. A communication will be sent out to each provider and to CCB CFOs and finance/accounting staff, with copies to the Associations.</p>	
SIS training plan	<p>Claire shared information from AAMR on the question raised on 9/14 about using one vs. two interviews when several respondents are needed. AAMR suggested getting as much information as possible from the first interview, and scheduling a second only if necessary. The second interview does not have to go through the full questionnaire; it can be used just to fill in gaps from the first interview. The rule of thumb is that approximately 15% of interviews require a follow up interview of roughly an hour. The consumer is not a mandatory respondent, although it is recommended that they be present. This data is incorporated in the SIS planning worksheets.</p> <p>At the 9/14 meeting, Claire presented a spreadsheet for CCBs to look at individual needs relative to SIS implementation. CCBs were asked to provide information regarding their training, staffing, and travel</p>	<p>CCBs need to provide the rest of the information about their plans and assumptions on SIS implementation before the October 5th meeting.</p>

Agenda Item	Status/Decisions Made	Assignments
	<p>assumptions; we do not yet have all of the results. Claire and Michele will follow up so we can compile resources needed by CCB, including the total hours of staff time needed per assessment. Comparing this figure will give some idea of the efficiency with which CCBs were able to assign resources. Some, for example, are training many staff (which takes 20 hours per training) but they won't do many assessments, so it adds a lot of resources on a per assessment basis.</p> <p>The spreadsheet will be used to have a dialog with CCBs regarding their plans, then to request assistance (as described in the "Contingencies" handout on 9/14). These estimates were done quickly, and will be refined as needed. Especially as we move through the pilot phase in December and January, we will learn more and need to be flexible.</p> <p>John Taylor's SIS Trainer heard that the sample size for SIS assessments required by December 31 had been increased to 700. Al responded that Laszlo was confirming that the sample was representative of the DD population, so they initially increased the size to 700, but are looking for oversampled cells to bring the number back down closer to 500.</p> <p>Claire requested that Department staff honor the process of reporting when work plan tasks and deadlines need to change, so that communication can be handled appropriately.</p>	
Stakeholders' proposed waiver	Claire asked if the Steering Committee wanted to add	

Agenda Item	Status/Decisions Made	Assignments
changes		
Funding discussion	<p>Kate described last Wednesday’s JBC meeting. The JBC was open to a request for supplemental budget related to the DD program, and surprised that the Department did not submit one. Henry Sobanet presented to the JBC in the afternoon, that the reasons were: a) there is a lot of money in the Adult Program costs line, so a supplemental is not justified yet, and b) the Department has had a hard time quantifying the need for additional funds. He asked for flexibility to use the money already in the line to spend on one-time costs related to the changes in waiver administration. The committee was amenable, and the governor’s office received an official letter of approval this week. The letter authorizes the Department to spend up to \$500K of the general fund line for one-time costs associated with changes in the waiver.</p> <p>Roger asked about funds approved for the COLA, to which Kate responded that it is still ambiguous in her mind; the funds have been reallocated for another purpose, we don’t know when the CMS cap will change, and we do not know how much money we need for the hold harmless funds. In addition, we still have not explicitly requested the \$7 million in CCB Match that will be need to keep the rates whole, although this was mentioned in the June briefing. In addition, the JBC specifically allocated those funds for other purposes and will have to act to change that commitment.</p> <p>Claire asked that the Steering Committee focus today’s discussion on the categories of expenses imposed on the</p>	

Agenda Item	Status/Decisions Made	Assignments
	<p>CCBs by the waiver change. The needs should be quantified using common language, and cost areas. The Department will have to report back to the JBC on how funds are spent. We should use the same level of discipline we use in requesting supplementals—with detailed analysis and consideration of alternatives.</p> <p>Specific cost considerations were discussed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Business Operation Costs: time to bill in the 9 categories in 15-minute increments has increased. ○ Contract Management: now includes a mix of direct bill and case management. Christine asked if it could be less administratively burdensome since CCBs are not being held to a dollar amount, but so far, problems on bills are coming back to Case Managers. ○ Hardware/Software ○ BUS: overtime costs. Extra entry for mini-mental, 803s, plan of care/IP cover sheet. Double entry due to case notes. Consultants to build interface. CCBs also need to account for what the BUS has replaced. ○ SIS: in addition to data that has already been collected, we need to consider license costs for SIS online. In addition, some CCBs have started to offer training to families and providers on the SIS. ○ Communication: Information about the impact of changes on families and providers. ○ PARs: increased staff time checking with providers, 	

Agenda Item	Status/Decisions Made	Assignments
	<p>crunching numbers—Roger has a write up of the time associated with this.</p> <p>Acceptable costs in these categories include staff overtime, new staff, consulting costs, hardware and software. Costs incurred both before and after July 1, 2006 can be considered (crossing the budget year is okay). For prior costs, CCBs and providers may consider overtime rates or whatever was paid; looking forward, they should use regular wage rates.</p> <p>Costs that have accrued to providers as well as CCBs. While providers had a choice in direct billing or not (CCBs had the change imposed on them), it is appropriate to pay the service providers for costs due to the change as well. For CCBs and providers to document these costs, standard questions should be developed.</p> <p>Claire and Michele will work with the Department and develop a data collection tool similar to what is being used for SIS implementation planning. The Steering Committee agreed to consider the following categories:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Business Operations: billing process, contract management, hardware/software, staff time. 2. PARs: staff time. 3. BUS: interface, consulting services, staff time, hardware/software. 4. SIS: (in addition to what has been collected) license fees, external forums. 5. Communications: Dissemination of information and staff training. 	<p>CCBs and providers on what data to collect.</p>

Agenda Item	Status/Decisions Made	Assignments
Public comment	<p>Gerrie commented that the rumor mill is going crazy with word of the assessments—some CCBs are calling them testing.</p> <p>An additional guest indicated that vacancy rates are still an issue.</p>	<p>Al is going to develop a communication to explain the purpose of the SIS.</p>

Hand-outs:

1. Agenda plus supplement (written updates)
2. Work Plan
3. Draft FY 07 Interim Rates Hold Harmless Distribution Plan
4. Stakeholder Input Summary: Comprehensive Services Medicaid Waiver