

**CMS Waiver Steering Committee Minutes - FINAL**

<b>Date:</b> November 20, 2006		<b>Location:</b> 157 Sherman St. 4 <sup>th</sup> Floor	
<b>Present:</b>		Elaine Wakasugi	X
Kathy Athens, Denver Options	X	Jay Kauffman, DD	X
Amanda Bickel		Cami Learned, CCB Partners	X
Josh Block, HCPF		John Miles, DDD	
LeeAnn Bellum, Denver Options		Kate MacLeod, Governor's Office	X
Claire Brockbank, Segue Consulting	X	Kim Eisen	X
Judy Brown, DHS		John Nevins, Alliance/Imagine	X
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	Jeremy Schupach, Alliance	
Luke Huwar, Governor's Office	X	John Taylor, Alliance/Imagine	X
Roger Jensen, Alliance/Starpoint		Christine Thomas, DHS	X
Matthew Solano		Gary Smith, HSRI	

Agenda Item	Status/Decisions Made	Assignments
Administrative tasks	<p><u>Minutes from Nov. 2</u>                      Claire received comments by e-mail, which have been incorporated. No other discussion.</p> <p><u>Meeting Dates</u>                      The next meeting scheduled for 11/30 will be cancelled, which may result in a longer meeting on 12/7 (potentially starting at 8:30). Christine proposed a December 18 meeting in lieu of December 14 or 20. It will be a lengthy meeting with HSRI and Navigant presenting. The start time will be 10:00; attendees should bring a lunch and anticipate meeting until 2:00 or so. There is also a meeting scheduled for January 4.</p>	<p>Claire or Michele will distribute final minutes for 11/02/06 for posting.</p> <p>Christine will arrange rooms for the upcoming meetings and e-mail the group.</p>

Agenda Item	Status/Decisions Made	Assignments
	<p><u>Work Plan Update</u> Will be addressed in status reports.</p> <p>John Nevins asked if DD’s website has been updated with current FAQs and minutes. The old site is still available and is causing confusion. It will be taken down so users can be directed to the new site soon.</p>	
Status reports	<p><u>Three-Way Contract</u> There is a delay because there were problems with encumbrance numbers on front page of contract. They were approved before the contract went out; Barb Ramsey will talk to Barbara Prehmus today to get it pushed through by the end of the month. The signature problems have been resolved.</p> <p>DD has tracked down the signed copy of the IAG; it was signed on August 21. Christine will share a copy with Barb to submit to CMS.</p> <p><u>CCB provision of provider emergency management data to DDD</u> Laszlo had data from five CCBs/ providers showing the difference in payment from last year to this year. Today is the cut off date for submission. The rates committee will meet next Wednesday.</p> <p><u>FAQs</u> A SIS technical document is being posted today. QA and UR reimbursement FAQs will be ready to go shortly. Other billing questions are also in process and Jay will send them to HCPF tomorrow.</p> <p>There was a comment a few weeks ago that there hasn’t been much activity and people are wondering where the FAQs are. Cami feels that the concerted effort to get things out the door has been fairly successful.</p>	<p>Update from Cami at next meeting on the entire process/picture—what is in process, what is complete, and what is not done.</p>

Agenda Item	Status/Decisions Made	Assignments
	<p><u>SLS Rule Change</u>  The work group’s original recommendation to set a cap on dollars was rejected. DD has found that there is also no good methodology to create a cut off by units of service without creating a huge number of appeals or over expenditure. Jay and Barb will sit down and review the data.</p> <p><u>BUS User’s Group</u>  Kim Eisen from HCPF explained that the BUS User’s Group met on 11/6 and 11/13. They also plan to meet next Monday (11/27). They decided to issue a list of programming changes that have been suggested by CCBs and providers. This has been given to a new HCPF programmer who started last Monday. She is in training, but will attend the next meeting of the User’s Group. After the first of the year, when she has gotten oriented, the group would like to meet with her quarterly to address outstanding issues. They feel very positive that the system will work for everyone.</p> <p>The list of programming changes has not been distributed outside the User’s Group. John Nevins asked to see it. Although Kim indicated a willingness to distribute the electronic copy of the list of programming changes, the Steering Committee was also reminded that the User’s Group participants should be sharing their work within their organizations. The point of the User’s Group is to get representative input and provide a mechanism for feedback. In addition, everyone who signs onto the BUS can submit a “BUS Tracker” to make a suggestion. Suggestions submitted via a Tracker request have been added to the list.</p> <p>In addition to the programming changes, the User’s Group is reviewing the draft Service Plan (IP Cover Sheet) created jointly by DD and HCPF. The document Kim showed appeared to be quite different from the current DD IP Cover Sheet. Concern was expressed about whether all appropriate information is being gathered and/or if the revised</p>	<p>Jay and Barb will come back next meeting with a recommendation on whether an SLS rule change will be further pursued.</p> <p>Claire and/or Barb will give Kim input on the three contract issues that were to be addressed by the BUS User’s Group.</p> <p>The BUS User’s Group will be on the agenda for 12/7.</p>

Agenda Item	Status/Decisions Made	Assignments
	<p>system will be more cumbersome than the one-page current format. DD noted that it is working on an addendum to include specific information not required by the BUS. Barb explained that HCPF and DD have been looking for the basic, required information for consistency across all waiver plans in the BUS, but that has morphed into a whole long term care service plan. Fred reiterated that the two departments are working toward a common standard. Because of their importance, Chris asked that the documents be circulated beyond the BUS User’s Group for input.</p> <p>Ted asked about priority for an ongoing upload and interface between the BUS and CCBs as a programming change. At present, “upload” is third on the list—but it is historical, not ongoing. Kim needs some clarification from the departments. This is an important issue to the CCBs for operational reasons but also because contractually, the 3-Way contract stipulates that CCBs should be putting case notes in the BUS system. To date there has only been a verbal agreement that they do not have to do this until the upload occurs. However, there is an FAQ regarding this issue, and it is in the Steering Committee minutes as well. Both departments reassured the CCBs that there is a strong commitment to permitting CCBs that already have an automated system to delay inputting into the BUS until the upload feature is available. If the CCB does not have an automated system it needs to use the BUS for contact notes.</p> <p>Claire suggested the Steering Committee have more opportunity to review the output of the User’s Group. There were three issues in the contract negotiations that the BUS User’s Group was asked to address. These include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ IP Cover Sheet (Service Plan)</li> <li>○ Case Notes</li> <li>○ Upload feature between CCBs and BUS</li> </ul>	

Agenda Item	Status/Decisions Made	Assignments
	<p>Although the IP Cover Sheet addendum will not be complete until January, the Steering Committee requested more extensive review of the User Group's overall work plan and work product during the meeting on 12/7.</p> <p>The first week, all participants attended the User's Group meeting. Last week only half attended. Christine expressed great concern over lack of attendance. The Departments have trusted that what comes out of the work group will be representative and well vetted.</p>	
HRSI/Navigant Update	<p>HSRI was going to present a report on Phase I (waiver redesign) today. Christine decided to postpone the presentation until December 18 to give the Departments a chance to review the report thoroughly. Key themes include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Potential financial implications of merging SLS/Comp.</li> <li>○ Eligibility and enrollment procedures.</li> <li>○ Configuration of services under waivers.</li> <li>○ Amount/scope/duration.</li> <li>○ Establishing total amount of services under SLS.</li> <li>○ Suggestions about service planning processes.</li> <li>○ Verification of provision of waiver services (audit checks on back end).</li> <li>○ Different Medicaid Authorities.</li> </ul> <p>Christine is anxious for everyone to receive the report and will distribute it well in advance of the meeting on the 18th. DD is also planning to post the report for public viewing. The Public will be invited to the meeting on the 18<sup>th</sup> and a room will be sought that can handle a larger audience. We will need to come up with a mechanism for public feedback that is more formal than what the CMSWSC normally entertains.</p> <p>The Steering Committee's input will be captured in minutes. We may</p>	

Agenda Item	Status/Decisions Made	Assignments
	<p>want to develop a separate report or statement with comments of the committee.</p> <p>Phase II of the project is rate setting. Navigant is working with available data and information. They will also present a report on the 18<sup>th</sup> that communicates their vision for how they will address rate setting. They will meet on December 7<sup>th</sup> with financial experts from CCBs to discuss data, what is usable, how much work would be necessary to scrub data, and how to move forward. Another option that will be explored will be building cost and rate setting models instead of using historic but flawed data. The meeting on the 7<sup>th</sup> will guide Navigant's report on the 18<sup>th</sup>. They may utilize that group through the whole process. The Phase II report will not likely be available for review by CMSWSC before 12/18.</p> <p>Gary's presentation a few weeks ago included some high-pressure deadlines on data over the holidays. Christine thinks those may get pushed out a little bit, depending on which path we take regarding existing vs. new data.</p> <p>Another issue is how SIS will tie into rate setting. Christine needs to clarify with HSRI if they will be prepared to present that on the 18<sup>th</sup> or not. It may not be available until SIS sample data is available.</p>	
Budget Overview	<p>Christine presented five tables for discussion:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. FY 2006-07 Long Bill Appropriation</li> <li>2. June 2006 1331 Emergency Supplementals</li> <li>3. Potential Additional Supplemental Issues for DDD</li> <li>4. Original Approved Supplemental Waiver Transition Costs</li> <li>5. Revised Waiver Transition Costs</li> </ol> <p>The JBC had a presentation last week about the overall, statewide budget picture. It stated that there is only \$2.8 million to distribute for</p>	

Agenda Item	Status/Decisions Made	Assignments
	<p>supplementals for the entire state. This group needs an understanding of how tight things are. Potential items that the Steering Committee has discussed for supplementals total in excess of \$18 million.</p> <p>Luke said that we need to identify the universe of possible costs—if you have additional input, e-mail Christine. Everything on the list can be considered for the supplemental. But also understand that the universe won't be funded. Data is due to OSPB this Wednesday.</p> <p>The handout does not reflect the department's position. It was merely assembled to illustrate the aggregate budget situation and to identify the total universe of possible requests for supplemental funding. To avoid it being misconstrued it was collected at the end of the presentation.</p>	
SIS Update	<p><u>SIS Online</u> As of Friday, we can go ahead with the licenses for the CCBs. AAIDD (previously AAMR) is programming Colorado's additional questions and hopes to be finished by the end of this week. At that point, the CCBs will be provided user Ids and granted access to the system. Rather than wait until AAIDD completes the programming necessary to proceed with online input, CCBs should be asked to identify their online users now. This way, AAIDD can start the process of assigning user IDs and logins to avoid further delays in providing CCBs access to the system.</p> <p><u>Additional SIS questions</u> DD identified two questions and two items of current services to ask about in addition to the universe of SIS questions. SIS trainers were notified of this on Friday (11/17) to get out to interviewers. One question deals with diagnosis of diabetes, because HSRI has found that it drives support not specifically addressed in the medical section. There is also one catch all question for additional needs, characteristics or situations not covered in SIS, in terms of support required. The CCBs</p>	<p>Both Associations should be copied on Gail's memos and e-mails on SIS issues.</p> <p>Claire will send the Associations the counts (as of Friday) for how many SIS interviews have been completed by CCB. AI will ask Gail to send updated data to Claire for this purpose.</p> <p>CCBs need to send the list of SIS online users in ASAP to get user IDs issued. Gail will check with AAMR regarding their ability to receive requests for user IDs before the programming is complete. Assuming this is feasible, Gail will send a memo</p>

Agenda Item	Status/Decisions Made	Assignments
	<p>have to get this new information on SIS assessments that have already been completed.</p> <p><u>FAQ and communication process</u> A first set of FAQs on SIS is being posted today, and the Department is working on some additional questions. Amy is collecting Gail's e-mails to convert them to FAQ responses.</p> <p>On 11/28, Phase V of the AAIDD training will be conducted for the original 19 trainers. They can ask questions and give feedback now that they have been working with the SIS. The afternoon will include an open session for parents, guardians, and others who want to ask questions at the auditorium at Fort Logan, with video/audio-conferencing available throughout the state.</p> <p><u>Contracting with the Department for SIS Interviews</u> A letter went out on Thursday of last week to CCBs asking for feedback no later than 11/30 to see if they would be interested in contracting with other interviewers if DD trained them. The cost would be roughly \$100 per interview. DD wanted to make sure they would be utilized (from January 1 on) before recruiting and training.</p> <p><u>Progress toward 12/1/ sample</u> DD developed a spreadsheet for each CCB and RC to show progress made the prior week in completing the sample. As of last week, 141 interviews completed (25% of 574 sample). We are about 50% of the way through the 9-week time frame for completing the SIS sample. Three CCBs did not report. It is very important to track this and make sure we don't fall behind.</p> <p><u>SIS Work Plan updates</u> Claire reviewed outstanding items including: o Add-ons: any due date except end of December?</p>	<p>to CCBs today. The memo also needs to remind each agency how many logons they requested. By 4:00 today if possible, tomorrow at the latest. Al will call Gail and ask her to send. Al will notify Claire if its not going to happen.</p> <p>Al asked CCB Partners and the Alliance to encourage CCBs to submit the reports. Claire asked that they ask each CCB if they are comfortable with their own progress, and if they have or need backup plans. The earlier we know this, the better. To facilitate this Gail will provide Claire an updated report by COB today. This will be massaged to add completion percentages for each CCB and then sent to CCB Partners and the Alliance for assistance in identifying progress, problem areas etc.</p>

Agenda Item	Status/Decisions Made	Assignments
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ SIS online: user IDs will be issued when? DD needs to send the list to SIS online. They only have to input the data, and then the registration is sent out.</li> <li>○ Cami asked about assistance from the Division for retroactive inputting.</li> <li>○ Process for disputing assessment results has been delayed until December 15. Do we think there is a backlog of these in the community? Do we need to communicate this? Al is getting information from AAIDD about how other states handle disputes. Not sure “dispute” is the correct word. It is not an “appeal” either. This may just be a communication vehicle.</li> </ul>	
PARs and IP Cover Sheets	<p><u>PAR data needed for billing purposes</u> In addition to case managers the CCB billing people have identified a need to have access to PAR data. Barb has filed a request for broadening access to the PAR with MMIS but has not heard back. The current system does not provide a year to date data or what remains. This issue impacts many providers and organizations in addition to the CCBs.</p> <p><u>PAR revisions</u> Jay wrote a directive about what has to be submitted for amendment to a PAR or establishment of the new annual PAR. That’s going out with PARs that are being returned, in today or tomorrow’s mail. It is also going out to the entire provider list.</p> <p>Two computer glitches locked DD out of the system for adding or amending PARs. These should be resolved in the next week. It has put Kelly and Amy behind the eight ball with getting things entered.</p>	<p>Barb will find out when this kind of access to PARs will be available. She will convene a meeting to address, but does not anticipate a rapid response.</p> <p>Jay will send out an e-mail to inform everyone when DD has access again.</p>
Billing Issues	Tiered rates are not consistently matching on the PARs. Mass adjustment has to be made on 22,000 claims. Jay believes these went in last Friday night.	

Agenda Item	Status/Decisions Made	Assignments
	<p>The item billing codes are not done yet; one of the key staff has been out ill. There will be issues with late bill override dates to deal with because of the delay.</p> <p>Some of the pricing displayed on the PARs is incorrect. It has nothing to do with payment, but the request is in to get it fixed. Transportation seems to be the primary area.</p>	
Public comment	Gerrie Frohne shared a handout from the Self-Advocates Advisory Council, which wrote up some of the concerns that they'd like HSRI to consider.	

**Hand-outs:**

1. Agenda
2. Work Plan
3. Update on Rate Setting Consultant Activities Presentation to CMS Waiver Steering Committee
4. Budget Presentation to CMS Waiver Steering Committee November 2006 (*for discussion only – copies returned at end of meeting*)
5. Self-Advocates Advisory Council Letter