



## MINUTES

Long Term Care Advisory Committee  
*Workgroup 3 Building Infrastructure*  
Via Teleconference  
Monday December 8, 2008  
3 PM – 4:30 PM

Members Present: Todd Coffey, Julie Reiskin, Lori Woods,  
Barbara Prehmus

Members Absent or:  
Excused Henry Claypool, Viki Manley, Barry Rosenberg  
Pat Tunnell

Guests: Marci Eads, Sean-Casey King, Laura Gilbert  
(PASCO)

1. **Call to Order:** Teleconference convened at 3 P.M.
2. **The meeting's assignment:** Review of current reimbursement methods and ideas/possibilities for reimbursement reform that could incent expansion of infrastructure capacity.
3. **Guests:** Casey King and Marci Eads, Rates Section introduced themselves. Casey has been with the Department for several years in various capacities, including eligibility policy. Marci has been at HCPF for 3 months and came from the private research sector. Casey and Marci are the primary folks assigned to long term care rates issues; including rates for the HCBS programs administered by the Department of Human Services. Barry Rosenberg was unable to attend so asked Laura Gilbert to substitute.
4. **Reimbursement Reform:** Casey provided background information on HCBS waiver services' reimbursements, how those rates are currently adjusted, and the Department's staged approach to reviewing/revising the methodology. In recent years CMS has increased its scrutiny on rate methodologies in general, and Colorado's rates for waiver services in the DD program area have undergone a recent major revision. Both Pennsylvania and Colorado's DD program approaches use an "acuity tool" to ensure that rates reflect the client care intensity. Julie Reiskin asked whether either of these existing tools might be appropriate for consideration, and whether review will include potential changes to case management reimbursement. Casey clarified that the SIS tool used for the DD program is unlikely to be appropriate for other waiver programs.

5. **Acuity Adjustments:** Discussion continued around the merits and considerations for having acuity adjustments to rates. Members cautioned that any application of an acuity adjustment needed to be reviewed to avoid being either too complicated or creating odd incentives, including the potential to crowd out family supports. Members identified 2 services categories for which having an acuity adjustment appears logical: personal care and alternative care facility. Additionally, there was interest in thinking through how administrative case management conducted by the Single Entry Point could be addressed. Julie raised the concern that some clients drive more time and efforts than others and whether a rate could be reflective of those differences.
6. **Budget Implications:** Casey shared that the implementation of the revised rates for the DD programs is being conducted within budget neutrality. Essentially the total funding remains the same so the higher rates for folks with greater needs are accomplished by reducing rates for clients with less intensive needs. Within the DD programs the acuity adjustment is matched to a specific client, not the provider. An alternative approach might be to categorize the providers but that would need safeguards to ensure that services are provided in accordance with the categorization. Members agreed that they would like any options considered by Casey/Marci to reflect these considerations.
7. **Case Management:** Julie raised questions about how SEP rates could adequately reflect the differences in client need. Discussion included the relative merits of a FFS approach, including the potential to drive additional utilization. Members expressed some interest in having greater flexibility in frequency of client contact tied to client outcomes as an approach. Discussion then focused on what kinds of outcomes might impact quality and which outcomes might be appropriate; avoidance of NF placement not sufficient. Members discussed the relative merits and challenges of competitively procuring case management entities as an approach to impact infrastructure building and holding SEPs accountable.
8. **Next Meeting:** To be determined after the holiday break.
9. **Meeting Adjourned:** 4:30 PM.

Reasonable accommodations will be provided upon request for persons with disabilities. Please notify Barbara Prehmus at (303) 866-2991 at least one week prior to a meeting if you need special accommodations in order to participate.