



**Senior Dental Advisory Committee
November 4, 2014
Meeting Minutes**

PRESENT	ABSENT	GUESTS
Linda Reiner	Keith Clear	Chandra Vital - HCPF
Sally Ryman		Malissa Williams – AG Office
Matilda Bottenbley		Marija Weeden-Osborn - CCHN
Carol Niforatos		Jennifer Goodrum - CDA
Todd Coffey		
Karen Reiplinger		
Alan Kislowitz		
Thomas Lavery - Phone		
Diane Brunson - Phone		
Nancy Dolson – HCPF		Cynthia Miley - HCPF

Approximate Time	Topic	Lead
3:00 – 3:10	<input type="checkbox"/> Welcome and Introductions	<i>Chair Linda Reiner</i>
	<input type="checkbox"/> Review and approve minutes	
3:10 – 4:30	<input type="checkbox"/> Continued committee review for possible committee action: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Eligible senior definition ○ Revised draft request for grant proposals ○ Revised draft grant review criteria 	<i>Nancy Dolson, HCPF</i>
4:30-4:45	<input type="checkbox"/> Public Comment	
4:30 – 5:00	<input type="checkbox"/> Committee action, if ready <input type="checkbox"/> Discuss schedule for next meetings <input type="checkbox"/> Wrap up and Adjournment	<i>Committee Members</i>

Next Meeting: November 21, 2014; 3:00 to 5:00 PM
225 East 16th Avenue, Denver, CO 80203
Conference Room 6 A/B

Sally Ryman called the meeting to order at 3:03 p.m.

Carol Niforatos motioned to approve minutes as written, **Alan Kislowitz** seconded.

Motion passed

Presentations:

Review Eligible Senior Definition, Revised Draft Request for Grant Proposals, Revised Grant Review Criteria

- Our current definition of an eligible senior follows what the legislation set for this program. An adult age 60 years or older who is economically disadvantaged who is not eligible for dental services under Medicaid or the Old Age Pension Health and Medical Care Program and who does not have private dental insurance.
- At 185% FPL there are approximately 88,000 seniors who would be potentially eligible, excludes Medicaid and long term care
- Above 185% up to 250% there would be a higher concentration of non-Medicaid individuals
- Lawful presence will be a requirement of this program
 - o Grantees will be required to determine lawful presence when they are qualifying people to receive services under this program
 - o Any public benefit that uses public funds, an individual who will be receiving services must sign an affidavit declaring that they are lawfully present in the country and then the grantee will need to verify documentation
 - o This is an additional administrative step that the grantees must take
 - o Some grantees may already have processes in place
- Grantees will need to invoice us on a monthly basis to let us know how many seniors were served and what services were provided
 - o Will want this even if it is zero
- Grantees may prioritize services to seniors most in need by considering factors such as race, ethnicity, disability status, frailty, language barriers, lower incomes or other criteria
- For all applicants provide documentation to demonstrate financial viability such as most recent audited financial report, year-to-date financial statement or first page of most recently filed 990 form. If applicant cannot supply this information supply a written explanation
- Eliminated appendix E and instead will ask how grantees will outreach
- Describe how the applicant will outreach to dental providers in the service area
- Experience with this population will most likely come through in their responses
- Have grantees explain how they will prioritize services to those most in need in their area
- Recommend to have the review committee look at what the strength and weaknesses are instead of scoring applicants
- The fee schedule will be set and the administrative costs are capped at 7% so there is nothing to be gained by someone who can come in lower so given the established rates we want to know how grantees will meet the other criteria of the grant
- Still value and need to know how many seniors they will serve

- Asking applicants why they believe they can serve this population given the parameters set in the application
- Looking for what efficiencies already exist such as already serving or have connections to these populations, CICIP providers, managing SAVE, determining financial eligibility
- **Todd Coffey** – Will there be the ability to look at past record for applicants who participated in programs such as OAP
- Ask if they are in good standing with the state from previous similar programs
- **Linda Reiner** – Add a questions asking to describe past state contract working with population and describe any evaluation results from that
- Want to know about economies of scale, system that are in place, past experience, leveraging
 - o Help us understand how you will be able to hit the ground running with this because you have systems in place, you have relevant experience
- Budget is moot in this program since we have an established fee schedule and a cap on admin costs
- Don't ask if they will be providing the whole scope of services
- **Linda Reiner** – Obligation of the grantee is to address the highest needs of that senior, how will they help ensure that the senior has their highest dental need met with this benefit, how will they assess and prioritize need and ensure they have the right referral mechanisms to meet those highest needs. A budget is a nice exercise to hold people accountable
- **Todd Coffey** - Instead of identifying services they will provide have them list what services they will not provide
- **Sally Ryman** – When listing what services they do or do not provide what is their solution for provisions of those services to their patients
- Suggesting department staff go through and make sure everything is there in the application before it goes to the review panel
- Suggesting that department staff review the information for financial viability prior to the review panel
- The Department may request clarification from applicant if needed
- Will look to one of the CPAs within the department to review financial viability of applicant
- Applicants do have to tell us who they are collaborating with or who they have these relationship with
 - o Will look at what specific community organizations listed will strengthen the applicants ability to reach eligible seniors in need of dental services
- Will provide the review panel with guidelines to consider including geographic region and percentage of estimated eligible seniors in each area
- When letters of regret are sent will include reasons why they were not chosen
- Regional distribution will be a key consideration and if there is not sufficient funds to award grants then priority will be given
- Looking at releasing application in January and receiving grant applications back in February or beginning of March
- Plan on presenting rules to Medical Services Board in January, once those rules are adopted we can issue the application

Public Comment

- **Marija Weeden** – Spoke on behalf of CCHN and presented the committee members with written comments from CCHN’s board. Not in favor of bumping it up to 250% because the current program is at a lower level and there is only \$3 million, we don’t know how many people will be added. The ceiling and allowing grantees to set lower restrictions that can mean across the state seniors would have access in one area and not in another. For simplicity of administrative reasons we think that it would be better to set an across the board level for economically disadvantaged and not have those numbers adjusted by grantee. Given that there is a 7% administrative limit we want to make sure that the providers that have been participating already are encouraged to continue to participate. We think it’s really important that the new program continue to be administratively simple and not become to overly burdensome. We think that with the eligibility it should just be across the board when it comes to economically disadvantaged. When determining eligibility we think it is best to just look at income and not try to determine assets. We think that there should be some direction to the review committee as to what should be distributed around the state. The committee should be given direction on if someone crosses multiple regions that they should be given consideration in both and not just in one region. Any region should get at least 10% of the funding to ensure that we do have funding throughout the state. Consider everything that is being asked in the application and how administratively burdensome this will be for some of the smaller provider to pull together all of that stuff.

Action Items

- **Diane Brunson** motioned that the definition of Eligible Senior mean a senior aged 60 years or older who is economically disadvantaged defined as up to 250% of the federal poverty level. **Sally Ryman** seconded. Motion passed

The meeting was adjourned at 4:45 pm.