Fiscal Sustainability Design Team Meeting Summary

Fiscal Sustainability Design Team	**Date of Meeting: July 13, 2011** **11 am – 4 pm**

Present:
Tina Chirico, Deb Franchini, Henry Hamelin, Eric Harris, Alden Kaplan, Anne Klingner, John Kemmer, Jay Kiyonaga, Keith McGriff, Amy Murrisky, Ramon Rodriguez, Michael Rogers, Pat Sarli, Jeff Sinsebox, Seth Stein, Louis Tehan

Absent: Steve Holmes, David Liscomb

Discussion Topics	Summary of Main Discussion Points, Considerations, Recommendations, Next Steps, etc.
Review of 6/20/2011 Meeting Summary	The design team accepted the summary without any changes.
Design Team Parameters	The team reviewed the Design Team Parameters document.
Other Design Team Briefing	Summary of what was discussed at other 1115 design team meetings held on 6/20/2011
Presentation of the Requested Analysis from the 6/20/2011 Meeting	The following analyses were presented: • OPWDD Medicaid expenditures for SFY 09-10 • The range in current per capita payments for supervised IRAs, ICFs, and supportive IRAs. Data were summarized to reflect the highest rate, lowest rate, mean rate and median rate. o Data confirmed the expectation that costs were on a bell curve, with most costs concentrated at a mid-level cost grouping.
Subgroup Presentation on Review of Other Systems & PACE	Team members presented research on other systems including Arizona, North Carolina, Vermont, Wisconsin, and PACE. (See PowerPoint)

Fiscal Sustainability Design Team Meeting Summary

Development of New York System / Structure	The team identified key components / features of other state systems that comport with the features described in the "Design Team Parameters" document. The team proposed the following characteristics for possible inclusion in the planned NYS system. • Care Management System In proposing structures, the team(s) will need to be cognizant of the following: o Creating multiple layers of administration/oversight which may add to the cost of serving people o Promoting choice through individualized services and within fiscal constraints is critical. o The role of the State must include providing controls that prevent conflict of interest (example: the State completing the assessment process that drives fiscal reimbursement and also serving as a provider who receives reimbursement based on the assessment process). • Subcontracting: o There is an outstanding question about the appropriate level of State involvement in subcontracting arrangements and determining the levels of payments to downstream contractors? • There should be mandatory enrollment, portability and Self-Direction in the planned system. • Shared Living Arrangements should be promoted. o Care coordination can expand services within the required budget neutrality by promoting lower-cost shared living arrangements. • It needs to be decided if state operated services will be included in the care management benefit package. • Inclusion of supports to individuals traditionally not supported by Medicaid should be explored. The below examples are a few that other states have included in their waivers: o Energy & housing assistance (Wisconsin) o Vermont's Flexible Funding is similar to New York State's Individual Supports & Services (ISS) and Family Support Services (FSS) programs.

Fiscal Sustainability Design Team Meeting Summary

	• The assessment tool should be tied to fiscal reimbursement and completed at arms-length from the care management entity receiving payment. • Capitation methodology may be composed of the following: o Annually adjusted, weighted capitation based on actual population being served, but not current payment methodologies o Add-ons similar to the CMS-HCC (Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services – Hierarchical Condition Categories) model, but specific to the target population: ▪ Age ▪ Grouped level of disability • Risk: o Retained by the care management entity, managed by use of small reserve funds, reinsurance, and stop-loss. • Transitional issues related to the transition from current fiscal methodologies to the planned care management system were Identified: o How will the assessment tool affect individuals who are currently receiving services? o Recommendation that a Fiscal Team comprised of a mixture of members continue after the summer to work through on-going transitional issues during the planning and pilot stages. o How is the aging out population handled?
Access & Choice Assessment Tools Technical Work Group	• Fiscal Sustainability Design Team representatives include John Kemmer and Deb Franchini. • State research completed by the Fiscal Sustainability Design Team is being shared with this technical workgroup. Any applicable information gathered by the technical workgroup will be shared at each Fiscal Sustainability Design Team meeting. • Work group is currently researching different assessment tools used by other states for applicability to NYS.
Business Items / Future Meetings	7/27/2011 meeting: • A preliminary proposed care management structure will be created based on the discussion of this meeting. It will be provided to members in advance of the

Fiscal Sustainability Design Team Meeting Summary

	7/27/2011 meeting to allow for discussion of the following: o Pros/Cons of proposed structure o Potential other structures o Rural vs. metropolitan variables o Other considerations which may affect a proposed structure

Action Items		
Action Item	**Owner**	**Due Date**
Send Federal Managed Care Regulations to Design Team Members	Amy Murrisky	Completed 7/14/2011

Next Meeting: **Wednesday, July 27, 2011**
11am – 4pm
44 Holland Avenue, Room 4B
Albany, NY 12229