

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

CABINET FOR HEALTH AND FAMILY SERVICES
ADVISORY COUNCIL FOR MEDICAID ASSISTANCE

Via Videoconference
September 28, 2023
Commencing at 10:03 a.m.

Shana W. Spencer, RPR, CRR
Court Reporter

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

APPEARANCES

ADVISORY COUNCIL MEMBERS:

- Elizabeth Partin - Chair
- Nina Eisner
- Susan Stewart
- Dr. Jerry Roberts
- Dr. Garth Bobrowski - Co-chair
- Dr. Steve Compton
- Heather Smith
- Dr. John Muller (not present)
- Dr. Ashima Gupta
- John Dadds (not present)
- Dr. Catherine Hanna
- Barry Martin (not present)
- Kent Gilbert
- Mackenzie Wallace
- Annisia Franklin (not present)
- Sheila Schuster
- Bryan Proctor (not present)
- Peggy Roark
- Eric Wright

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

P R O C E E D I N G S

CHAIR PARTIN: We'll call the meeting to order. Is our secretary on?

MS. BICKERS: I thought I saw her log in. I'm scrolling. In the interest of time, I'll just call roll instead of keep scrolling. I have --

CHAIR PARTIN: Thanks, Erin.

MS. BICKERS: You're very welcome. And I just wrote you guys down as you were coming in. I have Catherine.

(No response.)

MS. BICKERS: Hanna. Did -- okay. I have Beth.

CHAIR PARTIN: Here.

MS. BICKERS: Nina?

MS. EISNER: Here.

MS. BICKERS: Susan?

(No response.)

MS. BICKERS: I believe she said her microphone was not working.

Jerry?

(No response.)

MS. BICKERS: Heather?

MS. SMITH: Here.

1 MS. BICKERS: Garth?
2 DR. BOBROWSKI: Here.
3 MS. BICKERS: Steve?
4 DR. COMPTON: Here.
5 MS. BICKERS: John?
6 (No response.)
7 MS. BICKERS: Ishima?
8 DR. GUPTA: Ashima, yes. I'm here.
9 MS. BICKERS: Ashima. I'm so
10 sorry. I do that every time. My apologies.
11 John?
12 (No response.)
13 MS. BICKERS: Barry?
14 (No response.)
15 MS. BICKERS: Kent?
16 MR. GILBERT: Here.
17 MS. BICKERS: Mackenzie?
18 MR. GILBERT: Mackenzie --
19 MS. WALLACE: Here.
20 MR. GILBERT: Oh, okay.
21 MS. BICKERS: Annissa?
22 (No response.)
23 MS. BICKERS: Sheila?
24 DR. SCHUSTER: Here.
25 MS. BICKERS: Bryan?

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

(No response.)

MS. BICKERS: Peggy?

(No response.)

MS. BICKERS: Eric?

DR. WRIGHT: Here.

MS. BICKERS: Okay.

DR. ROBERTS: Jerry Roberts just
came in.

MS. BICKERS: Oh, thank you.

DR. HANNA: This is Cathy Hanna,
too. I am here. I'm having some -- it's
like my Internet is -- something is wrong, so
I may -- I turned my camera off to see if
that would help. But if it doesn't, I may
have to jump in on my phone, but I'm here.

MS. BICKERS: Okay. Thank you.

CHAIR PARTIN: Okay. Do we have a
quorum?

MS. BICKERS: You have 11, yes,
ma'am. Sorry. I had to count. I have a
hard time calling names and counting at the
same time.

CHAIR PARTIN: Me, too. Thank you,
Erin.

Okay. Next up on the agenda is approval

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

of the minutes. Would somebody like to make a motion?

DR. SCHUSTER: I'll move their approval. This is Sheila Schuster.

MS. EISNER: This is Nina. I'll second that motion.

CHAIR PARTIN: Any discussion?

(No response.)

CHAIR PARTIN: All in favor, say aye.

(Aye.)

CHAIR PARTIN: Any noes?

(No response.)

CHAIR PARTIN: Okay. The minutes approved. Thank you.

Moving into old business, what is the status of Anthem MCO?

MS. JUDY-CECIL: Good morning. This is Veronica Judy-Cecil with Kentucky Medicaid, and there is no change in the status. The case is still pending.

CHAIR PARTIN: Still in the court?

MS. JUDY-CECIL: That's correct.

CHAIR PARTIN: Okay. Thank you. I'll put that on for next meeting.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

Okay. And then next up is the DMS report on healthcare workforce, and thank you for sending that out to us. It was very interesting, but I think that maybe we have -- need more explanation and maybe some questions afterwards.

MS. JUDY-CECIL: Absolutely. And we have invited -- Matthew Walton is here from our sister agency, the Office of Data Analytics, and I believe Matthew -- I did not check to make sure he was on. But I believe Matthew -- there he is -- is going to have a short presentation to kind of go through the high level of the report and then happy to open it up for any questions.

CHAIR PARTIN: Thank you.

MS. JUDY-CECIL: And, Erin, if you could make sure that Matthew is a cohost, so he can share --

MS. BICKERS: I made him a cohost when he logged in.

MS. JUDY-CECIL: Excellent.

MS. BICKERS: I try to grab all of you guys in the beginning.

DR. WALTON: Yeah. I'm able to

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

share screen, so thank you, Erin, and thank you, Deputy Commissioner.

All right. So let me just -- thank you for the introduction. My name is Dr. Matthew Walton. I'm the lead researcher with the Office of Data Analytics at the Cabinet. And I have a short presentation for you all to -- just to highlight some of the things in the report. I bet I can anticipate some of the questions that you might have.

So the point here -- excuse me -- is to show you all what we did, the challenges that we faced. And then, really, the biggest takeaway for our team was ways that we can improve the quality of data available to answer questions like this.

So, really, the title here is the question: How many healthcare professionals are practicing in Kentucky? It's a harder question to answer than it may seem, and so this is just a couple of slides to do a brief discussion of our 2023 Healthcare Workforce Capacity Report.

So three simple things that this report does. You all are very familiar, I know,

1 with the Deloitte report that was -- it's
2 about ten years old now. Our charge was to
3 update that report. And in the process, so
4 we read it very carefully. We noticed the
5 things that that team from Deloitte was
6 telling us or telling, you know, its readers
7 what needed to happen to improve the quality
8 of services in Kentucky and to show parts of
9 the state that were lower -- you know, a
10 lower saturation of healthcare workers
11 compared to others. So we updated that, so
12 we provide a count of credentialed healthcare
13 professionals.

14 What we did, we added 14 more provider
15 types. So we added -- for example, in the
16 2013 report, physical therapists,
17 occupational therapists, speech pathologists,
18 audiologists, there was a long list of
19 professionals that were not covered. We --
20 in our updated version, we added them.

21 The second is we really grapple -- we
22 know that the ultimate interest in this
23 report is to answer questions: Where are we
24 insufficient to meet the demand for the
25 state? That is a very hard question to

1 answer in a kind of empirically rigorous way.
2 I think a lot of people intuitively know when
3 they live in a community that they need
4 another dentist, or they need another
5 pediatrician or, you know, where they're
6 deficient.

7 At a 30,000-foot level when you're
8 looking at data, there -- we talked to
9 federal agencies. We talked to medical
10 schools. We talked to several experts. And
11 what we -- the best that we were able to
12 offer in terms of a simple and rigorous way
13 to compare Kentucky's ratios was to just
14 compare them to what the nation has.

15 So this is another departure from the
16 Deloitte report. Deloitte constructed
17 measures that said this is the ratio of
18 people in an area or county or
19 administrat- -- or an area development
20 district, and this is how many dentists they
21 have. And you should have this many if you
22 want to be sufficient.

23 Their method is sound. I'm not knocking
24 it, but we did not feel on our team that we
25 could support that. We didn't feel like we

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

could defend it because we would prefer to use something like a national association, professional association's ratio that they recommend. And there really aren't things we could find that fit that description.

And the third thing I would offer is where we feel the report adds the most value. It's -- we obviously -- we're proud of the work that we did in -- just in terms of counting the professionals. We had to do some data science that we can talk to you all about if you're interested in terms of how to make sure that the data we're using is the -- is accurate.

But the most important thing is -- for what we feel like is where we can tell stakeholders to aim in the future, where future authors of a similar report could have better tools to answer these kinds of questions.

And so we rely really heavily on the licensure boards. That's the backbone source of data for all of the chapters in this report. And in a supplement that we wrote up, we offer fields -- data fields that if

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

they were to be collected and populated by providers, future authors who are doing the same work that we have just completed will have better tools and be able to answer more interesting and useful questions than we were able to do.

This is the last slide. I just chose three provider types that I know are represented on this call. We'll go through just brief, high-level conclusions, and then I think the best use of time would be for me to be available to answer questions that you all may have.

So, first of all, this is like what I mentioned before. There are some criteria out there in the literature. There's some criteria that some other states use. Our team did not feel like it was our place to tell -- I mean, this is stepping into the realm of policy, of policymaking.

What does it mean to have enough dentists in a community, or what does it mean to have enough physicians? What we felt like we could do really well was give the stakeholder group: Here are the ratios.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

Here's how many we can identify using licensure board data. Here's how many people the census says live in this area and then here's how that compares to the country.

And we used Bureau of Labor Statistics data for how many -- for example, how many nurse practitioners there are in the U.S. and how many Americans there are. So where you see green in the report, that means the ratios are at least as good or better than the national ratios. Where you see red, that's where the ratios -- and this is a little confusing. That's actually where they are higher.

If you think about this like student/teacher ratios, generally speaking, if your child can be in a lower student/teacher ratio, you prefer that. The same with the way that we're expressing ratios here. This is where in these green area development districts, there are fewer people per dentist; or in Lexington and Louisville area, fewer people per physician.

And I think a lot of this won't be very surprising to the people on this call. I've

1 certainly heard this in many meetings around
2 state government spaces, that we know that
3 the area around northern Kentucky,
4 Louisville, and Lexington is where there's a
5 high concentration of healthcare
6 professionals. And much of the data that we
7 find supports that conclusion, that, you
8 know, if you live in Kentucky your whole
9 life, you tend to think that's how it is.

10 So we would offer that the discussion
11 and the debates about where there are --
12 where there need to be more supply of
13 providers are well-served by coming to kind
14 of a shared definition of what it means to
15 have enough or what a certain community
16 needs. What does it mean to be sufficiently
17 supplied?

18 More specifically, it's -- these are 30
19 provider types, so it's hard to say -- you
20 know, it's hard to speak very broadly or
21 generally. But a lot of these, Kentucky is
22 broadly in line with the country.

23 Now, the critical challenge to that is
24 if the whole country is undersupplied by,
25 say, nurse practitioners and we are green on

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

these maps, that -- that is a limitation of this method. And we offer that very freely, that that goes back to this first point of if our only unit of comparison is a whole country that has a shortage of providers, then maybe you will look better than what the real, on-the-ground reality is.

But I picked three points to summarize very simply and shortly. If you look at dentists, you've got four area development districts in eastern Kentucky that look like they could use dentists. If you're looking at mental health clinicians, probably need them most across the whole state but especially in western Kentucky.

And for those of you on this call that are behavioral health professionals, we tried to take a very careful description because we heard the feedback on the previous report. We do not aggregate professional types and call them mental health counselors. Even this title here is a little bit of a generalization. We know that. That's not -- there's not a licensure type called mental health counselor. This is a compromise we

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

had to make because of the way the Bureau of Labor Statistics collects data and calls fields.

But we have clinical psychologists, licensed clinical social workers, marriage and family therapists. So we have -- you know, we know that this is not a singular field and that it's multiple different disciplines who do slightly different things. I myself am a social worker, so I'm sensitive to that, you know, those distinctions that need to be drawn.

And then we probably need physicians everywhere that isn't Lexington or Louisville. I think that was -- probably didn't need to do a report to know that. But what we can tell you with a little more precision is that Buffalo Trace up in northeastern Kentucky shows up. You can see just in these three, the ratios are worse than the country. So Pennyrile and Buffalo Trace show up in a lot of these maps. Pennyrile shows up in these two as well. When you go through the whole 30 provider types, you see this red show up several other

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

times.

And so, you know, to the extent that we can tell you something that maybe wouldn't have already been obvious, those are two area development districts that appear to be -- if there were to be, you know, an initiative to attract more healthcare workers, we can say that the ratios are the least favorable in those two and then a few others that we talk about in the report.

And the third thing, which would really be -- I know this is also aligned with many sentiments that have been articulated by this group. If we want to do better analyses and have more precise conclusions and answer better questions, we have to ask for better tools.

The group of analysts on the team that I work on really did a -- you know, a very, very strong effort of doing the very best that we can to say: If Dr. Walton is in Lexington in this dataset and there's another Dr. Walton but Walton is spelled W-e-l-t-o-n also in Fayette County, is that the same person?

1 Because what we do is -- I didn't talk
2 about this as much, but the -- where those
3 licensure board data have missing fields or
4 potentially incorrect data, we took data from
5 CMS, which is publicly available, and did a
6 linkage strategy to say let's validate this
7 information. So if it's missing, then we can
8 pull it from this other source, and that
9 dramatically improved the quality of data
10 available to us to write this report.

11 So I'll stop there and then I don't know
12 if we have much time for questions. But I'm
13 happy that you all were interested in this.
14 We feel like we learned a lot. Hopefully, we
15 give something to this group that's useful
16 and meaningful for your efforts.

17 CHAIR PARTIN: Okay. Thank you for
18 that report. I did have a question, and you
19 kind of answered that. But comparing the
20 numbers in Kentucky to national numbers, to
21 me, that didn't seem like it really told us
22 anything because we know nationally, there's
23 a problem.

24 So we were -- were you comparing knowing
25 that nationally the numbers were already bad?

1 And so if we were bad in Kentucky, we were
2 even worse than what we recognize is bad
3 nationally? Is that a fair assessment?

4 DR. WALTON: That's not how I
5 would -- so I would answer your question
6 first with a question. Just forgive me. I'm
7 a former professor, and so I tend to do this.
8 I would ask: How do you know that the
9 quantity nationally is too low? I've read --
10 I'm sure we've read a lot of the same
11 articles, but can you give me evidence that
12 what we have nationally is too low?

13 CHAIR PARTIN: No, I can't. But
14 that's part of the problem, I guess, in my
15 mind, is that comparing it to national, are
16 we assuming that national is low and then
17 Kentucky is lower than -- than that shows,
18 that there's even a bigger problem? Or are
19 we to assume that nationally, it's good, and
20 comparing Kentucky to the national numbers
21 shows that Kentucky is deficit in areas that
22 nationally are good? I couldn't tell from
23 the report.

24 DR. WALTON: We make no assumption
25 about whether or not the national numbers are

1 good or bad. The only reason -- the reason
2 that they are the anchor is because they're
3 the one thing we can point to and say we can
4 be -- we can be most certain that this number
5 is true because we placed faith in the Bureau
6 of Labor Statistics and say that's the best
7 source of available information to say this
8 is how many -- I should say we trust the
9 Bureau of Labor Statistics and the census
10 bureau because those are the two numbers.

11 Think of it -- it's a division equation;
12 right? The numerator is the number of people
13 in the country, and the denominator is the
14 number of dentists. And those two numbers
15 were the best source of data for us to say if
16 you're going to compare two things --
17 right? -- a ratio in Kentucky and a ratio in
18 the nation, the best job you can do is pick
19 numbers you can have faith in.

20 And so this is where our report really
21 is not going to take the whole question all
22 the way to the finish line because
23 question -- debates about good or bad or
24 enough or not enough rely on work that just
25 hasn't been done yet, in my opinion. We need

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

to do better about making better, rigorous definitions about what it means to have enough.

CHAIR PARTIN: Okay. So, really, it's a number that you can depend on, but we don't know exactly what that number means. Is that what you're saying?

DR. WALTON: We do know what it means. It's a comparison -- you're making some general assumption about the way that people who hire healthcare workers supply their areas. So in that sense, you can say it's at least enough to meet a minimum threshold that the people in the city are comfortable enough with how many doctors they have.

The issue is that you really -- you just have to take what this report gives you and elevate the discourse to the next step and say -- because you have issues about not all communities will need the same number of dentists, you know. If you have a really young population, they're not going to need health care the same way that a population where the median age is older.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

And that gets very challenging, and I think that's why the federal agencies have kind of stopped short and not held out the gold standard that all communities need to hit.

CHAIR PARTIN: Okay. And then follow-up to that question. In the report, you were comparing different types of healthcare providers to the total number in the population. So how do we know, for instance -- let me backtrack.

We know or have a pretty good idea about what the ratio should be with physicians to population. But we don't know what the ratio should be per population for, say, LPNs, but yet there was a comparison there.

So how do I get some meaning out of that with the -- comparing the number of LPNs to the total number of population or comparing the number of marriage and family counselors to the population? How do I -- how do I derive some meaning from that?

DR. WALTON: Well, so what you would -- what you would do is you could say it's at least not worse than the nation, and

1 that is -- I will agree, you know, it's not
2 the platonic ideal. But you can at least
3 start there. And then what you can do is
4 also derive meaning from saying: How does it
5 compare to the rest of Kentucky?

6 So a lot of what you -- how you derive
7 meaning is depending on the question that you
8 need to answer. And that's why we supply you
9 all of the area development districts, so you
10 can see how they compare to each other, which
11 may be the most meaningful. I can't say
12 because I'm not the one making the decisions
13 from this report. But you would -- meaning
14 you can compare to the country, and you can
15 compare to the other area development
16 districts.

17 So you can potentially assume that --
18 let's say that since we can't know for sure
19 if we have enough and let's assume we have a
20 deficient supply across the whole state, you
21 can at least know where you have the greatest
22 deficiency. And you can target resources
23 there.

24 MS. BICKERS: Beth, we have several
25 hands raised. I believe it was Dr. Gupta

1 first, then J.P. Hamm. Then I believe it was
2 Dr. Schuster and then Dr. Bobrowski, in that
3 order.

4 CHAIR PARTIN: So go ahead with the
5 first person.

6 DR. GUPTA: Dr. Walton, this is
7 Ashima Gupta. Thank you very much for that
8 report.

9 MS. BICKERS: We're having a hard
10 time hearing you.

11 DR. GUPTA: Can you hear me, Beth?

12 DR. SCHUSTER: Yeah. That's a
13 little bit better.

14 DR. WALTON: It's very muffled.

15 DR. GUPTA: If you can't hear me,
16 just stop me, and I'll just write it down in
17 the chat. This has been a major topic in our
18 Physician Technical Advisory Committee.

19 MR. GILBERT: I think we should
20 probably move to the next person because we
21 can't hear Dr. Gupta.

22 MS. BICKERS: If you'd like to drop
23 it in the chat, I can read it off after
24 someone's next question. Thank you.

25 CHAIR PARTIN: Next up.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

MR. HAMM: Yeah. This is J.P. Hamm with the Kentucky Hospital Association. Can you all hear me okay?

CHAIR PARTIN: Yes.

MR. HAMM: So thank you very much for the presentation, and I do want to applaud you all on asking for better data from all the different licensing boards because that is vital for our workforce.

Where I'm confused is, for example, the KBN, the Board of Nursing, has excellent data. And they do a deeper dive, and they -- and your first slide showed practicing, and I really focused on that.

Because if you do a deeper dive -- and they publish this in their spring newsletter. When you do that deeper dive, you all show the total number of licenses at 70, but the total number of people practicing is more like 48,000. So that's a difference of 20,000 nurses about and, you know, that difference is people who practice out of state or working for insurance companies or just taking time off.

So I'm concerned about the State showing

1 green for nurses when we know that there's a
2 nursing shortage even if you compare
3 (audio glitch) -- going to Nina's question.
4 And I think it's a little bit misleading.

5 And so I'm trying to figure out, if we
6 want better data, why we didn't take
7 advantage of KBN's better data to show that
8 the number of licenses does not reflect the
9 number of people practicing.

10 DR. WALTON: Yeah. Thank you for
11 that question. So that was -- that was a --
12 one of the challenges of putting together a
13 report like this was to try and do justice to
14 the publicly available data that the boards
15 put out.

16 And the Kentucky Board of Nursing poses
17 a unique instance because I agree with what
18 you said. Their data is one of the better,
19 if not the best quality. And they have --
20 because they license so many people, my
21 assumption is they just built up a data
22 infrastructure to handle that much
23 information.

24 Whereas, some of the boards -- like, for
25 example, the board that licenses me is much

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

smaller, and they probably don't have the same budget to manage big datasets. That was a judgment call that we had to make because we didn't want to put data into a public-facing report that counteracts.

They also have on their Web page just the total number of licenses that they have by county. And I -- you know, there's a deeper debate that we could add that we could potentially reflect that in two ways and show -- because we did make an effort to do practicing versus not practicing.

But not all boards do that. And so it was an effort to try and align all of the provider types with the publicly available information and present it in a way that's consistent.

So thank you for the question.

MS. BICKERS: Dr. Gupta's question, Dr. Walton, says -- oh, sorry. I've got to scroll up. The physician shortage has been a major topic in our Physician's TAC over the past couple of years. How will the data and the recommendations from this report be implemented?

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

DR. WALTON: Well, I can -- I can minimally respond to that because I'm not a policy maker. So I -- you know, my job is to give the information to policy makers.

But what I would -- what I would really call attention to is -- there's a little bit of reading between the lines that has to be done. But in the report, we present that medical school graduate degrees conferred in Kentucky's three medical schools have been going up over the time period that we catalogued but then the number of those graduates who go on to get a Kentucky medical licensure is trending down.

And I can only imagine if you just think about this, like, in a musical chairs example. I -- we did not look at how many residency spots there are in Kentucky's training institutions for physicians. But I assume that the number of graduates, degrees conferred, is going up faster than the number of residency spots. And we know from some evidence that people will tend to practice in the areas where they train, about half if you look at the national numbers.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

And so what I imagine is that while those medical colleges are growing the size of their classes, just by the nature of the way residency training works, they're having to leave the state and then I would assume many don't come back.

So we also replicated an analysis that Deloitte did that showed the J-1 visa program. It's not -- we don't know if a physician has a J-1 visa from the data that we have, but we do know if they graduated from an international medical college.

So we took what Deloitte did and updated it and found where a lot of the state's underserved areas are being -- they're practicing physicians that have graduated from an international medical college. And so that's -- that is one lever that can be pulled to recruit physicians to parts of the state that need doctors.

MS. BICKERS: I believe Dr. Schuster was next.

DR. SCHUSTER: Yeah. Good morning, Matthew. Sheila Schuster here. Thank you for your presentation, and thank you for

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

supporting something that I have testified on to legislators and to the MAC, and that is that our licensure boards don't have the data that we need. And KBN comes as close as any. So I'm particularly appreciative of the list of data fields that you all suggest.

And I would say to every professional group that's represented on the MAC, we need to find a bill sponsor and require the boards to literally ask those questions, and I always use myself as an example.

I've been licensed for 100 years as a psychologist but haven't practiced literally since 2000. But I've kept my license and done the CEs and so forth so that when I testify and so forth, I can say I'm a licensed psychologist. But I should not be counted as practicing.

And that was an excellent question that Mr. Hamm asked. So the county data is helpful, but it doesn't really reflect the practitioners.

I want to go back to the mental health groups, and I appreciate your not having lumped everything together because that was

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

one of our big complaints about the Deloitte report. And, of course, in the mental health groups, you're also not including psychiatrists and psychiatric mental health APRNs who are a big part of the mental health workforce. They're classified otherwise. So that -- that makes it a little bit different.

But I'm concerned about your numbers, and I'll tell you why. You list the licensed psychologists, and my guess is that you looked at just those, I think, 827 who have a doctoral degree. But we have licensed psychological practitioners who are independent practitioners and practice with a master's degree. And there's at least another 800 or 1,000 that weren't counted at all.

And that leads me to my next question, which is you have groups of people listed who require supervision. So you obviously didn't use as your criteria completely independently practicing people. And so if you go back and look at psychology, social work, marriage and family therapy, the alcohol and drug counselors, all of them have people that are

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

practicing and that are providing services who are working under supervision. And I guess I'm curious about whether you all thought about including those folks because, otherwise, it's very uneven.

I mean, LPNs are not independently practicing professionals. They work under supervision and direction of other people. And that's true of a number of other groups that you have in here. So I just wonder if you looked at the supervised people because they really do provide services, and they certainly are part of the workforce.

DR. WALTON: Yeah. Thank you for the question. So the first -- in the first point, LPCCs are featured in this report. They are one unfortunate case where what we call LPCCs does not exist in the Bureau of Labor Statistics data.

DR. SCHUSTER: Statistics, right.

DR. WALTON: They put it together. So in our report, licensed clinical alcohol and drug counselors and LPCCs are put together in a category, and that's a compromise that just had to be made to make

1 the comparisons with the national ratio. So
2 they are featured in this report. They're
3 just not -- we don't call them psychologists.

4 DR. SCHUSTER: But you don't
5 include the supervised folks in those fields.

6 DR. WALTON: No, we don't. And
7 I'll tell you -- I'll respond to that
8 question as well because that's -- we thought
9 hard about that. And the -- really, it's a
10 pragmatic reason, is that we thought we might
11 lose some parts of the audience if we went
12 really in depth about that.

13 We also know that if we -- I'll take
14 myself. I'm a CSW, so I could be under
15 supervision by an LCSW to sit for that. But
16 you end up with the same problem as if I were
17 retired. I don't see patients in my daily
18 work. And so if we were just to see the
19 licensures or the certificates of the CSWs,
20 we don't know which ones are under
21 supervision from our data. And so we end
22 up -- we could overcount the same way we
23 could undercount.

24 So I think this is one of the best
25 examples of -- that we need better tools to

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

be able to answer a question at that level of sophistication. Because that's really taking this and pushing it to the next level of depth, and we did not feel like what we had was able to do justice to that question.

DR. SCHUSTER: Well, I would encourage you to go back and add to the psychologists those who are licensed psychological practitioners because they are independent practitioners. They do not work under supervision, and there's at least another probably 1,000 of them. That's not true of the CSWs, and it's not true of the associates for the licensed professional counselors or the LADCs but just -- just to put that caveat in there.

Thank you.

MS. BICKERS: Beth, and I just had a quick question. I'm sorry. This is Erin. After Dr. Bobrowski's question, in the manner of time for a full agenda, if anyone has any other questions, they can drop them in the chat. And I will catch them and send them over to Dr. Walton, if that's okay with him. I know we have a full agenda today.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

DR. WALTON: Yes. That would be just fine. We would be happy to answer email questions or however it is most appropriate or useful for the group.

CHAIR PARTIN: Okay. And then when we do that, would you share them with the MAC, Erin?

MS. BICKERS: Absolutely. Yes, ma'am.

CHAIR PARTIN: Thank you.

MS. BICKERS: Dr. B, I think, was the last person with his hand up. Dr. Bobrowski. I'm sorry.

DR. BOBROWSKI: That's fine. That's all right. I'll try to be real quick. I was hoping that maybe I could give some information on the dentistry part of it, and I'll try to be real brief and hopefully maybe answer some of those questions.

But I know there was -- in dentistry, there was provider type 60, 61 per DMS. And I cannot remember how oral pathologists -- which provider type those are listed, but I understand that even they have been -- are not being paid by DMS. So those are a

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

specialty group of folks that may or may not be included in those numbers.

Now, I know a lot of that data -- well, Matthew, I want to thank you for your work on that. That's a tough project to get into. But I know some of those reports are based on number of providers per population. Well, the current studies -- well, even for the last 40-some years show that 50 percent of the population don't even go to the dentist. So sometimes those numbers can be skewed.

One of the things we like to look at is the number of paid claims per county or per area, so that kind of gives you a little bit more, I think, knowledge of who's doing the work or where's the work being done.

But the -- the licensure boards, I don't believe -- I used to be on our dental board, but they typically don't list the provider types. They have to get that information from DMS. But the -- they just keep who's licensed, who's actively licensed to do dentistry.

They don't -- the problem, too, is that the MCOs may show a dentist as a Medicaid

1 provider, but they may have quit seeing
2 Medicaid patients 20 years ago. So sometimes
3 those are tough ways to figure out who's
4 doing the work. Sometimes those paid claims,
5 you may have ten dentists in a county that
6 are listed as Medicaid providers, but only
7 one or two of them actually see the patients.

8 But, again, this is stuff that we've all
9 got to continue to work with our legislators
10 and DMS to help on this. But I've got more,
11 but I hope maybe that information might
12 answer some questions.

13 But thank you again, Matthew, for your
14 report.

15 DR. WALTON: Yes. Thank you,
16 Dr. Bobrowski. You illustrated another thing
17 that we thought very hard about, and if you
18 all -- I assume many of you all -- the Pareto
19 principle is something I think a lot about
20 when we do this kind of -- some of you all
21 may have heard of the 80/20 rule.

22 You know, if you look at a church and
23 you ask who are the volunteers in the church
24 and how much -- you know, the tithing and all
25 of that, 20 percent of the members of the

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

church will do 80 percent of the volunteer hours.

And you see that relationship consistent in all kinds of ways. 20 percent of a patient panel in an insurance pool will consume 80 percent of the dollars spent.

We've actually seen similar relationships happen -- because our team does analyses of Medicaid claims as well. So very, very sensitive to the point that you make, Dr. Bobrowski, that we've seen similar things, that -- I can't tell you because I've done an analysis.

But if that rule is true and describes the world reasonably well, something like 20 percent of the dentists will see 80 percent of the claims or visits for dental patients, and I bet you it's close. It may not be exactly that, but it'll probably be close.

And so the remaining 80 percent of the dentists who don't see very many are there, and they're licensed. And it complicates your -- a really thoughtful discussion about, okay, here's our supply. Are we getting what they can do to the people that need it? And

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

that is still a very hard question and -- which is why we offer this report with a healthy dose of humility that we don't claim to be able to answer that all-platonic question.

We rely on all of the partners, and what -- we hope what we can do is give a sort of incremental step in that direction and offer you a road map for the kinds of questions to ask or to keep asking to get closer to that sort of platonic ideal and -- and what kind of tools would you need to get there.

And that's really where we think -- which is why I want to lean into. The fields that the boards can collect would get us closer and closer. Because we ask: How much of your time in a typical week do you spend with patients? Because we know that we have researchers. We have administrators, business leaders, people who are licensed but do something else with their time versus see patients.

And I know that a lot -- you were kind of putting ideas out there as well as asking

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

questions, Dr. Bobrowski, but is that a suitable response for you?

DR. BOBROWSKI: Yes. Thanks a lot. Yes.

DR. WALTON: Yeah. Thank you all. Thank you for your interest in this topic and for the challenging questions. I mean, I appreciate it. We wrestled with all of this stuff as we wrote it. You all have found parts that we could have probably explained a little better in our narrative. We hope it's useful for you all. And, you know, it was a fun challenge to take on and to write, and hopefully it gives you something that you can use.

CHAIR PARTIN: Thank you, Matthew. We appreciate you reporting to us, and we look forward to hearing answers to more of the questions.

DR. WALTON: Thank you.

CHAIR PARTIN: Okay. Moving on, the next is an update on missed and cancelled appointments, and how is reporting going? And is there a common thread as to why patients are not showing up for appointments?

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

And this is the September update, and we have an update every six months.

MR. DEARINGER: Hi. My name is Justin Dearing. I'm with the Department For Medicaid Services, and I have a real brief presentation to show you all. As you all know, we've been working on a no-show or missed appointments dashboard for a while, and we've finally got that completed. We'll have a provider letter sent out very soon. And we have been, again, like I said, working on this for quite some time.

We initially started out with -- with the attempt of getting -- well, with the attempt of this being an online presentation. And the online version we struggled with because we had some issues with -- well, various technical issues.

So what we've done in the meantime is to allow for this no-show dashboard to be available for providers. So this is a provider-based only at this time. If you're not an active Kentucky Medicaid provider, you won't have access to this dashboard. But we are going to do our best to try to -- or we

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

continue to work on trying to get this to become an online dashboard for everybody to be able to use and to view.

So to start, we will just kind of look at -- the dashboard is currently available for all providers. It's available in the Kentucky MMIS system, which all Kentucky Medicaid providers have access to. It's under the KYHealth-Net part of the Kentucky MMIS system, and it's under DMS reports.

There are multiple search parameters in this provider dashboard, and there's a quick chart example. This is all provider types for the year, calendar year 2023. It allows you to search for all provider types for missed and cancelled appointments.

It allows you to search for any time parameter that you set. You can search for the week, the month, different years, other different data ranges that can show different missed and cancelled appointments.

You can break those down as far as provider type. As you can see, these are rural health clinics for the calendar year so far in 2023 and all the missed appointments

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

or cancelled appointments for rural health clinics.

And then you can break that down even further into reasons. So you can see here, there's the no-show. No reason provided was the top reason why appointments were missed or cancelled, and you can see the number there.

And then if you kind of look back and compare the number of no-shows and the number of no reason, that was primarily the only -- the only response that we got in this category. So you can see that the biggest gap that we found is no data, so there's no data being entered for a reason.

There's just nothing being put there by providers, and so that's probably one of the biggest issues that we've found, is that there is no data. And then the majority of the data -- the majority of the reasons is put in the "no reason" category. So that's another issue that we've found.

As you can see, our goal with this no-show dashboard was to capture accurate no-show data, of course. We wanted it to be

1 accessible to providers whenever they wanted
2 it, whenever they needed it. And then we
3 wanted it to be instantaneous. Prior to
4 that, any time we asked for reporting, it may
5 take a week or more to get those reports and
6 then you would only have the specific data
7 you were looking for. This allows providers
8 to be able to look at a variety of different
9 parameters, different time frames, and to be
10 able to have that instantly and to be able to
11 look that up instantly.

12 We see when we look at this data that we
13 need more accurate no-show reasons. That's
14 one of the biggest keys to trying to get this
15 done, is to hopefully show providers that we
16 need that information, that we don't have it
17 currently.

18 Again, the biggest number of no-show
19 data responses, there just wasn't a response.
20 There was nothing put in. The no-show was
21 put in there that there was an appointment
22 missed or cancelled, but there was no data,
23 no reason given as to why. And then the next
24 biggest reasoning for the no-shows was just
25 the -- the category "no reason."

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

So the goal really for us, for the division of policy, is to find those areas that are given for reasons for no-shows. So when providers have staff reach out to those individuals that have missed or cancelled appointments or when those individuals come in for their next appointment, really trying to get them to describe what those issues were that allowed them to not be at the appointment.

And we realize that there will still be a large number of no reason or no data. There will still be a large number of just simply forgot or couldn't come. But the goal is to get those bottom categories, whether they be child care, transportation, language barriers, knowledge of appointment times, whatever those things are, that we can figure out exactly what those areas are that are causing the most problems and then focus on those areas, providing resources there, providing training, providing member outreach so that we can reduce those missed appointments.

So that's all I have, and if anybody has

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

any questions, then I would be willing to take those so...

CHAIR PARTIN: So for the missed appointments, is it just a multiple choice thing where the -- it's usually the staff that's answering these rather than the providers.

MR. DEARINGER: Sure.

CHAIR PARTIN: Is it a multiple choice thing where they just choose an answer?

MR. DEARINGER: It is. So there's a list of different areas. There are some that -- there are some un- -- you know, some miscellaneous ones but a category that you can put some notes. But there are a list of different choices that you can pick from. No reason or no response down to, again, child care, transportation, communication, language, all kinds of different choices there.

And, again, like I said, what we found is that the majority of those -- majority of the time, none of those are selected.

CHAIR PARTIN: Okay. Because it --

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

just anecdotally, for my practice, it seems like the reasons are "forgot the appointment" or "transportation" seems to be the two biggest issues. But that doesn't seem to be indicated by what's being reported; is that correct?

MR. DEARINGER: Partially. So I think the second biggest issue that we've found on there is just kind of the "I forgot" category, which we can, you know, start to take -- we've already started a workgroup on possible ways to kind of find some solutions to that. But past that, we don't see that there's a lot of information as far as transportation, any other thing like that, that's jumping out. There's just not much data there.

So it's either really that there's no reason given or that the reason given is -- there's no real reason, which is maybe I forgot or just didn't feel like coming or something like that. And we anticipate that that will maybe be the biggest, you know, reason moving forward, of course. But it's those bottom reasons that we're really

1 looking to kind of focus in on to get some
2 proper data on so that we can attack those as
3 well.

4 CHAIR PARTIN: So maybe it's a
5 matter of staff not following up with the
6 patient as to why they didn't come in, and
7 maybe we need to be, as providers,
8 instructing our staff to follow up more
9 closely with patients to give a better
10 answer. So this can be something --

11 MR. DEARINGER: Right. Yes, ma'am.
12 And that's one of our goals, is to hopefully
13 get some better data so that we can really
14 pinpoint those exact reasons and causes. And
15 that way, we can spend some time developing
16 some solutions for those issues.

17 CHAIR PARTIN: Okay. Thank you.
18 Does anybody have any questions?

19 DR. SCHUSTER: Beth, this is --

20 MS. PARKER: This is Angie with
21 Medicaid. I was just going to add to this.
22 It's Angie Parker with Medicaid. I was just
23 going to add to this, that this data is
24 shared with the MCOs. So they do do some
25 reach-out to some of the patients if they

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

see a --

CHAIR PARTIN: We maybe need -- maybe we need to be even at more of a grassroots level, having providers instruct their staff to contact the patients and ask them specifically why and then reporting it, and maybe that's not happening.

DR. SCHUSTER: Beth, this is Sheila Schuster. And I was just going to say Justin has been so good about reporting for months now at the BH TAC meetings and working on this. And while I'm disappointed that this can't be public, I do think it's important that it's available to providers.

So I think we're back to what you just suggested, No. 1, that more providers use the dashboard to report. And No. 2, that you get your staff to really take that next step and ask the question more specifically about the reason why.

We know with the behavioral health members of Medicaid, really important to reach out and figure out why they haven't kept those appointments. And I agree with you, that a lot of times, it's

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

transportation. Sometimes child care is the other one that we hear.

So this has the potential to, I think, be really helpful to make sure that we're addressing those social determinants of health. Thank you, Justin.

CHAIR PARTIN: Yes. Thank you.

Anybody else?

(No response.)

CHAIR PARTIN: Okay. Thank you.

Then we'll go ahead and move on.

The next item is just a reminder that in January, we'll have a report on the community health workers and what they're paid and how they're being used in practices.

And, again, next up, Number E on the agenda is just a reminder that we will have another maternal/child update in January 2024.

Next on the agenda under old business is PDS rate increases remains an item we should get updates on as the process unfolds to case managers, support brokers, and PDS agencies. And this was something that Eric asked us to continue to have on the agenda.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

And, Eric, do you have anything specific that you would like to ask in this regard?

DR. WRIGHT: Well, there's been much discussion amongst social media about the rate increases and continued confusion a little bit amongst parents/representatives in relation to rate increases. And PDS stands for person directed services, which is offered through the waiver programs, most 1915C waivers.

Additionally, what we're seeing now is that there's a letter that is going out and some information related to the Appendix K policies that were in place now. But it appears -- correct me if I'm wrong, if I'm stating this wrong -- that they're just going to have a continuation of those current policies until there is an update from -- well, actually, I guess it's CMS and DMS working related to rate increases, which were enacted in 2022 based upon the ARPA funds.

And I know that the Kentucky legislature is going to take this up and continue to review these. But in the interim, though, I think there's still some questions. I have a

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

couple that I'd like to just put out today.

On the notice, it says that all policies that are currently approved and in place will continue past November 11th, 2023, until the effective date of the proposed waiver amendment. And so upon CMS approval and implementation of the revised waiver, only Appendix K policies defined in the Michelle P waiver or other waivers' amendment will be continued.

I have questions related to that because there seems to be information related to how much -- how many hours a provider can be offered at this time, particularly through agencies like DAIL. You know, they're suggesting now that things at the end -- October 1st need to be dialed back down to 40 hours if a parent maybe had been providing 60 hours during this ARPA funds period.

There seems to be some confusion whether that's going to continue even until November 11th or past that. Now -- so if there could be clarification to that today, that would be great, which could be reflected in the minutes. I think that would be very helpful.

1 MS. SMITH: So this is Pam with
2 Department For Medicaid Services. So that
3 was -- and I just found out that, last night,
4 the recording from the webinar that was held
5 on Monday and the slide deck has been posted
6 that goes through the updates for Appendix K
7 and what will be retained going forward
8 versus what will sunset once CMS has approved
9 the waivers. That is on the website.

10 We also are sending out -- we're working
11 on right now a participant version of the
12 information that has been shared. But one of
13 the things that is changing or that will be
14 going away is the overtime in PDS and in the
15 traditional services.

16 So -- but as of right now, as you
17 mentioned, Dr. Wright, it is -- it does
18 continue -- will continue until CMS approves
19 the waivers. The waivers are additionally
20 out for public comment as of last night, so
21 we're encouraging everyone to go and review
22 those waivers.

23 But the ability for the overtime, that
24 will be one of the changes that is not
25 continued, and we will be returning back to

1 the traditional limits, which for individuals
2 in Michelle P, is 40 hours a week. And an
3 additional limit on that related to parents
4 in all of the waivers is that regardless of
5 the number of children that are on the
6 waiver, that a parent cannot provide more
7 than 40 hours a week in total split amongst
8 the children. The child can still get 40
9 hours a week, but it can't be a parent in
10 combination that provides more than 40 hours
11 a week.

12 The rates are something -- the existing
13 rates that are in place -- so there are
14 three -- the three changes, which was the 50
15 percent for residential and then the 20
16 percent over fiscal year '23 and '24 that
17 were included as part of the legislative
18 required rate increases that we were directed
19 to use the ARPA funds for, those will remain
20 in place as well as the 50 percent rate
21 increase for providers that send in an
22 attestation that 85 percent of that rate is
23 passed through to the direct care workers.

24 Those all will remain in place. They
25 are written into the waivers. They will

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

remain in place until the rates -- based on the outcome of the rate methodology study. Once those are determined, then we will do another amendment to the waivers to update the rates. But until that point in time, they will continue to be in the waivers.

We're encouraging anybody that has questions, to send them to the Medicaid public comment box, and I can put that email in the -- in the chat so that everybody has it. We have found that while a lot of the social media groups are well-intentioned, there are some incorrect information that's being shared.

But to clarify on some of the other limits that I think were contributing to questions about increasing rates for PDS employees in particular, we removed the 40,000 and 63,000-dollar cap that was on Michelle P services because it was not fair to individuals to have an increased rate that was going to limit the amount of services they could get just because the rates increased. So that limit is no longer in place. The 40 hours a week is still in

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

place.

Similarly, in HCB, there was a limit of \$200 a day. We also have removed that limit because, again, we've increased the rates. It could result in individuals receiving less services to have that dollar cap. But the 45 hours a week service limit is still in place.

And there was clarification that just went out about that. And, again, we're working on a letter for -- directly to the participants to explain that a little bit better.

But I do encourage everyone, please go out and look at the waivers for public comment. We're in the process of notifying -- making sure that all of the TACs and other individuals that requested that we send separate notification when the waivers were posted, Kelli is getting all of those out. We did -- again, it was last night. It was, I think, close to 6:00 that the waivers did get posted. So we're in the process of getting all the notifications out.

But we have already started receiving public comment. I started looking at some of

1 them this morning. I think we've received 10
2 or 15 comments already between last night and
3 about 9:00 this morning. So that is
4 encouraging. We do want to hear from
5 everybody once those changes are reviewed and
6 encourage anybody that has questions, to ask
7 those as well so that we can help navigate.

8 We realize the waivers are not the
9 easiest thing to read. The format that they
10 are in is not -- not very user friendly, but
11 it is what we are required to use by CMS.
12 That is their format so...

13 DR. WRIGHT: Pam, can I ask a
14 follow-up question to clarify?

15 MS. SMITH: Absolutely.

16 DR. WRIGHT: With rates that are
17 currently enacted, is there a form or a
18 document in a PDF format that you could share
19 that shows what those rates should be at the
20 thresholds?

21 MS. SMITH: They actually are
22 posted on the website. So if you go to the
23 fee schedules on Medicaid's website, the HCB
24 rates are posted. And they have -- they
25 actually include what the rate was prior to

1 COVID, so what the rate was as of 2019, the
2 rate changes that were enacted through
3 Appendix K, what the rates were for state
4 fiscal year '23, and what the rates are now
5 as of July 1st of '23, so fiscal year '24.

6 DR. WRIGHT: So if you wouldn't
7 mind, if you could share that link maybe in
8 the chat, that would be a helpful thing for
9 us to be able to take a look at maybe during
10 the meeting.

11 MS. SMITH: I can do that. Yeah.
12 I'll go grab it. I'll put it out there.

13 DR. WRIGHT: That would be great.
14 The next question is --

15 MS. BICKERS: Pam?

16 MS. SMITH: Yes, ma'am.

17 MS. BICKERS: I was just going to
18 let you know I've already dropped that in
19 their follow-up email.

20 MS. SMITH: Thank you.

21 MS. BICKERS: You don't need to
22 drop it in the chat.

23 MS. SMITH: Thank you very much,
24 Erin.

25 DR. WRIGHT: Perfect. The next

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

question is, you mentioned sunseting and time frame. I think the confusion is we've had October 1st, November 11th, and until DMS approves. Which one relates to the overtime rule? And if you could help clarify that, that would be great today.

MS. SMITH: For the overtime rule, it is when CMS approves the waiver. And so that will be -- we are still -- it's going to be a prospective date, so it will be a future date. We are working with CMS right now to determine what the best date will be for all of our waivers.

Because if you have worked with the waivers at all, you know -- so each waiver is on a waiver year, and all of our waiver years were different. So, for example, Michelle P just restarted on September 1st. HCB just restarted on August 1st.

So we're working with CMS to determine what that best future date will be. Once that is determined, we will begin working with the providers to make sure that there is advanced notice, so it's not that everyone -- that it is decided that, okay, it's changing

1 tomorrow. You need to change tomorrow. We
2 want everyone to have time to work with
3 participants to return back to what those
4 pre-overtime -- what those units were and to
5 have enough time to change those
6 person-centered plans.

7 DR. WRIGHT: Well, I have to
8 reference then -- I had someone from DAIL
9 yesterday, in KIPDA, reference that there's
10 something that was stated that it was going
11 to be -- I guess April maybe was included in
12 the conversation. A number of people at DMS
13 that stated it was starting the 1st.

14 And so we were speaking with a support
15 broker just yesterday, that at least with
16 KIPDA, they're suggesting that the dial-back
17 starts October 1st, and we were just
18 notified.

19 MS. SMITH: We are encouraging
20 individuals to go on and start having those
21 conversations.

22 DR. WRIGHT: But it's not -- it's
23 not mandated?

24 MS. SMITH: But it is not -- it is
25 not mandated October 1st. And if you have

1 that in writing or if you can send that to
2 me, I -- we -- my team has been working with
3 the providers and individuals to address any
4 miscommunications.

5 DR. WRIGHT: Yeah. That was
6 something that was miscommunicated yesterday.
7 So are you --

8 MS. SMITH: If you can send that to
9 me, then I can -- we can address that.

10 DR. WRIGHT: Okay.

11 MS. SMITH: But we are -- I will
12 say we are encouraging them -- we have not
13 given dates, and you'll see this in -- or
14 hear this in the recorded webinar. We are
15 encouraging providers to start having those
16 conversations with individuals about things
17 that will be -- that will be sunseting once
18 that is over.

19 And there's still -- you know, as
20 always, there has to be the rationale behind,
21 you know, those person-centered service
22 plans. It has to be supported by the
23 participant's needs, and that has not changed
24 regardless of what the limits were so...

25 DR. WRIGHT: But just to clarify,

1 what I'm hearing today and just in summary is
2 that not October 1st, not October -- or not
3 November 11th. It's only when DMS
4 approves is when the --

5 MS. SMITH: When CMS, not DMS.

6 DR. WRIGHT: CMS.

7 MS. SMITH: CMS approves that
8 waiver. And so right now, they are out for
9 public comment until October the 27th, and we
10 will be submitting them to CMS for review on
11 November -- on or before November the 11th.

12 DR. WRIGHT: Okay. All right.
13 Thank you very much. You've clarified that.
14 That helps a whole lot.

15 MS. SMITH: Okay.

16 CHAIR PARTIN: Okay. Eric, you
17 indicated that you wanted this to be on the
18 agenda as an ongoing item. Would putting
19 this on the agenda, say, every six months be
20 sufficient, or do you need more -- more often
21 to be addressed?

22 DR. WRIGHT: I think if we put it
23 maybe on a quarterly basis until we get the
24 final -- you know, the -- once we get the
25 final approval, I think that would help, just

1 to kind of keep the rate -- you know, the
2 topic out for discussion. Yeah.

3 CHAIR PARTIN: Okay. So --

4 DR. WRIGHT: Maybe quarterly.

5 CHAIR PARTIN: So that would be
6 January; right?

7 DR. WRIGHT: Yes.

8 CHAIR PARTIN: Okay. Thank you.

9 DR. WRIGHT: Thank you all.

10 CHAIR PARTIN: Okay. Next up is
11 updates from Commissioner Lee.

12 MS. JUDY-CECIL: Good morning. I
13 am not Commissioner Lee. I'm Veronica
14 Judy-Cecil with Medicaid. Commissioner Lee
15 is attending a provider association meeting
16 this morning and speaking to the group, so
17 you get me.

18 I know one of the things that
19 Commissioner Lee likes to share is our
20 enrollment numbers. So as of this week --
21 and, you know, this is only as good as the
22 date that it gets pulled. But we do have --
23 excuse me -- 1,626,029 members --
24 unduplicated members enrolled in Medicaid.
25 We -- of that, 142,930 are fee for service,

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

and the rest, 1,483,099 are managed care.

Of that number of all Medicaid members, the expansion population, which is -- for those of you who are unsure what that means, they are the ones that are part of the expanded federal poverty level limit of 138 percent. That is -- 590,249 are part of our expansion population.

I also want to give an update on unwinding, and I'm going to share -- in the interest of time, I'm only going to share a couple of slides. We did have our stakeholder meeting last week. It was last Thursday, and that presentation is up on our unwinding website.

But just for the folks on today, wanted to provide some information about -- about our current renewals and, you know, where things stand and just chat a little bit about kind of what we're seeing for renewals.

So there we go. This is looking at enrollment across the unwinding period, and you'll see that we are starting that decline. The first set of renewals that were subject to a potential termination was in May, so we

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

saw that on June 1st, the first initial dip. And then as each month passes by, you know, we see additional folks.

We knew there were going to be people who were no longer eligible and were going to drop off. I think what our biggest concern is, we're seeing an increased number of procedural terminations. And what that means is that the individual has not responded to a notice. There's something they have to do, some action they have to take to respond to us for us to be able to make that determination. And if they don't do that by their renewal date or by the due date, then they -- they'll get terminated. So that's what we're working on.

Just a quick glance at what our July renewals -- since we did not present this at the last MAC meeting, but we had 54,975 that were in a July renewal. That means their renewal date was July 31st. Of those, 27,044 were approved. This is just the snapshot at the time of the July renewal. This aligns to the CMS monthly report that we post every month. So folks can go out and look at that

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

to see these numbers as well.

Of the approvals, we had about 82 percent that we were able to passively renew. That means they had to take no action whatsoever. We were able to go out and ping all the databases, the trusted sources that we have out on the federal hub and some state data resources, and we can perform that redetermination without them having to take any action.

But of the terminations for our July renewals, 20,344, there were 65 percent of those that were those procedural terminations. That does not mean that everybody in that bucket is eligible. We send a notice to someone. If we've gone out and tried to verify their information and it looks like they're no longer eligible, we'll send them a notice. So even those individuals that -- sorry about that -- that are no longer eligible get put into that bucket of procedural termination.

We do -- you'll see that we continue to have a pending bucket, and the reason for that is we are extending individuals, certain

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

individuals during the -- during this unwinding period for long-term care and 1915C waiver members. We're extending them up to two months if they've not submitted a response to a notice.

We also now have implemented this month for anyone -- for anyone who hasn't responded to a notice, we'll extend for one month. We get two months for the long-term care 1915C waiver members, only one month for the rest of the population. So we may see that pending number start to climb a little bit. This is also if somebody has submitted something and the State hasn't taken any action on it, then they will be in pending status.

So here are the numbers for August, and we'll send these slides out. But like I said, it is on our unwinding website. Again, the different buckets. Just to note, so in August of the approvals, 81 percent of those were passively renewed. They didn't have to take any action. We were able to just go ahead and update their eligibility for another 12 months and then the termination

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

bucket is -- about 65 percent are those procedural terminations and then again the pending.

So what a member can do if they're terminated is, within a 90-day period after their termination, they can respond to that notice. And if we -- if they respond and we're able to determine them eligible, we can reinstate. It's an automatic process that happens. They don't have to ask for reinstatement.

So they come in, provide the information. We determine them eligible. They'll automatically get reinstated back to their termination date if it's within that 90-day period.

So we're tracking those reinstatements, too. So this -- you know, this is those people that, for whatever reason, did not respond prior to their end date but have subsequently responded in some way.

So you'll see -- I'm not going to go through all the numbers, but you can see May renewals, the 90-day period has passed. So that's -- we're not going to see necessarily

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

reinstatements for -- under that unwinding flexibility, but folks should still be able to reapply. And we're working through those.

June, July, and August, as you'll see, you know, August being the most recent renewal that we've closed, those numbers are trickling in. But it's good to see that people are at least possibly getting back in if they've been terminated.

Couple of priorities I want to go over just very quickly, and that is we're really encouraging households with children that if they receive a renewal notice, to respond. Because the child eligibility federal poverty limit is higher than it is for an adult. So the adult may think, you know, oh, we're no longer eligible. But really, we want to encourage them definitely to send that in if there's a child in the household.

The other is just to send it in anyway. If we could make the determination -- you know, perhaps they are eligible. Maybe they're eligible in some other way. Without that response, we just can't do that. So we're just encouraging everybody to do that.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

And then, you know, our outreach is really focused around if you're terminated, do what you need to do in that 90 days, so we can get you back in.

We released a new flyer on our website and just encourage all of our providers and stakeholders that if you have members, you see members, they come into your offices or you're communicating with them, please pull those down. Maybe post them. Have them available. Hand them out. You know, we really want to continue to keep the word out there about renewals are happening, so certainly encourage you to do that.

Also, just want to remember -- remind folks that if you're no longer eligible for Medicaid, that member, that individual could be eligible for a Qualified Health Plan and premium tax credits that make that plan either zero or very, very low premiums. So just trying to encourage folks that if they've been determined ineligible, to take that next step. It is different because they have to choose a plan and they have to pay that premium, very different from Medicaid.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

So just encouraging folks to do that and remind everyone that, you know, that's the next step for somebody determined ineligible.

We're tracking QHP, Qualified Health Plan, enrollment because when we see the number -- the graph go down for Medicaid eligibility enrollment, we want to see the graph go up for QHP. Keeping people covered is critically important.

Just a reminder, our website is out there. Lots of information that we include on a regular basis. Social media, if you're not following us on one of the social media platforms, we ask that you do. You don't have to do all three.

We just recently -- just yesterday, late yesterday, made aware of a scam. It's kind of being recirculated, and we've been seeing that throughout the unwinding. The current one is a phone call. It has an 859 number, and the person is really pushing for personal information, bank information, very aggressive.

So we're going to be posting something on our social media today to just -- just to

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

remind folks, you know, there are lots of
scams out there. Just try to be vigilant as
you do that. And it's really hard. They
really do just kind of prey on someone's
vulnerability.

And for providers, a reminder that you
can see the member's redetermination date in
KYHealth-Net. It's in there in red, and we
have the Kentucky Level of Care Report that
our 1915C and long-term care providers can
pull reports out of.

I think that -- the only other thing I
want to mention is that, you know, we pushed
a lot of the cases involving children to
later in the unwinding period. And we did
that because we were implementing continuous
coverage for children.

So we are -- we really are kind of
trying to look at additional flexibilities
and strategies that we can put into place to
make sure that someone otherwise eligible is
not getting terminated, that we're doing
whatever we can to make sure that we can
perform that redetermination. So, you know,
just doing our due diligence for that.

1 And we have exercised -- CMS has posted
2 June 2023 a list of the state strategies
3 available to states. We've elected 20 of
4 those strategies. Two of them are not
5 available to us, and we're in conversations
6 about whether or not we -- we elect one of
7 the other ones. So we're really trying to do
8 everything we can, take advantage of the
9 flexibilities and strategies that are out
10 there to, you know, get through this
11 unwinding period.

12 And then we fully acknowledge the wait
13 times are just -- you know, they're not good
14 on our hotline -- on our call center lines.
15 Again, we're trying to bring people on.
16 We're continually discussing what can we do
17 different. We are bringing more and more
18 people on and getting them trained, not just
19 for the call center but to do eligibility
20 determinations. So we're trying to work on
21 it.

22 I think there was a couple of questions.

23 DR. WRIGHT: Yeah. Veronica, I had
24 my hand up, and thank you for your
25 information today. So a concern that I've

1 had posed to me a couple -- through a couple
2 platforms are individuals who are on waiver
3 services that have a child that's 17, and
4 they are going through the process of
5 guardianship. And they're also going through
6 the process of having to now, even if they
7 were medically deemed necessary, you know,
8 without the financial ability to meet the
9 criteria for Medicaid for waiver services
10 through the 1915C waivers, they have to
11 reapply for SSI. And in the interim, though,
12 they've been notified that they -- if they
13 don't get the approval, they're going to be
14 terminated for -- from the Medicaid waiver
15 program.

16 Someone who's gone through this myself
17 in the last couple of years with my daughter,
18 that process of SSI, you know, approval can
19 take three to four months. Can you explain
20 to me how you guys are going to address that
21 issue?

22 Because it sounds like that the timing
23 is a little off there. If SSI is not
24 responding within three to four months and
25 we're only having -- you know, we have to get

1 that SSI approval to meet the criteria at age
2 18, what's the solution?

3 MS. JUDY-CECIL: Right. It is --
4 sure. So one thing I would ask is that cases
5 that are complex like that, that there are
6 different impacts to the member and their
7 eligibility, is for those to be escalated, to
8 be quite honest with you. It's better for us
9 to be able to take a look at them and see
10 what are our options. We have some
11 discretion but not all discretion. So --

12 DR. WRIGHT: Well, the response is
13 that the ombudsman's office is getting very
14 busy with this, and so I don't know if y'all
15 are working hand in hand with the ombudsman
16 in the office there.

17 MS. JUDY-CECIL: We are.

18 DR. WRIGHT: Because, I mean, I
19 don't foresee that SSI, with their same
20 staffing issues, are going to see the process
21 being improved --

22 MS. JUDY-CECIL: Yep.

23 DR. WRIGHT: -- any quicker. So, I
24 mean, we're still going to see us being, you
25 know, three to four months.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

MS. JUDY-CECIL: Right, right.

DR. WRIGHT: And, therefore, we're not going to be able to see people. Because we're seeing -- I'm getting a lot of information about that, and all I can do is say call the ombudsman or call Medicaid.

MS. JUDY-CECIL: Right. Yeah. And let us take a look at it because we -- as I mentioned, so we have some flexibilities in being able to extend folks. There are what's called ex parte periods of time where somebody can continue to have that coverage while the process is going.

I'm just going to be perfectly candid, though. There are some times we have to follow the rules. And if that rule forces our, you know, ability to do something and it comes to a termination, you know, we have to move forward with that action.

I think -- and I note that, you know, someone posted in the chat that -- about appealing. And if someone appeals, it does allow them to maintain that coverage as it goes through the appeal process, so that's a really good note.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

But, you know, that's kind of where we are, and we are certainly here to try to help our members navigate this. Again, we don't want to see members, especially our vulnerable population who have great needs, to go without that coverage. So the right course is to try to get that up to us and have us take a look at it to see what our options are.

DR. WRIGHT: You mentioned ex parte --

MS. SMITH: Veronica, I'll add that we do not close the waiver slots in these situations. We have a mechanism where we are able to keep them open, so individuals are not losing their waiver slots during that time period where they're doing the SSI -- whatever, if it's the application or wherever they are in that process. We do not close -- we keep that waiver slot open, and we've worked with several -- with several individuals through that process so...

DR. WRIGHT: You mentioned ex parte. What is that again?

MS. JUDY-CECIL: So that is a

1 period of time where the person is granted
2 eligibility. Even though maybe we have
3 something on our -- and this is different
4 than the passive renewal. But if we have
5 something -- if they're eligible even though
6 they're being terminated because we're not
7 seeing them, the reason for their eligibility
8 has ended, then we can give them a period of
9 time. It's, I think, three months -- two to
10 three months. They maintain coverage to give
11 them the opportunity to file for, for
12 example, SSI or for maybe another Medicaid.
13 They can file a Medicaid application for
14 another coverage.

15 So -- and a lot of times, again, we have
16 to look at the specific case to see does it
17 fall into something where we can utilize that
18 discretion or, you know, that they're
19 eligible for that extended period of coverage
20 while, you know, they try to get eligibility
21 in another category.

22 DR. WRIGHT: Okay. Great. Thank
23 you so much. You've answered my question.

24 MS. JUDY-CECIL: Okay. Great. I
25 think Dr. Gilbert, you were next.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

MR. GILBERT: Yes. This is Kent Gilbert. Thanks, Veronica. Thanks for your help.

Listen, I understand that Kentucky is on the list of the 30 states that were required to pause terminations because they got procedural -- procedural terminations. So what's the status of that right now, and how does that affect the numbers that you've told us that are clearly -- you're clearly terminating people for procedural reasons? So what's the mitigation, and what's going on?

MS. JUDY-CECIL: Sure. So that -- on August 30th, CMS issued a letter to all the states ensuring that states are processing individuals in a household separately and at that passive renewal rate. So we go out. We check -- we verify income. The income comes back and makes the adult in the household not eligible, but the child is likely still eligible.

Several states -- Kentucky is not one of them. Several states would send the household a notice and then if that notice

1 wasn't responded to, terminate. In Kentucky,
2 we -- we do separate the eligibility. So if
3 someone is otherwise eligible, we will
4 separate them from that household notice, and
5 they'll continue their eligibility.

6 Kentucky was incorrectly included on
7 that list. We've been in communication with
8 CMS. Of course, with things like this, once
9 it's out there, it's hard to pull it back.
10 So you'll be seeing it get updated.

11 What we've done is, you know, a review
12 of all of our cases. We are going back and
13 just, in full disclosure, making sure that
14 nobody was inappropriately -- so we're going
15 back. We're looking at households with
16 multiple individuals and making sure that we
17 did appropriate -- the system did
18 appropriately separate them.

19 But, again, we have no evidence that
20 that has happened in Kentucky, so we are not
21 subject to that requirement to pause. And
22 it's not to pause all procedural
23 terminations. It's only the ones associated
24 with that particular issue.

25 MR. GILBERT: Gotcha. Thank you.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

And I appreciate that you're taking that kind of care because I think it does make a huge difference. I also was glad to hear about the 90-day -- you know, the ability to reapply and get things going.

The fee-for-service folks, though, they're -- how is that -- I mean, that's a mess. What's going on with --

MS. JUDY-CECIL: Yeah. So, you know, we continue to work on it. We -- we're doing the extensions if they haven't responded. I think the other challenge is, you know, these can sometimes be a little complicated because there's a resource or asset test. And we're continuing to educate our eligibility workers to make sure they understand that we have some flexibilities around that. So if something is pending or being denied based on an asset or resource requirement that, you know, we should -- we should be moving those on along and not have it hold up for that reason.

So, you know, we are -- I can assure you -- just really concerned as well about our long-term care and our 1915C members

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

having to navigate this and make sure that they're not terminated; which, if documents are pending, if we've not processed those documents, the member is supposed to be -- continue to be extended until that happens. And we do not retro that termination. It is always going forward and...

You know, but our system isn't perfect, and so we just continue to ask that when our providers are seeing this, to help escalate those cases to us so that we can take a look at it and see what's going on and reinstate if we need to in the interim.

But we are -- one of the solutions for this and for some of the other, again, more complex cases is we're trying to bring up staff, and we're redirecting staff from other agencies that can kind of help form a team that we can work on these and get them -- get them through.

I know one of the other issues is multiple requests for information. So somebody submits something and then they get another request and another request. And, unfortunately, that is the difficulty of the

1 process because we, you know, have to make
2 the determination based on evidence, and I
3 promise you we get audited on this every
4 year. So we want to make sure that we have
5 the evidence in our system to -- that if
6 we're determining somebody eligible, that we
7 have the document to back that up.

8 So -- but we're looking at those cases,
9 too. We've gotten a lot of examples of where
10 that's happened, you know, multiple RFIs.

11 MR. GILBERT: Well, and it's twice
12 the rate. I mean, those fee-for-service
13 folks are losing coverage at twice the rate
14 as everybody else, and so they also require
15 probably more documentation, which makes it
16 complicated on both sides and --

17 MS. JUDY-CECIL: We --

18 MR. GILBERT: Just from
19 constituency side points, you know, it's
20 really -- you know, escalating a case,
21 it's -- I mean, I so appreciate what you're
22 saying. But escalating a case from a user
23 standpoint is not very easy. I mean, you
24 know, you call. You wait four or five hours
25 to get the wrong person who doesn't know what

1 you're talking about on the phone. You
2 finally get a number. You call that number,
3 and it's too late, or they can't take your
4 call.

5 I mean, escalating a case isn't a simple
6 matter. So if you have any advice that we
7 can pass back, I would sure appreciate it
8 because I know both --

9 MS. JUDY-CECIL: Yeah.

10 MR. GILBERT: -- providers and
11 clients who are having trouble with this.

12 MS. JUDY-CECIL: Yeah. We're
13 working on that. We're working on an
14 escalation path outside of our connectors and
15 agents for this particular reason, and so we
16 will be sharing that information very soon.
17 We're just -- we're getting our ducks in a
18 row so that we can be ready for when we
19 re-launch that. I fully understand.

20 We have -- I will say that we have dug
21 into the fee-for-service terminations, so we
22 know who they are. We know what category
23 they're under. We know whether it's been
24 appropriate.

25 We've also -- you know, we did front --

1 at the beginning of the unwinding through our
2 allocation of the cases across the 12 months,
3 we fronted -- there were a lot of
4 fee-for-service members. They were the ones
5 that were eligible for and should be applying
6 for Medicare, or we've gotten notice that
7 they're no longer eligible from our Social
8 Security file. So there were, you know,
9 definitely a larger number at the beginning.

10 You will see that it has completely --
11 it is completely tailoring off, though. Not
12 to say that there aren't fee-for-service
13 members in long-term care and 1915C members
14 being terminated. But, you know, we are
15 tracking it very closely.

16 MR. GILBERT: I appreciate it.
17 Thank you.

18 MS. JUDY-CECIL: Dr. Schuster?

19 DR. SCHUSTER: Yes. Thank you.
20 And I'm so glad that Dr. Wright and Reverend
21 Gilbert brought up some issues around the
22 people on the waivers because we have -- we
23 keep hearing this with people on waivers and
24 fee for service, Veronica. So we appreciate
25 that you're looking more closely.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

Also, the scam -- and I will just say to people -- because I brought this to your attention last night. Several of our behavioral health members were getting phone calls, very aggressive, very, very aggressive, demanding information, saying if they didn't give it then, they would be terminated.

In both these cases, the people were wise enough to know they had already turned in the information. But I worry because we keep asking people to give their information, and I'm concerned that -- if we're not careful about how we get that out on social media and so forth. But I appreciate that you all are looking at that.

I have a question about passive renewals and, I guess, are there passive terminations? Because we're hearing from people that got a notice that they're terminated, and they never got a request for information. They never got anything from you to say that they need to submit information.

MS. JUDY-CECIL: No. The only -- if we've gone out and the trusted data source

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

tells us that their income is no longer eligible for Medicaid, they will receive a notice that is a prepopulated form to give them the opportunity to verify that information prior to -- it's not an automatic termination.

The only instance and when somebody might receive something different than that is if we go out and ping the trusted source and it tells us their income qualifies for advanced premium tax credit for a Qualified Health Plan, we want them to get kind of moving in that direction.

So they'll get a notice that tells them that. It clearly says your income says that you're no longer eligible for Medicaid, but you're eligible for APTC. If that information is incorrect, they should respond. Because we say in the notice, if this isn't correct, contact us.

So the reason for that is because the trusted data source is telling us -- or maybe they've even reported it to us that they're no longer eligible. It generates that notice to get them moving to a Qualified Health Plan

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

to get that process started, so there's no gap in coverage.

But, you know, we're trying to maybe educate more individuals along that line. But otherwise, if the trusted data source tells us they're no longer eligible, they get a renewal notice to go and do that active process before we will terminate them.

DR. SCHUSTER: Could you share that notice with us or send us a link to that? Because I think there's some confusion and maybe because they see the first part. And they see they're terminated, and the request for information is not -- or the request to verify, that they think they still are Medicaid eligible, is not as clear as it might be. Is that possible, to share that notice with us?

MS. JUDY-CECIL: Absolutely. Yep. Happy to do that.

DR. SCHUSTER: Yeah. I would appreciate that because we're hearing that, and we know that people get confused. And as you say, there are multiple outreaches, and they're hearing it from lots of different

1 people. But we really want to be sure that
2 people who, you know, inadvertently got
3 terminated and got a notice that they didn't
4 understand -- and I know you're trying to
5 keep those people in the loop. And we
6 particularly want to get them reinstated in
7 that 90-day period. So we're all focused --

8 MS. JUDY-CECIL: And they --

9 DR. SCHUSTER: We're looking at
10 close to 100,000 people in that 90-day period
11 right now.

12 MS. JUDY-CECIL: I will say that
13 they get outreached to as if they are going
14 through an active redetermination. So
15 they -- you know, we're calling them, and
16 their Managed Care Organization is calling
17 them to have that conversation.

18 So, oh, it looks like your income is no
19 longer eligible. You know, would you like to
20 sign up with a Qualified Health Plan? So the
21 outreach to them is similar to the outreach
22 we're doing for the rest of the population
23 going through an active renewal.

24 But yes, we're happy to share what that
25 notice looks like. And it's the notice that

1 we used prior to the Public Health Emergency.
2 This is part of the normal eligibility and
3 enrollment processing, so that hasn't
4 changed.

5 DR. SCHUSTER: Yes. I guess my
6 only point is let's be sure that people know
7 that they have an opportunity to give you
8 different data or to give you some reason why
9 they shouldn't be terminated. Obviously, if
10 they are not eligible, they're not eligible.
11 We're not asking you to make them eligible
12 when they're not.

13 MS. JUDY-CECIL: Yeah.

14 DR. SCHUSTER: But let's be sure
15 that they understand that they have an
16 opportunity to give you that information.
17 Thank you.

18 MS. JUDY-CECIL: Yep.

19 MS. BICKERS: Veronica, there's a
20 question in the chat from Peggy. She says,
21 I'm curious how we're helping folks who don't
22 have access to cell phones or computers,
23 language barriers, or ones who don't
24 understand.

25 MS. JUDY-CECIL: So that's an

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

excellent question and, you know, one of the challenges that we always face when we're really communicating with our members in any capacity. And that's why we do have multiple modes of communication. So it's the written notice, the phone call or text, or an email. And if we have any of that on file, that is -- you know, we ping all three modes of communication.

For language, you know, we're continuing to work on that and make sure that members understand what the path is to navigate, how to get help if there's a language barrier. Probably could do better there as well. And, you know, we have been working and, unfortunately, it just is taking us some time to try to translate the information into multiple languages. We do a good job of doing Spanish but not so good at doing other languages and just continue to work on that.

So, you know, we heavily rely on our partners in this area, and we're so grateful for our community based organizations that are out there in the communities that do help individuals that might have a language

1 barrier navigate the process. So I'm hoping
2 that those individuals are getting connected
3 in those communities with those resources.

4 And, you know, I will always say this.
5 If we can't prevent the termination, it's
6 what we do on day one after to try to get
7 them back in and make sure they understand.
8 And providers are just a great place for
9 that, not to add to the administrative burden
10 there.

11 But if the person comes in and you see
12 they're terminated, there are ways to get
13 them back on and, you know, we -- that's why
14 we've really been pushing the literature
15 that's on our website directed to providers
16 on what to do if somebody comes in and
17 they're no longer covered. So just trying to
18 continue to work on that.

19 CHAIR PARTIN: Okay. Anything
20 else?

21 (No response.)

22 CHAIR PARTIN: All right, then.
23 Let's move on to the update on the mobility
24 crisis.

25 MS. JUDY-CECIL: Yeah. And I think

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

we have Leigh Ann.

MS. FITZPATRICK: Yes.

MS. JUDY-CECIL: There we go.

MS. FITZPATRICK: Hi. Good morning. I'm Leigh Ann Fitzpatrick with the Department For Behavioral -- no, I'm not, with the Department For Medicaid Services. I'm a behavioral health specialist. I apologize.

I have just -- I'll be very quick. For mobile crisis, our mobile crisis implementation, for right now, we have our SPAs that have been approved by CMS. Those include a redefinition of mobile crisis services that goes along with the CMS SHO letter back in December of 2022.

We have created a new service of a 23-hour observation stabilization service that goes along with our residential. So in that case, if someone needs -- they don't need to go somewhere overnight but need to be somewhere away from a location or just a stable environment. With that, there would be a medical and a behavioral health assessment to see what services that person

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

needs.

With our residential crisis, we updated the definition, updated crisis intervention. Those were approved back in July 20 of this year.

The last item is our behavioral health crisis transports which was approved September 11th. It's a new provider type. This will be something -- it's two separate situations that, say, if someone has called 988 and they determine that a mobile crisis intervention services needs to be dispatched, the team gets there and works on -- works with that person, tries to deescalate.

And they see that that person -- it can't be done there on scene, that they need to go maybe to a 23-hour -- and sometimes, unfortunately, maybe to the hospital or to our most appropriate higher level of care. At that point, a behavioral health crisis transport provider can come and transport that provider (sic).

The second situation is -- I know that we have several -- this happens at several locations around the state, that someone

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

walks into the ED or is sent to the ED. And they need to go to either an inpatient facility because that ED doesn't have -- within the hospital system has that capability to treat them, and they need to go to a higher level of care. And we can't call 911 because that's not an emergency service or an ambulance or an EMS service.

So at that point, the ED somewhere within that system can call the behavioral health crisis transport provider and -- to be able to provide that person to the next level of care. And I will send this to Erin to send out to everyone as well.

With the SPA changes, also, we have -- as you know, we're seeking an ASO to oversee this model, provider capacity training, and to oversee multiple levels of funds that have been leveraged.

We do have our community crisis co-response model, a new notice out for a funding opportunity. And I'm going to put that in the chat for you. We put that out originally this summer. With increased interest and other feedback from persons that

1 are interested in that, we have reissued that
2 NOFO out. Applications are due October 31st.
3 There is a webinar this afternoon to work
4 with folks that want to send an application
5 in or have further questions.

6 The last thing is, along with the
7 behavioral health crisis transportation, we
8 also -- we also have put in a SPA to CMS for
9 a treat/not transport that is still with CMS.
10 And, also, with that, CMS told us that some
11 of our -- some of Kentucky's regulations are
12 more stringent than the federal ones,
13 particularly on that EMS cannot get
14 reimbursed and must provide -- cannot be
15 reimbursed if they go somewhere else besides
16 a hospital. We are changing that regulation
17 to say that -- an alternative location,
18 taking out hospital and just putting in
19 alternative location.

20 And I know there are some questions, so
21 I'd be glad to take them. Anyone, go first.

22 MS. EISNER: Who? Me?

23 MS. FITZPATRICK: Go ahead, yes.

24 MS. EISNER: Yeah. Okay. Thank
25 you. Thanks, Leigh Ann. I'm pleased to hear

1 about the BH crisis transport, but I'm
2 wondering if anybody is going to actually
3 start doing it. Do you have any ideas, or
4 are there additional providers coming on
5 board? Because there's such a --

6 MS. FITZPATRICK: So --

7 MS. EISNER: -- (inaudible)
8 resources.

9 MS. FITZPATRICK: So it is a new
10 provider type, and we have heard, like you
11 said, positive -- positive about it. So
12 let's say that an EMS -- you know, they have
13 the ambulance. If they have -- they could
14 enroll in that provider type as well if maybe
15 they have a van or car or something else. If
16 the NEMT providers, if they can, you know,
17 follow and meet the criteria, they can enroll
18 as that provider type as well.

19 So we're anxious, and we're hopeful that
20 we do have several that will be able to
21 enroll in that provider type.

22 MS. EISNER: Okay. Good. Thank
23 you. I'll remain cautiously optimistic.

24 MS. FITZPATRICK: Yes. Thank you.

25 MR. GILBERT: I'll echo that

1 cautious optimism as well. But I was just in
2 a meeting yesterday with house leadership
3 releasing a statement that they want to
4 introduce legislation to have sheriff's
5 offices, police officers, and various others
6 be eligible, too.

7 Is this part of your conversation? Have
8 you been in touch with them? We're curious
9 about this legislation that's going to move
10 in the new session, and I'm just not clear at
11 all how this -- how this interfaces. If
12 they're going to pass -- if they're going to
13 have something, it ought to dovetail.

14 MS. JUDY-CECIL: I can take that,
15 Leigh Ann.

16 MS. FITZPATRICK: Okay. Thank you
17 so much.

18 MS. JUDY-CECIL: Sure. So we
19 have -- based on previous legislation that
20 has come out that has directed some of the
21 work that underlies this new model, we --
22 there have been conversations with various
23 legislators. I can't tell you exactly, you
24 know, what leadership definitely, but yeah,
25 some conversations. Because they are aware

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

of how we're implementing current legislation and what, you know, the program is going to look like.

And we do have, as part of this, a community crisis response separate -- it's a component of what we're doing in this model that allows community -- communities to kind of develop and leverage maybe some law enforcement agencies.

The critical piece here is that we're not -- you know, this is not to arrest more people. It is to try to get the really important behavioral health professionals in the crisis response. And so that could be -- it could be a sheriff's office that has a team that meets this definition.

So we look forward to seeing -- you know, we've had to kind of create this just from scratch based on lessons learned in other states because states are doing this in some form or fashion but not like Kentucky. I mean, I think we really have developed a comprehensive approach for the crisis response.

So, you know, we'll certainly welcome if

1 there is -- and all that is having to be on
2 state dollars, by the way. So we can't --
3 you know, that grant program that we're
4 doing, that separate grant program is
5 separate from what we can do through
6 Medicaid.

7 MS. FITZPATRICK: Yes.

8 MS. JUDY-CECIL: So we would
9 welcome legislation that especially gives
10 funding, direct funding to a program like
11 that as long as -- and I --

12 MR. GILBERT: I wouldn't hold your
13 breath.

14 MS. JUDY-CECIL: Well, and as long
15 as it, you know, acknowledges and recognizes
16 that there has to be trained behavioral
17 health professionals --

18 MR. GILBERT: That's -- that is my
19 concern.

20 MS. JUDY-CECIL: -- as part of that
21 team.

22 MR. GILBERT: Yeah. My concern is
23 that they work very closely with you because
24 I think there are great opportunities, but
25 there are also great possibilities for either

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

misuse, abuse, or just plain ignorance causing greater harm.

I think this is -- the proposal is, you know, not -- we don't have legislative language yet, but it has a number of very concerning provisions including -- this medical transportation piece comes under the involuntary incarceration of the mentally ill. That's the title, involuntary incarceration.

I'm not real -- I am cautious. I want there to be appropriate transportation, and I want people to be able to get safely to and from the care they need. I am wanting to be -- I'm wanting all of us to be vigilant about making sure that it's from trained folks. Whether they're a driver or a sheriff or a deputy or a constable or a clergy person, they need to be meeting those standards. And I hope you'll help keep the legislative branch attuned to that.

MS. JUDY-CECIL: Thank you for sharing that.

MS. FITZPATRICK: I'll also send to Erin to send out our behavioral health crisis

1 transport policy because in that, there is.
2 There's specific training that's involved.
3 There's specific vehicle recommendations,
4 requirements that are involved. It's
5 required to have a driver and another staff
6 person, so the driver can focus on driving in
7 those situations. So I think the policy does
8 outline some things.

9 MR. GILBERT: That's great. Thank
10 you.

11 MS. FITZPATRICK: You're welcome.

12 MS. JUDY-CECIL: Dr. Schuster.

13 DR. SCHUSTER: Yes. I'm glad that
14 Kent brought up this proposal from house
15 republicans. And they use the term
16 "confinement," involuntarily confinement of
17 the mentally ill, which is never what it's
18 been. KRS 202A is a voluntary
19 hospitalization. We're talking about
20 treatment here, folks. This is going the
21 opposite direction from treatment. It's
22 going into criminalizing mental illness, and
23 I am really, really concerned about it so...

24 And I hope it doesn't get all caught up
25 in what you all are trying to do, Veronica

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

and Leigh Ann, over at Medicaid in terms of getting these crisis teams and getting mobile crisis and so forth.

I know that law enforcement has been unhappy for a number of years about transporting people after they've had a mental inquest warrant sworn by the judge, and we've had numerous pieces of legislation and numerous discussions.

And I don't -- you know, there's a lot of different issues here that could end up getting together into a mess, so I just think we really need to be on top of this.

Thank you.

MS. JUDY-CECIL: Yeah. That's why we thought it was important that we can't just do 988. We need to include 911, too, and make sure that any -- anyone responding to the crisis regardless of where it comes from, there's a consistent response that's appropriate for behavioral health, mental health, you know, somebody with a behavioral health or mental health issue and then transporting them.

You know, what I think is really great

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

is the flexibility that's in our program, is to be able to transport the person to an appropriate setting. And so that -- you know, in the past, transportation covered by Medicaid was to the ER, and we're doing away with that.

So, you know, we'll be able to assess and get individuals to, you know, a behavioral health treatment provider that we never have been able to do before. So we're really looking forward to the impact.

It is -- you know, we're rolling it out. It's still very much in its infancy. It's not even really been born yet. So, you know, we're looking forward to the implementation and working closely with providers on, you know, making this successful.

DR. SCHUSTER: Thank you.

CHAIR PARTIN: Thank you, everybody. I just want to note that we have about 30 more minutes to the meeting, and we have a lot more to cover. So this meeting is probably going to run over, so I just want to give everybody a heads-up about that.

Next up is MCOs report 98 to 99 percent

1 adequacy of compliance for services, but
2 Kentucky's third-party quality contractor
3 (IPRO) "secret shopper" reports only 30 to 40
4 percent compliance. There is a concern that
5 this compliance does not address actual
6 accessibility services, so we had requested a
7 report to address the discrepancies between
8 the MCO report compliance versus the IPRO
9 report.

10 MS. PARKER: Good morning -- good
11 afternoon almost. I think we have one more
12 minute. But I am Angie Parker. I'm the
13 Director of Quality and Population Health
14 within the Department For Medicaid Services.
15 And I have with me today Chuck Merlino who is
16 our account manager for our external quality
17 review organization contract known as Island
18 Peer Review, also known as IPRO.

19 And we are -- I am going to go through
20 some of the high level of the -- what --
21 network adequacy access and availability and
22 what the secret shopper survey process is all
23 about.

24 So, first of all: What does -- what is
25 the definition of network adequacy? And what

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

we have here is the state -- this is CMS' definition, that we must ensure that Medicaid and CHIP managed care plans maintain provider networks that are sufficient to provide timely and accessible care to our beneficiaries across the continuum of services.

The access and availability contract requirements are as follows: For urban areas, they have to be within 30 minutes or 30 miles of their place of residence or work, to the extent that services are available. In nonurban areas, PCP and hospital services are to be within 30 minutes or 30 miles of their place of residence or work, to the extent services are available, and other providers within 50 minutes or 50 miles of their place of residence or work, to the extent that they are available.

MCOs may request exceptions to network requirements due to challenges meeting the network adequacy such as workforce shortages. As Dr. Walton went through earlier, I think some of this can align to what he had reported on. And they can also ask to

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

utilize telehealth as -- to meet network adequacy per DMS approval.

Appointment wait times per contract, and my -- and also with providers, MCOs' contracts with providers -- is they are to -- you are to be able to see or get into -- see a physician within 30 days for a routine, for preventive services or, you know, just your yearly checkup. If I were to call today, the expectation would be to be able to get into my doctor within 30 days of that request.

For 48 hours, urgent care for 48 hours. And what I mean by urgent care is, like, sore throat, pneumonia, or a cold. Hopefully, people aren't going to see you for a cold, but sometimes they do. And, of course, for emergency and behavioral health services, they're to be available 24/7 regardless if they're in the network or not.

So what you had asked about is the secret shopper survey. And, basically, what this is, it's a telephone-based survey to evaluate access to and availability of providers participating in the MCO. It assesses the ability to contact providers and

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

make office-hour appointments using a secret shopper survey methodology.

We change annually. We select different provider types to review each year, and we do a random sample. And eval- -- IPRO does all this, evaluates availability of routine and urgent appointments and after-hours access. As I said, it's performed annually by IPRO.

The methodology, the IPRO -- the surveyors are instructed to role play as an MCO Medicaid member seeking care, and there are scripts in which they are to follow that -- based on routine or urgent-type scenarios.

And they call providers in an attempt to get appointments. They make at least four attempts to contact an actual staff person to complete the survey. In subsequent attempts, they call on different days, different times, just to make sure that -- to try to get in touch with that provider if they haven't been able to do that.

In the past ten years, these are the secret shopper surveys that IPRO has done -- performed for the Department For Medicaid

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

Services, and the last one was on pediatricians. We've done dentists a couple of times and, actually, we're doing them again this coming fall. We're surveying them.

So here are the results of the last secret shopper survey -- say that three times -- with a pediatrician. All MCOs sent information to IPRO, and they excluded selected providers based on certain criteria.

There were 1,169 providers in the final sample, and they attempted 491 routine calls and 491 urgent calls and 187 after-hours calls. The survey was conducted in December '22 and January '23. Your offices may have been contacted.

So what were the results? They were able to contact 80 percent for a routine call to get an appointment. And the reasons they were not able to contact the provider was -- and the No. 1 was their answering machine or voicemail system. That's what they were -- they got, and this was after four attempts. And the second would be the telephone message was out of order.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

Now, if there's any specific questions on what all these mean, Chuck can further explain all that. Constant busy signal, wrong telephone number, no answer, answering service, number of resident or nondoctor business, and put on hold for greater than ten minutes. That just occurred once.

So urgent call contact. They were able to make contact 83 percent of the time but, again, the reasons they were not able to contact certain providers were basically the same reasons as routine.

The appointments made -- and this is where the concern comes into play, is only 31.7 percent was -- an appointment was made for a routine call. And for urgent calls, only 29.5 percent when they were able to get through and make an appointment.

And the reasons appointments were not made, provider was not on site or no alternative provider available was the main reason provided for routine. Provider practice restricted to specialty. Those were the top two. And then they kind of drop down to provider not accepting new patients to not

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

a plan participant.

Also, for nonurgent/urgent calls, the main reason was provider practice restricted to specialty. So in this case, for a pediatrician, they may have been a pediatrician that specializes in hematology or something like that.

MR. MERLINO: Yep.

MS. PARKER: So we do have these reports along with all the quality reports that IPRO works on with us and for us on our website, and here is the link. And if you would like to go in and look at the entire report, it is available here. You can do a drop-down and pick the year.

And I'm not sure -- we have a few of the access availability surveys, but I'm not sure all 11 years are on there. But if there's a particular year or service that you would like to see, we can certainly get that for you.

Like I said, we contract with IPRO to do a lot of reports for us and help us with focus studies on different diagnosis and issues with -- that address our Medicaid

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

population.

We also -- Medicaid also performs other network adequacy reports that are reviewed internally by Medicaid's expert, I guess you would say. But we have a geo-mapping -- all the MCOs report quarterly a geo-mapping and access report. They are to submit a monthly provider network status report, quarterly and timely access report, and quarterly provider network adequacy exceptions report. These are all being reviewed by DMS' subject matter expert on a monthly or quarterly basis.

That was it, very quick. If there's any questions, or, Chuck, if you would like to add anything to this, the information regarding secret survey.

MR. MERLINO: Yeah. No. You did a good job explaining the process. The one thing I want to point out is I think that the purpose of this presentation was the discrepancy between what the MCOs are reporting and what IPRO is reporting. And I think the big difference is we are truly doing a secret shopper. We're calling on behalf of a Medicaid member trying to get an

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

appointment.

And from what I understand, that the MCOs, many of which use SPH Analytics, which is a vendor, and it's not a true secret shopper. They're calling, and they're -- the scenario or their script says, I'm calling from so-and-so health plan, and then they ask several questions.

So you could get a different response knowing that you're calling from one of the plans versus it's -- you know, they think it's a member calling. So I just wanted to add that because I think that was one of the things that you were trying to look at.

MS. PARKER: Yeah. It's not exactly apples to apples in what the MCOs are doing as far as a secret shopper versus what we are doing, what IPRO is doing.

Dr. Schuster, you had a question.

DR. SCHUSTER: Yeah. Thank you, Angie and Chuck. It looks like you only do a secret shopper once a year for a designated population of providers.

MS. PARKER: That is correct.

DR. SCHUSTER: Is that right?

1 MS. PARKER: That is correct.

2 MR. MERLINO: That's correct.

3 DR. SCHUSTER: Okay. Because I saw
4 where behavioral health was 2014, so could I
5 hope that it might come back around in ten
6 years and, you know, how often -- because
7 you've got lots of providers.

8 MS. PARKER: We'll put that on the
9 list for next year. Right.

10 DR. SCHUSTER: You know --

11 MS. PARKER: Right.

12 DR. SCHUSTER: -- I'll put in a
13 motion that you come back and do behavioral
14 health at some point, but it could take you a
15 long time to get through all of the provider
16 types, I guess, is what I'm saying so...

17 MS. PARKER: I was thinking we --
18 we did it -- in 2021, we did behavioral
19 health providers, alcohol and substance use
20 disorder providers. I was thinking that we
21 had done something like that in the time that
22 I've been with Medicaid.

23 MR. MERLINO: Yeah.

24 DR. SCHUSTER: Well, it says --
25 2018, it just says alcohol and other drug

1 providers. It doesn't say behavioral health.

2 MS. PARKER: Right here -- and we
3 have 2014. But right here in 2021, we did a
4 few different providers.

5 DR. SCHUSTER: Oh, you did a whole
6 bunch of providers.

7 MS. PARKER: We did a whole bunch.

8 DR. SCHUSTER: All right. Well,
9 let me go and look at 2021, then.

10 MS. PARKER: Okay.

11 DR. SCHUSTER: Thank you.

12 MS. PARKER: If it's not -- I'll
13 make sure -- if it's not on the website,
14 we'll send that to you.

15 DR. SCHUSTER: Okay. Thank you. I
16 appreciate it.

17 MS. PARKER: Uh-huh. Does anyone
18 else have any questions? I didn't know if
19 there's anything --

20 (No response.)

21 MS. PARKER: Okay. Well --

22 CHAIR PARTIN: Thank you, Angie.

23 MR. MERLINO: Okay. If anything
24 else comes up, you know, you can reach out to
25 Angie, and we'll get you an answer.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

CHAIR PARTIN: Thank you.

MR. MERLINO: Okay.

CHAIR PARTIN: Okay. We have 20 minutes, and we have two things on the agenda that -- where we have to have a quorum, and we have some members who have to leave on time. So I guess we need to go through the TAC reports, but we'll have to do this quickly and then we'll have to do the vote for the election.

And then, following that, we will do the reports from the MCOs so that we can have a quorum to vote to approve the recommendations from the TACs and to vote for the officers for the MAC.

So having said that -- and, again, I apologize to the TACs. We've had a very full agenda this time. But when it comes up for your report, if you would just give your recommendations and, again, I apologize. We'll try to do better next time to allow the TACs more opportunity to give information about what's going on with their TAC.

So having said that, we'll start with Therapy Services.

1 MS. BICKERS: I don't believe
2 anybody is on from Therapy, Children's TAC,
3 or the Hospital TAC.

4 CHAIR PARTIN: Okay. So I'll just
5 say it but then we'll move on.

6 Primary Care?

7 DR. MERRITT: Elizabeth, this is
8 Patrick with the Kentucky Primary Care
9 Association. Is this the correct TAC report?

10 CHAIR PARTIN: Yes. Yes.

11 DR. MERRITT: Yes. I apologize.
12 So we -- there are no recommendations at this
13 time.

14 CHAIR PARTIN: Okay. Thank you.
15 Physician's Services?

16 DR. GUPTA: We did not meet.

17 CHAIR PARTIN: Thank you.

18 Pharmacy?

19 (No response.)

20 CHAIR PARTIN: Persons Returning to
21 Society From Incarceration?

22 MR. SHANNON: This is Steve
23 Shannon. We met, and we have no
24 recommendations. Thank you.

25 CHAIR PARTIN: Thank you.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

Optometry?

DR. COMPTON: This is Steve Compton. We met and have no recommendations.

CHAIR PARTIN: Thank you.

Nursing Services, they had no recommendations. They posted in the chat.

Nursing Home?

(No response.)

CHAIR PARTIN: Home Health?

MS. BICKERS: They posted the recommendation in the chat. I believe Evan had to sign out.

CHAIR PARTIN: Okay. Thank you.

MS. BICKERS: It says -- my apologies. I'm trying to scroll to it. They request that Medicaid add code T4544 to the supply fee schedule allowed codes.

CHAIR PARTIN: Okay. Thank you.

Health Disparities?

DR. BURKE: Yeah. This is Jordan Burke. We met on September 6th. We have no recommendations at this time.

CHAIR PARTIN: Thank you.

EMS?

MR. SMITH: This is Keith Smith.

1 We've met several times. No recommendations.

2 But when we have the opportunity, I
3 would like to give some laudatory comments to
4 groups of individuals that have made a
5 significant change for EMS and Department of
6 Medicaid Services.

7 CHAIR PARTIN: Okay. Thank you.

8 If we have time at the end of the
9 meeting, we'll come back to you. If not,
10 we'll do it next time.

11 Dental?

12 DR. BOBROWSKI: Yes. This is
13 Dr. Bobrowski. The MAC -- to the MAC, the
14 TAC was wondering why the oral pathology
15 payments for adults has been removed. This
16 was a payable item. Now it's been removed.
17 And no one from DMS has contacted the TAC as
18 to -- about this or why, so we basically have
19 no knowledge of it, of this happening. So
20 we're wanting to know why this has happened.

21 And the other thing is that we are
22 working with DMS on the fees for the
23 expansion codes, but it continues to be that
24 the -- even though the codes, like for a
25 denture, for a partial denture were added, we

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

continue to have extremely low fee reimbursements that don't even cover the lab cost of doing the procedure.

So we're working on that, but that's all I have to report. We did have a quorum at our last meeting.

CHAIR PARTIN: Thank you.

Consumer Rights and Client Needs?

MS. BEAUREGARD: Good afternoon. Emily Beauregard, chair of the Consumer TAC. We met and had a quorum at our last meeting, and I have two recommendations. The first, that DMS should not send anyone with SSI, Social Security income, a Medicaid renewal packet or RFI, request for information, in order to maintain their eligibility.

The second recommendation is that DMS should provide anyone losing SSI with two months of ex parte Medicaid coverage when SSI ends to allow time for them to prepare and apply for Medicaid. That's only happening with certain people. And I shared the report in the TAC. There are some other issues that we discussed that -- about Medicaid renewals that we have some concerns about.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

CHAIR PARTIN: Thank you.

Children's Health?

(No response.)

CHAIR PARTIN: Behavioral Health?

DR. SCHUSTER: Yes. We met on September 14th and had a quorum, and we have no recommendations. Thank you. I did submit a written report to members of the MAC.

CHAIR PARTIN: Thank you. Okay. And I appreciate everybody --

DR. HANNA: Dr. Partin, I'm sorry. This is Cathy Hanna. I couldn't get off of mute earlier. I just wanted to say that the PTAC did meet August the 9th with a quorum. I do not have any recommendations, and I'll make sure the report is submitted. Thank you.

CHAIR PARTIN: Thank you. I appreciate everybody being --

MS. BICKERS: I think you skipped the IDD TAC.

CHAIR PARTIN: Oh, is it on the list?

MS. BICKERS: Did I not type it? Oh, it's on the second page down there. I'm

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

sorry.

CHAIR PARTIN: Okay. Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities?

MR. CHRISTMAN: Yes. We met on August the 1st with a quorum, and we have no recommendations.

CHAIR PARTIN: Thank you. And then Hospital?

(No response.)

CHAIR PARTIN: Okay. If the EMS TAC, if you can -- if you have something that you very briefly wanted to bring up, you can go ahead now and do that.

MR. SMITH: Thank you, ma'am. This is Keith Smith, the chair of the EMS TAC. I just wanted to give a great thanks to all of the MCOs along with our billing companies, EMS folks that participated, and Department of Medicaid Services.

We've been having a terrible difficulty with pre-certification, preauthorization approval for EMS to transport nonemergency patients. In working with the MCOs, we have changed to where there will no longer be a preauthorization, pre-certification process.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

It will go to a system very similar to the Medicare Physician Certification Statement that will be obtained at the time that the patient is being picked up and will be submitted with the claim, which should help financially with a great number of EMS providers in the state of Kentucky.

And I just really want to throw out a thanks to everybody, including the MCOs, for being willing to work with us, understanding the issues that our EMS providers have been having for a while now, especially with the pre-certifications and the work of everybody coming together. It was fantastic to be able to have the cooperation and everyone doing so in good spirit.

So that's all I wanted to bring up.

CHAIR PARTIN: Okay. Thank you, Keith.

Okay. So next, we'll move to vote for election of the officers, and I believe we just --

DR. SCHUSTER: Beth, did you need to make a motion to accept the recommendations from the TACs?

1 CHAIR PARTIN: Yes, I did. Thank
2 you, Sheila. I'm trying to --
3 DR. SCHUSTER: You're welcome.
4 MS. EISNER: I'll second that
5 motion. Nina.
6 CHAIR PARTIN: Any discussion?
7 (No response.)
8 CHAIR PARTIN: All in favor, say
9 aye.
10 (Aye.)
11 CHAIR PARTIN: Anybody, no?
12 (No response.)
13 CHAIR PARTIN: Okay. The motion is
14 moved to accept the recommendations.
15 And now we need to go to the vote for
16 the MAC officers. And I believe we have
17 three nominees, and we have three positions;
18 is that correct, Erin?
19 MS. BICKERS: Yes, ma'am.
20 CHAIR PARTIN: Okay.
21 MS. BICKERS: I have written down
22 Dr. Schuster for chair, Dr. Bobrowski for
23 vice-chair, and then I still have -- I wrote
24 Ms. Franklin -- I didn't write her first name
25 down -- as our secretary because no one else

1 stepped up to say they would like to hold
2 that position.

3 CHAIR PARTIN: Okay.

4 DR. SCHUSTER: Yeah. Mackenzie has
5 indicated that she would be willing to
6 continue as secretary.

7 MS. BICKERS: Why did I write down
8 Wallace, then? I apologize. Mackenzie. I
9 wrote down the wrong name.

10 DR. SCHUSTER: Yeah. Mackenzie
11 Wallace, isn't it?

12 MS. BICKERS: Yes, ma'am. I've got
13 her and Ms. Annissa Franklin right next to
14 each other, and I think I just jotted down
15 the wrong name.

16 DR. SCHUSTER: Yeah. Yeah. She
17 said that -- I think she had to get off, but
18 she said she was willing to continue as
19 secretary.

20 CHAIR PARTIN: Okay. Thank you.

21 So would somebody like to make a motion
22 to accept these three nominees for these
23 positions?

24 MS. EISNER: This is Nina. I would
25 make the recommendation that we accept the

1 nominees as submitted.

2 MR. GILBERT: And this is Kent
3 Gilbert. I'll second.

4 CHAIR PARTIN: Okay. Thank you.
5 Any discussion?

6 DR. SCHUSTER: Do we need to make
7 speeches or anything?

8 CHAIR PARTIN: No.

9 MR. GILBERT: No. But now is when
10 you distribute the lavish gifts to secure the
11 vote. This is the time. This is the time.
12 Gift cards are totally acceptable so...

13 CHAIR PARTIN: No speeches today,
14 Sheila.

15 Okay. So all in favor?

16 (Aye.)

17 CHAIR PARTIN: Any dissent?

18 (No response.)

19 CHAIR PARTIN: Okay. So we have
20 our new officers. Thank you, everybody, for
21 your vote and for the nominees who have
22 stepped forward.

23 DR. WRIGHT: Beth --

24 DR. SCHUSTER: I am going to make a
25 brief speech and say we all owe you a huge

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

round of applause.

DR. WRIGHT: I was getting ready to say the same thing.

MS. EISNER: Yes.

DR. SCHUSTER: Yeah. To Beth for her incredible service to the MAC and her incredible leadership as chair, so let's all give a round of applause.

DR. WRIGHT: I'll echo that.

DR. SCHUSTER: Yay.

DR. WRIGHT: Beth, your service to the commonwealth of Kentucky and always following up, particularly with those needs of the vulnerable citizens that are represented on the 1915C waiver, is greatly appreciated as a parent who has two daughters on the 1915C waiver.

So thank you, Beth, for your time.

MS. JUDY-CECIL: And, Dr. Partin, just from -- representing Medicaid, Department For Medicaid Services, we appreciate all your service on the MAC, look forward to your continued, you know, hopefully involvement in -- you've been just amazing to work with. You were always

1 available and accessible to us and were
2 willing to have conversations about, you
3 know, the programs and the agenda. So just
4 thank you again from the Department.

5 CHAIR PARTIN: Well, thank you,
6 everybody. It's been a privilege and an
7 honor to serve on the MAC and to serve as the
8 chair, I think, for the past 11 years. So
9 thank you, everybody. It really means a lot.

10 DR. WRIGHT: Is that three
11 governors, Beth; is that right?

12 CHAIR PARTIN: Yes.

13 DR. WRIGHT: Three governors that
14 you've served under. That's pretty amazing.

15 DR. SCHUSTER: I don't plan to
16 match that. I'm just telling you all.

17 DR. WRIGHT: Sheila, you'll be
18 around for as long as there is. I know you
19 well. You'll be around for a long time,
20 young lady.

21 CHAIR PARTIN: Okay. Well, thank
22 you, everybody.

23 We do have reports from two of the MCOs.
24 And before we do that, anybody have any
25 questions for the previous reports from Aetna

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

or WellCare?

MS. EISNER: No. But I just do want to propose something for consideration before we get into the MCO reports because I fear some folks might start to drop off. I'm just wondering if two and a half hours is sufficient time for this meeting.

And I don't know that it's always been that long, but it seems that, on a regular basis, through no fault of anyone's, just robust discussion and some great presentations, that we tend to run hurried and sometimes over.

So I didn't know if there was a reason why it is exactly from 10:00 to 12:30 or if there's any interest in extending that time.

CHAIR PARTIN: It's just always been that way, Nina. I don't think that there was any reason except that those were the hours that were chosen. I think the MAC can choose to change that if we so desire.

Would the MAC be in favor of extending the time frame of the meeting?

DR. SCHUSTER: I -- I would for sure because I think we're short-changing our

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

TACs all the time, and there is robust discussion beyond the recommendations. The recommendations are few but don't reflect the range of discussion and issues that are raised.

And I think if we want more interplay, which I think is appropriate between and among the TACs, the only way to do that is to be able to give more time for those TAC reports.

And we're -- you know, the MAC is bigger. We've added a couple of TACs, and we're delving into issues. Each of the presentations given today was excellent and worthy of the discussion that we had.

But I agree with Nina that we keep running into a time crunch. I think that --

CHAIR PARTIN: So would it be the pleasure of the MAC to maybe extend the time by a half an hour?

MR. GILBERT: I would be in favor of such a move, but I would -- I know it's very difficult for the folk -- maybe more difficult for the folks in western part of our state. But it is increasingly

1 challenging to move further into the noon and
2 afternoon. It's easier to move earlier on my
3 end of things. That's just a personal
4 preference.

5 CHAIR PARTIN: Yeah. It's -- since
6 our state is divided on Central and Eastern
7 Time, especially if we go to in-person
8 meetings, it makes it very difficult for
9 people coming from a Central Time Zone to
10 make it to the meeting. Dr. --

11 MR. GILBERT: An in-person meeting,
12 if I'm going to drive, you know, an hour and
13 a half or two hours to get somewhere, then
14 I -- I'd as soon camp there. So if we go to
15 in-person meetings, a longer meeting is going
16 to be, in some ways, easier to schedule
17 around because it'll automatically take the
18 whole day so...

19 CHAIR PARTIN: Dr. Bobrowski, you
20 had your hand raised.

21 DR. BOBROWSKI: Yeah. I just
22 wanted to agree with the other folks that
23 have said -- responded on the time. To add
24 half an hour is fine. It might be -- I'm in
25 the Central Time Zone, but if you're going to

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

take an in-person meeting, it almost winds up being a whole-day event in terms of scheduling things.

But I agree with Dr. Schuster that I really feel like that the TACs ought to be able to get a little bit more time other than just their recommendations. It's good to kind of know what they're talking about, what they're working on, even though it might extend that, you know, two minutes, five minutes.

You know, we're all in this to provide health care, you know, to the citizens of Kentucky. And in a lot of situations, our efforts, our expertise overlaps with each other. And I just think it would be good to have opportunity to give the TACs a little bit more time.

CHAIR PARTIN: I absolutely agree. The TACs have been short-changed a lot, and that's unfortunate. And we do need input from them.

So speaking for somebody from Central Time, I would -- I would be more in favor of adding a half an hour at the end of the

1 meeting and going until 1:00 rather than
2 starting earlier.

3 Anybody else have any thoughts or
4 comments on that?

5 DR. SCHUSTER: Beth, I wonder if we
6 might just -- I'll move that the MAC time
7 frame be extended to three hours with the
8 exact time to be settled on at our next
9 meeting, maybe.

10 CHAIR PARTIN: Okay. Is that
11 agreeable to everybody else?

12 DR. BOBROWSKI: I'll second that.
13 Garth Bobrowski.

14 CHAIR PARTIN: Any further
15 discussion?

16 (No response.)

17 CHAIR PARTIN: All in favor, say
18 aye.

19 (Aye.)

20 CHAIR PARTIN: Anybody opposed?

21 (No response.)

22 CHAIR PARTIN: Okay. Thank you.

23 DR. WRIGHT: Sorry. I was muted.
24 Aye.

25 CHAIR PARTIN: Thank you.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

DR. SCHUSTER: Yeah. Ashima has put something in. Maybe start 15 minutes early and end 15 minutes later to kind of split the difference, so that's something to consider.

CHAIR PARTIN: Okay. So we can put that on the next agenda.

All right. The MCO reports. We didn't have any questions for Aetna and WellCare, so Anthem is up first.

MR. LAMOREAUX: Okay. Can you hear me well?

CHAIR PARTIN: Yes.

MR. LAMOREAUX: Okay. Excellent. Now, we have an individual that's going to be helping us with the deck. Has he been given the control? All right. Here we go.

So -- well, members of the Medicaid Advisory Council, it's a pleasure for me to be here with you today. I'm Leon Lamoreaux. I'm the plan president for Anthem BlueCross BlueShield here in Kentucky. And with me here is Dr. Daniel Brunner, our medical director, and Jeremy Randall, our director of operations.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

I want to give each of them just a brief moment to introduce themselves since many of you may have not met them yet.

So Dr. Brunner?

DR. BRUNNER: Yes. Hello. I'm Dr. Daniel Brunner. By training, I'm an emergency medicine physician. I've practiced in northern Kentucky my entire career for over 22 years. I entered the managed care realm in 2019 and became a full-time medical director two and a half years ago here.

Jeremy?

MR. LAMOREAUX: Jeremy?

MR. RANDALL: Hi. My name is Jeremy Randall. As Leon said, I'm the director of operations, and I've been in the industry for over 25 years and here in the Anthem Kentucky Medicaid plan for the last eight.

MR. LAMOREAUX: Well, given that we've been asked to limit our remarks to 15 minutes but there were 19 original questions that came, we're going to have to keep this at a fairly high level. But within the deck, we've made it a point to answer all 19 of the

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

original questions.

To help organize the flow, we're going to address this in basically these six different agenda items: Anthem's whole health and health equity business model, an overview of Anthem's membership demographics, the Anthem provider network and network adequacy reports, which will have to be at a very high level. We'll talk a little about our operations excellence metrics and profile our member services. And then if time permits, we'll talk just briefly about quality and quality improvement.

I may not get a chance to go all the way into the material that is in the appendix, but that is -- I'll bring that to your attention as we move.

So as we go into slide No. 3, the vision of Anthem BlueCross BlueShield Medicaid is to improve the health of humanity. Our primary way to do that here in Kentucky is through a process we call "whole health." For me, whole health has evolved over time. It used to mean the combination of physical health and behavioral health. But more recently,

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

we've recognized that the concepts of health-related social needs, otherwise known as social determinants of health, also need to be taken into consideration.

For Anthem Medicaid, whole health requires whole teams, and whole teams include our care provider community and the community at large. Our model places the member in the center of our thinking. It integrates all of the disciplines within the health plan, and our local business partners and communities are an active part.

An ultimate goal is to identify and eliminate disparities and achieve health equity with purposeful actions and dedicated strategies. Whole health takes the whole health ecosystem working together to achieve positive results.

As depicted in the visual to the far right, Anthem whole health starts with analyzing data, determining our customer needs, and then we work with customers and other community members to see where we can make a positive difference.

Another element of our business model is

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

the purposeful efforts to achieve health equity for each of our subpopulations, trying to eliminate the inequities that do exist. Our planning and strategic process focuses our efforts in areas most needed by our membership.

And as we can see from slide No. 4, beginning in 2019, our planning cycle, Anthem reinvented itself using elevate whole health approach of strategic planning. The results of this detailed process have identified eight major areas of focus.

Those areas of focus are listed on the right-hand side of this slide, and it's no accident that we begin with decreasing crisis events from behavioral health and substance use since that is the area of greatest need for our specific population.

You can see other key terms here: Cancer, preventive care, chronic disease, diabetes, hypertension, dental visits, birth outcomes, mortality -- mortality and morbidity rates, and food and housing.

For a couple of years now, Anthem Medicaid has been producing what we call our

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

insights dashboard. This -- the numbers that you see displayed on this slide are for the year-to-date September 2023 results.

Since there's a lot to unpack here, let me orient you to the slide. Beginning in the top left, you can see Anthem has paid over three million claims for \$488,000,000. These claims on average are paid in 12.7 days with 96.4 percent of them processed within 30 days.

The top right outlines our call centers statistics in which we have answered 88,000 provider calls at an average of 17 seconds and answered 122,000 member calls at an average of 13 seconds.

Anthem Medicaid has paid nearly two million in prescriptions in 2023. 35 percent of our membership utilizes the pharmacy benefit, and 87 percent of the time, it is with a generic drug.

The top five prescriptions by utilization are those prescriptions for cardiovascular disease and hypertension, antidepressants, other behavioral health topics, allergy, and pain management

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

analgesics.

In the center of the page, one can observe from our quality measures, 2022 measures are highlighted in blue. '23 measures are highlighted in orange, and the year-over-year change is highlighted in green.

Just to the right of the quality measures is a couple of clinical utilization statistics you might find of interest. In 2023, admits per thousand is 46, down from last year's 53. Days per thousand is 260, also down from last year's 287. ER visits per thousand, 645, is up from last year, 623. And telehealth per thousand is 966, down from 1,651 in 2022.

At the far right side of the page is our membership and community outreach events, and one of the most intriguing statistics on this dashboard on the bottom, right-hand side are the top five diagnoses. The left column is based on claims paid amounts, and the right column is based on count of claims.

It may surprise you to see that Anthem Medicaid, our top one and two from both lists

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

are opioid dependence and other stimulant dependence. No. 3 is either sepsis in one venue or alcohol dependence in the other, and then rounding out the top five that are mentioned in either category, chemotherapy, hypertension, and generalized anxiety disorder.

Let's turn to our membership slide on slide No. 8 because Anthem, when it came -- let's move on to this -- keep moving, Brad. Slide No. 8, we're going to give you a little bit of a profile about the Anthem membership. As you can see, Anthem serves about 180,000 Medicaid members.

But one thing may be less obvious, is the mix of members that we serve. 49 percent of our membership is the TANF expansion membership; in other words, those childless adults or the working poor that came into Medicaid eligibility back in 2014.

One can also notice from this slide that Anthem's membership is evenly spread throughout the entire state, with 6 percent in Region 1, 9 percent in Region 2, 21 percent in Region 3, 16 in Region 4, 23 in

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

Region 5, and so on.

We also have a pretty good age distribution. In addition to our continual -- as we think about where we are right now, in addition to the material on this slide, it's important for us to focus on our network adequacy.

And as we think about this, Anthem Medicaid has an extensive and comprehensive network because our Medicaid network is derived from our commercial network, which has been being built for the past 85 years.

The contractual access requirements for MCOs, as we heard from Angie just a little bit ago, are threefold. The first requirement is providers within a certain mile range for urban or rural settings.

Slide 10 here outlines some of Anthem's access results. The first column outlines the provider category. The second column, the accessibility standards. The third are the unique count of providers of each one of those provider categories and then the percent of membership with that access, and the last column is the average distance to

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

one provider based on member zip codes.

So as you can see here, as a for instance, 110 hospitals, 6,229 primary care providers. And we can just kind of go all the way down through each of the rest of these specialty types.

Slide 11 outlines Anthem's compliance for use -- provider types for each region of the state. And as you can see, 100 percent compliance for each of these areas as outlined by the time and distance requirements.

When we look at slide 12, the second compulsory requirement for a provider is a member ratio requirement. You can see the fourth column over, the accessibility standards. Ratio of a PCP to members is 1 to 15. You can look in 2020, our results; '21, our results; '22, our results. And you can see that where the ratio is 1 to 1,500, our ratio is 1 to 16. So, in essence, Anthem dramatically meets any and all of these goals.

Slide No. 13, the third compulsory requirement for providers is to make care

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

available within certain time frames, and this slide outlines the last five quarters of appointment availability standards based on our quarterly survey results.

I do want to point out the staffing shortages in our post-COVID environment are placing significant pressures on offices to meet some of these access standards. Some of the things that we're trying to do, in addition to our continual network recruiting, is to promote digital technologies and telephonic technology solutions to provide increased access to Medicaid membership.

And then the last point that I would like to make is that, in addition, we have made strategic investments to try and help train up the next generation of healthcare providers. Over the course of the last three years, we've invested over \$700,000 in local colleges and universities to provide scholarships for individuals who agree to practice in rural settings here within Kentucky.

Slide No. 17, to briefly discuss some of our other questions, Anthem has approved 355

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

member requests for out-of-network providers.

And slide 18 talks about our 12-month rolling average where we have had to execute 45 single case agreements where services were simply not available in the state of Kentucky. That is a little bit less than we experienced last year.

I'm now going to turn the time over to Dr. Brunner, our medical director, to talk about some of our clinical insights from his perspective.

Dr. Brunner.

DR. BRUNNER: Thank you, Leon. You can go to the next slide, Brad.

We've seen an overall decrease in hospitalization rates since 2021 with a slight increase in behavioral health hospitalization rates the first quarter of this year. Over this time, we've seen an increase in electronic medical record access to facilities. With this, we can see in real-time the intensity of our members' needs and offer observation care. We can also coordinate post-discharge care through our case management teams.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

The cost per admission has decreased overall, but there's a slight increase in behavioral health costs per admission from 2021 to 2022. And to date, it has returned to that of -- close to that of 2021.

We've seen a fall in the hospital readmissions. With the prior authorization process in place for physical health, case management and social determinant of health teams can coordinate with providers. Post-COVID, primary care physician offices were able to see patients for disease management and post-discharge care.

While the readmissions per thousand have declined, the cost for readmissions has increased steadily over the past two and a half years.

The ER utilization overall has fallen since 2021. There's an increase in behavioral health emergency room visits, and these are driven primarily by anxiety, major depression, and substance abuse.

Despite the fall in the ER visits, the cost per visit for ER utilization has dramatically increased over the past two and

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

a half years.

Post-pandemic, we've seen our top diagnoses shift. Our top four expenditures this year to date are largely substance use-related including opiate, stimulant, and alcohol use. And also added to that is general anxiety.

And due to vaccine hesitancy, encounters for immunizations have dropped but are still in the top ten -- our top ten list, where child well visits have remained stable.

Regarding our prior authorization process, we are continually re-evaluating the process. We strive to simplify and streamline the process to ease the administrative burden on providers and their staff. The majority of prior auth requests are turned around within 24 hours.

Our digital Availity and Epic Payer platforms are tools used to help simplify this process. We utilize Milliman care guidelines and ASAM for utilization management reviews, which are peer-reviewed, evidence-based, nationally recognized criteria.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

I will now hand it off to Jeremy.

MR. RANDALL: Thank you,
Dr. Brunner. Next slide, please, Brad.

So first, I'd like to talk about our claim denial rates. On this slide, you can see our overall denial rate as well as the top ten denial reasons, both metrics going back to 2021. And I'd like to note that if circumstances change, Anthem will proactively adjust certain of these denials, trying to save the provider's office from making a phone call or having to submit an appeal or email the provider rep.

You know, so, for example, looking at the second highest denial reason there, if that registration changes at all after the fact, we will, on a monthly basis, identify all the denials impacted by that and have them adjusted.

Next slide. Yeah. On this slide, you will find a count of all the audit requests going back to 2021. Anthem offers multiple methods to fulfill these requests including via the Availity provider portal. And on the next slide, you will find the same volumes

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

broken out monthly. Thank you.

Next slide. And up next, you'll find a snapshot of our value-added benefits, and we would ask for the community's assistance in educating members on our value-added benefits. You know, it is our intent that we want all members to be aware and appropriately utilizing these benefits.

In addition, we offer multiple tools to support members with their whole health. And some of these are digital like a smartphone app. Some are a vendor. But all are trying to wrap around the care that is provided in the community.

And we had mentioned social determinants of health, and here you can find how our members' needs are reflected in the SDOH referrals we receive. You can see that 36.8 percent of the referrals are related to housing as our No. 1. Thank you.

And with that, I'll turn it back to Leon.

MR. LAMOREAUX: So I think in the interest of time, first off, I want to thank everyone on this call for your service to the

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

commonwealth, a special emphasis to those who have served over the course of the last 11 years, Dr. Partin in particular.

I hope you will join me as we think about this -- the challenges that we face as a state today are going to require the entire community to come together as we strive to improve the lives of humanity here in Kentucky. I want to thank you for the opportunity we have to be able to continue to serve.

I've got an amazing team here, and our desire is to be able to help you, help our members, and so there's many things we want to address with this particular presentation. There's a lot of material that we did not cover that is in the balance of the deck. But I think in the interest of time and out of courtesy to others, we will surrender the mic.

CHAIR PARTIN: Thank you very much.

Does anybody have any questions?

(No response.)

CHAIR PARTIN: Okay. We appreciate the information, and we will go through it.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

And then at the next meeting, we may have questions as we've had more opportunity to go through the slides. Thank you.

MR. LAMOREAUX: Thank you for the opportunity.

DR. BRUNNER: Thank you.

CHAIR PARTIN: Okay. Next up, UnitedHealthcare.

MS. BICKERS: Beth, United was moved to November per Dr. Cantor's request that you -- that we had agreed on.

CHAIR PARTIN: Okay. Okay. So are we doing three in November?

MS. BICKERS: Yes, ma'am. You and Dr. Schuster said that that was okay to move it.

CHAIR PARTIN: Right. Right. Okay. All right, then. Well, that's not too bad. We're 21 minutes over, 22 minutes over.

Anybody have anything else that they'd like to bring forward?

(No response.)

CHAIR PARTIN: Okay. I appreciate everybody's time and willingness to stay with the meeting. And I also appreciate all of

1 your comments. It really means a lot to me
2 to have the support from the MAC members.
3 And my -- my practice is made up of a lot of
4 Medicaid patients, and my heart is with them
5 and with providing the best health care we
6 can for them. So thank you, everybody.

7 Would somebody like to make a motion to
8 adjourn?

9 DR. SCHUSTER: I'll move that we
10 adjourn and thank you, again, Beth.

11 MS. EISNER: I'll second and thank
12 you, Beth.

13 CHAIR PARTIN: Thank you, Sheila
14 and Nina.

15 Any discussion?

16 MS. EISNER: No.

17 DR. HANNA: Just thanks, Beth.
18 Thank you.

19 DR. WRIGHT: Just gratitude.

20 CHAIR PARTIN: I'll probably be
21 here in November. I haven't heard -- I
22 haven't heard that I have a replacement yet.
23 So if I am, I'll look forward to seeing you
24 all. So all in favor, say aye.

25 (Aye.)

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

CHAIR PARTIN: Anybody opposed?

(No response.)

CHAIR PARTIN: So moved. Thank
you.

DR. SCHUSTER: Bye, y'all.

(Meeting concluded at 12:57 p.m.)

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

* * * * *

C E R T I F I C A T E

I, SHANA SPENCER, Certified
Realtime Reporter and Registered Professional
Reporter, do hereby certify that the foregoing
typewritten pages are a true and accurate transcript
of the proceedings to the best of my ability.

I further certify that I am not employed
by, related to, nor of counsel for any of the parties
herein, nor otherwise interested in the outcome of
this action.

Dated this 16th day of October, 2023.

/s/ Shana W. Spencer
Shana Spencer, RPR, CRR