

1 DEPARTMENT OF MEDICAID SERVICES  
2 INTELLECTUAL AND DEVELOPMENTAL DISABILITIES  
3 TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE

4 \*\*\*\*\*

5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14 TUESDAY, DECEMBER 3, 2024  
15 10:00 a.m.  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21

22  
23 Stefanie Sweet, CVR, RCP-M  
24 Certified Verbatim Reporter  
25

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 P P E A R A N C E S

**TAC Members:**

Wayne Harvey, Chair  
Melanie Tyner-Wilson  
Johnny Callebs  
Frankie Huffman  
Ann Pierce  
Doug Hoyt  
Brad Schneider

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. BICKERS: Good morning.  
This is Erin with the Department of  
Medicaid. It is not quite 10 o'clock and  
we are still clearing out the waiting  
room. We will give it just a moment  
before we get started.

Wayne, I did want to let you  
know that Ann is with us, our new member,  
so if you want to introduce her to the TAC  
once we get started.

MR. HARVEY: Absolutely.

Ann, can you talk to me so that  
I can see you?

MS. PIERCE: I can talk. I am  
waving and I am talking.

MR. HARVEY: I can see you now.  
I can put a face with the name. That is a  
good deal.

MS. PIERCE: Thank you.

MS. BICKERS: It is 10 o'clock,  
but we still have a couple of people  
filtering in from the waiting room if you  
want to give it just a moment longer.

I have Wayne, Brad, Johnny, and,  
and Doug logged in. Did I miss any 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

members?

MR. HARVEY: I know Cheryl said she wasn't going to be here because her mother was in the hospital. So I know that she won't be joining us. Melanie will probably log in anytime I would say.

MR. HUFFMAN: This is Frankie.

MS. BICKERS: Oh, there you are, Frankie. I didn't mean to miss you.

MR. HUFFMAN: That's okay.

MS. BICKERS: Wayne, your waiting room is clear and you do have a quorum, so we can go ahead and start. I can let you know if Melanie or anyone else -- I think that she is the only one that we are currently missing so if she logs in, I can go ahead and let you know.

MR. HARVEY: Thank you, Erin. I appreciate it. We have a quorum. All right. The first thing that I would like to do is welcome our new member, Ann, to the TAC.

Ann, if you would like to take just a minute to introduce yourself to the rest of the committee and all 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

people on the call, and just tell us a little bit about yourself and anything you want to say.

MS. PIERCE: Thank you, Wayne.

It is good to be here. I hope that I can bring a perspective. I actually am a consumer representative of a family member who participates in a Community Medicaid waiver program.

My daughter is 33. She has severe autism. She lives in a residential setting on the SCL waiver.

I am a piano teacher. It is good to be here. I hope that I can help somehow.

MR. HARVEY: Good, good. Thank you, Ann.

MS. PIERCE: Thank you.

MR. HARVEY: I'm sorry. Were you finished?

MS. PIERCE: Yes.

MR. HARVEY: Good.

The first thing that we have on the agenda today -- we have a lengthy agenda -- if you have different things 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

the agenda, anybody that you want to speak to, please have your comments ready and so forth when we get to that particular item, because it is going to be a good agenda to get through.

The first thing up on the agenda is a correction to the minutes itself. I noticed that the last meeting, the minutes listed as appearances Johnny Callebs, which he had a proxy in his place, Justin Jeter, who attended the call.

And also it listed Doug Hoyt as being present for the meeting, and it was actually Brad Schneider that was in attendance and not Doug. He had to miss that meeting.

So we need to make a motion as a committee to amend the minutes to reflect accurately who was at the October TAC meeting -- membership meeting -- and that would be that Doug and Johnny be removed from appearances on the minutes, and put in there place, Brad Schneider a proxy, and Justin Jeter for Johnny. Anybody want to make that motion?

1 MR. CALLEBS: I will make that  
2 motion if I'm allowed to, even though I  
3 wasn't there.

4 MR. HARVEY: You are a TAC  
5 member. You are a voting TAC member so  
6 yes, you are allowed.

7 MR. CALLEBS: I will make the  
8 motion to correct the minutes as you  
9 stated to more accurately reflect the  
10 attendance.

11 MR. HARVEY: Can I have a  
12 second?

13 MR. HOYT: Second.

14 MR. HARVEY: Good. All in favor  
15 say, "aye."

16 TAC MEMBERS: Aye.

17 MR. HARVEY: Any opposed?

18 MS. BICKERS: DMS notes those  
19 corrections and I will make those  
20 corrections to the court reporter and send  
21 out corrected minutes once received.

22 MR. HARVEY: Good deal. I  
23 emailed Erin and asked if we could just  
24 correct them without having to do all of  
25 that, but she told me we needed to go

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

through that so bear with us on that.

Approval of meeting dates and times scheduled for 2025. Erin did send out the meeting scheduled for next year. It is in line with what we have historically done in regards to meeting dates and times for the TAC. It is for February the 4th, April the 1st, June the 3rd, August the 5th, October the 7th and December the 2nd and all meetings are at 10 o'clock a.m.

Do I have a motion to go ahead and approve those meeting dates and times?

MR. HOYT: So moved.

MR. HARVEY: Can I have a second?

MS. PIERCE: Second.

MR. HARVEY: All in favor say "aye."

MS. MARKLE: Aye.

MR. HARVEY: Any opposed?

Okay. Erin, that's got our dates and times for 2025 approved.

MS. BICKERS: Thank you. We will get those out shortly.



1 MR. HARVEY: Okay. The next  
2 thing on the agenda is an update on the  
3 involuntary terminations. This was in  
4 relation to the survey information that  
5 the cabinet felt like they were capturing.  
6 This was related to the request back from  
7 February when Rick was the chair, and an  
8 email was forwarded to, I think, Erin.  
9 Were you the one who received email and  
10 forwarded it on to where it needed to be  
11 in the cabinet?

12 MS. BICKERS: Yes.

13 MR. HARVEY: Okay. Who in the  
14 cabinet wants to speak to that particular  
15 agenda item?

16 MS. HOFFMAN: Wayne, I'm going  
17 to go ahead and go over that. I know most  
18 of you in the cabinet probably know me on  
19 here. I have been on for quite some time  
20 and filling in for the director's position  
21 until it is a refilled.

22 So the update on the involuntary  
23 terminations, and that was a survey  
24 information. This was as of yesterday I  
25 got the information pulled.

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

Involuntary termination information for today was a total number of involuntary terminations in the last year, and this was for all services, was 38. And the total number of involuntary terminations in the last year, residential services only, was 25. So all services 38, residential services only was 25.

The total of involuntary terminations in six months, all services, 28. The total number for involuntary in six months for residential services only is 21.

Total voluntary termination not transitioned in the last year, all services 15, and for residential only was 12.

So for a year is 38 and 25, for six months it is 28 and 21, and not transitioned in the last year is 15 and 12.

MR. HARVEY: We have any questions from committee members in relation to that information?

MS. PIERCE: I have a question.

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. HARVEY: Sure.

MS. PIERCE: I'm sorry. This is Ann. Why are people being involuntarily terminated?

MS. HOFFMAN: I am going to ask -- Kathy are you on? We had this conversation yesterday.

MS. STAED: I can talk about this if someone wants me to.

MS. HOFFMAN: For reasons of maybe behavioral health reasons and/or --

MS. ADAMS: Leslie, Elizabeth is on. She can speak to that probably.

MS. HOFFMAN: Oh, thank you. I was looking for Kathy because I had a conversation with Kathy yesterday.

MS. ADAMS: Yes, Elizabeth can probably assist.

MS. MARKLE: There is a variety of reasons. Some things we have seen is folks' behavioral or mental health needs have changed over time, maybe an agency had supported them for ten years or more and just as they age and things change, that will sometimes be a 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

Also change to physical needs may have changed over time. Much like folks who are, you know, we have aging family members whose health needs change over time, so we may need a different level of care in those situations. Those are the primary reasons.

In some instances, there is -- maybe an agency no longer has a service provider in that particular area. That is more in line with the non-residential involuntary terminations. Typically, you would see that with your behavioral support services or your day training services.

And then in some instances, agencies have closed or want to close voluntarily, so I know at least four of those in here for the last year are for a small agency that had decided to close. So there is any variety of reasons.

MS. ADAMS: We have had some residential agencies that are attempting to downsize and that would potentially be some of those numbers as well 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

residential.

MS. PIERCE: Who said that? I'm sorry. This is Ann. Where do these people go? What happens to them?

MS. MARKLE: Typically they will transition to another agency, or they will remain at that agency until another service provider agrees to support them, or potentially a different level of care.

MR. HARVEY: Any other questions on the survey numbers?

MS. BICKERS: Amy has her hand raised, Wayne.

MS. STAED: I just want to clarify for maybe those who don't know. Involuntary termination does not mean that an individual is losing their waiver slot. What that means is that a provider, for a variety of reasons, realizes that they can no longer support that individual.

What they do is send out a notice -- a 30 day notice saying, "I can no longer support this individual. In 30 days, we will be involuntary terminating them from our 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

But Kentucky regulation requires that until another -- if it's residential or another living situation, or if it's a different service, then another service provider could be identified, that provider continues to support that individual.

Some people hear involuntary termination and think that someone is losing their waiver slot or access to services, and that is not the case. It is just the term that we have in regulation to describe that process.

MS. PIERCE: So that sounds like -- I'm sorry. This is Ann. That sounds like a big problem for providers. If they have to care for someone they feel they can't for. I'm probably going to have questions about this at the next meeting. I need to think about it. I'm sorry. Thank you so much for answering.

MS. MARKLE: No problem.

MR. HARVEY: Any other questions on the survey numbers?

MS. STAED: Hey, Wayne, I just

1 wanted to remind you as the TAC chair,  
2 that Rick initially asked for those  
3 surveyed numbers who guide the TAC's work  
4 in addressing the involuntary termination  
5 issue to move forward so that the TAC can  
6 inform its work and recommend a course of  
7 action to solve that problem.

8 We did take the TAC heard  
9 testimony from other states back in --  
10 gosh, I don't remember last year at some  
11 point -- Erin might remember. So maybe it  
12 might be appropriate --

13 MR. HARVEY: I think it was  
14 early 2023 --

15 MS. STAED: Yeah, maybe --

16 MR. HARVEY: 2022.

17 MS. ADAMS: -- for the TAC  
18 members to go back and review -- I don't  
19 know if we were recording those meetings  
20 at that point, but maybe the transcripts  
21 or if there was a presentation, and have  
22 members come up with a proposal.

23 MR. HARVEY: I think that is  
24 something that we will have to do separate  
25 of this meeting with this agenda that 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

in front of us.

MS. STAED: Sorry. I just meant for the next meeting.

MR. HARVEY: Absolutely. Absolutely.

Any other comments on the termination numbers given to us?

MS. PIERCE: This is Ann. I just want to say thank you, Amy, because this is a problem for providers, and it's also a big problem for people with IDD who obviously are not getting the care that they need if providers can't for them. So this needs to be addressed. I think it is very important. We have people, obviously, who are suffering.

MS. BICKERS: Wayne, this is Erin. If you can put that in writing to me, as the TAC sees fit, we can work on trying to gather that information up together and get it to you before the next meeting to get reviewed.

And let me also reflect that Melanie has joined us, for the record.

MR. HARVEY: Welcome, Melanie.



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. TYNER-WILSON: Hi, sorry. I couldn't find the Zoom link, so I had to go back to the cabinet website. So thank you.

MR. HARVEY: Good deal. We are on the agenda item of discussion of Medicaid Beneficiary Advisory Council, the BAC. This is a new requirement for DMS that has to be in place next year. Somebody from the cabinet want to speak to that?

MS. HOFFMAN: Wayne, this is Leslie. I just grabbed a PowerPoint that Veronica Judy Cecil did with, I believe it was with the MAC the other day.

So the Medicaid Beneficiary Advisory Council, BAC is a new requirement, like you said, for next year and it is part of the access and federal final rules.

I will go over some of the highlights of this presentation and Erin will send it out to you as soon as this meeting is over, if that is okay. It is really short because we are just getting

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

started, right?

So the Medicaid Advisory Committee and Beneficiary Advisory Council has, of course, a CFR that it is governed by. Under the Medicaid Access Rule are the new federal requirements of the new federal requirements for the Medicaid Advisory Committee, MAC, and the Beneficiary Advisory Council, BAC, and they are calling that the BAC.

Some of the key areas to focus on, of course, it brings consistency across all Medicaid programs and how external partners including individuals with lived experiences provide ideas and suggestions on policy development and effective administration for the program.

Some of the key focus areas for that are coordination, eligibility, enrollment and renewal processes, the quality of services, additional modifications that might need to happen to the benefits, beneficiary and provider communication by the state and the managed-care organizations or the MCOs,

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

health disparities, health equity, and cultural competencies.

And I believe we've got a contractor working on this as well so they should be reaching out fairly soon.

In collaboration with the external partners, states do have some flexibility in the composition within the federal requirements per the regulations, state Medicaid director is responsible, so that would be Lisa, Commissioner Lee for the selection of the members for the MAC and BAC. State agencies are also responsible for the development of the governance documents, planning, and facilitation of the meeting.

So Erin, you're going to be it again, I believe.

Some of the things that they are requiring, there is a difference in what would be required of the MAC and what would be required of the BAC related to composition, the term of how long you can serve. You can't have consecutive terms like we do in the MAC, and you have 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

meet at least every quarter and the BAC meetings do not have to be public, but the BAC must meet prior to the MAC meeting every month.

And then there are a lot of things related to the responsibilities. One of the things that I want to go over really quick -- and I'm going to have Erin send this out to you -- we've already got a roadmap started as to what this would look like.

Just to start out with an overview of the MAC and the BAC implementation process for Kentucky and again, it's not until next year. There will be a gap analysis. We will use best practices, we will do recruitments, and develop bylaws and community and partner engagement.

There will be a state plan amendment to occur in 2025, and of course we always want to be transparent. We will publish a lot of those documents and memberships on the website sometime around July of 2025.

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 are hoping to have the MAC and the BAC, according to the new rules, established by July the 9th of 2025.

That is pretty much it. That is pretty much what she gave out to the MAC and I think this might have been brought up at the Consumer Rights Technical Advisory Committee as well, but Erin will send that out to you, so definitely more to come out this.

As you are all probably aware or heard us talk about this, there are, I think, 20-some federal rules. We have kind of combined those into nine categories. We do have a vendor working on that, a contractor as well. And I think around four will be affecting the HCBS waivers and other community programs.

And that is it for right now, but definitely more to come on that. We can even come back if you wanted us to, Wayne, maybe when we get a little bit deeper into this. Maybe we can come back and do an official presentation.

MR. HARVEY: Good.

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

Johnny, that was your agenda item. Is that a good summary for now --

MS. HOFFMAN: Johnny?

MR. HARVEY: -- or were you looking for more?

MR. CALLEBS: Sure. No. I just wanted to introduce that subject to the TAC so that we can be working alongside Medicaid as it develops, and I know that there is a timeline and a lot of other rules for implementation as well.

Anyway, thanks Leslie. I appreciate that.

MS. HOFFMAN: No problem.

MS. TYNER-WILSON: This is Melanie. I have a question. As far as the -- because one of the things that seemed really optimistic is that there was a desire to have input from caregivers on these two groups so I am excited about that.

Will there be opportunities for groups that don't fall into that formal agencies that are represented like if there is a support group or advocacy group

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

within the state, would they also be considered as potential members?

MS. HOFFMAN: I think so, Melanie. The composition I have on my list here says, "current and former Medicaid beneficiaries, family members, caregivers, existing beneficiary advisory groups, the size will be determined by Medicaid," but it sounds like to me that, yeah, if you are willing, let us know that you are willing to be on a committee or participate.

MS. TYNER-WILSON: Okay. Thank you. I am very interested, but I know that there will probably be a lot of interest from several groups, so thank you for that.

MS. HOFFMAN: Yes. It looks like it is very open for Kentucky needs as well.

MS. TYNER-WILSON: Okay. Thank you.

MR. HARVEY: Any other questions for Leslie on the BAC?

Thank you, Leslie.

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

Next item up for discussion is the rate study implementation update.

MS. HOFFMAN: I can talk to that a little bit, Wayne, sorry. I think most of this is falling to me this morning.

As you are aware, we did post on our website the rate study. We have an anticipated approval date with CMS in January. They are still reviewing. We are still working with CMS, going through requests for information from them, so nothing is finalized yet.

And of course, systems changes are a big deal and working on the change orders that allow for the systems to occur in the pass-through of dollars to make the system changes happen.

So Alicia might be on, but that is what we are doing right now. There is a lot of work there.

MS. STAED: Leslie, can I ask a clarifying question about that?

MS. HOFFMAN: Absolutely.

MS. STAED: And this may be a little niche so if you don't know, that 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

totally okay.

Related to the rate study and the waivers -- and this may have been outlined in the May waiver changes when those changes were approved after Appendix K and became effective in May. There was discussion about splitting the billing code for home community-based PDS -- the case management portion and the FMA portion, because it was bundled and it was announced that it was going to be split. That has not occurred yet. And my inclination is that it will not occur until the rate study is formal, because technically the rate study creates that split rate, but I was just wondering if you had any update about that.

MS. HOFFMAN: You are correct. We have to get through these approvals first. And that is also -- if anybody's going to ask today as well -- that is also part of a larger conversation we are having with CMS related to PDS in general. So until we get the approvals, of course, we couldn't move forward with anything

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

get.

MS. STAED: Okay. Thank you. I have gotten a couple questions about it and I just did not want to assume.

MR. HARVEY: Any other questions on that particular agenda item?

Okay. The next item is clarification regarding governing standards and waivers.

I guess that calls to you, too, Leslie.

MS. HOFFMAN: Yes. I did put a question mark on this because I wasn't sure exactly what we were talking about.

It has to do with regulations, we are working on those now. If it has to do with waiver applications, we are trying to get the regulations and applications consistent. As you are aware, we have had changes throughout the years -- we've had to focus on certain things. This time we are really focusing on getting those rates in and getting those rates approved and not having a lot of requests for information from CMS.

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 there will be more amendments to come and we do know that if that is where that is coming from.

MS. STAED: I can clarify, Leslie.

MS. HOFFMAN: Okay. Go ahead, Amy.

MS. STAED: This came up in June -- during the TAC meeting -- May or June -- I may be getting my months wrong of when the TAC meeting actually occurred. We had this discussion when your predecessor was still here.

The question became -- because we have a lot of documents on there. We have waiver applications that are approved, right? We have the waivers themselves that are approved and have a set of standards in them that are not articulated in regulation.

Providers are becoming increasingly confused about when the waivers, themselves, and the regulations are in conflict, which set of standards are required?

1                   And the previous answer was when  
2                   the waiver application requires more than  
3                   the regulation requires, right? When it  
4                   requires something more severe or  
5                   something additional, you go with the  
6                   harsher standard, right? But there was  
7                   supposed to be something put out in  
8                   writing about this, and it has never been  
9                   issued and providers, obviously, when it  
10                  comes to not following the regulation and  
11                  following something else, they get a  
12                  little nervous, and we just wondered if  
13                  maybe we could have something in writing  
14                  maybe articulating what standard gets  
15                  followed when.

16                  MS. HOFFMAN: Yeah. Actually, I  
17                  made a note, because I had this discussion  
18                  yesterday. And I have been on the  
19                  provider side, too. I worked at a  
20                  community mental Health Center for eight  
21                  years.

22                  I think this may have come up  
23                  with CAP wanting something in writing. I  
24                  will tell you that we probably won't do  
25                  anything right now, because we are in the

1           midst of so many changes, and I feel like  
2           we would have letter ABCD and I think that  
3           that would be very confusing for  
4           everybody.

5                        I did mention I talked to  
6           Jonathan yesterday -- Jonathan Scott.  
7           There is some language in the regulation  
8           about general federal approvals. I  
9           understand that you are worried about  
10          consistency, so there is probably not  
11          going to be anything out until after  
12          January, so don't hold me to anything  
13          until sometime next year, if that is okay.

14                      MS. STAED: Yeah, that is  
15          totally fine. My only concern is -- and  
16          there are some really specific things.  
17          Really specifically, one of the most major  
18          changes has to do with family home  
19          providers and some of the training  
20          requirements, and other standards et  
21          cetera that are not articulated in  
22          regulation.

23                      If a provider hasn't been tuned  
24          in to the TAC meetings's, they have no  
25          idea that there are changes in addition to

1           what is in the regulation, and I fear that  
2           there are a ton of providers out there  
3           that are just looking at the regulation  
4           and think that they are doing the right  
5           thing and aren't doing the right thing  
6           because they don't know.

7                   MS. HOFFMAN: I've got you, Amy.  
8           I understand because I have been there. I  
9           am going to have Jonathan grab that  
10          language.

11                   And Erin, we are going to get  
12          that out to them after this meeting that  
13          we currently have in the regulations that  
14          talk about CMS approvals.

15                   But until then, Amy, just give  
16          me a little bit of time and we actually --  
17          you probably are aware that we need to  
18          make more amendments after we get this  
19          approved, we just didn't want to get what  
20          we had at CMS clouded that they couldn't  
21          just hurry up and get those rates  
22          approved. That was a very important piece  
23          to this so we do have additional  
24          amendments that will be coming out going  
25          forward, so just give me a little bit of

1 time on that, okay? But I will grab that  
2 language for you too, just so that you  
3 have it.

4 I do understand and I know that  
5 reviewers change and I know people in my  
6 position change. I have left before and  
7 come back, so I understand that.

8 We have already been in  
9 conversations with DBH as well, and DALE,  
10 and we can continue those conversations to  
11 be as consistent as we possibly can.

12 MS. STAED: Thank you. I really  
13 appreciate it. Thank you so much.

14 MR. HARVEY: Any other question  
15 on the clarification regarding governing  
16 standards and waivers?

17 Okay. The next item up for  
18 discussion is the rough 2025 timeline  
19 regarding rates and regulations.

20 MS. HOFFMAN: The best that I  
21 can do right now, because you know we are  
22 waiting for CMS, we have only had one  
23 round of requests for information, and we  
24 sent those back around the 25th, I  
25 believe, of November. We have not heard

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

back from those.

So if that is all that they had in the approval, we put in the request for information, it will keep us moving. We are still very hopeful and CMS has given us no reason to believe that the waivers wouldn't be approved in January.

So we have to get the waiver approvals, we have the rates that CMS is also looking at as well and then the regulations. We have already drafted rough draft regulations so that when we continue to work with CMS we can speed up that process, and working with the secretary's office as to whether how those will be implemented as an e-reg or an o-reg, and what else we can do to speed those up.

MS. STAED: And then, I accidentally left this off -- this was my agenda item. But I know -- Leslie I don't know if it was you, but I know somebody with the cabinet presented pretty recently to the legislature about the update on the children's waiver work. Could you just



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

run through that quickly, if you don't mind?

MS. HOFFMAN: I can. Hang on just a second. I actually have that pulled up. It's on my presentation. I have a presentation today. I told Wayne that I might not be able to stay on the whole time. We have another interim joint committee meeting today. Let me just see if I can pull this up for you really quick.

MS. TYNER-WILSON: I think that is at one.

MS. HOFFMAN: Yes. Just a second.

Can I share my screen really quick, Erin?

MS. BICKERS: You should be able to share it now.

MS. HOFFMAN: Can you see that? Can you see Children Specific waiver?

MS. CLARK: We can see it, Leslie.

MS. HOFFMAN: It's not lit up for me like it usually is. Okay. That 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

weird.

This is the Child Specific waiver. If you all remember, I guess this has been last year sometime, Guidehouse had worked on doing the feasibility study and they worked on doing some town hall meetings, and probably a lot of you all participated in those.

It has become something a little bit larger that we are working on and this has now taking on a very important interest to the secretary's office and we are working on something that looks a little bigger.

In the budget by the way, they did not give us funding until state fiscal year '26. So we are not behind or anything.

This is a much larger group. Myers and Stauffer contractors are now working on this as well, and they have all of the information from the stakeholder meetings, town halls, and the feasibility study that was done last year as well.

So again, we didn't get money

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

until 2026. We are going to conduct a comprehensive system assessment, conduct service mapping, collect other documents and collect data, identify stakeholders and build a registry, develop a communication plan, and there is an upcoming advisory work group that you all will hear about, and I can bring this back to you all as well in January of 2025.

This waiver may be a waiver and it may be a state plan amendment. We have not gotten that far yet. It may be a 1915(i) depending on everything that we want to include all-inclusive into one program.

So it is exciting, but we do have support. These are huge meetings that we have been having internally so far. DALE sits in there, DCBS sits in there, Department of Juvenile Justice sits on these meetings, of course Medicaid, our partners at DBH, we are all working on this in collaboration.

That is the only slide that I have to share yet. Remember, it doesn't

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

start until state fiscal year 2026.

MS. BICKERS: Leslie, Frankie has his hand raised.

MS. HOFFMAN: I see a hand. Go ahead.

MR. HARVEY: Go ahead, Frankie.

MR. HUFFMAN: I just have a quick question regarding the town halls -- possibly two questions depending on the answer.

When you say town halls, is that what they did when Navigant did the waiver redesign?

MS. HOFFMAN: Yes. I call them town halls, but there were stakeholder meetings in the public held last year, I believe, with folks who used to be at Navigant, but then were also moved to Guidehouse. So Guidehouse would have been the ones who facilitated those meetings and they came up with -- kind of collapsed everything together from those meetings on the wants and desires of the folks and that will all be brought out.

I've given that all to Myers 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

Stauffer now and they will be utilizing that information when they start the stakeholder advisory meeting in 2025.

Again, that is more to come, it is just not happening publicly yet. We have been meeting for several months trying to get a grasp on what we want to accomplish which is a much bigger picture. I think you all will be impressed with what we are trying to do with that waiver or state plan amendment.

Is that the right answer for you?

MR. HUFFMAN: Yeah. If you don't mind, I have two questions about that, because I didn't know that that was going on last year.

When is the next meeting that is open to the public for the town halls?

MS. HOFFMAN: We will start in January, just a couple of weeks away, in 2025 with stakeholder meetings again.

I just want you all to know that what you did or what you participated in -- if you did participate last year is

1 not lost. I have all that information and  
2 I have shared it with Myers and Stauffer  
3 so they have that in hand. I just want  
4 you to know that what you did work on was  
5 not a lost effort or time.

6 So January is your answer. We  
7 will start January.

8 MR. HUFFMAN: Okay. And then  
9 the last question I had, I'm so sorry --

10 MS. HOFFMAN: It's fine.

11 MR. HUFFMAN: -- is when it was  
12 Navigant a few years ago, I was on a board  
13 with Pam and I believe it was Alicia  
14 Clark. Do know if they are going to do  
15 those boards again as well?

16 MS. HOFFMAN: The advisory  
17 committee that they will develop in 2025,  
18 I am not sure about having a board.

19 They will probably have a core  
20 team and I am just guessing that is pretty  
21 much what we do now. We have stakeholder  
22 groups and then we have core team meetings  
23 and then we have an advisory that all of  
24 that will roll up to. So I am just  
25 guessing.

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. HUFFMAN: Okay. Thank you.

MS. HOFFMAN: And Crystal is offering information. Thank you, Crystal. "Access rule requirements for grievance process and procedures and we are working in regards to" -- oh, sorry.

MS. ADAMS: I was just giving additional information for something else.

MS. HOFFMAN: Yes. I'm sorry. You just sent that to me directly. I was thinking it was the group. I apologize.

So I think I answered your question. I can bring it back to this meeting when we get start with those advisory workgroups, okay?

MR. HUFFMAN: Okay. Thank you.

MS. HOFFMAN: You are welcome.

MR. HARVEY: Any other questions in regards to that agenda item?

Okay. The next item up for discussion is an update regarding the waiting list for the waiver programs.

MS. HOFFMAN: Let's see. I am going to read what information I have here, which might be more than what 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

are asking for.

We have 13,409 total number of people on one or more waiting list. So we are trying to address the fact that folks are on multiple waivers when we are thinking about numbers -- or multiple waiting lists when thinking about numbers.

38.6 percent, 5,172 have a current allocation for a waiver; HCBS, the waiting list is 2,449. Let's see. There is about 270 -- 269 of those are on one or more list.

Michelle P. is 9,281 and 1,296 of those are on other waiting lists as well. When we think about the numbers, they are extravagant and they are large, and I understand that, but we do have many people who are duplicated because they are on multiple waiting lists. We have been trying to get a grasp on exactly how many are on.

SCL is 3,525 and 1,053 of those are on other waiting lists.

I think that is it. And that is all the waiting lists we have right now;



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

SCL, Michelle P., and HCB.

MR. HARVEY: Are any of the SCL waiting list people, are they in the emergency category?

MS. HOFFMAN: Let's see. I don't believe so because we were able to allocate --

MS. ADAMS: No.

MS. HOFFMAN: Thank you. We were able to allocate the 2025 slots that were allocated by the General Assembly and I think we have been utilizing that, and I think they may -- Crystal?

MS. ADAMS: We have been allocating from the urgent waiting list as well, so we currently have some folks still listed as on the waiting list, but these are people who are working to get the documentation, updated records and things submitted for allocation and are in the process of being allocated.

So those are largely our future planning folks only.

MS. STAED: Crystal, 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

clarify, we do still have reserved  
emergency slots though?

MS. ADAMS: Yes.

MS. STAED: If there is an  
emergency.

MS. ADAMS: Yes, the additional  
slots that we received over and above,  
that amount is what was utilized to pull  
folks from our urgent list.

MR. HARVEY: I see Frankie has  
his hand up again. Frankie?

MR. HUFFMAN: I do have one  
question regarding SCL. We might be  
talking about that at a later time, I'm  
not sure. But I have been getting calls  
from people asking me about the SCL. It  
used to be when I got on it a few years  
ago, it was based on -- they would assist  
you to see what your IQ was and it used to  
be based on that.

People keep asking me if it is  
still based on your IQ when you first get  
on it or if it is based on the disability  
now?

MS. ADAMS: So, there are a few

1 different steps. The first step is to  
2 determine if you need that target  
3 population for eligibility, and that is  
4 where we are looking at that IQ and  
5 adaptive sores and diagnosis initially  
6 that you're talking about. And once a  
7 person receives that allocation, they go  
8 through a level of care review process  
9 where they look at that same information,  
10 but also some additional information to  
11 determine if that person means ICF level  
12 of care in order to get services. But  
13 those are the two criteria that we look  
14 at.

15 As far as determining if they  
16 meet emergency criteria, that is where you  
17 look at the person's current living  
18 situation, support needs, et cetera but  
19 that is a separate step for just the  
20 eligibility.

21 For the eligibility piece, it is  
22 still based on the IQ and adaptive  
23 assessment and the diagnosis that you  
24 thought. That has not changed.

25 MR. HUFFMAN: 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

MR. HARVEY: Johnny, you have your hand up?

MR. CALLEBS: Yeah, thanks Wayne.

I just wanted to point out that even with the additional funding for waiver slots, the waiting list still keeps climbing and I know that the slots have been allocated and people are accessing services, and I also understand that a person may be on more than one waitlist. But even still, even in just the past few weeks, the total number of people on waitlists has climbed 175 people almost.

And I am not criticizing anyone on this call, it is just a matter of funding and provider capacity and a number of factors. I just wanted to point out that despite all of the efforts and the additional funding, people are still desperate for services and the waiting list keeps climbing.

I did want to ask one thing, maybe for Leslie or Crystal. All of the recent allocations -- waiver funding

1 allocations that were made, have those  
2 people been able to access services, or is  
3 there anyone waiting or still trying to  
4 find services even though they have waiver  
5 funding and can't find the services they  
6 need, or does anyone have that  
7 information?

8 MS. ADAMS: As far as the  
9 individuals who have been allocated, we  
10 would have to look at the data to see the  
11 status of all of those individuals and  
12 where they are in the process from the  
13 time of allocation to that.

14 I could not say right off that  
15 everything single one of those are exact  
16 numbers that were allocated. They have  
17 been allocated, but we would have to  
18 specifically pull for their group. We  
19 know we do have individuals who have been  
20 allocated who have not yet accessed  
21 services, but as far as that particular  
22 group of people, we would have to look at  
23 that data to be able to say for sure where  
24 they are.

25 MR. CALLEBS: Okay. 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

MR. HARVEY: Frankie?

MR. HUFFMAN: I'm so sorry. I wanted to ask one more question regarding the waiver slots.

I know years ago, I think it was before Commissioner Lee, it was Commissioner Anderson, she had talked about right before they contracted with Navigant, instead of doing Michelle P., SCL, and HCB, to do a super waiver based on everybody's needs. Are they still thinking about doing that?

MS. HOFFMAN: Currently, what we have been approved for is that children's waiver, so we do have the funds to work on that, which may help with some of the slots or folks who are on the waiting list children-wise.

I was just going to mention, too, we did get -- you all are aware of this -- we did get 650 slots, I believe, for state fiscal year '25. I know this is a drop in the bucket when you look at the total numbers, I understand that. But we did get 1,275 for state fiscal year '26.

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 we are asking for CMS's approval to release those ASAP. We have already turned that in to DMS.

Can I share my screen really quick?

Thank you, Erin.

I'm sorry I am rushing, but I have to take off in a minute and Alicia will take over. Can you see my screen there? Can you see my screen okay?

You will see new slots in state fiscal year 2025 and new slots in state fiscal year 2026. So these are the ones that the General Assembly allotted us to include.

Of course, we have to get CMS approval just because the legislature says we can add slots, doesn't mean that CMS will allow us always, especially if you are in a situation where you might be out of compliance or something, but that is not our situation. So we have already asked CMS if we can allot these slots for '26. I tried to get ahead of it just a tad.

1 MS. TYNER-WILSON: Yeah, that is  
2 wonderful.

3 MS. HOFFMAN: I know it is just  
4 a drop in the bucket, guys. I understand  
5 that.

6 Are there any other questions?  
7 Go ahead.

8 MS. TYNER-WILSON: This is  
9 Melanie. Do those numbers also include --  
10 I know that the kids that are out of home  
11 care or foster adoption, there is kind of  
12 a separate pot, if you will, of waiver  
13 allocations. Do the numbers that you have  
14 shared today, do they represent that group  
15 as well?

16 MS. ADAMS: Yes.

17 MS. TYNER-WILSON: Thank you.

18 MS. HOFFMAN: And there is also  
19 Money Follows the Person slots embedded.

20 MS. ADAMS: Yes. It includes  
21 all of those.

22 MR. HARVEY: Any other  
23 questions?

24 MS. PIERCE: This is Ann. I  
25 have a question.



1 I wondered, Crystal, will you be  
2 getting that information that Johnny is  
3 asking for and report back next time?

4 MS. ADAMS: I will work with  
5 Medicaid on the data, yes.

6 MS. PIERCE: Okay. Thank you.

7 MR. HARVEY: Any other  
8 questions?

9 The next agenda is: Ombudsman  
10 for adults with IDD living in community  
11 homes. I think this is one from Melanie.

12 Melanie, do you want to clarify  
13 what you are asking specifically there?

14 MS. TYNER-WILSON: Right. This  
15 information was shared with me that there  
16 was no specific ombudsman person that  
17 somebody could reach out to for adults  
18 living in community homes, and I just  
19 wanted to find out if there is an office  
20 that we need to be getting in contact with  
21 or a specific person?

22 MS. HOFFMAN: I put two items in  
23 the chat --

24 MS. ADAMS: They only came to  
25 me.

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. HOFFMAN: Oh, I'm sorry.

MS. ADAMS: It defaulted to the last thing we sent.

MS. HOFFMAN: That's my fault. Sorry.

MS. ADAMS: It's all my fault.

MS. HOFFMAN: Hang on. I am getting it.

So you have PNA, and there is an intake line, and I have worked with PNA over the years hundreds of times with folks with disabilities. And then ombudsman office is not specific to this population, however, they do cover this population.

If you all have ever met Sherry Culp, she is a wonderful person and very passionate about what she does. I have put PNA in the chat as well as the ombudsman Cheri Culp, and she is the long-term care ombudsman.

MS. STAED: And I did just want to add that by regulation all providers are required to have a complaint and dispute process. That process is DIDD to

1 make sure that they have it, every year  
2 doing those reviews and that information  
3 is distributed to the individuals every  
4 provider supports so providers will also  
5 have that own process and information  
6 available too. And if you have a loved  
7 one that is being served, then you can  
8 request that information.

9 MS. PIERCE: This is Ann. Can I  
10 speak?

11 MR. HARVEY: Sure. Go ahead.

12 MS. PIERCE: Thank you.

13 I appreciate your all's  
14 comments, but I have to tell you that  
15 everything you just said is ineffective.  
16 You get bounced around -- and this  
17 question actually came from me. It is a  
18 problem.

19 The long-term care ombudsman  
20 will not represent my daughter. She  
21 bounces me off to CHFS Listens and when I  
22 go to CHFS Listens, I get bounced back to  
23 the long-term care ombudsman who tells me  
24 that she doesn't represent people -- only  
25 nursing homes -- not people in long-term

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

care like community homes on a waiver.

PNA, if you cannot communicate, they won't represent you also, plus they are so overworked, but they only do self-advocates so neither of those are effective.

And what was the third thing? What did you call it, Amy? Every provider has a complaint system? That is also ineffective.

So they need to have -- and deserve to have an ombudsman just for them, since the long-term care is not doing it. How do we make that happen?

MR. HARVEY: Well, I don't think we can create new offices in government.

MS. PIERCE: Do we have to go to the legislature for that?

MR. HARVEY: Well, that is not what this committee is for.

MS. PIERCE: I am asking you all for your opinion, because they need an ombudsman. People with IDD who cannot communicate need an ombudsman also.

So I don't know -- who do 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

think we should approach about that?

MR. HARVEY: I think you may have some issues specific to your daughter that you may need to take up with people that work with the cabinet, if you are having issues with regards to different grievances or complaints that you may have or that your daughter may have.

To say that there is not representation for people, I mean, I don't know that this committee can agree with that. Every provider in the waiver program is required to have a grievance and appeals process. There's other means beyond those grievance and appeals process that people can access. That is the direction that I would point you in.

MS. PIERCE: Well, it is not just me. I just used myself as an example because I shouldn't be talking about other people, but there is people on a Medicaid waiver who need an ombudsman and don't have access to one.

So that seems like an issue for this committee to me, because this is a

1 need for people with IDD. So I guess --

2 MR. HARVEY: I think Leslie  
3 shared the information in regards to the  
4 long-term care ombudsman.

5 MS. PIERCE: Yes, and I can  
6 repeat what I said, but those things she  
7 shared are not --

8 (Reading)

9 "We do have a grievance..."

10 MS. BICKERS: Ann, this is Erin  
11 with Medicaid.

12 MS. PIERCE: Erin, thank you.

13 MS. BICKERS: If you would like  
14 to email me some of those issues, I can  
15 ask around and see who can possibly  
16 address some of those for you.

17 MS. PIERCE: Thank you, Erin. I  
18 appreciate it as we need to move on. I  
19 think the next agenda item is going to be  
20 related also.

21 MR. HARVEY: Are these your  
22 items, Ann, because I got them from  
23 Melanie?

24 MS. PIERCE: Yes, they are.  
25 Yes, they came from Melanie.

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. HARVEY: In the future, if you want to present items, then you need to present those directly to me as the chair --

MS. PIERCE: Yes, sir.

MR. HARVEY: -- so that I know who to address in the meeting for those particular items.

MS. PIERCE: I certainly will. Thank you.

MR. HARVEY: Go ahead if this is your item. Go ahead.

MS. PIERCE: It speaks for itself. There is no legal representation either for people with IDD in community homes.

MS. BICKERS: Frankie, did you have a question about the previous -- I'm sorry, I just saw that your hand was raised.

MR. HUFFMAN: That's okay. I apologize. I am not very good with names. I just have a really quick comment on what she was saying.

Is there a way that I can get

1 her contact information to find out a  
2 little bit more of what she is talking  
3 about?

4 MS. PIERCE: I would love to  
5 speak with you, Frank.

6 MR. HUFFMAN: Okay. Thank you.

7 MS. BICKERS: I can share your  
8 all contact information with each other  
9 after the meeting, if you would like. As  
10 long as it is not TAC related business,  
11 you can speak independently.

12 MS. PIERCE: Thank you. Thank  
13 you so much.

14 MR. HUFFMAN: Okay. Thank you.

15 MS. HOFFMAN: Since I have to go  
16 here any minute, can I run through the  
17 next couple of items, if that is okay?  
18 And then I'll leave the last one or two  
19 for Alicia. Is that okay?

20 MR. HARVEY: Sure. Go ahead.

21 MS. HOFFMAN: I know that folks  
22 have been worried about the election and  
23 what changes might come, and what does  
24 that mean for Kentucky, and what does it  
25 mean federally, and what does that mean



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

for waivers, and CMS, and nationally and, things like that?

So I have been through changes like this before. Usually, it doesn't mean a yes or no, it is just a delay. And I am just going to be honest with you.

It's not that they are going to say no to anything that we are working on federally, it is not that they are going to say yes. It is just that they have to understand it.

Usually, sometime around the 20th of January, the inauguration, CMS usually gets an email that says halt a lot of the approvals until the new team has time to take a look at it and make decisions. Again, it is not that they are going to say no.

So I know that that is probably worrisome for folks, but we don't have any information now other than our previous history. Nobody has said anything about any changes for states. We just know that in the past it has delayed time.

We have been in contact with

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

several CMS groups, whether it be the 1915(c), the 1915(i), the 1115 waivers, all of those things that we are working on, and they are working desperately to get things done over the holidays.

That is kind of where we are. Nothing other than us discussing it and starting to gather some information, too, about what we have pending at CMS.

Commissioner Lee has started to gather all of the state plan amendments we have pending, the 1115s, the waivers we have pending with CMS and gathering that all into one document.

Erin, I think you were part of that. She had state plan amendments, she has waivers, multiple types of waivers, and just the information and anything that we might have pending at CMS.

I just wanted to let you all know that. We don't have any more information other than that right now.

I'm just going to keep moving and then we can go back. The current status of the PDS cap from CMS is still

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

unofficial. We are still working with them and we are meeting with them on a regular basis, so I will have more to come on that fairly soon, just not today. I don't expect to get anything formally in 2024 for sure, because we are working with them.

The status of the six waiver applications and updates and anticipated timelines, I talked about that earlier. We are currently, right now, answering questions, requests for information back to CMS.

Our last submission was all six waiver questions went back to CMS on 11/25, which was a pretty good feat to get all of that done in one night. We anticipate the rates would be proved effective January 1, 2025.

We do have some things that we have to watch over if you've heard us talk about the ARPA funds. We have to make sure on some changes and modifications in the future, we have to ensure that all ARPA funds are exhausted before we can

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 some changes.

We are expecting those ARPA funds to be exhausted at the end of this year or the first quarter of next year, and whether they are exhausted by the first quarter of next year or not, CMS will only allow us to go into March. That is it. That is how long that you can access those additional ARPA funds.

The projected timelines for regulations, I have already talked to you all about that. We are working as hard as we can, working on the regulations now and working with the secretary's office to what that will look like in the future. And that is for all six waivers.

This was previous. The ICF IID information. I've got how many individuals in Kentucky ICFs, how many have been in the last 15 years, 20 years, and 40-plus years.

I've got member count is 194, 15 years and less, 47 are greater than 15 years, and 128 are greater than 20, and 82 of that total count have been there for 40

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 greater.

And I think that that is all of the information that I have to give you today. Is there anything else I can help with really quick?

MR. HARVEY: Any other questions for Leslie?

Johnny, go ahead.

MR. CALLEBS: Hi, thank you.

Leslie, do you know if the people who live in ICFs and/or are stuck in limbo in a state psychiatric hospital, do those people have access to slots if they want to leave?

MS. ADAMS: I can answer that. So those individuals meet emergency criteria for SCL allocations. They fall under that category.

Generally, as far as the state ICF, it's different with the private ICF folks who aren't necessarily there under the least restrictive option, but when they are identified as being ready to transition, they have a transition process at the ICF where they work to identify

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

providers.

Staff from DIDD attends all of their monthly meetings and is involved with that process to transition. And when they feel that they have gotten to a point where they are close to discharge, then they just send us the emergency request and the allocation.

Hospital, it is a little bit of a faster moving process ideally, because it is an acute setting, but it is the same kind of situation. If they identify somebody who needs it, they will submit the application or work with the CMHC to get that application in, and when they feel that they are ready to pull that trigger to actually get the allocation that they feel that they are close to being able to having those lined up, then they will let us know and we will process that allocation. But they do meet that emergency criteria and have access to those slots.

MR. CALLEBS: And one follow-up, if I may. The people who are ready 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

transition out or want to, I have heard reports that the person and their team or guardian would like to the person to leave, but they just cannot find a provider willing or able to provide the needed support for the person.

So in effect they are stuck in an institutional setting for lack of provider. The funding is there, the desire to leave is there, and they just cannot get a provider who is able or willing to say yes to trying to support them.

Can you comment on that, or how prevalent is that problem? Is there anything that can be done to assist providers?

MS. ADAMS: Yeah. There are multiple levels of things that are impacting that. Staffing issues, just higher acuity of individuals, so we are looking at it from a variety of different angles of what is needed, but what we're doing on the individual level.

Like I said, our staff is

1 involved both with our hospitals and our  
2 ICF facilities. We meet regularly with  
3 those teams to work through the individual  
4 cases and so when we come across  
5 individuals that traditional referral  
6 process isn't working for, we just try to  
7 attack that individually and look at what  
8 those barriers are, and do whatever we can  
9 to put things in place to get them to that  
10 point where they can be allocated.

11 It moves slower, I think, at  
12 times than it used to, but I would say  
13 that most people aren't necessarily stuck.  
14 It is just not as quick as we would like  
15 it in the past.

16 Ultimately, with most folks we  
17 are able to identify providers and put  
18 things in place that we are able to  
19 transition out and we just continue to work  
20 with individuals who are not seeing that  
21 progress regularly and continuously until  
22 we can get them there.

23 MR. CALLEBS: Okay. Thank you.

24 MR. HARVEY: Any other questions  
25 while we still have Crystal with us?



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

Leslie had to go ahead and leave for her 1 o'clock meeting, and we certainly appreciate all of the information she shared during the meeting.

MS. STAED: Wayne, I had a question and a comment.

MR. HARVEY: Sure. Go ahead.

MS. STAED: Crystal, you may not know this, because I don't know if you put that data together. That data is only state ICFs, or is it the privates too?

MS. ADAMS: My assumption is that it is including the two private ICF data, because they all do bill Medicaid, so that is where the information comes from.

I don't believe it is just specific to ours, which is why I was putting that caveat in there, because they don't necessarily have the same stringent requirements for least restrictive that we do.

MS. STAED: Sure. And then my comment would be -- and this situation predates me, so I may be misspeaking 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

it. Wayne can jump in and correct me if I'm wrong.

But back in the day, there was the tiered transition rate for individuals coming out of institutional settings into the community setting, and it was available for a certain period of time for a provider who was accepting and could transition individuals into the community-based setting.

It may be worth exploring the possibility of that if we're having -- obviously you can't make this decision today -- but just to put a pin in it, it may be worth exploring that system again to see if that can help get individuals transitioned out of the institutional settings.

MR. HARVEY: Yeah, Amy --

MS. ADAMS: That has certainly been brought to us and that is one of the items on the list to considered that we didn't have previously for a few years.

We do now have Money Follows the Person, the ten slots for that, which is a

1 recent comeback. That is not exactly what  
2 you are referring to, but that is one of  
3 the things that existed in the past that  
4 had gone away for awhile.

5 MR. HARVEY: Yeah, I think some  
6 of the funding that Amy was referring to  
7 was when they had that big push to get a  
8 lot of folks out of Oakwood and into the  
9 community, and place them all around the  
10 state and so forth. I remember exactly  
11 what she was talking about.

12 Any other questions for Crystal?  
13 Okay.

14 Do we have any other questions  
15 in regards to closing discussion?

16 MS. GRIBBINS: Wayne, this is  
17 Myra.

18 I do have one question for  
19 Crystal and an overall question for  
20 someone who is trying to get the SCL  
21 emergency. If we cannot find  
22 documentation from a school where someone  
23 was in special ed prior to the age of 18  
24 or 21, is there another option for trying  
25 to get that information? Because some

1           folks we have -- of course, they were in  
2           school even before we had the American  
3           Disabilities Act and things like that.

4                   MS. ADAMS: Yeah, if you can  
5           email me -- just email me about those  
6           because there can be a variety of  
7           different options depending on the  
8           individual case of what might be  
9           available. But if you want to drop me an  
10          email we can kind of have a discussion  
11          about that and I can identify some of the  
12          different things that we can use, like  
13          social security records and things like  
14          that.

15                   MS. GRIBBINS: Okay. Thank you.

16                   MR. HARVEY: Any other question  
17          or anything else anybody wants to talk  
18          about during this meeting before we call  
19          an adjournment? Okay.

20                   Before we adjourn, I do want to  
21          thank Crystal and all of the cabinet  
22          representatives that spoke today. I know  
23          Leslie had to leave for a meeting and  
24          everything -- I see a hand up by Frankie.

25                   Frankie do you have a question?

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. HUFFMAN: Yes. Sorry. I just had a quick question.

I'd say it's hard -- a whole number of things that we have to do -- but last year sometime, I had sent an email to Commissioner Lee about something, but I haven't heard anything.

Does anybody know of another email I can send it to and it will most likely get to her?

MS. BICKERS: Frankie, this is Erin. You can send that email to me and I can pass it along to everybody who needs to help address it.

MR. HUFFMAN: Thank you.

MS. BICKERS: You're very welcome.

MR. HARVEY: Any other questions? I'm not see any other hands.

Do you Erin?

MS. BICKERS: I do not.

MR. HARVEY: Okay. Well, thank you for all of your help, Erin.

Merry Christmas to everybody.  
Hopefully everybody has a nice holiday

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

period and we will see everybody back at  
the next TAC meeting in February.

MS. BICKERS: Thank you  
everybody. Have a great day.

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, STEFANIE SWEET, Certified Verbatim Reporter and Registered CART Provider - Master, hereby certify that the foregoing record represents the original record of the Technical Advisory Committee meeting; the record is an accurate and complete recording of the proceeding; and a transcript of this record has been produced and delivered to the Department of Medicaid Services.

Dated this 5th day of December, 2024.

          /s/ Stefanie L. Sweet          

Stefanie L. Sweet, CVR, RCP-M