



**MINUTES**  
**Rate Structure Work Group Meeting**  
**Friday, 10/8/21 from 10:00AM - 12:00PM**  
**Held via: Zoom Webinar**

**Attendance:** Cynthia Mahar, Shelley Kelleher, Sudip Adhikari, Matthew Cordaro, Erin Hall, Jonathan Routhier, Ellen McCahon, Jeremiah Donovan, Kim Shottes, Kara Nickulas, Larry Linden, Sandy Hunt, Jennifer Doig, Jessica Gorton, Drew Smith, Ozzie Chung. *Note: Members of the public who joined as attendees in listen-only mode are not included in this list.*

*Please reference the corresponding slide presentation for the detailed agenda, including topics and themes covered in the meeting and corresponding takeaways and applicable action items.*

Major Topics and Themes	Key Discussion Areas
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Introductions and Ground Rules</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A member expressed hope that stakeholder input would be bidirectional, that the rate methodology would be sensible, etc.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Planning for Change</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A member wanted the group to consider how the change moves the state closer to the vision of supporting the mission of developmental services.</li> <li>• A member wanted the group to be aware of operational impact of change.</li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Rate Discussion</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A member expressed concern about stakeholder input into the A&amp;M recommendations in the context of working with a rate vendor selected from the rate RFP process, and about the proposed two-waiver system. Later, the member expressed concern regarding the degree of transparency in the rate work group structure.             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ BDS responded that questions about the rate RFP should be directed to the bidders' conference or the email address outlined in the RFP.</li> <li>○ A&amp;M responded that the review process was informed by claims and assessment data examining current levels of support and access to services.</li> <li>○ BDS responded that the work groups exist to help build the implementation plan for the recommendations.</li> <li>○ BDS responded that the work along building out a rate had been happening for multiple years as part of the conflict of interest corrective action plan mandated by CMS in 2018, and that the work was transparent.</li> <li>○ BDS responded that the rate work would help the State comply with CMS, and that the recommendations in the A&amp;M report are in alignment with the requirements from CMS and the State was headed in this direction of system change.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• There was additional follow-up discussion between the member and the State/A&amp;M regarding the extent to which stakeholders are able to direct and influence past and future program decisions.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>A member asked whether the rate development is tied to the final waiver structure.</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ BDS responded that the waiver and rate groups would overlap in work. BDS responded that it was uncertain, at this point, to what extent the two structures would overlap.</li> <li>○ A&amp;M responded that the waiver and rate work groups have been started at the same time to account for the relationships between waiver structure and rate structure.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <b>A member asked if the rate work group was influencing methodology or rates.</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ A&amp;M responded that the rate vendor would introduce a methodology tied to proposed rates that the State would then react to (and not necessarily take as proposed).</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <b>A member asked whether the rate vendor would be operating under an accepted methodology or whether there was flexibility in offering alternative methodologies.</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ A&amp;M responded that the State would be open to other methodologies, but that from its experience CMS was directionally interested in a transparency and adaptability of a methodology like the brick methodology.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <b>A member asked about flexibilities considering other rate methodologies.</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ A&amp;M stated that there was an interest in the brick methodology but also an interest in learning more.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• <b>A member noted there was a lack of savings to changing rates, and asked about whether there was an understanding that, in changing rates, additional money would need to be invested in the rate process and in the system.</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ A&amp;M responded that any projection of savings would be subject to many decisions that will be made along the path of system change.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Assignment and Next Steps</b></li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Please refer to the corresponding work group PPT for details on assignments (if any) and next steps.</i></li> </ul>