

## Participant Directed Programs Policy Collaborative Meeting

July 22, 2020

### Approved at the August 2020 Meeting

The meeting was called to order at 1:00 PM

Attendance and voting rights were dealt with.

June minutes: There were no changes and the draft minutes were approved.

#### **Open Forum #1:**

No comments

#### **Department Update – Erin Thatcher:**

- a) We had discussed moving this to Google meets. They have researched and looked at pros and cons and this will begin in August. There are a few changes. They will no longer use this call in number, there will be another call in number. There is also a google meets app. You can also join by phone and web.
- b) HCPF will be convening a background check workgroup—what the FMS process is, board of nursing checks, making it better. They will be sending information shortly and if you want to participate but have not told us let John know so you can get on the list.
- c) Jessica-manager with participant direction. The survey results of the FMS area has been provided to the group and we will discuss more deeply in August. People should identify any questions or topics for discussion and prepare for next month
- d) Erin: Rate Changes:
  - The JBC approved a 1% decrease for all services including CDASS. This has not been done for many years and they are working on communication and work flow process. Provider agency decreases went into effect July 01 but because CDASS is complicated. Ours will be effective 10/1/2020. They are working with case management, FMS, and an operational member was published yesterday. They want all systems ready by 9/1 and notification sent out mid-September so people can figure out allocation. Katie is lead.
    - a. Question: Rates of what? All CDASS services. Health maintenance, personal care, homemaker. Also the SLS services.
    - b. Question: Does this mean our attendants are paid less? Not necessarily – employer has to decide how to make this work. Employers can choose to decrease wage but do not have to do so.
    - c. Question: Is the decrease implemented 10/1 going back to 7/1—no.
    - d. Question: If there was verbal approval of allocation is that in place June 01- now? Is this from October-following October or is there a different timeline? As long as there is no change in hours this will not change amount or category but there will be 1% decrease in rate forward. This stays in effect until the legislature makes a change.

### **Eligibility Discussion – Jennifer VanCleave:**

They are still in a holding pattern and have not gotten an end date for the public health emergency. They are working with their federal partners. She opened up for questions:

Question: How is an inheritance dealt with? If someone receives notice they need to notify their eligibility site. It is income in the month it comes in and assets after that time. The changes can be reported through any method by which you can submit an application. It can be calling the county, PEAK, etc.

Question: Why are people getting letters saying their benefits are set to end and is there any insight as to why that might be happening? CCDC is advising appealing to protect these but there does not seem to be a rhyme or reason. Answer: She is going to ask the systems team to see if there are any known issues or help desk tickets.

Question: Person did all redetermination which was due in April. She sent it in certified on March 9<sup>th</sup> and then everything stopped. Does this mean the person will have to do this over in January and was the information kept or not. Answer: Counties are still working eligibility documents as they come in and HCPF is encouraging people do to recertification because the system will recognize that and set your determination for a year out. It is very important to do redeterminations as they come so it is not chaos when the public health emergency ends. They should not have trashed it as they are required to retain documentation for several years after eligibility ends. Jennifer is willing to check on her specific case if the person reaches out to John.

Linda: People who have an asset concern might want to explore a Medicaid trust.

### **Case Management Transition:**

Victor Robinson was on the agenda to talk about case management but apparently was not working today and was not on the call. Gerrie said she was frustrated that he neither showed up nor let anyone know about it and asked that this be conveyed to him.

Corrine said that she applauds Erin for how she is managing the meeting.

Fortunately, the HCPF Folks were able to get a quick replacement: Michelle Topkoff presented on SEP transition: All of the transitions have gone through as of July 01. They are continuing regular meetings with receiving SEP agencies. There were 5 transitions total. So far, things have gone pretty smoothly. There have been some issues with systems access (case manager access to the BUS, etc.) They will meet with receiving agencies for at least 6 months. They will also do lessons learned meetings internally and with exiting and receiving SEPs to identify what went well and what could be better. This will be at the 3-6 month mark. Three of these changes were done as emergency due to the timeline so they did not get an RFP so they are working on the RFP to send out for the next year. They will have a 4 year period so they will be in line with the other contracts.

- Question: Michelle was thanked for stepping in at the last minute. She was asked to review the transition process and she did so.

- Question: People are having trouble reaching a case manager-what do people do if they need something specific to CDASS. This is a metro area issue. Someone is trying to get on CDASS and start the process –they started when it was Colorado Access and then fell apart. Answer: Rocky Mt Human Services has the landing page up so go through the website.
- Question: Were letters sent out by all SEPs? Answer: yes but that does not mean there are not lags. They should have sent letters from both SEPs but it would not have identified who the case manager would be.
- Question: Person got verbal only notice just saying allocation was approved, no number nothing in writing and could they help get follow through. John will give Michelle the info.

### **EVV – Lana Eggers:**

Moving forward coming close to state mandate on August 3—under 2 weeks away. There are some delays with FMS vendors and providers and working with them. In general presentation yesterday on the website there is information that will help agencies if they still have questions.

- Question: Attendants are getting notifications on EVV app asking if they are still working with a particular client and this is coming at all hours waking people up. Why is this happening and how does it stop? This is the PPL app. The FMS vendors use a provider of choice system. This is not collected by the state. Asked PPL to answer: PPL can send out push notifications which are reminders for pieces of submission. This is attendants logging hours or member needing to approve using the app. The ones are reminders that can be turned off –these may be if the person forgets to clock out. These individuals have clocked out.
- Question: Clients are having trouble connecting with FMS, they are not getting support from customer service lines. How to support the clients? Asked each FMS to provide info on training:
  - PPL: went live on 7/1 and underway and leading up to July they sent notification by physical mail and every email they had on file to all members, attendants and AR in general then sent to ARs. Offering training sessions and provided 67 training sessions. A few more to offer.
  - Acumen: Started training on 7/13 and sent info to all people on how to use EVV with schedule and they are scheduled through the end of August but will continue beyond if needed. Also helping case by case and over the phone.
  - PALCO: Weekly email blasts, working on getting everyone registered, mailing back in May, going live on 8/3 and will start making outreach calls if people need info. If people log in the first page will be reminder on where they can find additional information.
- Julie R said Julie from Montrose should reach out directly to people in Colorado and not use the call lines and customer service. She offered that clients or case managers could reach out to CCDC if they could not get through. Julie M. from Montrose said that was their experience

- Corrine asked if CCDC was a state sponsored coalition and Julie said no it is a completely separate private organization and independent advocacy.
- Commenter said that this transition with Acumen has made her dazed, confused and angry. It has been very frustrating working with Acumen. Acumen said they would reach out to hear more about concerns.
- Next week is member and caregiver subcommittee 7/28 10:30-noon. They want to hear from members or caregivers. 877-820-7831 Passcode is 869804
- She mentioned another listening session scheduled for the day after this meeting. They tried to revamp the website to make it easier to navigate.

Lana will be on maternity leave after this so another member of her staff will be attending:

## **Open Forum #2**

Cheryl Hargett Dorsett said she wanted to be part of the background check meeting. Jessica will send invitation and it will be over google meet.

Renee wanted information on task definitions and where they are located. This is the norms document and she could not find it. Alyson with Consumer Direct has those resources on their website and she can make sure Renee has them and can also provide any further information. Gerrie asked that they be sent

Anonymous Stakeholder Comment (read aloud by Erin Thatcher):

“Dear PDPPC Members,  
 During our meeting in May a stakeholder made a statement that made some other participants become upset, defensive, and even offended as it was directed towards PDPPC not having ethnically diverse members attending the group monthly. As some of you know PDPPC stakeholders have and continue to work on making this meeting as inclusive and supportive to all disabilities, ethnicities, cultures, diverse professions and with those that personally have a diverse background overall. Please continue your efforts to outreach others you feel would be able to represent a population we are unable to at this point as we’d love to hear their perspective and feedback, not just at PDPPC but at our subcommittees as well.  
 Please just be mindful when making comments like those, as this meeting should be a safe place for everyone and assumptions upon race, ethnicity, culture, and/or disability shouldn’t be made based off one’s appearance in a meeting or their voice over the phone. That being said, in the future please be mindful of thoughts that may make assumptions in which upset, or make our fellow stakeholders and colleagues become defensive. Thank you for time and your understanding.”

- Maria disagrees and would like a copy and would like to respond. Julie suggested it be in the minutes (*Editor's Note: See above*) and read at Open Forum or it could go to either the co-chairs or HCPF or talk to other people.
- This is a community and people can speak and be heard without having to agree on everything.
- Louise: Would like the person who submitted to clarify what they heard or what they thought was said so she can have a frame of reference.
- Corrine: She thinks this is a waste of time and this is inclusive and as a person of color she objects to bringing race and ethnicity into things. I have always felt included. This is my personal opinion. I think you all do a great job.
- If this warrants and agenda topic people can request this. People can submit a statement in writing or have it dictated over the phone it can be put in the minutes.

The meeting adjourned at 3:15 pm.

Notes taken by Julie Reiskin