

## Final Rule Stakeholder Call

### Topic: The Provider Contact Form and the Self-Assessment Process

5/16 /2018

#### Noon call (63 participants on the line)

1. I had a question about how this self-assessment compares to the previous two self-assessments does, and if you have completed one or both of the previous two self-assessments do you need to complete the third?
  - a. **KDADS:** Yes, if you have completed any self-assessments prior to this one, you will need to complete the third. That is the issue that we have been mindful of. This is why we are trying to take as much time as necessary, to assure that this assessment gets all of the information that we need to demonstrate to CMS, that we have done a self-assessment that complies with what is required under the federal rule.
2. Did I understand WSU in saying that, during the field trial period they think that will take about a month (self-assessment field testing period), and then they will have the two (months) available after that?
  - a. **WSU:** Yes, that is what we are thinking. When we do the field testing, between contacting providers, and getting them set up, and getting them the information to do the assessment, that will take a little bit of time. In addition to that, allowing two to three weeks, we haven't really nailed down the exact number of days, but that will be open during the field testing portion. There will be approximately two-ish weeks to take the assessment. Our team needs at least a week to walk through and see what kind of changes. Hopefully not big changes. That gives us about a week to incorporate feedback from providers that say, "Hey this was really burdensome is there anything we can do to solve this?" Or, "Hey I was confused about this question." if we get a enough of those kinds of comments related to a specific question on the self-assessment or something related to an instruction that we need to clarify, these are the kinds of kinks we are trying to work out through the field testing phase. That altogether will take about a month once that has wrapped up then we will send out, once we've incorporated the changes, and make the assessment fully available to all HCBS providers.
3. Has there been any consideration of the cost of compliance with the settings rule? Is there a belief that these field tested self-assessments and or the site visits will occur after that, will that give the state a better understanding of the potential cost of compliance? Is there a plan to ask the legislature for additional monies to support compliance with the settings rule?
  - a. **KDADS:** Within my division I have not done any fiscal impact analysis in terms of the time and resources involved KDADS personnel, or the potential fiscal impact it will have on the provider world. My role and responsibility at this stage is to get the transition plan submitted and initially approved. That's why we are at the point we are at in terms of trying to get this self-assessment done in an approvable format. As far as any particular appropriation request, within my scope I am not involved in any of that and I am not aware of any focused effort in that regard. This is purely a mandate that comes without any additional funding for states or providers.

4. Is the draft of the transition plan that is on KDADS website the of the draft transition plan that is intended to be submitted or is it an older version of the transition plan?
  - a. **KDADS:** It is a much older version, we have done a good amount of work in consulting with CMS. We have technical assistance calls with them once a month. We're to the point where we will go through the plan that's out on the website from top to bottom and compare it with the next iteration of the plan. It will take into consideration all technical assistance that we've been given. Then we will be posting that version as soon as we get clear with CMS on all changes we're making in this iteration vs the last iteration which is the one on the website. There is also the question of how substantial, and are the changes substantial enough that we would have to put it back out for public comment as opposed to just saying, "Hey, we've got technical assistance, stakeholders we have this new version of the plan, go out and take a look." That process would be different than going through a formal public comment period. If we have enough substantial changes that we will have to go through that whole public comment period again. That's what we're trying to distinguish, how substantial are the changes and are they substantial enough to require a full public comment period, or can we just consider them technical assistance and just let stakeholders know that the plan's out there for them to take a look at? We don't really feel like any of the changes that we have made at this point are really substantial, we are hoping that they will be technical assistance in nature and we can just get the plan cleaned up, get some dates modified based upon changes we have made to our systemic assessment.

#### **Adjourn**

#### **Evening Call (10 participants on the line)**

1. No questions

#### **Adjourn**