
	
	<b>Meeting Topic:</b> Front Door Rules Stakeholder Group
	<b>Date:</b> July 28, 2008
	<b>Time:</b> 1:00pm – 3:00pm
	<b>Location:</b> Lazarus A501

<b>Meeting Attendees:</b>	Lauren Phelps, Jane Black, Diane Dietz, Michael Schroeder, Frank Fleischer, Beverly Laubert, Terry Watts, Elise Geig, Susan Marshall, Rebecca Sarchet, Teresa Lampl, Chris Murray, Berna Bell, Deborah Clayton, Sara Sherman
<b>Purpose of Meeting:</b>	Front Door Rules Stakeholder Group

## AGENDA ITEMS:

Time	Topic	Discussion Lead
5 minutes	Welcome & Announcements	Lauren Phelps
10 minutes	Review of revised draft timeline	Lauren Phelps
5 minutes	Review of revised draft PAS rule	Lauren Phelps
90 minutes	Review of draft Resident Review (RR) rule	Lauren Phelps
10 minutes	Action Items/Next Steps	Lauren Phelps
Adjourn		

**Next Meeting:** Monday, August 25, 2008 from 1:00 – 3:00p.m.

	
	<b>Meeting Topic:</b> Front Door Rules Stakeholder Group
	<b>Date:</b> July 28, 2008
	<b>Time:</b> 1:00pm – 3:00pm
	<b>Location:</b> Lazarus A501

## MEETING NOTES:

### Revised Draft Timeline:

Lauren distributed a revised draft timeline for the workgroup’s review. The table attempts to delineate subject matter/topics for future discussion dates. Lauren stated that the topics may be moved to different meeting dates depending on how quickly (or slowly) various agenda items are discussed. In addition, some meetings may need to be extended in order to allow for adequate discussion. Members will receive agendas prior to each meeting. The draft timeline estimates that the rules could be filed through the JCARR process by the end of the calendar year (CY) with an anticipated effective date at the end of the first quarter of CY 2009. Lauren stated the various departmental rules would be filed as a package so they all go through the process concurrently.

### Review of New “Definitions” Rule:

Lauren distributed a revised version of the PAS rule and a newly proposed “definitions” rule. Lauren walked the workgroup through the definitions rule first. Most of the definitions had been reviewed and discussed during the collective group review of the PAS rule. There were several definitions moved from the Resident Review (RR) rule. However, there were not substantive changes proposed to those 3-4 definitions.


Lauren will check the ODMH and ODMRDD PASRR rules to assure that any additional definitions currently included in those rules are pulled into this overarching new definitions rule as well.

Stakeholders asked if a decision had been made on the definition of convalescent stay. It was noted that language contained in the other PASRR rules could be impacted by the decision whether or not to allow the convalescent exemption for individuals coming from psychiatric hospitals or units. Lauren stated that several options were on the table as noted in the rule but that a decision had not yet been made.

Rebecca stated that the PAAs would like for the timeframe in the “current diagnosis” definition to be extended to 180 days.

Lauren stated she was checking with other Medicaid staff to ensure that the “Nursing Facility” definition and certification/licensure terms were written appropriately.

Under Readmission, it was requested that the last clause be removed since individuals are not “readmitted” to the PASSPORT waiver. Therefore, the following text will be deleted: “...or

	
	<b>Meeting Topic:</b> Front Door Rules Stakeholder Group
	<b>Date:</b> July 28, 2008
	<b>Time:</b> 1:00pm – 3:00pm
	<b>Location:</b> Lazarus A501

PASSPORT HCBS waiver services are resumed.”

Although there were no proposed changes to the “Significant Change of Condition” term, there was an inquiry around when the NF should initiate the Resident Review; upon a change for the worse or better. Lauren replied that it should be either.

Lauren noted that the definition for Usual Living Arrangement would need further discussion. The concept/term is related to issues surrounding the need for a safe and orderly discharge. This item will be placed in the “parking lot” for future discussion.

**Review of Revised PAS Rule:**

Lauren walked the workgroup through the revised PAS rule: noting changes, comments and items needing further follow-up.

Lauren stated that language in (B)(1)(b) regarding not assigning an effective date earlier than the date the PAS/ID determination was made was deleted based upon 7/14/08 comments. However, per federal regulations screenings are to occur prior to admission. Diane stated that according to her members, backdating happens (it varies by region). It is usually related to weekend hospital discharges. She asked if there was a way to expedite the process (Level 1). Rebecca stated that PAAs have weekend hours (until midnight Saturday). She also stated that the hospitals should be sending the PASRR information to the PAAs for the Level 1 screen. The PAAs then reply to the hospital and the hospital should notify the NF if admission is considered appropriate. The process usually takes 24 hours or less. This could be a training issue. Diane is going to follow-up with her members to obtain more information.

Under (D)(7) Susan & Rebecca stated that the PAAs would like the timeframe changed to 180 days.


**Review of Draft Resident Review (RR) Rule:**

Lauren walked the workgroup through the revised rule.

It was noted that text in (B)(2) should be revised to read PASSPORT instead of PASRR.

A workgroup member asked what the language in (B)(3) (deleted) was referencing; state staff clarified it was referencing new admissions.

Deborah Clayton suggested merging the language/paragraphs in sections (B) and (C)(1)

	
	<b>Meeting Topic:</b> Front Door Rules Stakeholder Group
	<b>Date:</b> July 28, 2008
	<b>Time:</b> 1:00pm – 3:00pm
	<b>Location:</b> Lazarus A501

pertaining to RR/ID criteria and requirements. Workgroup members supported this suggestion.

In (C)(1)(a) Diane asked if the RR/ID request should be submitted sooner than 29 days following the date of the exemption. Mike clarified that it should be as soon as the NF believes the individual will remain but not longer than 29 days after the PAS/ID exemption. The workgroup agreed that this timeframe/language may need to change/depend on the convalescent stay definition decision. This language will be “flagged” for future reference.

In (C)(1)(b) Lauren will change “transfer to readmission” to “transfer or readmission” in the last line.

In (C)(1)(c) regarding significant change of condition, Deborah Clayton asked why the timeframe was 72 hours. Michael Schroeder stated this entire section attempted to clarify timeframes. Lauren stated she would check her prior notes. This also led into a discussion of significant change of condition. Deborah Clayton asked why one would care if an individual became sicker. Michael Schroeder stated because it could mean that an individual who did not previously need specialized services may now require them. And conversely, if they get better/improve the departments would want to identify them to help them leave the NF.


In (C)(5)(d) Lauren will delete the extra “review” at the end of the line.

Language in (C)(5)(e) lead to discussion around “indications” of MRDD versus CBMDD eligibility. The text was added to address ODMRDD “rule outs”. Jane Black suggested that the text in question be taken back to the smaller interagency workgroup for review.

Michael suggested revising the text “either or both” in the first line of (C)(6)(b) since the paragraph was not intended to address only dual-eligibles.

Workgroup members suggested changing “PASRR/SMI, PASRR/MRDD and PASRR” in (C)(6)(b)(ii) to read simply RR/SMI, RR/MRDD and RR.

For section (C)(6)(b)(iii) regarding transfers, Rebecca and Susan asked that we reference the necessary discharge language/requirements. Michael stated he had concerns about this since ODJFS, ODMH and ODMRDD do not have authority over those requirements, ODH does. Bev Laubert provided the ORC citation of 3721.16. Michael suggested adding language that states something like, “nothing in this rule shall mitigate the requirements as specified in XXXX”.

	
	<b>Meeting Topic:</b> Front Door Rules Stakeholder Group
	<b>Date:</b> July 28, 2008
	<b>Time:</b> 1:00pm – 3:00pm
	<b>Location:</b> Lazarus A501

Deborah Clayton asked why transfers were not just treated like a PAS since already in process. Michael stated they are the same thing (PAS and RR) they just occur at different times. Members asked how long a RR usually took to complete. Terry Watts stated that usually they could be completed within 5 working days but occasionally took longer.

In (C)(6)(c)(ii) and (iii) Chris Murray had questions/concerns about the language: Once section talks about providing hearing rights if a person is determined not to supply necessary paperwork and the following states they cannot be retained by the NF. However, if a person files an appeal payment would not stop and a person would not need to be discharged immediately. Lauren stated she would revise the language.

In (G)(3)(a) Diane asked what the language “initiate procedures to terminate” meant. Michael stated they simply meant to notify necessary parties that NF services were not appropriate and payment would be stopped.

**Next Steps:**

- Lauren to update the rules based upon meeting discussion.
- Lauren to delineate “parking lot” issues needing further discussion
- Lauren to send agenda for next meeting