Attendees

- **Provider Representatives:** Dan Cross, Brad Saathoff, Jennifer Gray, John Hackett, Julie Peterson, Kristin Kline, Mel Bertram, Nathan Stallinga, Pam Hanna, Sandra Lee, Shirley Halverson, Steve Watkins
- **State Representatives:** Alana Suiter, Barb Hemmelman, Jamie Morris, Jaze Sollars, Joey Younie, Julie Hand, Liliana Borcea, Sam Hynes
- **Guidehouse:** Andrew Vidikan, Dennis Finnegan, Jeff Moor, Poorna Suresh

Agenda

1. Welcome and Introductions
   *Meeting Discussion:*
   a. Provider representatives and State representatives introduced themselves
   b. Guidehouse team provided introduction and insights into experience with DD rate setting projects

2. Operating Guidelines and Goals
   *Meeting Discussion:*
   a. Reviewed DHS’s rate setting goals and provider representatives shared the following goals (not exhaustive):
      i. Identify appropriate wages and true costs for service delivery
      ii. Identify and address gaps in the current reimbursement model
      iii. Develop rates that account for additional supports (e.g., maintenance, transportation, administrative, etc.)
      iv. Provide rate structure that reflects the varying needs of participants and types of employment
      v. Account for workforce challenges (e.g., administrative burden on support staff)
      vi. Align intra-state and inter-waiver service and rate provisions
      vii. Develop a rate structure and methodology that is compliant with CMS requirements
   b. Discussed the Independent Rate-Build Up Approach
      i. Explore transitioning away from the current A3 model to an independent rate build-up approach
         - Some provider representatives expressed that providers are open to moving away from A3, depending on the new model, its effect on reimbursement, and administrative burden
         - State representative discussed how there are certain fundamental aspects of the A3 model that must be addressed for CMS compliance
      ii. Ability to develop individual factors that are reflective of provider costs and how services are delivered
         - Guidehouse provided additional insights into the ability to account for provider costs through a rate build up approach
         - Potential to account for certain elements of the A3 model in a new model that is CMS compliant
      iii. Reviewed the role of the workgroup in assisting with rate modeling processes

3. Work Plan and Timeline
   *Meeting Discussion:*
a. Discussed accelerated project timeline and the final report’s deadline of November 30, 2021
b. Annual Report will outline the Workgroup’s recommendations and decisions, and offer rationale for the final rate methodology

4. Next Steps
   Meeting Discussion:
   a. Rate Methodology Workgroup
      i. Provide subject matter expertise on survey development
      ii. Prepare stakeholders for provider survey
   b. Guidehouse
      i. Schedule monthly Rate Methodology Workgroup meetings
      ii. Work with Rate Methodology Workgroup on survey design
      iii. Conduct research of other states’ services and reimbursement methodologies

5. Questions and Answers