

Comments on Rule 22P014
1557-Reg-Revision-QA-FINAL-2022.pdf

Hello, please Excuse my last submission as I was attempting to copy and paste this document.

On behalf of stakeholders, my family member included, I'd like the committee to allow a comprehensive service system that allows contracted supports which are not available at any designated agencies to follow this law. Currently, ABA providers must operate at a fiscal loss when providing a contracted service under HCAR rule of \$30.11 cap. This is discriminatory in use of federal funding.

I'd appreciate a chance to discuss this issue further.

Thank you so much,

A parent of adult daughter with hcbs waiver

Submitted Electronically to:
Medicaid Policy Unit
AHS.MedicaidPolicy@vermont.gov

In re: GCR 22-029 to 22-033
Health Benefits Eligibility and Enrollment Rules Update

Dear Medicaid Policy Unit,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the proposed program changes to the Health Benefits Eligibility and Enrollment Rules.

The Office of the Health Care Advocate (HCA) and the Disability Law Project (DLP) at Vermont Legal Aid submit the following comments in response to the proposed HBEE changes:

Part Two:

Categorical Eligibility for Foster Children

The HCA and the DLP support the proposed changes in Rule 9.03(e) to expand categorical eligibility for foster children. The proposed rule expands eligibility for former foster children to include former foster children from other states. Under the current rule, this category had been limited to former foster children from Vermont. We strongly support this expansion.

We suggest some clarification to Rule 9.03 (e)(iii) that defines eligible former foster children. The rule currently reads,

“If the individual attained 18 years of age on or after January 1, 2023, . . .”

In approximately half the states in the country, foster care has been extended beyond age eighteen. (See [Extending Foster Care Beyond 18 \(ncsl.org\)](https://www.ncsl.org)) The proposed rule should not be read in a limited way that would define this category to include only foster children who leave foster care at eighteen. It should be interpreted to also include foster children who leave foster after age eighteen.

Disabled Child Home Care Eligibility

The HCA and the DLP oppose the proposed eligibility changes to 8.05(k)(6) Disabled Child in Home Care (DCHC, Katie Beckett).

We have two concerns with this proposed rule change:

1. “Institutional level of care” is an evolving standard. In 1965 when the federal Medicaid program began, many children with serious medical conditions lived in institutions. Institutionalized medical services for children continued through 1981, when the Katie Beckett Medicaid Waiver was passed under President Ronald Reagan. It was through the advocacy of parents and Olmstead litigation that our medical system moved towards providing care so that children with serious medical conditions could live at home.

The rule references skilled nursing facilities and intermediate care facilities as two of the three standards. Yet, Vermont does not have these institutions for children. Children are also explicitly excluded from the Choices for Care program which provides coverage for nursing facility care. Even when Vermont had an ICF-DD, this facility, too, had exclusion criteria for admission that made it inaccessible to children. It is better for children’s development, and it is fiscally prudent for children to live at home, when medically advised. Vermont has worked hard to increase the amount of care that children can receive at home.

Requiring eligibility tied to modern standards of admissions for institutions that do not exist in Vermont will make it almost impossible to for children to be found eligible for Katie Beckett Medicaid. Furthermore, to require proof that “without the receipt of institutional level of care in the home, the individual would be required to continue to reside in an institution,” as described in (6)(i)(B)(II), is another standard that is impossible to meet.

Parents have shared with us that they would rather lose everything they have, any savings, their jobs, and their homes, than send their child to an out of state institution, even if supports are inadequate at home. In other words, it is not without severe stress and financial burdens that parents can care for their medically needy children at home. It is financially better for the Vermont Medicaid program to have children receive medical care at home. To enable this to continue, DVHA needs to use the institutional standard of 1965.

We urge DVHA to delete 8.05 (6)(1)(A and B).

2. No information exists that supports the proposition that a standardized level of care tool is necessary or helpful for these eligibility determinations. It is unclear what problem DVHA is trying to solve by use of a standardized tool. Proposing an as-yet-unidentified tool without any stakeholder input leads us to conclude that DVHA

believes too many children are mistakenly found eligible for Katie Beckett Medicaid.

In our experience, children are frequently found ineligible for coverage either on a first application or at a continuing eligibility review. We have seen no evidence given the regular stream of children and families with meritorious cases in need of assistance with denials and terminations that the current process for Katie Beckett eligibility is erroneously generous.

Furthermore, in representing dozens of children in appeals in Katie Beckett cases, the medical needs and interventions are extremely individualized. We have not seen a pattern or “type” of case that would be amenable to fitting into the standards of a tool. We have not seen a draft of any tool, so it is hard to envision how the diverse experiences of a small number of medically needy children can be standardized.

We urge DVHA to not change the rule to require a tool. There has been no community conversation or consensus on the value of a standardized tool, or the contents of a standardized tool. It is possible that DVHA may find that no tool is either helpful or practical. Research and community engagement should precede any potential change to this rule.

We urge DVHA to cut sections (A-C).

Part Three

The HCA suggests that HBEE Rule 23.02 be amended to mirror the proposed federal rules that address the “family glitch.” The Department of Treasury and the IRS have released proposed rules on this issue, and the HBEE rules should mirror the proposed federal rules. The proposed rules will change how affordability is calculated for family members when one member of the household has an offer of employer insurance.

Under current regulations employer-based health insurance is defined as “affordable” if the coverage solely for the employee, and not for family members, meets the affordability requirements. That means that affordability is calculated based on what it would cost for the employee to purchase a self-only plan. If the cost of the employee only plan meets the current affordability test, the employee *and their family members* are not eligible for Advance Premium Tax Credit (APTC). This is called the “family glitch” because it makes family members ineligible for APTC, even though the cost of a *family plan* with the employer is not “affordable.” The proposed rule change would allow for two separate calculations: one for the employee and the other for family members. Under the proposed federal rules, if the cost of covering family members were not affordable, they would be eligible for APTC. This

change addresses a long-standing problem and will allow more Vermonters to enroll in affordable coverage on Vermont Health Connect.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment. Please feel free to reach out should you have any questions.

Sincerely,

/s/ Marjorie Stinchcombe

Marjorie Stinchcombe
Helpline Director
Office of the Health Care Advocate
Vermont Legal Aid

/s/ Rachel Seelig

Rachel Seelig
Director
Disability Law Project
Vermont Legal Aid

/s/ Barb Prine

Barb Prine
Staff Attorney
Disability Law Project
Vermont Legal Aid