

Rothermel, Paul J (DHS)

From: Parker, Pamela J (DHS)
Sent: Wednesday, September 18, 2013 11:30 AM
To: Knutson, Katie M (DHS)
Subject: FW: PCG

Here are my comments as sent to Mark, Katie. I am ok where this is re: my issues the way it is now, but thought there could have been other improvements as stated below!

-----Original Message-----

From: Parker, Pamela J (DHS)
Sent: Monday, September 16, 2013 9:12 PM
To: Hudson, Mark J (DHS)
Subject: PCG

Was able to review the latest PCG report draft. Much better for my issues so I am generally ok with it. Thanks for sending and the opportunity to talk to them.

If they were going to really make this report right they should mention our payment/delivery and total cost of care reform efforts for seniors, our dual demos and our extra benefits of care coordination and co-pay buy outs for seniors and disabled. Also on page 10 it says we don't review program goals behind added services, that is not true for our programs, we even have contract provisions around that.

On page 11 they are still saying that we offer added high cost benefits such as LTC, mental health and HCBS that are "not covered in many states." This statement doesn't really make the point any worse for us, as we do have higher coverage than many, but it might make them look foolish, since most other states do cover some mental health and HCBS and LTC (most people use this term to mean nursing homes) is not an optional benefit. We may cover these in a more comprehensive manner than many states, but most states do cover some benefits in each of these categories so the way it is said is not quite accurate.