BEFORE THE STATE OF OHIO CONTROLLING BOARD

In the Matter of:

Agenda Item No. 40, the
Ohio Department of:
Medicaid respectfully
requests Controlling Board:
Approval to Increase
Appropriation Authority in:
Fund 3F00, ALI 651623,
Medicaid Services Federal, by \$561,700,000
in SFY2014 and
\$1,999,500,000 in SFY2015.:

EXCERPT OF PROCEEDINGS

before Mr. Randy Cole, President; Senator Bill Coley; Senator Chris Widener; Senator Tom Sawyer; Representative Chris Redfern; Representative Ross W. McGregor; and Representative Jeff McClain, Controlling Board, at the State of Ohio Controlling Board, Statehouse Senate Office Building, Room North Hearing Room, Columbus, Ohio, called at approximately 2:35 p.m. on Monday, October 21, 2013.

ARMSTRONG & OKEY, INC.

222 East Town Street, Second Floor
Columbus, Ohio 43215-5201
(614) 224-9481 - (800) 223-9481
Fax - (614) 224-5724

2.

Monday Afternoon Session,
October 21, 2013.

- -

2.0

2.1

4 * * * *

PRESIDENT COLE: Item 40, Ohio Department of Medicaid. Please introduce yourself to the Board.

DIRECTOR McCARTHY: Hello. I am John

McCarthy, Director of the Department of Medicaid.

PRESIDENT COLE: Senator Coley.

SENATOR COLEY: Thank you, Mr. President and Director. As you know, the Buckeye Institute pointed out that the Ohio Revised Code Section 127.17 limits this Board's authority to requiring that we carry out legislative intent. Of course, you are aware that the -- included in the recently passed budget the General Assembly specifically prohibited the Governor from expanding Medicaid as you did last week. I mean, that's a done deal. You've already expanded Medicaid per -- per the documents you sent to my office.

Are -- are you aware -- and we both know the Governor line item vetoed that section out of the budget bill. Are you aware of any other time where a Governor came to the Controlling Board in order to obtain funding for a program that the General

Assembly had tried to prevent?

2.1

DIRECTOR McCARTHY: President Cole,
Senator Coley, I personally am not aware of such a situation.

SENATOR COLEY: Okay. And, Mr. President and Director, I thank you. You and I have met for many hours on this, and you and your staff have just been great to work with. Thank you for indulging all my questions.

I wanted to follow up with you. As you know, one of my concerns all along has been sustainability. And last night I sat there watching a speech that Milton Friedman gave to the Mayo Clinic back in 1978 and I still swear he could have gave that last night and it would have been just as timely. And I think he referred as schizophrenic organized medicines behavior towards government involvement in medical care.

Noble-awarded Milton Friedman then pointed out, and I quote, "Although initially it may appear as the purveyors of medical care could get additional resources by tapping the government till, that is a transitory phenomenon. When the government is taking over any activity, there is more money available. But what typically happens is once" --

"once the government has taken it over, the situation changes. There are no more votes to be gotten by taking it over some more. You" -- "you have to move on to new fields and take over a new areas in order to get some new votes. And the result of that is that those areas that are already taken over get starved and instead of there being more resources available, there are fewer."

2.1

Director, some of us hope to be here in 2019 when we're doing that budget and beyond. Now that the Federal Government has expanded its takeover of this medical program, do you think that Milton Friedman was wrong in his analysis of history and his belief that there would actually be fewer resources available in the future?

DIRECTOR McCARTHY: President Cole,
Senator Coley, I can't speak for Milton Friedman, but
what I can say is what we have looked at in the
program is the exact same question around
sustainability of the Medicaid program.

As you know, the last couple of years we have been doing a lot of work to make sure that it is a sustainable program, and we have worked with the Governor. And that's been one of the things that he has said to me that no matter what we do it must be a

sustainable program.

2.1

And to do that we have made a number of reforms to ensure that the program is growing, the expenditures are growing, at a rate that's lower than the revenues coming into the State. And we have done that in the last budget and then in this current budget to the point of in this current budget we actually put in there the fact that we are capping the managed care plans at 3 percent growth going forward these two years. We have been able to do that through a number of different reforms over the last couple of years to make sure that's happening.

I also want to point out that the Medicaid program is not a takeover of the -- of medicine. I mean, we have privatized the program. Most of our enrollees in the program are in private managed care contractors that we did a procurement just a couple of years ago and actually redid how we procured the program so that we could drive more savings into the program.

As you know, one of the things we put forward both in this -- in this request and the budget was that we were able to drive down the costs of administrative costs in the managed care plans by another 1 percent which we have already done by being

able to consolidate. How did we do that? We used to have eight regions. We shrunk eight regions down to three. We used to have two — two to three plans per region, two different contracts. We took those and shrunk those. We have one contract that they sign. We have five plans that are statewide. We're able to get out of that efficiencies to make sure that the program is able to be sustainable going forward.

2.1

PRESIDENT COLE: Follow-up, Senator?

SENATOR COLEY: Yes. Director, currently our State pays approximately 40 percent of the cost of our Medicaid program with the Federal Government picking up about 60 percent of that cost. If the Federal Government changes those predicted percentages in 2019 and beyond to more of that 60/40 split, do you believe that our State could afford a 40 percent — a 40 percent share of this now expanded Medicaid program?

DIRECTOR McCARTHY: President Cole,
Senator Coley, as you know, when we made the proposal
in the budget and as we have put forward in this
request, that a — the decision was based on a deal
between the Federal Government and the states.
Specifically it says that for three years it's funded
at 100 percent. Then the next three years it goes

95, 94, 93 to 90 into the future. If that was to change, we would put in our request, we have said it before, we would need to go back and revisit that decision.

2.0

2.1

I can't at this point in time say in 2019 where the finances of the State will be to say one way or another if we could or could not afford it.

What I do know is that is not the agreement that we have said we wanted to enter into. And if there is a change in that agreement, I think we should go back and take a look at that agreement and revisit that agreement and how the program moves forward.

PRESIDENT COLE: Senator, before your next question I just -- I respectfully want to remind everyone what is before this Board which is an increase in federal appropriation through June of 2015. And I understand the long-term sustainability question. But whether it was in this budget or through an appropriation action of this Board, we cannot bind a future General Assembly or move beyond the biennium in an appropriation. And I know you know that, Senator.

SENATOR COLEY: Thank you, Mr. President.

PRESIDENT COLE: But I just wanted to

remind everyone of that context as we're discussing

years well beyond that and multiple budgets down the road.

2.1

SENATOR COLEY: Thank you, Mr. President.

And the Director has been wonderful to work with, and we have had these discussions. I just thought that the public would benefit from having a couple of them in public so that's why this one.

Director, one -- as you correctly point out, one of the hallmarks both in what you proposed in the budget that was submitted to the House of Representatives last winter and -- and what you are proposing here involves a mechanism for the State of Ohio to withdraw from the program if the Federal Government was to change those shares as far as the percentages being paid. There's -- you are aware and I know you and I have discussed the concerns that -- that Chief Justice Roberts in his opinion on this never opined as to what happened if you got in, you know, could you get back out without -- without the Federal Government affecting your existing Medicaid program.

My question to you, sir, is what assurances have you gotten from your contacts in the Federal Government that if something should change and the Federal Government should decide to get its

fiscal house in order and try to pass huge percentages of this program for the State of Ohio, what protections are there for the taxpayers to make sure that we would be able to afford the program as it would then be positioned?

2.0

2.1

DIRECTOR McCARTHY: President Cole,
Senator Coley, we obviously have talked to our legal
counsel extensively and looked at the Roberts
decision. Looking at the Roberts decision we believe
that it is clear a state can enter and exit without
penalty because they state -- they basically said in
the decision there shall not be a penalty for a state
to leave the program or to enter the program.

In addition to that, yes, I have had conversations with the Director of the Medicaid program at the federal level, Cindy Mann, about this and asked specifically could a state enter and exit.

She said a state could enter and exit and asked me -- I said if I would ask for a letter, would you put that in writing? And she said she would. We didn't even get a chance to do that. The State of New Hampshire asked for such a letter. They got the letter so that's on public record.

In addition, Secretary Sebelius in her testimony under oath said that a state could enter

and exit the program without penalty. So all of those things together we have said, you know, everything points to that we could exit the program without a penalty.

SENATOR COLEY: Thank you, Director. Thank you, Mr. President.

PRESIDENT COLE: Thank you, Senator.

Senator Sawyer.

SENATOR SAWYER: Thank you,

Mr. President.

2.1

Questions that go at the fundamentals of what the action that's before us today. And they go at the question of matters that have been before this

General Assembly throughout most of this year. I suspect that one way or another everybody has heard these questions, but these questions have not been before the Controlling Board. So in summary,

President Cole, I thought it would be a good opportunity to get these questions out on this table as a -- as well as some of the several others that have been before us throughout this legislative year.

So let me ask first, Director McCarthy, who will benefit from this Controlling Board action?

DIRECTOR McCARTHY: President Cole,

Senator Sawyer, there are a number of people who are going to benefit from this. I will start and answer and then turn it over to Director Moody to go into this a little bit further. But based on the numbers that we're looking at there's about 366,000 individuals that we would estimate would enroll into the program. About half of them are currently working. They have some income.

2.1

The issue is many -- for many of those individuals who actually might be serving individuals on the Medicaid program because they are home health aide, some type of caregiver in a home, they're making below the federal poverty level or just slightly above it so about \$11,000 a year, a little over \$11,000 a year. Their employer either doesn't offer insurance or they can't afford the insurance. So those individuals are stuck in an area of having to decide between do I go to see the doctor, or do I eat, or how does it happen.

Now, I have heard many times, well, part of it they can always get health care. They can just go to an emergency room. That's true they could just go to an emergency room but when you go to an emergency room, you're probably putting off some chronic condition or some other piece of — some

other issue that's coming up.

2.0

2.1

Additionally, this coverage is for parents. I think that's one of the things that people don't understand. In the State of Ohio we currently cover parents to 90 percent of the federal poverty level but we would be covering those parents above that also. So their children are currently enrolled and have health care insurance but they don't.

I also want to clear up the fact that many of the times people have said this is just for childless adults and people say, oh, well, you know, a childless adult means the person has never had a child. That's not true. A childless adult in the Medicaid world around eligibility means an individual who does not have a dependent child at home currently.

So, for instance, if I was 50 years old, I've had three kids, me and my wife have, you know, worked all our lives, our kids have grown up and left the home, something happens to my job and I'm laid off. Currently in the Medicaid program you cannot get on. You cannot get on the Medicaid program in that scenario if you have no dependent children.

The only way you might be able to get on

is if you were able to claim you were disabled. If you were actually disabled, then you could get on. So when we talk about childless adults, we have to remember it's not that a person has never had a child but that the person currently doesn't have -- does not have a child living at home.

2.1

And actually Director Plouck will come up now and talk about other individuals.

PRESIDENT COLE: Director, that's a frequent thing. I thought you were going to call for the lefty, and instead you called for the righty. So that's all right.

DIRECTOR PLOUCK: President Cole and Members of the Board, good afternoon. In listening to Director McCarthy speak just now, I was thinking about the many hundreds of people I've interacted with in this world over the last few years, people who are themselves struggling with mental health or addiction challenges or members of their family are. And I wanted to share just a couple of thoughts of folks I've encountered in the last week, literally in the last seven days.

Last week I was contacted by a man from Miami County. He has a 35-year-old son who is working, who is uninsured, and who is addicted to

opiates. The son desperately wants to get clean, has no insurance, doesn't make enough to fund his own treatment. The father has paid more than \$4,000 at this point to try to help his son and he is out of — of resource to help. And he's terrified that his son is not going to be able to manage this, is going to overdose, and is going to die. So that would be one example.

2.1

Another example on Friday afternoon last week, I was in -- in Wood County, and I met a woman in her late 20s who was born and raised in Wood County, seemingly, you know, middle class family.

She's a recovering alcoholic. She has a young child, was able through Medicaid to access residential treatment, and is now in recovery. She is working.

She's raising her son, and she is three semester away from a Bachelor's degree. So that's an example of what the interaction for a time limited period with services can do to help course correct someone on their path of life.

And, finally, I wanted to mention an individual from Wayne County who actually -- a young man, he had at an early adulthood stage begun exhibiting symptoms related to serious mental illness, and he decompensated, had interaction with

law enforcement, and through that interaction as unfortunate as that was was able to connect with treatment. And he's now involved in his local peer organization, and he is actually serving as an inspiration to other people who are struggling with recovery from the symptoms of mental illness in that area of the State. And he was just honored last Thursday night as the Person of the Year by the Wayne Homes ADAMH Board.

2.1

And so I think bottom line take away is that people from all walks of life are impacted by addiction and mental illness, and nobody asks for it. I think that it's not just the individuals, but it's the families. It's the loss of income and this offers an opportunity to really give people a hand up to help restore the lives that they had been leading or should be leading in many cases and assisting in rebuilding families, rebuilding relationships, and ultimately rebuilding our economy here in the State.

SENATOR SAWYER: Yes, thank you, Chairman Cole.

PRESIDENT COLE: Follow-up, Senator?

We can certainly see how this affects the lives of individual Ohioans in large numbers. Can you comment about how this affects Ohio corporately?

How does this affect more broadly the Ohio economy and in that way touch the lives of all Ohioans?

2.1

DIRECTOR McCARTHY: President Cole,
Senator Sawyer, there's a couple of different pieces
to that. The one that's most obvious is the impacts
of employers around penalties with the Federal
Exchange. Jackson Hewitt, the tax company, estimated
that the impacts on employers in the State of Ohio if
Medicaid coverage is not extended somewhere between
55 and 88 million dollars.

So the question is how accurate is that number? It's been interesting as I have been out talking to different home health care agencies and other small employers. A couple of them said to me I don't know how that number is so low. You know, just for us it's going to be a certain amount.

So how does that work so people understand? If an employer has over 50 employees, under the new laws they must offer health coverage equivalent to what's available through the Federal Exchange. If they don't and an employee chooses to go on to the Exchange, that employer must pay a penalty. If, however, we extend coverage up to 138, those individuals would go into the Medicaid program and, thus, there would not be a penalty to that

employer. So that's one -- one big piece.

2.0

2.1

A second one is around our Ohio hospitals. There is a program that's called the Disproportionate Share Hospital Program. That's usually called DSH. In the State of Ohio it's called the HCAP program. A part of the change to Title 19 wants to reduce the amount of funds in that program flowing to hospitals who serve individuals that don't have insurance.

Our estimate on that is that it will be reduced, if we just do a straight line estimate -- we can't for sure say what the impact on Ohio is going to be right now because of the fact that the final rules are not out -- but we estimated that for the State of Ohio the hospitals would be looking at about a 48 percent reduction in those -- in those funds.

Additionally, then looking at the program overall, obviously from an economic impact, individuals currently are going someplace to get those services, whether it be to the emergency room or some other place. Those costs are borne by all of us through higher insurance premiums.

So part of the proposal here was to ensure that were able to cover the costs of those individuals, thus, driving down the amount of

```
uncompensated care to the tune in the second year, again just looking at the Controlling Board request, of nearly $2 billion in the second year to cover those costs.
```

2.1

PRESIDENT COLE: Senator?

we -- there are two arenas that I haven't heard mentioned directly, but I can't believe that in a decision that reaches and touches so many lives that it doesn't touch both of these. Certainly the ability to affect job creation in counties all across the State is -- is a collateral benefit. But I'm thinking more in terms of the way in which an effort of this kind affects veterans and working poor across this State. Do we have any data on our expected consequence with regard to those populations?

DIRECTOR McCARTHY: President Cole,
Senator Sawyer, I'm going to call on Department of
Veteran Services to help answer that question.

DIRECTOR DOMINGUEZ: Mr. President, Senator, there are --

PRESIDENT COLE: Please, if you would please introduce yourself to the Board.

DIRECTOR DOMINGUEZ: Oh, excuse me.

Jason Dominguez, the Interim Director of the Ohio

Department of Veteran Services. Mr. President -PRESIDENT COLE: Thank you.

2.0

2.1

apologies. There are a couple of different dynamics when it comes to veterans and Medicaid expansion.

One of the most significant is that under the V.A. rules for health care there are eight priorities for veterans. There are a number of veterans who fall within the pri — the 7 and 8 priorities in terms of the lowest priority. Because of the demand for health care in the V.A. system priority 8 which is — are veterans who do not have a service connected disability but are classified under a veteran — as a veteran under the federal terms. Those veterans are currently closed out of the V.A. system.

The next priority up is priority 7.

Those veterans are low income veterans who do not currently have a service connected disability, have served this country honorably but on a case-by-case basis due to their income they are considered for -- for care through the V.A. It's not guaranteed. It is a case-by-case basis.

However, underneath the rules for the -for the V.A., for the Veterans Health Administration,
if a veteran is eligible for Medicaid, they

immediately are -- are taken from priority 7 and 8 and moved up to priority 5. What that does for them is that greatly expands their ability to -- for us to draw down our federal drawdown, first off, and it greatly expands that veteran's access to services even though they may not even be paid for by Medicaid. That is just -- that's their ticket in the door to get there.

2.1

So things like mental health care, things like -- like some of our substance abuse, alcohol abuse programs that are within the U.S. Department of -- of Veterans Affairs programs, it greatly increases the access that veterans have for those programs.

I'll just give you a couple -- an idea of some of the numbers that we're dealing with. Data as of September, 2013, this is -- this came from the Director of the V.A. Medical Center in Cleveland who gave me numbers for all of Ohio. As of that date, in 2000 -- I'm sorry, 251,495 veterans sought care from a V.A. facility here in Ohio. 3.69 percent of those were turned away as ineligible by V.A. standards so that's a approximately 9,277.

Now, those individuals were folks like -- I love to use my case example, she is sitting in the

2.1

back room, Rachel Jones who works in our office.

She's an Air National Guardsman who many of those

National Guardsman were activated for 89 days. 89

days is a — is a key number because once you hit 90

days, you are then eligible for V.A. benefits. If

you reach a cumulative of two years on activation,

you're eligible for V.A. benefits.

2.0

2.1

But because many of these guardsmen are oftentimes nationwide, and this comes down from the National Guard Bureau, something that General Ashenhurst has no control over, those guardsmen are then shut out of the V.A. health care system. So even though Rachel Jones, whose probably embarrassed right now, is — has gone to — deployed to multiple countries —

PRESIDENT COLE: We're okay. She's still smiling.

DIRECTOR DOMINGUEZ: Okay. Good. I've got to live with her after this.

Even though she's been to multiple countries and served our nation, she is not eligible for V.A. health care. She's eligible for our emergency financial assistance at the county level being cited by the Ohio Revised Code, but she is shut out of the system.

So in her case regardless of the priorities of the V.A., she can't be helped, but underneath Medicaid expansion though she would be able to be helped so that's another category that we're dealing with.

2.1

so going on with that 2,000 -- 251,000 number, 21.9 percent of those were deemed priority 7 or 8. That's approximately 52,556. So in total 24.59 percent, a total combined, representing 61,833 former service members who were turned away are lucky enough to be seen after their case was reviewed individually by -- in category 7. Those are some of the numbers that we had.

We know that 60 percent of the suicides that do occur amongst veterans, they do happen outside the V.A. health care system. Some veterans are too proud to reach out their hand for help. Some of them don't -- don't get help until we finally catch them down at Twin Rivers once they have been apprehended in a situation and they don't have access to health care and they fall in these situations.

 $\hbox{So this -- these are vital services that} \\ \hbox{are needed and I -- and I ask you for your support.}$

PRESIDENT COLE: Thank you. Follow-up,
Senator? Did you want more information on this issue

or the job creation?

2.0

2.1

SENATOR SAWYER: President Cole, I -- I am concerned that there is a great deal of information we combined here today, and I don't intend to take the Committee's time this afternoon to do all of it. I'm just going to mention one that I didn't raise, the -- as a former local -- as a mayor, I looked at the effect of this on -- on law enforcement, jails, and the kind of pressure that communities all over the State of Ohio are facing in those terms and recognize that every mention that you've heard of the kinds of economic pressures that we've heard have an effect on that as well.

If the Director would care to mention any of that, I would be happy to entertain it, but other than that I have only one real closing observation.

PRESIDENT COLE: Director, can you assess or explain, you or your team, the local government impacts of Medicaid extension?

DIRECTOR McCARTHY: President Cole,
Senator Sawyer, at the local government impact
there's a couple of different levels that we would
see. One of them has to do with the mental health
system which I will turn back to Director Plouck here
in a second to -- to answer.

Before that though I wanted to touch on one other group that was discussed and it's those that Mr. Dominguez talked about and that is the active duty, individuals on active duty. And that as Jason was talking about, there are individuals currently -- you know, this is -- this is an issue about national readiness and making sure people are prepared to go to combat. So we have General Ashenhurst here to speak to that issue.

2.1

GENERAL ASHENHURST: President Cole,
Members of the Board, I am Debbie Ashenhurst, the
Adjutant General. I command over 16,000 of your
fellow Ohio citizens in the National Guard.

It's hard to categorize how many National Guard members would be subject to or be eligible for this because they have to self-report if they're unemployed. And many of our guardsmen don't report themselves as unemployed when they're students. And the members of this legislature are very generous with our guards members in that they pay 100 percent tuition so many of our guardsmen don't have to work, and they do just attend school.

Well, with the federal drawdown of funds and as the war in Afghanistan and Iraq are coming to a -- a reduction, I won't say a close, I have great

concerns about the medical readiness of our service members because throughout this war we were always in a state of preparing ourself to go to war, the Federal Government provided great funds to keep our service members at a pretty high state of medical readiness.

2.1

I'm already seeing a degredation of those services and those contracts that were available to our service members to keep them medically ready, dental and medical, that I have fears that — that now it's going to be back on me and the cost of the individuals, whether they have insurance or don't have insurance, to maintain that state of readiness. And if post — or pre911 is any indication of how ready our service members are, it wasn't good. It was not good.

So if a guardsman is solely reliant on their guard pay, meaning if they are a 100 percent paid tuition student, they go to school, and their only income is their drill weekends and their annual training, anybody under the grade of general officer would qualify — would benefit — could benefit from this expanded Medicaid. Now, I would say that's not the majority of our guardsmen, you know, the majority of our guardsmen where they are but particularly our

lower enlisted, our enlisted level 1s and 2s and 3s and 4s are the most at risk of not being employed in some manner in which they have access to other insurance and are most likely to suffer and that is the majority of our service members. I can't put a number to that, but I can tell you I have fear as of the impact of the reduction in medical services will be.

2.1

Now, they have the ability to purchase insurance through the military through Tricare. It's \$52 a month. For some reason it's that same category of young people that don't think they need to buy insurance because they are, of course, invincible.

Just ask them.

So I have great concerns. You know, I put a number out there of 400 known that would certainly be impacted, but I will tell you the potential is much greater for our guardsmen, your fellow Ohioans, to be — to benefit from this Medicaid expansion.

PRESIDENT COLE: Thank you. Director

Plouck, follow-up on the local government impact?

DIRECTOR PLOUCK: President Cole and

Senator Sawyer, I did want to follow up on the local government impact because, again, mental health and

addiction services is somewhat uniquely situated here. Today we partner with 53 ADAMH Boards, Alcohol and Drug Addiction Mental Health Services, around the state to fund services at the local level. And today these boards are purchasing a variety of clinical services as well as other kinds of recovery support.

2.1

And many of the clinical services will be able to be funded through Medicaid in the future if this proposal goes forward. And that will actually create a greater level of agility locally because today rather than having a board exact pay for a counseling service, Medicaid will reimburse that. So there could be a redirection of those funds into things like prevention partnerships and housing and employment supports, peer-led organizations, other things that are gaps in the safety net in many communities because, you know, funding is challenging.

But this would be able to occur without any additional dollars being added to the system; rather it's a redirection. And the nice thing about this is that it could be locally prioritized so if there is a concern particularly about let's say residential or sober housing for folks who are recovering from heroine in one area of the State,

they could make that sort of investment. If there is a greater interest in prevention services with schools in another area, they could make that decision. And so the boards as the local statutory planning authorities would have the ability to do what best meets the needs of their communities.

2.0

2.1

PRESIDENT COLE: Thank you, Director.

SENATOR SAWYER: President Cole, as I mentioned before, we could go on at some considerable length with this. I don't propose to do this today. But while this proposal has generated some controversy and represents a very large amount of money, I would submit, President Cole, that this is not fundamentally different from other items brought before this Board. The only difference is one of the scale of the request and not type.

Pursuant to Ohio Revised Code 131.35 one of the authorized purposes of the Controlling Board is to appropriate increases in available federal funds. That's why I believe this is a completely appropriate role for the Controlling Board to play. A lot of us, Democrats and Republicans, have been spending months working to expand Medicaid coverage to 275,000 Ohioans including 26,000 veterans. The expansion covers the working core who don't earn

enough money to purchase insurance through the new health care exchange. It also provides much needed assistance to Ohioans suffering from addiction, mental health problems so they can lead more productive lives.

2.1

We've heard that characterized in broad and general ways and with specific examples here this afternoon and it's one of the reasons why I enthusiastically support the matter before us this afternoon. And I thank you for your patience and endurance and your patience of my colleagues on the Controlling Board.

PRESIDENT COLE: Senator, you're just fine. I'm sure there's plenty more patience that will need to be exhibited this afternoon.

You do bring up a couple important points though that if I can just comment on, Senator, you're right, the scale is large but if you remember our June meeting, we had over \$1.6 billion in transactions approved at that June meeting. Now, that was the entire agenda, not one item, but it was a significant sum. And just this year 50 times we have approved a request for an increase in federal appropriations. That is a customary action of this Board. And I recognize the controversy, again, the

importance, but thank you, Senator, for putting that in context. Just because people don't always watch what we do it doesn't mean we're not doing it, right? Thank you, Senator.

2.1

Mr. McCarthy, I believe you have a couple more people who have questions for you.

Representative McClain.

REPRESENTATIVE McCLAIN: Thank you, Mr. President, and thank you, Director, for coming.

As has been mentioned earlier, expansion already happened. It happened a week ago. We're just here to okay the money. If this is to go through, my first question is during the introduced -- or rather in the introduced version of House Bill 59 the Office of Health Transportation linked about \$400 million in cuts. If this is approved today, what's the thought on that, how soon that's going to happen ,and just -- if you could explain that a little bit.

DIRECTOR McCARTHY: President Cole,
Representative McClain, we stick by what we put in
the budget. We believed in it then; we believe in it
now. We are planning to move forward with all of the
things that we proposed that we can move forward with
that we are legislatively allowed to do. So does

that -- what are a couple of those things? For instance, making the change to the administrative portion of the managed care contracts, a reduction of 1 percent, that's going through; the change in inpatient hospitalization, that will go through; and the other ones. Again, as long as it's allowed underneath the leg -- the current law, we're going to move forward with those.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

Our goal is to hit all of those on January 1. Hopefully we will hit them January 1. Of course, some of them we have to go through rules processes and a couple of other things. We will expedite things as much as possible, but I don't see losing more than, you know, a month or two on -- on some of those. So we are moving forward with those as fast as we can. The -- assuming everything moves forward, things like the change in the managed care rates for sure will happen January 1 because we haven't given them their rates yet. We were planning to give them their rates at the end of the month. actually had another issue we had to work through so we still have that ability to make that change.

REPRESENTATIVE McCLAIN: Yes. Director, as it's been well known for quite a while, there are a great number of members of the House and Senate

both that don't think this is the right way to go but at the same time have been working very hard,

Republican and Democrat alike, to continue the reforms that — to commend the administration in working with the House and Senate on a number of great things that have happened in the last three years. We applaud you for that.

2.0

2.1

But we want to make sure that going forward either way that we continue this process. I think you're aware of a lot of the discussions that have been going on and we want to continue to go on. So what would be the administration's take on this? We want to make sure, I guess, that you're ready to get right back into the ditches with us and make sure that we make the reforms we think are necessary because we can't just leave the program the way it is as I think you agree. So if you could just talk about that a little bit.

DIRECTOR McCARTHY: President Cole,
Representative McClain, ever since I met you, which
is about two and a half years ago, we have been on
the same page with this. We have said we need to
make changes to the program. Reform is -- is
important. The reforms that we have done over the
last few years I want to make sure that people

understand we have been able to reduce the growth rate of the program from 10 percent down to about 3 percent. And we didn't kick anybody off. We didn't cut benefits or things like that.

2.0

2.1

What we did was we improved how the program will end. We started changing how we do payments, paying for quality instead of quantity. We put in a new claims payment system that greatly helped us pay more accurately on a fee-for-service side. All of those things we have done ensuring that people can get better health outcomes.

We've tied more of the managed care payments to improving health outcomes. We went to nationalized standards. I'll never forget, I think it was the second week on my job, I walk in and on my desk is a letter from one of the managed care plans saying that they disagreed with how we did their calculation for their bonus payment. So I immediately said we're not going to have Ohio specific measures any more. Let's get rid of that. Let's go to nationalized standards. There's no more fighting other that. It reduced their administrative burden; it reduced our administrative burden. And we are all on the same page of that.

We want to continue to do those reforms

moving forward of how do we make the program more efficient and how do we improve health outcomes for Ohioans. I mean, that is what we have been focusing. Everything we have done is how do we get health outcomes to improve.

2.1

REPRESENTATIVE McCLAIN: Now, one of the ways we have been discussing, at least a lot in the House and the Senate the discussions have been about looking at different way, looking for the nontraditional, that maybe faith-based, maybe mission-driven kind of things. In fact, if I'm not mistaken, the gentleman Director Plouck was talking about is helped by a program that's about a third of the cost of the program that it replaced. And it really is peer led and appears to be very effective. We know those things are happening.

How are we going to continue to work with the administration? How is the administration going to cooperate with us, I guess, on looking at that to make sure we're doing -- getting the best result that we can for our constituents but in way that is manageable going forward?

DIRECTOR McCARTHY: President Cole,
Representative McClain, we have been open to looking
at all of those possibilities and trying to figure

out how to make sure we could get those to work, how do we weave those into the programs. We are committed to still doing that.

2.1

There -- you know, we have used a number of new interesting partnerships in the program. For instance, just -- many people don't know this but here in Franklin County there is an organization called Bread. It's a faith-based program here in Franklin County. They reached out to me saying, John, we -- we know many of the individuals on your program, and they are not getting services. They are not being -- their services aren't being coordinated and I said okay. They said, well, you know, can you contract with us to do something with them?

And I said, well, hold on. Most of those individuals are in the managed care plans. Managed care plans say, John, we can't find the individuals. So what do we do? We got the plans together with Bread, and the two of them are now working together to ensure that individuals in the program are found and then are getting the services that they need.

And how is that done? It's been kind of interesting. You can't share medical information.

You can't say, oh, here is the people on the Medicaid program and, here, can you go find them in your

congregation. What we've seen is the opposite, is the congregations have approached us and said here are individuals that we think need help. Are they in your programs? And we're able to then identify them and hook them up and to make sure they get the services.

And I want to make clear the Department is not involved in that. We have stepped away from that. That is that faith-based organization along with the managed care plans working together to ensure that people are getting care.

So we are -- we are more than willing to work with you all and other entities to figure out how we can make those partnerships work because many of them do work very well.

REPRESENTATIVE McCLAIN: Well, I would just I think end on the fact I'm glad to hear that because I know, at least speaking for the House, a lot of the House members, our intention — Russ is laughing. Our intention is — is to continue to work very hard on this even this fall. We have a lot of great ideas, and we want to continue to do things that are going to help our citizens.

PRESIDENT COLE: Thank you,

Representative.

2.0

2.1

```
37
 1
                  Representative Redfern.
 2
                  REPRESENTATIVE REDFERN:
                                           Thank you,
 3
     Mr. President.
 4
                  I actually have a few questions for
 5
     the -- for the Director who has not yet appeared,
 6
     Director Moody, who was kind enough to visit with me
 7
     on Friday and -- and to rest your feet a bit,
     Director McCarthy, I would ask Director Moody to come
 8
     and take the podium. And as he does, Director,
 9
10
     you're Director of the Governor's Office of Health
     Transformation? Is that your title?
11
12
                  PRESIDENT COLE: We usually let the
13
     witnesses introduce themselves, Representative.
14
                  REPRESENTATIVE REDFERN: Since he didn't
15
     I was trying to be polite. I was trying to be
16
     polite.
17
                  PRESIDENT COLE: You're being -- you're
18
     being very polite. You're always civil,
19
     Representative.
2.0
                  REPRESENTATIVE REDFERN:
                                           Thank you.
2.1
                  DIRECTOR MOODY: And, Mr. President, the
22
     Representative is well informed. I'm Greg Moody, the
     Director of the Governor's Office of Health
23
24
     Transformation.
```

REPRESENTATIVE REDFERN: Does -- does

25

this document look familiar to you? It was I believe your testimony before Chairman Amstutz's House Finance Committee on February 14, 2013.

2.1

DIRECTOR MOODY: Mr. President, about six hours' worth of testimony.

REPRESENTATIVE REDFERN: Well, I will limit mine, about half that. Well, in your testimony you use the word Obamacare four times, and according to — to notes taken by our caucus staff 24 additional times in — in answering questions from members of the Finance Committee. Do you use the term Obamacare as a descriptive term, a pejorative? Why not Affordable Care Act and why Obamacare?

Representative Redfern, after President Obama himself used the term Obamacare to describe the law, we did use it as a general term. However, whenever we can, we try to be as precise as we can, and for the action today mostly what we're talking about are amendments to Title 19 in the Social Security Act.

DIRECTOR MOODY: Mr. President,

REPRESENTATIVE REDFERN: So you would reject it as a pejorative?

DIRECTOR MOODY: I --

REPRESENTATIVE REDFERN: As an insult to the President and those of us who believe the health

care is a right, not a privilege?

2.0

2.1

DIRECTOR MOODY: Mr. President,

Representative, I would certainly never intend it in that tone.

REPRESENTATIVE REDFERN: Because in your testimony you point out that Obamacare is not the path Governor Kasich would have chosen for Ohio, but it is for now the law of the land. What is the path that the administration would have chosen had it not been for the simple — implementation of the Affordable Care Act and the appropriated federal dollars that you're hoping the Controlling Board were to — were to take action on today?

DIRECTOR MOODY: Mr. President,
Representative Redfern, it is -- it is confusing in
the complexity of the federal reform because it has
many different components. And depending on the
particular component that is being discussed, there
are different levels of concern. So primarily the
concern relates to the federal reforms that change
health insurance in a way that includes new mandates,
new requirements, new penalties, essentially the
focus of Ohio's Issue 3 related to not compelling a
person to participate in a health care program.

Consistently the administration has

expressed concern about some of those elements of the program. There is another set of issues related to health insurance exchanges. The idea of a marketplace which early on we were excited about the prospect of establishing a state-based health insurance exchange. But as the federal guidelines for that were clarified, it was clear that states actually had very little discretion as it relates to that issue. So Ohio eventually made the decision not to run our own state-based exchange but to allow that to be run by the Federal Government. And, in fact, I think folks saw that on October 1, the Federal Health Insurance Exchange activated here in Ohio. So concern in those areas.

2.0

2.1

There are other areas related to Health
Care Delivery System Reform that the federal form
really looked to states to see what seemed to be
working and copied that. So, for example, a number
of states had already pursued the idea of
coordinating Medicare and Medicaid programs together.
The federal reform picked that up. And then we acted
on the authority to do a project like that here in
Ohio. So some of the Health Care Delivery System
changes we actually embraced. Many of them were
originated by states.

And then the fourth big category is the one that's the subject of the hearing today. When we say we wouldn't have designed it a particular way, there are a lot of complex details related to eligibility levels and interactions with other programs, but the fact is it was designed a particular way. And given the federal law we posed the question to ourselves what is the most direct and efficient way to assure affordable coverage for all Ohioans. And that's ultimately what led them to the decision of — to pursue expanding Medicaid.

REPRESENTATIVE REDFERN: Right. Mr. President, Director, when did you pose that question?

DIRECTOR MOODY: Mr. President,

Representative, posed which question?

2.1

REPRESENTATIVE REDFERN: You spoke rhetorically "we posed the question to ourselves." I assume the working group that had been working on Medicaid starting January 11, 2011, that was the date you gave me on Friday, the first time you came together as a working group under the administration. You posed the question. We found ourselves with this — these groups of facts, and we chose to take this path to paraphrase your presentation, the final point. Who are "we"?

```
1
                  DIRECTOR MOODY: Mr. President,
     Representative Redfern, you'll remember that on
2
3
     January 10, 2011, when Governor Kasich took office --
4
                  REPRESENTATIVE REDFERN: I remember.
5
                  DIRECTOR MOODY: We -- I'm sorry?
6
                  REPRESENTATIVE REDFERN: I remember.
7
                  DIRECTOR MOODY: Yeah, you remember that
     day. Mr. President, that was also the first day I
8
9
     came into this current position. I came into that
10
     position knowing that we were under a federal mandate
11
     to extend Medicaid coverage. And on that day
12
     Medicaid was growing 8.9 percent. And we understood
13
     that if it grew at that rate, we would not be able to
14
     responsibly extend coverage.
                  So we immediately put our focus on
15
16
     Medicaid reform. And through the first budget bill
17
     which many here assisted to enact, we were able to
18
     get reforms in place that Director McCarthy was
19
     describing that brought the rate of growth down to
2.0
     3.3 percent.
2.1
                  REPRESENTATIVE REDFERN: Director, if I
22
     may interrupt --
23
                  DIRECTOR MOODY: Subsequent to that --
24
                  REPRESENTATIVE REDFERN: -- who are "we"
25
     in that first meeting of January 11, 2011? I
```

1 appreciate the encouraging remarks about the reforms 2 and the process and the progress, absolutely, but I 3 would like to know who was included so we can go down 4 this path of asking some questions and ask ourselves 5 from a Controlling Board standpoint why we are here. 6 And these are questions that I'll be asking --7 DIRECTOR MOODY: Mr. President --REPRESENTATIVE REDFERN: -- to not 8 9 belabor the point. 10 PRESIDENT COLE: Thank you for clarifying, Representative. Director. 11 12 DIRECTOR MOODY: President Cole, 13 Representative Redfern, I -- I was attempting to make 14 a distinction that at that earliest date we were 15 under a mandate to expand coverage, and we considered 16 it all hands on deck to reform the program. 17 example, the Office of Health Transformation was 18 created to bring together the multiple separate agencies that involve Medicaid. So it involved the 19 2.0 Directors of those different agencies and all -- all 2.1 of our senior staff working together to build out 22 that proposal. 23 What changed then was the Supreme Court 24 decision in August the next year where we went from 25 being under a federal mandate to extend Medicaid

coverage to technically still a federal mandate, that is still in the federal law. What changed was the Federal Government's ability to enforce that law on a state that chose not to extend coverage. So it effectively made extending coverage optional.

2.1

That was a different sort of decision where then we had to assess where we were at the time. Because we were growing the program at below 3 percent and believe we had moved into a sustainable position, that's where we -- and when I say "we," I mean the administration -- collectively --

REPRESENTATIVE REDFERN: Well, with all due respect, Director --

DIRECTOR MOODY: -- the decision to proceed.

REPRESENTATIVE REDFERN: -- two weeks ago and four weeks before this very body the Department of Medicaid came before us with an appropriation request of additional dollars. And I asked specifically if thus -- this was a buildup for this particular vote and whether or not these were scaling questions. I was assured, at least by the representative, that that, in fact, was not the case.

I then inquired to the Controlling Board

President whether or not the legislature was going to

1 take this issue up through the Finance Committee, 2 perhaps through the Health Committee, rather than 3 Controlling Board because there was some of us who 4 felt maybe the end around the legislature process was 5 occurring, right or wrong, legal or not, 6 Constitutionally protected or not, but, in fact, 7 gathering up as much information as possible. 8 At that January meeting in 2011, was the 9 Lieutenant Governor in that meeting? And if she was, 10 did she voice her exception to the notion that we as a State by policy should embrace the expansion of 11 Medicaid to 138 percent of the poverty levels? But 12 she's the Director of Insurance. She's not here 13 14 today. 15 PRESIDENT COLE: Representative, were 16 there two questions in that or just one? 17 REPRESENTATIVE REDFERN: I -- you can 18 separate them, Mr. President, or I can come back. 19 PRESIDENT COLE: You counted five, 20 Representative McGregor? 2.1

REPRESENTATIVE McGREGOR: Five.

22 REPRESENTATIVE REDFERN: You can count

30. 23

24 PRESIDENT COLE: Well, that's fine. 25 just wanted to help direct the witness.

DIRECTOR MOODY: Mr. President,
Representative Redfern, perhaps -- perhaps I'll pick
the question to answer.

REPRESENTATIVE REDFERN: Well, we could start with the January 11.

DIRECTOR MOODY: Yeah.

2.1

REPRESENTATIVE REDFERN: Who are "we"?

DIRECTOR MOODY: The team -- the team was entirely in place in -- in January. We had all our Directors onboard. The Lieutenant Governor had been elected along with the Governor.

We frequently meet in a group where everybody has an opportunity to share their opinions. As an administration, we move together in a unified manner. For example, in those other categories I mentioned, because we had — both the Governor and the Lieutenant Governor had concerns about the insurance market reforms, as Insurance Commissioner, it was natural that she led out on those issues and also as it related to the exchange because the Department of Insurance had the formal authority as it related to the Federal Government.

On the other areas, Medicaid -- extending Medicaid coverage and Health Care Delivery System Reform, those were more directly under the formal

authority of the Medicaid Director and the Office of Health Transformation. So we -- we took the lead on those.

2.1

However, when asked, I, of course, support the Lieutenant Governor in the decisions as they relate to insurance, and she has been clear she supports the decisions as they relate to Medicaid.

REPRESENTATIVE REDFERN: I'm sorry.

Could you repeat that the final statement, the

Lieutenant Governor supports the expansion of

Medicaid --

DIRECTOR MOODY: Correct.

REPRESENTATIVE REDFERN: -- in this proposal? Because -- and it's an important -- and I hope -- I hope, Mr. President, fair point that I would like to explore either with the Director of Medicaid or Health Transformation. This is a temporary expansion as was stated, I think, in one of the first sentences. We are only bound by the actions of the Controlling Board through the end of the biennium.

Additionally, legislators come and go and so those of us who do believe that expanding Medicaid is a mere first step and not the last step, we want to ensure that we're stepping in the right direction.

And as you know, as we've spoken together, you were 1 2 with Governor Taft's administration in 2003, I 3 believe it was, when during difficult budget times 4 decisions were made to -- to roll back the number of 5 those who were quaranteed health care under a 6 state-funded Medicaid program; is that correct? 7 DIRECTOR MOODY: Mr. President --REPRESENTATIVE REDFERN: Feel free to 8 9 paraphrase or to --10 DIRECTOR MOODY: -- correct. 11 REPRESENTATIVE REDFERN: To -- I am a 12 correct in that. 13 DIRECTOR MOODY: You are correct. 14 REPRESENTATIVE REDFERN: And difficult 15 decisions were made to roll back from 100 percent to 16 I believe 90 percent of the Federal Poverty 17 Guidelines those who would be eligible for health 18 care; is that correct? 19 DIRECTOR MOODY: Mr. President, 20 Representative, as it relates to parents, that's 2.1 correct. 22 REPRESENTATIVE REDFERN: And Adjutant 23 Generals came forward and I'm sure Directors of Jobs 24 and Family Services, of the other agencies that were 25 named differently at the time came forward and

probably spoke heartfelt about these issues and its impact it would have on families. But you and the then Governor made the decision at the time to balance the budget without increasing other taxes perhaps, without cutting other areas or cutting more, that that would be the step we would take.

2.0

2.1

That's what concerns me going forward.

This is a temporary increase you are requesting from the Controlling Board only through the end of this biennium. In your testimony to -- to the Finance Committee, you indicated that Ohio would receive \$13 billion over seven years including \$6 billion into hospitals and \$2 billion into doctors' offices under the subset Protect Ohio Jobs. Do you recall that? These aren't one time payments. Ohio is not going to receive -- we're not appropriately \$13 billion according to the agenda item. We are -- how do you arrive at the \$13 billion figure over seven years including 6 billion into hospitals and 2 billion into doctors' offices?

PRESIDENT COLE: Representative, before

Director Moody response, again, just to clarify, I'm

surprised that you and Senator Coley have compared

notes today, but what is being approved today is an

appropriation request through June of 2015. The same

way it would be through budgetary action or an appropriation request, we cannot bind future General Assemblies or make an appropriation beyond the biennium.

2.0

2.1

In that context, Director, how do you get to \$13 billion?

DIRECTOR MOODY: Mr. President,
Representative Redfern, as it was described at the
time, it is unusual for us to look out that far and
certainly beyond the biennium. However, we did not
want to mislead legislators at the time that this was
somehow only federal funding.

We wanted to make sure it was clear that at a point in the future by making the decision to go in this direction that it would bring about an obligation at a point in the future where State funds would be involved.

And we proposed that even though we couldn't appropriate that in the current budget, that future budgets would appropriate the State funds to support the State share of the program. That's also where we clarified that if those terms changed as Director McCarthy was describing, then we would have to rethink the terms of the decision like that.

So the 13 billion was a projection into

the future, although I think -- I hope we were clear that what was in front of the legislature at the time were the appropriations related to the budget through June, 2015.

2.1

REPRESENTATIVE REDFERN: Sure. And,
Mr. President and Director, it's a fair point but it
hinges on promises that had been made yet not funded
over the course of many years and health care as -as we've heard, it's the difference -- it stands in
between a bankruptcy, a lost job, a lost opportunity
of a 35-year-old son or daughter suffering from an
addiction to opiates. Health care stands between
that treatment or not.

And in two years it's not if the budget goes south or if somebody is elected to the office of President or Congress changes and the additional dollars that we hope are appropriated are redirected. We've just gone through this debate in Washington, and it's a telling point I hope for all of us having served in this body on and off since 1999 that you and I lived it in 2003 when I voted no.

And I don't want to be put in a position where we're doing really good things in the short-term to only let 366,000 Ohioans down in maybe 24 months or 36 months or frankly whenever the

winds -- the political winds were to change. I don't believe that will happen if Hillary Clinton is elected president in 2016, but we all know -- but we all know that if Ted Cruz is -- and it's an important point.

PRESIDENT COLE: I understand, Representative.

2.1

REPRESENTATIVE REDFERN: That if I may, if Senator Cruz wins, he has made it a point that — that he is opposed to expanding Medicaid at the State level using federal dollars.

PRESIDENT COLE: Representative --

that I — that I voice is in — is prefacing this question. Governor Kasich said on August 15 that the Affordable Care Act and the expansion of Medicaid dollars was not Obama's plan; it's Hillarycare.

Those — Hillarycare. Those hyperbolic statements poison the well for those of us who care deeply about ex — expanding health care for the parents, for the soldiers, for the enlisted men and women, for the veterans who are at the Ohio's largest nursing home in my district in Sandusky, Ohio. They mean a great deal. And using Obamacare in a pejorative fashion may — some may take it in an pejorative way poisons

the well.

2.0

2.1

And what kind of assurances can you provide this Controlling Board that going forward that this administration, that your office, that the Director of Medicaid, that the Adjunct General, the Director of ODJFS who we lost on Friday, Director of Veterans Services, that these well-intentioned public leaders are going to continue to embrace the Affordable Care Act, a full throated embrace of Obamacare, as you stated, with the expansion of Medicaid? What kind of assurances that during the mid-biennium review there won't be any retreat as we saw in 2003?

PRESIDENT COLE: Director, you do not have to -- you do not have to comment on the 2016

Presidential campaign. This hearing today has already received enough coverage without it being the kickoff of the Presidential race.

DIRECTOR MOODY: Mr. President,
Representative Redfern, understood. Representative,
I understand that priorities change over time. It's
why legislatures don't commit future legislatures
to the priorities of the future.

I can tell you that standing in front of you today the Governor has made extending Medicaid

coverage a priority. I have worked with him for many years. And in all of that time, if nothing, I have learned he is decisive. We do not make this decision to take federal money today and then avoid a responsibility in the future. We make the decision to proceed under the terms of the federal law into the future.

2.0

2.1

And we believe we have moved the program into a position of strength and sustainability that will allow that to be not only good for the Ohioans who will benefit from getting coverage but also for taxpayers over time by holding down the rate of the growth of the program.

REPRESENTATIVE REDFERN: (Inaudible) known and worked with the Governor for a period of time.

DIRECTOR MOODY: Mr. President,
Representative, one of my first professional
opportunities was on the House Budget Committee in
Washington, D.C., when he was the chairman of the
program.

REPRESENTATIVE REDFERN: At our Friday meeting I indicated to you that that was a concern of mine because in -- in his service on the Budget

Committee he voted five times to cut Medicaid because

of difficult budget decisions. I'm not suggesting those were easy decisions, but past is prologue for many of us who lived through Governor Taft's decisions to roll back from 100 percent to 90 percent.

2.0

2.1

Director McCarthy was -- was also with us on Friday and indicated that it was the Department's opinion that Medicaid expansion would be funded, his words, in perpetuity. Do you still stand by that statement, Director? Director Moody or Director McCarthy.

PRESIDENT COLE: Director.

DIRECTOR MOODY: President Cole,
Representative Redfern, I believe the context of the
conversation was a question about whether or not the
Federal Government had rolled back at any point its
financial commitment that it made to the Medicaid
program. And we indicated we were -- we were not
aware of that.

I understand that -- that -- that -- that -- that -- well, no. I'll leave it at that.

PRESIDENT COLE: Representative, do you have a follow-up?

REPRESENTATIVE REDFERN: Oh, sure. I would like to ask some questions about the exchange

program at the Department of Insurance because in a revealing conversation on Friday some exciting things were — were provided to me by Director McCarthy in this case about how over the course of the next 24 hours or perhaps over the next 90 days between now and January 1, 366,000 Ohioans would become aware that they are now qualified for Medicaid funding. How does that process begin, hopefully how does it end, and what's it going to cost?

2.1

So, Director McCarthy, perhaps you could -- if, Mr. President, if that is germane to this particular request?

PRESIDENT COLE: If it involves the enrollment and how many citizens are available for this and through what purpose, it is germane. And I would just request respectfully, Representative, that following your comments about poisoning the well, that the line of questioning does not put us in a position that it makes it hard to act on this request today.

REPRESENTATIVE REDFERN: I didn't say all those things.

PRESIDENT COLE: Okay.

REPRESENTATIVE REDFERN: Director.

PRESIDENT COLE: Director.

DIRECTOR McCARTHY: President Cole,
Representative Redfern, as I said on Friday, if we -if we obtain approval here, we would move forward to
change our eligibility systems, our new one, to be
able to enroll individuals into the program.

2.1

So your question is what is the additional cost? There is no additional cost. We are doing it all within our current budget that we have appropriated to us on our administrative services line. There is no request in this Controlling Board request to increase those funds. The request was purely to cover the services for those individuals. We are doing everything possible within the Department to operate within our budget, and we will operate within our current appropriated budget to enroll the individuals.

REPRESENTATIVE REDFERN: And how?

Mr. President, to the witness, how?

DIRECTOR McCARTHY: Mr. President,
Representative Redfern, the new eligibility system
when it comes online for this group, individuals will
be able to go online for the first time and directly
enroll into the Medicaid program. They can also go
to their local county JFS office to enroll. They can
for the first time call in and do an online

application so we have opened up two new ways for people to get into the program besides going into their county JFS office.

2.1

PRESIDENT COLE: And, Representative, I think, if you remember, those were the answers consistent when that request was before this Board.

REPRESENTATIVE REDFERN: Mr. President, thank you for reminding me. Director, you indicated on Friday that those who are now eligible, the 366,000, assuming the Controlling Board supports the request, wouldn't have to present any income eligibility documents like in past — like in the past processes, that there is an overlay where you ping — I think you used the word ping whether it was the Internal Revenue Service or some other body to access this information regarding income eligibility. Could you — could you perhaps expand on that or correct me if I'm wrong?

DIRECTOR McCARTHY: President Cole,
Representative Redfern, if you read any of the
articles about the current healthcare.gov system and
some of the issues that they've had and some of the
technical pieces behind it, some of the articles I've
read have talked about the fact that there's two
pieces to that system. The piece that has been

working, I won't say well or good or bad or indifferent, but the piece that's been working is the federal data hub. That is the back end of the system for which we verify people's income.

2.1

So when we designed the current system, what we wanted to do was ensure we were able to get individuals into the program who deserve to be in the program and, of course, for individuals who don't deserve to be in the program make sure they're not enrolled and then put them — point them in the direction we should be pointing them which would probably be the Federal Exchange.

So, correct, the way the online application works the person goes to the online application, and I want to clarify something on this. This isn't just for the 366,000 people we're talking about here. It is also the way the Federal Government has said that parents and children shall enroll also, go online to the website, you put in information. If you put in certain information, specifically if you're willing to put in your Social Security No., then you put in what your income is, we then —— and there is some other pieces of information obviously, name, birthdate, and things like that, we then ping the federal data system to determine if the

values you gave us are legitimate. Specifically are you a U.S. citizen? You must be a U.S. citizen to enroll in the Medicaid program. Is your Social Security number a valid Social Security number? And does your income match what's on the IRS files for the modified adjusted gross income under the new eligibility rules?

2.0

2.1

If the answer is yes, per federal law we must do an instantaneous eligibility decision for all three of those groups. Currently it takes the State of Ohio somewhere around 30 days to process an application. I don't believe that would meet the new definition of instantaneous. While there isn't been offered a definition of instantaneous we are hoping it's faster than that. It will come back and say if the person is eligible or not eligible. If they're eligible, it will say you're eligible for the program. We are still working out some of the pieces behind that.

But there -- we have also made changes to the Medicaid claim system where now it's a live connection back and forth. It's not even an overnight connection. There's a live connection that a person would obtain eligibility immediately. If they're not eligible, the system will then point them

in the direction that they should go, most likely then back to the Exchange itself or someplace else.

2.1

REPRESENTATIVE REDFERN: Mr. President, to the witness, when you mentioned "exchange," you -- you're using it to describe the Federal Exchange because the State of Ohio does not operate a state exchange. You're participating with HHS through its -- its national exchange, that's correct, right?

DIRECTOR McCARTHY: President Cole,
Representative Redfern, that is correct. The State
did not choose to run its own exchange as just
similarly the State did not choose to have the
Exchange do Medicaid eligibility determinations. We
could have let them do that, but we chose not to. We
do our own eligibility determinations, and so then we
have to exchange data with the Federal Change.

REPRESENTATIVE REDFERN: And,

Mr. President, Director, this then would — these
activities that now Medicaid eligible individuals can
choose from automated online or telephone or in
person at a local county offices. If they would
choose online, they go to insurance.ohio.gov or is
there a stand-alone site? Will there be a
stand-alone site tomorrow?

DIRECTOR McCARTHY: President Cole,

Representative Redfern, the current site so it's not a site tomorrow --

2.1

REPRESENTATIVE REDFERN: Okay.

with the new eligibility system back on October 1, there's benefitsohio.gov. That is the portal for which people will move through to enroll in the program. Now, I will tell you, as I have said before, it will not be ready tomorrow. It's just I am good at what I do, but I can't make that happen that quickly, okay? So we are -- again, if approved, we would be working towards making those changes.

REPRESENTATIVE REDFERN: Fair, fair.

And, Mr. President, Director, let's say a month or two, I don't -- I don't want to hold you to a date, but for 366,000 people we don't want to buy \$50,000 worth of radio advertisement in Columbus, Ohio, to do it. How would we advise those people that this is something they ought to do? I would assume when they go to healthcare.gov and they enter their information, this is one of the avenues that is suggested that you are now Medicaid eligible and your state, assuming this vote occurs, will now allow you access into the Medicaid system.

DIRECTOR McCARTHY: President Goal --

President Cole, Representative Redfern, at some point in the future, yes, that is the way it is supposed to work is that if a person were to go through healthcare.gov first, that when they do the prescreen, it will say you are probably eligible for the Medicaid program in the State of Ohio. It passes that information over to us. We are then supposed to process that information to make a determination if the person is eligible or not. So that is one way.

2.1

Mr. President, Director McCarthy, is there any way the State can participate without the direct involvement of pinging the Internal Revenue Service and the IRS providing that private information to —to the State? You have to have that access, don't you?

DIRECTOR McCARTHY: President Cole,
Representative Redfern, it's actually unclear right
now if you have to have that access because you could
use State information instead of federal information
for some of it.

REPRESENTATIVE REDFERN: Right.

DIRECTOR McCARTHY: Income, for instance. We are not done with our eligibility system. The problem with using the federal hub is that that

information is a year old because it's last year IRS information. We currently use their systems to determine if a Social Security Number is valid and if the person is a U.S. citizen using their — that person's Social Security Number, name, date of birth.

2.1

But for the income information the federal system actually may cause more false negatives in that because it's looking at last year's data. As a part of the new eligibility system, we were also looking at the possibility of using state-based information too to make that determination if it would go quicker.

REPRESENTATIVE REDFERN: And we're budgeted for that particular activity. These resources are not being used for that activity. You are budgeted at the appropriate level to take this project on between now and the end of the year or you think you'll be back --

DIRECTOR McCARTHY: President Cole,
Representative Redfern, we are appropriated to
implement the new eligibility system and all the
components of it, and as -- as people were here a
couple weeks or a month ago asking for changes in
those appropriations, I think -- I believe I told
you, you know, some of the timelines we have for the

implementation of a system.

2.0

2.1

REPRESENTATIVE REDFERN: They did and that's why I asked them why, are expecting to come to the Controlling Board with this, and they said, no, we have not had that discussion yet. That's why I had to ask that, no offense.

If I may to Director Moody in his proposal, he indicates that there are \$400 million over this particular biennium will be saved by embracing Medicaid coverage at 136 to 138 percent of the poverty levels. And if I could, Mr. President, ask Director Moody to come to the podium if you agree to answer a couple of questions regarding that \$400 million savings.

PRESIDENT COLE: Director Moody.

DIRECTOR MOODY: Thanks. Representative, you know, along that line of the system itself and we got way down in the weeds there.

REPRESENTATIVE REDFERN: Yep. And I think, you know, given the fact that this thing isn't going through the legislature, I think the weeds is where we ought to start. No, offense, Mr. President.

Director Moody, on your -- on your particular handout that you provided to the Finance Committee which Chairman Amstutz chairs, you

indicated there would be a \$404 million savings if Ohio were to embrace extended Medicaid coverage over this biennium. That number there is some lucidity perhaps but that \$400 million number is still a pretty good number?

DIRECTOR MOODY: Mr. President,
Representative Redfern --

2.0

2.1

 $\label{eq:REPRESENTATIVE REDFERN:} \mbox{ It was February}$ so I — it was February.

DIRECTOR MOODY: Yeah. And -- and what that was was the discussion of the package of reforms as introduced with the budget seeking the legislative authority to move in combination all of the reforms. The items related to extending Medicaid coverage we did indicate were in the scale of 404 million. They don't necessarily happen outright. However, they -- they would require an action.

REPRESENTATIVE REDFERN: And -- thank you, Mr. President, Director. And, yes, I understand budgeting -- budgeting. I would agree with you. So if the -- if the number is 400 million or given the reforms that Chairman McClain and others want to take up and legislation that we're considering -- or they're considering in the Senate, perhaps there'll be additional savings, what do we do with that

\$400 million? Do we set it aside so in the second biennium -- in a second term rather of a Governor reelected or first term of a new Governor that there will be resources once -- once the federal drawdown begins so we're not caught offguard by it?

2.0

2.1

DIRECTOR MOODY: Mr. President,
Representative, that would be a decision for the
legislature to make as it relates to reform.

REPRESENTATIVE REDFERN: And would that be something you could support as a 30-year veteran of these kinds of debates?

DIRECTOR MOODY: Mr. President, I'm sorry, support?

REPRESENTATIVE REDFERN: Would you support -- a few years ago, eight or nine years ago, there was a stabilization fund for -- for these kinds of funded programs actually in the legislature. And it again, it may be Senator Sawyer could correct me or someone whose been here longer, since '99, that fund was created to provide stability going forward knowing that General Assemblies change from time to time, the drawdowns occur from time to time, and for 366,000 Ohioans, many with so many profound challenges that they ought not be -- be -- be really put in a position where legislatures in Columbus,

```
Ohio, are making decisions, where they have access to health care that you and I have. So would you support taking savings — regardless of the amount, that are found because of this extended Medicaid coverage and the embrace of Obamacare by this administration, would you support taking those dollars and placing them in a lockbox of sorts?
```

2.1

DIRECTOR MOODY: Mr. President,
Representative Redfern, clearly the idea of
stewardship going forward is important. It's why we
took the \$1.89 in the Budget Stabilization Fund and
acted to raise that to a significantly higher number.
There has in the past been Medicaid stabilization
funds. We would include that like any of the number
of reforms that are on the table as something that we
are very willing to engage.

PRESIDENT COLE: Any additional questions, Representative?

REPRESENTATIVE REDFERN: I would like to -- Representative McGregor, he has been chomping at the bit to answer -- ask a couple of questions so.

REPRESENTATIVE McCLAIN: (Inaudible.)

REPRESENTATIVE REDFERN: If you could

come back to me, I would appreciate that.

Thank you, Director.

PRESIDENT COLE: Representative McGregor.

REPRESENTATIVE McGREGOR: Thank you,

Mr. President.

2.0

2.1

As has been mentioned repeatedly, what we are looking at here today is really a temporary proposal to access federal funds until June of 2015. Absent any legislative action between now and then, one would expect that the administration would need to come back before Controlling Board to continue on beyond that point in time.

Assuming that may be the case, what type of metrics for anticipated outcomes do you expect to see based on a positive vote today and accessing these federal funds? What would the story — what would you hope the story is going to be and how are you going to measure it and analyze it for perhaps future considerations?

DIRECTOR McCARTHY: President Cole,
Representative McGregor, our plan if we move forward
is to have the individuals that we are talking about
today be enrolled in our privatized managed care
plans.

As I talked about earlier, we use something called HEDIS measures. There's a whole bunch of them but we focus on the ones that mattered

the most to the program to get them focused. And what we look for is improvement in those HEDIS measures from year to year. So just like the rest of the populations, we're proposing the holdback 1 percent of the cavitation payments so as to create the incentive to managed care plans to improve health care coverage and get those HEDIS scores to go up from where they are at now. That is one of the ways we measure our health plan performance in measuring those outcomes.

So we would be bringing that information forward along with much of the information we already bring forward around utilization, our utilization, impacts on individuals that we find, but also in no small part is financial impacts. We'll be measuring obviously the expenditures of the program and bringing that back and saying how does the growth in that population compare to other populations that we have? Is it greater? Is it lower? Is there something different in there? So it's all those different pieces we would be bringing forward to the legislature.

REPRESENTATIVE McGREGOR: Thank you.

PRESIDENT COLE: Thank you,

Representative.

2.0

2.1

Representative, Redfern.

REPRESENTATIVE REDFERN: Thank you,

Mr. Cole, Mr. President. Thank you.

2.0

2.1

Director Moody, if I may, the dollars that are going to be used to -- if the Controlling Board agrees, what happens if the Controlling Board decides not to use? There's been some talk that these dollars will go elsewhere, that if Ohio doesn't get its fair share -- a similar argument was used, if you may recall, if Ohio doesn't use dollars that are available for high speed rail, that these dollars would go elsewhere and that we were just going to Washington with "a tin cup." What happens to these dollars if they are not used in Ohio today?

DIRECTOR MOODY: Mr. President,
Representative Redfern, the disposition of those
dollars are a matter of Congress. We did say in our
testimony that if there was some way to return those
dollars to the State directly, that would be relevant
in our decision making but that is not within the
authority of the legislature of the Governor's
Office.

So the fact is that Ohio federal taxes will go to the Federal Government. The question is then do those services occur here or elsewhere? We

believe it is appropriate that they occur here.

PRESIDENT COLE: Follow-up,

Representative?

2.0

2.1

REPRESENTATIVE REDFERN: My final question for eithers — either Director McCarthy or Director Moody is — is if this particular action is enjoined, what is the plan for those 366,000 Ohioans to achieve health care coverage if the Controlling Board's action today is enjoined? Is there a similar working group looking at going forward to — with a ballot measure that's been talked about? I see John Allison over there with the Hospital Association or another approach to achieve this goal of embracing Obamacare?

DIRECTOR MOODY: Mr. President,
Representative Redfern, it's the same team. As you
might expect throughout this process, we've tried to
identify what is both most appropriate to achieve the
objective to extend coverage on January 1. We
believe this action is appropriate. We were very
careful to understand the nature of the authority
that's involved. We believe a challenge — that we
would prevail in a challenge, but it is not within
our control to predict what the nature of that
challenge might be, if there is one. So today we are

acting on what we can choose to act on. The team is assembled and ready for whatever might follow.

2.1

REPRESENTATIVE REDFERN: Does that -final question, does that team include the Lieutenant
Governor of this State, a vocal critic of Obamacare?

DIRECTOR MOODY: Mr. President --

REPRESENTATIVE REDFERN: The operator of the Exchange.

DIRECTOR MOODY: -- Representative

Redfern, the team includes all of the senior

leadership of the administration. Particularly in

her role with insurance, it includes the Lieutenant

Governor. It includes the Directors who have visited

with you today and all of our staffs.

PRESIDENT COLE: That said, Director Moody, Senator Widener has some questions.

This is the final step. The (inaudible) was approved and under 131.35 there is no executive order required. The action of the Controlling Board finishes the appropriations process so you can proceed; is that accurate?

DIRECTOR MOODY: Mr. President, Members of the Committee, that -- that is correct. The group would be covered under existing eligibility rules so there are not other requirements, for example,

through the JCARR process. And the systems have been designed in a way to accommodate extending coverage January 1 so I would agree with you that we believe the final action to extend coverage on January 1 would be approval of the appropriation by the Controlling Board.

2.0

2.1

PRESIDENT COLE: Senator Widener for the purpose of a question?

SENATOR WIDENER: Thank you,

Mr. President. Director Moody, keep you up there for
a few minutes longer, if you don't mind. So

following up with what President Cole just said, I

read your request today that says Ohio law gives the

Medicaid Director express authority to seek a state

plan amendment without additional legislation and

that plan amendment has been received on October 10,

2013.

So I would just like to clarify, maybe wrap up some of the loose ends of some of the questions all of the Cabinet Members have been asked today, your request is not before Controlling Board to expand Medicaid to additional persons in Ohio, is it?

DIRECTOR MOODY: Mr. President --

SENATOR WIDENER: I'll rephrase. You are

not asking Controlling Board to expand Medicaid, are you?

2.1

DIRECTOR MOODY: Mr. President, Senator Widener, we have requested from the Federal Government the authority to expand Medicaid. What we are asking of the Controlling Board is the authority for an appropriation to receive the federal dollars.

SENATOR WIDENER: Right. I just want to be clear for all the groups and organizations that have chosen to communicate with us as legislatures over the last week or two which is fine, and I'm perfectly fine with that, phone calls, e-mails, whatever, that the idea that the Controlling Board could stop the expansion, I just wanted to be clear, that's not what you are asking us to do today.

The Governor and his team and research of all the months and even years that you've described here today are going into this decision, and his decision is to expand. He asked the Federal Government to do that and that approval has already been received; is that right?

DIRECTOR MOODY: Mr. President and Senator Widener, and specifically it's Revised Code 5163.03 that provides that the Medicaid program shall cover all mandatory eligibility group and may cover

any of the optional eligibility groups.

2.1

SENATOR WIDENER: Right.

DIRECTOR MOODY: And separately it's

Revised Code 5162.07 that gives the Medicaid Director

the authority to seek a state plan amendment to do

that so we are acting under the authority of the

administration to seek that approval.

SENATOR WIDENER: All right. And since I notice that you or someone brought a color chart over there by our Communications Director, whatever, do you mind if someone sets that up there in front of Representative Redfern and I can just ask a couple of questions? That looks like your chart, is it not?

(Inaudible.)

SENATOR WIDENER: Yeah, if you can just have them set it up there on the corner of the dias there.

Director Moody, okay. Okay, now, I can't see it. Just set it up there on the corner. Have Mr. McClelland hold it up there on the corner of the dias there so everybody can see that.

PRESIDENT COLE: This is the Senator's question. I'm not going to get involved in this.

SENATOR WIDENER: Okay. I just want to make sure that was the same one I thought it was. So

what we're talking about today is those folks not in the color column -- 1 through 5 columns that are in a wide area, I believe it says coverage gap; is that right?

2.1

DIRECTOR MOODY: That's correct.

President Cole, Senator Widener, what you're looking at is — is a fairly well circulated picture of eligibility for access to affordable coverage beginning January 1. What you're looking at in yellow are the income ranges from 100 percent of poverty to 400 percent of poverty where through the Federal Health Insurance Exchange Ohioans will have access to an income tax credit for insurance they purchased on the Exchange.

In the blue what you're looking at are the current eligibility categories for Ohio Medicaid so we cover children to 200 percent of poverty, parents to 90 percent and people with disabilities and seniors.

According to the federal law the eligibility for the the Exchange does not go below 100 percent of poverty. So if we choose not to extend Medicaid coverage, then there is a group of Ohioans below 100 percent poverty that would not have access to Medicaid and not have access to the Federal

Exchange. That coverage gap is the group that you heard described earlier.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

SENATOR WIDENER: And, Mr. President, Director Moody, it's fair to say that the ACA or Obamacare, as President Obama has referred to it himself, I believe his Presidential opponent got him to agree to that in a Presidential debate many years ago so it is a common term to define the ACA, those persons below 100 percent of poverty, single adults in the State of Ohio, and those single parents between 91 percent and 99 percent in that coverage bar that you're showing over there were not covered in ACA. They were not covered in an exchange. They were not covered by the President's law whatsoever. And the only thing in that federal law offered a little carrot to the states to decide for themselves as to whether to cover these folks by Medicaid or go on their own and pick some other plan; is that right? DIRECTOR MOODY: Mr. President, Senator Widener, and technically there was an assumption that that group would be picked up under extending Medicaid as a mandate on states, and then it was the Supreme Court decision that opened up the coverage gap through the optional nature of the decision.

SENATOR WIDENER: So, Mr. President,

Director Moody, so between the law and the Supreme Court decision primarily an interpretation of the law, the federal law did not cover the working poor in the State of Ohio or in any other state as it was conceived or written; is that right?

2.1

DIRECTOR MOODY: Mr. President and Senator Widener, the circumstance we have today is that, yes, that is true, that this group without the decision of the Controlling Board would make to allow us to expend the funds related to the federal approval, that group would remain uncovered.

SENATOR WIDENER: Okay. Mr. President, moving on to the cost, you're asking in the Controlling Board request for approximately \$560,000,000 increase in FY14 and 2. -- well, about 1.9 billion in FY15 so those costs have to come along with estimates that you make of the number of people and I think you and Director McCarthy have -- have been into the details on this and I happen to be aware that Cuyahoga County, and Metro Health in particular, had been running a pilot program which you helped them obtain the permission to do and in my mind that would kind of lead towards a field case as to whether these estimates of number of people and the costs per person per month, I suppose, of how

these estimates were derived are accurate. Are you still, A, believing that the Metro Health is a good test for how these people and those coverage gaps can be offered health care and that health care can be managed at a reasonable cost going forward?

2.1

DIRECTOR MOODY: President Cole, Senator Widener, we hired an outside actuary to do our projections and so these aren't internal numbers that we came up. It is an actuarial firm who put the numbers together both for the numbers of people and for the per member per month costs because at the time when we had asked them to do that, we assumed everyone would be in managed care so that's why they were putting those together.

The numbers that we used in our projections are based on -- based on past history assuming actually that individuals enrolled would be slightly healthier coming into the program, just slightly, so the number -- the prePM that we have put into our projections are slightly lower than our current managed care numbers.

So how does that compare with what's going on at Metro in Cuyahoga County? So the Metro System when it came up has a more limited network because of the fact that it's just individuals coming

through the Metro Hospital System. And also the benefit limits, there are benefit limits in there. They have seen a number that is coming in because we're watching that because there is a waiver cap. They originally proposed \$580 of the waiver cap or thereabouts. That's coming in about \$382 per member per month but that's just for the medical costs. That doesn't include the administrative load that is put on there which includes state sales taxes and things like that. So if you look at where the Metro costs are, they have been inching up actually every month slightly as more people are coming into the program.

2.1

They thought that the ramp up would be a little bit quicker than it has been. It's actually slowed down. It was a little slower than they thought it was going to be. But as they are looking at it and they are seeing the services that are covered, the reason that it's going up slightly is because those people that got in the program at the beginning are those that are chronically ill, and so now they're seeing their costs continue month to month.

So as that's been inching up a little bit, it's moving right into the range of the medical

component of our estimates. Again, as we do every budget, just this last budget and this budget, we use our actuaries to set an actuarial sound rate and then from there in addition — in addition to that we go back and we will call it a negotiation, I guess, with our managed care plans but just because the number is in the budget doesn't mean that's the number they get.

2.1

Some of our savings that we've had over the last couple of years is that we budgeted at one level and we were able to negotiate a lower rate with the managed care plans going forward. We've proposed at this point in time the six-month rates for the managed care plans. And so what does that mean? We will put a rate forward six months and if the experience comes in a little lower than that, then we would go back and lower our per member per month that we offer to the plans.

SENATOR WIDENER: Mr. President, so just in summary the numbers you are asking for today in the increase of this federal Medicaid line item you believe are accurate as we know today based on population and the cost of health care that this group may consume over the next 18 months.

DIRECTOR MOODY: President Cole, Senator

Widener, they are pure best estimates for this population.

2.1

SENATOR WIDENER: And, Mr. President, just to confirm you've actually even had a case study in Cuyahoga County, been able to watch and compare their numbers up there based -- and compare back your actuarial numbers.

DIRECTOR MOODY: Mr. President, Senator Widener, our actuaries have worked with us very closely on this continuing to look at Metro, what's going on in Cuyahoga County, and any other changes that we've had in the program including budget changes.

SENATOR WIDENER: And, Mr. President, you mentioned Metro is right around 380, 390 per person per month in their pilot project and what is your person per month that you've based this estimate on here today?

DIRECTOR MOODY: President Cole, Senator Widener, it was \$445 per member per month.

SENATOR WIDENER: Mr. President, so you have some room built in there just in case something were to be different than what you know today then for the next 18 months.

DIRECTOR MOODY: President Cole, Senator

Widener, I want to make it clear the Metro number does not include the administrative load on there so you would have to add on another 12 percent to the 383 that they are currently experiencing, again, with that going up. So when you put those two together and the numbers of people, it is very close.

2.1

SENATOR WIDENER: And, Mr. President, could you also then on the front page of your request you have a sentence if this federal Medicaid assistance percentage is lowered, meaning the 100 percent, the State -- State funds will not be used to do supplant the federal funds. Can you describe what you mean by that?

DIRECTOR MOODY: President Cole, Senator Widener, it's what I spoke about earlier I believe to a question from Senator Coley and that is we're asking for the appropriation authority during the next -- during our biennium, the time limited span.

During that time limited span Title 19 of the Social Security Act says the federal matching rate for those individuals is 100 percent federal dollars. That's what it says.

The deal that we are entering into with the Federal Government is that that is 100 percent, and so we won't be using any State dollars as a State

match like we do for the other versions of the program. The reason we put that in there, as I said earlier, we believe in the deal that we put forward, and if that deal changes, then we need to go back and revisit that deal.

2.0

2.1

SENATOR WIDENER: Mr. President, if we could move maybe to talk a little bit about the people that are in that coverage gap area that Director Moody identified, I've got a couple of questions maybe for General Ashenhurst or Director of Veterans Affairs or together maybe, both. I have a couple of questions for them.

Mr. President, partly because I worked 10 years at Wright-Patterson Air Force base I know not to leave the General sitting there without properly asking the questions that I believe she might have the information on.

General, you mentioned that many of our active guardsmen and women today may or may not have access to health care coverage. And I just wanted to ask a couple more detailed questions about that because obviously if they are a student, full-time student, of which I think we have about 14, 15 hundred in Ohio that we provided guards scholarship for which is one of the reasons why your manpower is

normally well over 100 percent, as I recall. If they're a full-time student, their parents don't have health care coverage that they can be on as a student, if they just have the guard as their only income, and if they have no other health care, you mentioned — really the only other thing I heard you mention they may be able to go to is Tricare which is the Federal Health Insurance Program.

2.0

2.1

And so my questions are how does Tricare compare to Medicaid, particularly in the areas of mental health, behavioral health? I mean, the Director mentioned some of the post-traumatic stress syndrome issues that we have in our guard as well as throughout the country. How does Tricare really compare and are those services really adequate as compared to Medicaid which is what we're being asked to look at today?

GENERAL ASHENHURST: President Cole,
Senator Widener, although Tricare does cover some
basic mental health and preventive care and some
limited -- the coverage is very limited and more
restrictive is the number of providers that will
actual -- actually accept Tricare as their -- the
provider. We are struggling and although we are
continuing to expand the number of providers in Ohio,

there are certain areas that still are not covered and particularly in the areas of mental health we're struggling to get providers to accept Tricare. There are limited services and it -- it gets pretty detailed as to the initial service, whether it was an emergency service that starts the service and whether there are follow-on services. As with many insurance programs, it's somewhat -- it's very much restrictive for those services.

2.1

SENATOR WIDENER: And, Mr. President, I assume that probably even some restrictions on the prescriptions that are often prescribed as a part of mental health or behavioral issues?

GENERAL ASHENHURST: Mr. President and Senator, yes, as -- if you think of this as a very minimalistic insurance program, that is what Tricare is. It is really to make sure that basically our healthy guardsmen can retain their good health and be prepared to go to war.

SENATOR WIDENER: Right. And,

Mr. President, so, General, I think you mentioned

there's at least 4 -- maybe 400 or so guardsmen and

women you've identified today that you think will be

eligible based in this coverage gap area, based on

their life circumstances, and what else they do

outside and above being a part of our National Guard here in Ohio. And you mentioned it might be more than that. What about the veterans, what about have you had a chance to look into the folks that have left the guard, either retired or retired early or something like that?

2.0

2.1

DIRECTOR DOMINGUEZ: Mr. President,

Senator, once -- a challenge that we constantly face
with the Department of Defense in general and this is
something that, of course, General Ashenhurst has no
control over is that the Department of Defense tends
to not necessarily track their troops after they
leave service.

And so oftentimes it's left up to us and the State to identify who those veterans are and to connect them to their benefits. So what we constantly work with the U.S. Department of Veteran, Affairs and even through the U.S. Department of Defense when we are working federal systems like DPRS that let's us access a veteran's military records in order to file for benefits.

We are constantly striving to bridge that gap but that's something that DOD as far as keeping track of the troops once they leave was not necessarily done in the past and is trying to get

better at here in the future with a couple of programs like Soldier for Life, Sailor for Life, and Marine for Life, but we still have a long way to go so.

2.1

SENATOR WIDENER: Thank you. And,

Mr. President, I appreciate your description earlier

to talk about the V.A. because I think many people

I've talked to around Ohio assume that whether the

folks are in the guard or whether they are retired,

if they wore a uniform at any point in their life,

they can go to the V.A. for services. And I think

you identified very clearly and very well that's not,

in fact, the truth.

I heard someone actually -- retired guardsman from my area mention to me, you know, the V.A. is a system. It's not insurance. Medicaid is like many others insurance with these coverages that the -- that we ask the general about and the prescription coverage and so on and so forth and there is a difference basically.

DIRECTOR DOMINGUEZ: Mr. President, Senator, that's absolutely correct.

SENATOR WIDENER: So I next would like to ask some scenarios of who these people are to Directors Moothy -- Moody or McCarthy, either one,

because I have talked to some people in my district and around the State of Ohio, and I'll just talk about the guards person even though it's not going to be a guard-related issue. If someone were to leave the guard, Director McCarthy, leave early, say at the age of 52, go home to attend to parents whose health is ailing and they were to leave with less than \$11,000 a year in retirement income because they had to leave early, have no V.A. benefits, have no federal Tricare, would that person be eligible for Medicaid in that coverage gap area over there on the chart, a single adult making less than \$1,000 a year?

2.0

2.1

DIRECTOR DOMINGUEZ: President Cole,
Senator Widener, the answer to that is not only
single adult but a husband and wife if they were
making less than \$11,490 a year, yes, would be
eligible for the program.

SENATOR WIDENER: So, Mr. President, so people that actually left military service after, you know, 20 plus years of the guard and federal service but never really falling in a deployment that actually led to these benefits that the Director and General mentioned to and didn't have access to federal health care, they served our country, they served our State, now they are going home to take

care of ailing parents to save our State health care costs and keep seniors in home aren't themselves going to have health care coverage under that scenario I described.

2.1

DIRECTOR McCARTHY: President Cole -SENATOR WIDENER: They wouldn't be
covered under this gap that I described.

DIRECTOR McCARTHY: President Cole,
Senator Widener, that is correct. They would not be covered.

SENATOR WIDENER: Well, that is one person I talked to in Ohio. The second person I talked to in my district, Mr. President, is a senior at Wright State University, has no health insurance now, although has a part-time job. When she did have a full-time job and health insurance two years ago, she had brain surgery which obviously requires some follow-up and some ongoing visits. She's not able to get those visits now because she doesn't have that job any more.

She's trying to finish her degree to obtain a full-time job and full-time insurance, but right now, she's part-time, less than \$11,000 a year with her part-time job, and would she fall in that coverage gap?

1 DIRECTOR McCARTHY: President Cole, 2 Senator Widener, yes, she would fall in that gap. SENATOR WIDENER: 3 Thank you, 4 Mr. President. That's someone else from my district 5 and she's also going to the emergency room for simple 6 things like staph infections in her eye and so forth which you would admit, Director, that's our highest 7 cost option for some procedure like that? 8 9 DIRECTOR McCARTHY: President Cole, 10 Senator Widener --SENATOR WIDENER: An emergency room? 11 12 DIRECTOR McCARTHY: -- yes, the emergency 13 room is one of the more expensive options to use in -- for routine care. 14 15 SENATOR WIDENER: All right, thank you. And, Mr. President, another person I spoke to from my 16 17 district lost her job from DHL two years ago, lost 18 her -- obviously her health insurance with that job, 19 is struggling with health care coverage for her son 20 who has Asperger's, and she was forced to put off her 2.1 own hernia surgery for the last two years while she 22 didn't have health care or full-time employment. 23 She's hoping to get full-time employment 24 as a nurse since she went back to school and 25 full-time health insurance. Would that person,

Director McCarthy, be in this coverage gap?

DIRECTOR McCARTHY: President Cole,
Senator Widener, yes.

2.1

SENATOR WIDENER: Next, I would like to ask about the reforms that I think both
Representative McClain and others asked you about. Ithink you're familiar with Senator Burke's work in the Senate to try to work alongside with you and OHT to continue to provide you the tools necessary to monitor costs and monitor health outcomes which I believe is an initiative that you all started since coming into office.

And Senator Burke's bill talks about not only the cap in terms of per person per month growth in health care costs going forward but I think may also lead us to some other work he's done. I think he had some work done and probably shared it with you that showed if we were to add 273, 300 thousand Ohioans to the Medicaid roles for which I know a lot of members in the House and Senate have had a lot of issue with, in particular related to sustainability obviously going forward, I think Senator Burke's had some work done that has shown the cost of increase coming down at the same time enrollment would meet somewhere out there in about the year 2019. Are you

familiar with that work that he had done and could you give us your opinion on that?

2.0

2.1

DIRECTOR McCARTHY: President Cole,

Senator Widener, I am familiar with that. He asked

my -- my understanding is he asked the Health Policy

Institute of Ohio to do the analysis around that. It

is similar to some of the analysis that we've done in

looking at the sustainability of the program.

The -- we -- in looking at those projections and how they were put together, we agree that if the reforms that we all want to do go into place, that we will be able to significant -- significantly curtail the growth of the program and keep the growth of the program within the growth caps that he has actually proposed in the bill.

that, specifically around those percentages and those are equal to the ones we've been looking at keeping the growth under. I think they've moved around a little bit in his latest version of the bill, but it's — it's doable in the long run if we can keep the growth of the program somewhere around medical inflation, 3 percent, somewhere in there.

SENATOR WIDENER: And, Mr. President, I think at that study also showed that if we can keep

at or below the medical rate of inflation in Ohio going forward and you and your team, I think, are — deserve the credit to show us the light that's actually feasible and possible because of the work that's happened in the last two budgets here at that same percentage versus the — versus the prior percentages that you inherited.

2.1

If that's, in fact, the case in going forward, I believe his analysis showed that this additional number of persons coming on to the roles could actually be sustained past 2019 at the standard call it 60/40 federal/state match. And do you believe that analysis to be accurate?

DIRECTOR McCARTHY: President Cole,

Senator Widener, that -- that is an accurate

representation of -- of his analysis. Our numbers

are very close to that. And, you know, I have

nothing to dispute his numbers right now to say that

his numbers are not accurate. I think we were

differing by, you know, a few months on -- when those

two things would happen, but the analysis we're

pretty close together.

SENATOR WIDENER: And, Mr. President, so yours and Director Moody's assessment would be that, you know, certainly understand the skepticism of

adding another 270,000, 300,000 Ohioans to the Medicaid roles was something you would probably rather not do given a clean sheet of paper, but since we don't have a clean sheet of paper, we have the ACA, we have those coverage gaps over there on your chart, that providing coverage to these Ohioans so they can get back to work as quickly as they would like to, that that also can be done in such a way that we should reasonably expect with continued reforms of the Medicaid system we actually can sustain this number at the traditional 60/40 match going forward in the next few years; is that right?

2.1

DIRECTOR McCARTHY: President Cole,
Senator Widener, we agree completely that we must
sustain the reforms that we've started and continue
to do those. I mean, we have said those continuously
and, you know, have -- all of our work has pointed
towards that, and we keep proposing more and more.
And so assuming that all of those can happen and then
even some more happen, that possibility of
sustainability at the current FMAP is a possibility.

SENATOR WIDENER: And, Mr. President, so the question's, I think, been asked but I just wanted to hear a short, direct answer, if you could, between you and Director Moody, if not Medicaid to cover this

group that's identified on your chart there as not currently obtaining coverage, what by January 1 is the answer or answers to provide these persons in Ohio with the health care much like the three scenarios I mentioned to you for Andrea and Taylor and Victor, which I didn't give you the names before but now I just did? For them what is the answer come January 1 and their call it midlife crisis that we have health carewise? What else can be done?

2.1

DIRECTOR McCARTHY: President Cole,
Senator Widener, if we were unable to extend Medicaid
coverage to those individuals, on January 1 they will
continue where they're at, receiving services —
either putting them off or receiving services in the
emergency rooms. There is nothing else for us to do
at that point.

Mr. President, that's interesting. I thought that the answer myself, although some national experts that were in town last week talking to legislatures said, well, you know, we have federally qualified health care clinics. We have FQHC lookalikes. We have other things hospitals can do, doctors can do, we have free clinics and described to me basically status quo because my community has an FQHC in

Springfield, Ohio, and I think it started about 10 years ago is about how long it took us to get established, to get it qualified, to get it to see adults and kids, and so on and so forth so I don't see any of those options as anything that can be done by January 1 or frankly, Director, by next January 1, do you? Am I missing something?

2.1

DIRECTOR McCARTHY: President Cole,
Senator Widener, I am aware of some of the
discussions around using more FQHCs. You are
correct, that is a federal program. That is not a
state program. The State cannot create federally
qualified health centers. There's a process they
have to go through. First, you usually have to be
lookalike before they become a federally qualified
health center and that process does not happen
overnight. It takes a while for that to actually
happen.

So I agree, there's no way that could happen by January 1 of next year. I doubt it would happen by January 1 of the following year. It still takes resources to put those together, and I'm sure the federally qualified health center in your district got those resources from somewhere else to pull together to move forward. It would not

happen -- it does not happen in a very quick manner. We work with fairly qualified centers right now in the Medicaid program, and they are a provider to the program but a very small percentage of individuals in the program just because there's not -- although there seems like a large number there's not that many in the State of Ohio to cover everyone.

2.0

2.1

SENATOR WIDENER: President Cole, I was just pointing out the irony of some groups that say that we should not before additional dollars from the Federal Government to cover those people on the chart over there but we should take federal dollars to do FQHCs in our community. It just seems a little bit ironic to me. I don't have to answer that. That was — that was a statement.

PRESIDENT COLE: Additional questions, Senator?

SENATOR WIDENER: I just have one,
Mr. President, and so since you didn't bring this
chart along, Director Moody or McCarthy, this was
also part of that presentation that was a PowerPoint
and I just want to clarify in terms of the taxpayer
relief here in Ohio and I just want to clarify your
intent that if this is approved today, your other
budget implications that you talked about in both the

House and Senate testimonies, I believe, or maybe less in the Senate because of the -- of the House testimony. But prison costs, \$27 million in the GRF will not be spent in DRC. I believe I confirmed that with Director Keen. Hospital rates will be reduced by 5 percent which is savings of about \$96 million to the GRF. The hospital capital payments will be reduced \$21 million. Health plan administrative savings, Director, I think you already said will be reduced \$52 million from the current rates and, thus, there will be sales tax revenue. That will all add up to about \$404 million in the current GR -- GRF and I think the other representatives asked perhaps maybe an unfair question what do we do that with. That's our job as appropriators.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

2.1

22

23

24

25

But are all those basically planned to be done administratively, no future legislation required? The taxpayers of Ohio will have those dollars for legislators to reappropriate over the next 18 months; is that right?

DIRECTOR McCARTHY: President Cole,
Senator Widener, everything that we are able to do
without legislative change we are planning to do
moving forward.

SENATOR WIDENER: And, Mr. President, all

those things that I just mentioned are able to be done administratively through your actions as the Director of Medicare?

2.1

DIRECTOR McCARTHY: President Cole,
Senator Widener, they're all able to be done except
for the -- on the hospital reimbursement rate there
is a portion of that that is tied to specific
outpatient rates at -- in current Ohio Administrative
Code locks in the rate. This is the one area that we
have not been able to figure out a way
administratively to do. So that is a small reduction
to that \$96 million.

SENATOR WIDENER: Thank you and thank the rest of the Governor's cabinets for your answers today. Thank you.

PRESIDENT COLE: Senator Coley, follow-up?

SENATOR COLEY: Yeah, thank you,

Mr. President and to Director McCarthy. As we've
said, the Governor and your -- Director has expanded

Medicaid coverage in the State. There are not
sufficient funds in the GRF in the budget that we
already approved last summer. If this panel does not
approve these funds, how long will the existing

Medicaid program have funds to operate without

approval of the funds that you would -- are asking for approval of the expenditure today?

2.0

2.1

DIRECTOR McCARTHY: President Cole,

Senator Coley, that is an analysis that the -- it

depends on where we come in below our current

appropriation levels. We are obviously running under

budget slightly for this fiscal year. So sometime at

the end of this fiscal year we would probably run out

of money.

Into next fiscal year though, I mean, obviously the extension happens January 1 and so it's only a half of a year and we weren't expecting everyone coming in January 1 and so it's ramped up to 366. Then when we get into the next fiscal year, '15, we would have a serious budget crisis fairly quickly because we're looking at about \$2 billion that would be needed and -- for the expenditures.

So it would be either at the end of this fiscal year or the beginning of next fiscal year.

It's hard for me to paint an exact date down right now just because of the variables in our current budget. I mean, but the good news is that with all the things we're doing we are still running under budget for this year.

SENATOR COLEY: Thank you, Mr. President.

Thank you.

2.1

PRESIDENT COLE: Thank you, Senator.

Representative Redfern.

REPRESENTATIVE REDFERN: Thank you,
Mr. President. Just a couple of follow-ups, if I
may. The number is 366,000 income eligible Ohioans
that would be covered by this extension — this
temporary extension of Medicaid. 366,000, that's the
number Director Moody gave me on Friday and the
number, Director McCarthy, you said earlier. Not
275, not 250, 366.

DIRECTOR McCARTHY: President Cole,
Representative Redfern, I will clarify why there's
two different numbers. I'm assuming your question
goes on that path. It's 366,000 would be added to
the program under the change in the eligibility
levels. The net change as we talked about in our
budget presentation in the House and in the Senate
was due to changes in the eligibility groups and
other affordable options for individuals and where
they would fall.

REPRESENTATIVE REDFERN: Sure.

DIRECTOR McCARTHY: So between those two things it's a net number of 275 but it's 366,000 coming up.

REPRESENTATIVE REDFERN: And you -Mr. President, you scale for 366, or do you scale for 275?

2.1

DIRECTOR McCARTHY: President Cole,
Representative Redfern, we always scale to meet the
needs of what's coming in. 366 is the number that we
would be ready for. If it's slightly higher than
that, we're ready for it. If it's below that, we're
ready for it.

McCarthy, Mr. President, Director McCarthy, in the required explanation of requests, the last sentence, if I may read, if this federal medical assistance percentage is lowered, State funds will not be used to supplant federal funds. And that's been the position both of you and Director Moody to myself and to the Board for this biennium. And you've made assurances that it's not the intent to — to find GRF moneys to supplant federal losses if in the — in the following bienniums there would be a retreat from at that 100 percent number.

But after three years, I think it is,

Director Moody, we do begin the process of scaling

down. 90 -- if I may, Mr. President, 99 percent, 98,

97, 2 or 3 per year or 1 percent per year. And

according to your actuarial study what is the number of Ohioans that will lose health insurance, those people that Senator Widener has spoken so eloquently about and myself and many others who believe that expanding health care for all Ohioans is a necessity, how many would lose that health care coverage per year in that fourth year, the fifth year, sixth, and the seventh, those stories that would not have a good ending? How many of those folks are we talking about?

2.1

DIRECTOR McCARTHY: President Cole,

Representative Redfern, I -- I'm a little con -- is

there -- I'm a little confused by your question. Are
there two questions in there?

REPRESENTATIVE REDFERN: You can accept as many as you'd like, Director.

DIRECTOR McCARTHY: The way I heard the question was what -- was when we have to start picking up the State's share, we would be asking to remove people from the program and that is not what we have proposed or what we talked about in the -- in this proposal or in the budget.

What we proposed in the budget was that we would move forward with this coverage as long as the federal deal stays intact which for the first

three years, '14, '15, and '16 is 100 percent federal funding; '17, '18, and '19, it drops down 95, 94, 93; and then 2020 goes to 90 percent. When we proposed this in moving forward, we assumed that that is the deal that would stay in place.

2.1

What we were saying about not using additional federal dollars was in this biennium if that number changed, we wouldn't use State dollars. We weren't saying that in the future because this proposal isn't about the future. What we were talking about these two years but in our budget proposal in the budget when we were asked about it, we said we are assuming that the federal matching percentage will stay in place at phased down to 90 percent and that we were working towards a program that Senator Widener talked about ensuring that we were able to sustain coverage for this group if it was at 90 percent as it is in the law.

REPRESENTATIVE REDFERN: Through reforms.

PRESIDENT COLE: So, Director, the same thing you said during the budget is the same thing you're saying here today.

DIRECTOR McCARTHY: That is correct, President Cole.

REPRESENTATIVE REDFERN: And similar

things, quite frankly, Mr. President, were said in 2003, similar assurances. We were going to achieve this through reform. And then there were ideas that we would send people out picking up litter so they could keep their health care. Or we would drug test everybody who was Medicaid eligible so as to ensure that they get Medicaid coverage.

2.1

Reform to you is different to you than it is to others, and I want to be sure that third and fourth year that the same level of strong commitment that I've heard from you and Director Moody and the other directors continues going forward in perpetuity, that we make this a -- a -- a goal, a shared goal, Republican, Democrat, old and young, rich and poor, that more Ohioans have access to health care rather than fewer.

And that sentence gives me pause knowing full well that during this request it will be fully funded. I cede you that argument, absolutely. But there are no guarantees, are there not, Director, in the third or fourth or fifth year? There are no guarantees as there were no guarantees in the -- in the biennium review of, I believe, Director Moody, 2003 or 2004.

DIRECTOR McCARTHY: President Cole,

Representative Redfern, even going back to clarifying which you said I said on Friday, no, there are no quarantees to anything in life.

2.1

PRESIDENT COLE: Thank you, Director.

Thank you for all of the questions and the deliberation today. Thank you, Directors, and everyone who was involved in this.

I think we've come to that moment everyone was waiting for. And I would just say quickly in a strange twist I have heard from hundreds of people across the State of Ohio who want me to both vote for this and against it via e-mail, phone call, letters, and no one has actually, that I know, asked me to vote for this, Director.

But just like the 65 other things on this agenda, they don't get to this agenda without my review and OBM and the attorneys and everyone else making sure it's something that should come before this Board. So it's reached that but I'll let you have the last word. Would you like me to vote for this request, Director McCarthy?

DIRECTOR McCARTHY: President Cole, yes,
I would please ask you to vote for this request.

PRESIDENT COLE: As a father with young children and a Gen-Xer that has to live for this

decision for the rest of their careers, I very happily support your request. DIRECTOR McCARTHY: Thank you. PRESIDENT COLE: Are there any objections to the request? SENATOR COLEY: Objection. REPRESENTATIVE McCLAIN: Objection. PRESIDENT COLE: Senator Coley objects. Representative McClain objects. Secretary, please prepare a yellow sheet. This request is approved with two objections. Thank you, Directors. DIRECTOR McCARTHY: Thank you. 2.1

CERTIFICATE I do hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and correct transcript of the proceedings recorded by audiotape and transcribed by me in this matter. Karen Sue Gibson, Registered Merit Reporter. (KSG-5771)