Agenda

• Welcome and Forum Logistics
• Introductions
• Director’s Comments
• Recent History of NEMT in South Carolina
• Examples of the Approach to NEMT Programs in Other States
• Stakeholder Comments / Recommendations
• Closing Remarks
Welcome and Forum Logistics

• Sign-In

• Comment / Recommendation Requests

• Comment Cards
Introductions

- Michael Collisi - Facilitator
- Michael Chowning - Facilitator
- Zenovia Vaughn - Program Manager
- Mike Benecke - Contract Manager
- Tony Keck - Agency Director SCDHHS
Director’s Comments
Recent History of SC NEMT

• By 2004 SCDHHS recognized the lack of accountability and efficiencies of NEMT program
• 2005 CMS relaxed the requirement for states to request Waivers for Broker Models
• 2005 first RFP was posted
History Continued

• Prior to 2007 SCDHHS managed a primarily Fee For Service (FFS) model
• SCDHHS contracted with a primary transportation provider in each county and reimbursed on a per passenger per mile basis
• Members contacted local Dept. of Social Service Offices and eligibility employees arranged transportation
History Continued

- 2007: First implementation of the broker model – 2 brokers awarded contracts
- Contracts with state and local governmental entities (school districts, DSS Foster Care)
- FFS for all ambulance transports
- FFS for all travel with overnight stay
Current Program

• 2011: Second implementation of the broker model – 2 brokers awarded contracts
• Contracts with state and local governmental entities (school districts, DSS Foster Care)
• FFS for 911 ambulance transports only
• Broker responsible for all travel with overnight stay
Current Program Continued

• Transportation Advisory Committee (TAC)
  – Required by Legislation
  – Provides stakeholder input for the program
  – Representation from SC medical associations, transportation providers, members and other state agencies
  – Quarterly meetings – link to minutes and reports: http://www.scstatehouse.gov/reports/reports.php#h
Compliance /Oversight Activity

• Monitoring
  – Monthly performance reporting
    o On-time performance
    o Provider / member no shows
    o Complaints
    o Call volumes
  – Quarterly broker-sponsored meetings
  – Random on-site reviews of broker and providers by SCDHHS staff
Compliance / Oversight Activity

• Satisfaction Surveys
  
  - 2009 Member Survey
    http://www.scdhhs.gov/sites/default/files/Medicaid%Transportation%20Survey%202009%Final%20Report.pdf

  - 2012 Transportation Provider Survey
    https://www.scdhhs.gov/sites/default/files/2012%20Medicaid%20Transportation%20Provider%20Survey%20Results_final_011613.pdf
NEMT Models Used in Other States

• Three Basic NEMT Models
  – FFS
  – NEMT Broker
  – NEMT carved into Managed Care Organizations (MCO)
NEMT Models Used in Other States

• State by State Comparisons
  – Some states use a combination of some or all of the three models
  – Variations in services included in NEMT make state by state comparisons a challenge
  – Some states use non-profit entities to coordinate all human services transportation in regional areas
NEMT Models Used in Other States

• Florida
  – NEMT managed by an independent state agency (Commission for the Transportation Disadvantaged (CTD))
  – Program features include Transportation Disadvantaged Trust Fund

Source: Human Service Transportation Coordination State Profile: Florida, National Conference of State Legislatures, Nicholas Farber and Jaime Rall, September 2010
NEMT Models Used in Other States

• Florida
  – Local coordinating boards recommend community transportation coordinators who in turn contract with the CTD
  – NEMT was Legislatively prevented from a carve-in to MCOs in 2008
  – The local coordinating boards decide on the model for the provision of transportation for all transportation-disadvantaged groups

Source: Human Service Transportation Coordination State Profile: Florida, National Conference of State Legislatures, Nicholas Farber and Jaime Rall, September 2010
NEMT Models Used in Other States

• Georgia
  – NEMT Broker Model
  – 5 Regions
  – 4 of 5 Regions managed by for profit brokers
  – 1 Region managed by a regional commission – Southwest Georgia Regional Commission (SWGRC)

Source: Georgia – Governor’s Development Council, House Bill 277 Report: Coordinating Rural and Human Service Transportation in Georgia, August 2011
NEMT Models Used in Other States

• North Carolina
  – FFS model
  – Administered by county social services
  – 50/50 FMAP rate (administrative)
  – Administrative rate provides more flexibility in NEMT benefit
  – Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS) review in 2008 indicated a problem with program oversight

Source: North Carolina – Department of Health and Human Services Report to the Joint Legislative Oversight Committee on Health and Human Services, October 2012
NEMT Models Used in Other States

• North Carolina
  – Posted RFP for broker model in 2012
  – Still in procurement process
  – No projected final decision date on procurement

Source: North Carolina – State of North Carolina Interactive Purchasing System Website
NEMT Models Used in Other States

• Summary
  – 39 states are using some form of a broker model
  – 11 states are using primarily FFS
  – 2 states started transitioning from a FFS model to the broker model in 2012 (NC, AL)
  – At least 4 states are primarily using the MCO model

Stakeholder Input

• How does transportation support healthier outcomes for the Medicaid population?

• What is the best way to set up the transportation program to meet this goal?
Closing Remarks

Thank you for attending:
SCDHHS values your input!