



June 29, 2023

Administrator, Chiquita Brooks-LaSure
Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services
Department of Health and Human Services
Hubert H. Humphrey Building
200 Independence Avenue, SW, Room 445-G
Washington, DC 20201

RE: Medicaid Program; Medicaid and Children's Health Insurance Program (CHIP) Managed Care Access, Finance, and Quality (CMS-2439-P)

The Community Health Care Association of New York State (CHCANYS) is grateful for the opportunity to provide comments on the proposed rule, Medicaid and CHIP Managed Care Access, Finance, and Quality. CHCANYS is the statewide primary care association representing New York's federally qualified health centers (FQHCs), also known as community health centers (CHCs). New York's FQHCs provide care at over 800 sites to more than 2.3 million patients. Among our patients, 89% live at or below 200% of the federal poverty level (FPL), and 59% are enrolled in Medicaid, Child Health Plus, or dually enrolled in Medicare and Medicaid.

CHCANYS supports this proposed rule, which strives to enhance access and utilization of health care and health services and promote opportunities for beneficiaries to be more involved in their care. We appreciate CMS' intent to better align Medicaid Managed Care and CHIP protections and provisions with other payers. CHCANYS submits these comments in alignment with those submitted by the National Association of Community Health Centers (NACHC). Our comments are broken down into four sections: I. Network Adequacy Provisions; II. In-Lieu of Services; III. State-Directed Payments and IV. Other Recommendations.

I. Network Adequacy Provisions

CHCANYS appreciates CMS' proposal to implement wait time standards for certain services at §438.68(e), specifically in the categories of substance use disorder/mental health, primary care (adult and pediatric), and OBGYN. In 2021 New York's FQHCs provided over 10 million visits, offering a range of essential services to their patients and communities. **While we agree with the spirit of the provision, CHCANYS is concerned about the continued shortage of workers seen across the healthcare sector, which has negatively impacted health centers.** A 2022 NACHC survey found that 68% of health centers lost between five and twenty-five percent of their workforce, with a majority citing financial opportunities at a large health care organization as the main reason for departure.¹ Nurses represent the highest category of workforce loss, followed by administrative, behavioral health, and dental staff. Workforce challenges can adversely affect patients and their health, as they contribute to longer wait times, decreased hours of operation for health centers, and decreased appointment availability.

¹ The National Association of Community Health Centers. (2022, March). Current State of the Health Center Workforce. Pandemic Challenges and Policy Solutions to Strengthen the Workforce of the Future. <https://www.nachc.org/current-state-of-the-health-center-workforce/>



With a shortage of behavioral health staff, meeting the 15-day appointment wait time standard for SUD/mental health would be particularly difficult for health centers. Unfortunately, there are no immediate solutions to address the healthcare workforce shortage and we anticipate challenges lasting beyond 2027, when these wait time standards will be mandated. A survey conducted by the Association of American Medical Colleges projects that the United States will face a shortage of up to 124,000 physicians by 2034, including 48,000 primary care clinicians.² Beyond dealing with workforce shortages, health centers have dealt with long delays in getting their providers credentialed, further contributing to the appointment wait time issue.

CHCANYS recommends CMS modify §438.214(b) to include additional requirements to ensure credentialing does not impede access to timely services and reimbursement. CMS must hold managed care entities more accountable in the provider credentialing process. We understand and appreciate CMS' proposal to add categories of services that credentialing must address. However, CHCANYS suggests CMS support some alternative strategies to mitigate the credentialing problem health centers are currently facing. Managed care entities have a business motive to prolong the credentialing process, and as a result, providers – including health centers – often have months-long periods of not being able to bill for the complete range of services provided by their clinicians. Estimates of revenue lost by not being able to bill for an average primary care provider can cost more than \$30,000 a month.³

By creating protections to ensure plans cannot stifle a provider's credentialing process, health centers will have more providers available to see their patients and could be better equipped to meet the proposed wait time standards. To hold plans accountable, CMS could, for example, require managed care entities to establish retrospective credentialing effective dates, or to delegate the credentialing function to network providers, like health centers, that have an internal credentialing process.⁴ These creative strategies would help decrease the burden oftentimes faced by health centers while maintaining the integrity of credentialing.

For the proposed appointment wait time standards, CHCANYS also seeks clarification on which patients this applies to – new versus existing patients – as well as definitions of “routine” versus “urgent” or “emergent” appointments. It is important wait time standards take into consideration the varying level of administrative and prep work required to get patients from the waiting room and in with a provider. Even if the new patient is a walk-in, where the intake process happens in person, health centers need to collect key pieces of information from patients prior to scheduling their appointment. Health center workflows are based on educating the patient, assessing their financial eligibility, and often screening for social drivers of health. Furthermore, health centers allocate a certain number of visits per day for walk in patients. To ensure adherence to these proposed wait time standards, it is imperative that CMS defines the types of visits subject to these proposed standards and also establishes wait time standards that take into consideration the health center patient populations and healthcare workforce challenges.

Further, the proposed language states that these wait time standards apply to “routine” appointments. We understand CMS' desire to allow States to develop and provide their own definitions, however, it would be beneficial if CMS provided States with clear guidance on ways to categorize these appointments. It will

² <https://www.aamc.org/media/54681/download>

³ <https://www.beckershospitalreview.com/finance/reclaiming-revenue-a-found-money-trifecta-in-credentialing-privileging-and-enrollment.html>

⁴ <https://www.beckershospitalreview.com/finance/reclaiming-revenue-a-found-money-trifecta-in-credentialing-privileging-and-enrollment.html>



be easier to compare access standards between States when CMS gathers that data and that the same standards apply for all appointments requested by patients, no matter what state they reside in.

CHCANYS understands that CMS defers to States in deciding what services to cover via telehealth. However, having more states cover telehealth services is a crucial component to help address wait times for appointments. **We ask CMS to continue to educate States on the importance of coverage and encourage comprehensive coverage of Medicaid services via telehealth.** However, CHCANYS is concerned that the patchwork of Medicaid coverage for telehealth services nationwide creates inequities across the country based on geography. To ensure all beneficiaries have equitable access, we encourage CMS to evaluate all states and US territories telehealth parity regulations and promote adequate reimbursement for primary care services.

While telehealth does not serve as a complete substitute for in-person medical care, the ability of health centers to provide care via telehealth has been crucial in bridging gaps to care for patients. In 2021, 99% of health centers nationwide offered telehealth services compared to just 43% in 2019.⁵ As a result of the various Medicaid flexibilities put in place – including permitting delivery of telehealth services via audio-only technologies and permitting reimbursement at an amount equal to an in-person visit in most circumstances – health centers have proven highly effective at utilizing telehealth. While telehealth flexibilities in Medicaid will not singularly resolve the workforce shortage, it will help connect more patients to care, a key goal of this proposed rule especially in the proposed wait time standards.

CHCANYS data shows that behavioral health visits are the most frequent telehealth visit type for health center patients. Overall, health care providers saw increased utilization of mental health services over the course of the pandemic, and providers have reported that no show rates for telehealth visits are extremely low. Given increased utilization, it is important that these services are not only accessible but paid the same rate as in-person services.

CHCANYS supports CMS’ proposal at §438.10 to direct MCOs to keep provider directories up to date.

This will alleviate the burden on patients from needing to call multiple providers to inquire if they are accepting new patients, or search for an updated phone number for the provider. We also support §438.10(h)(1) to require the managed care entity to mark a provider’s availability to provide appointments via telehealth. Some health centers have also cited that the delays of credentialing providers directly impacts maintenance of accurate, up-to-date provider directories. As previously mentioned, CMS should work with stakeholders to find solutions and improve credentialing to ensure the accuracy of provider directories as well as mitigate the healthcare workforce shortage.

To ensure compliance with these proposed standards, CHCANYS supports CMS’ proposal at §438.602 that directs the State to perform secret shopper surveys of plan compliance with appointment wait times and accuracy of provider directories.

We agree that MCOs must meet at least a 90% compliance rate and send directory inaccuracies to the State within three days of discovery. These secret shopper surveys will be a direct test of compliance, helping inform the State about network adequacy across plans and better ensure patients’ access to care. CHCANYS also supports the requirement that states post the results of their secret shopper surveys on their websites. This will enable enrollees, advocates, and providers to track plan performance, and hold plans and policymakers accountable to implement remedial measures to address and correct any deficiencies. We encourage CMS to consider compiling these reports

⁵<https://www.nachc.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/04/Community-Health-Center-Chartbook-2023-2021UDS.pdf>



and publishing them in one place on its Medicaid.gov website as well, to make it easier to find and compare the reports of different states, or to evaluate the performance of an MCO across various states.

CHCANYS supports CMS' directive for States to create a remedy plan at §438.207(f) in case network adequacy standards are not met but urge CMS to protect providers from adverse reactions from managed care entities. CHCANYS strongly supports the proposal to require states to promptly submit a remedy plan when CMS identifies areas for improvement for access to services and requiring that the remedy plan identify specific steps and timelines to achieve the goals of the remedy plan. This requirement would impose much-needed transparency and accountability to managed care rates. However, we ask CMS to ensure that providers and practices are not penalized or excluded from networks for managed care entities to better achieve at least 90% compliance with appointment wait times and provider directory accuracy. The requirements in the proposal will be a plan-wide requirement, but in practice, managed care entities may add more stringent wait time requirements as a standard part of network provider agreements, leaving providers instead of the specific plan being penalized.

CHCANYS supports developing more protections for providers like FQHCs to ensure managed care entities cannot deliberately exclude certain providers from their networks. Furthermore, we ask CMS to further clarify how they plan to hold States/managed care entities accountable if a 90% compliance rate is not met after state remedy plans. If multiple edited and updated state remedy plans still do not meet set network adequacy standards, we request CMS develop requirements to impose accountability on States and managed care entities to ensure patient access to services is not being hindered. We also recommend that the remedy plans, once approved, be posted on the state's website and that the state agency be required to share them with the Medicaid Advisory Committee and the Beneficiary Advisory Group.

CHCANYS supports CMS' proposal at (§§438.66(b) and (c), 457.1230(b)) to States on surveying enrollees and utilizing results to better evaluate their plans' networks to assure patient access to services. Having publicly available data regarding access to covered services allows consumers to become better informed when picking plans to ensure their plan not only meets their needs but maintains a high quality of care standards. We also appreciate CMS having States separately publish enrollee satisfaction related to telehealth appointments, which will help provide a fuller picture of patient experience with telehealth.

The availability of telehealth is popular among health center patients. Preliminary results from a new NACHC survey show that almost 90% of patients surveyed agreed that telehealth addressed their needs, was suitable for interaction with their clinician, and that they were generally comfortable and satisfied with care via telehealth. A quarter of the patients surveyed had a visit for behavioral health – 52.55% via audio-only and 65.7% via video (and some were both).⁶ This adds to the growing body of research about the strength of telehealth in providing clinically equivalent care⁷ besides eliciting strong satisfaction from patients.

II. In Lieu of Services or Setting (ILOS)

CHCANYS appreciates CMS codifying previous ILOS guidance⁸ into regulation through this proposed rule and supports creative ways States can utilize ILOS to provide enrollees more choices for health care

⁶ NACHC Patient Telehealth Satisfaction Assessment 2023, In review.

⁷ <https://jamanetwork.com/journals/jamanetworkopen/fullarticle/2796668>

⁸ <https://www.medicaid.gov/federal-policy-guidance/downloads/smd23001.pdf>



services. We applaud CMS in codifying the allowance for states to extend ILOS to better address health-related social needs (HRSNs).⁹ For years, health centers have been leaders in screening and addressing social drivers of health, connecting patients to essential services. Furthermore, CHCANYS supports CMS underscoring that managed care patients will always have the right to choose an ILOS, and that the state plan service and cannot be required by a managed care plan to use an ILOS. It is imperative that policies center the patient's choice and right to receive these services at their FQHC. **However, we ask CMS to grant some protections to FQHCs' Prospective Payment System (PPS) to ensure the FQHC Medicaid benefit is preserved and cannot be substituted for an ILOS.**

At §438.2, CMS proposes granting States more flexibility in determining when and how ILOS can be offered by managed care plans. States have the authority to identify the services that can be replaced and establish the criteria and conditions for offering alternative services, specifically "...that an ILOS can be used as an immediate or longer-term substitute for a covered service or setting under the State plan, or when the ILOS can be expected to reduce or prevent the future need to utilize State plan-covered service or setting."¹⁰ **CHCANYS recommends CMS clearly state that this flexibility does not allow States to substitute ILOS for any of the non-ambulatory, Medicare-defined components of the Medicaid FQHC benefit, which State Medicaid programs are required to cover.**¹¹ Congress created the FQHC Medicaid benefit – a statutory right – to ensure patients could always access high quality-comprehensive services. Given health centers' unique care coordination and patient-centered model of care, allowing States to not cover specific FQHC services could interrupt the continuum of care health centers provide and could negatively impact the patient. While we understand that patients would still be allowed to choose which service they want, CHCANYS is concerned about the unintended consequences to our payment model if states substitute services.

CHCANYS also wants to ensure that a state's ability to substitute an ILOS for another covered service does not result in a reduction of PPS/APM payment for these FQHC services, or otherwise reduce payment by other means such as restricting the definition of a billable encounter. If this does result in altering the billable encounter scheme, states should be reporting these changes to CMS and provide a justification. CHCANYS requests CMS require states to demonstrate the parameters for billable ILOS visits in comparison to current visits without-ILOS coverage. Having a written determination that provides an explanation of how the ILOS does or does not impact the PPS/APM rate will help health centers have a better understanding of what services are covered under the FQHC benefit for their patients. Health centers are required to serve all patients, regardless of their ability to pay. When specific services are no longer covered at the FQHC, that further impacts the health centers' already scarce resources. This will enhance transparency for FQHCs to see the potential impact of ILOS changes on PPS/APM payments. CHCANYS also requests that payment below PPS cannot occur when the State is calculating capitation rates.

CHCANYS recommends CMS further define parameters around scope, duration, and intensity of quality of services within §438.3(e)(2)(i). CHCANYS appreciates CMS' intent to ensure managed care plans demonstrate that ILOS being offered are equivalent in scope, duration, and quality to the services specified in the Medicaid State Plan. Plans must show that the alternative services meet the same needs and achieve the same outcomes as the original services. However, not every State Plan has the same definitions around these terms (scope, duration, and intensity). Having common definitions for these terms will enhance

⁹ <https://www.medicare.gov/federal-policy-guidance/downloads/smd23001.pdf>

¹⁰ Pg 28162, Managed Care Proposed Rule

¹¹ Section 1861(aa)(1)(A)-(C) of the Social Security Act



protections for health center patients if they receive an ILOS, and set common expectations around quality of services, regardless of the State a health center patient lives in. Changes in the scope of FQHC services are also defined by similar parameters, specifically as “a change in the type, intensity, duration and/ or amount of services.”¹² State Medicaid agencies should have a documented definition of a “change in the scope of services” and define parameters for duration and intensity. These definitions could be similar for FQHCs and ILOS to ensure consistency. The definition should at minimum include the four types of changes listed in the 2001 CMS issuance: changes in type, intensity, duration, and intensity (amount) of services. Furthermore, setting a standard for States when approving ILOS will make it easier for CMS to monitor new ILOS’ requests.

CHCANYS supports CMS’ proposals at (§§438.16(e) and 457.1201(e)) to include beneficiary protections when it comes to ILOS. However, we urge CMS to outline a better timeline/set of parameters related to notifying a beneficiary about the termination of an ILOS. The proposed language directs states to “[n]otify enrollees that the ILOS they are currently receiving will be terminated as expeditiously as the enrollee’s health condition requires.” A lack of a clear definition/timeline for expeditiously, or how the severity of the enrollee’s health condition affects the notification timeline of termination of ILOS could negatively impact health center patients. Health center patients have higher rates of chronic conditions than in previous years and have uniquely complex health needs,¹³ making timely notification imperative to ensure continuity of care is not interrupted. Furthermore, terminating these services will create a void for patients in trying to find another provider or coverage for those services. This can create health inequities as the gap in care will negatively impact health outcomes. Clearer language will help better guide States when notifying enrollees on termination of an ILOS.

III. State Directed Payments

CHCANYS appreciates and supports CMS’ intention to increase transparency around State Directed Payments (SDPs) while creating regulatory flexibilities to enhance states’ ability to utilize them, especially for value-based care arrangements. **However, CHCANYS requests CMS clarify that FQHCs can take advantage of both incentive and value-based payment arrangements as an SDP and that these amounts should be excluded from the FQHC supplemental payment calculation.**

Federal law addressing the Medicaid FQHC PPS contains special provisions regarding payments to FQHCs for services rendered under contract with an MCO. By statute, states are required to make payments to FQHCs to cover the difference between amounts paid to the FQHC by an MCO and the FQHC’s PPS rate (if the latter is higher).¹⁴ These supplemental payments, which are made directly from the State to the FQHC, are sometimes referred to as “wraparound” payments. By statute, value-based and incentive payments must be excluded from the calculation of supplemental payments.¹⁵ Any other type of SDP would be considered payment for specific services provided, and thus would be incorporated into the supplemental payment calculation.

CHCANYS recommends CMS codify language in its 2000 State Medicaid Director Letter describing this exclusion.¹⁶ Furthermore, similar language is also repeated with respect to Medicare Advantage

¹² the 2001 PPS Guidance: <https://www.nachc.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/11/PPS-Q-As-2001.pdf>

¹³ <https://www.nachc.org/wp-content/uploads/2023/04/Community-Health-Center-Chartbook-2023-2021UDS.pdf>

¹⁴ SSA § 1902(bb)(5)

¹⁵ 42 CFR 438.6(c)(1)(i))

¹⁶ <https://www.medicaid.gov/federal-policy-guidance/downloads/smd092700.pdf>



wraparound.¹⁷ By excluding SDPs from supplemental payment calculations, this would ensure health centers can fully utilize SDPs for their intended purpose: helping states better achieve “their overall objectives for delivery system and payment reform.”¹⁸

As mentioned previously, States are required to make payments to FQHCs to cover the difference between amounts paid to the FQHC by a Medicaid managed care organization (MCO) and the FQHC’s PPS rate (if the latter is higher).¹⁹ With 72% of Medicaid beneficiaries enrolled in an MCO,²⁰ many states are seeking to avoid FQHC wraparound payments as a separate payment obligation, and instead, to delegate the responsibility to the MCO to pay FQHCs their full PPS rates. Because the Medicaid statute requires direct wraparound payments from the state to the FQHC, states may delegate PPS payment to MCOs only through a CMS-approved APM documented in the Medicaid State plan. CMS made clear that states “would remain responsible for ensuring that FQHCs and RHCs receive at least the full PPS reimbursement rate. States must continue their reconciliation and oversight processes to ensure that the managed care payments comply with the statutory requirements of the APM.”²¹ To preserve their role as critical safety net providers in a Medicaid landscape increasingly dominated by managed care, health centers need to receive their full PPS rate for services furnished to managed care enrollees. **CHCANYS requests that CMS have more oversight over prompt delegated wrap payments.**

Based on CMS’ definition of an SDP,²² a delegated wraparound arrangement would fall under a type of SDP, specifically related to the “minimum fee schedule” type. **If this is true, we ask CMS to clarify in the text of the regulation that delegated wrap is considered a form of an SDP.** If a wraparound payment is considered an SDP, **CHCANYS requests that the same special protections of providers and federal/State funds for SDPs should then, by default, be extended for delegated wrap arrangements as well.**

However, if CMS decides delegated wrap arrangements are not considered an SDP and thus not subject to the scrutiny/federal protections described in 438.6(c), then CHCANYS recommends CMS implement clearer protections for a delegated wrap. CMS should reaffirm its statements in the 2016 SHO letter to include the following protections:

- The delegated wrap payment be included in an APM.²³ In New York, the state Department of Health delegated the FQHC PPS payment to MCOs for behavioral health and substance use disorder services without submitting a State Plan Amendment. Three years since the guidance was issued, FQHCs are still not regularly receiving their full PPS rates from the MCOs, and have no recourse to receive their full PPS for partial MCO payments.
- States should maintain the same reconciliation and oversight processes as used under traditional supplemental payments. Because CMS is instituting more scrutiny over SDPs to better hold managed care entities and the providers who receive these payments accountable, this recommendation falls in line with CMS’ actions in this proposed rule.

¹⁷ 42 CFR 405.2469(c)

¹⁸ <https://www.federalregister.gov/d/2016-09581>

¹⁹ SSA § 1902(bb)(5).

²⁰ <https://www.kff.org/medicaid/issue-brief/10-things-to-know-about-medicare-managed-care/>

²¹ State Health Official Letter # 16-006, from Vikki Wachino, Director, Center for Medicaid & CHIP Services, CMS (Apr. 26, 2016), re: FQHC and RHC Supplemental Payment Requirements, pp. 2-3

²² 438.6(a)

²³ 1902(bb)(6)



- Furthermore, states must ensure that amounts added to capitation payments are actuarially sufficient for managed care entities to comply with cost-related payment requirements. Failure by the State to pay actuarially-sound rates to MCOs could jeopardize reimbursement rates to FQHCs in their network as well.
- CMS should also clearly state its expectations as to which provisions states would need to include in its contracts with managed care entities, similarly to what is included in this NPRM.²⁴

CHCANYS supports CMS’ proposal to require states to report on provider-specific payment amounts of SDPs by submitting data to T–MSIS. We urge CMS to make aggregated data publicly available to facilitate evaluation of access and equity for these SDPs. Furthermore, we request this data to be aggregated by 1905(a) benefit categories, with FQHCs/RHCs as one category. Given the current opaqueness of SDPs, having this reporting mechanism will allow stakeholders to see how many FQHCs/RHCs providers are receiving SDPs and can help further enhance FQHC participation in receiving SDPs. Furthermore, this data empowers FQHCs to better hold their states accountable for these SDPs.

CHCANYS appreciates CMS’ proposed change to §438.6(c)(2)(iii)(C) and (D) that will allow States to set the amount or frequency of the plan’s expenditures and allow the state to recoup unspent funds allocated for these SDPs. CHCANYS appreciates CMS recognizing the resources required for FQHCs and other safety-net providers to transition in VBP. States need the flexibility to determine the best manner to use SDP funds. Given the importance of investments for infrastructure to support FQHCs in VPB, CHCANYS requests CMS clarify that States reinvest any extra funds back into health care to support safety-net providers and their patients. If not clarified, States may utilize these unspent SDPs to offset other parts of their budget, which goes against the spirit and intent of these SDPs.

CHCANYS recommends CMS better specify patient attribution requirements and processes for value-based care arrangements - specifically population-based and condition-based payments - in SDP contracts²⁵ and explore where patient attribution strategies can be better streamlined across payers. Patient attribution helps identify the health care relationship between the patient and provider. Successful patient attribution is crucial to success in value-based care (VBC) arrangements²⁶ and CMS has strongly encouraged health care providers, including FQHCs, to increase their participation in these arrangements. We understand that CMS is directing states to ultimately decide what type of attribution methodology to employ, however, there should be clearer direction from CMS on what types of methodology is acceptable.

If health centers are allocated these VBC arrangement SDPs, accuracy in patient attribution for providers is crucial to measuring success of SDPs achieving their stated value-based care goals. Some health centers participating in VBC arrangements, such as the Medicare Shared Savings Program and Accountable Care Organizations, have reported issues with the patient attribution system. While these arrangements do differ, they showcase the ongoing issues providers face in accurate patient attribution.

IV. Other Recommendations

Health centers strive to be good partners with MCOs in order to increase patient access to quality health care services. Because this proposed rule looks to extend flexibilities and protections in different aspects of managed care, CHCANYS requests CMS implement more guardrails to ensure health centers have adequate protections as well. We understand CMS’ rationale to carve out health centers from mandated

²⁴ 438.6(c)(5)

²⁵ §438.6(c)(5)(iii)(E)

²⁶ <https://www.soa.org/493462/globalassets/assets/files/resources/research-report/2018/patient-attribution.pdf>



reporting of payment-related data, due to the unique nature of the PPS. Congress established the PPS rate to ensure stability and predictability for health centers given the important role health centers play in serving the Medicaid and uninsured populations. FQHC PPS ensures health centers are not forced to divert their Federal Section 330 grant funds, which support operations and care to the uninsured, to subsidize low Medicaid payments.²⁷

CHCANYS recommends that CMS reinstate time and distance wait time standards from the 2016 managed care rule for network adequacy. Appointment wait times, while a valid way to measure network adequacy, is not the only factor that should measure patient access to care. Given that the 2020 CMS Medicaid managed care final rule removed the state requirement of using time and distance standards,²⁸ states currently calculate provider network adequacy quantitatively. Many health center patients face geographic and distance barriers in getting access to timely care, in addition to other challenges. Reinstating time and distance standards will more accurately measure patient access to services.

CHCANYS is concerned about the new proposed standards placing more pressure on the providers rather than managed care entities to ensure that services are available in the network. If MCOs are not contracting with enough providers to ensure appointment availability, it places the onus on existing providers to try and bridge the gap in care. To combat this, CMS should create a standard for MCOs to contract with a sufficient number of providers, including FQHCs.

CHCANYS requests that CMS institute a policy like what is listed in the Essential Community Providers (ECP) provision of the Affordable Care Act²⁹ to ensure that MCOs are contracting with an adequate amount of health centers. Congress designed the ECP provision of the Affordable Care Act (ACA)³⁰ to ensure that consumers purchasing coverage on the Marketplace have guaranteed access to trusted providers, which include entities such as community health centers, HIV/AIDS clinics, and family planning health centers. A similar provision for Medicaid could be developed to set mandated minimums for MCOs to contract with a certain number of FQHCs.

We also request CMS engage more in oversight to ensure that FQHCs are reimbursed at least their PPS rate in contracts with their MCOs. CMS should create a tracking system to show timeliness on interim and annual reconciliation payments, as well as tracking time to payment received. Health centers operate on razor thin margins and timeliness of payments from MCOs is crucial to continuing operations to provide care for health center patients.

Thank you for your consideration of these comments. We appreciate CMS' initiative to further strengthen the Medicaid program, advance innovation in payment methodologies and benefit strategies, and enhance access to health care services for all enrollees. CHCANYS looks forward to continuing to partner with CMS on advancing these Medicaid Managed Care initiatives. If you have any questions, please contact Marie Mongeon, Vice President of Policy: mmongeon@chcanys.org.

²⁷ <https://www.nachc.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/06/PPS-One-Page-Update.pdf>

²⁸ <https://www.federalregister.gov/documents/2020/11/13/2020-24758/medicaid-program-medicare-and-childrens-health-insurance-program-chip-managed-care>

²⁹ § 156.235

³⁰ Section 1311(c)(1)(C)