

**Medi-Cal LEA Billing Option Program
RMTS Implementation Advisory Group (IAG)**

Meeting #12 Summary
November 3, 2015

On Tuesday, November 3, the twelfth RMTS Implementation Advisory Group (IAG) meeting took place at DHCS in Sacramento. The following was accomplished during this meeting:

- The Department confirmed they have not yet received a response from CMS on SPA 15-021, submitted on September 30, 2015. CMS has up to 90 days after DHCS' SPA submission to review the SPA draft before approving or submitting requests for additional information (RAIs) to DHCS.
- Discussed stakeholder feedback received via the [Stakeholder Feedback Tool](#) regarding the LEA Medi-Cal Billing Option Program RMTS.
 - One stakeholder expressed concerns regarding reporting of LEA costs for substitutes or infrequently billed practitioners. For example, how salaries should be reported for a health aide that occasionally substitutes during the 'regular' practitioner's lunch, and bills 8 hours for the whole year. The stakeholder was concerned that including the practitioner's salary when they bill so little time would inappropriately skew the CRCS settlement results.
 - The IAG discussed the issue and believes that the guidance on how to report salaries, benefits and other costs is clear on the CRCS and has been consistent over many years. If an LEA bills any time for a practitioner, they must report that practitioner's costs on the CRCS. If the LEA is worried about the impact on the CRCS, they will need to model their specific scenario to determine the best course of action for their LEA. For example, if the LEA believes that reporting costs for infrequently billed practitioners is skewing their cost settlement, they can decide not to bill the LEA Medi-Cal Billing Option Program for this practitioner, and exclude their costs on the CRCS.
- Discussed pros and cons of a regional RMTS versus a statewide RMTS, which is common among most other state models.
- Reviewed school-based implementation guide examples from six states, specific to Activity Codes. Evaluated differences and similarities in the guides, and how they compare to SMAA Manual Section 5.
- The IAG reviewed potential coding discrepancies related to Code 2, identified by IAG members from 2015 SMAA moments. Discussed possible future coding changes with respect to Code 2 and potential training points for participants and coders.
- The IAG began review of detailed points on implementation-related topical areas needing further discussion, including: outreach and training, oversight and monitoring, resource materials, contracting and cost reporting.
- The IAG continues to review and discuss stakeholder feedback submitted via the [Stakeholder Feedback Tool](#), and encourages stakeholders to submit feedback. Stakeholder information submitted through the feedback tool is treated as confidential.

The next RMTS IAG Meeting will take place in Sacramento on Wednesday, December 9, 2015.