

IRS MEC Reporting and Form 1095-B Returns

1095-B Stakeholder Meeting Minutes, 10/07/15

Meeting Overview:

- Question arose at previous meeting if Xerox, (the call center that will be used to address 1095-B questions for the beneficiaries), supports language translation services by bi-lingual representatives or a separate language line that provides translation services. MCED contacted Xerox and confirmed all translation services are performed “in-house.” **(Action Item #1 Closed)**
 - Request was made at previous meeting that MCED translate the beneficiary letters into all 13 threshold languages. MCED will not be able to provide a translation for all thirteen threshold languages, but will provide a fully translated Spanish version with a tagline, translated in all remaining languages, informing the beneficiary to call our call center for support in their language. (Spanish speaking population, 34.5% + English speaking population, 59.8% = 94.3% of total population) **(Action Item #2 Closed)**
 - Request made at previous meeting that MCED include a blurb regarding EITC tax filing into the MEDIL. Possible solution is to add information to the FAQ webpage. **(Action Item #10 Closed)**
 - Suggestion was provided at previous meeting regarding utilizing social media via Facebook and Twitter to further outreach efforts of the 1095-B mailing. MCED has drafted first series of tweets or messages promoting Form 1095-B Returns. Once internally approved we will ask for feedback from stakeholders. **(Action Item #3 Ongoing)**
 - Two questions arose at previous meeting regarding the inclusion of the beneficiary letter in the Joint vs Rank (JVR) mailing:
 - Could MCED place the beneficiary letter in front of the hearing rights notice to avoid the letter being potentially discarded by the beneficiary? **(Action Item #4)**
 - How is the address file being organized for the JVR mailing, for example- by county or alpha numeric order? (Action Item 5)
- JVR liaison informed MCED that due to Form 1095-B’s significance it was already bumped to the 2nd position. The JVR insert will remain at 1st position. The JVR mailer will go out in alpha order by county name. **(Action Item #5 and #5 Closed)**
- Question arose at previous meeting regarding the timeline how the beneficiary letter and 1095-B form will be mailed. MCED is looking into the process of mailing for the JVR and awaiting a response from the printing vendor. **(Action Item #6 Ongoing)**

- MCED has drafted the Cover Letter that will accompany the Form 1095-B mailer. It is currently in management review and will be sent for stakeholder review once approved. **(Action Item #7 Ongoing)**
- MCED has begun policy discussion with EITS and will facilitate a meeting between CWDA, EITS, and MCED to discuss dispute process parameters and system requirements. MCED will engage stakeholders after we establish a baseline for discussion. **(Action Item #8 Ongoing)**
- MCED received feedback from stakeholders regarding the beneficiary webpage content. MCED is in the process of incorporating them. Anticipated launch date is planned to be released the same time as the MEDIL for the beneficiary notice in the JVR mailer. **(Action Item #9 Ongoing)**
- MCED has drafted the first comprehensive “Questions and Answers” document which will be utilized on the web, as well as used to update scripts for Xerox. Once internally approved, MCED will ask stakeholders for review. MCED has also included EITC QAs into the FAQs. Additional outreach regarding EITC will also be conducted by including information in the January 2016 JVR. **(Action Item #10 Ongoing)**
- There has been discussion with CMS in regards to the Medically Needy group and the SOC population, especially when SOC has been met. CMS will be responding and providing written direction on this population soon. Once DHCS has their response, we will incorporate their direction and provide insight to our stakeholders. **(Action Item #11 Ongoing)**

Added Action Items

Question arose as to whether the Form 1095-B will mirror the schedule of the November beneficiary notices such as alpha numeric order by county. MCED will have a response by the next meeting. **(Added Action Item #10)**

Regarding the dispute process discussion, a question arose about the proposed dispute process for individuals who want to contest their Medi-Cal coverage and plan to file their taxes early. **(Added Action Item #11)**

Recommendation was made to add messaging to Q&A and cover letter about dual coverage in receiving both a 1095-A and 1095-B. **(Added Action Item #12)**

Questions arose as to how “limited scope” pregnancy coverage would look on the 1095-B form, as CMS has verbally stated it would be considered MEC. Also, is there an effective date? MCED is awaiting written clarification and guidance from CMS. **(Added Action Item #13)**