

Rule Summary and Fiscal Analysis (Part A)**Department of Aging**

Agency Name

Division

Tom Simmons

Contact

**50 West Broad Street 9th floor Columbus OH
43215-3363**

Agency Mailing Address (Plus Zip)

614-728-2548

Phone

Fax

173-39-02.18

Rule Number

NEW

TYPE of rule filing

Rule Title/Tag Line

Non-medical transportation service.**RULE SUMMARY**

1. Is the rule being filed consistent with the requirements of the RC 119.032 review? **No**

2. Are you proposing this rule as a result of recent legislation? **No**

3. Statute prescribing the procedure in accordance with the agency is required to adopt the rule: **119.03**

4. Statute(s) authorizing agency to adopt the rule: **173.02, 173.391**

5. Statute(s) the rule, as filed, amplifies or implements: **173.39, 173.391**

6. State the reason(s) for proposing (i.e., why are you filing,) this rule:

Currently, the PASSPORT program only provides consumers with a non-emergency medical transportation service. (cf., Rule 173-39-02.13 of the Administrative Code.) That service transports consumers between their homes and a destinations such as a doctor's office or a pharmacy. ODA is proposing this new rule to create the non-medical transportation service. This service will transport consumers between their homes and destinations such as a grocery store, a senior center, or a government office. This creation of this new service for PASSPORT may be essential to decreasing the number of consumers who, without this service, might end up in Medicaid-funded institutionalized care.

BACKGROUND: The Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS) requires each state to obtain public input regarding the design of each existing Medicaid waiver prior to the renewal of that waiver. As a result, ODA held public forums across the state and obtained input through a survey on the web site. The issue needing transportation for non-medical purposes kept coming up as an unmet need. Therefore, ODA asked CMS to consider an amended version of the PASSPORT Medicaid waiver to include a non-medical transportation service as a new service for the PASSPORT program.

INTER-AGENCY COOPERATION: This proposed new rule is being filed in conjunction with a corresponding rule filing by ODJFS that was filed with JCARR on April 15, 2008.

The adoption of this rule is subject to the approval of a proposed amendment in the PASSPORT Medicaid waiver by CMS.

7. If the rule is an AMENDMENT, then summarize the changes and the content of the proposed rule; if the rule type is RESCISSION, NEW or NO CHANGE, then summarize the content of the rule:

This proposed new rule:

1. Defines a non-medical transportation service and provides examples of that service.
2. Provides the eligibility criteria that a consumer must meet in order to qualify for the service.
3. Lists the requirements of providers who perform the service, which may be broken down into three categories: general requirements (e.g., documentation, service back-up plans), requirements of vehicles used for the service (e.g., routine inspections), and qualifications of drivers (e.g., driver's license, required training courses).
4. Explains that the rates are negotiable, but that they have a ceiling that is listed in rule 5101:3-1-06.1 of the Administrative Code, which is a rule that is adopted by ODJFS.

8. If the rule incorporates a text or other material by reference and the agency claims the incorporation by reference is exempt from compliance with sections 121.71 to 121.74 of the Revised Code because the text or other material is **generally available** to persons who reasonably can be expected to be affected by the rule, provide an explanation of how the text or other material is generally available to those persons:

This response left blank because filer specified online that the rule does not incorporate a text or other material by reference.

9. If the rule incorporates a text or other material by reference, and it was **infeasible** for the agency to file the text or other material electronically, provide an explanation of why filing the text or other material electronically was infeasible:

This response left blank because filer specified online that the rule does not incorporate a text or other material by reference.

10. If the rule is being **rescinded** and incorporates a text or other material by reference, and it was **infeasible** for the agency to file the text or other material, provide an explanation of why filing the text or other material was infeasible:

Not Applicable.

11. If **revising** or **refiling** this rule, identify changes made from the previously filed version of this rule; if none, please state so:

On April 18, 2008, ODA revised this proposed new rule in the following ways:

1. In paragraph (C)(1)(c), the language was clarified so that it is unmistakable that ODA wants a provider to document the information listed in paragraphs (C)(1)(c)(i) to (C)(1)(c)(v) for each service provided.

2. The language formerly located at paragraph (C)(2)(b) was revised to require a provider to possess a back-up plan for providing the service with a driver or vehicle is unavailable. Previously, the paragraph required a back-up plan only for when a vehicle is unavailable. That paragraph is now numbered as paragraph (C)(1)(d) of this rule. The format of paragraph (C)(2) was modified to reflect the absence of the back-up plan language from that paragraph, but the change was technical in nature and not a substantial change to the rule.

3. In paragraphs (C)(3)(a), (C)(3)(b), and (C)(3)(c), and (C)(3)(d) clarifications were added concerning a non-agency provider, because, the language should mention a non-agency provider in a way that reflects that a non-agency provider, as a self-employed individual, is also the driver of the vehicle. This was a technical revision, not a substantial change to the rule.

4. In paragraph (C)(3)(a)(vi), corrections were made to two of the references. This was a technical revision, not a substantial change to the rule.

5. In paragraph (C)(3)(d), the words "that each driver" as they appeared between "documentation" and "on the compliance" were deleted. They did not contribute to

the clarity of the sentence. This was a technical revision, not a substantial change to the rule.

Additionally, along with this revision on April 18, 2008, the RSFA was updated.

12. 119.032 Rule Review Date:

(If the rule is not exempt and you answered NO to question No. 1, provide the scheduled review date. If you answered YES to No. 1, the review date for this rule is the filing date.)

NOTE: If the rule is not exempt at the time of final filing, two dates are required: the current review date plus a date not to exceed 5 years from the effective date for Amended rules or a date not to exceed 5 years from the review date for No Change rules.

FISCAL ANALYSIS

13. Estimate the total amount by which *this proposed rule* would **increase / decrease** either **revenues / expenditures** for the agency during the current biennium (in dollars): Explain the net impact of the proposed changes to the budget of your agency/department.

This will have no impact on revenues or expenditures.

\$0.00

Although it is possible that more funds will be spent upon individual consumers, the spending on the entire PASSPORT program is limited by the biennial budget established for ODA by the Ohio General Assembly. Therefore, ODA estimates that the adoption of this proposed new rule will have no impact upon the budget established for ODA by the Ohio General Assembly. (The projected cost for SFY 2009 is approximately \$3.3 million all funds with about \$1.3 million from GRF.)

14. Identify the appropriation (by line item etc.) that authorizes each expenditure necessitated by the proposed rule:

GRF-490-403 PASSPORT

3C4-490-607 PASSPORT

4J4-490-610 PASSPORT/Residential State Supplement

4U9-490-602 PASSPORT Fund

15. Provide a summary of the estimated cost of compliance with the rule to all directly affected persons. When appropriate, please include the source for your information/estimated costs, e.g. industry, CFR, internal/agency:

ODA estimates that there will be no cost of compliance to any consumer as a result of the adoption of this proposed new rule because a consumer who receives this service receives it free of charge.

ODA estimates that a provider who provides a non-medical transportation service will experience cost in complying with this rule, but that the provider will be reimbursed by ODA for providing that service. The amount that a provider is reimbursed for a service is negotiable since each trip is different than every other trip. For example, one consumer may need a round trip to a grocery store that is only one mile away while another consumer living in the Appalachian region may require a lengthy trip to a grocery store that is twenty miles away. The maximum rate allowable for a one-way trip and a round trip are listed in rule 5101:3-1-06.1 of the Administrative Code.

It is expected that the reimbursement given to a provider for providing this service covers not only the cost of the gasoline used for that service, but also the cost of inspecting and maintaining the vehicles used for the service and the cost of employing and training personnel.

By way of comparison, the PASSPORT program currently reimburses providers who provide a non-emergency medical transportation service under rule 173-39-02.13 of the Administrative Code. The non-emergency medical transportation service provides a service that is substantially similar to the non-medical transportation service being proposed by this new rule. The expenditure data for the non-emergency transportation service for FY07 shows that the average one-way trip cost \$42.23 and the average round trip cost \$70.12. Since this proposed new rule has substantially similar requirements (e.g., vehicle inspections, driver requirements) and because the transportation of a consumer for a non-emergency medical purpose is substantially similar to the transportation of a consumer for a non-medical purpose, ODA estimates that the cost to provide this proposed new service will be similar to \$42.23 for a one-way trip and \$70.12 for a round trip with an increase to account for the higher costs of gasoline.

Of course, no person is mandated to become a certified provider who performs the non-medical transportation service. A person must willingly agree to become a provider of this service. Therefore, providers who may provide a transportation service, but have no intention of transporting consumers through this service, will not incur any cost of compliance as a result of the adoption of this proposed new rule.

16. Does this rule have a fiscal effect on school districts, counties, townships, or municipal corporations? **Yes**

You must complete Part B of the Rule Summary and Fiscal Analysis in order to comply with Am. Sub. S.B. 33 of the 120th General Assembly.

17. Does this rule deal with environmental protection or contain a component dealing with environmental protection as defined in R. C. 121.39? **No**

Rule Summary and Fiscal Analysis (Part B)

1. Does the Proposed rule have a fiscal effect on any of the following?

(a) School Districts	(b) Counties	(c) Townships	(d) Municipal Corporations
No	Yes	Yes	Yes

2. Please provide an estimate in dollars of the cost of compliance with the proposed rule for school districts, counties, townships, or municipal corporations. If you are unable to provide an estimate in dollars, please provide a written explanation of why it is not possible to provide such an estimate.

ODA estimates that a provider who provides a non-medical transportation service will experience cost in complying with this rule, but that the provider will be reimbursed by ODA for providing that service. The amount that a provider is reimbursed for a service is negotiable since each trip is different than every other trip. For example, one consumer may need a round trip to a grocery store that is only one mile away while another consumer living in the Appalachian region may require a lengthy trip to a grocery store that is twenty miles away. The maximum rate allowable for a one-way trip and a round trip are listed in rule 5101:3-1-06.1 of the Administrative Code.

It is expected that the reimbursement given to a provider for providing this service covers not only the cost of the gasoline used for that service, but also the cost of inspecting and maintaining the vehicles used for the service and the cost of employing and training personnel.

By way of comparison, the PASSPORT program currently reimburses providers who provide a non-emergency medical transportation service under rule 173-39-02.13 of the Administrative Code. The non-emergency medical transportation service provides a service that is substantially similar to the non-medical transportation service being proposed by this new rule. The expenditure data for the non-emergency transportation service for FY07 shows that the average one-way trip cost \$42.23 and the average round trip cost \$70.12. Since this proposed new rule has substantially similar requirements (e.g., vehicle inspections, driver requirements) and because the transportation of a consumer for a non-emergency medical purpose is substantially similar to the transportation of a consumer for a non-medical purpose, ODA estimates that the cost to provide this proposed new service will be similar to \$42.23 for a one-way trip and \$70.12 for a round trip with an increase to account for the higher costs of gasoline.

Of course, no person is mandated to become a certified provider who performs the

non-medical transportation service. A person must willingly agree to become a provider of this service. Therefore, providers who may provide a transportation service, but have no intention of transporting consumers through this service, will not incur any cost of compliance with this rule.

3. If the proposed rule is the result of a federal requirement, does the proposed rule exceed the scope and intent of the federal requirement? **No**
4. If the proposed rule exceeds the minimum necessary federal requirement, please provide an estimate of, and justification for, the excess costs that exceed the cost of the federal requirement. In particular, please provide an estimate of the excess costs that exceed the cost of the federal requirement for (a) school districts, (b) counties, (c) townships, and (d) municipal corporations.

Not Applicable.

5. Please provide a comprehensive cost estimate for the proposed rule that includes the procedure and method used for calculating the cost of compliance. This comprehensive cost estimate should identify all of the major cost categories including, but not limited to, (a) personnel costs, (b) new equipment or other capital costs, (c) operating costs, and (d) any indirect central service costs.

Please see the above remarks.

(a) Personnel Costs

Please see the above remarks.

(b) New Equipment or Other Capital Costs

Please see the above remarks.

(c) Operating Costs

Please see the above remarks.

(d) Any Indirect Central Service Costs

Please see the above remarks.

(e) Other Costs

Please see the above remarks.

6. Please provide a written explanation of the agency's and the local government's ability to pay for the new requirements imposed by the proposed rule.

Because a local government would be reimbursed for the costs incurred for providing this service, there should be no need to acquire new revenue to comply with this proposed new rule.

7. Please provide a statement on the proposed rule's impact on economic development.

This rule should have a neutral impact upon economic development.