



## Adult Program Improvement Advisory Committee (PIAC) MEETING MINUTES

**DATE:** February 10, 2026

**LOCATION:** Virtual

**TIME:** 4:00PM – 6:00PM

Name	Organization	Present	COA Staff Present
Amy Albrecht	Intermountain Health		Dave Aragon
Annie Bacci	TGTHR		Carrie Jones
Ashleigh Phillips	CommonSpirit Health	v	Dr. Lauren Brassfield
Carolyn Hall	Heartland Mental Health, CO Mental Wellness Network	v	Elise Cooper
Cassie Williams	Denver Department of Public Health & Environment	v	Tyannah Reed
Chantal Holt	Health First Colorado Caregiver	v	Alina Naismith
Denise Hosier	WellPower	v	Shelley Cooper
Hiba Muhtar	Health First Colorado Member		
Jamie Rodriguez	Adams County Public Health		
Judy Shlay	Public Health Institute at Denver Health		
Laura Brayer-Don	Arapahoe County Public Health	v	
Laura Ciancone	Douglas County - DHS	v	<b>Other Guests</b>
Lyssa Towl	Vivent Health	v	
Mary Henneck	Health First Colorado Caregiver	v	
Michael Chism	Mile High Psychiatry		
Miriam Garcia	Para ti Mujer		
Rachel Henderson	Health First Colorado Member	v	
Robert Conkey	Health First Colorado Member	v	
Ross Miller	SafeSide Recovery		
Sarah Holt	Health First Colorado Member	v	

(x) - In Person attendee; (v) – Virtual attendee

Agenda Items	
<b>Welcome, Intros</b>	
<b>Member Attribution Overview and Discussion</b>	<p>Presenter: Elise Cooper, Colorado Access</p> <p>Key Points</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Attribution determines which primary care provider a member is matched with based on where members actually receive care.</li> <li>• As of July 1 (Phase Three implementation), attribution reflects real utilization rather than assigned home clinics.</li> <li>• 72% of members currently have a medical home, matching Medicaid industry averages.</li> <li>• Youth attribution prioritizes well visits over sick visits.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Member choice always overrides system-driven attribution.</li> </ul> <p>State Reattribution Process</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Occurs every 90 days; first round took place in November, next in February.</li> <li>• Claims from primary care (not ER/urgent care) drive attribution.</li> <li>• Unattributed members (~28%) are monitored by care management teams.</li> </ul> <p>Group Discussion Points</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Barriers to Staying Connected to Primary Care <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Participants identified barriers from both member and provider perspectives: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Loss of telehealth options reducing accessibility.</li> <li>▪ High provider caseloads and scheduling limitations.</li> <li>▪ Long wait times for specialty care.</li> <li>▪ Health, mobility, childcare, or transportation challenges.</li> <li>▪ InteliIRide unreliability causing late/no-show pickups.</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> <li>• Trust-Building in Care <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ What builds trust: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Providers reviewing charts beforehand</li> <li>▪ Warm handoffs and clear next steps</li> <li>▪ Validation and active listening</li> <li>▪ Follow-through on stated actions</li> <li>▪ Transparent communication</li> </ul> </li> <li>○ What breaks trust: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Rushed appointments</li> <li>▪ Provider turnover</li> <li>▪ Pushing interventions patients cannot realistically complete</li> <li>▪ Repeated screenings without meaningful follow-up</li> <li>▪ Providers appearing unfamiliar with patient history</li> </ul> </li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<p><b>Pay-for-Performance Metrics Review and Feedback</b></p>	<p>Presenters: Tyannah Reed, Colorado Access; Alina Naismith, Colorado Access; Stacy Stapp, Colorado Access</p> <p>Overview</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pay for Performance (P4P) rewards improvement in preventive care, behavioral health engagement, maternal care, and care transitions.</li> <li>• Metrics include diabetes control, hypertension, cancer screenings, depression screening, immunizations, well care visits, and developmental screenings.</li> </ul> <p>Interventions Used</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reminder calls/texts</li> <li>• Community partnerships</li> <li>• Scheduling support</li> <li>• Culturally-tailored outreach (e.g., targeted well care postcards)</li> </ul> <p>Member Feedback on P4P</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Desire for member incentives, similar to Kaiser’s model (e.g., \$120 for completing screenings).</li> <li>• Need for transparency around why certain measures are prioritized.</li> <li>• Depression screening concerns: overused, inconsistent, not always followed by adequate behavioral health access.</li> <li>• Administrative burden on providers limits meaningful engagement.</li> </ul>

<p><b>Policy and Emerging Issues Update</b></p>	<p>Presenter: Carrie Jones, Colorado Access; Jeanine Draut, Colorado Access</p> <p>Federal HR1 (Obamacare Accountability Act) Changes Effective late 2026–2027:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Medicaid Eligibility Changes (Oct 1, 2026):       <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Certain lawfully present immigrants lose Medicaid eligibility (refugees, asylees, trafficking survivors, etc.)</li> </ol> </li> <li>2. Work Requirements for expansion adults:       <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. ~\$580/month earnings or 80 hrs work/volunteering/school</li> </ol> </li> <li>3. Renewal Cycle Change:       <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Medicaid renewal every 6 months (starting 2027)</li> </ol> </li> <li>4. Reduced Retroactive Coverage:       <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. 1 month for expansion population</li> <li>b. 2 months for others</li> </ol> </li> </ol> <p>State &amp; Colorado Access Preparation</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ~\$100M needed over 3 years for staff, software, communications</li> <li>• Phased automation; 40% of members (≈150,000) will need to self-attest to exemptions</li> <li>• Advocacy ongoing—especially from disability community</li> <li>• Colorado Access’ “Stay Connected, Stay Covered” campaign reached 5,600+ members</li> </ul> <p>Questions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. How will medically frail exemptions be determined?       <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Pending state definition.</li> <li>b. Process for documenting exemptions is still unclear.</li> </ol> </li> <li>2. Can providers verify work-requirement compliance?       <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. No. Federal law prohibits health plans and providers from validating compliance. Only state and county agencies may do so.</li> </ol> </li> </ol> <p>Group Discussion Points</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Administrative Burden Concerns       <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Significant worries about the strain on members with disabilities and caregivers.</li> <li>b. Likelihood of increased churn due to 6-month renewal and complex work requirement tracking.</li> </ol> </li> </ol> <p>Need for Accessible Communication</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Participants recommended:       <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Email blasts, webinars, town halls</li> <li>○ Materials accessible to those with limited tech literacy or physical dexterity</li> <li>○ Coordination with community-based organizations for outreach</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
<p><b>Action Items</b></p>	

Meeting Adjourned at 6:00 pm  
Next PIAC Meeting: May 12, 2026, hybrid