



**An independent voice for  
those served by KanCare.**

Barb Conant / 785 383-4272  
baconant@hotmail.com

Sean Gatewood / 785 220-5355  
seangatewood@outlook.com

---

TO: Rep. Dan Hawkins, Chairman, House Health and Human Services Committee  
FR: KanCare Advocates Network  
RE: Administration's response to subcommittee recommendations regarding waiver integration

Rep. Hawkins, we appreciate your ongoing efforts to gain support from the Administration for your subcommittee's recommendations regarding a delay of the KanCare waiver integration. We have reviewed the letter from Lt. Gov. Colyer regarding the Administration's plans for the proposed integrated waiver. We are disappointed to see that the response falls far short of your subcommittee's recommendations. Our concerns about the Administration's letter are as follows:

1. The letter does not promise any legislative input and oversight into the planning process. Instead, it merely offers a chance for legislative "review." This is a replication of the process used to develop KanCare, wherein the Administration considered, decided, and then allowed modest legislative "review." The choice of timing is also worth noting, since the legislative review may not occur prior to submitting the plan, but prior to implementing the plan. In other words, legislators will be told what is going to happen, before it happens, nothing more.
2. The letter introduces the topic of a "block grant" as a justification for the integrated waiver. This was not mentioned during the hearings on the integrated waiver nor during the WISE meetings with advocates. This is an admission of a concern we expressed but which the Administration denied; i.e. lost protections for persons served. The block grant is ultimately a way for the State to accept less federal money, in exchange for less federal oversight. This is an enormous policy difference between the current waiver systems and the integrated waiver/block grant approach. Legislators have a right to

expect that this would have been fully discussed during the hearings, instead of glossed over.

3. Finally, it must be addressed that the lead paragraph calling out the one billion dollars in savings is an extraordinary statement that legislators should scrutinize. Where are these savings? Are these “savings” the result of the thousands of Kansans waiting for their Medicaid applications to be processed, a reduction in services to KanCare members, and long overdue adjustments in reimbursement rates? The answer must be, yes. In which case, this cannot be called “savings.” We should not balance the State’s budget on the backs of Kansans who need services and those who provide it.

We continue to support the recommendations of Rep. Dove’s subcommittee and strongly urge you and your colleagues to request the Administration agree to the provisions of the subcommittee recommendations by placing that language into an appropriate legislative vehicle. We would welcome the opportunity to speak with you further about this issue. Thank you for your consideration.

cc:

Rep. Willie Dove

Rep. Jim Kelly

Rep. Les Osterman

Rep. Jim Ward