ACQ (ADVISORY COUNCIL ON QUALITY)
MI VIA VENDOR STAKEHOLDER COMMITTEE MINUTES

4/14/2026

Attendees: Angelique Tafoya, Althea Denet-Davis, Alexis Hernandez, Andrea Perea, Cassandra DeCamp, Debbie Kenney, Diane Brown, Eddie Romero, Ermanda King-Begay, Fallon Vincell, Jennifer Hollins, Jessica Gutierrez, Jessica Jaramillo, Johanna Armendariz, Karen Garcia, Kathy Briseno, Krystal Navarrete, Lisa Brow, Margarita Chavez, Margarita Chavez-Sanchez, Maria Castellano, Megan Chavez, Nalisha Dickson, Ryan Sherman, Steve Wrigley, Tracy Perry

State Partners: Elaine Hill

Discussion

Opening, agenda, and distributed materials

The meeting opened with logistical remarks and confirmation that committee members received an email containing the agenda, minutes, ANE posters, DDSD Mi Via billing memo, slides from two recent DDSD meetings, and the Mi Via April newsletter. The chair offered to resend materials to anyone who did not receive them and framed the agenda to review March minutes action items and new topics including migration to Turquoise Claims and other state updates.

Review of March action items and Selina assignments

The group reviewed action items from the March 10 minutes, noting many items were assigned to Selina, including guidance on required claim identifiers and confirmation on GRT requirements in vendor packets, and members asked whether Selina had circulated the noted documents. Elaine confirmed Selina was working on items but had not yet provided the committee with the requested memos and FAQs.

- Several action items assigned to Selina—claim identifier format, GRT memos, and an FAQ—remain outstanding.
- Vendors flagged unresolved questions about whether vendor packets must include GRT.
- Vendors reported inconsistent ability to view auto-generated GRT budget goals in their systems.

GRT issues, vendor packets, and budget visibility

Vendors raised questions about whether GRT should be included in vendor packets and invoices, and requested memos clarifying invoice formatting with separate line items for base rate and GRT. Members reported problems viewing auto-generated GRT budget goals in their portals and questioned who is permitted to view GRT information.

FOCoS access, portal onboarding, and invoice routing

Attendees discussed who can obtain FOCoS access and how non-billing vendors obtained credentials by emailing the portal contact, with mixed experiences reported; one vendor offered to repost contact details for others. The committee also discussed online invoice routing to EORs and noted that EOR notification emails sometimes go to spam, causing signature and processing delays.

- Some vendors obtained FOCoS access without billing through FOCoS by emailing the portal contact, while others were denied and were advised to retry.
- Providers can submit mixed billing (partial online and partial paper) rather than switching entirely to online billing.

Outstanding memos, website listing, and committee communications

Members reiterated outstanding requests for memos about nonprofit GRT exclusions and noted the need to inform vendors through the committee if home-study policies change. The committee also requested inclusion of this vendor committee on the ACQ website and planned follow-up with the website upload team and with Claudia Rice on SSP guidance status.

- Elaine agreed to locate and share the original hospitalization exemptions memo for inclusion in committee materials.
- Elaine will consult with Deanna to clarify authority over billing when notes are not submitted within 24 hours.

Hospitalization exemption memo and timely documentation timelines

- Participants asked Elaine to confirm whether the hospitalization exemption memo still applies.
- Participants asked Elaine to clarify the 48-hour language noted in the Mi Via billing memo, noting difficulty locating a 48-hour requirement in CMS or NMAC documentation. The group referenced Arizona's experience removing strict 24/48-hour language after legal review and emphasized CMS language uses "timely fashion," prompting a request for state clarification.
- The group opened by identifying that vendors are unable to produce required documentation and discussed accountability for that shortfall. Participants questioned the department memo's appropriateness and whether the department is open to discussing the requirement with vendors.
    - Vendors are struggling to produce requested documentation under the new memo
    - The ACQ vendor group agreed to draft a single statement of concerns for leadership. Attendees proposed that interested members stay after the meeting to craft a single, concise statement of concerns for leadership and to ensure the feedback comes from the ACQ vendor group rather than individuals.
    - Cassandra asked whether the Arizona example referenced was operating under a 1915(c) waiver and requested confirmation to ensure comparisons are valid. The speaker (Ryan) said he would check with his lobbying group and get back to the questioner, and Elaine offered to try to obtain an answer before leaving the meeting.
        - Ryan confirmed that the case referenced was operating under a 1115 waiver and not a 1915© waiver
    - Participants clarified that the 48-hour requirement applies to completing documentation, not to billing submissions, and confirmed providers have up to 90 days to bill. Jessica confirmed the 48-hour documentation window and the longer billing window.
    - Attendees raised concerns that EORs and direct employees must comply and questioned who will monitor direct employees through Palco and who will oversee non-paid EORs, arguing that vendors may lack capacity to ensure compliance. Elaine offered to capture and share those concerns with leadership.

Leadership change of committee

Angelique announced she will roll off as this committee's chair effective June 30 and encouraged members to consider chairing the committee or to speak with Tracy on the executive committee about whether the role must be fulfilled by a current ACQ member.

Mi Via training compliance and billing/Turquoise Claims issues

The chair introduced a Policy and Quality Committee item about training compliance that impacts vendor providers and noted the committee is developing DDSD's process for monitoring trainings. Mi Via was reported as 22% non-compliant in required trainings and members were asked to send feedback about how vendors should be captured in the training monitoring process to Deanna De Herrera, copying Selina and Melanie.

Billing/Turquoise Claims issues

- The discussion shifted to billing; attendees were told to expect a DDSD link from Tammy Barth about Turquoise Claims, Deanna is working on CSV upload timelines, and members requested a clear e-blast from Conduent/DDSD about known issues and timelines, citing Conduent timestamp and processing delays that are affecting payroll.
  - DDSD will provide a link this week to help vendors with Turquoise Claims issues
  - Deanna is working on a timeline for when Conduent/Palco can accept CSV uploads for documentation
  - Providers reported Conduent processing and timestamp inconsistencies that are delaying payments and affecting payroll
- Participants discussed alerting HCA leadership about the billing problems and mentioned that Jennifer Zwally and Scott Doan will inform Secretary Armijo of the provider network's concerns. Several speakers emphasized that, as a governor-appointed body, the ACQ should ensure both the secretary and the governor are aware of issues affecting service continuity.
- Attendees described how smaller agencies are being financially harmed and some cannot make payroll because payments are delayed or missing. Speakers stressed that these payment failures put IDD services at risk and that louder advocacy is needed to protect service delivery.
- Several participants criticized Conduent's rollout and raised concerns including HIPAA breaches, poor rollout quality, and historically lax vendor standards despite large taxpayer investments. Frustration centered on nonchalance in vendor responses and the expectation that contractual standards should be enforced.
- The group discussed that Turquoise claims was paused then released without critical functionality such as prior-authorization reporting, which providers rely on and were told could be months away. Participants said DD waiver needs were not adequately represented in testing, leaving providers effectively acting as beta testers for missing features.
- Providers described extreme operational burdens, such as one hour to verify five clients and reliance on denial lists as a workaround for missing prior-auth data. Members reported claims disappearing in transmission, taxonomy code problems, and reversed modifiers on annuals, increasing manual reconciliation work.
- **The committee requested a clear HCA communication (e-blast/memo) that lists known issues, resolution timelines, and consideration of extending the 90-day timely-filing window for affected claims. Elaine and others committed to aggregating vendor reports and pushing for a formal memo with timelines to be distributed.**

Committee Logistics and Succession

- The conversation closed with logistical items about who will compile submissions and how committee leadership might be redistributed, including suggestions to split topic ownership across experts to support a new chair. Participants agreed to continue capturing issues for the ACQ report and to remain engaged even if chair responsibilities shift.

Palco form updates and impact on Conduent processing

- Cassandra DeCamp reported that Palco published new vendor and EOR paperwork and that the forms look different though much of the requested information is similar, warning that agencies using prefilled old forms could face processing delays. She committed to raise the question of whether DDSD will continue to accept old forms at the quarterly DDSD meeting on Thursday. The group asked Cassandra to share the updated documents with Angelique for posting in meeting minutes and to notify the committee when she is confident the information is complete.
  - Update 4/23 per email communication between Cassandra and Deanna: "…information I received from Deanna DeHerrera about the use of PALCO forms with the introduction of the new forms: 'You can use the old forms until you receive notice that they will not accept them by a certain date. You are good to go using both.'"

Discussion of the DDSD memo and the 48-hour documentation requirement

- Participants examined a DDSD memo asserting a 48-hour documentation requirement and noted that neither CMS rules nor NMAC explicitly specify a 48-hour timeline, creating concern about an unsupported enforcement standard and conflict with the 90-day claim submission rule. Attendees hypothesized that the timeline may originate from a contractor audit and recommended widening the request for evidence to include CMS contractors and audit reports, not only CMS guidance. The group discussed precedents in Arizona where similar language was reversed after legal and lobbying pushbacks.
  - The DDSD memo referenced a 48-hour documentation requirement that participants could not locate in CMS or NMAC rules.
  - The committee will formally request CMS or contractor guidance showing a 48-hour (or 24/48) timeline if it exists.
  - Angelique will draft and send a statement to DDSD leadership and the executive committee and will circulate it to members first.
- The committee agreed to request the specific rule or guidance that establishes the 48-hour (or 24/48) requirement and to reference both memos if applicable; Angelique volunteered to draft a clear, professional statement to send to DDSD representatives including Jen and Kari and to the executive committee for review prior to distribution. The meeting ended with thanks, confirmation of follow-ups, and reminders to send items to Angelique for future agendas and packets.
  - Updated: Message was sent to Elaine and Selina by Angelique on 4/20 after no further feedback from committee – was not sent to Executive Committee prior to DDSD.

    The Advisory Council on Quality (ACQ) Mi Via Vendor Stakeholder Committee has reviewed the March 1, 2026 DDSD memos regarding billing and documentation requirements for both DDW and Mi Via. After careful consideration, the Committee does not support the inclusion of a 48-hour timeline for documentation. At this time, we have not been provided with any federal rule, CMS guidance, or direction from CMS contractors that clearly establishes this specific requirement. As written, the expectation appears to reflect a broad interpretation rather than a standard grounded in formal guidance.

    We respectfully request that DDSD provide the specific source or authority supporting the 48-hour requirement. In the absence of clear direction, the Committee cannot support implementation of this provision and recommends further review in partnership with stakeholders.

- **Information from Teams chat**:
  - Tammy Barth
    - tammy.barth@hca.nm.gov
  - Deanna Herrera
    - deanna.deherrera@hca.nm.gov
    - 505-629-7260
  - Guadalupe Monge, FOCoS
    - Guadalupe.Monge@conduent.com

- **Action Items:**
  - DDSD:
    - Meeting participants will send Selina and Elaine examples of billing issues and claims denials for Conduent review.

- Selina will:
  - email the committee clear direction on the required claim identifiers and billing information format for research (TCN, name, DOB, Medicaid ID) on denied claims
  - confirm whether vendor packets must include GRT and will follow up with Conduent or relevant teams to verify the requirement
  - resend memos and communications that specify GRT invoice formatting and the need for two separate line items (base and GRT) on invoices
  - follow up and confirm who can view auto-generated GRT budget goals and communicate the correct answer to Angelique
  - issue a memo to consultant agencies and provide a list of nonprofit vendor agencies clarifying when GRT should not be included in budgets
  - reach out to vendors via this committee if the decision about home studies changes
  - issue a frequently asked questions document if providers submit questions to the state regarding the recent memo (3/03)
- Elaine will:
  - locate and share the original memo on hospitalization exemptions with the committee
  - share finalized SSP-sharing guidance and logistics with consultants and this committee
  - consult with Deanna to clarify who determines whether a provider can bill when notes are not submitted within 48 hours
  - inquire about inclusion of Mi Via Vendor Committee on the ACQ website. Angelique has submitted all requested documentation.

- Jessica Gutierrez will locate and send the example to Selina for Conduent clarification and follow-up as needed
- Karen Garcia will provide her contact information in the meeting notes so the state can advise where to send the IHLS log for review.
- Deanna's audit team will serve as the contact for documentation requests and will conduct the internal audits described by the state.

Next Mi Via Vendor Committee Meeting: May 12th, 2026

Join the meeting now

Meeting ID: 267 837 093 271 7

Passcode: cs2FZ7vA