**Section-by-Section Comments for the RHP 10 Plan**

Instructions: The following table includes HHSC comments about sections of the RHP Plan. Outstanding issues are noted, and the associated plan section is identified. Space is provided for CMS to comment on each RHP Plan Section.

| **Plan Section** | **HHSC Comments to CMS** | **CMS Comments** |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Full Plan |  |  |
| I | Issues identified with invalid TINs for the anchor and the following additional TINs in the “RHP Participant and Stakeholder Information” table: 17560004399150, 75139762200201, 11616766869150. |  |
| II | HHSC noted that certain items in Section II, Summary of Categories 1‐2 Projects table, do not match the information included in Section V. These mismatches are highlighted on the “Section II” tab of the *RHP10 Technical Review and Valuation* document. |  |
| III | CMS review of October 31, 2012, Community Needs submission did not include feedback for this region. HHSC did not request that RHP 10 make changes to Section III.  |  |
| IV | HHSC did not note outstanding issues for RHP 10 for Section IV.  |  |
| VGeneral | Please see the *RHP10 Technical Review and Valuation* document for information related to Valuation and Technical Review of Section V. |  |
| VCat. 1 | Please see the *RHP10 Technical Review and Valuation* document for information related to Valuation and Technical Review of Section V. |  |
| VCat. 2 | Please see the *RHP10 Technical Review and Valuation* document for information related to Valuation and Technical Review of Section V. |  |
| VCat. 3 | Please see the *RHP10 Technical Review and Valuation* document for information related to Valuation and Technical Review of Section V. |  |
| VCat. 4 | HHSC did not note outstanding issues for RHP 10 for Category 4.Most providers met requirements of this section. Outstanding issue identified with Category 4:* Provider Cook Children’s did not clearly indicate which of their projects would impact the identified RD-1 measures.
* The final plan template with updated RD-6 format was not used by the following providers: Huguley Memorial, Texas Health Arlington Memorial /130614405, and the following Texas Health Harris Methodist facilities - Fort Worth / 112677302, Southwest Fort Worth / 120726804, Stephenville / 121794503, Azle /127304703, Cleburne / 131036903, Hurst Euless Bedford / 136326908
* Texas Health Harris Methodist Azle (127304703) and Stephenville (121794503) did not make clear how their primary care project and outpatient diabetes project would impact inpatient PPCs and inpatient patient satisfaction (RD-3 and RD-4).
* The following Texas Health Harris Methodist facilities had RD-5 narratives that focused on proper ED utilization rather than admit decision time to ED departure time: Southwest Fort Worth (120726804); Cleburne (131036903), and Stephenville (121794503).
* Wise Regional Health System (130606006) did not provide planned reporting periods or measurement periods for RDs in table.
 |  |
| VI | HHSC review verified required signatures included in Section VI. |  |
| VII | Appropriate addendums included.  |  |