

## **Minutes for the TBI Finance Sub Work Group**

Meeting April 2, 2019

Attendance: John Bishop, Jon Wilkerson, Susan Pierce, Dan Parker, Gigi Parker, Eddie Williams, Kim Lamb, & Danny Bercher

Meeting began at 1:00 pm

The group reviewed the charge of the committee, which is to look at potential financial sources to fund support for the TBI community. The group was asked to share comments about their thoughts on the documents distributed including the Waiver / Trust Fund US Map, the Top Ten Driving Violations, the NASHIA Waiver Programs, and the NASHIA TBI Trust Funds Overview.

Jon Wilkerson commented that NASHIA Waiver Program participant numbers look low considering the population of each state. Danny Bercher commented that it could be that most of the waivers are demonstration projects. Jon Wilkerson also commented that his experience with the state legislators was that their perception of case management in the spinal cord commission was duplicative and unnecessary. He said that education of the legislators by the Ark. Spinal Cord Commission has been an ongoing battle.

The consensus of the group was that there needs to be a simplified economic message concerning the need for rehabilitation services and case management for TBIs after post-acute care. Furthermore, that there needs to be a clear message about the return on investment for case management and rehabilitation.

Danny Bercher said that there is already a set of general talking points for legislators that illustrates the costs of TBI to the economy. The message lacking is where rehabilitation and case management may make a difference. He said that Dr. Lindberg is interested in developing a matched TBI case study with and without rehabilitation utilizing the All Payer Claims Database to illustrate cost comparisons. The problem right now is that we do not have any data in Arkansas to make this case.

The group agreed that a simplified argument needs to be developed that would justify and convince the legislature that paying for rehabilitation and case management could result in a return on investment to the economy.

Jon Wilkerson suggested that a more defined literature review might be helpful to ascertain studies that might illustrate the return on investment with after post-acute rehabilitation and case management. He referenced one study in which the older TBIs had better outcomes with long term rehabilitation.

Kim Lamb volunteered to seek assistance from ACL for convincing state arguments for TBI support.

Dan Parker suggested that each committee member contact states they are interested in the NASHIA documents and research their respective arguments for TBI support.

In summary, the group believes that the messaging and key arguments for TBI Waiver or Trust Fund needs to be refined so that a legislator can understand the issues better. The argument needs to be made that rehabilitation services can improve the outcomes of TBIs that will result in a return on investment to the economy. The three strategies to build a cohesive message are:

1. Refine a literature search illustrating the benefits of rehabilitation after post-acute for TBI patients with a return on investment (John B, Jon & Danny).
2. Reach out to ACL for arguments that the states have found useful (Kim).
3. Each committee member will research states of their choosing from the NASHIA documents that they believe might shed light on arguments for the TBI cause. (Danny will send a list out and take volunteers who wish to investigate.)

The group agreed to meet on a future date either before or after the May 7 general work group meeting. We will work out the details via electronic messaging.

Meeting adjourned at 2:10 pm.

Respectfully submitted,

Daniel Bercher, PhD