## Ceading Age SUPPORT

SENIOR HOUSING | ASSISTED LIVING | ADULT CARE FACILITIES | HOME CARE | RETIREMENT COMMUNITIES ADULT DAY HEALTH CARE | PACE/MLTC | NURSING HOMES

## MEMORANDUM A.7742 (Paulin)/S.7483 (Cleare)

AN ACT to amend the public health law, in relation to promoting efficient and effective oversight of continuing care retirement communities; and to repeal certain provisions of such law relating thereto

This legislation would modify Articles 46 and 46-A of the Public Health Law in a way that would eliminate various barriers to the development, expansion, and efficient operation of Continuing Care Retirement Communities (CCRCs) in New York State while preserving vitally important resident protections. It would consolidate authority for the approval and operation of CCRCs into the Department of Health (DOH). The bill would also allow the state to update through regulation the limit on priority reservation fee deposits. This fully refundable fee is currently capped by statute at \$2,000, a number that hasn't changed since 1991. The ability for the Department of Health to update this cap would help ensure that the deposit amount reflects current market conditions and is indicative of a genuine interest in the community.

Article 46 was first enacted in New York in 1989, and Article 46-A (which allows for fee-for-service CCRCs) was added in 2004. Over the last 30 years, the number of CCRCs and similar communities has grown dramatically across the nation, including in neighboring states such as Pennsylvania. CCRCs have become one of the primary means by which older adults of varying income levels can fund and provide for their own long-term care services and housing needs. However, there are only 14 CCRCs in the state.

The requirements of Articles 46 and 46-A have created an environment in which it is prohibitively expensive and administratively burdensome to start or expand a CCRC, and extremely difficult for current CCRCs to operate efficiently and make their services more affordable. CCRCs are regulated by two State agencies [DOH and the Department of Financial Services (DFS)], and in certain cases by a third entity, the Office of the Attorney General. This level of oversight is burdensome, time-consuming, creates conflicts and duplication, and adds significantly to the cost of developing and operating CCRCs.

This model made sense 30 years ago when DOH lacked any experience with insurance. However, since that time, DOH has developed a vast depth of expertise with insurance. DOH currently reviews financial oversight and solvency – the only DFS role for CCRCs — resulting in considerable duplication of functions that slows processes and makes it difficult for CCRCs to respond nimbly to the changing environment. Delays in these processes can slow repositioning that would benefit CCRC residents, and delay projects that would enhance quality of life.

In addition, the CCRC Council must provide final approval for establishment and most operational changes. Unfortunately, the Council has experienced significant turnover, resulting in members who are often unfamiliar with the details of the program. By statute, only one member of the Council may be an operator or board member of a CCRC. For years, the Council has frequently had difficulty even achieving a quorum. Cancellation of the infrequently scheduled Council meetings is common. This issue predated

LeadingAge New York

13 British American Blvd., Suite 2 | Latham, New York 12110-1431 | P 518.867.8383 | F 518.867.8384 | www.leadingageny.org

the pandemic, and unfortunately continues today. At the most recent Council meeting in May, another member retired adding to the number of open seats. The inability to keep these seats filled has and will bring critical projects to a standstill when the Council can't achieve a quorum, given their current responsibilities.

Not only does the cumbersome multiple agency oversight and Council approval cause delays that result in increased costs for existing CCRCs and their residents, but it also discourages providers who might otherwise pursue this model of care from proceeding. We believe this is a significant contributing factor to New York's lack of CCRCs compared to neighboring states: Pennsylvania (197), New Jersey (27), and Massachusetts (31).

This legislation would address these problems by modifying provisions of Articles 46 and 46-A that mandate multiple agency involvement to consolidate oversight in DOH and make it clear that other agencies are involved in a limited, consultative role. It would also limit the CCRC Council to an advisory role. It is important to note that almost all other councils in the health space are exclusively advisory in nature.

CCRCs are a proven economic driver for local communities. Further, the CCRC is a private-pay model, not a new Medicaid program that will cost the State money. On the contrary, older adults who invest in their care and housing needs through a CCRC do not divest their assets to qualify for Medicaid-funded services.

For these reasons, LeadingAge NY strongly supports this legislation and recommends that it be adopted in this legislative session.

Leading Age New York represents over 400 not-for-profit and public long term care providers, including nursing homes, home care agencies, senior housing, retirement communities, assisted living, adult care facilities, adult day health care and managed long term care.

Contact: Sarah Daly, sdaly@leadingageny.org