

1 **Colorado Medical Society**

2 Position Paper
3 Medicaid

4 The Colorado Medical Society (CMS) supports efforts to create a streamlined Medicaid
5 program that will promote state innovation and efficient use of funds, while maintaining the
6 program's role as a safety net for the state's poorest and most vulnerable populations. A major
7 challenge in restructuring the Medicaid program is to appropriately balance Colorado's interests
8 in securing increased flexibility in light of fewer federal funds for Medicaid against the very real
9 needs of the people that the Medicaid program is intended to serve, most of whom have no other
10 means of access to health care coverage.

11 As compared to some state programs for which broad waivers have been granted, the
12 State of Colorado has historically placed budgetary concerns over those of patient access and
13 choice, reasonable provider reimbursement, and solvency of participating managed care entities.
14 The result has been that recipients' access to quality medical care has been inadequate. The CMS
15 believes that flexibility of the state government must be tempered by the need for accountability
16 standards designed to ensure that Colorado programs fulfill Medicaid's objective of improving
17 access to quality medical care and comply with fundamental protections embodied in the federal
18 Medicaid Act. Such standards are also critical to assuring that the Colorado Medicaid program
19 will have sufficient provider participation to meet the recipients' needs, without resorting to
20 coercive approaches to securing that participation. Moreover, with Colorado's interest in moving
21 the Medicaid population into managed care systems in hopes of achieving savings, safeguards are
22 necessary to ensure that Medicaid recipients receive high quality, cost effective care and are
23 treated fairly. CMS opposes the transfer of all Medicaid eligibles into capitated Health
24 Maintenance Organization (HMO) managed care at this time. Independent studies by the Urban
25 Institute of Washington, D.C., have found minimal cost savings in such an approach when
26 conversion occurred from a totally unmanaged Medicaid system. With the success of the
27 Colorado Primary Care Physician Program, we believe that additional cost savings might be
28 negligible. Additionally, capitated HMO managed care has not had experience in caring for the
29 disabled or nursing home populations, which combined, account for the majority of costs in the
30 current Medicaid program. Concern also should be raised in breaking ongoing patient
31 relationships with physicians and providers of ancillary services in a patient population that often
32 finds it difficult to develop such relationships.

33 In addition, it is essential that state reforms are enacted that facilitate the purchase of
34 private health insurance for Coloradans who do not qualify for Medicaid. Colorado should
35 consider a buy-in program that allows low-income individuals to participate in the state Medicaid
36 program.

37 The CMS supports the application of the following principles under any restructuring of
38 Medicaid, whether by block grant program, a continuation of the current program, or any other
39 alternative.
40
41

42 Income-Based Eligibility with a State Floor

43 Because of limited federal and state resources for Medicaid, Colorado will face difficult choices
44 regarding who will be eligible for Medicaid coverage. An eligibility floor is essential to ensure
45 that Colorado will not cut coverage for the poorest Coloradans, which would add to the growing
46 numbers of uninsured and exacerbate cost-shifting and uncompensated care. At a minimum,
47 Colorado must provide Medicaid coverage to those whose incomes fall below an eligibility
48 requirement set at, or at some percentage of, the federal poverty level. Colorado should maintain
49 current efforts in covering children to age 18, pregnant women and dual Medicaid-Medicare

1 eligibles. In addition, since there may be a large number of Colorado residents who have incomes
2 which are higher than the established eligibility floor but still have no health care coverage,
3 Colorado should allow those with low incomes that do not meet eligibility requirements to buy
4 into Medicaid. In order to discourage Medicaid recipients from not earning income in order to
5 retain eligibility, a mechanism should be created on a sliding scale dependent on the individual's
6 income to provide proportionate partial funding for payment of such Medicaid premiums.

7 Minimum Adequate Benefits

8 Basic standards of uniform minimum adequate benefits should be established for Medicaid
9 recipients. Without such standards, Colorado may see restructuring which results in inadequate
10 coverage for recipients and increased uncompensated care costs for our state. Colorado should
11 have the flexibility to provide additional benefits to recipients as we choose, using our own
12 resources.

13 Access Standards

14 The desire to have the freedom to tailor our Medicaid program must be balanced against the
15 necessity for more active legislative oversight if Colorado's management of the Medicaid
16 program results in significantly diminished access and/or quality of care. To allow for this, the
17 legislature should require the development of certain "access standards" by which to measure
18 Medicaid eligibles' access to providers and covered health care services. These standards must
19 include guidelines for adequate provider reimbursement levels, which have a demonstrated link to
20 recipients' access to medical care. In addition to such guidelines, changes in uncompensated care
21 which might reflect an inadequacy in the eligibility levels should be monitored.

22 An oversight process should be established whereby Medicaid should be required to rectify
23 problem areas. This oversight authority should continue until Medicaid is in conformance with
24 the access standards. Interested parties, including CMS, should have input at the state level into
25 the development and implementation of access standards.

26 Promoting Patient Empowerment and Market Competition

27 Medicaid recipients should be empowered to utilize Medicaid funds in the most rational, efficient
28 manner possible. Rather than a single health delivery system dictated by the state, which
29 generates inefficiencies and stifles a competitive market, Medicaid recipients should be provided
30 with as many choices of health delivery systems as possible, including managed care, traditional
31 indemnity, and benefit payment schedule where available, within a defined contribution
32 framework. This will achieve the twin goals of predictable Medicaid expenditures, and price and
33 quality competition on the Medicaid market.

34 1. Vouchers

35 Colorado should issue publicly-financed vouchers for an actuarially determined amount of
36 insurance to allow Medicaid eligibles to choose among private health insurance plans that provide
37 required benefits. Colorado should ensure that Medicaid recipients are given a choice among
38 types of health delivery systems. In order to ensure that Medicaid recipients obtain necessary
39 care while purchasing health care services in a cost effective manner, Colorado should establish
40 programs to educate Medicaid eligibles in the efficient use of health care services.

41 2. Provider Networks

42 Innovative states have recognized the benefits of creating incentives for providers to treat
43 Medicaid patients by enacting laws that facilitate provider networks' ability to "manage" the care
44 of Medicaid recipients. Allowing provider networks to contract to cover Medicaid recipients
45 creates a competitive atmosphere for Medicaid business and promotes high quality for Medicaid
46 recipients by placing medical decision making and quality assurance activities in the hands of
47 those who are responsible for providing the care. Provider networks that contract directly with
48 states to cover Medicaid recipients also are able to reduce the cost of the insurer "middleman,"

1 who diverts a layer of the Medicaid dollar from patient care. Eliminating barriers to provider
2 networks ability to contract with Medicaid will result in enhancing competition in the commercial
3 health care market.

4 3. The Primary Care Physician (PCP) Program

5 The PCP program is one program in Colorado, which has proven that it can control costs¹. It is
6 important to maintain this program. Colorado should create mechanisms for traditional Medicaid
7 providers, who have been serving this population for decades, to continue to participate in
8 Medicaid managed care.

9 4. Health Plan Standards

10 Regardless of the methods for financing or delivering Medicaid health care services, the
11 paramount concern must be the quality of patient care. In an increasingly competitive market,
12 and with fewer Medicaid dollars, health plans
13 face incentives to ration patient care, reduce choices of physicians, deny treatment and base
14 medication and other clinical choices on cost rather than quality considerations. Plans often
15 apply similar pressures on providers as a condition of participating in the plans. Patients must be
16 protected from practices that are unfair or impair the quality of care that they receive.
17 Moreover, accountability standards and state oversight requirements must be established for
18 health plans that contract to cover Medicaid recipients. These standards must address: coverage,
19 marketing and enrollment, fairness, physician involvement in medical policy decision making,
20 quality management/utilization review, administrative simplification, continuity of care, smooth
21 transition into newly contracted health plans or providers, access to both primary and specialized
22 care and incentive plans.

23 Quality Improvement Systems and Quality Performance Measures

24 Outcomes research and technology assessment are the preferred ways to measure quality
25 improvement and quality performance. Good objective information fed back to physicians to
26 improve their clinical decision making is invaluable. Quality performance measurements, if well
27 done, can provide oversight to previously discussed utilization review or coverage decision
28 making systems that review the medical decisions made or recommended by physicians.

29 Long Term Care

30 The long term care component of Medicaid consumes 35% of Medicaid spending. Since few
31 Coloradans purchase long term care insurance, and instead, even middle-income Coloradans who
32 require long term care often access Medicaid to cover their costs by sheltering and disposing of
33 their assets and thus “spending down” for Medicaid coverage, taxpayers end up paying for the
34 long term care of individuals who could afford to purchase the care and/or long term care
35 insurance. This drains Medicaid money from intended recipients -- Colorado’s poor.

36
37 Colorado must separate long term care from health care and establish incentives and mechanisms
38 for individuals to plan for their long term care costs. Stronger state requirements should be
39 implemented to limit individuals’ ability to divest or transfer assets in order to qualify for
40 Medicaid long term care coverage. Colorado should phase-in rules to allow individuals an
41 opportunity to purchase long term care insurance and establish a spend down “offset” for

1 The Colorado Department of Health Care Policy & Financing calculated PCP program savings at \$10,386,904 for FY92-93. Savings projected for the federal waiver renewal period were projected at \$8.49 per recipient month. The projected number of recipient months enrolled under the waiver during the renewal period will be 2,108,136. Therefore, savings under the renewal period should be \$17,898,075.

1 individuals who purchase such insurance. CMS endorses the concept of transforming our current
2 health care delivery system into an individually selected and individually owned system where
3 the individual chooses the health plan which best meets personal and family needs. In such a
4 system, individuals would be able to establish a medical savings account (MSA) for long term
5 care when first entering the workforce. Accumulated unspent funds in such an account could be
6 used to pay for long term care and other end-of-life medical care needs, and to plan for these
7 financial needs in a prospective way similar to the planning that occurs for funding the
8 educational needs of children, and for retirement.

9 Potential alternative methods of financing long-term care must be studied including, but not
10 limited to, the use of the following devices: long term care insurance, including the possibility of
11 Medicaid-funded stop loss coverage and tax incentives for employers to provide and individuals
12 to purchase such insurance; and tax incentives for family caregiving. Investigations should also
13 be conducted into an adjustment of the Diagnosis Related Grouping (DRG) system as applied to
14 capitated long term care such that care of chronic morbidities is appropriately funded within a
15 cost controlled model.

16 Guidelines for Provider Reimbursement

17 Medicaid has historically set provider reimbursement levels considerably below private sector
18 and Medicare levels. As long as Medicaid reimbursement levels remain considerably below
19 those of other payors, there is a disincentive for providers to participate in Medicaid, which
20 ultimately impacts on recipients' access to quality medical care. Colorado needs flexibility in
21 financing Medicaid and the ability to achieve equity in Medicaid provider reimbursement,
22 therefore Colorado must urge the federal government to replace the Boren Amendment² with
23 broader reimbursement/access standards for all Medicaid providers and standards for payment to
24 plans that are aimed at ensuring access to care.

25 CMS supports basing provider reimbursement on the following:

26 - In the fee-for-service arena, Medicaid programs should utilize a resource based
27 relative value scale with a single conversion factor for physician reimbursement.

28 - Any Medicaid payments or reimbursement based on capitation must be founded on
29 sound actuarial and utilization assumptions.

30 - If plans utilize provider fee withholds or other financial incentives for providers to
31 limit care, they must be equitable, particularly as compared to other payors. Financial
32 incentives should not be linked to a provider's treatment decisions for a specific patient and
33 should take into account a provider's "case mix" of patients.

34 Emergency Room Care

35 Inappropriate use of emergency rooms by Medicaid recipients is one component contributing to
36 spiraling Medicaid costs. Colorado should create incentives for Medicaid recipients to use the
37 most appropriate time and site of care. Such incentives might include a program for nominal
38 copayments for emergency room visits. Additionally, provisions should be made to retain the
39 current emergency room triage program which screens Medicaid recipients on entrance to the
40 facility, and refers non-urgent problems to the most appropriate clinical setting.

41 Conclusion

42 Regardless of whether the federal mechanism for financing Medicaid is a block grant program, a
43 continuation of the current program, or any other alternative, it is imperative that the function of
44 Medicaid as a safety net for the state's poorest and most vulnerable populations be maintained.
45

² 43 U.S.C. §1396a(a)(13) which requires that hospitals be reimbursed at 100% of reasonable costs.

1 Our proposal for transforming Medicaid attempts to achieve the necessary balance between
2 flexibility and standards of accountability. Such safeguards are essential to ensuring that the
3 Colorado Medicaid program fulfills the crucial objective of the Medicaid program -- to maintain
4 and improve the health of Medicaid recipients.