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AGO Cost Trends Examinations

• Authority to conduct examinations:
  – G.L. c. 12, § 11N to monitor trends in the health care market.
  – G.L. c. 12C, § 17 to issue subpoenas for documents, interrogatory responses, and testimony under oath related to health care costs and cost trends.

• Findings and reports issued since 2010.

• This examination focused on two key cost containment initiatives that aim to encourage patients and providers to choose higher-value care.
Questions Presented

I. Are consumer-facing cost estimator tools influencing patients to select lower-priced care options?

II. How do patient movement across health plans and administrative complexity impact provider incentives in APMs?

III. Have patient expenditures shifted towards lower-priced hospitals in recent years?
Few Patients Use Payers’ Online Cost Estimator Tools

The Number of Searches Per 100 Members Ranged From 2.0 to 6.6 in 2017-18
Consumers in High-Deductible Plans Are More Likely to Use Cost Estimators

The Opportunity to Reduce Spending Among Consumers with High-Deductibles is Limited
Consumer “Shopping” Patterns Highlight Opportunities for Tool Enhancement

The Total Number of Searchable Services and Top Searched Services in 2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PAYER 1 (245 services)</th>
<th>PAYER 2 (1625 services)</th>
<th>PAYER 3 (105 services)</th>
<th>PAYER 4 (800 services)</th>
<th>PAYER 5 (770 services)</th>
<th>PAYER 6 (302 services)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Imaging (MRI, Mammography)</td>
<td>Physician Office Visits</td>
<td>Imaging (MRI, X-Ray)</td>
<td>Imaging (MRI, Ultrasound)</td>
<td>Imaging (MRI, X-Ray)</td>
<td>Imaging (MRI, X-Ray)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Colonoscopy</td>
<td>Imaging (MRI, X-Ray)</td>
<td>Clinical Pathology</td>
<td>Specialist Office Visits</td>
<td>Clinical Pathology</td>
<td>Pregnancy &amp; Childbirth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Physician Office Visits</td>
<td>Behavioral Health</td>
<td>Colonoscopy</td>
<td>Physician Office Visits</td>
<td>Pregnancy &amp; Childbirth</td>
<td>Colonoscopy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Elective Surgery (Orthopedic)</td>
<td>Pregnancy &amp; Childbirth</td>
<td>Elective Surgery (Bariatric)</td>
<td>Colonoscopy</td>
<td>Elective Surgery (Gastrointestinal)</td>
<td>Physician Office Visits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Pregnancy &amp; Childbirth</td>
<td>Chiropractic Visits</td>
<td>Pregnancy &amp; Childbirth</td>
<td>Behavioral Health</td>
<td>Preventive Care</td>
<td>Elective Surgery (Bariatric)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Questions Presented

I. Are consumer-facing cost estimator tools influencing patients to select lower-priced care options?

II. How do patient movement across health plans and administrative complexity impact provider incentives in APMs?

III. Have patient expenditures shifted towards lower-priced hospitals in recent years?
Patient Movement Across Payers Makes it Difficult to Measure APM Performance

Only Half of Patients Enrolled in a Payer or Product Remained Over a Two-Year Period (Jan. 2017 - Dec. 2018)
Complex APM Attribution Methods May Add Costs and Hinder Incentives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PAYER A</th>
<th>PAYER B</th>
<th>PAYER C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Providers Eligible for Attribution</td>
<td>• Primary Care Physicians</td>
<td>• PCPs</td>
<td>• PCPs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Specialty Care Physicians</td>
<td>• Double-Boarded Physicians (i.e. PCP/SCP combination)</td>
<td>• Nurse Practitioners (“NPs”)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Physician Assistants (“PAs”)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attribution Lookback Period</td>
<td>18-27 months</td>
<td>24 months</td>
<td>24 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attribution Criteria and Methodology</td>
<td>• Member selection of PCP</td>
<td>• PCP visit in previous 24 mos.</td>
<td>• Member selection of PCP, NP, PA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Well-visit in previous 24 mos.</td>
<td>• Rx in previous 24 mos.</td>
<td>• At least 1 well-visit in previous 12-24 mos. (if multiple, most recent visit)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Evaluation and Management visit (“E&amp;M”) in previous 24 mos.</td>
<td></td>
<td>• At least 1 E&amp;M visit in 12-24 mos. (if multiple, most recent visit)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Prescription (“Rx”) from a PCP in previous 24 mos.</td>
<td></td>
<td>• 3 or more Rx from a PCP in previous 12-24 mos. (if multiple, most prescriptions; if tied, most recent)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Well-visit with certain SCPs in previous 24 mos.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• E&amp;M visit with certain SCPs in previous 24 mos.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Rx from certain SCPs in previous 24 mos.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attribution Limitations</td>
<td>• All IP, OP and Behavioral Health claims are excluded</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Patient must be MA Resident</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• OP claims must be in MA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Questions Presented

I. Are consumer-facing cost estimator tools influencing patients to select lower-priced care options?

II. How do patient movement across health plans and administrative complexity impact provider incentives in APMs?

III. Have patient expenditures shifted towards lower-priced hospitals in recent years?
Expenditures at Lower-Priced Hospitals Have Decreased Since 2014

The Share of Inpatient Expenditures at Higher-Priced Hospitals Increased by 2.5%

(BCBSMA, 2014-2018)

Year    | Lower-Priced | Higher-Priced | Change in Inpatient Expenditures at Lower-Priced Hospitals
---      |--------------|---------------|-----------------------------
2014    | 38.9%        | 61.1%         | -2.5%                       
2018    | 36.4%        | 63.6%         |                             

Share of Inpatient Expenditures

© 2019 Massachusetts Attorney General’s Office
Expenditures at Lower-Priced Hospitals Varied Significantly Across Providers

System Composition May Influence Patient Use of Lower and Higher-Priced Hospitals

(BCBSMA, 2014-2018)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provider Organization</th>
<th>Lower-Priced</th>
<th>Higher-Priced</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PARTNERS</td>
<td>19.6%</td>
<td>80.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAHEY</td>
<td>23.0%</td>
<td>77.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STEWARD</td>
<td>36.9%</td>
<td>63.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATRIUS</td>
<td>40.7%</td>
<td>59.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEQCA</td>
<td>46.1%</td>
<td>53.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MACIPA</td>
<td>57.2%</td>
<td>42.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIDCO</td>
<td>60.3%</td>
<td>39.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOWELL</td>
<td>85.1%</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Recommendations

1. Temper expectations that consumer-driven price transparency tools will reduce health care cost growth.
   - Design transparency tools that help consumers choose PCPs affiliated with high-quality, lower-cost systems.
   - Enhance cost estimator tools to focus on shoppable services, expand access for non-English speakers, and integrate pharmacy, behavioral health services.

2. Closely review incentives for providers to direct patients to lower-cost settings.

3. Recognize that providers’ APM incentives are hampered by frequent patient movement across payers.

4. Standardize APM attribution methods.
Up Next
Presentation: State Policy Options to Increase Investment in Primary Care
Dr. Marie Ganim, Health Insurance Commissioner, Rhode Island
Mr. Chris Koller, President, Milbank Memorial Fund
INVESTING IN PRIMARY CARE

A RHODE ISLAND CASE STUDY

Marie Ganim, PhD.
Health Insurance Commissioner
State of Rhode Island
The Office of the Health Insurance Commissioner (OHIC) was created by the Rhode Island General Assembly in 2004.

- Protecting the interest of consumers
- Guarding the solvency of health insurers
- Encouraging policies and developments that improve the quality and efficiency of health care service delivery and outcomes
- Viewing the health care system as a comprehensive entity and encouraging and directing insurers towards policies that advance the welfare of the public through overall efficiency, improved health care quality, and appropriate access.
AGENDA

- Primary Care Investment in Rhode Island
- Considerations for Policy Design
- Tracking Investment and Accountability
- Next Steps in the Evolution of Primary Care Investment
- Integrated Behavioral Health in Rhode Island
- Primary Care Payment Reform
In 2010 OHIC required commercial insurers to increase the percentage of their overall medical spending dedicated to primary care by 1 percentage point per year for five years.

The primary care spending requirement was one of several Affordability Standards established by OHIC.
RHODE ISLAND’S RATIONALE FOR PRIMARY CARE INVESTMENT

- Correct underinvestment in Rhode Island compared to high performing systems.
- Policy lever to drive transformation of primary care.
- Opportunity to improve system performance on cost, quality and access.
CONSIDERATIONS FOR POLICY DESIGN

- What constitutes spending on primary care?
- What is your baseline and how does it compare to external benchmarks?
- What outcomes do you want to achieve?
- Once you decide to increase investments, what specific investments should be encouraged?
Rhode Island used mandatory investment in primary care as a catalyst for practice transformation and payment reform.

Rhode Island convened a multi-payer PCMH project and encouraged investment in PCMHs.

Investments through non-FFS payments were specifically encouraged.
RHODE ISLAND’S BASELINE MEASUREMENT

EXHIBIT 1

Primary Care Spending As A Percentage Of Total Medical Spending, Rhode Island Average (Baseline) And Benchmarks From Six Large Insurers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Health Plan</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island average</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geisinger Health Plan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermountain Health Care</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts HMOs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Health Cooperative (WA)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tufts Health Plan (MA)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Health Plan (RI)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SOURCES Office of the Health Insurance Commissioner, Rhode Island; and various other sources (see below). NOTES The Rhode Island average is the mathematical average of the two largest commercial insurers in the state, Blue Cross Blue Shield of Rhode Island and UnitedHealthcare of New England. The Rhode Island target is 10.9 percent, which is the current rate plus five percentage points, as set in affordability standards. *Plan-specific spending rates are greatly influenced by membership mix. *Source: Self-reported by insurers. Source: Oliver Wyman Study, 2008 Sep, based on commercial, fully insured health maintenance organizations (HMOs) only. Primary care includes obstetrics/gynecology; excludes pay-for-performance. Source: Wagner EH, director of the MacColl Institute for Healthcare Innovation, Center for Health Studies, Group Health Cooperative. Group Health Cooperative is a group-model HMO with owned facilities, like Kaiser Permanente.

TRACKING INVESTMENT & ACCOUNTABILITY
Baseline assumes the share of total spending dedicated to primary care remains fixed at 7.1% (2010).
Percent of Primary Care Spending Dedicated to Non-FFS Investments by Insurer
2008 - 2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BCBSRI</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>23.6%</td>
<td>29.0%</td>
<td>39.6%</td>
<td>40.1%</td>
<td>46.7%</td>
<td>53.2%</td>
<td>51.3%</td>
<td>56.3%</td>
<td>57.8%</td>
<td>57.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UHC</td>
<td>2.0%</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
<td>33.0%</td>
<td>42.0%</td>
<td>54.6%</td>
<td>56.4%</td>
<td>51.2%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>59.0%</td>
<td>54.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>THP</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>17.0%</td>
<td>25.5%</td>
<td>33.6%</td>
<td>41.3%</td>
<td>69.0%</td>
<td>69.5%</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NHP</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>17.7%</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RHODE ISLAND NAMED MOST IMPROVED STATE BY THE COMMONWEALTH FUND

- The Commonwealth Fund assesses and ranks each state on 47 measures of health care access, quality, efficiency, health outcomes, and disparities. This year, Rhode Island was ranked as the number one most improved state in the country.

- Rhode Island has improved nine ranks over other states – making Rhode Island the seventh highest ranking state in the country. In the past year Rhode Island has improved on access and affordability, prevention and treatment, disparity, healthy lives, and uninsured adults.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RI Ranking Highlights</th>
<th>2019 Ranking</th>
<th>Change from Baseline*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall Ranking</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>+9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access and Affordability</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>+10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevention and Treatment</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>+15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoidable Hospital Use and Cost</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthy Lives</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>+14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disparity</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>+7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The baseline year varied depending on each measure - it ranged from 2011 - 2016.
NEXT STEPS IN THE EVOLUTION OF PRIMARY CARE INVESTMENT
INTEGRATED BEHAVIORAL HEALTH

- OHIC has prioritized the integration of behavioral health into the primary care setting as a cost-effective way of increasing access to behavioral health services.

- A 2019 analysis of the CTC-RI’s Community Health Teams work shows significant reductions in patient health risk, depression, and anxiety after less than 5 months in care.

- Among other successes, the CTC-RI Integrated Behavioral Health program has also reduced emergency department visits.

- OHIC is committed to the expansion of the IBH model in primary care by:
  - Removing administrative barriers to IBH.
  - Promoting provider payment models which enable and sustain IBH.
OHIC is encouraging the adoption of APMs for primary care.

APMs, such as capitation, may encourage transformations in the delivery of primary care that are not possible under fee-for-service payment.

OHIC has aligned quality measures for primary care.

- For 2020 there are 8 core measures and 14 menu measures.
- The measure sets are updated annually.
LINKS FOR MORE INFORMATION

- OHIC website: ohic.ri.gov
The Case for a Primary Care–Oriented Delivery System

Massachusetts Health Policy Commission

October 23, 2019

Christopher Koller
What Is Primary Care?

Barbara Starfield’s 4 characteristics of effective primary care

• First Contact
• Comprehensive
• Coordinated
• Continuous

From the Patient-Centered Primary Care Collaborative:
Why Should an Entity Accountable for Population Health Outcomes Be “Primary Care Oriented”?

• “Primary care helps prevent illness and death, regardless of whether the care is characterized by supply of primary care physicians, a relationship with a source of primary care, or the receipt of important features of primary care.”

• “Primary care (in contrast to specialty care) is associated with a more equitable distribution of health in populations”

  —Starfield, Shi, Macinko (Milbank Quarterly, 2005)
Primary Care Spending Is a Way to Evaluate an Entity’s Primary Care Orientation

- Easily understood by many people
- Focuses on dollars
- Distinguishes low percentage of primary care spending relative to other health spending and other countries

Source: Patient-Centered Primary Care Collaborative – Investing in Primary Care, 2019
It is Significant: As Primary Care Spending Increases, ED Visits Decrease...

...and Hospitalizations Decrease

Alternate Payment Mechanisms alone will not promote a Primary Care-Oriented Delivery System

- Yes - Primary Care-based Accountable Care Organizations do better than hospital- or specialty-based ACOs.
- But health care does not follow rules of market.
- Addressing the economics is not enough - must address the politics as well.
- Intent behind state-level action on Primary Care Spending.
- Consistent with a “market-oversight” state health policy.
States Are Taking Action to Promote More Primary Care Spending

Activity as of July 2019. Click on the state to read the bill or regulation.

- Reporting
- Formal Measurement and Study
- Increase and Maintain (OR and RI)

Source: Milbank Memorial Fund
Collaborative Activity in New England on Measuring Primary Care Spending Rates

Vermont: 9.69% (Medicare, Medicaid & Commercial, 2016)

Massachusetts 6.6% (Commercial Payers, 2015)

Rhode Island: 11.5% (All Commercial Payers, 2016)

Connecticut: 4.7% (State Employees, 2017)

Health Policy Commission staff have played an integral role in the Primary Care Workgroup established by New England States Consortium Systems Organization. The workgroup generated these primary care spend estimates for states that had data available.

Source: NESCSO Primary Care Workgroup Presentation, 18 October 2018
Biggest Lesson from Other States: Must Not Only Measure but Have Ongoing Public Discussion

- Oregon – Commission, ongoing legislation
- Rhode Island – Health Insurance Advisory Council
- Other states have created primary care collaboratives, which are designed to bring stakeholder input into state policy decisions on primary care investment
- Need to create a public discussion that prioritizes primary care.
- Sometimes tied to multi payer work on primary care transformation
What’s in? How to Calculate Primary Care Spending

• The numerator can be defined in a narrow or broad way

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary Care Specialties</th>
<th>Primary Care Only Service Codes</th>
<th>Primary Care Providers – All Service Codes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Internal Medicine, Family Practice, Pediatrics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internal Medicine Family Practice, Pediatrics, and Other Specialties</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

States are not waiting for a national definition – some are going quite broad.

Other Lessons

• The perfect vs the good
  • Is the policy goal a greater emphasis on primary care or more high-quality primary care?

• What is the accountable entity?
  • State, payer type (Medicare, Medicaid, commercial), health plan, accountable delivery system

• What is an adequate level?
  • Depends on population
  • Depends on numerator
  • We won’t know until we start to measure.

• Target or Standard?
More Lessons

• Accounting for non-fee-for-service spending, such as:
  • Salaried providers; Bonus payments; Capitated payments
  • Payments to accountable delivery systems – is there a public interest?

• Where do increases go?
  • How directive to be?

• Relationship to broader delivery system reform (value-based payments, consolidation, etc.)

• Answers to these technical questions have policy implications
  • Need a public table for ongoing conversations
Manage Expectations: A Primary Care Orientation Is Necessary but Not Sufficient for a High-Performing Health System

Four challenges for the United States, based on international comparisons:

1. Lack of access to health care. (Affordable and comprehensive insurance coverage is fundamental.)
2. Relative underinvestment in primary care
3. Administrative inefficiency
4. Pervasiveness of disparities in the delivery of care

Source: “From Last to First – Could the U.S. Health Care System Become the Best in the World?” N Engl J Med 2017; 377:901-903
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Witness Panel 3: Strengthening Primary and Behavioral Health Care
Witness Panel 3
Strengthening Primary and Behavioral Health Care
A lower share of Massachusetts health care spending goes to primary care, compared to other states.

Percent of all health care spending devoted to primary care, 2011-2016 combined

Notes: Data represent an average of the “narrow” and “broad” definitions of primary care spending as reported in noted source. Narrow definition includes primary care services provided by primary care physicians (family medicine, general practice, geriatrics, general internal medicine, and general pediatrics). Broad definition also includes NPs, PAs, OB/GYNs, and behavioral health care providers. Data do not include non-claims based spending.

Strategies to Support and Increase Investment in Primary and Behavioral Health Care

**Primary Care**

- Higher **reimbursement** for primary care services
- Eliminating **scope of practice restrictions**
- **Greater collaboration** between PCPs and other providers, and improved **care coordination**
- Utilizing **care navigators or Community Health Workers**

**Behavioral Health Care**

- Co-locating **behavioral health clinicians in primary care**
- Increasing access to **outpatient care**, emergency **behavioral health beds**, and **telemedicine**
- Improving use of **behavioral health screenings** across the care continuum
- Utilizing **multidisciplinary teams** with knowledge in behavioral health
- Increasing **care management resources** that include behavioral health

Witness Panel 3: Strengthening Primary and Behavioral Health Care

Witnesses

Dr. Joseph Frolkis, President and CEO
New England Quality Care Alliance

Dr. Jeffrey Greenberg, Co-Founder and COO
Firefly Health

Richard Lynch, COO
Blue Cross Blue Shield of Massachusetts

Dr. Nancy Norman, Medical Director of Integration
Massachusetts Behavioral Health Partnership

Christina Severin, President and CEO
Community Care Cooperative (C3)

Goal

This panel will focus on strategies to enhance primary and behavioral health care in the Commonwealth through direct investment, expanding workforce, behavioral health integration, and other capacity building.
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Witness Panel 4
Provider Market Trends and Cost Drivers
Hospitals continue to consolidate and care is increasingly concentrated in the largest health systems.

The share of volume in the **top five systems increased 18 percentage points** from 2010 to 2017 (accounting for current affiliations). The share of volume in **independent community hospitals declined 16 percentage points**.
AMCs and teaching hospitals still provide half of the scheduled community-appropriate care for patients who live near community hospitals.

- A community hospital was the closest option for 80% of commercial patients who received scheduled, community-appropriate care.

- From 2010 to 2017, approximately half of patients whose closest hospital was a community hospital traveled to a non-community hospital for scheduled, non-maternity, community-appropriate care.

**Site of Care for Adult Patients Receiving Scheduled, Non-Maternity Community-Appropriate Services Whose Closest Hospital is a Community Hospital (2010 – 2017, Commercial)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Share Used Non-Community Hospital (%)</th>
<th>Share Used Other Community Hospital (%)</th>
<th>Share Used Community Hospital Within 5 Min. of Closest (%)</th>
<th>Share Used Closest Community Hospital (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2011</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2012</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Community-appropriate discharges represent a narrow set of inpatient services that could likely be performed effectively in any hospital setting.
Price variation persists without significant improvement over time.

BCBS Relative Prices Over Time for Highest-Priced and Lowest-Priced Hospitals (2010)
Higher health care spending is driven by both higher prices and higher volume at higher-priced providers.

In 2017, **38.7%** of hospitals had above-average statewide relative price. These hospitals received **48.8%** of inpatient and outpatient volume, and captured **70%** of commercial hospital revenue.

Price and share of statewide commercial revenue data source: [2017 Statewide Relative Price](#) (see tab A). Data reported by payers to CHIA. Inpatient Discharges and Outpatient Discharge Equivalents data source: 2017 Hospital Cost Reports. Data reported by hospitals to CHIA.
The HPC’s 2016 *Community Hospitals at a Crossroads* report identified challenges for community hospital sustainability and a need for action. Many of these challenges persist.
Commercial inpatient spending grew 11% even as volume fell 14% between 2013 and 2018.

Cumulative change in commercial inpatient hospital volume and spending per enrollee (percentages) and absolute, 2013-2018

Spending per commercial discharge grew 29% (5.2% annually), from $14,500 to $18,700, from 2013 to 2018.

Commercial prices in Massachusetts are both high and growing. A recent RAND study found that Massachusetts has the fourth-highest inpatient commercial prices compared to Medicare out of 25 states.

Strategies to Address Health Care Spending Growth

Strategic Priorities

**Payers:**
Expansion or prioritization of APMs or value-based models

**Providers:**
Shifting care to lower-cost settings

Recommended Policy Actions

- Expansion of **telemedicine**
- Increased **reimbursements** for community-based providers
- Addressing **pharmaceutical costs**
- **Transparency** around pharmaceutical prices
- Addressing **provider price variation** and hospital consolidation
- Addressing **out-of-network** or “surprise” billing

Witness Panel 4: Provider Market Trends and Cost Drivers

Witnesses

Thomas Croswell, President and CEO  
Sandra Fenwick, CEO  
Kim Hollon, President and CEO  
Dr. Anne Klibanski, President and CEO  
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Goal

This panel will examine how changes in the provider market continue to impact spending as well as quality of and access to care. The panel will include discussion of trends in the appropriate use of lower-cost sites of care, the impacts of continued market consolidation, and the role and future of community-based providers.
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Concluding Discussion
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