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Who is the Consortium?

• Formed by rural providers in 2012 to avoid being left behind
• Followed IPA model – aggregating independent providers employed by independent hospitals
• Began operating first ACO in 2014
• Operated 6 ACO’s in 2015 – formed 501c3
• Awarded $31 million TCPI grant in 2015 to assist 525 rural health systems to get ready for value-based payments
• Organized 170 rural health systems into 24 ACO’s for 2016 performance year under AIM – 223,000 Medicare Beneficiaries
• Our goal is to enroll 25% of rural providers in APM’s by 2018
Our Triple Aim

- Provide Better Care
- Improve Financial Performance
- Lower Per Capita Cost
Rural Strategic Plan for Transformation

- Optimize Cost and Quality (TCPI)
- Form Clinically Integrated Networks with Other Independents
- Form ACO’s – MSSP, Commercial and Medicaid
- Form Rural Provider-Based Medicare Advantage Plans
- Enter Commercial and Private Exchanges
A Snapshot of Rural Health Providers

- Approximately 60 million people live in rural America
  - Peer reviewed data says they are sicker than urban
  - HCC data does not agree (MedPAC, June 2012, NRACO data)
- ~ 2000 rural health hospitals anchor the majority of rural physicians
  - Few and rapidly disappearing independent clinicians
- Most rural hospitals are now “health systems” with inpatient, outpatient, swing bed and primary care services
  - More than half also have home health, hospice or SNF
  - Mission statement is universally to serve their community
  - 75% of business is outpatients

- Most rural providers are exempt from reporting Medicare quality data, including 4,800 CAHs and 5,000 RHCs and rural FQHCs
Special Payment Systems Preserve Access

- ~4000 Rural Health Clinics – Cost-based, all inclusive rate billed under Part A
  - Physician owned capped at $80/visit vs 2013 FFS average $107
  - Hospital-based clinics bill cost ($100-$300/visit)
- ~1000 Rural FQHCs ~ $165/visit
- RHCs and FQHCs not eligible providers for PQRS or Medicare Meaningful Use payments
- Critical Access Hospital Clinics – Fee Schedule +15%
- CAHs paid 101% of reasonable costs x Medicare share less sequestration
- Generally FP, NP, PA, OB, GS, IM with a few cardiologists
Evolution of Quality Measures

Measures Individual Performance

Facility Measures
- Meaningful Use
- PCMH

Facility and Patient Measures
- PQRS
- Readmission Rates
- ACO Measures
- Voluntary Bundles
- Patient Satisfaction
- MACRA - MIPS
- MA Star Ratings

Patient Measures
- Value-Based Modifier
- CCJR Bundles
- More TBD

Measures SYSTEM of Care
## Estimated Penalties for Low Cost/Quality Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PQRS</th>
<th>MA</th>
<th>MIPS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Loss</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>5-15%</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PER PT</td>
<td>$128</td>
<td>$500-$1500</td>
<td>$576</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PER 1000</td>
<td>$128,000</td>
<td>$500K - $1.5M</td>
<td>$576,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- MA assumes $10,000 per beneficiary premium, 5 Star bonus
- PQRS assumes $10,000 per beneficiary cost, 16% MD services, 8% swing
- MIPS assumes $10,000 per beneficiary cost, 16% MD services, 36% swing
That Puts the Target on Our Back

- Objective data suggests we are not high value providers.
- We have to find a way to participate in ambulatory quality programs, even though we don’t have to yet, and to advocate for different payment standardizations.

The greatest threat to the sustainability of rural healthcare systems are market forces that will force doctors and patients to choose high value providers and partners – and rural providers will be left behind if they don’t work on these measures.
How Does Rural Score in Value Assessment?

• Cost
  • In 2013 rural patients were 3.7% less than urban for total spend (Medicare Statistical Supplement) – which is not transparent to urban providers or patients
  • Unit costs for CAH inpatient and swing beds, outpatient procedures and provider-based RHC visits are typically higher than urban (1-3x)

• Quality
  • Rural hospitals have high HCAHPS scores but limited experience with CG-CAHPS.
  • AHRQ study indicates lower ambulatory quality scores in rural – not a volume or talent issue, a process issue
Disparities in quality of care measures for noncore areas by 4 NQS priorities and Access

**Key:** n = number of measures.

**Better** = Population received better quality of care than reference group

**Same** = Population and reference group received about the same quality of care

**Worse** = Population received worse quality of care than reference group
Potentially avoidable hospitalizations for all conditions per 100,000 population, by residence location, 2005-2012

All emergency department visits per 100,000 population, adults age 18 and over, by residence location, 2008-2011

Challenges

- Stand alone health systems – two thirds are local governmental facilities with no affiliations
- Little to no growth potential – declining populations
- Need to remain financially viable to support community health
- Very limited managed care and IT expertise
- Independent provider mentality – live free or die.
- “Sick” care not “health” care orientation
- Very difficult to recruit and retain physicians
- 70% Medicare and Medicaid with negative margins
- Although hospital is only 25% of revenue, it gets 90% of attention
- CEO turnover is typically < 3 years
- Community board is dedicated but not educated and experienced in healthcare
- Many rural states did not expand Medicaid – and their hospitals are closing
Strengths

• Integrated delivery networks can provide 70% of needed services
• Passionate about serving their community
• Deep relationships with their population
• Nimble – able to change quickly when they know what to do
• Fixed population served “cradle to grave”
• Excess capacity can be leveraged to work on population health
• Increased local volume reduces per capita costs dramatically when cost-based reimbursed
• Local brand is typically very strong – most beloved institution in town and major economic driver.
Rural Solutions

• Coordinate care for chronically ill to reduce costs and build market share
• Provide 24 Hour Advice Nurse Hotline to reduce ED primary care
• Redesign workflow at clinic to address care gaps
• Require Annual Wellness Visits to promote prevention
• Revisit billing practices and Physician compensation
• Join forces with other independent providers to qualify for programs and spread costs (CINs)
• Join forces with strong tertiary systems to provide best value for patients
• Enroll in ACOs to get data and advance down payment continuum
Governance

• Rural faces same issues as faced by independent small practices
  • Must join with unaffiliated providers to achieve minimum number of lives

• Our model
  • Equal voice for each member regardless of number of lives
  • Payments split based on individual performance
  • Each member is a mini-ACO

• Mutual Accountability
  • Need to identify non-performers early and ACT!
  • We use AWVs, CCM billing, attendance as early proxy
Unaffiliated Governance Model - ACOs
Unaffiliated Governance Model - CINs
### Participation at Meetings & Events

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monthly Workgroup</th>
<th>Steering Committee</th>
<th>Monthly Cohort Calls</th>
<th>Quarterly Regional Workshop</th>
<th>Biannual Division Meeting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NRACO Staff</td>
<td>FC, CCP Coach</td>
<td>CCP Coach</td>
<td>CCP Coach, ACO Ex Dir, SMEs</td>
<td>CMO, ACO Ex Dir, SMEs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACO Champion</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Care Coordinator</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CEO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physician Lead</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others as relevant</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Accountability – 1st Year

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member Responsibilities/Success Metric</th>
<th>DUE DATE</th>
<th>Time Estimate</th>
<th>Who</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Financial Consultant Questionnaire</td>
<td>Oct 12th</td>
<td>&lt;15 Minutes</td>
<td>CEO/CFO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT Systems Questionnaire</td>
<td>Nov 1st</td>
<td>&lt;15 Minutes</td>
<td>IT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial Consultant Selected</td>
<td>Nov 15th</td>
<td>2-3 hr</td>
<td>CEO/CFO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nurse Advice Hotline Survey</td>
<td>Dec 1st</td>
<td>&lt;15 Minutes</td>
<td>ACO Champion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attend Pre-Launch Webinars</td>
<td>Dec 10th</td>
<td>14 x 1 hr</td>
<td>Various</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSSP Application Responsiveness</td>
<td>Jan 1st</td>
<td>0-1 hr</td>
<td>CEO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patient Satisfaction Questionnaire</td>
<td>Jan 1st</td>
<td>&lt;15 Minutes</td>
<td>ACO Champion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demographics file submitted</td>
<td>Jan 1st</td>
<td>1-10 hr</td>
<td>IT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attend Feb ACO Board Meeting by phone</td>
<td>Feb 29th</td>
<td>2 hr</td>
<td>CEO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attend Feb National Meeting (extra credit)</td>
<td>Feb 29th</td>
<td>2-4 days</td>
<td>CEO &amp; Physician Leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Care Coordinator hired</td>
<td>April 1st</td>
<td>10-12 hr</td>
<td>HR &amp; Supervisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Host Launch Meeting</td>
<td>April 1st</td>
<td>1 day</td>
<td>ACO Champion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attend first Regional Workshop</td>
<td>April 30th</td>
<td>1 day</td>
<td>CC, ACO Champion, Practice Manager(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attend May Division Meeting</td>
<td>May 31st</td>
<td>1 day</td>
<td>CEO &amp; Physician Leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bill for AWV, CCM, TCM</td>
<td>June 1st</td>
<td>0-5 days</td>
<td>Practice Manager(s) &amp; CC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Lingering Issues with Virtual ACO’s

• First 3 years everyone is learning and shared savings are unlikely.
• If low performers are ejected, what happens to them and their patients?
• Presumably can use first cycle performance to aggregate similar players for cycle 2 – but goes against a regional approach.
• Using claims data to distribute shared savings is only a proxy – impossible thus far to replicate CMS calculations.
• What percentage of shared savings should be distributed based on quality vs. cost savings?
• How are highest quality performers recognized?
• How predictive is past performance on future performance?
• Given these complexities few (if any) are preparing to take risk.
Lessons Learned From ACO Data
2015 NRACO Communities

- Six ACOs with 29 Rural Health Systems enrolled ranging from $5 million to $700 million in annual revenue
- 62,360 Medicare Beneficiaries in 9 states (Indiana, Iowa, Illinois, California, Washington, Oregon, Texas, Missouri, Michigan)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NRACO (2014 starters)</th>
<th>NWRACO</th>
<th>SHOACO</th>
<th>ARACO</th>
<th>Reid ACO</th>
<th>NRACO II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Margaret Mary</td>
<td>Mason General</td>
<td>Hancock</td>
<td>Matagorda</td>
<td>Reid</td>
<td>Virginia Gay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logansport</td>
<td>Summit Pacific</td>
<td>Henry</td>
<td>Chambers</td>
<td>Iowa Specialty</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alcona</td>
<td>Peace Harbor</td>
<td>Johnson</td>
<td>El Campo</td>
<td>Fayette</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McKenzie</td>
<td>Hendricks</td>
<td>Brazosport</td>
<td>Morris</td>
<td>Ridgecrest</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John C Freemont</td>
<td>Witham</td>
<td>TTMG</td>
<td>Connally</td>
<td>S Inyo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mammoth</td>
<td>Coryell</td>
<td>Missouri Delta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2015 NRACO Communities

- Additional Community Characteristics:
  - 45% (13) Critical Access Hospitals
  - 45% (13) have Rural Health Clinics
  - 10% (3) have Federally Qualifies Health Centers
  - Fun fact - 12 different EHRs & 1 on paper
## Current NRACO Service Delivery Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quarterly</th>
<th>Monthly</th>
<th>Ongoing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACO Board Meetings; CMS Expenditure &amp; Utilization Reports</td>
<td>Community-level Steering Committee meetings</td>
<td>1:1 Care Coordination coaching</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence Based Medicine (EBM) initiative training for clinicians</td>
<td>Data: Community-level Claims Data Reports on Part A, B &amp; D; Patient Satisfaction Survey Results</td>
<td>Lightbeam training via NRACO user group webinars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workflow redesign and implementation training on EBM topic for ambulatory practice staff</td>
<td>Peer Community: Care Coordination Cohort calls per ACO</td>
<td>Preparing for Quality Measure Reporting – IT interface &amp; QM education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Care Coordination Newsletter</td>
<td>Ad-hoc webinars and support</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Progress - Care Coordination

• Every community successfully hired an R.N. Care Coordinator

• Many have built good referral processes with their primary care partners through Transition of Care program implementation

• Chronic Care Management caseloads are growing
  • As of June 2015, NRACO communities are providing Chronic Care Management and/or Transitional Care Management to over 4,000 high-risk, chronically ill patients
  • In aggregate, 6.5% of total attributed Medicare beneficiaries receiving integrated and coordinated care
  • Remember - Top 5% of Medicare patients account for 50% of Medicare spend!
Progress – EBM Initiatives

Educated and trained clinicians and practice staff in four areas:
1. Chronic Care Management
2. Transitional Care Management
3. Prevention and Wellness/Annual Wellness Visits (AWVs)
4. Post Acute Care

• Highlights:
  • AWV: As of Sept. 2015, **72% (21) of communities regularly performing Medicare Wellness Visits**; 8 others actively working on finalizing workflow and documentation capture.
  • PAC: Many holding scheduled meetings with Community PAC facility partners and performing “warm hand-off’s” at discharge to PAC facilities
## Progress – Lightbeam Interface

Clinical data file transfer from community EHR to Lightbeam for 2015 Quality Measure Reporting and Population Health Analytics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interface Status</th>
<th>Communities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Complete</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In QA</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ready for Backload</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In Process (writing queries, submitting test files)</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not Started</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will not Interface</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Expecting 25 to be complete prior to quality reporting
Progress - Overall Cost

Total Expenditures per Assigned Beneficiary vs Financial Benchmark
Q2 2015

- ACO 1: $8,369 - $35
- ACO 2: $9,875 - $17
- ACO 3: $9,449 +$126
- ACO 4: $11,505 +$236
- ACO 5: $11,269 +$503
- ACO 6: $11,936 +$911
- ACO 7: $11,433
- ACO 8: $10,962
- ACO 9: $10,051
Expenditure and Utilization Opportunities

1. **Long Term Hospital Expenditures** – Half (3/6) of ACOs are above MSSP average.

2. **Skilled Nursing Facility Expenditures and Utilization** – 40-50% higher

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SNF</th>
<th>Rural</th>
<th>MSSP</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Discharges/1000</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Days/1000</td>
<td>2250</td>
<td>1596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$/Bene/yr</td>
<td>$1177</td>
<td>$730</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. **Bacterial Pneumonia Rate** – All 6 ACOs have higher rates than the MSSP average: 20-50%.

4. **Emergency Department Visits** – All 6 rural ACOs had higher ED visit rates this quarter compared to the MSSP: 9-20%.

5. **Primary Care Services** – 5/6 ACOs provide fewer visits with PCP than the MSSP average this quarter. RHC average is 3 vs 4.8 FFS.
Summary

• Year of ACO implementation is for adjustment and learning
• Moving rural to a population health orientation. Using data to identify high risk/high cost patients and quality gaps
• Making a difference for patients.

• For more information: 
  Lbarr@nationalruralaco.com
• Join CMMI Practice Transformation Network
  www.nationalruralaco.com - “Apply Now”