

Southwestern Conference on Medicine April 25, 2015

Health Care Reform 2015: Where are we now?

presented by Paul J. Giancola pgiancola@swlaw.com

Did You Know?.....

- We spend \$2.8 Trillion per year (2012) (\$9,000 per person)
- We waste over a Billion a year annually through:
 - Unnecessary services (\$210 billion)
 - Inefficient delivery of care (\$130 billion)
 - Excess administrative costs (\$190 billion)
 - Inflated prices (\$105 billion)
 - Prevention failures (\$55 billion) and
 - Fraud (\$75 billion)
- For 31 of past 40 years, health care costs have increased at a greater rate than economy as a whole
- Health care is 18% of US GNP

Did You Know....?

- 1% of patients account for 21% of those costs in 2010?
 - That equals \$88,000 per person
- 5% of patients account for 50% of U.S. health care costs?
 - That equals \$41,000 per person

AHRQ, Medical Expenditure Panel Survey

Health Care System Problems

- Quality of Care
- Cost
- Growth
 - Aging population
 - Life expectancy
 - Cost of technology
 - Level of care
 - Mental/behavioral health

Recommendations to fix the system

- Better use of clinical & financial data;
- Reimbursement that rewards quality and value;
- EHRs and mobile technologies; and
- Transparency about costs and outcomes of care.
- More enforcement against fraud

IOM Report: "Best Care at Lower Cost" (Sept. 7, 2012)

Health Care Reform (2010)

- Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act and Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act (ACA) or "Obamacare"
- Attempts to:
 - Provide access to affordable insurance coverage (Titles I II)
 - Medicaid Expansion
 - Individual Mandate
 - Exchanges
 - Subsidies
 - Improve quality and efficiency of care (Titles III VIII)
 - Curb cost growth
 - 2002 9.7%
 - 2009-2012 3.7%

Supreme Court Review (2012)

The Supreme Court decided two key issues:

- Whether the individual mandate is constitutional.
- Whether Congress may revoke all Medicaid funding if a state does not agree to Medicaid expansion.

Individual Mandate

- The individual mandate requires most Americans to maintain a "minimum essential" level of health care beginning in 2014 or face a penalty or "tax."
- The Supreme Court found that the individual mandate is not a valid exercise of Congress' power under the commerce clause.
- But the individual mandate is constitutional under Congress' taxing power.
- Subsidies between 139% 200% FPL

Medicaid Expansion

- The Supreme Court held that Medicaid expansion is constitutional, but the federal government cannot withhold or revoke existing Medicaid funding if the state elects not to participate in the expansion.
- All adults with incomes at or below 138% of the federal poverty level will be eligible for insurance coverage under Medicaid.
- FPL \$32,913 for family of 4

- Goal
 - Reduction in number of uninsured
 - Covers the gap between those who qualify for Medicaid and those who qualify for subsidies through the Marketplace (139% - 200% FPL)
 - Estimates that with full expansion about ½ of the uninsured would be covered (17 Million)
 - Many states have concluded that expanding
 Medicaid saves and/or raises money for the state

- CBO: state "optional" expansion drops new insureds from 17 million to 11 million (assuming 70% in states that expand by 2020).
 - Feds will pick up 100% of Medicaid expansion for 2014 –
 2016 and no less than 90% on a permanent basis
 - Urban Institute, Lewis Group estimated state savings between \$26 - \$101 billion

- Arizona and 28 other states and D.C. have expanded Medicaid (3/16/15)
- Governor Brewer noted the following:
 - No cost to Arizona Hospital provider reimbursable self-assessment fee (\$256M a year)
 - Will inject \$8 Billion into the economy over the first 4 years (\$2M a year)
 - Protects rural and safety net hospitals for uninsured (uncompensated) care

- Impact
 - 60,000 new applications
 - 240,000 childless adults gain coverage in existing program
 - Uncompensated care costs decrease
 - About 17% of Arizonans are currently without insurance
 - Total AHCCCS population 1.6M (03/01/15)
- Opponents
 - Failed to get on the ballot
 - Goldwater Institute lawsuit
 - Self-Assessment imposed a "tax" without a 2/3 majority vote in violation of the Arizona Constitution ("taxation with representation")

Biggs v. Cooper (12/31/14)

- AZSCT Holding
 - House legislators who voted against expansion have <u>standing</u> to challenge whether law was passed in a constitutional manner

Biggs v. Cooper (12/31/14) (Cont'd.)

- The Issue
 - Bill includes an assessment on hospitals to fund expansion
 - AZ constitution requires certain laws that increase revenues must pass by supermajority (2/3)
 - Legislature decided by majority vote, it did not
 - Law passed by majority vote

Biggs v. Cooper (12/31/14) (Cont'd.)

- Court held the supermajority depends on constitution – not legislative discretion
- Exception to supermajority requirement
 - "Fees and assessments that are authorized by statute, but not prescribed by formula, amount or limit, and are set by state officer or agency" (Art 9, § 22(c)(2))
 - A.R.S. 36-2901.08, Hospital Assessment Statute
 - AHCCCS determined methodology by rule

Biggs v. Cooper (12/31/14) (Cont'd.)

- Other options to defeat expansion
 - Repeal law
 - Referendum

Fifth Anniversary of ACA

• John McCain

"Repeal and Replace"

"Five years after its enactment, Obamacare has been full of empty promises that have only made our nation's health care problems worse"

- 16.5M gained coverage
- Uninsured dropped from 20.3% to 13.2% (35% drop)

Health Care Reform (Cont'd.)

- Insurance Exchanges
 - State 17
 - Federal 34
 - 8.2 million enrolled (premium credits avg. \$268/mo)
 - 204,000 Arizona residents (\$158/mo)

Another Constitutional Challenge

King v. Burwell

Appeal from 759 F3d 358 (4th Cir 2014)

If a state chooses not to run a health insurance exchange, can it still be provided with tax subsidies?

The 8 Words

• ACA authorizes federal tax-credit subsidies for insurance purchased through an

"exchange established by the state under Section 1311"

- IRS rule extends tax-credit subsidies to participants in states served by the federal exchange
- Circuit court split

Burwell

- Statutory construction case
 - What do the words mean?
 - What did Congress intend?
- Section 1321 if a state does not establish its own exchange, HHS "secretary shall establish and operate such Exchange within the state…"

Plaintiffs

 Unconstitutionally coerces states to establish exchanges by imposing onerous consequences on states that decline

i.e. Congress limited subsidies to state-run exchanges to incentivize states to form their own exchanges

U.S.

- Out-of-context "misreading of a single phrase" in 1000 page law "would thwart" care reforms in the 34 states that exercised their right to allow HHS to establish exchanges for them
- Legislative intent credits available in every state

The Score So Far

• Uphold 4

– Ginsburg, Breyer, Sotomayor, Kagan

- Strike down 3
 - Scalia, Thomas, Alito
- On the fence 2
 - Roberts, Kennedy

Oral Argument

- Numerous questions about adverse consequences on states and people
- Kennedy "insurance market death spiral"
- Scalia "Congress would step in for the problems" [laughter]
- Alito States could establish own exchanges, with delayed effect of decision
- Scalia Congressional intent does not matter only what they wrote

Hail Mary Options

- States could act to set up own exchanges
 Use healthcare.gov as host
- Congress could fix [laughter]
- ACA basic health plan for people with incomes of 139% to 200% of FPL
- Case outcome limited to 4 Plaintiffs