

Paying for sequential stays and aligning regulatory requirements in a unified payment system for post-acute care

Dana Kelley and Carol Carter

October 5, 2017

Two years' analyses culminated in recommendation in 2017

- Analyses based on 8.9 million PAC stays in 2013

Commission recommendation

- *Implement a PAC PPS beginning 2021 with a 3-year transition*
- *Lower the aggregate level of payments by 5%, absent prior reductions*
- *Concurrently begin to align regulatory requirements*
- *Periodically revise and rebase payments, as needed, to keep payments aligned with cost*

This year's PAC PPS work

- Paying for sequential PAC stays
- Aligning setting-specific regulatory requirements
- June 2018 chapter

Establishing accurate payments for sequential PAC stays

- Many beneficiaries transition from one PAC stay to another as their care needs change
 - Most often from higher to lower intensity settings
 - Infrequently, from lower to higher intensity settings
- Over the course of sequential stays, average cost of a stay is likely to decline as a patient's care needs decline
- Under a PAC PPS, payments will be based on patient characteristics, not setting

Sequence of PAC stays may affect the cost of care




- How to pay for sequential stays so that referrals to 2nd PAC use are neither encouraged nor discouraged?

Why do we care about the costs of sequential PAC stays?

- If payments are not accurate:
 - Providers may base their care on financial reasons rather than focus on what is best for the beneficiary
 - Unnecessary PAC
 - Exposes beneficiaries to risks associated with care transitions
 - Raises program spending

Defining sequential PAC stays when the beneficiary is treated in place



- How to accurately pay for care when providers opt to treat in place?
- How to encourage providers to treat in place when appropriate?
- How to discourage unnecessary 2nd PAC use?

Planned analyses

- Examine the cost of stays based on their timing
 - Initial stays versus later stays
 - Among initial stays, those with and without a later stay
 - Consider policies to adjust payments
- Evaluate alternative ways to delineate “stays” when a beneficiary is treated in place

Aligning setting-specific regulatory requirements for PAC providers

- Near-term: Consider waiving certain setting-specific requirements
- Longer-term: Develop a common core set of requirements; additional requirements if providing special care
- To determine which policies to waive and what to replace them with, policymakers should first consider the intent and effect of current requirements

Why is regulatory reform necessary?

- PAC settings face different regulatory requirements with different associated costs
- Under a PAC PPS, providers that treat similar patients will receive similar payments and should face similar regulatory requirements
- Reform will:
 - Give high-cost settings flexibility to reduce costs
 - Give all providers flexibility to treat a broad mix of cases

Current regulatory environment

Regulations that distinguish levels of care	Regulations that limit coverage	Regulations that ensure appropriate care
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • LTCH: ALOS \geq 25 days • IRF: 60% rule 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • IRF: only if beneficiary needs 2+ types of therapy and can tolerate & benefit from ~3 hours/day • SNF: only after ACH stay of 3+ days • LTCH: only after ICU stay of 3+ days or if on ventilator • HH: only if beneficiary is homebound 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Services and staffing • Patient assessment and care planning • Quality and safety • Patients' rights • Administration

Current regulations ensuring appropriate care differ across settings

- Service and staffing requirements for LTCHs and IRFs generally more stringent and costly to meet
 - Certified as hospitals
 - Physicians integral to the provision of services
 - Require richer mix of nursing staff
- Facility-based vs. HHA requirements
- PAC vs. long-term care requirements
- Patient assessment requirements vary widely

Aligning regulations under a PAC PPS: Near term

- Eliminate regulations that distinguish levels of care
 - LTCH ALOS \geq 25 days
 - IRF 60% rule
- Consider need for regulations that limit coverage
 - IRF intensive therapy requirement
 - SNF 3-day ACH stay requirement
 - LTCH 3-day ICU stay/ventilator requirement
 - HH homebound requirement

Aligning regulations under a PAC PPS: Longer term

- Align regulations that ensure appropriate PAC
 - Staffing and services
- Develop special requirements for certain conditions
 - Prolonged ventilator dependence
 - Intensive therapy
 - Severe wounds
 - Brain and spinal cord injury

State regulatory requirements

- States may have:
 - Different setting definitions
 - More stringent requirements, especially staffing
 - Specific requirements for facilities providing certain types of services
 - Certificate of need laws

Summary: Continued work on unified PAC PPS

- Paying for sequential PAC stays
 - Examine the cost of stays based on their timing
 - Evaluate alternative ways to delineate “stays” when a beneficiary is treated in place
 - Consider policies to adjust payments
- Aligning setting-specific regulatory requirements

Discussion

- Comments on planned analyses
- Guidance on categories of regulations that might be considered for elimination or alignment
- Other issues