Subject: FW: Public Hearing Invitation - Commission on Fiscal Stability and Economic Growth

Date: Sunday, January 21, 2018 at 11:21:27 AM Eastern Standard Time

From: Benjamin Krynick

To: Benjamin Krynick

Attachments: image001.jpg, image002.png, image003.png, image004.png

From: "McEvoy, Kate" <<u>Kate.McEvoy@ct.gov</u>>

Date: January 19, 2018 at 2:46:46 PM EST To: "'repatricelli@gmail.com'" <repatricelli@gmail.com>, "'paul@cthealth.org'" paul@cthealth.org>Cc: "Bremby, Roderick L." <<u>Roderick.Bremby@ct.gov</u>>, "Gilbert, Michael J." <<u>mike.gilbert@ct.gov</u>> Subject: sincere thanks and immediately available information [not-secure]

Dear Bob and Paul:

Thank you very much for the opportunity to join the discussion today, and to contribute to your important process.

I understand that the Department will have the chance to present more detailed information to the Commission, but as we agreed would be helpful am forwarding some of the material that you requested on a more immediate time basis.

Wishing you all the best,

Kate

Kate McEvoy, Esq. Director Division of Health Services State of Connecticut Department of Social Services 55 Farmington Avenue Hartford, CT 06106 (860) 424-5383

Effect of Hospital Avoidable Health Care Use and Costs on State Health Ranking

The most recent annual Commonwealth State Health System Ranking shows that overall Connecticut ranks 8th among states, with favorable rankings for access, prevention and treatment and the best ranking in the country for health lives. What stands out very starkly,

however, is that we rank 39th for avoidable hospital use and costs.

Commonwealth Fund	Health System Data Cent Explore Regional Performa							
Enter a new location: Q. Sea	rch by zip coo	it, state or	honpital referri	n region i	HAR).	or netsing	to map	
Connecticut State Health System Ranking		8	2017 OVERALL (out of)		[4 Rankie	oad Connecti o Report PDF File)	<u>cwt</u>
	tank Quintile	Estimated Impact of Improvement:						
	51 51			to the level of the best-performing STATE)				
	5 1 39 4	87,986 more adults would be insured.		fewer adults would go without needed health care because of cost.		22	22,035 fewer emergency department visits	
Costs						o fewer		
	1 1 8 1					would	would occur among people with Medicare.	
							EESTIMATES	
						WER ROM	E COLIMATED	
					ADD TO MY LIBRARY EMAIL SH			
Nimension and Indicator	State Rate	U.S.	Best State Rate	Rank	State Rate	U.S. Average	Actual Change in State Rate	Comp to ot Stat
Access	201750	orecard Perf	ormanice	5	Baseline Per	formance	Change in Rate	
dults ages 19–64 uninsured 0	8%	13%	4%		13%	20%	-5	-
					1.0.79	2079		COM
hildren ages 0–18 uninsured 🛛	4%	5%	1%	0	4%	8%	0	
dults who went without care because of	4% 11%		HULL IN	000				COM
dults who went without care because of ist in past year • dividuals under age 65 with high out-of- ocket medical costs relative to their		5%	1%	-	4%	8%	0	Cow
dults who went without care because of ost in past year • dividuals under age 65 with high out-of- ocket medical costs relative to their inual household income • trisk adults without a routine doctor visit	11%	5% 13%	1% 7%	-	4% 12%	8%	0	Cow
dults who went without care because of ist in past year • dividuals under age 65 with high out-of- ocket medical costs relative to their inual household income • trisk adults without a routine doctor visit past two years •	11%	5% 13% 14%	1% 7% 10%	-	4% 12% N/A	8% 16% N/A	0 -1 N/A	
hildren ages 0–18 uninsured O dults who went without care because of ost in past year O dividuals under age 65 with high out-of- ocket medical costs relative to their nnual household income O t-risk adults without a routine doctor visit past two years O dults without a dental visit in past year O	11% 11% 10% 12%	5% 13% 14% 13%	1% 7% 10% 6% 11%		4% 12% N/A 10%	8% 16% N/A 14%	0 -1 N/A 0	

Here is a link to the entire Connecticut report:

http://datacenter.commonwealthfund.org/scorecard/state/8/connecticut/?

CMS Star Ratings for CT Hospitals

https://www.medicare.gov/hospitalcompare/results.html#dist=25&state=CT&lat=0&Ing=0

Eligibility Limit Ranges

Sourced from Kaiser State Health Facts (<u>https://www.kff.org/statedata/</u>):

Medicaid income eligibility limits for adults as a percentage of FPL as of January 1, 2017:

- Parents (in a family of three): 138% FPL; U.S. median value 138% FPL; range from 18% (Alabama) to 221% (DC)
- Other adults (for an individual): 138% FPL; U.S. median value 138% FPL; range from 0% (non-expansion states) to 215% (DC)

Medicaid income eligibility limits for children as of January 1, 2017:

- Infants age 0-1: Connecticut 201% of FPL; U.S. median value 195%; range from 144% (Utah) to 380% (Iowa)
- Children age 1-5: Connecticut 201% of FPL; U.S. median value 149%; range from 138% of FPL (Oregon) to 324% of FPL (DC)
 * Children age 6-18: Connecticut 201% of FPL; U.S. median value 138%; range from 133% FPL (many) to 324% DC

Medicaid income eligibility for pregnant women as of January 1, 2017:

 263% of FPL; U.S. median value 200%; range from 138% (Idaho, South Dakota) to 380% (Iowa)

Medicaid eligibility through the Aged, Blind and Disabled Pathway as of January 1, 2017:

- Annual income limit: Connecticut \$6,276; U.S. median value \$8,820; range from \$6,276 (Connecticut) to \$13,860 (Hawaii)
- % of FPL for an individual: Connecticut 52%; U.S. median value 73%; range from 52% (Connecticut) to 100% (many including, for example, DC, Illinois, Maine)
- Asset limit: Connecticut \$1,600; U.S. median value \$2,000; range from \$1,600 to \$7,280 (South Caroline) and no limit (Arizona)

Information on Members and Spend on Long-Term Services and Supports (LTSS)

We are using diverse strategies (e.g. support for individuals in transitioning to the community from nursing homes, bond funding for diversification of nursing home services, workforce development activities, consumer education) under a Governor-led "rebalancing plan" to enable older adults and people with disabilities (categorically high need, high cost individuals) to meaningfully access Medicaid-funded long-term services and supports (LTSS) in the community, as opposed to in institutional settings.





A comparison of average community and institutional costs for individuals at nursing home level of care (2012)



of Social Services Making a Difference

Benchmarks Percentage of LTSS Expenditures and People Community vs. Institution

