Introduction

The movement towards population-based payment arrangements with provider organizations is occurring rapidly in some states, and is becoming more prevalent in Medicaid programs overall.\(^1\) Contracts can be held directly between states and provider entities, or between Medicaid managed care plans and provider organizations. From Minnesota to Oregon, Colorado to Iowa, New York and beyond, these relationships vary tremendously. In some states provider organizations are eligible to share in savings they generate through health plan contracts, while in other states they assume full risk and for all intents and purposes operate as a health plan. What they have in common is acceptance of clinical responsibility and some measure of financial responsibility for the health and health care of a defined Medicaid beneficiary population and a defined set of services. For the purposes of this brief, we will apply the term “Accountable Care Organization (ACO)” to this diverse array of provider entities and define a “safety-net provider ACO”\(^2\) as a safety-net provider-based organization that:

1. assumes clinical responsibility for an attributed Medicaid patient population, and
2. assumes financial responsibility for that population through a shared savings or risk contract.

Experience shows that formation and operation of an ACO can be quite expensive, with budgetary requirements running into the millions of dollars.\(^3\) For this reason, many of the early Medicaid ACOs have been organized by large, well-capitalized hospital and health systems. Safety-net providers, however, are increasingly forming ACOs to contract with Medicaid and with other payers. The organization of safety-net ACOs is sometimes driven by a state initiative, and sometimes occurs without state influence.

If states believe that population-based contracting with accountable provider entities is a potentially beneficial purchasing strategy, they will be challenged to extend this approach to safety-net providers. These providers typically lack the capital, experience and/or scale to operate as an ACO. However, given their significant role in state Medicaid programs, a state will not be able to fully implement a population-based payment strategy with ACOs if the state or its contracted health plans don’t involve safety-net providers. This brief will explore the unique challenges states face in trying to achieve successful safety-net provider participation in Medicaid ACOs.
In some instances, safety-net provider-led ACOs have reported problems with state or health plan provision of claim data, particularly related to lack of timely access to such data.

4. The hospital conundrum: For ACOs that are led by hospitals, including safety-net hospitals, there is a conundrum. The financial imperative of the hospital is to keep beds as full as possible since most of hospital payments are still based on volume and absent significant risk-sharing arrangements, while the business interest of the ACO is to reduce hospital admissions and ED usage in order to contain costs.7

State Strategies to Support Safety-Net Provider Development of ACOs

There are several strategies that states can take to support safety-net providers that want to pursue ACO status and contract on a population basis with the state or Medicaid managed care plans.

1. Provide start-up investment. While Medicaid statute and regulations don’t permit states to use Medicaid funds to make investments in provider ACO capacity development, states may have other options.
   - New York is investing in Delivery System Reform Incentive Payment (DSRIP)† funds to development ACO capacity among safety-net providers statewide.
   - Vermont has used State Innovation Model (SIM) grant funds to cover the cost of ACO medical chart abstraction for clinical quality measures and to support ACO health information capacity development.

2. Provide technical assistance. States can provide consultative support to safety-net provider ACOs.
   - The Oregon Health Authority maintains a “technical assistance bank.”9 Each contracted Coordinated Care Organization is eligible to receive up to 35 hours of consultation services per year from a state-selected contractor.

3. Create flexible contracting parameters so that small safety-net providers can come together to form an ACO. Many safety-net providers – especially primary care providers – lack the reserves or the attributed population necessary to operate as an ACO. States can help these providers by allowing them to collaborate with one another to form an ACO and addressing possible anti-trust concerns.
• Minnesota designed its Integrated Health Partnership program so that “virtual” ACOs consisting of networks of independent providers could participate without the requirement to assume downside financial risk.\textsuperscript{10}

4. Create a health information utility to provide timely, accurate and complete analytic information to the ACO.

• Colorado has contracted with a third party analytics contractor to provide information to its contracted Regional Care Coordination Organizations.\textsuperscript{11}

• North Carolina’s Community Care program has provided regional physician networks with access to the Medicaid claims database, and analytic tools to help mine the database.\textsuperscript{12}

5. Create consistent business rules across Medicaid ACO and other agreements. Many providers, regardless of safety-net status, speak of the resource implications of payers using different performance measure sets and financial risk parameters. Some also complain about multiple non-aligned state programs (e.g., health home, ACO, managed care) affecting the same beneficiaries.

• Minnesota specified for its Medicaid managed care plans the performance measures and financial risk parameters that would govern its Integrated Health Partnership contracts.

Conclusion

States pursuing new population-based payment models with providers should consider the impact on their Medicaid programs if safety-net providers cannot successfully participate in the new models as ACO sponsors or ACO participants.

Safety-net providers face a challenging task in evolving into their own ACOs. Absent state action, they may choose to affiliate with larger (sometimes non-safety-net) delivery systems for contracting purposes, avoid ACO participation (if given the option) or fail as ACOs. An individual state may consider one or more of these scenarios to be acceptable, but they all certainly carry some potentially negative implications in terms of the viability the safety net provides in the long term.

This brief highlights the approaches some states have made to support providers to succeed in a new Medicaid ACO environment. Working either directly with ACOs, or through contracted Managed Care Organizations (MCOs), states have a variety of steps they can take to increase the likelihood that safety-net providers will successfully transition to a new world through provision of infrastructure support and technical assistance.
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