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Presentation Overview

1. Description of the Project
2. Defining the Types of Cost Analysis
3. Steps to Conducting a Cost Analysis
4. Reports from the Field: Downtown Emergency Service Center and Alameda County Behavioral Health Care Services
5. Next Steps/Questions/Discussion

Overview of the Project

• The cost analysis small group TA was requested by grantees working on sustainability plans

• DESC, Alameda County, Tarzana, Heritage, CHCS participated from July-September, 2013

• Lessons Learned
  1. Craft your analysis to fit organizational needs
  2. Some analysis is better than no analysis
  3. Don't bite off more than you can chew
Defining Our Terms/Types of Cost Analysis

A **cost estimation/assessment** tells you that the average hospitalization cost of one BH consumer at your integrated clinic is $500/year.

A **cost-effectiveness analysis** tells you that the $500/year hospitalization cost at your integrated clinic is less than a control clinic that has lower prevention costs but higher back-end hospitalization costs and poorer consumer physical and behavioral health outcomes.

A **cost-benefit analysis** projects the total costs to the clinic (or a payer) associated with two alternate approaches to providing integrated care.

Cost Analysis Steps:

1. Choose the Cost Analysis Team
2. Identify the Audience
3. Define the Scope
4. Structure the Cost Estimate
5. Develop a Cost Analysis Design
6. Gather Data and Conduct the Data Analysis
7. Effectively Present Findings
Sustainability Strategies

Alameda County Behavioral Health Care Services
Freddie Louis Smith, Project Director
Faith Elizabeth Fuller, Evaluator

Primary Care Partners

Oakland, California
Fremont, California

Goals of PATH Project

1. Improve Access to primary care services for SMI clients
2. Become the “Medical Home” for SMI clients served in County Mental Health Centers
3. Develop a “Sustainable Financial Model” to help expand PATH Clinics to additional Centers
Psychiatric Diagnosis
Fiscal Year 13-14

2814 Adult Clients (18-65 years old) assigned to Service Teams

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Diagnosis Breakdown</th>
<th># Clients Served</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Schizophrenia Disorders</td>
<td>1824</td>
<td>65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bipolar Disorders</td>
<td>372</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depressive Disorders</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychotic Disorders</td>
<td>243</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anxiety Disorders</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjustment Disorders</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PATH Sustainability Workgroup Focus

1. **Documentation** of health outcomes for charts, graphs, presentations, and grant applications and proposals

2. Preparing a **Financial Plan** and **Service Model** where implementation and operating costs are covered

3. Developing strong collaborative **Partnerships** with our primary care partners

4. **Building Support** from BH Executive Staff, elected officials, and community and consumer groups
### Improved Access to Primary Care

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LifeLong Medical Patients Pre-Post Study</th>
<th>Low Users</th>
<th>Moderate Users</th>
<th>Heavy Users</th>
<th>Total Patients or Visits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number in Study Sample</strong></td>
<td>N=24</td>
<td>N=23</td>
<td>N=18</td>
<td>N=65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average # visits 1 Year Prior to Integration</strong></td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td><strong>N=340</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average # Visits 1 Year Post Integration</strong></td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td><strong>N=347</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Comparison Group Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-PATH</th>
<th>Number Improved</th>
<th>% Improved</th>
<th>Number Improved</th>
<th>% Improved</th>
<th>Number Improved</th>
<th>% Improved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clients with Abnormal HgbA1c</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>484</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Clients with Abnormal BP</td>
<td>77</td>
<td></td>
<td>271</td>
<td></td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# PATH Outcomes

 BHCS Service Team Clients with PATH Integrated Care

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Size</th>
<th>Clients with Abnormal HgbA1c</th>
<th>Number Improved</th>
<th>% Improved</th>
<th>Clients with Abnormal BP</th>
<th>Number Improved</th>
<th>% Improved</th>
<th>Clients with any Baseline BMI</th>
<th>Number Improved</th>
<th>% Improved</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PATH</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**PATH**

- **HgbA1c**: 93 clients, 48 improved (52% improved)
- **Blood Pressure**: 126 clients, 81 improved (64% improved)
- **BMI**: 159 clients, 86 improved (54% improved)

**Health Outcomes Compared**

- **Improved A1c**: Non-PATH 40%, PATH 52%
- **Improved BP**: Non-PATH 56%, PATH 64%
- **Improved BMI**: Non-PATH 40%, PATH 54%
What are the costs of a PATH clinic?

### Exam Room Set up and Computers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equipment</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Cost: $15,000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Office Computers</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Printers/Fax Machines</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exam Table</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weighing Scale</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blood Pressure Monitor</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thermometer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pulse Oximeter</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Otoscope</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ophthalmoscope</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halogen Exam Light</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical refrigerator</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazard Container</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>File Cabinets with locks</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Ongoing Operations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary Care / CBO</th>
<th>FTE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary Care Physician</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinic Coordinator</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical Assistant</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin Asst.</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Salaries                  | $187,000 |
| Medical Supplies           | $55,000  |
| Other costs                | $28,000  |
| Annual Salaries            | $270,000 |

### BH / County

| Nurse Care Coordinator    | 1     |
| Peer Support Counselor    | 1     |

| Salaries                  | $220,000 |
| Supplies                  | $18,000  |
| Other costs               | $20,000  |
| Annual Salaries           | $258,000 |

Annual Direct Costs: $528,000

---

Breakeven Analysis (Primary Care, FQHC)

- **Primary Care Clinic: Annual Operating Expenses**: $270,000
  - **Medi-cal reimbursement rate per visit**: $206
  - **# Annual visits required for break even (95% insured)**: 1376
  - **# visits per 4 hour shift (about 30 min. each)**: 7
  - **Breakeven # of shifts required a year**: 197
  - **Available weeks per year [net of holidays, vacation, sick]**: 49
  - **Breakeven # of half-day clinics/week**: 4.0
Can we cover costs with revenue?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
<th>Year 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Third Party Revenue (Medi-Cal, Medi-Care, Self-Pay)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$ 62,219</td>
<td>$ 165,918</td>
<td>$ 244,849</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foundation Grant</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$ 15,000</td>
<td>$ 15,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Behavioral Health Service Team Revenue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Projected</th>
<th>Year 1</th>
<th>Year 2</th>
<th>Year 3</th>
<th>Year 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MAA (Medi-Cal Administrative Activities)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$ 76,000</td>
<td>$ 112,000</td>
<td>$ 136,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental Health Services Act dollars or other Grants</td>
<td>$ 258,000</td>
<td>$ 182,000</td>
<td>$ 146,000</td>
<td>$ 122,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Can we find other ways to cover costs?

- Mental Health Services Act Funding (CA)
- Foundation Grants
- In-Kind goods and services
- Collaborative Partnerships with more CBOs
- Partnerships with local Colleges and Universities for Research
- Interns from local schools
- Billing Revenue
Goals for the Future

• Open clinics at additional sites
• Integrate Substance Abuse Treatment
• Continue to collect and analyze data on access, health, and on effects of the wellness program
• Access to data on:
  • Emergency Room visits
  • Hospitalizations (psychiatric and medical)
  • Criminal Justice System Contacts
Are We Reducing Costs by Integrating Care?
Imara I. West, MPH

Overview

PBHCI funding allowed primary care services to be integrated into two mental health centers serving SMI safety-net population

- DESC - New to integrated primary care
- HMHAS - History of integrated primary care

Population
- 38% with schizophrenia
- Average age of 48 years
- 67% male
- 42% non-white
- 34% homeless
Cost Analysis
Phases

Phase I:
- Program Costs
- Pre-Post change comparison of HMHAS PBHCI clients to a propensity score matched comparison group

Phase II:
- Pre-Post change comparison for DESC and HMHAS PBHCI clients

Cost Analysis Data

- Harborview Medical Center (HMC) billing records
  - Outpatient (OP) medical utilization and costs
  - Emergency department (ED) utilization and costs
  - Inpatient hospital utilization and costs
- Visits and costs were presented as per member per month (PMPM) in the pre and post periods
  - One year pre/post period
- Clients must have had at least 1 month of post period data to have been included
Comparison

PBHCI Group vs Comparison Group

- Comparison enrolled in similar services at HMHAS, but not in PBHCI

Propensity score matched on age, gender, race/ethnicity, primary language, homeless status, type of insurance, and pre-period health care costs and utilization

Difference in Difference Model
OP Medical Visits
Increased After PBHCI Enrollment

No Group Differences in Medical Utilization or Costs

Decreases in utilization and costs in both groups, but no significant differences

- Relatively small n (192), lots of variability
- Comparison group may have differed from PBHCI in ways not measured
- Sample drawn exclusively from HMHAS
  - Clients may not have been impacted by PBHCI due to long-standing integration of PC & MH treatment
PHASE II

Phase II Primary Question

Did PBHCI have a differential impact on the two sites?

- DESC: No prior PC-BH integration
- HMHAS: More than a decade of PC-BH integration

Pre-Post comparison of utilization and costs for both sites
Percent of Clients with One or More OP Medical Visits Increased at Both Sites

- Year Before/Year After HMHAS (n=358): 81% increased by 89%
- Year Before/Year After DESC (n=361): 39% increased by 73%

Percent of Clients with One or More ED Visits Decreased at Both Sites

- Year Before/Year After HMHAS (n=358): 50% decreased by 37%
- Year Before/Year After DESC (n=361): 56% decreased by 47%
Per Member Per Month
ED Costs Decreased at Both Sites

- Year Before/Year After HMHAS (n=358): $77, $74
- Year Before/Year After DESC (n=361): $108, $99

Percent of Clients with One or More
Inpatient Admissions Decreased at Both Sites

- Year Before/Year After HMHAS (n=358): 18%, 11%
- Year Before/Year After DESC (n=361): 24%, 21%
Conclusions

• PBHCI is associated with an increase in outpatient medical visits
  - Especially at DESC which did not have integration of primary and behavioral health care prior to PBHCI
• PBHCI was also associated with decreases in percent of clients using the ED, ED costs, and percent of clients admitted to inpatient hospital at both sites
• Overall, these findings suggest that the investment in primary care integration can have a positive impact whether the site has a history of integration or not

Cautions

• Because we did not have a control group in Phase II, it is possible that changes in medical utilization and costs could have been caused by something other than the PBHCI intervention
• Medical services could have been undercounted as we only had access to service records at HMC clinics while clients could have received services at non-HMC clinics and hospitals
Tips

• May be difficult to construct a truly comparable comparison group
  • Non-PBHCI participants at a PBHCI site are likely to differ from participants in ways that may be difficult to measure
• State level data may help to identify all medical utilization
• Obtaining medical data can be facilitated by establishing relationship with medical records staff
• Strong programming skills are essential in managing large medical data sets
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HMC Decision Support
Next Steps…

- Guide is available please let us know what you think!

- Support is available from CIHS, RAND, & the grantees that took part!

- Discussion/Questions?
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