

COMMENT GUIDANCE
MHCC CON STUDY, 2017-18

Please consider your answers in the context of Maryland's adoption of global budgets for hospitals, its commitment to achieve the goals of the Triple Aim, and its aspiration to bring health care spending under a total cost of care model beginning in 2019. Please provide a brief explanation of the basis for your position(s) in each area of inquiry beginning with the overarching question regarding continuation of hospital CON regulation. All responses will be part of the Maryland Health Care Commission's public record for the CON Workgroup.

Need for CON Regulation

Which of these options best fits your view of health care facilities CON regulation?

- CON regulation of hospital capital projects should be eliminated. [If you chose this option, many of the questions listed below will be moot, given that their context is one in which CON regulation would continue to exist. However, please respond to Questions 13 to 15.]
- CON regulation of hospital capital projects should be reformed.
- CON regulation of hospital capital projects should, in general, be maintained in its current form. Please provide a brief explanation of this position.

ISSUES/PROBLEMS

The Impact of CON Regulation on Hospital Competition and Innovation

1. In your view, would the public and the health care delivery system benefit from more competition among health care facilities?
2. Does CON regulation impose substantial barriers to market entry for new health care facilities or new health care services? If so, what changes in CON regulation should be implemented to enhance competition that would benefit the public?
3. How does CON regulation stifle innovation in the delivery of health care services under the current Maryland regulatory scheme?

Scope of CON Regulation

Generally, Maryland Health Care Commission approval is required to establish or relocate a health care facility, expand bed capacity or operating room capacity at health care facilities, introduce certain services at a health care facility, or undertake capital projects that exceed a

specified expenditure threshold. For a more detailed understanding of the scope of CON and exemption from CON review requirements, you may wish to review COMAR 10.24.01.02 - .04, which can be accessed at:

http://www.dsd.state.md.us/comar/SubtitleSearch.aspx?search=10.24.01.*

4. Should the scope of CON regulation be changed?
 - A. Are there health care facility projects that require approval by the Maryland Health Care Commission that should be deregulated?
 - B. Are there health care facility projects that do not require approval by the Maryland Health Care Commission that should be added to the scope of CON regulation?

The Project Review Process

5. What aspects of the project review process are most in need of reform? What are the primary choke-points in the process?
6. Should the ability of competing health care facilities or other types of providers to formally oppose and appeal decisions on projects be more limited?

Are there existing categories of exemption review (see COMAR 10.24.01.04) that should be eliminated? Should further consolidation of health care facilities be encouraged by maintaining exemption review for merged asset systems?

7. Are project completion timelines, i.e., performance requirements for implementing and completing capital projects, realistic and appropriate? (See COMAR 10.24.01.12.)

The State Health Plan for Facilities and Services

8. In general, do State Health Plan regulations for health care facility and service projects provide adequate and appropriate guidance for the Commission's decision-making? What are the chief strengths of these regulations and what do you perceive to be the chief weaknesses?
9. Do State Health Plan regulations focus attention on the most important aspects of health care facility projects? Please provide specific recommendations if you believe that the regulations miss the mark.
10. Are the typical ways in which MHCC obtains and uses industry and public input in State Health Plan development adequate and appropriate? If you believe that changes should be made in the development process for State Health Plan regulations, please provide specific recommendations.

General Review

Criteria for all Project Reviews

COMAR 10.24.01.08G(3)(b)-(f)) contains five general criteria for review of all CON projects, in addition to the specific standards established in the State Health Plan: (1) Need; (2) Availability of More Cost-Effective Alternatives; (3) Viability; (4) Impact; and (5) the Applicant's Compliance with Terms and Conditions of Previously Awarded Certificates of Need.

11. Are these general criteria adequate and appropriate? Should other criteria be used? Should any of these criteria be eliminated or modified in some way?

CHANGES/SOLUTIONS

Alternatives to CON Regulation for Capital Project

12. If you believe that CON regulation of health care facility capital projects should be eliminated, what, if any, regulatory framework should govern health care facility capital projects?
13. What modifications would be needed in HSCRC's authority, if any, if the General Assembly eliminated CON regulation of hospital capital projects?
14. Are there important benefits served by CON regulation that could be fully or adequately met with alternative regulatory mechanisms? For example, could expansion of the scope and specificity of health care facility licensure requirements administered by the Maryland Department of Health serve as an alternative approach to assuring that certain health care facilities and services are well-utilized and providing an acceptable level of care quality, with appropriate sanctions to address under-utilization or poor quality of care? Are there ways (other than those touched on in earlier questions) in which the regulation of hospital charges could be adapted as a substitute for CON regulation?

The Impact of CON Regulation on Hospital Competition and Innovation

15. Do you recommend changes in CON regulation to increase innovation in service delivery by existing health care facilities and new market entrants? If so, please provide detailed recommendations.
16. Should Maryland shift its regulatory focus to regulation of health care facility and health systems merger and consolidation activity to preserve and strengthen competition for hospital services?

Scope of CON Regulation

17. Should MHCC be given more flexibility in choosing which health care facility projects require approval and which can go forward without approval, based on adopted regulations for making these decisions? For example, all projects of a certain type could require notice to the Commission that includes information related to each project's impact on spending and the pattern of service delivery, and that is based on the proposals received in a given time period.

The Commission could consider and adopt staff's recommendation not to require CON approval or, based on significant project impact, require the health care facility to undergo CON review.

18. Should a whole new process of expedited review for certain projects be created? If so, what should be the attributes of the process?

The Project Review Process

19. Are there specific steps that can be eliminated?
20. Should post-CON approval processes be changed to accommodate easier project modifications?
21. Should the regulatory process be overhauled to permit more types of projects to undergo a more abbreviated form of review? If so, please identify the exemptions and describe alternative approaches that could be considered.
22. Would greater use of technology including the submission of automated and form-based applications improve the application submission process?

Duplication of Responsibilities by MHCC, HSCRC, and the MDH

23. Are there areas of regulatory duplication in health care facility regulatory processes that can be streamlined between HSCRC, MHCC, and MDH?
24. Are there other areas of duplication among the three agencies that could benefit from streamlining?

Thank you for your responses. Remember that it will be helpful if you provide a brief explanation of the basis for your position(s) and /or recommendation(s) in each area of inquiry.