



September 17, 2021

The Honorable Chiquita Brooks-LaSure
Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services
U.S. Department of Health and Human Services
Attention: CMS-1753
P.O. Box 8016
Baltimore, MD 21244-8016

Delivered Electronically

RE: CY 2022 Medicare Hospital Outpatient Prospective Payment System and Ambulatory Surgical Center Payment System Proposed Rule (CMS-1753-P)

Dear Administrator Brooks-LaSure:

On behalf of the American Medical Rehabilitation Providers Association (AMRPA), we appreciate the opportunity to provide comments in response to the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services' (CMS) Calendar Year (CY) 2022 Hospital Outpatient Prospective Payment System and Ambulatory Surgical Center proposed rule ("OPPS proposed rule"). AMRPA is the national trade association representing more than 650 freestanding inpatient rehabilitation hospitals and rehabilitation units of general hospitals (referred to by CMS as "inpatient rehabilitation facilities," or "IRFs"). Our members focus on the care and functional recovery of some of the most vulnerable Medicare beneficiaries – such as traumatic brain injury, stroke, and traumatic spinal cord injury patients. Our member hospitals help patients maximize their health, functional ability, independence, and participation in their communities, so they are able to return to home, work, or an active retirement.

Since the start of the COVID-19 public health emergency (PHE), AMRPA members have continued to demonstrate the distinct value of IRF care for post-acute care (PAC) patients, as AMRPA members have been able to safely care for more complex patients (both acute COVID-19 patients and traditional rehabilitation patients) while maintaining the same high rates of discharge to home and community and other vital quality metrics. The demands of the PHE continue to affect our member hospitals across the nation through continued COVID-19-related surges, staff shortages, and unanticipated demands on members' information systems, among many other impacts. AMRPA has greatly appreciated CMS' recognition of IRF's pivotal role in the national pandemic response effort, including through the issuance of numerous waivers and flexibilities to allow our members to focus their time and resources on patient care.

Anthony Cuzzola · Chair, AMRPA Board of Directors

Vice President/Administrator, JFK Johnson Rehabilitation Institute

529 14th Street NW, Suite 1280, Washington, DC 20045 · Phone: 202-591-2469 · Fax: 202-591-2445

With respect to the CY 2022 OPSS rule, our comments focus only on the proposal to increase the penalties that apply with respect to the hospital price transparency requirements that took effect as recently as in January 2021. As a global matter, AMRPA reiterates the concerns we raised in our CY 2020 OPSS comment letter (see Appendix A) regarding the applicability of these rules to inpatient rehabilitation hospitals given that our hospitals do not generally provide many of the “shoppable services” that are the primary focus of the regulations (e.g., outpatient physician clinic visits or elective procedures). While some AMRPA members have posted information regarding the outpatient services they provide in an effort to comply with CMS requirement,¹ CMS’ rules are focused on the services that are “commonly provided to [the] hospital’s patient population.”² The most “commonly provided” care within an IRF consists of services that are required by inpatients - not outpatients, are urgent in nature, and are not services that can be “shopped” individually in advance of the care being provided. We continue to urge CMS to recognize that our member hospitals and units cannot be expected to post 300 services since they don’t provide that large a variety.

More specific to the new penalty structure proposed in this year’s rule, AMRPA believes that this proposal is unduly burdensome given the relatively recent implementation date as well as the scope and complexity of the rule’s requirements. Perhaps most importantly, we believe this action is seriously ill-timed, as the ongoing demands of the COVID-19 PHE on AMRPA member hospitals have and will continue to significantly complicate good faith compliance efforts.

For all these reasons, we urge CMS to withdraw, or at minimum delay, the proposed penalties in the CY 2022 OPSS. A more detailed overview of our concerns and recommendations follow:

I. The “Shoppable Services” Posting Requirement is Generally Inapplicable to Inpatient Rehabilitation Hospitals and Units in its Current Form and should be Modified to Reduce Confusion & Unnecessary Burden

Earlier this year, CMS implemented a regulation that requires all hospitals – including IRFs - to make public their payer-specific negotiated charges for at least 300 “shoppable” services in a “consumer-friendly” format. The 300 services would be comprised of 70 CMS-selected shoppable services and 230 hospital-selected shoppable services. CMS defines a “shoppable service” as a “non-urgent” service that can be scheduled by a healthcare consumer in advance, allowing consumers to “price shop and schedule a service at a time that is convenient for them.” Specific examples provided by CMS include certain imaging and laboratory services, radiology

¹ CMS requires hospitals to post 70 services specified by CMS (e.g., a kidney function panel test), as well as the 230 services selected by the hospital that reflect the services “commonly provided” to its patient population.

² Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services. (n.d.). 10 Steps to Making Public Standard Charges for Shoppable Services. Retrieved September 17, 2021, from <https://www.cms.gov/files/document/steps-making-public-standard-charges-shoppable-services.pdf>.

services, and office or other outpatient visits, among others. With respect to the hospitals' selection of shoppable services, CMS has encouraged hospitals to select such services based on the utilization or billing rate of the services in the past year.

AMRPA would like to reiterate our prior concerns about the application of this requirement to IRFs. AMRPA generally supports CMS' efforts to empower patients to make more educated decisions on the price and convenience of their treatment *when such services are truly "non urgent" and can be "shopped" across providers*. As part of our members' efforts to comply with this requirement, a number of our hospitals with outpatient rehabilitation programs have posted data that reflect their provision of services that meet the "shoppable" criteria (for example, physical therapy evaluations). At the same time, our members report challenges in meeting the 300 service-threshold provided by CMS, particularly given the fact that the services "most commonly provided" in our inpatient rehabilitation hospitals do not qualify under CMS' definition of "shoppable services." For example, the core services provided by IRFs – which in theory would make up the "shoppable services" list - are those provided to inpatients. A consumer in the inpatient setting is unable to compare prices and go to alternative providers in the manner an outpatient could.

AMRPA also urges CMS to take into account the fact that most IRF admissions come directly from an acute hospital where they were treated for serious illness/injury, often arriving in an ambulance for services that are rarely scheduled in advance. IRFs' primary services are therefore a continuation of this form of "non-shoppable" initial inpatient treatment. For IRF patients, their medical and clinical circumstances and care trajectories afford little or no opportunity to plan or anticipate what level of services they may need or where those services should be acquired, in contrast to a reasonable interpretation of "shoppable services."

The COVID-19 PHE further illustrates the distinct role that IRFs play in the healthcare continuum and the inapplicability of the "shoppable services" requirement to our member hospitals. Throughout the pandemic, IRFs have played a key role in helping shorter term acute-care hospitals (STACH) respond to capacity issues, often admitting higher acuity and more complex patients that would normally remain in the STACH setting while also continuing to care for traditional rehabilitation patients. In fact, several Medicare Advantage plans fully waived prior authorization in the early stages of the PHE and at various times over the past months for IRFs in direct recognition of the need for timely access to the care provided at our hospitals. These practices clearly demonstrate how the services provided within an IRF varies significantly from services that patients would "shop" based only on cost, rather than complex and multidisciplinary care provided within the rehabilitation hospital.

While AMRPA members have tried in good faith to comply with these requirements in the 9 months since their implementation, our members report widespread issues in listing the required number (300) of shoppable services for all the reasons described above. As CMS aims to improve compliance with the price transparency regulations, AMRPA urges the agency to closely examine the scope of the current requirements and determine whether revising the applicability of requirements to certain providers would be a more effective way of improving reporting.

II. CMS Should Delay Any Change to the Current Penalty Structure in Light of the Current Stage of the Public Health Emergency

As CMS is well-aware, the PHE continues to evolve and present serious operational and clinical challenges for all providers in the Medicare program. IRFs in particular face residual effects of the earlier pandemic phases (e.g., serious to critical-level staffing shortages; significantly backlogged information systems departments) and new and evolving impacts as a result of more serious COVID-19 variants (e.g., surge capacity limitations; higher acuity patients and care needs). As such, we have greatly appreciated CMS' recognition of the importance of minimizing administrative burdens wherever possible.

For these reasons, we believe the current proposal to increase penalties for an already onerous regulation stands in conflict with CMS' broader efforts to alleviate administrative burdens during the PHE. As a practical matter, the regulations have only been in effect for eight months (all while the PHE was in effect), and our member hospitals are still adjusting to the rule's complex requirements. In addition, due to the aforementioned staffing challenges, there have been continuity issues with respect to those personnel who were initially trained on the reporting requirements and those who are now being charged with the hospital's compliance. AMRPA believes additional educational resources and training would be a far more appropriate method for improving compliance rates at this early implementation stage, rather than substantially increasing the amount of the civil monetary penalty amount at a time when resource allocation is already an issue for many members.

Lastly, AMRPA recognizes that at the time this proposed rule was issued, COVID-19 cases had dropped significantly compared to 2020 and early 2021. However, as CMS knows, as a result of the Delta variant, cases are climbing at a substantial rate. IRFs are also seeing an increase in COVID-19 patients as coded by U07.1.³ It should also be noted that AMRPA members report current COVID-19 patients and survivors seem to be sicker and in need of more intensive services compared to patients in earlier phases of the pandemic or traditional rehabilitation patients. These surges have further strained personnel and other resources within our member hospitals, and current projections indicate that these challenges will persist into 2022. Given the ongoing demands facing our hospitals now and over the coming months, AMRPA respectfully requests that CMS at minimum delay this penalty structure until after the PHE is declared over. This action would also be consistent with CMS' stated approach to other key PHE-related policies.

AMRPA welcomes continued opportunities to collaborate with the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) and CMS on these matters. If you have any questions about AMRPA's recommendations, please contact Kate Beller, J.D., AMRPA Executive Vice

³ Per eRehabData® data from July 2021, COVID-19 IRF admissions are beginning to increase for both Medicare fee-for-service and across all-payers. Due to data lags, the admission rates are unlikely to reflect the full scale of the current August Delta variant surge.



President for Government Relations and Policy Development (kbeller@amrpa.org / 202-207-1132).

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, which appears to read "Anthony Cuzzola".

Anthony Cuzzola
Chair, AMRPA Board of Directors
VP/Administrator, JFK Johnson Rehabilitation Institute

Appendix A

AMRPA Comments in Response to CY 2020 OPSS Price Transparency Proposal

September 27, 2019

The Honorable Seema Verma
Administrator
Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services
U.S. Department of Health and Human Services
Attention: CMS-1694-P
7500 Security Boulevard
Baltimore, MD 21244-1850

Delivered Electronically

RE: Proposed Requirements for Hospitals To Make Public a List of Their Standard Charges & Request for Information (RFI): Quality Measurement Relating to Price Transparency for Improving Beneficiary Access to Provider and Supplier Charge Information [CMS-1717-P], 84 FR 39398 (August 9, 2019)

Dear Administrator Verma:

This letter is submitted on behalf of the American Medical Rehabilitation Providers Association (AMRPA) related to the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services' (CMS) proposed price reporting requirements included in the Calendar Year 2020 Hospital Outpatient Prospective Payment System (PPS) and Ambulatory Surgical Center (ASC) Policy Changes and Payment Rates Proposed Rules. Our comments focus specifically on CMS' proposal to require hospitals to: (1) post a list of all of their standard charges – both gross charges and all negotiated rates – for all items and services in a machine-readable format on their websites, and (2) post the negotiated rates for specific types/numbers of “shoppable” services in a consumer-friendly way. As an overarching issue, AMRPA believes that the standard and shoppable price posting requirements, as proposed, would result in significant administrative and financial burdens across the entire hospital industry. At the same time, due to the nature of the pricing information that CMS proposes to be made public, consumers would see limited benefit from this data, and may in fact make inappropriate treatment decisions as they attempt to base care decisions off such complex information.

Furthermore, in the event that CMS proceeds to finalize the policy in whole or in part, AMRPA respectfully requests that inpatient rehabilitation hospitals and units (referred to by CMS as inpatient rehabilitation facilities, or IRFs) be exempt from these proposals. AMRPA believes an exemption is appropriate due to: (1) the unique, patient-specific negotiation with payers that IRFs often engage in, (2) the fact that inpatient rehabilitation services – designed to treat some of the most medically complex patients in the Medicare program – contrast sharply with the other “shoppable” services (such as laboratory services) included in the proposed rule, and (3) given

that IRFs are arguably the most regulated hospital entity in the Medicare program, these additional regulatory burdens pose a substantial threat to patient access to inpatient rehabilitation services. While AMRPA strongly supports the Administration’s longstanding interest in improving price transparency throughout the healthcare ecosystem, we believe that this proposal will not achieve its intended goal – improved consumer awareness and decision-making – and may unintentionally result in inappropriate or less clinically effective post-acute care placements.

AMRPA is the national voluntary trade association representing more than 650 freestanding rehabilitation hospitals and rehabilitation units of general hospitals (collectively referred to by CMS as inpatient rehabilitation facilities (IRFs)), outpatient rehabilitation service providers and several other types of rehabilitation providers. In 2017, IRFs served 340,000 Medicare beneficiaries with more than 380,000 IRF stays.⁴ On average, Medicare Part A payments represent approximately 60 percent of IRF revenues.⁵ AMRPA members help patients maximize their health, functional ability, independence, and participation in society so they are able to return to home, work, or an active retirement. Medicare beneficiaries admitted to IRFs for their immediate post-acute care have significantly better outcomes across a range of quality indicators compared to clinically matched beneficiaries who received their immediate post-acute care in another setting.⁶

The services provided by IRFs are based directly on patient need/conditions, due in part to the extensive pre- and post-admission evaluations and documents that apply specifically to IRFs. The interdisciplinary nature of inpatient rehabilitation services distinguish IRFs from other sites of care, with CMS requiring physical therapists, occupational therapists, speech-language pathologists, rehabilitation nurses, rehabilitation physicians, and other clinician types to work in a highly coordinated manner in order for a patient with a serious debility to regain function and quality of life.⁷ These and other requirements help demonstrate why IRF services are significantly distinct from other types of “shoppable” services that patients can easily select in isolation and/or in advance, as outlined in more detail below.

AMRPA, along with numerous other provider associations, urges CMS not to finalize this proposal. If adopted, the proposal would not only create new and often crippling burdens for the hospital industry, but would also run in direct contrast to the goals of this Administration’s *Patients over Paperwork* initiative. In the first section of our comments, we detail our major concerns with this proposal across the sector, as well as highlight how these measures would result in exceptional burdens for IRF providers and their patients. The second section of our comments addresses our separate legal concerns that the proposal exceeds the agency’s regulatory authority and raises Administrative Procedure Act issues.

⁴ Medicare Payment Advisory Commission (MedPAC), “Chapter 10: Inpatient Rehabilitation Facility Services,” Report to the Congress: Medicare Payment Policy, March 2019

⁵ Id.

⁶ Dobson Davanzo & Associates, *Assessment of Patient Outcomes of Rehabilitative Care Provided in Inpatient Rehabilitation Facilities (IRFs) and After Discharge* (July 2014)

⁷ See Medicare Benefit Policy Manual § 110.2.5 - Interdisciplinary Team Approach to the Delivery of Care

In light of the potential policy and legal issues tied to these measures, AMRPA urges CMS withdraw this proposal and instead convene hospital stakeholders to identify best practices that more meaningfully educate patients -- without creating new burdens for their providers. We have provided below a summary of CMS' proposals, which are followed by our substantive recommendations and comments.

I. AMRPA Response & Recommendations to CMS' OPPTS Price Transparency Proposals

A. Proposed Definition of Hospitals Subject to Price Transparency Requirements, p. 39,575

CMS proposes to define "hospital" for the purpose of its transparency proposal as "as an institution in any State in which State or applicable local law provides for the licensing of hospitals, (1) is licensed as a hospital pursuant to such law or (2) is approved, by the agency of such State or locality responsible for licensing hospitals, as meeting the standards established for such licensing." CMS specifically proposes to require that IRFs that satisfy these two criteria to comply with the price posting/transparency requirements.

CMS also notes that the agency considered whether it was appropriate to establish different requirements for hospitals located in a rural areas, or hospitals that are not federally owned or operated but that serve special populations (such as psychiatric hospitals), among others. CMS states, however, that because "such hospitals are open to the general public, and their charges are generally not made available to the public," CMS believes there "is value in such hospitals making public their standard charges."

AMRPA urges CMS to employ a more tailored approach in determining which hospitals must comply with the standard/shoppable charges posting requirements. Unlike general acute care hospitals, IRFs furnish specific services tailored to the needs of patients with specific conditions (required under CMS' 60% rule), such as traumatic brain injury (TBI) and stroke. Often, what specific services the patient needs (and consequent financial liability) will not be determined until after admission to the IRF, when the patient can be fully assessed. In fact, Medicare regulations require that IRFs complete a post-admission patient evaluation (PAPE) and develop an Individualized Plan of Care (IPOC) outlining the trajectory of services to be furnished to its patients, based on the extensive evaluations provided at and after admission.⁸ It will be difficult for a patient to know which services they will need prior to assessment by the IRF and the corresponding cost. Even then, the services needed will be a wide-ranging mix of rehabilitation and medical services provided by an interdisciplinary team, rather than a single or simple set of services that can be "shopped" in advance. As such, the services provided by IRFs are distinct from those provided in other hospital settings, and for this reason among others, AMRPA urges CMS to carve-out IRFs from the proposed definition of hospitals subject to the rule's transparency requirements.

⁸ 42 C.F.R. 412.622

B. Proposed Definition of the Standard Charges that Must be Posted by Hospitals, p. 35,977

CMS proposes to require hospitals to make public two types of standard charges: (1) gross charges; and (2) payer-specific negotiated rates. The rule defines a gross charge as the charge for an item or service reflected in a hospital's chargemaster without any discounts. CMS explains that making gross charges publicly available is important because hospitals use these charges as the starting point for negotiating discounted rates with insurers. According to the Agency, higher gross charges are associated with higher negotiated rates and higher premiums and out-of-pocket costs for insured individuals.

Because more than 90 percent of consumers rely on a third party to cover their health care costs, CMS further proposes to require publication of negotiated rates. The rule explains that improving transparency for negotiated rates will enable consumers to compare the charges between hospitals and determine his or her out-of-pocket costs. CMS proposes to define payer-specific negotiated rates as the charges that the hospital has negotiated with third-party payers for an item or service. This would also include charges negotiated with Medicare Advantage (MA) plans.

AMRPA strongly urges CMS to reconsider its proposal to require IRFs to publicly post their gross charges and payer-specific negotiated rates. With respect to gross charges, AMRPA notes that Medicare beneficiaries will only pay a deductible and possibly a set co-pay based on the number of days the beneficiary has been hospitalized for hospital (Part A) services for that benefit year. AMRPA is not aware of any situation in which a Medicare beneficiary would be required to pay a percentage of gross charges for Part A services, and therefore asserts that this "standard charge" information is not meaningful for Medicare beneficiaries. AMRPA also urges CMS to consider that, in the context of inpatient rehabilitation, pricing information is affected by patient's assessment (required before and after every IRF admission). This would make IRF-specific standard charges even more difficult for patients to understand and may actually convey inaccurate or misleading information about the cost of care when provided in advance of the assessment.

Furthermore, with respect to payer-negotiated rates, it is critical for CMS to keep in mind that privately insured individuals have a wide range of different cost-sharing arrangements depending on their insurer and plan. Given the specialized treatment provided by IRFs and unique nature of costs associated with IRF services, IRFs often negotiate patient-specific rates with these third-party payers, including MA plans. Requiring IRFs to post *patient-specific*, payer-negotiated rates would be an incredibly burdensome task for IRFs from an administrative standpoint. CMS notes in the proposed rule that payer-specific rates will be helpful in light of the fact that "an increasing number of consumers are discovering that sometimes the providers' cash discount can mean paying lower out-of-pocket costs than paying the out-of-pocket costs calculated after taking a third party payer's higher negotiated rate into account." Given that patients in IRFs receive an intensive mix of services from an interdisciplinary team, CMS' rationale would be very unlikely to apply in the context of inpatient rehabilitation.

Moreover, as CMS directly acknowledges in the proposed rule, the public display of payer-specific negotiated rates may have the effect of increasing hospital prices in concentrated markets due to anticompetitive behavior. These anticompetitive behaviors would particularly impact geographic markets where there are relatively few IRFs compared to other providers.

AMRPA would also like to make CMS aware of a number of other unanticipated effects of the proposal. Through this policy, CMS will be incentivizing patients to pick their providers/sites of care based solely on price, rather than outcomes-based or quality-related measures. Given that the standard charges that IRFs would be required to post are likely to vary from the patient-specific, payer-negotiated rate that would ultimately impact patient liability, AMRPA has grave concerns that patient care decisions will be guided by misrepresentative/inaccurate pricing information. Without other critical and complementary information, patients (receiving rehabilitation services in both the inpatient and outpatient setting) may ultimately make *less* informed decisions about their care by relying on limited and potentially misleading information. Therefore, in light of the significant burden that the proposal represents for IRFs, and the lack of any clear benefit to consumers (and possible harm), we urge CMS to reconsider its proposal to require IRFs to post their standard charges, as defined by CMS.

C. Proposed Requirements for Consumer-Friendly Display of the Payer-Specific Negotiated Charges for Shoppable Services, p. 39,585

CMS is proposing to require hospitals make public their payer-specific negotiated charges for at least 300 “shoppable” services in a “consumer-friendly” format. The 300 services would be comprised of 70 CMS-selected shoppable services and 230 hospital-selected shoppable services. CMS defines a “shoppable service” as a “non-urgent” service that can be scheduled by a healthcare consumer in advance, allowing consumers to “price shop and schedule a service at a time that is convenient for them.” Specific examples provided by CMS include certain imaging and laboratory services and outpatient clinic visits, among others. With respect to the hospitals’ selection of shoppable services, CMS proposes that hospitals should select such services based on the utilization or billing rate of the services in the past year.

AMRPA generally supports CMS’ efforts to improve patients’ understanding of their healthcare costs and enable them to make more educated decisions on the price and convenience of their treatment *when such services are truly “non-urgent” and can be “shopped” across providers*. In stark contrast to the types of services CMS provides as examples of “shoppable” services, however, the services provided by IRFs are those specifically required to advance the recovery of some of the most medically complex patients, such as TBI patients. Furthermore, timely access to these services in IRFs is linked to demonstrable improvement in outcomes, whereas the time required for price comparisons for other “shoppable” services do not have the same recovery-related implications. The importance of IRF patients receiving both *specific* inpatient rehabilitation services and *timely access* to such services is evidenced by the American Heart Association and American Stroke Association’s guidelines for stroke recovery, which direct that stroke patients receive their immediate post-acute care in IRFs.⁹

⁹ “In-patient rehab recommended over nursing homes for stroke rehab,” American Heart Association/American

AMRPA also urges CMS to take into account the fact that most IRF admissions come directly from an acute hospital where they were treated for serious illness/injury, often arriving in an ambulance for services that are rarely scheduled in advance. IRF services are therefore a continuation of this form of “non-shoppable” initial treatment. For these patients, their medical and clinical circumstances and care trajectories afford little or no opportunity to plan or anticipate what level of services they may need or where those services should be acquired, in contrast to a reasonable interpretation of “shoppable services.” As such, AMRPA urges CMS to exempt IRFs from its proposed shoppable services-related posting requirement in light of the critical differences between the patient-tailored services provided in IRFs and other “shoppable” services listed by CMS in this proposal.

D. Noncompliance and Enforcement Mechanisms for Price Transparency Requirements, p. 39,591

In the case of noncompliance, CMS proposes to first issue a warning and, if the violation continues, it proposes to require hospitals to submit and follow a corrective action plan. If a hospital does not submit or adhere to the corrective action plan, CMS proposes to impose a civil monetary penalty (CMP) of up to \$300 a day.

AMRPA urges CMS to limit the use of CMPs in the context of policy and ensure both inpatient and outpatient providers have sufficient education and training required for compliance with this proposal. Based on many of the points raised earlier in this comment letter, AMRPA believes the burden of any enforcement mechanism would far outweigh the benefits to consumers. As part of its *Patients over Paperwork* initiative, CMS states that it aims to “mov[e] the needle and remov[e] regulatory obstacles that get in the way of providers spending time with patients.” AMRPA believes imposing any such penalties on hospitals for price transparency requirements would accomplish just the opposite of that goal by straining hospitals’ resources in order to furnish information that is minimally beneficial to consumers. In addition, given that IRFs would face special burdens in posting patient-specific payer-negotiated rates, the proposal would create serious administrative and financial burdens for IRFs if they run into logistical challenges in posting the required information.

E. CMS Burden Estimates

With respect to its proposed price transparency measures, CMS estimates that it would take hospitals 12 hours, translating to a cost of \$1,017.24, to comply with these requirements. Specifically, the agency estimates that hospitals will need four hours to compile and post charge data for all items and services and eight hours to identify the 300 shoppable services and their corresponding ancillary services, collate the charge data, create a consumer-friendly approach to displaying the data, and post it on their websites.

Stroke Association Scientific Statement, May 4, 2016, *available at* <http://newsroom.heart.org/news/in-patient-rehabrecommended-over-nursing-homes-for-stroke-rehab>. *See also* AHA/ASA, GUIDELINES FOR ADULT STROKE REHABILITATION AND RECOVERY: A GUIDELINE FOR HEALTHCARE PROFESSIONALS FROM THE AMERICAN HEART ASSOCIATION/AMERICAN STROKE ASSOCIATION (2016), *available at* <http://stroke.ahajournals.org/>.

CMS has grossly underestimated the administrative and financial burdens associated with this proposal. As outlined in prior sections of this comment letter, IRFs in particular would likely need to post patient-specific, payer-negotiated rates, which results in a significantly higher volume of information to organize, post and update. CMS has also failed to take into account the resources – in terms of both time and staff – that would be required to build or purchase the “consumer friendly” interfaces required under this proposal. Perhaps most alarmingly, this proposal would likely require IRFs and other hospitals to shift resources away from ongoing efforts to meaningfully inform patients about their healthcare service costs and patient liability, and instead focus on compliance with new regulatory requirements that would not result in helpful price data for patients.

II. Legal and Policy Arguments Compel Withdrawal of CMS’ Transparency Proposal

A. CMS Proposal Exceeds the Agency’s Regulatory Authority

In addition to the aforementioned implementation-related concerns, AMRPA concurs with other hospital organizations in concluding that CMS lacks the legal authority to require hospitals to make public payer-specific negotiated charges. While AMRPA understands that CMS seeks to implement Section 2718(e) of the Public Health Service Act’s (PHSA) requirement that hospitals make public a list of their “standard charges for items and services,” we believe that the proposed definition is not a reasonable interpretation of this term. Instead, AMRPA finds that the term “standard charge” has been interpreted to mean a hospital’s usual or customary charge – found in the hospitals’ chargemaster. In the proposed rule, however, CMS seeks to require hospitals to post *payer-specific* charges, and in the case of IRFs, potentially *patient-specific* charges negotiated with various payers. AMRPA believes that this proposal is therefore an unreasonable interpretation of the authority provided to CMS under the PHSA.

For these same reasons, the proposal also likely violates the Administrative Procedure Act (APA), as it is unreasonable for CMS to interpret “standard” charges as payer-specific charges, which by definition vary by year and across payers/plans.

B. Public Posting of Payer-Specific Negotiated Charges Would Have Unintended Consequences on Patient Access & Market Competition

Beyond the serious legal issues raised by this proposal, AMRPA also notes that this proposal could potentially result in the opposite of its intended impact on competitive pricing and value-driven care decisions. In fact, the Federal Trade Commission (FTC) has warned numerous times that the disclosure of competitively sensitive information, specifically included health plans’ contractual terms,¹⁰ can “facilitate collusion, raise prices and harm...patients...”¹¹ The FTC has taken a position similar to the one urged by AMRPA, calling for transparency efforts to be

¹⁰ FTC Letter to Hon. Joe Hoppe & Hon. Melissa Hortman, Jun. 29, 2015.

¹¹ FTC Letter to the Hon. Nellie Pou, Apr. 17, 2001.

sensibly limited to “predicted out-of-pocket expenses, co-pays, and quality and performance comparisons of plans or providers”¹² – information that AMRPA believes will meaningfully inform patients with relevant data for their treatment decisions. In contrast, the current and overly broad proposal will actually have a negative effect on market competition, without providing patients with the type of information that can be effectively applied when making decisions on (what AMRPA views as) truly shoppable services.

III. Overall Recommendation

In all, AMRPA supports efforts to educate consumers and implement much-needed improvements to pricing transparency throughout the healthcare system. However, CMS’ proposed approach would not give patients the information they need to make informed health decisions (such as their own financial liability for services, rather than the total cost), yet would introduce significant additional administrative and financial burdens for the hospital industry. AMRPA therefore urges CMS to withdraw this proposal in its entirety and instead engage in a collaborative effort with hospital stakeholders to identify ways to more effectively provide patients with meaningful information about their actual anticipated costs.

AMRPA also reiterates that this proposal is particularly misplaced when applied to the IRF sector. With IRFs often engaging in patient-specific, payer-negotiated rates, the standard posting charge would: (1) result in IRFs being required to post charges that are not “standard” across their patient population, and (2) require IRFs to publish a substantially greater volume of data compared to other hospitals. Furthermore, as required by Medicare regulations, IRFs must engage in extensive pre- and post-admission evaluations to ensure that the services provided by the IRFs are specifically tailored to improve patients’ recovery, outcomes and independence. In IRFs, rarely are the services provided to any two patients the same, and never would a patient be admitted to an IRF for just one service. Simply put, IRF services are not “shoppable,” and stand in sharp contrast to the types of services described in the proposed rule – such as laboratory services – that are not patient-tailored and can be provided in a number of hospital settings. Given that IRFs are already arguably the most regulated entities among providers participating in the Medicare program, these additional burdens would pose a significant threat to IRF operations and to patients’ continued access to critical inpatient rehabilitation services.

Lastly, AMRPA has previously provided CMS with specific recommendations to address this issue, such as focusing efforts to directly communicate cost-sharing arrangements to beneficiaries so that they fully understand their liabilities. AMRPA stands ready to work with CMS to identify and implement alternative approaches that will achieve the desired goals of improving price transparency while minimizing provider burden, in line with the goals of the Administration’s other initiatives.

¹² *Id.*



AMRPA welcomes continued opportunities to collaborate with the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) and CMS on these matters. If you have any questions about AMRPA's recommendations, please contact Kate Beller, J.D., AMRPA Executive Vice President for Government Relations and Policy Development (kbeller@amrpa.org / 202-207-1132).

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Richard Kathrins". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a prominent "R" and "K".

Richard Kathrins, Ph.D.
Chair, AMRPA Board of Directors
President and CEO Bacharach Institute for Rehabilitation

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Mark J. Tarr". The signature is cursive and stylized, with a large "M" and "T".

Mark J. Tarr
Chair, AMRPA Regulatory and Legislative Policy Committee
President and Chief Executive Officer, Encompass Health