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In February - March 2003 OHP benefits changed for ~89,000 Oregon Health Plan (OHP) Standard members.

- Added premiums - $6-$20 per month based on income.
- Expanded co-pays - office visits, labs, ED, prescriptions, hospitalization.
- Non-payment of premium results in 6 month “lock-out” from OHP.
- Eliminated coverage for dental, vision, outpatient mental health, substance abuse, durable medical equipment.
- Temporarily (two weeks) eliminated prescription benefits.
Study Objectives

The purpose of this study is to assess the impact of benefit changes on the OHP Standard Population across three domains:

- Enrollment
- Access to care
- Utilization
Methods


- Over-sample of 1,500 African Americans, Native Americans, and Hispanics.

- Preliminary survey results based on 2,195 English-speaking individuals.

- Preliminary response rate = 32%. Final disposition not yet available.

- Longitudinal cohort design: If funded, OHP Standard members will be compared over time with OHP Plus members, whose benefits did not change.
## Demographic Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Eligible Sample (n=8,487)</th>
<th>Respondents (n=2,741)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>39.4%</td>
<td>32.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>60.6%</td>
<td>67.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race/Ethnicity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African-Am</td>
<td>10.0%</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NA/AN</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>62.8%</td>
<td>69.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Language</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>87.9.7%</td>
<td>92.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vietnamese</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Population</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OHP Plus</td>
<td>51.6%</td>
<td>50.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OHP Standard</td>
<td>48.4%</td>
<td>49.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
% Reporting Chronic Conditions in OHP Standard Population

% Diagnosed with Chronic Condition

- Any Chronic Condition*: 49%
- Depression/Anxiety: 36%
- High Blood Pressure: 30%
- Asthma: 17%
- Diabetes: 12%
- Emphysema: 12%
- Congestive Heart Failure: 3%

* Excluding depression/anxiety
Section I

Impacts on Enrollment and Insurance Status: OHP Standard
OHP Standard members were more likely to lose OHP coverage. Those who lost OHP were asked how many of the last 6 months had they been without coverage...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Less than 1 to 2 months</th>
<th>3 to 5 months</th>
<th>6 months</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OHP Standard</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OHP Plus</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percent of those losing coverage
Most OHP Standard clients who left do not currently have health insurance coverage.

**Former OHP Standard: Current Insurance Status**

- 72% Uninsured
- 11% Returned to OHP
- 7% Employer Sponsored
- 10% Other
African Americans were more likely to lose OHP Standard coverage...

% Losing OHP Standard Coverage

- African-American: 53%
- Hispanic: 48%
- Caucasian: 47%
- Asian, Native Hawaiian & Other: 26%
- Native American: 26%

p<.05
OHP Standard clients with chronic conditions are more likely to stay continuously enrolled...

- 61.2% of those reporting a diagnosis of one or more chronic conditions** maintained continuous enrollment vs.

- 52.4% of those with no chronic conditions maintained continuous coverage.

**Diabetes, Asthma, Hypertension, CHF, Emphysema
Significant, p<.05 (chi square)
Cost-sharing was a major driver of loss of coverage...

Financial Reasons

- Owed Premiums: 27.9%
- Could Not Afford Copays: 28.4%
- Income Increased: 29.9%
- Could Not Afford Premiums: 33.9%
- MH/CD Benefits Cut: 6.0%

Non-Financial Reasons

- Obtained other coverage (e.g., Medicare, ESI): 9.0%
- Late Application: 10.0%

Note: Categories are not mutually exclusive. Will not sum to 100%.
Among those stating financial reasons for loss of coverage, most cited both premiums and copays as factors...

- More Than 1 Cost Sharing Reason: 32%
- Owed Premium Only: 5%
- Could Not Afford Copay Only: 5%
- Could Not Afford Premium Only: 5%
- Reasons not related to cost-sharing: 53%
Cost sharing disproportionately affected lowest income group...

Percent reporting cost sharing as reason for loss of coverage

- 0% to 10% FPL (n=133): 57.0%
- More than 10% of FPL: 41.0%

* p<.01
Respondents state a willingness to pay with small decreases in premiums...

If Premiums were lowered by $3 per month would you continue without coverage or reapply for OHP?

**Percent who would reapply**

- **0% to 10% FPL** (n=133)
  - 57.0%

- **More than 10% of FPL**
  - 43.0%

* * p<.05
Section II
Impacts of Program Changes on Access to Health Care: OHP Standard
Loss of OHP and lack of current insurance lead to higher unmet need

Was there ever a time in the past 6 months when you needed care but did not get it?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Continuously enrolled</th>
<th>Not continuously enrolled</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td>60.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Currently insured</th>
<th>Currently uninsured</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>32.0%</td>
<td>65.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percent Responding “YES” to Unmet Health Care Need.

*Significantly different, p<.01.
Loss of OHP and lack of current insurance lead to higher unmet need, even for urgent care...

When you needed care right away for an illness or injury, how often did you get care as soon as you wanted?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Continuously enrolled</th>
<th>Not continuously enrolled</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Currently insured</td>
<td>36.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currently uninsured</td>
<td>66.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significantly different, p<.01.*
Cost was a major reason for not getting needed care...

- Cost Too Much: 72%
- Did Not Have Copay: 15% (Continuously Enrolled), 26% (Not Continuously Enrolled)
- Owed Provider Money: 15% (Continuously Enrolled), 16% (Not Continuously Enrolled)
- Do Not Have Dr.: 9% (Continuously Enrolled), 16% (Not Continuously Enrolled)
- Insurance Not Accepted: 4% (Continuously Enrolled), 30% (Not Continuously Enrolled)
- Could Not Get Appt.: 8% (Continuously Enrolled), 20% (Not Continuously Enrolled)
- No Transportation: 6% (Continuously Enrolled), 16% (Not Continuously Enrolled)

Note: Categories Are Not Mutually Exclusive. Will not sum to 100%.
Former OHP Standard clients report there have been occasions when they have not purchased prescription medications due to cost...

Percent reporting could not afford prescription medications.

★ Significantly different, p<.05.
OHP Standard clients who lost coverage were more likely to report unmet mental health care needs...

Percent who reported needing but not receiving mental health care.

☆ Significantly different, p<.01.
Loss of OHP Standard coverage particularly affected those with chronic conditions...

Unmet Need Among People with Chronic Conditions**

**Diabetes, Asthma, Hypertension, CHF, Emphysema

Significantly different, p<.01
Former OHP Standard respondents were more likely to report ED as Usual Source of Care...

- **None**
  - Continuously enrolled: 9%
  - Not continuously enrolled: 24%

- **ED**
  - Continuously enrolled: 2%
  - Not continuously enrolled: 9%

- **Private Clinic**
  - Continuously enrolled: 57%
  - Not continuously enrolled: 39%

- **Public Clinic**
  - Continuously enrolled: 18%
  - Not continuously enrolled: 18%

*Significantly different, p<.01*
Section III
Impacts on Utilization:
OHP Standard
Former OHP Standard clients utilize primary care services less...

% with 1 or more primary care visits

- Continuously enrolled: 83%
- Not continuously enrolled: 55%

*Significantly different, p<.01
Loss of coverage increased Emergency Department use, especially among lowest income group...

% with at least 1 ED visit past 6 months

*Significant difference, p<.05
Continuous enrollment mitigates ED use for lowest income persons with chronic illness...

% of Chronically ill with at Least 1 ED Visit in Last 6 Months

Continuous enrollment vs. Not continuously enrolled:

- 0% to 10% FPL:
  - Continuously enrolled: 35%
  - Not continuously enrolled: 30%

- 10% + FPL:
  - Continuously enrolled: 55%
  - Not continuously enrolled: 29%

*Significant difference, p<.05.
Conclusion and Implications

- **Enrollment – Standard Population**
  - Most who lost coverage remained uninsured.
  - Premium Cost was most common reason for loss of coverage.
  - Lowest income group was disproportionately affected by cost sharing.
  - Most would reapply if premiums were decreased.
Conclusion and Implications

- Access
  - Those who lost coverage had higher unmet needs for medical care, urgent care, mental health care and prescription medications.
  - Persons with chronic illness who lost coverage were more likely to report unmet health care needs.
  - Cost was primary reason for unmet health care needs.
Conclusion and Implications

- **Utilization**
  - Those who lost coverage were nearly 3 times more likely to have no usual source of care and were 4-5 times more likely to report the Emergency Department as usual source of care.
  - Those who lost coverage were less likely to have a primary care visit.
  - Loss of coverage increased the likelihood of an ED visit among individuals in the lowest income group especially those with chronic conditions.
Data Limitations

- Analysis is based on preliminary mail-return data including only the English speaking population.
- Data on enrollment, access, and utilization are based on self-report.
- Survey respondents may have higher rates of chronic illness than general OHP population.
- This is the baseline, cross-sectional survey and associations may not be causal.
Next Steps

- This is the baseline survey for a proposed longitudinal cohort design.
- Funding is currently being sought to complete 2 additional surveys at 12 and 18 months using a combination of mail and telephone surveys.
- Follow-up surveys will allow causal analysis of the impact of program changes on OHP Standard.