CONFIDENTIAL

LEGISLATIVE BILL REVIEW FORM: 2016

Bill Number: H.761 **Name of Bill:** An act relating to cataloguing health care performance measures

Agency/ Dept: AoA **Author of Bill Review:** Devon Green/Robin Lunge

Date of Bill Review: 5/6/16 **Related Bills and Key Players** S.255 and H.812

Status of Bill: (check one): _____Upon Introduction _____ As passed by 1st body _X__As passed by both

Recommended Position:

_X__Support _____Oppose _____Remain Neutral _____Support with modifications identified in #8 below

Analysis of Bill

1. **Summary of bill and issue it addresses.** *Describe what the bill is intended to accomplish and why.*
Requires the Green Mountain Care Board, Agency of Human Services, and Vermont Medical Society to examine current quality/performance measures for primary care physicians and come up with a plan to reduce and align the measures and submit the plan to SHW and HHC by 1/15/17.

2. **Is there a need for this bill?** *Please explain why or why not.*
Providers, such as primary care physicians, have to deal with a number of quality measures. It would help their practices if they were more streamlined to reduce administrative burden .

3. **What are likely to be the fiscal and programmatic implications of this bill for this Department?**
No fiscal implications. Programmatic implications-- AoA will likely want to be involved or keep track of this to see how it aligns with quality measures required by MCOs and quality measures required by ACOs.

4. **What might be the fiscal and programmatic implications of this bill for other departments in state government, and what is likely to be their perspective on it?**
GMCB: Will have to dedicate resources to doing this, but already has a good grasp on quality measures
AHS: Will have to contribute what they know about quality measures and ensure federal compliance

5. **What might be the fiscal and programmatic implications of this bill for others, and what is likely to be their perspective on it?** (f*or example, public, municipalities, organizations, business, regulated entities, etc)*
No fiscal implications.
Vermont Medical Society: Supports this bill
ACOs: Will be interested in plan because it will potentially affect their quality measures
MCOs/Insurers: Will be interested in plan because it will potentially affect their quality measures

6. **Other Stakeholders:**

   6.1 Who else is likely to support the proposal and why?
   Primary care physicians—this may reduce their administrative work.

Please return this bill review as a Microsoft Word document to Jahala.Dudley@vermont.gov & Jessica.Mishaan@vermont.gov

6.2 Who else is likely to oppose the proposal and why?
No one.

7. **Rationale for recommendation:** *Justify recommendation stated above.*
Necessary to align standards among providers and payers, while reducing administrative burden for providers.

8. **Specific modifications that would be needed to recommend support of this bill***:* *Not meant to rewrite bill, but rather, an opportunity to identify simple modifications that would change recommended position.*
None.

9. **Will this bill create a new board or commission AND/OR add or remove appointees to an existing one? If so, which one and how many?**
No.

Secretary/Commissioner has reviewed this document: ____Robin Lunge_____ Date: _5/6/16_____

Please return this bill review as a Microsoft Word document to Jahala.Dudley@vermont.gov & Jessica.Mishaan@vermont.gov