ACCESS TO HEALTH CARE AFTER THE AFFORDABLE CARE ACT
After Medicaid expansion and the launch of WA Healthplanfinder, uninsurance rates drop significantly in both the health safety net population and general adult population.

The largest reductions in uninsurance rates were experienced by adults, Seattle residents, non-Hispanic adults, low-income adults, and unemployed adults.

Although uninsurance rates dropped significantly, there are still eligible low-income residents in need of insurance:
- In 2014, roughly 1 in 5 health safety net medical users remain uninsured
- And roughly 1 in 6 health safety net dental users remain uninsured
- And roughly 1 in 4 King County residents income-eligible for Apple Health have not enrolled (2015)

Availability of primary care providers accepting adult Medicaid members fell between 2013/2014 and 2015; appointment wait times have not increased.

Data access barriers and fragmentation continue to limit health reform evaluation and measurement of progress towards equity.

Successful evaluation of health reform in King County will require increased data sharing and transparency, as well as cross sector and cross agency collaboration.
Health care reform comes at a time of great need, with persistent health disparities despite rising costs of care.
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**Sources:** Health expenditures per capita, 2013 and life expectancy at birth, 2013 (World Bank); Social expenditures per capita, 2011 (OECD)
Health follows wealth, and the United States suffers from extreme income inequality.

Income inequality

Sources: Income inequality, 2011 (OECD); mortality, 2009-2013 (WA Department of Health, death records); household income, 2009-2013 (American Community Survey)
Health care disparities in King County

Disparities across multiple ACA-relevant indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Worse</th>
<th>Same</th>
<th>Better</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age 18-24</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-44</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-64</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65+</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIAN</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiple</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NHPI</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; High school graduate</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school graduate</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some college</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College graduate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>East Region</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Region</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seattle</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Region</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adults age 18-64 with no health insurance by Health Reporting Area, King County, 2008-2012
The Affordable Care Act was designed to promote health equity, better health overall, and lower costs.

The first step for King County was to ensure that the benefits of the ACA reached those with the greatest need.
Public health analysis guides targeted outreach and enrollment efforts

Adults age 18-64 with no health insurance by Health Reporting Area, King County, 2008-2012

1. Identify neighborhoods with largest numbers of eligibles
2. Monitor success and identify remaining areas of need
3. Target outreach and enrollment events
King County saw great success with first year of health insurance enrollment.

Sources: WA Health Benefit Exchange & WA Health Care Authority. Historical estimates by APDE. Revised 8/12/14.
Public health analysis continues to guide on the ground enrollment efforts

**SPRING 2015**

Top 29 ZIPS with largest *estimated* number of income-eligible adults not enrolled in Apple Health or QHPs with tax credits

**Source:** Enrollments – Health Benefit Exchange, Health Care Authority; Adults age 18-64 by ratio of income to FPL (<138%, 138-399%) – American Community Survey 2009-2013
With these early successes with enrollment, King County’s second step is to **assure** that improved access to health care leads to health equity, better health overall, and lower costs.
Conceptual framework for QA and evaluation of the Affordable Care Act

Policy change

Affordable Care Act 1/1/2014

1. Equitable access for all
   - Access
   - Utilization

2. Improve quality and patient experience
   - Quality
   - Patient experience
   - Capacity

3. Reduce per capita cost
   - Cost

Long-term impact

- Improve health of all populations
- Population health

Fundamental policy goals

- Improve equitable access for all
- Improve quality and patient experience
- Reduce per capita cost

Topic Areas

- Access
- Utilization
- Quality
- Patient experience
- Capacity
- Cost
- Population health

Equity Lens

The 10 Essential Public Health Services

- Monitor health
- Investigate health problems
- Enforce health regulations
- Assure provision of health services
- Assure competent health workforce
- Evaluate health services
- Research new health solutions
- Inform, educate, empower
- Mobilize community partnerships
- Develop policies
# QA & Evaluation Framework to monitor ACA impact in King County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic area</th>
<th>Indicator areas</th>
<th>Illustrative indicators</th>
<th>Data sources</th>
<th>Data availability*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Access</td>
<td>Coverage, Unmet need, Affordability</td>
<td>Uninsurance, Not seeking care d/t cost, Enrollment</td>
<td>ACS, BRFSS, HBE, CHARS</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Viscits per capita, Routine checkup past year, Avoidable hospitalizations</td>
<td>BRFSS, CHARS, DCHS, ProviderOne</td>
<td>Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilization</td>
<td>Percent using any care</td>
<td>Evidence-based practices, Health outcomes</td>
<td>ProviderOne, WHA Community Checkup</td>
<td>Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality</td>
<td></td>
<td>Clinical Process Measures (e.g. Heart Failure Care)</td>
<td>ProviderOne, WHA Community Checkup</td>
<td>Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patient experience</td>
<td>Satisfaction with health care received</td>
<td>Satisfaction with health care received</td>
<td>BRFSS, CAHPS</td>
<td>Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity</td>
<td>Plan network adequacy, Health provider capacity</td>
<td>Per capita supply of HCPs, Accepting new patients</td>
<td>OIC, Safety net, Mystery shopper</td>
<td>Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost</td>
<td>Total costs of health care per capita</td>
<td>Estimated price of inpatient (all) and total (Medicaid) care</td>
<td>CHARS, ProviderOne</td>
<td>Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population health</td>
<td>Preventive services, Health status</td>
<td>Late/no prenatal care, Child immunization rate, Fair/poor health status</td>
<td>Vital stats, WSIIS, BRFSS</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Good data availability is defined here as routinely collected, low-cost/free data available on the King County level by sub-populations (i.e. equity lens).

The PHSKC framework in action:

In 2014 and 2015, has access to health care improved among those with the greatest need?
3 ways to measure changes in access to care after the ACA

1. Track uninsurance rates in the health safety net population

2. Track access to primary care and specialty providers among Apple Health members

3. Track uninsurance and other access to care indicators in the general adult population
Uninsurance among the health safety net population
In this report, the health safety net includes providers that deliver a significant level of health care to uninsured, Medicaid, and other vulnerable patients:
- By legal mandate or explicitly adopted mission, they offer care to patients regardless of ability to pay

Report includes 8 organizations that are part of the King County Health Safety Net System:
- Receive city and county funding to serve uninsured, under-insured and vulnerable populations
- 7 are designated as Federally Qualified Health Centers (FQHCs)\(^1\)
- All FQHCs that operate in King County are included in this report
- Harborview Medical Center’s Pioneer Square Clinic (not an FQHC) is also included because of its mission and the vulnerable population it serves

Looking at the total King County population in 2014:
- 1 in 11 residents received medical services through the health safety net (179,081 clients)
- 1 in 25 residents received dental services (86,503 clients)
- 1 in 5 residents is income-eligible for Apple Health\(^2\) (2013)
- Click [here](#) for a demographic comparison of medical safety net users and the general population

Notes:
1. County Doctor, HealthPoint, International Community Health Services, Neighborcare, PHSKC’s Public Health Centers (PHCs), SeaMar, Seattle Indian Health Board
2. Source: American Community Survey 2013 data. Note: this includes children and adults income-eligible for Apple Health (98% of all Apple Health enrollees), and excludes the 2% of enrollees with AEM, Family Medical, and Pregnant Women coverage.
Medical uninsurance rates fall after Medicaid expansion and the launch of WA Healthplanfinder

**Annual change before ACA: 2006-2013**

**Change between 2013 & 2014 after ACA**

Data Source: Community Health Services Division, PHSKC
Dental uninsured rates fall after Medicaid expansion and the launch of WA Healthplanfinder

**Annual change before ACA: 2006-2013**

**Change between 2013 & 2014 after ACA**

**Legend**
- Significantly better
- No significant change
- Significantly worse

**Data Source:** Community Health Services Division, PHSKC
Measuring equity – absolute versus relative disparity explained

Medical unemployment rate by race/ethnicity, 2013

- Hispanic: 47%
- Multiple: 47%
- White: 43%
- AIAN: 40%
- Black: 31%
- NHPI: 30%
- Asian: 27%

**Absolute disparity** measures the public health impact of inequality. For example, if Hispanic medical users had the same unemployment rate as Asian users, this would translate to ~10,000 fewer uninsured Hispanic residents. An absolute disparity of ZERO indicates perfect equality.

**Relative disparity** can identify inequality even when the number of people impacted is small. This is particularly important for very rare events, such as cancer or death. A relative disparity of ONE indicates perfect equality.

- **Absolute** disparity measures the public health impact of inequality. For example, if Hispanic medical users had the same unemployment rate as Asian users, this would translate to ~10,000 fewer uninsured Hispanic residents. An absolute disparity of ZERO indicates perfect equality.

- **Relative** disparity can identify inequality even when the number of people impacted is small. This is particularly important for very rare events, such as cancer or death. A relative disparity of ONE indicates perfect equality.
Comparing medical insurance disparities in 2013 versus 2014

Change in absolute disparity from 2013 to 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Change in Absolute Disparity (Percentage Points)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regions</td>
<td>-0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seattle neighborhoods</td>
<td>-7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race/ethnicity</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income as % of FPL</td>
<td>-4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-24.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Change in relative disparity from 2013 to 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Change in Relative Disparity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regions</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seattle neighborhoods</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race/ethnicity</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income as % of FPL</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Legend:
- Significantly better
- No significant change
- Significantly worse

Data Source: Community Health Services Division, PHSKC
Interpreting the 2013-2014 change in medical uninsurance disparities

Race/ethnicity

- Increase in disparities driven by a widening gap between Asians (lowest pre-ACA rate) and Hispanics (highest pre-ACA rate)
- Barriers to insurance coverage remain for adults with less than 5 years of US residence or undocumented immigration status

Seattle neighborhoods

- Area with highest pre-ACA uninsurance rate (North Seattle) and area with lowest pre-ACA rate (Southeast Seattle) saw similar reductions in uninsurance
- Thus, absolute disparity decreased (i.e. fewer people affected) and relative disparity stayed the same

Age

- Substantial decrease in disparities as adults catch up to children
- Child uninsured rates dropped prior to 2014 due to Medicaid income eligibility expansion and the ACA mandate that dependents can be covered by parental/guardian plans up to age 26
Comparing **dental** insurance disparities in 2013 versus 2014

**Change in absolute disparity from 2013 to 2014**

- **Regions**: -4.0
- **Seattle neighborhoods**: -24.1
- **Race/ethnicity**: -12.4
- **Income as % of FPL**: 0.1
- **Gender**: -0.5
- **Age**: -32.4

**Change in relative disparity from 2013 to 2014**

- **Regions**: 1.0
- **Seattle neighborhoods**: 0.7
- **Race/ethnicity**: 1.1
- **Income as % of FPL**: 1.2
- **Gender**: 1.0
- **Age**: 0.7

**Legend**
- **Significantly better**
- **No significant change**
- **Significantly worse**

**Data Source**: Community Health Services Division, PHSKC
Interpreting the 2013-2014 change in **dental** uninsurance disparities

**Race/ethnicity**

- Group with highest pre-ACA uninsurance rate (AIAN) and group with lowest pre-ACA rate (NHPI) saw similar reductions in uninsurance.
- Thus, absolute disparity decreased (i.e. fewer people affected) and relative disparity stayed the same.

**Seattle neighborhoods**

- Substantial reduction in absolute and relative disparities driven by the larger reduction in Central & Downtown (highest pre-ACA rate), as compared to Southeast Seattle (lowest pre-ACA rate).

**Age**

- Substantial decrease in absolute and relative disparities as uninsurance rate among adults moves closer to the rate among children.
Except for uninsurance rates, post-ACA client demographics show little change.

**Medical users – 2014 vs 2013**

- **UNINSURED**
  - -16%

- **RESIDENCE**
  - North Region
  - East Region
  - South Region
  - North Seattle
  - Central & Downtown
  - Southwest Seattle
  - Southeast Seattle

- **RACE/ETHNICITY**
  - AIAN
  - Asian
  - Black
  - Hispanic
  - NHPI
  - Multiple
  - White

- **INCOME AS % OF FPL**
  - 100% and below
  - 101-150%
  - 151-200%
  - Over 200%

- **GENDER**
  - Female
  - Male

- **AGE**
  - 0-5
  - 6-12
  - 13-18
  - 19-34
  - 35-59
  - 60-74
  - 75 and over

- **Veterans**
- **Homeless**
- **Limited English-Speaking**
- **Persons with Disabilities**

**Dental users – 2014 vs 2013**

- **UNINSURED**
  - -13%

- **RESIDENCE**
  - North Region
  - East Region
  - South Region
  - North Seattle
  - Central & Downtown
  - Southwest Seattle
  - Southeast Seattle

- **RACE/ETHNICITY**
  - AIAN
  - Asian
  - Black
  - Hispanic
  - NHPI
  - Multiple
  - White

- **INCOME AS % OF FPL**
  - 100% and below
  - 101-150%
  - 151-200%
  - Over 200%

- **GENDER**
  - Female
  - Male

- **AGE**
  - 0-5
  - 6-12
  - 13-18
  - 19-34
  - 35-59
  - 60-74
  - 75 and over

- **Veterans**
- **Homeless**
- **Limited English-Speaking**
- **Persons with Disabilities**

**Data Source:** Community Health Services Division, PHSKC.

**Notes:** AIAN – American Indian/Alaska Native; NHPI – Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander; FPL – Federal Poverty Level
Access to primary care and specialty providers among Apple Health members
Mystery shopper survey (MSS):
- Interviewer’s purpose unknown by the respondent
- Interviewers called providers acting as an uninsured resident of King County

Massachusetts Medical Society has conducted Physician Workforce Study since 2005

King County MSS objectives:
- Assess validity of Medicaid Managed Care online provider directories
- Estimate health care provider availability and wait times before and after Medicaid expansion for adult Apple Health clients

Measured at three time periods:
- Dec 2013 (Primary care providers [PCPs])
- April 2014 (PCPs)
- April 2015 (PCPs, OB/GYNs, Orthopedic surgeons)
PCP availability falls significantly in 2015, no significant change in wait times

Percent of primary care providers accepting adult Medicaid patients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Dec '13/ Apr '14 (n=481)</th>
<th>Apr '15 (n=76)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>34% *</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Median wait time for routine adult checkup

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Dec '13/ Apr '14 (n=212)</th>
<th>Apr '15 (n=30)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wait time</td>
<td>7 days</td>
<td>9 days</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
1. Source: PHSKC mystery shopper survey of Medicaid Managed Care-contracted providers
2. Difference between surveys assessed with Adjusted Wald test (PCP accepting Medicaid) and Hodges-Lehmann median difference (wait time)
3. * Difference between 2013/2014 and 2015 statistically significant (p-value < 0.05)
4. Wait times are for providers who are accepting any MCO plan
FQHC PCP availability continues to remain higher than private practice

Percent of primary care providers accepting adult Medicaid patients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Dec ‘13 / Apr ‘14</th>
<th>Apr ‘15</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All clinics</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FQHCs</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private practice</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All clinics</td>
<td>34% *</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FQHCs</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private practice</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
1. Source: PHSKC mystery shopper survey of Medicaid Managed Care-contracted providers
2. * Difference between 2013/2014 and 2015 statistically significant (p-value < 0.05)
Average number of MCO plans accepted increases among FQHC PCPs

Average number of MCO plans accepted by providers accepting Medicaid

- All clinics: 2.9
- FQHCs: 3.8
- Private practice: 2.6
- All clinics: 3.6
- FQHCs: 4.9 *
- Private practice: 3.3

Notes:
1. Source: PHSKC mystery shopper survey of Medicaid Managed Care-contracted providers
2. * Difference between 2013/2014 and 2015 statistically significant (p-value < 0.05)
Inaccurate PCP contact information continues to challenge surveys

Percent of PCPs with an accurate online phone number

- **MCO directories - NPs**: 28%
- **MCO directories - MDs & PAs**: 34%
- **MCO directories - NPs**: 15% *
- **WSMA directory - MDs & PAs**: 46% *

**Notes:**
1. Source: PHSKC mystery shopper survey of Medicaid Managed Care-contracted providers
2. * Difference between 2013/2014 and 2015 statistically significant (p-value < 0.05)
3. In 2015 for the first time PHSKC was provided Medical Doctor and Physician Assistant contact information by the WA State Medical Association (WSMA)
4. Nurse Practitioner contact information extracted from online MCO provider directories for all surveys
5. Click [here](#) for explanation of how phone numbers were identified as inaccurate in the April 2015 survey
A first look at access to specialty providers in April 2015

Percent of providers accepting adult Medicaid patients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provider Type</th>
<th>Accepting Medicaid Patients</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OB/GYNs</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orthopedic Surgeons</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Median wait time for appointment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provider Type</th>
<th>Wait Time (Days)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OB/GYNs</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orthopedic Surgeons</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average number of MCO plans accepted by providers accepting Medicaid

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provider Type</th>
<th>Average MCO Plans</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OB/GYNs</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orthopedic Surgeons</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percent of providers with an accurate phone number

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Provider Type</th>
<th>Accurate Phone Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OB/GYNs</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orthopedic Surgeons</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
1. Source: PHSKC mystery shopper survey of Medicaid Managed Care-contracted providers
2. OB/GYN and orthopedic surgeon appointments for a 1st prenatal care appointment at 8 weeks and routine exam for knee pain, respectively
3. Provider contact information was provided by the WA State Medical Association (WSMA)
4. Wait times are for providers accepting any MCO plan
Uninsurance in the general adult population
In the general adult population, uninsurance rates fall in 2014 for some groups.

Data Source: Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System, 2000-2014
Additional adult indicators to be available soon...

Access to care
- Uninsured at some point in last year
- Uninsured for a year or more
- Unmet medical need due to cost
- Non-cost-related reasons for delaying medical care
- Medical debt

Population health
- Not screened for mammography
- Not screened for colorectal cancer
- No flu vaccine
- Fair/poor health status
- Serious psychological distress
- Excessive alcohol consumption

Utilization of care
- No routine checkup in past year
- No dental visit in past year

Patient experience
- Less satisfied with health care received
Barriers to measuring progress in King County and potential solutions
### Addressing data fragmentation in King County and WA state

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic Areas</th>
<th>Major Barriers</th>
<th>Potential Solutions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Equity Lens</td>
<td>Fragmentation of/limited access to administrative and clinical data forces reliance on surveys (sample sizes too small for equity analysis)</td>
<td>Build robust HIE infrastructure Pay for survey over-samples</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access</td>
<td>No one has access to all enrollment data</td>
<td>HCA, HBE, OIC, and OFM collaborate on unified health reform evaluation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilization</td>
<td>No one has access to all claims data</td>
<td>All payer claims database (APCD) through OFM, if government/researchers can be guaranteed affordable access</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality Cost</td>
<td>No price transparency</td>
<td>Sentinel provider network Health system-sourced capacity data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capacity</td>
<td>No one monitoring population-level access to care Inaccurate provider directories limit surveys</td>
<td>Integration of CAHPS data across agencies Analysis of consumer grievance data</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patient Experience</td>
<td>Population-level, representative patient experience info either not collected OR not accessible for in-depth analysis</td>
<td>State’s Link4Health and other regional solutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population health</td>
<td>No existing HIE for all health care providers</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Next steps for health reform evaluation in King County
## The road ahead

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic Areas</th>
<th>Next steps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Equity Lens** | Advocate for core equity lens in all evaluation frameworks in WA state  
Pursue access to large administrative health databases for equity tracking  
Continue to investigate novel methods for measuring equity |
| **Access** | Continue to advocate for synergy in heath reform evaluation in WA state & the US  
Continue to pursue detailed enrollment data from the Health Benefit Exchange  
Continue to track access to care in safety net and overall adult population |
| **Utilization**  
**Quality**  
**Cost** | Begin working with Medicaid claims data through HCA data sharing agreement  
Continue to advocate for affordable and unfettered access to APCD |
| **Capacity** | Publish recommendations for system capacity monitoring based on PHSKC surveys  
Investigate use of consumer grievance data for monitoring capacity |
| **Patient Experience** | Investigate use of CAHPS and other survey data for population-level analysis |
| **Population health** | Continue to track health outcomes through survey and vital statistics data  
Advocate for access to state's Clinical Data Repository (Link4Health) |
APPENDIX

See 2013-14 report for complete description of ACA QA/Evaluation framework and methodology.

FOR MORE INFORMATION, CONTACT:
Assessment, Policy Development & Evaluation Unit
Public Health - Seattle and King County
Phone: 206.263.8786 | Email: data.request@kingcounty.gov
Demographics in 2013: Medical users versus the overall King County population

**Data Source:**
- Health safety net – Community Health Services Division, PHSKC
- Overall King County population – US Census Bureau, American Community Survey, 2013

**Legend**
- AIAN: American Indian/Alaska Native
- NHPI: Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander
- FPL: Federal Poverty Level
Each phone call is assigned to a call status category:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Survey</th>
<th>Complete interview</th>
<th>Inaccurate phone number</th>
<th>Not applicable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Primary care provider</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OB/GYN</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orthopedic surgeon</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reasons for inaccurate phone number include:
- Requested provider was never at the practice location
- Requested provider is no longer at the practice location
- Phone number was non-working or a fax machine number
- Phone number was provider’s personal line
- Long hold time (After 2 attempts on different days)

Reasons for not applicable interviews include:
- PCP: specialty/venue (e.g. cardiology, ED), patient/service restrictions (e.g. low-income patients only, school-based health center, WIC office)
- OB/GYN: specialty (e.g. GYN only), patient/service restrictions (e.g. High-risk pregnancies only, ultrasound only)
- Orthopedic surgeons: specialty excludes knees (e.g. hand and wrist only)
Indicators included in summary health care disparities figure by demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographic category</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Race/ethnicity</th>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Employment</th>
<th>Region</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Insurance coverage</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unmet medical need</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual checkup</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual dental visit</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mammography screening</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorectal cancer screening</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cholesterol screening</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flu shot</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Childhood vaccinations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair/poor health status</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate prenatal care</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uncompensated hospital care</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Timeline for acquiring pre- and post-ACA data used in the Framework

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data source</th>
<th>Pre-ACA data acquisition date†</th>
<th>Post-ACA data acquisition date‡</th>
<th>Time from 1/1/14 to post-ACA data acquisition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACS</td>
<td>12/6/14</td>
<td>12/6/15</td>
<td>23 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRFSS</td>
<td>4/1/14</td>
<td>4/1/15</td>
<td>15 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHARS</td>
<td>1/1/15</td>
<td>1/1/16</td>
<td>24 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HBE</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mystery shopper survey</td>
<td>1/1/14</td>
<td>6/1/14</td>
<td>5 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ProviderOne</td>
<td>2015 Q1-Q2</td>
<td>2015 Q1-Q2</td>
<td>~18 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vital statistics</td>
<td>12/31/14</td>
<td>12/31/15</td>
<td>24 months</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WSIIS</td>
<td>3/1/14</td>
<td>9/1/14</td>
<td>8 months</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

†Pre-ACA = 2013 or any time period before 2014.  
‡Post-ACA = After January 1, 2014.

ACS – American Community Survey; BRFSS – Behavioral Risk Factor Surveillance System; CHARS – Comprehensive Hospital Abstract Reporting System; HBE – Health Benefit Exchange; TBD – To be decided; WSIIS – Washington State Immunization Information System.