Connecticut Health Care Costs

How much does Connecticut spend on health care?

In 2009 Connecticut spent $30.4 trillion dollars on health care. That is $8,653.57 for every state resident.¹

Projections for future spending had been that, without intervention, that trend would accelerate.² However there is potential good news. US health care cost growth moderated significantly as the overall economy slowed in 2008. However the slowdown in health costs pre-dated the 2008 recession, suggesting that structural changes to the system, such as generic drugs, encouraging preventive care and reforming payment to reward quality, may be working to bring costs in line.³ And there are indications that the slowdown in health cost inflation is continuing as the national economy recovers.⁴

In 2009, health care consumed 13 cents of every dollar spent in Connecticut’s economy and that proportion was rising as well.⁵
Health care costs largely track the rest of Connecticut’s economy. It is true that total health spending in Connecticut averaged 7.9% annual increases from 1980 to 2009, higher than the 6% growth rate for our overall state economy (Gross State Product, GDP). However, when overall economic growth slows, health care spending growth does as well.\footnote{vi}

Per person health care costs vary significantly by population and payer source in CT. Medicare beneficiaries have the highest health care spending per person, followed by state employees, private commercially or self-insured state residents, with Medicaid members the least expensive on average.\footnote{vii} It is important to note that there additional wide variability within each of these groups.
Who pays?

The share of health bills paid by government has risen significantly over the last two decades. Surprisingly, although the total costs of health care for households have risen, the proportion of total costs paid by households has declined. The share paid by private businesses has remained largely steady.

Where do we spend our health care dollar?

Almost half of Connecticut health care spending goes to hospitals and physicians. Prescriptions make up 15% of spending and nursing homes 10%. 
Mirroring national trends, the proportion of Connecticut health spending devoted to prescriptions is growing faster than the rest of health care, but that may not be a bad thing. Appropriate use of prescriptions for many conditions can keep patients out of hospitals and more expensive care.

What is driving rising health costs?

- Market consolidation – Competition keeps prices down and Connecticut’s health care market is very concentrated. One Connecticut insurer controls more than half the individual health plan market. Hospital mergers and the trend toward larger physician practices are creating fewer, larger providers increasing negotiating power and eventual costs.
- Prices – Prices for health services are rising faster than for other parts of the economy. Between 2009 and 2010, prices for outpatient care rose 10% while prices in the general economy grew 1.6%. Prices for health care services can
vary by five fold in the same community, with no clear link to quality. Higher US health care spending is driven mainly by higher prices for care than other industrialized countries, far more than utilization, supply or quality of care.  

- Expensive medical technology – New technologies, drugs and devices in health care are estimated to account for up to 65% of the growth in health care spending, far more than any other factor including the aging of our population, prices or administrative costs.  

- Obesity – Obesity is associated with 36% higher inpatient and outpatient spending on health care and 77% higher prescription spending. These increases are more than the increased costs of smoking or drinking. It is estimated that increasing levels of obesity drove about 4% of the increase in health spending from 1987 to 2001.  

- Our historic fee-for-service payment system – The vast majority of health care providers are paid based on the number and intensity of services they deliver to patients, generally in-person. Providers are paid more to provide more care to more people, not to prevent or reduce the need for care. Payments are not linked to the quality or effectiveness of the care delivered – good and poor quality care pay the same. Recently there have been significant efforts to align payment incentives to shift from volume-based funding to a system that rewards providers for quality, efficient care.  

- Administrative inefficiencies – It is estimated that 31 cents of every US health dollar is spent on administration, almost twice the rate of other countries with better health outcomes. Fragmentation of our health system has significant costs. Physician offices spend 3 hours/week or three weeks/year just getting paid by insurers. Connecticut insurers spent between 8 and 37% of revenues on administration last year. It is estimated that the US health system could save $130 billion/year if services were delivered efficiently and that excessive administrative costs, including profit, cost the system another $190 billion/year.  

- Overtreatment and inappropriate care – There is wide variability between health care settings and communities in the costs of care for identical conditions. It is estimated that across just hospital care for three conditions (hip replacement, colon cancer and heart attacks), bringing high cost, high treatment hospitals up to the performance of high quality providers could reduce spending by 8%, saving the US health system over $1 billion each year and giving an extra year of life to 11,500 people. Eliminating preventable medical errors could save the US as much as $16 billion/year and eliminating redundant tests would save $8 billion. Many new drugs and treatments are widely adopted because they are new, before their effectiveness has been tested. The federal government has begun a large investment in Comparative Effectiveness Research to study new
treatments and learn whether they are any better than what they replaced and whether they are worth the extra cost. It is critical that health care payers, such as the state, incorporate that new research into payment and prevention policies. xxiii

- Prevention – Missed opportunities to prevent disease are a significant driver of health costs. It is estimated that increasing the use of clinical preventive services could save the US over $55 billion/year. xxiv

What isn’t driving health costs (or not as much as we think)?

- Medical malpractice – While it may be a cost driver for some individual providers, estimates place medical malpractice, and resulting defensive medicine, costs at only 2.4% of all health care. Reducing medical malpractice premiums by 10% is estimated to result in savings of less than 1% of total medical care. xxv

- Prescription drugs – While spending on prescription drugs has increased faster than the rest of health care over the last 30 years, that growth has moderated recently. There is also some evidence that increased prescription spending may be more than compensated for by reductions in hospital and physician costs by preventing or managing disease. xxvi

- Aging – About 8,000 baby boomers turn 65 every day, qualifying for Medicare. As we age, health needs and costs rise. So it is understandable that many believe that our aging American population is driving rising health costs. However, economists estimate that the increasing age of the population accounts for only 2% of the increase in health costs, far less than other factors. xxvii

- Consumers do not bear the full cost of increases – Since consumers in traditional health plans pay the same copayments whether they seek treatment from a high or low price provider, they have no incentive to price-shop. It has often been suggested that reversing this incentive, or giving consumers some “skin in the game”, will bring competitive market forces to bear and reduce prices. Unfortunately, that hasn’t happened. Consumer-directed health plans, that force consumers to use their own funds to self-pay many health costs, have not been demonstrated to reduce overall costs. While costs for consumers enrolled in the plans are lower, members reduce the use of both unnecessary and necessary preventive and maintenance care. There is also evidence that consumer-directed health plans attract healthier members, leaving consumers with more costly health problems in traditional coverage, raising those costs. It is very difficult to price-shop as an individual consumer, and most do not have the sophistication or the information to know what they need and judge the quality of providers to get the best valuexxviii.
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