Testimony for the Record
Northwest Portland Area Indian Health Board

Before:

Senate Committee on Indian Affairs

"Promises Made, Promises Broken: The Impact of Chronic Underfunding of Contract Health Services"

December 3, 2009

Chairman Dorgan, Vice-Chair Barrasso, and members of the Committee, thank you for this opportunity to provide our testify for the record and for conducting this very important hearing on "Promises Made, Promises Broken: The Impact of Chronic Underfunding of Contract Health Services."

The Northwest Portland Area Indian Health Board (NPAIHB) was established in 1972, as a P.L. 93-638 tribal organization that represents forty-three federally recognized Tribes in the states of Idaho, Oregon, and Washington.[1] The Board facilitates consultation between Northwest Tribes with federal and state agencies, conducts policy and budget analysis, manages a Tribal epidemiology center, and operates health promotion and disease prevention programs. Our Board is dedicated to improving the health status and quality of life of all American Indian and Alaska Native (AI/AN) people.

I. Federal Trust Relationship

The United States and the federal government have a duty and an obligation—acknowledged in treaties, Executive Orders, statutes, and court decisions—to provide for the health and welfare of Indian Tribes and their members. In order to fulfill this legal obligation to Tribes, it has long been the policy of the United States to provide health care to AI/ANs through a system of the Indian Health Service programs, Tribal health programs, and urban clinics. These services are provided to members of 567 federally-recognized tribes in the United States, located in thirty-five different states.

II. Indian Health Disparities

The Indian Health Care Improvement Act (IHCIA) declares this Nation's policy to elevate the health status of the AI/AN people to a level at parity with the general U.S. population. Over the last thirty years the IHS and Tribes have made great strides to improve the health status of Indian people through the development of preventative, primary-care, and community-based public health services. Examples are seen in the reductions of certain health problems between 1972-74 and 2000-2002: gastrointestinal disease mortality reduced 91 percent, tuberculosis mortality reduced 80 percent, cervical cancer reduced 76 percent, and maternal mortality reduced 64 percent; with the average death rate from all causes dropping 29 percent.[2]

Unfortunately, while Tribes have been successful at reducing the burden of certain health problems, there is strong evidence that other types of diseases are on the rise for Indian people. For example, national data for Indian people compared to the U.S. all races rates indicate they are 770 percent more likely to die from alcoholism, 650 percent greater to die from tuberculosis, 420 percent greater to die

[1] As defined in the Indian Self-Determination and Education Assistance Act, P.L. 93-638, 25 U.S.C., Section 450(b) a Tribal organization is a legally established governing body of any Indian tribe(s) that is controlled, sanctioned, or chartered by such Indian Tribe(s) and designated to act on their behalf.

[2] FY 2000-2001 Regional Differences Report, Indian Health Service, available: www.ihs.gov.

from diabetes complications, 91 percent greater to die from suicide, and 52 percent more likely to die from pneumonia and influenza.[3] Northwest data indicates a growing gap between the AI/AN death rate and that for the general population. In 1994, average life expectancy at birth for AI/ANs born in Washington State was 74.8 years, and is 2.8 years less than the life expectancy for the general population. For 2000-2002, AI/AN life expectancy were at 74 years and the disparity gap had risen to 4 years compared to the general population. The infant mortality rate for AI/AN in the Northwest declined from 20.0 per 1,000 live births per year in 1985-1988 to 7.7 per 1,000 in 1993-1996, and then showed an increasing trend, rising to 10.5 per 1,000 in 2001.[4]

What is alarming about this data is the fact that there is evidence that the data may actually ***underestimate*** the true burden of disease among AI/ANs because, nationally and in the Northwest, people who classify themselves as AI/AN are often misclassified on death certificates. Unfortunately, it is safe to say that the improvements for the period of 1955 to 1995 have slowed; and that the disparity between AI/AN and the general population has grown. Factors such as obesity and increasing rates of diabetes contribute to the failure to reduce disparities.

III. Portland Area Tribes

The IHS Portland Area Office provides access to health care for forty-three federally recognized Tribes in the states of Idaho, Oregon, and Washington. Fifty-five different health facilities provide an array of health services to an estimated 167,000 AI/AN people. A range of health services are provided through thirty-nine outpatient health centers, thirteen health stations and preventive health programs, and three urban programs. The health centers provide a wide range of clinical services and are open forty hours each week. Health stations provide a limited range of clinical services and usually operate less than forty hours per week. Preventive programs offer counselor and referral services. The three urban programs provide direct medical care in addition to outreach and referral services.

Twenty-nine of the health centers are tribally operated, while ten are federally operated. One of the health stations is federally operated, while the remaining thirteen are tribally operated. There has been a decline in direct care outpatient visits in the Portland Area falling from 954,375 visits reported in FY 2006, down to 736,025 in FY 2007. This decline is attributed to the meager CHS budget increases as many services were likely reduced to absorb costs of inflation and population growth. There are no hospitals in the Portland Area, therefore inpatient and specialty care services that are not available in health facilities must be purchased through the CHS program. This is an important distinction that

[3] Jon Perez, Testimony before the U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, briefing, Albuquerque, NM, Oct. 17, 2003.
[4] American Indian Health Care Delivery Plan 2005, American Indian Health Commission of Washington State, available at: www.aihc-wa.org.

makes IHS Areas like the California, Bemidji, Nashville, and Portland Areas highly reliant on the CHS budget—and are commonly referred to as "***CHS Dependent***" Areas.[5]

IV. The IHS Contract Health Service Program

The IHS Contract Health Service (CHS) program originated under the Department of Interior, Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) when authority to enter into health services contracts for AI/ANs was provided under the Johnson O'Malley Act of 1934. The program was continued when responsibility for Indian health was transferred from the BIA to the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare in 1955 when IHS was established. The CHS program is used to supplement and complement other health care resources available to eligible AI/ANs. The CHS program is administered through twelve IHS Area Offices that include 163 IHS and Tribal service units. The CHS program purchases health care services for IHS beneficiaries from non-IHS providers. Purchasing health care services from non-IHS providers is essential to the overall IHS health care delivery system, as many IHS hospitals and clinics cannot provide these services. These services are critical for Tribes that do not have access to needed clinical services. The CHS funds are used in situations where:

1. No IHS direct care facility exists,
2. The direct care facility cannot provide the required emergency or specialty services,
3. The direct care facility has an overflow of medical care workload.

The CHS budget supports essential healthcare services from non-IHS or Tribal facilities and include, but is not limited to, inpatient and outpatient care, routine and emergency ambulatory care, medical support services including laboratory, pharmacy, nutrition, diagnostic imaging, and physical therapy. Some additional services include treatment and services for diabetes, cancer, heart disease, injuries, mental health, domestic violence, maternal and child health, elder care, refractions, ultrasound examinations, dental hygiene, orthopedic services, and transportation. The agency applies stringent eligibility rules and uses a medical priority system in order to budget CHS resources so that as many services as possible can be provided.

The regulations at 42 CFR, Part 136 require that CHS services must be authorized or no payment will be made. Non-emergency services must be pre-authorized and emergency services are only authorized if notification is provided within 72 hours of the patient's admission for emergency treatment. The agency also has adopted the financial position that it is the Payer of Last Resort. This requires patients to exhaust all health care resources available to them from private insurance, state health programs, and other federal programs before IHS will pay through the CHS program. The IHS also negotiates contracts with providers to ensure competitive pricing for the services provided; however, there may be only one

[5] ***CHS Dependent*** Areas are those Areas of the IHS that rely on the CHS program for all of their inpatient care which include the California and Portland Areas, and; for nearly all their inpatient care in the Bemidji and Nashville Areas.

or a limited number of providers or vendors available to the local community. The CHS authorizing official from each IHS or Tribal health program either approves or denies payment for an episode of care. If payment is approved, a purchase order is issued and provided to the private sector hospital. CHS regulations permit the establishment of priorities based on relative medical need when funds are insufficient to provide the volume of care needed. Because of insufficient funding in the CHS program, many IHS and Tribal health programs begin the year at a Priority One level.[6]

V. **CHS Funding**

The CHS budget is the most important budget item for Northwest Tribes since there are no hospitals in the Portland Area. CHS dependent Areas lack facilities infrastructure to deliver health services and have no choice but to purchase inpatient and specialty care from the private sector. Nationally, the CHS program represents 19 percent of the total health services account. In the Northwest, the CHS program represents 30 percent of the Portland Area Office's budget. This makes the CHS budget the most critical budget line item for Portland Area Tribes. Our estimates indicate that the CHS program has lost at least $732 million due to unfunded medical inflation and population growth since 1992.[7] This has resulted in rationing of health care services using the CHS medical priority system, in which most patients in the Portland Area cannot receive care unless they are in a Priority One status. In FY 2008, this under-funding resulted in a backlog of over 300,000 health services that were not provided because there simply was not enough funding. These services were not provided because they did not fall within the medical priorities, administrative processes were not followed, or a patient had moved outside of the CHSDA.[8] What is most concerning is that the patients requiring CHs services continue to need care. The patients are put onto a "denied/deferred" services status and when health programs receive funding for the new fiscal year, most health programs begin clearing this backlog of service.

This process immediately puts many Portland Area Tribes into a Priority One status at the beginning of each fiscal year. Postponing treatment often results in higher costs once a patient is finally able to receive care. In other instances patients will quit reporting to Tribal health facilities because they know that the health program is in a Priority One status and funding is limited. They know their required health care services may be denied or deferred, so they don't seek health care. Because of this, the data used to estimate denied/deferred services is often incomplete and can never accurately estimate the complete level of unfunded CHS need.

---

[6] CHS Prioritized Levels of Care available at: www.ihs.gov/NonMedicalPrograms/chs/index.cfm

[7] "The FY 2010 IHS Budget: Analysis and Recommendations," p. 25, June 10, 2009, available at: www.npaihb.org.

[8] 42 CFR Part 136, Subparts A–C. Subpart C defines a Contract Health Service Delivery Area (CHSDA) as the geographic area within which contract health services will be made available by the IHS to members of an identified Indian community.

Table 12: Contract Health Services (CHS) Lost Purchasing Power 1993 - 2009 (Dollars in Thousands)					
Year	Approved Budget	Required CHS Budget with Medical Inflaton	Un-funded Medical Inflation	Un-funded Population Growth	Total Unfunded
FY 1992	$ 308,589	(Base Year)			
FY 1993	$ 328,394	$ 331,425	$ 3,031	$ 6,480	$ 9,511
FY 1994	$ 349,848	$ 354,260	$ 4,412	$ 6,896	$ 11,308
FY 1995	$ 362,564	$ 373,635	$ 11,071	$ 7,347	$ 18,418
FY 1996	$ 362,564	$ 390,428	$ 27,864	$ 7,614	$ 35,478
FY 1997	$ 368,325	$ 406,744	$ 38,419	$ 7,614	$ 46,033
FY 1998	$ 373,375	$ 419,433	$ 46,058	$ 7,735	$ 53,793
FY 1999	$ 385,801	$ 438,218	$ 52,417	$ 7,841	$ 60,258
FY 2000	$ 406,000	$ 414,350	$ 8,350	$ 8,102	$ 16,452
FY 2001	$ 445,773	$ 444,570	$ (1,203)	$ 8,526	$ 7,323
FY 2002	$ 460,776	$ 490,350	$ 29,574	$ 9,240	$ 38,814
FY 2003	$ 475,022	$ 518,373	$ 43,351	$ 9,500	$ 52,851
FY 2004	$ 479,070	$ 536,558	$ 57,488	$ 9,581	$ 67,069
FY 2005	$ 498,068	$ 557,836	$ 59,768	$ 9,961	$ 69,729
FY 2006	$ 517,297	$ 581,959	$ 64,662	$ 10,346	$ 75,008
FY 2007	$ 543,099	$ 605,714	$ 62,615	$ 11,405	$ 74,020
FY 2008	$ 579,334	$ 648,854	$ 69,520	$ 12,166	$ 81,686
FY 2009	$ 634,477	$ 636,688	$ 2,211	$ 12,166	$ 14,377
		Eighteen Year Total:	**$ 579,608**	**$ 152,520**	**$ 732,128**

There are at least two ways to calculate the amount of additional funding needed in the CHS program. The first is to take the IHS denied/deferred services reports and apply an average outpatient cost to the number of services. Last year, 300,779 unfunded services would have been approved had adequate funding been available. Applying an average outpatient rate of $1,107 to these services estimates that an additional $333 million was needed for the CHS program in FY 2008. Adding this amount to the approved FY 2010 CHS budget indicates that minimally, the CHS program needs at least $1.1 billion. Another method of calculating additional funding needed in the CHS program, is to estimate the unfunded inflation and population growth over a period and apply that amount to the current funding level. Since 1992, we estimate that the CHS program has not received adequate funding for mandatory cost of inflation ($579.6 million) and population growth ($152.5 million) and that the CHS budget should be at least $1.5 billion in FY 2010.[9]

The reason the CHS budget has eroded so badly is due to the fact that the Administration—or IHS—has not requested adequate increases; or that the Congress have failed to provide adequate increasese to cover inflation and population growth. The CHS program is more vulnerable to inflation pressures than any other program in the Indian health system. CHS budget increases have averaged 4.5 percent over

[9] The FY 2010 CHS budget is $779.3 million + our estimates for unfunded inflation $579.6 million + unfunded population growth $152.5 million equals a CHS budget of at least $1.5 million in FY 2010.

the last ten years, despite the fact that medical inflation has exceeded 10 percent in many of these years. Similar public health programs like Medicaid obtain budget increases that are based on actual medical inflation estimates. The Medicaid program has averaged an annual budget increase of 7.5 percent over the same period. The CHS program should receive medical inflation adjustments equal to the Medicaid program since both provide similar services and purchase care from the private sector. Medicaid's enrollment in FY 2008 grew by 2.2 percent and is comparable to the growth rate of 2.1 percent for IHS, so population growth alone does not justify the higher inflation rate for Medicaid. Surely, the relatively small Indian Health Program is not able to secure better rates from providers than the Medicare and Medicaid programs. It is reasonable to expect that Medicaid program inflation rates will exceed 12 percent in FY 2010. It seems clear that CHS, while an efficient alternative to building hospitals and specialty clinics, is subject to higher rates of inflation than the rest of the IHS budget and should be provided with an appropriate budget increase annually.



Almost all Tribes in the Northwest contribute Tribal resources to complement their health budgets and most often for the CHS program. Tribes in the Northwest see resources needed for economic development and other priorities increasingly absorbed by health care expenses in violation of treaty obligations of the federal government to provide for these health care services. If Tribes do not provide these resources the situation would be drastically worse and Congress must be aware of this.

VI. Denied/Deferred Services

The IHS maintains a deferred and denied services report that is updated each year. The report is inclusive of CHS data from IHS direct operated health programs and includes limited data from Tribally-operated health programs. Unfortunately, the denied/deferred services report **understates** the true need of CHS resources due to the data limitations and the fact that many tribes no longer report deferred or denied services because of the expense involved in tracking. More disturbing is that many IHS users do not even visit health facilities because they know they will be denied services due to funding shortfalls. Thus, using the denied/deferral report to estimate funding shortfalls in the CHS

program is not always appropriate because it under represents the amount of funding required to address unmet need.

IHS FY 2007 CONTRACT HEALTH SERVICE PROGRAM DEFERRED & DENIED SERVICES REPORT ALL AREA OFFICES January 22, 2008										
		Denied Service Categories								
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	I	
IHS AREA	Deferred Services Within Med Priorities	Eligible But Care Not Within Med. Priority	Eligible But Alternate Resource Available	Patient Ineligible for CHS	Emergency-Notification Not Within 72 Hours	Non-Emergency No Prior Approval	Patient Resides Outside CHSDA	IHS Facility Available & Accessible	All Other Denials	TOTAL
Aberdeen	*7,895*	9,116	17,463	2,409	774	3,357	2,565	3,969	1,398	41,051
Alaska	*2,785*	*1,463*	5,472	602	129	3,459	464	1,389	478	13,456
Albuquerque	*3,383*	2,078	4,448	223	220	66	1,180	186	256	8,657
Bemidji	*2,278*	572	1,909	872	964	1,930	617	626	1,811	9,301
Billings	*14,319*	6,707	4,740	1,227	236	3,577	1,529	3,118	187	21,321
California	*2,123*	318	1,308	352	303	274	25	13	7,532	10,125
Nashville	*1,927*	2,650	237	234	362	412	137	218	103	4,353
Navajo	*75,673*	2,654	16,247	229	1,311	523	602	2,026	2,779	26,371
Oklahoma	*45,159*	*5,069*	1,313	89	1,262	2,961	856	2,869	8,381	22,798
Phoenix	*2,720*	1,941	9,457	546	922	906	1,307	1,538	922	17,539
Portland	*3,389*	*2,562*	1,916	1,525	1,425	3,440	187	500	0	11,555
Tucson	*100*	*25*	1,535	93	125	14	173	1	11	1,977
TOTALS	***161,751***	***35,155***	***66,045***	***8,401***	***8,033***	***20,919***	***9,642***	***16,453***	***23,858***	***188,504***

The denied/deferred service issue is a special concern for CHS dependent Areas. When a patient is not authorized to receive care; or does not report to a health clinic because they will be denied care, their visit will not be counted in IHS user population or workload reports. This is important, because user population and workload data drive many funding formulas to allocate IHS resources, including CHS funding. Those Areas with inpatient hospitals can generate more workload and users and internalize costs associated with providing care that would normally be purchased by CHS dependent Areas. Hospital based systems can provide care in some of these instances and get to count the patient visit in their user population and workload data. The effect of this is that CHS dependent Areas may not receive a fair share of resources if they cannot deliver the same level of care as those Areas that have inpatient care.

VII. Catastrophic Health Emergency Fund

The CHS program also includes a Catastrophic Health Emergency Fund (CHEF) that covers high cost cases and catastrophic illness. The term "catastrophic illness" refers to conditions that are costly by virtue of the intensity and/or duration of their treatment. Cancer, burns, high-risk births, cardiac disease, end-stage renal disease, strokes, trauma-related cases such as automobile accidents and gunshot wounds, and some mental disorders are examples of conditions that frequently require multiple or prolonged hospital stays and extensive treatment after discharge. The CHEF is used to help offset high cost CHS cases that meet a threshold of over $25,000 per incident. In FY 2008, the CHEF program provided funds

for 1,084 high cost cases totaling $26.7 million. For FY 2010 the CHEF fund has been increased to $48 million and should cover a higher level of catastrophic CHS claims.

One of the most fundamental distinctions in the IHS system is the dichotomy between those Areas that have hospitals and those that are CHS dependent. This division is a result of a decades old facility construction process that prioritizes dense populations in remote areas over small populations in mixed population areas. The priority for facility construction may have been logical at one time, however, over time has created two types Areas—those that are hospital based with expanded health services and those that are CHS dependent with limited ability to provide hospital like services. Unlike hospital based Areas that can provide specialty care services, CHS dependent Areas must purchase all specialty care utilizing CHS resources. The core issue is that IHS hospital level care can substitute for CHS purchased services in some Areas but not in others. Yet the annual distribution of CHS funds does not consider this fundamental exchange. This problem and the resulting reductions in access to care will continue as long as access to CHS funds are considered in isolation from access to directly provided hospital care. The impact of this problem is compounded in the CHS dependent Areas by organization structure and IHS policy on access to the CHEF. This inequity is depicted in the graph below comparing those CHS dependent Areas to those that have hospital based services. Clearly, the average CHEF claims for those CHS dependent Areas has lagged significantly behind those Areas that have hospital services.



CHS dependent Areas are disadvantaged in three fundamental ways. First they lack access to inpatient and specialty services such as radiology, specialty diagnostics, laboratory, and pharmacy services. These types of services tend to be associated with hospital based facilities. Comparatively, CHS dependent Areas have very few facilities with specialty services and limited pharmacy. In CHS dependent Areas access to services is restricted not only by the general underfunding, but also by the fragmentation of

resource into a large number of independently operated Tribal health programs. This can result in excess funds in one operating unit while other operating units are denying even life threatening care.

Lastly the relatively high threshold for access to CHEF disproportionably impacts CHS dependent Areas, where hospital services cannot be substituted for CHS coverage. This is because rational management of small CHS pools leads to policies that restrict high cost cases in favor of extending program activity to all four quarters of the year. One proof of this analysis is the persistent pattern of comparative CHEF utilization between two similarly sized IHS Areas one with hospital capacity and one without. A decade long comparative analysis of California Area and Billings Area CHEF utilization indicates a persistent rate for Billings Area that is 500 percent higher than that for the California Area.

CHS Funding Distribution Methodology

The most important issue for CHS dependent Areas is the distribution methodology used to allocate CHS resources. In 2001, a CHS Workgroup proposed a new distribution methodology that arguably has never been officially adopted by previous IHS Directors. The former CHS distribution methodology was made up of three components with a percentage appropriated to each as follows: (1) Workload and Cost – 20 percent; (2) Years of Productive Life Loss – 40 percent, and; (3) CHS dependency – 40 percent.

The former methodology carried a greater weight for CHS dependency than the new formula, which resulted in slightly more funding for CHS dependent Areas to deal with the unique circumstances of not having access to inpatient or specialty care. The previous formula's CHS dependency component was not adopted by the CHS Workgroup because it was felt that it did not adequately relate to the population being served, nor did it recognize that all Areas have some degree of CHS dependence, and was reportedly distorted when applied to operating unit level data. This position was not unanimous within the CHS Workgroup that developed the formula, with the previous formula components supported by those CHS Dependent Areas. Because the workgroup did not use a consensus process, the new changes were accepted based on a of majority support. Since there are only four CHS dependent Areas, defending the former CHS methodology was a losing proposition. The effect of the revised formula is that it will result in significantly less funding for CHS dependent Areas.

In 2001, understanding the contention of the newly proposed CHS funding methodology, the IHS Director decided to distribute the $34.9 million CHS funding increase on a non-recurring basis using a blended formula. One half of the funding was distributed using the existing formula at the time, and the other half was distributed using the Workgroup's *proposed* formula.[10] The following fiscal year (2002), the IHS Director again allocated on a non-recurring basis the FY 2001 increase ($34.9 million) and the FY 2002 increase ($15 million) "using the FY 2001 blended formula", which was *based on a blend of the*

[10] See "Dear Tribal Leader Letter", by Dr. Michael H. Trujillo, IHS Director, dated June 7. 2001.

former formula and the formula recommended by the 2001 CHS Workgroup.[11] Finally, in FY 2003, Dr. Charles Grim, IHS Director, made final the $49 million distribution by allocating the funds on a recurring basis using the "FY 2002 formula".[12] The slight increase of $10 million that was provided by Congress in FY 2003 was not adequate to fully fund medical inflation; therefore the new formulary portion was not applied. While the IHS Director indicates his "plan was to distribute increases in the future" using the proposed formula, it leaves in question whether the CHS Workgroup proposed formula has ever been officially adopted by the IHS. Certainly, the previous IHS Directors never officially adopted it in light of their use of a blended formula when allocating funding increases in FY 2001, FY 2002, and FY 2003.

It is the position of Portland Area Tribes that new CHS formula has never been officially adopted through the use of "Dear Tribal Leader" letter that that is the common practice of the IHS when making substantive policy changes. In fact the IHS Director's decision letters in FY 2001 and FY 2002 state the following:

> "I support the Workgroup's strong recommendation to convene a follow-up Workgroup to address these issues," and; "..the decision regarding recurring allocation can be deliberated more comprehensively with contemporary and agreed upon data. By using this approach, it is my hope that we will continue our dialogue on the outstanding issues related to the disparity between need and the resources available for CHS."

The statements above indicate that then IHS Director, Dr. Michael Trujillo, intended to continue to work to refine the CHS formula. There has not been a CHS funding increase sufficient until FY 2009 for the IHS to apply the new formulary components, in which the Agency allocated a $20.1 million increase using the proposed 2001 Workgroup formula. Because the formula has never officially been adopted by the IHS, the IHS should have conducted Tribal Consultation to determine if the Tribes would prefer to use the blended formula adopted by previous IHS Directors when there were CHS funding increases in 2001, 2002, and 2003; or use the 2001 Workgroup proposal. It is the position of Portland Tribes that this is not a closed case and the IHS Director should consult with Portland Area Tribes over this matter.

Another concern related to the CHS funding methodology is the use of inflations rates that are not indicative of actual medical inflation. It is recommended that Congress direct the IHS to use actual medical inflation rates to purchase inpatient and outpatient hospital care when determining inflation amounts for CHS distributions to Tribes.

---

[11] See "Dear Tribal Leader Letter", by Dr. Michael H. Trujillo, IHS Director, dated December 31, 2001.
[12] See "Dear Tribal Leader Letter", by Dr. Charles W. Grim, IHS Director, dated April 10, 2003.

VIII. Recommendations

1. It is the position of Portland Tribes that the proposed formula developed by the 2001 CHS Workgroup has not been officially adopted by the IHS and that the Agency should continue to consult with Tribes over its continued use. The IHS Director should also convene a new CHS Workgroup to revisit the CHS formula to consider the following:
    a. Alternate resources (Medicaid, Medicare, Private Insurance, and changes under health reform) when making CHS distributions.
    b. CHS Dependency
    c. Use of actual medical inflation when allocating CHS funding.

2. The unique circumstances of CHS Dependent Areas must be addressed by the IHS and Congress in national and internal health reform, otherwise these systems will continue to be plagued with chronic underfunding and may not be able to capitalize on health care coverage expansions that will come with health reform.

3. To address the lack of access to the CHEF, it is recommended that Congress consider establishing an intermediate risk pool for CHS dependent Areas.