1	
2	COMMONWEALTH OF PENNSYLVANIA HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
3	HOUSE OF REFRESENTATIVES HOUSE AGING AND OLDER ADULT SERVICES COMMITTEE
4	OLDER ADOLI SERVICES COMMITTEE
5	
6	MAIN CAPITOL BUILDING ROOM 60 EAST WING
7	HARRISBURG, PENNSYLVANIA
8	
9	WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 18, 2009
10	9:04 A.M.
11	IN RE: PUBLIC HEARING ON
12	
13	IMPROVING END-OF-LIFE EXPERIENCES FOR PENNSYLVANIANS
14	
15	
16	BEFORE:
17	HONORABLE PHYLLIS MUNDY, CHAIRMAN HONORABLE TIM HENNESSEY
18	HONORABLE KAREN BOBACK HONORABLE MICHELE BROOKS
19	HONORABLE VANESSA LOWERY BROWN HONORABLE PAUL J. DRUCKER
20	HONORABLE MAUREE GINGRICH HONORABLE WILLIAM C. KORTZ, II
21	HONORABLE DEBERAH KULA HONORABLE BARBARA MCILVAINE SMITH
22	
23	BRENDA S. HAMILTON REPORTING
24	P.O. BOX 165 ELM, PENNSYLVANIA
25	717.627.1368 FAX 717.627.0319

		2
1	(CONT'D)	
2	HONORABLE DUANE MILNE HONORABLE RICHARD MIRABITO	
3	HONORABLE MARGUERITE QUINN HONORABLE EDDIE DAY PASHINSKI	
4	HONORABLE STEVE SAMUELSON	
5	HONORABLE ROSEMARIE SWANGER HONORABLE KEN SMITH	
6	HONORABLE RANDY VULAKOVICH	
7		
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

		<u> </u>
1	ALSO PRESENT:	
2	CHARLES QUINNAN, MAJORITY EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR	
3	SHARON SCHWARTZ, MINORITY EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR SUZANNE CHADWICK, LEGISLATIVE ASSISTANT	
4	DDENDA C HAMTIMON DDD	
5	BRENDA S. HAMILTON, RPR REPORTER - NOTARY PUBLIC	
6		
7		
8		
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

			4
1	INDEX		
2	NAME	PAGE	
3	INTRODUCTORY REMARKS BY:		
4	HONORABLE PHYLLIS MUNDY, CHAIRMAN OF THE AGING AND OLDER ADULT SERVICES	5	
5	COMMITTEE		
6	HONORABLE TIM HENNESSEY	6	
7	TESTIFIERS:		
8 9 10	JOSEPH STRATON, M.D., M.S.C.E., ASSISTANT PROFESSOR, FAMILY MEDICINE AND COMMUNITY HEALTH, UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA; CHIEF MEDICAL OFFICER, PENN WISSAHICKON HOSPICE	9	
11	HONORABLE JOHN MICHAEL HALL, SECRETARY OF THE DEPARTMENT OF AGING	60	
121314	ANN S. TORREGROSSA, DIRECTOR OF THE GOVERNOR'S OFFICE OF HEALTH CARE REFORM	79	
15	SUSAN GERHART, NATIONAL DIRECTOR OF REIMBURSEMENT AND OUTCOMES	122	
16	ASERACARE HOSPICE		
17			
18			
19			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			

PROCEEDINGS

3 | - -

2.2

CHAIRMAN MUNDY: Good morning, everyone.

Good morning. We were just slightly delayed this morning. Not a problem. And it's good to have some of our members here on what turned out to be a nonsession day.

I'd like to welcome you to the House

Aging and Older Adult Services Committee. This is
a public hearing on end-of-life issues.

And the purpose of the hearing is to discuss the report and recommendations issued by the Governor's Task Force for Quality at the End of Life, improving end of life experiences for Pennsylvanians.

The report brings to light some troubling findings. Less than a quarter of Pennsylvanians die at home despite the fact that an overwhelming majority would prefer to do so. Hospice use among Pennsylvanians is low with only 25 -- 21 percent of those age 65 and older having used Hospice in the last year of life.

Less than one percent of health care providers in the Commonwealth are certified in

palliative care, and pain is often managed poorly despite the ready availability of safe and effective treatments.

As a committee, I believe it's important that we utilize all available resources in our efforts to enhance the well being of older Pennsylvanians. All too often studies and reports end up on the shelf and never get the attention that they deserve.

So I'm glad we have the opportunity today to examine the important work of the task force, and I look forward to a productive dialogue.

Chairman Hennessey, would you like to say a few words?

REPRESENTATIVE HENNESSEY: Thank you, Madam Chairman.

I'm pleased to be with you here today to listen and learn from experts who practice in end-of-life situations.

Many of us have probably experienced family situations where we recognize the sad reality of losing a loved one. And that is a singular event and has emotional consequences that we were forced to deal with.

But sometimes the onset of death really

is accompanied by the distress of an extended end of life. That's excruciating not just for the dying but for the family members who have to sit and see and witness this on a day-to-day basis.

Add to that the -- the emotional trauma -- add to the emotional trauma the financial burdens that people have to recognize, and sometimes you destroy a nest egg that you intended for a surviving spouse.

So you can see the consequences of this kind of thing can play out on several levels.

As individuals none of us can really be prepared for that; but as a Commonwealth, we do have the ability to help our fellow citizens by drawing upon the shared experiences of all our citizens.

We can make difficult situations more manageable and more predictable and less

Draconian. And today's hearing will give us an insight into what the future can hold for all of us and for our viewers who are watching us across the Commonwealth and hopefully help us to prepare to manage the difficult or -- difficult ordeal if and when it comes.

Thank you, Chairman Mundy, for convening

```
1
      this hearing and thanks to our presenters.
 2
                CHAIRMAN MUNDY: Would the members of our
      committee please introduce yourselves to the
 3
      audience.
 4
 5
                REPRESENTATIVE DRUCKER: Are you talking
      to me? I'm -- I'm Paul Drucker, 157th District.
 6
 7
      That's Chester and Montgomery County.
 8
                REPRESENTATIVE McILVAINE SMITH: Barb
 9
      McIlvaine Smith, Chester County.
10
                REPRESENTATIVE WILLIAMS: Jewell
11
      Williams, Philadelphia County.
12
                REPRESENTATIVE MILNE: Duane Milne,
13
      Chester County.
                REPRESENTATIVE BROOKS: Michele Brooks,
14
      portions of Crawford, Mercer, and Lawrence
15
16
      counties.
17
                REPRESENTATIVE VULAKOVICH: Randy
18
      Vulakovich, Allegheny County.
                REPRESENTATIVE SAMUELSON: Steve
19
      Samuelson from Lehigh Valley.
20
21
                MR. QUINNAN: Chuck Quinnan, Democratic
22
      executive director to the committee.
23
                CHAIRMAN MUNDY: Phyllis Mundy from
24
      Luzerne County. I'm chairman of the committee.
25
                REPRESENTATIVE HENNESSEY: Tim Hennessey
```

```
1
      from Chester County.
 2
                MS. SCHWARTZ: Sharon Schwartz,
      Republican executive director for the committee.
 3
 4
                REPRESENTATIVE SMITH: Good morning. Ken
      Smith, Lackawanna County.
 5
                REPRESENTATIVE PASHINSKI: Representative
 6
 7
      Eddie Day Pashinski, Luzerne County.
 8
                REPRESENTATIVE MIRABITO: Rick Mirabito,
 9
      Lycoming County.
10
                REPRESENTATIVE KULA: Deberah Kula,
11
      Fayette and Westmoreland County.
12
                REPRESENTATIVE KORTZ: Good morning.
      Bill Kortz, 38th District, Allegheny County.
13
                REPRESENTATIVE BOBACK: Karen Boback,
14
      parts of Luzerne, Columbia, and Wyoming Counties.
15
16
                CHAIRMAN MUNDY: Thank you, members. Our
17
      first testifier this morning is Dr. Joseph Straton,
      assistant professor, family medicine and community
18
      health from the University of Pennsylvania and
19
20
      chief medical officer of Penn Wissahickon Hospice.
21
                Dr. Straton, if you'd please take your
22
      seat and you can begin whenever you're ready.
23
                DR. STRATON: Good morning, everybody.
24
                REPRESENTATIVE PASHINSKI: Good morning.
25
                DR. STRATON: Good morning, everyone.
```

And thank you very much for inviting me to present 2 today.

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Thank you, Chair -- Chairwoman Mundy and all the members of the House Aging and Older Adult Services Committee.

It is -- it's a great honor to be here with you and -- and really to be with you to talk about my great passion in life, which is taking care of people at the end of life.

And as -- as you described, I'm an assistant professor at the University the Pennsylvania. I'm a palliative care and hospice physician, and my whole career is really devoted to taking care of people at the end of life and making this experience great.

And I, you know, think very often as I meet people who may not be as familiar with the -you know, with this type of care and work. You know, especially medical students and nursing students and others.

I'm always asked, how do you do this? How do you spend your life with people who are dying?

And -- and what I've learned is -- is to help people understand that I don't spend my life

with people who are dying. You know, quite the contrary. I spend my life with people who are living.

And -- and so I think very often when we talk about the end of life, it -- it has this feeling of -- of, you know, this initial feeling of sadness or difficulty. But, you know, it's really quite the opposite.

I spend my time with people who are really living much more fully than I live my life on a day-to-day basis because their time is very limited and -- and they're not really focused on the things that I focused on this morning of, you know, darn, I spilled coffee on my suit.

They -- they're really focused on, you know, I've got a limited amount of time. I got to make the most of it. I got to be with my kids, my grandkids, my parents, you know, really focused on the most important things in life.

And -- and the work that I do and I think the work that we're all focused on this morning is how do we assist people to make that time as great as it can be, and -- and just my own personal story, I got into this line of work because my brother died when he was young. He was 26. I was

24. He was being taken care of at the -- at MCP, the Medical College of Pennsylvania, in Philadelphia, and he had -- he had a terrible brain tumor.

But we had together in the hospital my whole family, my brother, my younger brother, my mom, my dad, other family members. We had six weeks together in -- in the hospital where we all got to take care of him, share memories.

And as terrible and tragic as that was, some of the best six weeks of my life, of my family's life, and we all reflect, and what made it great, was the care that we received from the doctors, nurses, social workers, chaplains, everybody who was around us who made this experience -- made this awful experience a very, very positive and memorable experience for us.

And so, again, not -- not to focus on myself or my family but -- but just to note that, you know, the work that we're doing and the -- really the important work that we can do as -- as a Commonwealth is to make sure that everybody has a great experience and so that everybody can, as they're living out final days, weeks, and months, know that they have all the support they need to

make this experience positive and that their family members will, just like me, forever look back on these experiences as, you know, incredibly important memorable and really life-changing events.

And as Chairwoman Mundy introduced, that's not the way -- that's not the experience that many people have right now. Many people feel abandoned. They feel alone. They're -- they're in pain. They're suffering from other symptoms or other distress.

And -- and really our work is to make sure that -- that we're using all the resources that we have available to us and that are really already available to people to make sure that -- that these experiences are the opposite of what they are now. They're not painful. They're not lonely. They're -- they're comforted. Their symptoms are incredibly well managed and that these are very, very positive experiences.

And, again, it's a great honor to present to you, and I'm so grateful for the opportunity so that we can work together in any way -- in every way that we can to change these experiences for people.

The Task Force on Quality at the End of
Life did a tremendous work generating the reports
that they generated to summarize the information
that's available about the current state of affairs
and to suggest recommendations about how we can
change things.

The reports came up with 160 recommendations, each of which is important.

And in my comments I'd like to really focus on -- on your assistance in -- in leading the improvement to access the services that are available. There's so many services that are already available with palliative care programs and hospice programs throughout the Commonwealth.

And one of the key things that I think we need to do is not create new services but just improve access to the services that already exist.

And we really need to improve access to these service, and especially for people -- for aging -- for Pennsylvanians who are 65 years and older.

Well, you know better than I that people in this age group make up about 16 percent of the state population, but four out of five people who die in the state, 80 percent of the people who die

in the state, are 65 years and older.

And so by improving end-of-life services for everyone in the state, we're really improving them for older Pennsylvanians.

And, in addition, Pennsylvanians who are 65 years and older are not dying suddenly. They're not dying unexpectedly. They're, as the report shows, they're dying from chronic illnesses.

They're dying from illnesses such as cancer, heart disease, lung diseases such as emphysema, from kidney disease.

So said another way, people aren't dying from these diseases. They're living with these illnesses. And -- and our job is that, as they're living with these illnesses, that we can make sure they have all the support they need, that in the final days, weeks, and months that their experiences are great.

And -- and these are the illnesses that can most benefit from hospice and palliative care services.

When I teach medical students and nursing students, people often say, what the heck is the difference between palliative care and hospice?

And it's very confusing because palliative care and

hospice are really focused on the same thing.

They're focused on improving quality of life by reducing distress and really by aggressively managing symptoms and other forms of distress. So they really do the same thing.

Palliative care services are -- are not as well defined as hospice services. We have three hospitals in our health system. We have palliative care services in all of the three hospitals, and each service looks different.

Hospice services are much more uniform because they're really well defined by Medicare and other insurance programs. So I think of hospice programs as insurance defined programs of providing palliative care.

And so all hospice programs look pretty similar. They all have physicians, nurses, home health aides, social workers, chaplains, volunteers, and many others, and provide a pretty set -- set of services, standard set of services, to people who enroll in them.

Palliative care programs provide similar services, but -- but in very disparate ways.

They're just not as well defined because it's not a insurance defined program.

1 I'll focus a lot of my talk or

legislative districts.

presentation about hospice because hospice is so well-defined and it's similar throughout all of the counties you represent. And -- and really there are great services available in all of your

What we need to do is make sure that people are aware of these services and improve access to them. And so I think that's the way that we can get the biggest bang for the buck, is to just take the services that are already available and make sure that people are aware of them.

And so just by doing that we can dramatically improve the end-of-life experience for older Pennsylvanians.

And so improving access is critically important for two reasons. First and foremost, there are numerous studies that demonstrate the positive impact that hospice and palliative care have on the quality of life for people who are dying and for their families.

And, second -- a second reason that's critically important, or at least that I see, is I see the effect of it every single day. As the lead physician for Penn's hospice, I oversee the daily

care for 250 people in five of the counties that we already spoke about here today.

The large majority of these patients are 65 years and older. Many of these people or most people are living at home. Many people are living in nursing homes. Many people are living in inpatient facilities.

And every day, every single day, my team and I are thanked by patients and families for all the physical care they received. For all the emotional support that they received, and we're told every single day that -- how our services help somebody live more fully and helped their family feel confident and supported.

And every day we're told by people we wish we had known about this sooner. Had we known about it sooner we would have enrolled in hospice sooner, we would have taken advantage of these services sooner.

As the reports demonstrate, about 30 percent of people enroll in hospice in the last seven days of life. About half of people enroll in hospice for only 20 days of life. And the Medicare hospice benefit provide services 180 days or longer.

The recommendation is -- or people can enroll in the last six months of life, but most people only enroll in about the last two or three weeks of life.

By us getting the word out about these services that are provided to people that are already paid for, that cost us nothing in addition to what's already provided, by just getting the word out, people can enroll sooner and really benefit from these services.

And so I think two simple and inexpensive ways to improve access to hospice and palliative care services throughout the Commonwealth are these.

First, that as a committee, I think that you have the capability to lead an effort to promote -- to promote awareness throughout the Commonwealth. And so just by promoting -- you know, if there's a way that this committee can lead the promotion of awareness of these services, then we can just -- we can increase access to services that are already paid for through insurance benefits or through Medicare.

Currently, Pennsylvanians find out about hospice and palliative care services by word of

mouth. They find out from their friends, their family members, their physicians. And as -- as we've already known people find out too late. This is not an effective way of finding out about it.

So I think as a committee there may be a way that we can lead an awareness campaign throughout the state so people can find out about this sooner.

And by finding out about these services sooner, I think it's the second important task ahead of us, is that we would be able to dispel the myths about hospice care or end-of-life decision making.

The more people know about hospice and palliative care services the more likely they are to talk about it, the more likely they are to talk with their physicians and clinicians about it, and to say in the office, you know, doctor, I heard about hospice. Sounds like a great thing. You know, what is it?

And -- and that way doctors and other health care providers would have the opportunity to counsel their patients about the type of services that are available and also to help promote autonomy for their patients. Where the patients

and the doctors could talk about, you know, what somebody's preferences are, how they would like to live out their days, and how we can take that autonomy or maintain the autonomy by providing decision-making capacity for family members and by making sure that they enroll in the right programs and get the services they need.

So I think, again, it's -- I want to be very clear that it's of the upmost importance that we help people prepare for the end of life and that the best way we can do this is to inform people about the services that are available and to educate patients to have conversations about their wishes with clinicians and with their family members.

I want to thank you once again for inviting me to testify before your committee, and I'd be happy to answer any questions that you have.

Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN MUNDY: Thank you, Dr. Straton, and thank you for your work in this area.

Before I open it up to the other committee members, I wanted to ask you, as you were talking, it struck me that, you know, we as

legislators -- you're saying we as legislators, we as a committee, should make people aware of these services, and it seems to me that the most effective source of information about what's available at end of life would be the medical community. Because obviously that's where people go when they have an illness or when they, you know, are experiencing symptoms, pain, et cetera.

What -- what is the medical community doing to inform itself and -- and become better counselors in terms of what's available for people in palliative care?

DR. STRATON: So they're a lot of initiatives that are currently undertaken so that the medical -- we as a medical community can be informed and that we can be very proactive in talking with patients and families.

The National Hospice and Palliative Care
Organization and the American Academy of Hospice
and Palliative Medicine are aggressively working to
educate physicians throughout the nation about
end-of-life services. So that primary care
physicians and specialists are all aware of what's
available.

And also we're training people in how to

1 have conversations about the end of life. 2 Physicians are people. You know, we're comfortable 3 talking about the things we're talking about. 4 things we're uncomfortable talking about we avoid. 5 And --CHAIRMAN MUNDY: Us, too. 6 DR. STRATON: Yes. I hope my wife isn't 7 8 watching on television. But, right. But if I'm 9 going to be late from work, I sometimes avoid, you 10 know, being proactive in talking about that. 11 And we -- and so I think -- so a lot of what we're doing is -- is training physicians and 12 nurses and others how to talk about end-of-life 13 issues so that we're comfortable about bringing it 14 up and so it's not something that's left to a 15 16 crisis. 17 And within the state, the Pennsylvania 18 Hospice Network is very engaged in bringing 19 hospices together throughout the -- throughout the 20 Commonwealth to -- to work on initiatives 21 throughout the Commonwealth.

So I think there's much that's being done. Not enough certainly that's being done in the medical community.

And one thing that's not being done in

22

23

24

the medical community is kind of bringing people together, doing public service announcements or, you know, other initiatives to make not just patients aware but people throughout.

You know, it's one thing to educate patients, I think it's another thing to just educate people. You know, people like all of us who go to the supermarket and, you know, walk through town to be more aware of hospice.

So it's not just a medical thing. It's just a life thing.

CHAIRMAN MUNDY: Thank you. And the other thing that struck me, you talked about some of the myths about hospice care. Could you give us some examples of what you perceive as myths?

DR. STRATON: I -- a close friend of my family has metastatic breast cancer and -- and she's not responding to chemotherapy. She's in clinical trial.

Another way of describing her is she's dying from metastatic breast cancer. Because she has widely metastatic breast cancer. She's not responding.

She called me up the other day and said, gosh, should I be -- is it time for me to be

thinking about palliative care? And -- and I
thought, boy, four years ago was -- you know,
palliative is aggressive symptom management
throughout the course of illness and you should be
getting that the whole time you're getting
chemotherapy and everything else.

I think what she was saying was, am I dying? Should I be thinking about hospice?

But even she, you know, who I'm a close friend of hers and this is what I do for a living, she avoided calling me because she didn't want to think about these issues.

And -- and even when she had the nerve to call me she brought it up in -- in this kind of couched or coded language.

One of the myths? I think people feel like once hospice is called in they're dying in the next couple of days. So when a clinician finally has the nerve to bring up hospice, I think the myth is that people feel like this is coded language, oh, my gosh, I'm dying tomorrow.

As opposed to, you can bene -- you can bene -- your Medicare pays for this for 180 days at least. So that's one of the myths.

I think that there are myths about

morphine that, oh, if the -- if the doctors and nurses are suggesting morphine that means they're trying to hasten my death. That morphine is equivalent to euthanasia.

Which I -- patients will ask me that or family members will ask me that. And I have to first remind them it's actually illegal for me to do euthanasia. And -- and so, oh, great, okay.

So I think there are myths about euthanasia, myths about morphine, myths about hospice itself.

There are -- I hate to bring it up because I don't want to derail our conversation, but there's the whole myth that when Medicare tried to pay physicians to have conversations about preferences about end-of-life care -- excuse me -- that suddenly that was a death panel.

So I think that there are -- those are among the myths; that hospice means death; that morphine means death, that having conversations about end-of-life care is equivalent to a death panel.

So I carried on. I'm sorry. There are many myths.

CHAIRMAN MUNDY: Oh, no. That was very

interesting. I really appreciate that. Because I -- you know, I think the -- the myths that you talked about are exactly what deter people from getting this very important and -- and helpful treatment.

When I -- when my mother was dying a couple of years ago in -- she was in hospice for the last week. She had been in a nursing home for many years.

And one of the issues that arose was the issue of the nursing home rules and regulations.

Now this was in Florida, not Pennsylvania.

But nursing home rules and regulations versus hospice rules and regulations. And my hospice nurse was telling the family that there are things that I should be able to be doing for your mother that I can't do because she's in the nursing home.

Are there similar conflicts here in Pennsylvania and could you just briefly touch on those?

DR. STRATON: There are. And Joan Teno at Brown University has done a tremendous amount of work in this area. And in our own hospice we've hired a geriatrician and we have a team that's

dedicated to the nursing homes be -- to work within the culture of a nursing homes because they're a community. They have their own specific culture, each one.

And -- and we've learned to provide effective care we need to be, you know, welcomed into the community as knowledgeable members.

But some of the -- some of the challenges of people dying in nursing homes, even though a large percentage of older adults die in nursing homes, and there's a great chance that we're all going to die in nursing homes, that nursing homes are not designed as places where people die. They were designed as a place where people go for restorative care.

And so nursing homes in their -- in their regulations, in the -- in the groups that oversee nursing home care, if people are losing weight, nursing homes, you know, get -- they get dinged for that. If people are -- develop ulcers or wounds on their body, nursing homes -- the -- the accrediting agencies, you know, they can get deficiencies for that. If people die, nursing homes can get deficiencies for that.

Death in a nursing home is -- and dying,

the process of dying is seen as really a negative outcome.

And so nursing homes in many states, and here as well, they try to prevent people from losing weight. So if somebody can't eat, they get a -- they get a tube so they can get tube fed.

And if -- if people are -- if people are dying and they're too ill to get out of bed, sometimes nursing homes will say but we're -- by regulation we have to get you out of bed.

So we'll get dying people into a chair and bring them into community rooms so they can, you know, be this public -- you know, they can sort of die publicly rather than privately.

And so -- so when -- two -- I think two ways to intervene on a local level, each of us, you know, as a hospice and palliative care community, can work within the culture of the nursing home to help think through ways that they can get -- not get around -- make sure that people get the care they need and the nursing home doesn't get deficiencies for people dying or losing weight.

And then I think from a state's standpoint, to make sure that the way we measure nursing homes doesn't get in the way of end-of-life

care.

2.2

CHAIRMAN MUNDY: How about medications?

we will all face as -- as we are dying.

DR. STRATON: Morphine, so morphine is a great medicine for pain, for shortness of breath.

It's a great medicine for many of the things that

Morphine is hard to -- to get in many nursing homes. It's hard in many nursing homes to get what we call as-needed medicines for -- for someone to see that someone has a symptom and then give them medicine as needed.

And so many of the medicines that we usually order in the home as needed, we would tell a family member if your -- you know, if your mother, father, son, has shortness of breath, has pain, please give this medicine as needed.

In the nursing home, we need to order them as standing medicines. You must give this every four hours because it's difficult to give as-needed medicines in nursing homes.

I wish I could think of a statewide fix for these things. In my experience it's really a nursing-home-by-nursing-home, hospice-by-hospice collaboration to make these cultural shifts.

CHAIRMAN MUNDY: Thank you very much,

Dr. Straton. I appreciate your answers.

Representative Pashinski has a question.

REPRESENTATIVE PASHINSKI: Thank you very

much, Madam Chairman.

And thank you very much, doctor, for your testimony.

I -- I was struck by the same thing that Representative Mundy pointed out, that, you know, you're looking towards us as being a body that's going to make the kinds of changes necessary in the medical field, and I -- I had the same feeling. I believe that this should be part of any relationship between a doctor and a patient.

And -- and it seems to me that we have some gaps in a natural transition in our lives from living to dying.

You know, when a person is in the state that you have identified, just recently here, it would seem to me the natural transition would be then to take them from that nursing home and put them into palliative care, hospice care.

What -- from your position, what would need to happen in order to make that transition smooth? And that transition, I would assume, would be best decided by the -- the medical staff that's

attending to that patient.

DR. STRATON: These are great points.

And -- and I -- for many people who are living in nursing homes, they've been living there for maybe months or maybe years, and this becomes home. And so in many ways people don't want to leave their home. They want services brought in to them.

And so I think one interpretation is that how do we make sure that people get all the services they need in the home where they are?

And I absolutely agree with you. I think physician education and education in the nursing home communities about the benefits of palliative care and hospice services is really critically important so that we can — so that those people who are caring for the person in the nursing home or — or for family members who have taken care of somebody in the home or physicians who are taking care of people in the outpatient office or — or in the hospital, they know. They can see these triggers, like, gosh, this is a person who can benefit from those services. I need to call in these services.

And the nursing home, in particular, I think it's critically important that -- that we as

```
1
      a medical community, as you're saying, educate
 2
      nursing homes about what are the -- what are the
 3
      triggers to call in hospice and palliative care
 4
      services that can -- that can benefit people who
 5
      are residing in a nursing home.
                And for those people who are residing in
 6
 7
      a nursing home who need care that they can't get in
 8
      the nursing home, to create smooth and simple
 9
      processes so they can move to a palliative care
10
      setting.
11
                Like we have an inpatient hospice unit
12
      where people move from the nursing home, the
      hospital, or the home to our inpatient -- our
13
      inpatient hospice unit to get that level of care.
14
15
                REPRESENTATIVE PASHINSKI: Are you
16
      satisfied with the medical community's work in
17
      trying to move towards your goal?
18
                DR. STRATON: No. No.
19
                REPRESENTATIVE PASHINSKI: So that's why
20
      you've come to us?
21
                DR. STRATON: Yes. Absolutely. But --
22
      but --
23
                REPRESENTATIVE PASHINSKI:
                                            It's a Catch
24
      22 there.
25
                DR. STRATON: But -- but also coming for
```

two reasons. One, I absolutely agree with you. W have a lot more work to do in the medical community, the nursing community, the social work community, to educate all clinicians about what services are available and how to talk with patients about these services.

I also truly believe that it will be helpful to non-medicalize this to make -- and this is where I'm coming to you. I think something that we can't do as a medical community is make Pennsylvanians at large aware of the services that are available to them, so that -- so that we think of hospice and palliative care as something that all Pennsylvanians should be asking -- like go to your doctor and ask about this.

REPRESENTATIVE PASHINSKI: But that's what I was suggesting, a transition from one phase of your life into the next, it would be a natural transition, you know, if -- if your medical condition warranted it.

DR. STRATON: Yes.

REPRESENTATIVE PASHINSKI: No different than when you get sick you go to the doctor or when you get severely sick you have to go to the hospital.

DR. STRATON: Correct.

REPRESENTATIVE PASHINSKI: And as you're coming towards the end of life, then you -- you may go into a nursing home and then into a hospice or something of that nature.

Can I also ask you, do you have any thoughts on, advance directives or living wills, when that discussion should be initiated?

DR. STRATON: I do. And I actually did quite a bit of research early in my career on -- on advance directives and medical decision making.

I think advance directives comprise several different types of documents. One is a health care decision maker.

So -- so one as me designating my wife as my health care decision maker if -- if I'm not able to make decisions for myself, I think that's something that everybody should do at any point in life.

Because if they don't designate that, you know, then -- then, you know, we have -- fortunately the Pennsylvania legislature passed a provision that determines who the decision makers are. Before that it was -- there was no provision.

But -- but even that provision, you know, may designate people who I might not want making decisions for me.

And so -- so I think it's critically important that everybody at every point in life determines who -- whether they're terminally ill or not -- who their decision maker should be.

Medical directives are things that say, if I'm unable to make decisions for myself and I'm terminally ill, I do or don't want dialysis, I do or don't want CPR.

I -- the research shows that those are very, very difficult decisions. And none of us can really accurately predict -- predict a future state.

I tell the medical students that -- about this topic, that, you know, my wife and I, when we were first engaged, we decided we were going to New Zealand for our honeymoon. Eighteen months later when we were married we went to Nova Scotia. You know, we were only half a globe wrong. But it -- but we couldn't even predict that decision 18 months later. But, you know, there were things like finances, time away from medical school, and all that stuff that got in the way of going to New

1 Zealand. 2 And -- and the same way that I'm -- even though I'm in this business, I don't know what I 3 4 want if I'm in a state 20 years from now or even a year from now. 5 Medical directives are tough. I think 6 7 the most critically important thing is that every 8 single person designate and inform their clinicians 9 of who their decision maker is if they can't make 10 decisions for themself, and then to have a conversation with their decision maker. 11 12 I should have a conversation with my 13 If I get hit, you know, by a car on my way home that I do or do not want these things and then 14 she knows what decisions to make. 15 16 REPRESENTATIVE PASHINSKI: Thank you very 17 much, doctor. 18 DR. STRATON: Thank you. 19 REPRESENTATIVE PASHINSKI: Thank you, 20 Madam Chairman. 21 CHAIRMAN MUNDY: Representative

Madam Chairman.

CHAIRMAN MUNDY: Representative

Samuelson.

REPRESENTATIVE SAMUELSON: You -- you

talked about medical reimburse -- Medicare

reimbursement. What are typical rates for hospice

2.2

23

24

25

care? How much does Medicare reimburse and are there charges above and beyond Medicare which are covered by either insurance or -- or family members? DR. STRATON: I think -- I think Congress in 1982 did a great job of designing the hospice Medicare benefits. And I say that because all of us as we die will probably have multiple illnesses, but we enroll in hospice for just one of those and we still continue our regular Medicare benefit for all of our other illnesses.

So if I'm dying from heart failure and I break my arm, I can still get my arm fixed. I can still get curative treatment for everything else in my body. I'm just receiving hospice for my heart failure.

Medicare pays for home hospice about a \$160 a day to the hospice program for everything that the hospice provides, medicines, nurses, doctors, social workers, beds, oxygen, everything.

And Medicaid and the private insurers pretty much follow the hospice benefit. So everybody pays about \$160 a day.

So for people who are short stays in a

```
1
      hospice, three-day stay in a hospice, that's a
 2
      money losing venture for the hospice. You get
 3
      about $500 to provide a ton of services. People
 4
      who stay in a hospice -- the break point is about
      20 days on average.
 5
                And so -- so I think, you know, in
 6
 7
      general the Medicare benefit pays well or -- you
 8
      know, nobody is making money on this, but Medi --
 9
      but -- it's -- it pays well.
                Medicare currently is, I think, wisely
10
11
      looking into paying more for the first few days and
      the last few days of care when it's the most
12
      expensive and paying less for the middle interval
13
      of care where it's generally less expensive.
14
15
                I think that's a much wiser way for
16
      Medicare to pay for hospice services.
17
                REPRESENTATIVE SAMUELSON: Do hospice
18
      providers typically accept Medicare as full payment
19
      or do they charge above and beyond?
20
                DR. STRATON: Oh, thank you.
21
      payment.
22
                CHAIRMAN MUNDY: Representative Kula.
23
                REPRESENTATIVE KULA: Thank you, Chairman
24
      Mundy.
25
                Doctor, we -- we've talked about -- and
```

```
1
      you've enlightened me greatly on -- on hospice
 2
      care. But we all sitting here today and -- and
 3
      some of us are much, probably, closer to end of
 4
      life than some of us sitting here today. But
 5
      can --
                REPRESENTATIVE WILLIAMS: Never know.
 6
 7
                REPRESENTATIVE KULA: Myself included.
 8
                DR. STRATON: The representative pointed
 9
      no fingers.
10
                REPRESENTATIVE KULA: I did not.
11
                DR. STRATON: No.
12
                REPRESENTATIVE KULA: Nor did I look at
13
      anyone.
                But as myself -- and I can tell you in --
14
      in being a care giver, and most of the people here
15
16
      today on the committee have heard me testify as far
      as being a care giver for my mother, and the
17
18
      hardest thing for me was she had no directive. I
19
      pretty much had to say this is truly what I believe
20
      my mother would want knowing my mother.
21
                I -- I really never want my children to
22
      have to make those decisions. I -- I mean I -- I
      want to relieve them of that burden that I know I
23
24
      had afterwards, did I do the right thing and is
25
      this really what she would have wanted?
```

So can -- can anyone pretty much through hospice care or is it just the -- the advance directive route that -- that someone would take as far as making sure that their wishes are known long before it happens?

And in this day and age we really don't know when that may be. So you're suggesting advance directives and letting people know this.

Getting that word out, I -- I know most people don't think about it. I know I did not think about it until I was faced with that situation as far as a power of attorney and -- and things such as that.

But are there ways that we in the legislature can help to educate people about what needs to be done?

DR. STRATON: I believe there are, yes.

The -- I think, as we described, picking a -
picking someone who will be your decision maker,

writing that down, giving that information to your

physicians. Telling that decision maker what you

would want.

Even just in general terms. You know what, if I'm hooked up to a machines and I'm never going to get off those machines, I don't want

that. Please stop those machines.

That's -- my brother instructed us, I don't want to be a vegetable. This is 20 years ago. And so that was enough for us to know that, you know, if there were machines that he was going to be hooked up to, that he didn't want to, that we said, no, he does not want that.

And I think also clearly picking who that decision maker is. I have many people who say, you know what? I can't burden my kids with this.

So they choose a neighbor or -- or people will say, you know what? My kids, they're going to ignore what I say. So I'm going to chose, you know, this person who really doesn't love me as much as my kids do because they're going to do what I tell them to do. And I've had people who said that and it works out well.

And advance directives, I think, are critically important. Even though I've said, you know, I couldn't figure out -- you know, I was a poor predictor of where we wanted to honeymoon and I'm probably an equally poor predictor of what I don't want specifically in the future, if I'm brain dead, if I'm Karen Ann Quinlan, there are things that I don't want.

And -- and that's what those medical directives are critically important for. I can check all those boxes, give those to my physician, give them to my kids, that way when my kids -- when I'm in that condition and my kids are asked, instead of saying, gosh, I don't know or I think or my kids fighting, no, he wanted that, no, he didn't, they can just go pull this out and say, look. Dad wrote it down.

And so many family members, so many kids say, thank God mom wrote this down because now it's easy for me.

There's a great advance directive

document called Five Wishes that is -- I'm blanking

on who developed it. It's called Five Wishes.

It's easily, you know, visible through Google.

One of the -- one of the problems with many advance directives is they're written in medical language. If I am in such and such a condition, I do or do not want these treatments that I don't have a clue what they are. They're written in medical language, not people language.

Five Wishes is written in medical -- in people language. If I am dying, I do want this music played. I do want to be massaged. I do not

want these interventions. And it explains what the interventions are. Five Wishes is a great document.

Pennsylvania is one of the several states where that is a legal advance directive and I think that -- one thing that we can do as a medical community and as a state is to promote that document because it's very user friendly.

REPRESENTATIVE KULA: Okay. And -- and do you find that, you know, are there times that advance directives are -- are questioned by family members that say this advance directive was done two years ago, three years ago, and as you talked about your honeymoon, and -- and maybe, you know, someone -- you know, one family member saying, well, I don't think she was really thinking clearly, this isn't really what she would want, and -- I mean do you see those types of conflicts?

DR. STRATON: Every day. Every day. And I think my job as a physician is really counseling

And -- and I think to many of your points, I think one of the things that we need to educate the medical community about is that this document, it's a living, breathing document, and

families in that situation.

that our job is to help work with families to say,
what is it that dad -- what do we think dad was
saying at that time? We -- we know what he wrote
down. He may or may not have understood what these
check boxes meant. But, you know, this is the
condition dad is in. What would he -- if he could
speak right now, what would he tell us?

And that's the purpose of the document, is that when somebody can't speak any longer, what would they -- what would they say if they could tell us?

And I think that's something that we as a medical community don't do a good job of. We -- we walk in. We have a quick conversation. We say, look, that's what dad said. You know, tough beans.

But -- but, you know, I think that -- you know, I think of when I bought a house, my real estate counselor was, you know, more of a financial counselor, marriage counselor, and all these other roles.

And I think, you know, this is an equally big decision to buying a house, and we need to counsel family members through it by help -- by -- by just saying, this is the condition that dad is

```
1
      in. If dad could talk now, what would he want?
 2
      What would he say?
                And regardless of -- and use the document
 3
 4
      as a guide but not a rule book. Thank you.
 5
                REPRESENTATIVE KULA: Thank you very
      much.
 6
                Thank you, Chairman.
 7
 8
                CHAIRMAN MUNDY: Representative Quinn.
 9
                REPRESENTATIVE QUINN: Thank you, Madam
10
      Chair.
11
                And thank you, doctor, for being here.
                You've said through your testimony at one
12
      point that people can enroll sooner?
13
14
                DR. STRATON: Yes.
15
                REPRESENTATIVE QUINN: But I'm under the
16
      impression from what I know of hospice that
      typically someone who's not self-referring, there's
17
18
      typically -- they're that ill that they're not --
      it's not a cognizant decision on the part of the
19
20
      patient. Am I correct?
21
                DR. STRATON: You are correct.
22
                REPRESENTATIVE QUINN: Okay. So then you
23
      mentioned about your friend who came to you with
24
      the breast cancer and said, well, you should have
25
      -- you said, she should have, could have been here,
```

like, four years ago, for palliative services.

And you used the word services

throughout, but I -- I've yet to hear a menu other

than it's not morphine. I mean could you tell

me -- I mean at four years prior, she's not going

to obviously be laying in a bed in four years.

DR. STRATON: Right.

REPRESENTATIVE QUINN: Like what type of services would you -- would be included in a typical care like that? Are you counseling her that could be contrary to what the doctor is saying, let's try this? Because at one point for her to self-refer I think there's -- she's giving up hope that she can beat the darn cancer.

DR. STRATON: Thank you very much for bringing that up. One of the big differences between palliative care services and hospice services, hospice is an insurance-defined benefit. It provides a huge package of services, home health aides, nurses, nurse -- home nursing visits, free medications for symptom management, volunteers, physicians, social workers, a huge and relatively expensive package of services.

And so it's -- to make sure that Medicare doesn't go broke, it's -- it's limited who can

enroll. So it's limited to people who have a prognosis of six months or less, they're likely to die in six months or less, and to people who are no longer pursuing curative treatment for that illness.

So my friend four years ago would not qualify for hospice services because she's still pursuing curative treatment.

That's why palliative care services can be very beneficial, hand in hand with curative services. And -- and those palliative care services are tougher to pin down because, as I said, in our three Penn hospitals they're different in the three hospitals. And so they're different across the Commonwealth.

Palliative care services can be -- in general are really aggressive symptom management.

Thinking of my friend in general, she was naus -- I'm sorry. It's after breakfast. She was nauseous from the chemotherapies that she was receiving. She should -- she should be seeing a symptom specialist in addition to the oncologist to aggressively manage her nausea while she's getting the chemotherapy.

I don't think people should be forced

into a choice of curative treatment or feeling good. They should get both. And -- and that's where palliative care services over the last four years, in combination with the chemotherapy, she -- could have really benefited her.

REPRESENTATIVE QUINN: I could only imagine that if there was an oncologist sitting here right now he would say, wait a minute. When I'm treating someone, I'm also very cognizant of their -- their vomiting and can't do much about the hair loss, but that's -- you know, I have friends through it. So it seems like there's almost another leg that you're putting on that stool of total treatment.

DR. STRATON: Yes. And -- and is there another leg I'm putting on the stool? Yes. Yes.

And I think there are -- there are many oncologists who are outstanding at managing symptoms. There are many oncologists who are not outstanding at it. And I think everybody should have access to outstanding symptom management.

And so I think for many oncologists, having another leg on the stool, having another specialist involved, I think would be very, very helpful.

1 Does everybody need that? No. Do many 2 people need that? Yes. 3 REPRESENTATIVE QUINN: Thank you. 4 CHAIRMAN MUNDY: Representative Gingrich. 5 REPRESENTATIVE GINGRICH: Thank you, Madam Chairman. 6 7 Actually I think I'm going to ensure your 8 services now. I like your style and Deb has me 9 very scared that I might be next. I -- I truly 10 like your perspective on the -- on the palliative 11 care piece. 12 What I wanted to do was -- was highlight more specifically in a hospice category something 13 you talked about earlier in the challenges that our 14 nursing homes face, almost on a weekly, sometimes a 15 16 daily basis, they have to help make these decisions 17 with and for families. 18 In my prior industry life I worked in 19 health care and aging, and I worked in a CCRC where 20 we did all that. 21 DR. STRATON: Yep. 22 REPRESENTATIVE GINGRICH: Very large, 23 very up scaled, thoughtful mission-based 24 operation. 25 And one of the things that is burned into my mind was an experience that I not only observed but had to be part of and it was -- it was a patient who had transitioned through a vital life and residential living there to the nursing home, 24/7 skilled and was at the end of her life. Knew it, was cognizant.

It happened to be a cancer-related thing that it was clear what was happening to her. She made a conscious decision that the battle was over for her and she was at peace with that and wanted to proceed with that.

It became a conflict with the mission of the community to allow her to say -- she -- her mistake may have been in verbalizing that, in saying I recognize this and I want to plan for my end with dignity.

And she looked for all these opportunities to -- for -- in one aspect simply stop eating.

Well, the nursing home found great conflict in that. And this was several years ago, and I'm -- I'm hoping that we've -- we've accommodated some of that a little better than we were forced to do at that time.

But what happened to this woman who was

being cared for well, but her needs had changed at the end of life, we weren't -- we made an administration -- administrative decision not to allow her to do that, and she left the facility and went to her daughter's home and we made -- they made all that possible for her at home and she was able to end her life with the dignity and the plan that she had for herself.

I don't know that legislatively what
we -- we as legislators are very sympathetic and
understanding of this, but a regulatory system it
would seem, looking straight at Secretary Hall,
that we need to -- we need to talk about what -what we can do to improve the opportunities for
both facilities providing -- I'm talking now
nursing home --

DR. STRATON: Uh-huh.

REPRESENTATIVE GINGRICH: And there's a lot of dignity in staying home and making these arrangements. There's no question about it. But a lot of people are in -- are in facilities.

Have you seen that in your time in the field? Have you seen that improve, not improve?

Can we help with that regulatory process that is so important but so tightly binding to our nursing

homes?

DR. STRATON: I think there are ways that we can improve that process from a regulatory standpoint for nursing homes. Again, Joan Teno is in -- works in Brown University and through her work Rhode Island has made great strides in accommodating the needs of people who are dying in nursing homes.

The state of Oregon has also done a great job of being very proactive in adjusting the nursing home regulations to accommodate for people who are dying in nursing homes.

And -- and I'm very sympathetic to nursing homes and the challenges they face because they -- they're -- there are these two discordant populations. The large majority of people who are there for restorative care.

But there are many, many people who are going to die there and -- and -- and as we're dying, all of our organs slow down and if we put food into a stomach that's slowing down, it just sits there and makes people nauseous. It's kind of like post Thanksgiving, you know, on a regular basis. It's not comfortable.

And so -- so I think -- I think that

Island, Oregon, and other states that have really pursued this very aggressive that we can follow up on -- on some of the regulatory changes that they've made to accommodate the needs of people who are dying in nursing homes, to help nursing home administrators feel that we are not going to be punished for providing great end-of-life care.

I think right now many nursing homes and,
Chairwoman Mundy, as you also said, you know, in
Florida that many nursing home administrators feel
like we're going to face a choice, either we
provide great end-of-life care for this patient and
get deficiencies because of it or we don't get
deficiencies and we don't really meet the needs of
this patient.

So I think that there is from a statewide basis opportunities to really look thoughtfully at the current regulations and see if there are ways that they can be tweaked.

REPRESENTATIVE GINGRICH: I want to thank the chairman for -- and those who organized this discussion today because I think it's critical that -- that we bring this to our attention and determine what we can do to help, to help move it

1 along, but ultimately to improve -- improve the 2 circumstances. And as Deb said, you know, we're just 3 4 around the corner. 5 Thank you. DR. STRATON: CHAIRMAN MUNDY: Representative Brown. 6 7 REPRESENTATIVE BROWN: Good morning. 8 DR. STRATON: Good morning. 9 REPRESENTATIVE BROWN: And thank you for 10 your testimony. 11 I had an experience where I have requested the services of hospice care. Many times 12 I talk about my relatives that I take care of. And 13 I have a 90 -- well, she was 94 at the time, and 14 she totally fit the requirements. 15 16 The doctor gave her six months, and she 17 wasn't eating, she wasn't thriving, and there was no curative medication for her. 18 19 And we brought in the hospice care, and 20 she greatly appreciated it, and you'd be surprised 21 how much she appreciated it. She came out of the 22 depression, and she's still here two years later 23 after the hospice care. 24 And I'd like to note, do you have any 25 statistics on how many of the patients who receive

```
1
      hospice care actually do start to thrive and not
 2
      expire?
 3
                DR. STRATON: We -- there's a -- a
 4
      colleague of mine, Dave Casarett, who is a
 5
      nationally known researcher, who has done work
      on -- on what we informally call hospice graduates,
 6
 7
      and it's about five -- five to ten percent of
 8
      hospice enrollees across the country who -- who
 9
      thrive with the hospice services.
10
                And I think it's really a testament to
11
      really the -- the impressive amount of services
      that hospice provides and how well people can do
12
      when they're receiving home health aid visits, home
13
      nursing visits, social work visits, all this
14
      attention that -- that can really help turn around
15
16
      what looked like a dying process.
17
                And so it's -- it's about five to -- five
18
      to ten percent of the population across the nation
19
      of hospice enrollees who -- who graduate from
20
      hospice.
21
                REPRESENTATIVE BROWN: It's good to hear
22
      that you have hospice graduates. I love that
23
      term.
24
                DR. STRATON:
                               Yes.
```

REPRESENTATIVE BROWN: And I just wanted

25

1 to add, with my aunt at the age of 94, I think that 2 there are many elderly folks when they hit 90 they 3 think it's over, and a lot of people don't realize 4 that with the medical care we have and the quality 5 of life that we have that there are more people thriving to over a hundred. And individuals just 6 are not accepting that until they're faced with 7 8 it. 9 She's now 96. 10 DR. STRATON: Uh-huh. 11 REPRESENTATIVE BROWN: And she's starting to believe that possibly she could live beyond a 12 hundred. 13 14 DR. STRATON: Uh-huh. REPRESENTATIVE BROWN: And we really 15 changed her quality of life and mental status 16 because of the hospice care. 17 18 DR. STRATON: That is so great to hear. You know, we had a 102nd birthday on our 19 20 hospice unit a couple months ago, and it was -- it 21 was awesome. It was so fun. 22 We also had a college graduation a month 23 before that. It was really kind of both ends of 24 the spectrum. It's -- it's been a lot of fun. 25 I know it's weird to say hospice is a lot

```
1
      of fun.
               Sorry.
 2
                CHAIRMAN MUNDY: That's quite all right.
 3
      Representative Kortz.
 4
                REPRESENTATIVE KORTZ: Thank you,
      Chairwoman Mundy.
 5
                Thank you, Dr. Straton, for your
 6
 7
      information today.
 8
                I just wanted to key upon what
 9
      Representative Gingrich had mentioned. It's not an
10
      isolated incident where people won't eat.
11
                I went through that with my uncle, and
      this was a guy who fought in World War II in the
12
      Marines and went through all the way with the
13
      island hoppings, all that carnage.
14
15
                But at the end of his life, he told me
16
      one day, he said, I can't taste anything.
17
                DR. STRATON: Uh-huh.
18
                REPRESENTATIVE KORTZ: He said, Young
      Bill, he said, it just -- it just -- there's no
19
20
      taste to it. It tastes like cardboard. And
21
      obviously his body was breaking down. He just
22
      refused to eat.
23
                He just said it was -- it's not an
24
      isolated incident. And there's nothing they could
25
      do. So I just wanted to make a comment.
```

Thank you. And I think DR. STRATON: along those lines, there are -- one of the challenges is separating, you know, which people have kind of made a decision that they're ready to die because they're depressed and which people have made a decision that, you know, it's time to die because they've really hit the end of the road and life -- there's no way that life can have the quality or meaning that -- that brings, you know, them satisfaction.

And I think it's really important that people know that they have -- they do have control over this. That -- that people who are dying and don't want that dying process prolonged can choose to stop eating.

They can choose -- you know, I mean none of us can commit suicide. None of us can commit euthanasia. But people can decide to stop life-continuing or -- or life-prolonging interventions of a whole variety, from mechanical ventilation to tube feeding.

And -- and that all these interventions that are life prolonging are -- you know, it's totally permissible to stop so that people can die naturally.

1 So thank you very much. 2 CHAIRMAN MUNDY: Dr. Straton, we thank you so much for being here this morning and sharing 3 4 all this valuable information and your experiences 5 with us. Thank you. 6 7 DR. STRATON: Thank you. It's been a 8 great honor. Thank you very much. 9 CHAIRMAN MUNDY: Now, ladies and 10 gentlemen, we're now 35 minutes late, but I think 11 that was well worth the extra time, that dialogue with Dr. Straton. 12 Next we're going to hear from the Rendell 13 14 Administration, our own Secretary of the Department 15 of Aging, Secretary John Michael Hall. And Ann 16 Torregrossa, Director of the Governor's Office of 17 Health Care Reform. 18 SECRETARY HALL: Good morning. 19 CHAIRMAN MUNDY: You can begin whenever 20 you're ready. 21 SECRETARY HALL: Thank you. 22 DIRECTOR TORREGROSSA: Good morning. 23 SECRETARY HALL: I -- my name is John 24 Michael Hall. I'm the Secretary of Aging. It's 25 nice to be back with the committee. Thank you for

inviting me to come and talk about this.

2 I'll talk louder.

This is an issue that, like Dr. Straton,

I worked on early in my career. It's been a

personal and professional passion for more than two

decades.

And, frankly, I can't imagine -- and I say this in all sincerity in listening to

Dr. Straton's testimony -- I can't imagine anybody better to follow than -- than him in terms of laying out the key issues that we still deal with in this area.

You have copies of prepared testimony that my staff worked on, and let me first say that I think they did a wonderful job. And then let me say next that I'm not going to rely on it at all in my comments.

I'm going to -- I think it covers some of the history and some of the work that's going on now.

And I know that Anne is going to want to talk about some of the work that the Governor's Office of Health Care Reform has been doing on this issue and, most recently, work that they've done with Allegheny County and the -- and the Area

Agency on Aging out there. So I will -- I'll leave that to her.

I -- I noted again today that whenever we talk about this subject, whether it's Dr. Straton himself or whether it's the members of the committee, it's almost impossible to talk about this subject without relating to it on very personal terms.

Everybody has a story. Everybody has an experience that they've gone through. And I'm not immune to that either. So I'm going to share with you some of my history with this as a way of illustrating what I think doesn't work as well as the things I think that we can do.

And I want to make a point also of coming back and talking to some of the issues around how we approach death in nursing homes and how we interface with the hospice program before I finish.

Back in the mid '80s I started working with the Vermont Ethics Network to work on some of the earliest advance directives. Working to put things like living wills into people's hands.

I was the lead drafter of one of the earliest durable powers of attorney for health care and then lobbied the legislature to pass it.

And what was significant about that event was not that the legislation itself passed. It was more significant that it triggered a earnest discourse within the state about this whole question of end of life.

It resulted in meetings around the state over the course of many years, in communities and town meetings, trainings with doctors and lawyers, meetings that I -- I spent hundreds and hundreds of hours over the years going to hospitals on Wednesday nights or on Tuesdays at lunchtime, meeting with doctors when they were doing their staff meetings.

We held trainings where nurse practitioners and folks from nursing homes and folks from hospitals would come in and we would talk about the bio and medical and legal and ethical issues of how this works, what the documents are and how you help people go through them and what they mean and how you honor them and how you deal with conflicts that arise.

And I will readily admit that in those days when I was more naive and bright eyed than I probably am today, I thought that these issues, particularly as somebody who writes statute, you

tend to think, well, it's the law, it's clear, they're clear lines, and things are black and white.

And I look back at the trainings and the conversations we had where a doctor would get up and ask, how should we handle this? Or I would stand in front of a group of 300 people and say, this is how you react if you have an instruction from a surrogate under power of attorney.

And what you -- what you figure out over time, or at least I did, is that this is an area where things are not and cannot be black and white. Where they are almost inescapably gray.

And you come to these situations and families in a very situational way trying to figure out what's the best thing that you can do. And even if you have an advance directive, you find that you're still trying to find your way towards the right decision.

About ten years after I started working in this area and doing all those trainings and writing booklets and working with the legislature, my mother was diagnosed with advanced liver cancer on Mother's Day in 1996.

She was reported feeling badly on that

Sunday and was -- we took -- my sisters took her to the hospital. And what happened was a intensive, aggressive course of treatment for the liver cancer that took her through the spring and into the summer and into the fall.

And I by that time was living in New England, but I visited her several times during the course of that treatment. And then one day in early October I got a phone call from my sister that mom was not going to last long and that I needed to get on the next plane to Illinois.

So I drove the three hours to Boston

Logan Airport faster than I have ever driven them

before or since and got on a plane and was in her

hospital room in midafternoon.

Shortly -- within half an hour after I got there, her treatment team, including the lead oncologist, came into the room on normal rounds and started describing for her the steps they were going to take to start trying to make her more comfortable. And during the course of that discussion, it struck my mother that what they were talking about is that she was going to die.

Over the course of the summer, remember, she had been going to chemotherapy on a weekly

basis, would call me up every week and tell me what her white blood count was, tell me what her progress was. But the truth is that during those six months she wasn't, in fact, progressing. The cancer was metastasizing and she was getting weaker and weaker.

But that was a conversation that never occurred between her and the oncologist and the doctors until that day in early October when he started describing the fact that they weren't going to do any further treatment and that they were going to start preparing her to be comfortable.

Remember, I had flown in because my sister had said that she was probably not going to last the day. And my mother said, you're telling me that I -- that you can't cure me. You're telling me that I'm going to die. And the doctor said, yes.

And let me just tell you something about my mother. My mother was a very strong willed, very tough person. She was not the kind of person who you made angry. And -- and all of my brothers and sisters will attest to that.

That really made her angry. And obviously what was wrong with what happened on that

day is that conversation should have happened months before. The type of cancer they were treating was not novel or new. The course of the disease was not a surprise.

And my mother, by sheer force of will, lived for another two weeks. I want to emphasis, she lived, despite all the medical evidence that said she should have died that day, for two more weeks because she was mad. She refused to sleep.

Going back to something that Dr. Straton said, she refused to let the priest into the room because the priest coming into the room was the signal that that was the end.

She refused to die. And she put it off for two solid weeks before death finally overcame her.

Now, the tragedy in that case is that a lot of damage, I think, was done to her -- to her and to the family members by the way that was approached. My mother spent the last two weeks of life fighting to stay alive when what she should have been doing was getting ready to die.

She spent that -- those last two weeks, and indeed the spring and the summer and the fall, not coming to terms with the fact that she was

going to be leaving this world. She came -- she spent the time every week optimistically looking forward to her recovery instead of putting her affairs in order.

She had seven children. And the children, in another example of the difference between theory and reality, were all over the map. There were -- there was one sibling who was -- wanted to know why we weren't increasing the morphine drip and a couple of brothers who were in complete denial that she was dying at all.

One of the family members had arranged to have her sign a power of attorney for health care designating my dad as the surrogate to make decisions, which, to be perfectly honest, was just about the absolute worst choice of anybody to be a surrogate that could have been made.

My dad was a wreck, and he was not capable of making a single coherent decision about how to handle her death, not to mention the fact that he was afraid of her.

And so those last weeks were terrible to get through. How do you span -- how do you span the differences between the siblings? How do you give the doctors instructions about what to do?

How do you talk to mom about the fact that she is leaving?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And -- and as a result, when she finally died on the afternoon of October 15th, neither she nor anybody in that family was prepared for the fact -- for her death.

I think when we talked palliative care and when we talked about the difference between comfort care and the measures that can be taken to help people deal with terminal disease, what, I think, sometimes gets left out of the discussion -and I'm not saying this in the sense to be critical of the conversation we've had this morning or Dr. Straton's comments at all -- is, as important as focus on good pain management is and as important as palliative care should be in terms of our approach to how we work with people who have terminal disease, I think we also need to recognize that a key element of hospice, for instance, and a key element of our responsibility to patients, is to recognize that there is a nonmedical aspect to dying; that there is the psychological aspect; that there is some coming to terms with our own death and helping people. All of us are reluctant.

As Dr. Straton said, who among us brings

this up on our own? Who of us wants to even contemplate that we're going to die?

I think that from a public policy

perspective one of the things that we need to do is

making sure that the conversation happens,

recognizing that we're probably not going to

initiate it ourselves.

A number of years ago Congress passed the Danforth Patients Self-Determination Act which required that every individual who is admitted to care in a nursing home or hospital or at home health care that receives funds from the federal government is required to be provided with information about advance directives.

But I think obviously that this is more than handing people a packet on admission. It's about how do you ensure that there's a culture that puts this on the table, that says, let's talk about this.

Standing in the room when my mother was dying in those two weeks was my uncle John, her closest sibling, and he had a chance to -- and he and I talked, both of us attorneys, about what we were seeing and how we were going to handle the ethical issues and the conflicts between the

brothers and sisters.

He was diagnosed earlier this year with -- with an advanced form of lung cancer.

The -- there are two key differences in John's experience versus my mother's. The first is that he made a decision to not undergo aggressive treatment to combat the disease.

The final ten months of his life were spent at home with his family, having dinner on Wednesday nights with his granddaughter, going out for walks with the dog, watching Judge Judy in the afternoon and doing the crossword puzzles at lunch with his aunt -- with his wife, and trying to maintain as normal a life as he could with as much quality as he could in those months.

And my aunt and I talked a lot in the days after his death, and one of the things that we contrasted is how different those ten months would have been if he had agreed to start -- undergo chemotherapy. Not the least of which is it wouldn't have changed the course of the disease and it wouldn't have changed the date of his death in any meaningful way.

But it would have changed what his relationship was with his family and what those --

and his ability to get ready for his own death.

The other thing that was notable is that
he was treated at a hospital in the suburbs of
St. Louis that had a very progressive policy on
ensuring that every individual who was being
treated for terminal disease in -- on their
treatment team included not only the oncologists
and the physicians who were managing their care,
but also on that treatment team included palliative
care physicians and -- and -- and -- and
counselors.

And so, even when he was admitted to the hospital a couple weeks before he died, one of the very first contacts that he had was with members of the palliative care team to talk about how -- how the next -- what alternatives he had and how he could shape what the next weeks should look like.

In the work that we did in the past when I was working with the Ethics Network, one of the things that we did was work with hospitals, for instance, to encourage hospital boards to put into — to make changes in their bylaws and operating principles, incorporating the concept of palliative care in their standard operating protocols so that every physician who was on staff

at that hospital would do the kind of thing that I was talking about -- that I was describing happened at the Sisters of Mercy Hospital a few weeks ago with my uncle.

I do think that from a public policy perspective one of the things that we can do and one of the things we need to do is institutionalize the conversation. Not because we're trying to push people in a certain discussion. This is about choice.

But choice has to be about making sure that they have full information and neglecting to have a conversation with someone about the prospects for recovery, the effect it's likely to have on their quality of life, the degree to which this will change their outcomes, neglecting to include that early on is neglecting to give them the kind of information that they need to have to decide how they want to handle this.

It's pretty hard for people who are in my mother's situation to come to terms with their own mortality if they're being -- if they're not told that they're going to die, and I think that is missing today from a large number of conversations and interactions that people have.

1 Let me talk quickly about some other
2 public -- public policy work that we're doing.

I'm -- I'm glad actually that the
committee spent so much time talking with
Dr. Straton about -- about the issue of nursing
homes.

You know, today nursing homes by and large have two types of patients in them as the doctor said, people who are in there for short-term rehabilitation and people who are at the end of life.

People who have stayed at home typically for as long as they possibly can and then because of the complexity of their illness or the fact that their needs have taxed their family's capacity to keep them independent any longer, they go into nursing homes for the last few weeks.

So in numbers that are quite high today, as he said, people die in nursing homes, but they die in an environment that is conflicted about -- about that.

Back in 1987 Congress passed the Nursing
Home Reform Act called OBRA 87 which put in place a
very strong, quality structure for making sure that
people had initial and regular assessments of their

condition, that they had comprehensive care planning which was regularly updated.

And a key aspect of the Nursing Home

Reform Act was the requirement that nursing homes

maintain and help -- nursing homes do everything

they can to help patients attain and maintain the

highest practicable level of physical, social, and

psychosocial functioning.

The problem with that standard -- well, let me say this. In 1987 the people who were in nursing homes, the cross-section of who we were serving there, looks much -- looked much different than it does today 22 years later. And I think Representative Gingrich can attest to that.

The -- imposing the highest practicable level of functioning standard did worlds of good for improving the quality of care in nursing homes for 1987.

And none of us who have worked in this field and none of us from the nursing industry would ever want to go back to what it was like before OBRA 87 was passed.

But I think what we now know is that that standard care of care is not particularly compatible for people who are dying. That we are

doing all the things that Dr. Straton talked about in order to assure that we don't get a deficiency when the nurse surveyors come and struggling with the fact that what people really want to do is they want to be comfortable, they want to be left alone, and they want to die in peace.

And so there is work that has started in other states on making changes to the culture of nursing homes and the regulatory environment.

We've started to have discussions here in my department about doing that as well.

And in the coming weeks my plan is to bring together folks from the Department of Health who do the surveys in nursing homes, as well as folks from the nursing home industry, to talk about how we change the culture and the regulatory standards and the standard of practice in nursing homes so that we recognize the reality of the people who receive services there today.

In the area of hospice and Medicaid, one of the real challenges we have had historically is that we have two programs, Medicare and Medicaid, and that -- that despite the fact they're administered by the same federal agency, can't figure how to get along with each other all that

well.

The -- even within our hospice benefit paid for by Medicaid, programs for -- that are the -- the program that we have for providing hospice services to people who have terminal illness has been historically all but incompatible with the services that we provide under the aging waiver for helping people living independently in the community as they age. So much so that patients have been forced in many cases to choose one or the other.

The benefits in the aging waiver and the benefits in hospice are not the same. They have great strengths in some areas, but they don't do everything.

And too often people are forced to decide am I going to take the hospice benefit and go without the supports I could get under the aging waiver that help me -- that -- that support home and community-based services or am I going to take the aging waiver and go out -- go without the benefits of hospice?

So we're in the process right now of changing that policy. We recently issued a draft policy statement that -- sent it out to

hospice and home and community-based waiver service, wrap them around each other, and allow individuals who are receiving long-term care to receive -- take -- get the benefits from both at the same time, not have to choose one or the other.

And we hope to have comments back from home health agencies, area agencies on aging and other stakeholders in the near future and be able to finalize that policy so that we administer those programs in a way that meets the needs of the individuals rather than being focused on the programmatic rules.

The -- I think the -- the last thing that I will say is that from a larger public policy perspective there continues to be a challenge in terms of the -- the degree to which this is part of the education that -- that happens in the medical community.

End-of-life care, palliative care is, in most cases, not part of the core curriculum in medical school, and too many physicians come out of school with this not being a central part of their training or their consciousness.

There are a growing number of physicians who have a focus and a passion for palliative care and for hospice, like Dr. Straton, and I have had the honor of working with many of them over the years.

But this needs to be the -- the conversations that are happening, often happen in the office, in your home town, with your primary care physician when the results of the x-rays come back, and that's the place where the conversation and the choice-making often needs to start. And we need to train doctors. We do a better job today than we did before.

When we were doing the early work in this 20 years ago, the dynamic of patients and doctors was much different. We didn't think that patients had the right to question a doctor, or to ask questions or to say I want this. We were supposed to listen to what physicians were tolding us —told us.

We've come a long way in the ensuing two decades and some of the work that's happened in legislation and the -- the national discussion about this has advanced that.

But I think we have more work to do.

We -- I think that we do need to do a better job of training as well.

 $\label{eq:solution} \text{So let me -- let me leave it there and} \\ \text{turn it over to Anne.}$

DIRECTOR TORREGROSSA: Good morning.

CHAIRMAN MUNDY: Good morning.

DIRECTOR TORREGROSSA: It's not H1N1.

That's the good news. I have these -- these

grandchildren who are like little petri dishes.

They go out in the community and they gather all

the germs and they bring them back to me when I babysit.

So pardon me for my gravelly voice.

I want to focus on an area not covered by the end-of-life task force report, and that is the large geographic and hospital variations and the amount and cost of care Pennsylvania patients receive at the end of life.

The research, more than 20 years, that

Dartmouth College has done has conclusively shown

that some hospitals spend much, much more on end of

life than others.

And so this is follow the money, and this issue is -- is an important one that we can't miss as we talk about reforms that we need for end of

life.

They spend much, much more money and for no good reason. This -- the care is not going to cure or help the person.

And it's certainly not because of the patient's preferences. Surveys consistently show that patients don't want intensive hospital-based care when they die. They don't want to be on breathing machines and tubes everywhere. They want to die at peace and the home.

And Dartmouth found that this excessive end-of-life care really harms patients. It costs us billions of dollars a year in our health care costs and it's misaligned with what patients want.

Even within a geographic area there's large variations in the amount and cost of end-of-life care amongst hospitals. Dartmouth Atlas found that Medicare costs per enrollee for the last two years of life, between 2000 and 2005, averaged \$117,086 at Hahnemann Hospital and 71,633 at Fox Chase Cancer Center.

That's a difference of 50 [sic] percent.

Double the cost at Hahnemann, half the cost at Fox

Chase. And -- and both had the same outcome.

People died within two years of end of life.

But other academic studies have found that Pennsylvania hospitals end-of-life care intensity varies depending on how the hospital staff routinely use specific life sustaining treatments.

Now, certainly some patients come to hospitals with an unexpected intensive care need where it's appropriate to put them on these life supports, but to have a patient with metastasized cancer, who has an advance directive that says they don't want that, and to go into a hospital and be put on all those machines is not appropriate.

One Pennsylvania study found that hospitals have a real fingerprint on how they use intensive life supports.

And I talked to the researcher and she said, I can tell you hospitals that routinely put you on those things no matter what you want and the ones that, perhaps like the ones your uncle went to, where they had that conversation and they don't do that.

So what this means for us in Pennsylvania, and across the country, is that the circumstances of our deaths, whether we die with tubes and respirators rather than at home and the

cost of how much end-of-life care is for us may depend more on where we live or which hospital we end up than on what our advance directives says.

And this is very concerning and it's something that needs a lot of attention.

Dartmouth Atlas research also found that critical -- the critical role of discretionary decision making by physicians, such as whether to admit a patient to the hospital, refer to a specialist, order diagnostic tests, or see the patient more frequently can lead to wide variations in end-of-life costs.

And this is often influenced by supply-enticed demand. You got a lot of specialists? You got empty hospital beds? You get referred to the hospital instead of to hospice.

This was illustrated recently in our work with primary care practitioners and their chronic-care-patient-center-medical homework where we have seven learning collaboratives going on across the Commonwealth with 800 primary care practitioners.

If they become NCQA certified, as the patients enter medical home, submit their data monthly and really working on make sure that all

their patients have evidence-based care, they get enhanced payments from all the payers except

Medicare Fee-For-Service.

And we're really seeing a reduction to hospital usage. We're seeing a reduction in referral to specialists.

One of the payers that was involved was talking to a specialist about this, and the specialist said, I don't care whether or not this reduces the number of patients that come from these practices to me. What I'll do is just up how often I see the other patients to maintain my -- my standard of living.

So we really have to look at supply-induced demand. We have to look at whether, in fact, hospitals are using intensive life sustaining support inappropriately. And we have to look at some of the follow-the-money issues that are involved in this issue.

Federal reforms will attempt to begin to address some of these issues through bundled payments and accountable care organizations, but it's something that we in Pennsylvania have to pay attention to and I wanted to make sure that it was -- that you were aware of this as you address

```
1
      this important issue.
 2
                Thank you.
                CHAIRMAN MUNDY: Okay. Questions?
 3
 4
                Ms. Torregrossa, we're not going into
      certificate of need here.
 5
                DIRECTOR TORREGROSSA: I thought you
 6
 7
      might think of that.
 8
                CHAIRMAN MUNDY: We're not -- no. No,
 9
      we're not going to -- you know, that's -- you know,
10
      that's before the Insurance Committee, and I'm
11
      hoping there will be a vote on that soon.
12
                But it does raise the issue of supply and
      demand, supply driving demand as opposed to
13
      vice-versa, as it should.
14
15
                What -- is there a legislative fix or is
16
      this something that we're just going to continue to
17
      discuss and make people aware of?
18
                DIRECTOR TORREGROSSA: Well, certainly
      New York has -- has taken one approach. And -- on
19
20
      the supply side.
21
                I think it's also payment reform. Right
22
      now it's -- it's profitable for hospitals to
23
      provide maximum end-of-life care for certain
24
      payers. And so, you know, they're trying -- they
25
      are rationalizing and -- I'm trying to do
```

everything possible for the patient, but it also happens to help the bottom line.

So I think we have to -- to look at payment reform as a way to more efficiency -- efficiently use our resources and align it with what patients' preferences are.

And I don't think we have our payment aligned in that manner right now.

CHAIRMAN MUNDY: Well, I -- I honestly don't know -- I can't think of an initiative that we could initiate as legislators.

So if you have ideas for legislation that might be necessary, we would really like to talk to you about that.

In fact, what I would like to do is convene a task force of members of this committee just to meet informally about -- after this hearing to discuss, is there legislation that's needed in these areas? Are there public policy concerns that we can bring to the attention of the various departments?

So any member of the committee who is interested in -- in getting together to discuss this should let me know.

Questions?

1 Representative Vulakovich. 2 REPRESENTATIVE VULAKOVICH: Thank you, Madam Chairman. 3 4 I'll start backwards. You mentioned about discretionary treatment in your statement. 5 Could you say that again what you -- what you said 6 there? I -- I -- I missed that. 7 8 DIRECTOR TORREGROSSA: Certainly. 9 There's -- what the Dart -- the Dartmouth Atlas 10 found was that a lot of the end-of-life costs that 11 were above normal in some of these hospitals and for some of these specialists was for discretionary 12 treatment. 13 That is, how often you saw a specialist. 14 Did you see a specialist every week, every month, 15 every quarter? How often you were referred to the 16 17 hospital? Were you referred to the hospital for 18 tests or when you really were in need? 19 Diagnostic testing, how often did you go for an x-ray, for a CAT scan, or that -- that --20 21 there was a lot of discretionary referrals that 22 weren't necessarily medically necessary. In fact, 23 were not medically necessary. 24 REPRESENTATIVE VULAKOVICH: Okay. You 25 know, I don't know how you legislate something like

1 that when we -- we tend to get back to the idea 2 that with a lot of the primary physicians that should, you know, be in control of your health and 3 4 quide you in other areas -- we talk so much about that preventive health and everything else. 5 I don't know how you legislate something 6 7 like that and tell a doctor that, even though in 8 your opinion or in your conscience, you're saying I 9 believe this person should go see this specialist 10 and have this treatment done and -- somehow we're 11 going to legislate that because were putting dollars on that. 12 13 I don't -- I don't know how you legislate 14 that. 15 DIRECTOR TORREGROSSA: I agree. I don't think you do. 16 17 REPRESENTATIVE VULAKOVICH: And -- and I 18 think sometimes you just can't legislate things. 19 DIRECTOR TORREGROSSA: But I think you 20 can --21 REPRESENTATIVE VULAKOVICH: You know? 22 DIRECTOR TORREGROSSA: You can have 23 payments that make hospitals, specialists, and 24 primary care providers be more efficient in how

they're utilizing health care and -- and that's

25

what we got to figure out.

Because right now the incentive is exactly the opposite. You know, the more you do the more you get paid. And -- and whether it's necessary or not.

And so, of course, people are going to -going to do that. And -- and -- and it's really -and payment reform is something that we really need
to look at.

REPRESENTATIVE VULAKOVICH: What I would be fearful of is that we would -- we would go towards the way Medicare goes where they're not paying the doctors near what it cost them to treat patients and -- and, you know, we can't even afford Medicare.

But I just think that, you know, we get into a thing here where we talk about the doctors, you know, relying on them, instead of people like us telling doctors, giving them guidelines and mandates and regulations on what they're going to do, and -- and I understand. There's -- there's good and bad in everything and there's always the -- the dollar figure in there.

But, you know, most of these doctors really have -- I mean when they took that oath,

it's something they always wanted to do their whole life. And they worked long hours and they have a lot of decisions and they go through a lot of heartaches with their -- with their patients when they -- when they establish their relationships with them with going to the doctor's office.

And I don't know how you tell doctors,

you know, when they treat or don't treat. But I -
I think there's certain things that you go down a

really slippery slope when you try to legislate

those things. So --

DIRECTOR TORREGROSSA: I agree. Could I give you an example of what we're doing on chronic care?

We have -- we started in southeast

Pennsylvania. We have all the major payers,

including Medicaid HMOs. We know that in 2007 the

PHC board told us that hospitals charged \$4 billion

for avoidable hospitalizations; that is, if people

got the care that they needed in the community from

their primary care practitioner, they wouldn't have

needed that hospitalization and they wouldn't have

gotten so sick that they had to have that

hospitalization.

So we're wasting a lot of money there.

We're not paying our primary care doctors enough to see patients with chronic conditions.

They got to see so many patients every hour just to pay -- keep the lights on. So we're in this conundrum where all the money is over here. We're not paying enough here to get the right outcome.

So what the -- what all the payers said was, okay, if you transform how you provide primary care, you make sure that all of your patients have evidenced -- all the evidence-based care they need for their chronic condition, we're going to take -- we're going to believe that we'll save some of that money for -- from avoidable operations and if you get certified as an NCQA, patients enter medical home, if you -- if you get a level of a three, we'll give you an extra hundred thousand dollars a year.

And so what we found, one Medicaid HMO found that -- that in the first ten months of doing this their -- their hospitalization for diabetics was reduced 26 percent.

So it was a combination of working with the doctors to provide the appropriate care, creating the financial incentives to spend the time

with the patient at the primary level rather than just shooting them off to the specialist, avoiding hospitalizations, and really appropriately reimbursing physicians in payment reform.

And -- and we're hoping this kind of thing is -- is going to work across Pennsylvania.

PREPRESENTATIVE VULAKOVICH: I see your point, and I'm not trying to be confrontational. I just -- you know, I think sometimes we just mandate so much and we over-regulate so much that we create these problems and then we come back and try to say, okay, now we got to do these mandates and these regulations to control something that maybe should have happened.

And I go to -- still come back to letting the primary doctor do doctoring. Letting him make his decisions and don't over-regulate.

And, you know, I -- I believe strongly in my heart that these physicians -- they say there's good and bad in everything, but they really have the best interests of the -- of the patient in hand.

I mean they took that oath, and -- and most of these people, this is what they wanted to be most of their lives, a doctor.

1 DIRECTOR TORREGROSSA: I agree with you. REPRESENTATIVE VULAKOVICH: And I -- and 2 I -- this is a discussion for another day, but I 3 4 think letting doctors do what they want to do and getting into some tort reform, I think we wouldn't 5 have to worry about all these intricate ways of 6 7 trying to settle these problems. 8 But I thank you. 9 Could I -- or, Madam Chairman, could we 10 have her testimony with her statistics and the 11 study that she has? DIRECTOR TORREGROSSA: Yes, I'll provide 12 that to you. I'll attach the studies. 13 But I really suggest, if you have a 14 couple minutes, to Google Dartmouth Atlas and you 15 16 can -- they have the ability to -- for your area, 17 click on hospitals and click on these issues and 18 you'll be amazed at the variation in end-of-life 19 care, specialist referral, use of hospice or 20 nursing home. It's very fascinating. And it's -- it's -- they've been doing it 21 22 for over 20 years. 23 REPRESENTATIVE VULAKOVICH: Thank you. 24 Thank you. 25 Secretary Hall, I wanted to -- I wanted

to make a comment on -- you said that you think the policy that we should initiate is to try to institutionalize end-of-life issues and medical treatment.

How -- how do we go about generalizing all people? Your mother obviously was a very strong-willed person and had some attitudes. You might say very positive attitudes about life and death.

Some people joke about life and death.

I've seen -- gone to funerals where, you know,
they're there and they're in the midst of all the
people and they're carrying on regular
conversations while the deceased is over there, and
then the next month you're going to someone who
passed away of theirs and it's a totally different
situation.

So death, when it hits you personally, puts a little different name on it.

But, you know, I absolutely know many people that if they came in and they had cancer and it looked pretty bad and you said, now, look, we're going to try some treatment here but in case it doesn't work, you know, we want to start talking about -- maybe we need to talk to you about

hospice, I -- I think that you would take hope away from them and even maybe destroy them or you would literally put them into some type -- not that they're not already in maybe some type of depression.

But I just don't think you can generalize this.

And sometimes I -- you know, I've thought about it. I've gone through this with hospice with my uncle where I had to take charge because of my aunt and -- and everything and so I know a little bit about it. But it was awhile ago. Things have changed.

But the feelings are still there. And -- and -- and I just know some people, if you carry on that conversation too early with them, you're going to make them a mess.

So -- so do we -- how would you define institutionalizing the end-of-life issues and medical treatment? I -- I don't know. I'd like to see you put that on paper, because if we would even think of some type of legislation like that and -- and Dr. Straton, I believe he used the words about people language. I always use the term eighth grade language.

Because the last thing we need, like you referred to, is medical people putting this in words or the attorneys and their legalese.

How would you -- how would you put this down on paper to institutionalize end-of-life issues and medical treatment?

SECRETARY HALL: Well, let me say first off that I don't think this is about taking something away from people, taking hope away and taking options away from people.

I think it's about giving people the information so that they can make choices. And the choices they make are not going to be uniform.

Somebody is going to choose hospice care or palliative care based on their own sensibilities and somebody with exactly the same diagnosis is going to choose that they want to undergo aggressive treatment to try to beat it. I think that's a right that people have.

But they're also -- they also have a right to know what the choices are, to be presented -- and to have those choices presented on equal terms.

You know, a key part of this discussion that has entered our consciousness in the last 20

years is the conversation that you have with doctors about routine surgical procedures right up to the end-of-life care should revolve around the concept of informed consent.

That patients have a right to consent and that consent needs to be informed, which means that they need to be provided with all the information on the alternatives and on the risks and benefits, the pros and cons, the chances of something working versus the chance -- something -- something not working so that they make a decision about which course they want to pursue.

I think that that's -- I think that we do a better job today than we did before. But in a world where less than 40 percent of medical students get training, less than 40 percent of medical schools even offer an elective course in palliative care. Fewer still have it as a mandatory course requirement for graduation.

It's -- it's -- we're not at a place where the kind -- the quality of information that's provided to people so they can make a choice on their own is really where it needs to be. And that --

CHAIRMAN MUNDY: Can I interrupt for one

```
1
      second? Just -- I want to follow up on --
 2
                REPRESENTATIVE VULAKOVICH: Sure.
                CHAIRMAN MUNDY: And if I understood
 3
 4
      Dr. Straton correctly, palliative care could be a
 5
      choice that's given along with aggressive
      treatment.
 6
 7
                SECRETARY HALL: Absolutely.
                CHAIRMAN MUNDY: So when -- and the other
 8
 9
      thing is I heard you say, at least I thought I did,
10
      that we need to make sure that the conversation
      happens, that we need to make -- institutionalize
11
      the conversation.
12
                SECRETARY HALL: That -- if -- if
13
      it -- if the --
14
15
                CHAIRMAN MUNDY: The information.
16
                SECRETARY HALL: If the words came out of
17
      my mouth differently than that, I apologize. What
18
      I --
19
                CHAIRMAN MUNDY: That's what I heard you
20
      say.
21
                SECRETARY HALL: What I think should
22
      happen --
23
                CHAIRMAN MUNDY: That we need to
24
      institutionalize the conversation. Not
25
      institutionalize what people's -- what people must
```

choose or what doctors must say. But simply tell people this is what your diagnosis is, this is what I would recommend that the course of treatment be, and here are your options.

SECRETARY HALL: Here are the range of options. And here -- here's the -- here's the efficacy of one versus another.

So that you have -- I think that that should be -- particularly for people who are facing the potential for life-ending disease, I think that we have a responsibility to give them that information.

CHAIRMAN MUNDY: Go ahead.

REPRESENTATIVE VULAKOVICH: And I don't disagree with that at all. I understood it completely that you were talking about the conversation.

But in that conversation you're talking about talking about not only palliative care, because that I understand. Because you want to address the symptoms that go along with it, which I got to tell you, I thought most doctors who handled this stuff would know that something has to follow up with the -- the symptoms, you know, that you have, like the nausea afterwards. You would just

think that would happen.

So that's something that needs to be addressed. But when you're talking about the actual end of life and just talking about when you throw hospice in there, my point being is how do we judge at what time you're going to have that particular part of that conversation?

Because all people are different and -and I don't think anybody can sit here and say
that -- I agree with you, choice, options, get all
that information. But for certain people that
plays into a certain time in their life.

Now, their doctor may know them so personally that they know exactly when to do that.

If they don't, you know, the only other people that can help them to, say hey, I know how my mom is and I know how my dad is.

For example, you want to have that conversation with me, I'm like your mom. You can have that with me. I don't know if you could do that with my wife. But I know that.

And I don't want some legislator or someone else that has some philosophy making that on their own. I want to be part -- I want to be part of that conversation for my spouse if it needs

to be.

So all I'm saying here is that I agree with so much of all of what you said, but there's a slippery slope, I think, that goes along with this that we can't generalize people. And I do not want to get into things with mandating things to doctors and -- and -- and putting certain regulations in that I don't know that you can do.

Now, I could be totally wrong. I -- I couldn't come close to your expertise in this. But it's me thinking out of the box, just this is how I am, and -- but I'll tell you, I'm really glad I attended this hearing today because this -- this is one of the better hearings I've been to.

And I agree so much with what you said, with all three of you, what you say. But I just have some reservations there. And -- and I don't know. Maybe I'm not putting them in the right words, but I want to thank all of you.

And, Dr. Straton, what I like about you, there's no spin with you. You really speak totally -- no talking points. It's from the heart, and I appreciate that. Thank you.

Thank you, Madam Chairman.

CHAIRMAN MUNDY: Representative Swanger.

1 REPRESENTATIVE SWANGER: Thank you, Madam 2 Chair. And thank you, Secretary Hall and 3 4 Director Torre -- Torregrossa? Is that right? 5 Thank you for being here. And this certainly has been a very valuable experience. 6 And also the doctor, I thank him, too. 7 But I'd like to talk about the movement 8 9 in our country as we get closer and closer to 10 single payer health care. Much of the resist --11 resistance, I think, is coming from seniors who 12 fear that once they reach a certain age they will be denied life-saving treatment and coverage and 13 that age would be determined by the government. 14 And, therefore, they'll be facing this end-of-life 15 16 situation much sooner than they would like. I see most -- a lot of us in this room 17 18 are senior citizens, and I'm just wondering is this what we have to look forward to in our future as 19 government resources and other resources for health 20 21 care become more and more scarce. 22 Some people have said, well, this will 23 never happen in our country. But, in fact, it's 24 happening in Great Britain. It's happening in

25

Canada.

1 And I believe from information I've received and shared with the Chairman that it is 2 happening in our country in the state of Oregon 3 where seniors have been denied care because of 4 their age and instead offered lethal drugs in order 5 to end it all if the pain becomes too unbearable. 6 7 Can you comment on this? Is this what we have to look forward to? 8 9 SECRETARY HALL: Do you want to go first? 10 DIRECTOR TORREGROSSA: I certainly hope 11 not. 12 SECRETARY HALL: Yeah. I -- let me just say that I -- I don't think that there's a -- any 13 14 public appetite for that future in -- in the United 15 States. 16 But I do think that the surveys that have 17 been done over and over again indicate that the 18 public feels strongly about having the ability to control their own destiny and decide their own 19 20 course of care. 21 And overwhelmingly they say -- and this 22 gets back to the issue of conversations we have 23 with our -- our friends and family members and 24 acquaintances -- that they say, I wouldn't want to

have extraordinary measures. I wouldn't want to be

25

kept alive artificially. I want to die with dignity and die peacefully.

But they want to make sure that they have a chance to exercise that right as well and they have the information to do that.

So I think our focus as we go forward in health care reform at both the state and national level ought to be on making sure that we assure people that they'll have a right to put in their own vote on that.

DIRECTOR TORREGROSSA: One thing that some programs are doing is something called shared decision making.

Michael's mother didn't get good information. She was led along to think that if she went through all these things she would be there with her seven children. She didn't get information that would have perhaps made her do differently at some point or not.

Oncologists will be -- I mean their job is to make you have hope and tell you, okay, we're going to fight this together and da da da da da. Surgeons, their job is to tell you, okay, we're going to cut it out. Yeah, I think I got it all. Da da da da da.

One thing that Dartmouth is doing is realizing that the -- that these health care providers have to have that happy face and whatever, and they're doing something called shared decision making. Only if the patient wants it. Which is going to a neutral provider and getting kind of what are the odds here, what are the choices.

Now, maybe your wife wouldn't want to do that and maybe you would want to do that. Before you made the decision, am I going to have this -- this big operation or am I going to go through chemotherapy?

And they've found that people feel much, much better -- I mean because they'll go into the shared decision making and one might do one thing and one might do another, but they feel much more comfortable about that decision and they're -- and they're much more at peace with the outcome.

And that -- that's maybe something we should look at.

REPRESENTATIVE SWANGER: Yes. And I hope we continue to have those choices and not have the government make those decisions for us.

Thank you.

1 DIRECTOR TORREGROSSA: I agree. 2 CHAIRMAN MUNDY: Representative Kortz. REPRESENTATIVE KORTZ: Thank you, Madam 3 4 Chairwoman. 5 And thank you both for your testimony today. 6 7 Secretary Hall, it was mentioned a little 8 while ago that fewer than 40 percent of the medical 9 schools offer elective courses in palliative care 10 and even fewer than that have mandatory courses. 11 What would you recommend that we as a committee do to address that? 12 SECRETARY HALL: Well, I'm hesitant to 13 jump right to legislation to address that. But I 14 think that there's -- we have some of the best 15 16 medical schools in the country in this state and we 17 turn out some of the best-trained physicians. And I think there's a conversation that 18 19 could happen and should happen about the curriculum 20 and the training that people have as they are 21 coming out of schools so that we make sure that 22 physicians are equipped with the skills to -- to 23 meet the needs of patients who want to have this 24 kind of information. 25 If it -- I think it's the kind of thing

1 that the -- some schools have understood the wisdom 2 of doing and have pursued that. And I -- I think the place to start would be to shine a light on it 3 4 and then figure out where you go from there. 5 REPRESENTATIVE KORTZ: Maybe some follow-up public hearings? 6 SECRETARY HALL: Well, I think there 7 are -- I think there are folks from those schools 8 9 that should be part of the conversation about the 10 right way to go. 11 And I think including in that would be 12 people like Dr. Straton and his colleagues around the state who have a keener sense than I of what 13 would be useful in terms of the training that 14 15 physicians get. 16 REPRESENTATIVE KORTZ: Thank you. 17 CHAIRMAN MUNDY: Chairman Hennessey? 18 REPRESENTATIVE HENNESSEY: Thank you, Madam Chairman. 19 20 Ann, you had suggested for -- you had 21 stated that some hospitals spend more money 22 routinely on end-of-life care than others and then 23 suggested that there are doctors who are routinely 24 ignoring advance directives and involving the

patient in -- in extended -- you know,

25

1 life-extending services.
2 Now, I guess w

Now, I guess what I'm trying to figure out is, first of all, I'm assuming that one is happening — that those doctors are practicing in those hospitals where their costs are routinely high or higher for end-of-life services; and, secondly, I guess the more important question would be, how is it happening?

Do -- do the doctors -- you know, are they aggressive in trying to talk the patients into overruling their own decisions and changing their minds? Do they get family members to do it? Do they just ignore the advance directive?

What's -- what do you think is happening that is allowing this to happen?

DIRECTOR TORREGROSSA: What I quoted were studies. I'm not saying -- I mean I -- I don't have the personal information myself. I'm quoting studies.

I think what happens --

REPRESENTATIVE HENNESSEY: Okay.

DIRECTOR TORREGROSSA: Excuse me. Is what happened with your mother. And some of the issues on -- your -- your loved one's having trouble breathing.

```
1
                REPRESENTATIVE HENNESSEY:
                                            Lisa is
 2
      getting you water right now.
 3
                DIRECTOR TORREGROSSA:
                                        Thank you.
 4
      me.
 5
                You rush her to the hospital.
                Thanks so much.
 6
 7
                She has this directive. If you go to
 8
      Hospital A, they'll put her on a respirator and
 9
      say this -- this -- hopefully this will help her.
10
      You, da da da da da.
11
                You don't know. Is this it or, you know,
      will this be it? So they have -- they are -- have
12
13
      the tendency to much more aggressively use these
      life-sustaining things without saying, time out.
14
      Your mother has metastasized cancer. We can put
15
16
      her on the respirator or we can make her
      comfortable. Which would you like us to do?
17
18
                So Hospital A is going to -- unless you
19
      say, stop right now, don't do this, is going to put
20
      her on the respirator and you don't know if this is
      it. If it's -- it's such a hard and horrible
21
22
      time. You're -- you're not thinking straight.
23
      It's just terrible.
24
                You've got nieces coming in, and they're
25
      saying, oh, we've got to do something, and they
```

haven't been involved in the long-life care of this whole problem.

And it happens. I'm not saying doctors ignore -- pardon me -- advance directives. I think -- I think some are much more purposeful when there is a situation like that to say, all right, time out, family. Do we really want to use this respirator at this time? This may be the time to make your mother comfortable.

Another hospital will put her on the respirator, maybe ask about advance directives later, but are much more aggressively using life-sustaining services.

And as I told you, the researcher that I talked to said that hospitals really have a fingerprint. That you can look at the use of these life-sustaining instru -- services and they vary widely by hospital.

REPRESENTATIVE HENNESSEY: Okay. But it sounds like you're saying that there's not a -- not an ignoring of an advance directive, but maybe not seeking out information on whether a person who presents at a hospital and needs care has ever -- has ever executed an advance directive.

Is it assumed that they didn't and go

1 through -- you know, put her on the life-sustaining 2 care and initiate that process and worry about whether or not an advance directive has been 3 4 executed at a later time? 5 DIRECTOR TORREGROSSA: And not letting the person who has the power of attorney know what 6 7 the situation is, that this is probably your 8 mom's -- sorry -- you know, your mom is fading 9 fast. 10 REPRESENTATIVE HENNESSEY: Okay. 11 DIRECTOR TORREGROSSA: We can put her on 12 a respirator and see if she does any better or we can make her comfortable. What -- what would you 13 like us to do? 14 15 SECRETARY HALL: Chairman Hennessey, can I make a point? 16 17 REPRESENTATIVE HENNESSEY: Thank you, 18 Ann. SECRETARY HALL: You know, a few years 19 ago, and I lost track of exactly how long it was, 20 21 but not too long ago, I believe the Harvard Medical 22 School published a study in the New England Journal 23 of Medicine where they studied over time the -- the

contents of durable powers of attorney for health

care and then looked at the course of treatment and

24

25

compared what was in the power of attorney for health care, what the instructions from the patient were, compared to what action the physician took, compared to what action the surrogate, the -- the agent took.

And what they found was that in a distressingly high number of cases the action that the physician took was not consistent with what was in the power of attorney for health care.

But what I found more dismaying is that the -- in more than half of the cases the action that the agent, the surrogate, took was not consistent with what was in the power of attorney for health care.

When that report came out, there was a fair amount of discussion about what should we do about that? How can we assure that people are not ignoring people's advance directives?

And I will just share my personal view that I don't think that that's the thing that -- kind of thing that's susceptible to law.

I think we're going through a cultural change. I think the medical profession itself has been going through change for the last two decades. And the respect for these kinds of things

is much higher than it was before -- 20 years ago and it will be much higher 20 years from now as we all become more accustomed to the role and responsibilities that the physicians have and the -- and the obligations and the role that patients want to play in this.

We -- the kind of public discourse that Dr. Straton talked about, conversations that happen in communities and hospitals is an important piece of it.

Making sure that there are routine procedures in place for making -- for providing this information to people is a piece of it.

I think that there's no question that advance directives get disregarded on a regular basis in all too many cases, but we -- we have some of the methods for improving on that in our hands now.

Many hospitals today have ethics panels that cases can be referred to if there's a dispute either between family members or a dispute between a physician and the -- and the surrogate.

And if -- if an individual who is designated as the agent feels strongly that the mother, or whoever it is that did the power of

1 attorney, would have wanted something and finds 2 themselves in conflict with -- with a physician, they typically have the authority under that power 3 4 to change physicians or go to a different hospital or do something else. 5 That's -- and that was one of the 6 7 purposes of creating those advance directives in 8 the first place. 9 This is the kind of thing that I think 10 society is still learning how to do. 11 REPRESENTATIVE HENNESSEY: Thank you very 12 much. 13 CHAIRMAN MUNDY: I --14 DIRECTOR TORREGROSSA: Could I just add 15 one thing on --16 CHAIRMAN MUNDY: I --17 DIRECTOR TORREGROSSA: -- on that? I 18 think when you're given the responsibility of -- of terminating treatment for a loved one, it's -- it's 19 a horribly brutal position to be put in, particular 20 21 if it's someone you love. 22 And so often when you're given that 23 authority, they might tell you the extreme case, 24 you know, I'm brain dead or whatever, but the

in-between stuff you don't have that discussion.

25

There's a wonderful tool out there -- and I'll include the link for it in my testimony -- that really takes you through seven scenarios and -- and you can fill it out and give it to the person who has the power of attorney.

It goes from the extreme of I'm brain dead. I'm on machines. There's no hope. You know, what would I want? Advanced -- you know, aggressive treatment, palliative care, nothing.

To -- to the other extreme of you're involved in an automobile accident. You're being rushed to the hospital. There's a good chance of your recovery. You probably want aggressive treatment, you know, in that case.

And then they have five other kind of variations -- I mean less extreme things going down.

And so that it really, I think, helps someone who has a power of attorney to really know what the person would want and give -- perhaps give you the strength to overcome the emotional load that -- that denying treatment requires.

SECRETARY HALL: And I'd like to just add to that that one of the things that you learn the hard way in this process is filling out one of

these forms.

It's hard enough when there's not even a -- an advance directive, but to think that filling out a durable power of attorney for health care or signing a living will is going to take care of this isn't -- isn't the case.

It really gets back to the conversation that Dr. Straton was having with the committee. It has to do with knowing the mind of the person -- of the family member. Being able to stand in their shoes and say, even with the benefit of advance directive, this is what they would have wanted.

A classic case that we use in ethical trainings that we did with physicians had to do with something very similar to -- to what Ann was talking about.

A 34-year-old individual, otherwise in good health, has signed an advance directive saying he wants no extraordinary measures, and then an ambulance responds to his home finding that he's aspirated a grape.

So the question is do you withhold the treatment that in -- in conformance with the advance directive, that says no extraordinary measures, or do you figure out you clear the air

pathway so that he can continue breathing again?

It's -- that's -- that's a situation that we see all the time where you have to go beyond what's written on the piece of paper and try and understand what the person would have wanted.

And it's an example of how this is an area that's not black and white. That you -- too often it is gray, and the only way you find your way through that grayness is by having a quality -- and this is where I wind up and it goes back to what I've said many times today -- a quality of conversation between the individual and the family members, between the individual and the doctors, that gives you insight into their minds and preferences and wishes and sensibilities so that you can find your way through those decisions.

REPRESENTATIVE HENNESSEY: Thank you very much.

Thank you, Madam Chairman.

CHAIRMAN MUNDY: As I look through this report, which I thought was really interesting, this end-of-life -- Improving End-of-Life Experiences for Pennsylvanians, the one that struck me about the Departments of Aging and Public Welfare is that the Departments of Aging and Public

1 Welfare should reverse the decision that restricts 2 people on the Medicare hospice benefit from also receiving home-based services through the PDA 3 4 waiver program and reinstate community choice for 5 people in need of waiver services and Medicare hospice. 6 7 If it's simply a question of reversing a 8 decision, why can't we just do that? 9 SECRETARY HALL: In my earlier testimony 10 I indicated that we have a draft policy directive 11 circulating right now that intends to harmonize those two programs instead of having them be in 12 conflict with each other. 13 CHAIRMAN MUNDY: Well, was the -- was the 14 old policy the right policy? Why -- I mean I'm not 15 16 sure why we have to go through a lengthy process. 17 SECRETARY HALL: Well --18 CHAIRMAN MUNDY: Why not just put it back 19 the way it was? 20 SECRETARY HALL: Well, historically --21 historically the CMS had communicated to the states 22 that the -- that hospice services and long-term 23 care waiver services could not be received 24 simultaneously. 25 CHAIRMAN MUNDY: Okay.

SECRETARY HALL: This was interpreted by the states as saying if you're -- if you're on hospice you couldn't get the waiver and vice-versa and you had to choose one or the other.

In December of 2008, CMS issued a policy clarification that signaled new flexibility on their part on this issue, and we've been in conversation, both with our hospice community, with Vicki Hoak and her folks at Homecare Association and the Area Agencies on Aging, to craft a new policy which takes advantage of that more flexible thinking at CMS.

CHAIRMAN MUNDY: So it's more CMS mischief?

SECRETARY HALL: Well, I mean I think -I think that historically -- and this goes back to
work that I've done in earlier parts of my
career -- a great frustration here has been CMS's
inflexibility on this.

That having been said, I think that states for too long just took that lying down and didn't say, well, why is that? That makes no sense.

And I think that's what's starting to turn around.

1 CHAIRMAN MUNDY: Okay. And then before 2 you leave, I just want to highlight two other recommendations -- and for committee members who 3 haven't had the chance to review the end-of-life 4 report, there is a set of recommendations in the 5 back and, what, there are some -- how many -- 160 6 7 recommendations, but I can really -- as I looked 8 through them, I could only find really two that 9 required legislation. 10 One was the legislature should update 11 advance directive law to assist in empowering 12 surrogates, assigning default surrogates, broadening the legal definitions surrounding 13 terminal illness, standardizing and simplifying 14 advance directive procedures and forms, and 15 16 mandating the development of a statewide HIPAA compliant registry for advance directives. 17 18 Are you aware whether there's any such 19 legislation before the Judiciary Committee or any 20 other committee to do that? 21 DIRECTOR TORREGROSSA: That was done with 22 Act 169. Yeah. 23 SECRETARY HALL: 24 CHAIRMAN MUNDY: Does that need 25 updating? That was 2006.

```
1
                DIRECTOR TORREGROSSA: The -- the
 2
      potentially outstanding work is on the POLST,
 3
      physician's order for life-sustaining treatment.
 4
                CHAIRMAN MUNDY: I'm sorry. I couldn't
      hear what you said.
 5
                DIRECTOR TORREGROSSA: I'm sorry. It's a
 6
 7
      disease.
 8
                CHAIRMAN MUNDY: Sorry about that.
 9
                DIRECTOR TORREGROSSA: I think there may
      be some -- some work that needs to be done on the
10
11
      POLST, the physician's order for life-sustaining
12
      treatment. And I think the Department of Health is
      in the process of doing that.
13
                CHAIRMAN MUNDY: That was Recommendation
14
15
      Number 2.
16
                DIRECTOR TORREGROSSA: The legislation, I
17
      think, created a process to do that. And that, I
18
      think, is the only thing that needs updating on
      that, sure.
19
20
                CHAIRMAN MUNDY: Okay. So even though
21
      this -- this -- this report and the
22
      recommendations -- oh, they're from 2000 -- okay.
23
      Sorry.
24
                SECRETARY HALL: I think in direct
25
      response to that report, Act 169 was passed. It
```

```
1
      set up the Life-Sustaining Wishes Advisory
 2
      Committee, and that committee was charged with
 3
      developing some of the things that the report
 4
      called for, including updating the physician order
 5
      process.
                CHAIRMAN MUNDY: Okay. And then the only
 6
 7
      other one that I see -- and correct me if you see
      others -- is Number 6, the Pennsylvania legislature
 8
 9
      should increase funding for scholarships, offer
10
      incentives for advanced training or certification
11
      in palliative care, such as the end-of-life nursing
      education consortium and the education on
12
13
      palliative and end-of-life care programs or board
      certification.
14
15
                Do you know where we are on that?
                                                    Is
      there anything --
16
17
                DIRECTOR TORREGROSSA: I don't --
18
                CHAIRMAN MUNDY: -- pending on that?
19
                DIRECTOR TORREGROSSA: -- believe that
20
      has happened.
21
                CHAIRMAN MUNDY: Well, obviously funding
22
      for anything at -- at the moment is problematic.
23
                DIRECTOR TORREGROSSA: Is very difficult.
24
                CHAIRMAN MUNDY: But these other
25
      certifications, anything pending with the medical
```

```
1
      education institutions?
 2
                DIRECTOR TORREGROSSA: Not that I'm aware
      of.
 3
 4
                CHAIRMAN MUNDY: Okay. All right.
                                                     Thank
      you very much. Appreciate your being here.
 5
                DIRECTOR TORREGROSSA:
 6
 7
                CHAIRMAN MUNDY: Thanks for your
 8
      testimony.
 9
                SECRETARY HALL: Thank you.
10
                DIRECTOR TORREGROSSA: Thank you.
11
                CHAIRMAN MUNDY: Oh, sorry, Deb.
12
                REPRESENTATIVE KULA: That's okay.
13
      Just -- just as you made that statement and -- and
      they talked about maybe incentives or whatever,
14
15
      what we talked about earlier was medical schools
16
      requiring this.
17
                I mean that -- that seems that eventually
18
      that would fill the gap if we can bring about more
19
      training in the medical schools without really
20
      having to do separate training for, say, other
21
      individuals.
22
                It seems that if we can get doctors to
23
      graduate from medical school with this training it
24
      may be able to fill that gap. Just a comment.
25
                CHAIRMAN MUNDY: Thank you.
```

1 REPRESENTATIVE KULA: Thank you, Madam 2 Chair. 3 CHAIRMAN MUNDY: Thank you. I really 4 appreciate Susan Gerhart's patience with us. We're 5 going to ask her to come forward now. National Director of Reimbursement and Outcomes with 6 7 AseraCare Hospice. 8 Thank you, Ms. Gerhart, for being here, 9 and thank you for sitting so patiently while the 10 committee asked so many questions. 11 You can begin whenever you're ready. 12 DIRECTOR GERHART: Thank you. 13 CHAIRMAN MUNDY: This is true. 14 ahead. 15 DIRECTOR GERHART: Good morning and thank you Chairpersons Mundy and Hennessey and committee 16 17 members. 18 As you said, my name is Susan Gerhart and I'm the National Director of Reimbursement and 19 20 Outcomes for AseraCare Hospice. I'm also a member 21 of the Advisory Council for the Lancaster County 22 Office of Aging. 23 I'm a past president of the Pennsylvania Homecare Association, and I was a member of 24 25 Governor Rendell's task force that developed the

end-of-life report that you currently have in front -- in front of you.

I commend the committee for holding this hearing to stimulate further discussion concerning end-of-life experiences for Pennsylvanians and to explore the next steps that are necessary to improve end-of-life care in Pennsylvania.

AseraCare Hospice has 12 hospice agencies throughout Pennsylvania that provide services to -- for more than 800 families, patients and families on any given day.

We take great pride in our family-centered approach which ensures the needs and wishes of both our patients and their family members are met throughout the hospice experience.

Hubert H. Humphrey stated, it was once said that the moral test of government is how that government treats those who are in the dawn of life, the children; those that are in the twilight of life, the elderly; and those who are in the shadows of life, the sick, the needy, and the handicapped.

That statement still resonates well today. The Improving End-of-Life Experience for Pennsylvanians report notes that providing quality

end-of-life experiences for all Pennsylvanians is
to -- a challenge of increasing urgency and one
that must be tackled by all of us, legislators,
government officials, medical professionals,
educators, activists, and citizens.

But little progress has been made since this report was released in 2006 as families seeking and utilizing hospice and end-of-life services in Pennsylvania still face daunting challenges in accessing these services.

Hospice use remains low, and less than a quarter of Pennsylvania residents die at home, even though they say that is their -- they would prefer to spend their remaining days at home.

What is hospice, palliative care, end-of-life care?

I think Dr. Straton verbalized that very well this morning, and I had never heard of hospice put in that -- in that verbiage of insurance defined but that was -- that was excellent. I noted that, doctor. Thank you.

So hospice care and palliative care and end-of-life care, they're all used simultaneously, inter -- interchangeably, and I think it does produce confusion among people. And so I would --

I would just urge you again to kind of review those definitions. They really kind of all intermingle and interact with one other.

Advances in modern technology and breakthroughs in modern medicine have allowed people to live longer resulting in an increase in the number of people living with chronic illnesses.

In addition, Pennsylvania today is faced with a growing elderly population. This population, people age 65 and older, comprise 15 percent of Pennsylvania's total population. Of that group, the number of people age 85 and older is projected to double to seven million by 2020.

These facts help us shape our discussion here today. How can we collectively improve access to hospice, palliative care, and end-of-life care through a better coordination of services within the financial confines of today's Medicare and Medicaid budgets?

As a nation, Medicare currently spends 27 percent of its total dollars on people who are in the last year of life. About 70 percent of the people who die each year are covered by Medicare, with about 13 percent also covered by Medicaid.

An independent study at Duke University in 2007 showed that patients receiving hospice care cost the Medicare program about \$2,300 less per patient than those who did not receive hospice care, accounting [sic] to annual savings of more than \$2 billion.

These same kinds of savings could potentially be achieved in the Medicaid program through better coordination of hospice services between various state Medicaid providers and programs.

As the end-of-life report noted, care for people who are in the last phases of life is often delivered in a variety of health care settings, including acute care hospitals, skilled nursing facilities, inpatient hospice units, and, where people want to spend their last days, if possible, at home.

One way to better coordinate this care is by allowing patients to assess Medicaid services necessary to allow them to remain home.

We support the draft bulletin, from July 2nd, 2009, that was created by the Office of Long-term Living. The bulletin clarifies the participation of consumers in aging waiver who are

seeking hospice benefits.

Currently, the AAAs must contact the

Office of Long-term Living to clarify questions or

concerns regarding the addition of waiver

services. We strongly urge this bulletin's speedy
adoption.

Hospices, by definition, provide the core services of nursing, medical social services, counseling, and aide services to a hospice patient and their family.

The hospice benefit that was designed to support care givers of that hospice patient. It was not designed to be an all-encompassing benefit that provides continual care giver services.

This is an important distinction when it comes to discussing the role of the aging waiver [sic] has in conjunction with hospice care.

The role of hospice is to effectively
help the patient to manage symptoms related to
terminal illness, including support of care
givers. This support of care givers is offered by
volunteers and, when appropriate, through
short-term respite care. However, primary cave
givers remain family and friends.

Yet many patients do not have access to

an adequate support network in their home. As a result, many patients are left to spend their final days in hospital or long-term care facility rather than at home because they cannot access adequate home and community-based services to allow them to remain home.

Home and community-based services assist patients in being able to remain at home by providing them with assistance with activities of daily living. Many people are denied access to these services through the aging waiver because they are receiving hospice services.

While we support the administration's efforts to ensure that Medicare is the payer of last resort, it is important to realize that home and community-based services offered under the aging waiver program are not being used in place of hospices-covered care but rather is a compliment to the hospice benefit.

That is why we strongly support the report recommendation that the Departments of Aging and Public Welfare should work to reverse policies that restrict people on the Medicare hospice benefit from also receiving aging waive -- waiver services.

Under the new conditions of participation for hospice that were just effective last year,

Medicare CMS allows for coordination of care between these two programs.

In the -- in the Section 418.76 entitled Hospice aide and homemaker services, it states:

Services under the Medicaid personal care benefit may be used to the extent that the hospice [sic] routinely service a hospice patient's family in implementing a patient's plan of care.

The hospice must coordinate its hospice aide and homemaker services with the Medicaid personal care benefit to ensure the patient receives the hospice aide and homemaker services he or she needs.

The hospice benefit is not intended to replace a primary care giver. Rather, it should offer the expertise and support needed to live better at the end of life. This would also allow people to die at home rather than in a more costly environment; that is, a hospital or a nursing home.

While we recognize that there are a myriad of quality recommendations that will assist the state in advancing hospice care, the need to

support patients and their families in the home is paramount.

People should have a choice where to die. That choice is a personal one and it should be based on what is comfortable, not if -- not based on one in which a care [sic] is reimbursable.

I'd just like to give you two of -- two different examples of patients in which one that we could coordinate services with waiver and what the outcome was, and one that we were not able to coordinate services.

In the first example we had an 86-year-old gentleman at home with his 84-year-old wife and they did have the waiver services in place. As his -- he was end-stage cardiac.

As his cardiac condition worsened, his physician did suggest hospice care. We were allowed to enter the care of that patient and coordinate our services with the waiving -- the waiver services.

The waiver services provided blocks of time during each day as well as assistance with additional activities of daily living, washing, cooking, that sort of thing.

We, on the other hand, came in and assisted that family with their medications, supplied oxygen for the gentleman, supplied a hospital bed so that he could sleep in an upright position more comfortably rather than in the bed that he was on trying to prop himself with 50 million pill -- pillows.

But it was a perfect example of how the two programs worked beautifully together. They went in the morning. We went in the afternoon.

They went back in the evening for a different block of time.

Together, we gave that 84-year-old spouse a lot of support and -- and care. We were also able to provide them with psychosocial support, emotional support, spiritual support.

In addition, once her husband passed away, part of the hospice benefit is 13 months of bereavement.

So we remained with her for the next 13 months providing her with the grief counseling and support she needed to move her life forward without her lifelong partner.

The other instance did not have such a pleasant outcome. In this case it was a

70-year-old woman with metastatic cancer living with her daughter and her son-in-law. In this case, hospice was in caring for her. She was independent during the day. Daughter and son-in-law were there in the evening.

But as she began to decline, the hospice services were not able to increase to meet her needs throughout the day when her daughter, who was a teacher, was at school. And we were not successful in -- in bringing in the waiver services.

Ultimately they paid a few months out-of-pocket for some private care during the day and she eventually ended up living her final days in a skilled nursing facility, which is what neither she nor her daughter had intended.

But it was an example of if we had co -could have -- could have coordinated with waiver
services I'm sure she could have remained at home
with her daughter.

Another challenge facing hospice patients is the portability of advance directives, living wills and do-not-resuscitate orders. Better education is needed for health care providers, families, and consumers for these various methods

for people -- patients to express their wishes and the standard recognition of each of these documents throughout this health care system.

Despite having a DNR, a hospice patient in a personal care home must have an ambulance called for them as described in the Licensing Measurement Instrument for the Personal Care Home Regulations, 55 Pa. Code, Chapter 2600.

As it states, if there is a DNR order and the resident requires emergency medical services, the home must contact emergency medical personnel. The home should inform the medical personnel of the resident's DNR order.

However, even with the DNR order, the home must still call emergency medical support in every incidence. They cannot -- they can withhold CPR if there is an DNR in place. That same rule applies for hospice residents in that personal care facility as well as for any other.

A call to the hospice agency is also required. However, this does not take place -- the place of the home's call to the EMTs. The hospice agency may choose to give alternate directions to the EMTs, but the home is not qualified or permitted to not call the EMTs.

And I must tell you it is the EMT's

discretion whether they are going to accept what

hospice is telling them as an alternate choice.

More times than not the EMTs will transport that

person who has ceased to breathe based on their -
the -- the direction they're given from their

command.

But I have to tell you the majority of times those patients are transported, having ceased to breathe, are transported to an emergency room for pronouncement rather than wait for the hospice nurse to get there.

A call to -- in accordance with state law, 35 Pennsylvania Statute 450.507, a registered nurse is legally permitted to assess life signs and pronounce death. Therefore, if an RN or a physician pronounces the death of a resident, EMTs do not need to be called. This applies to hospice, as well as in all personal care homes.

This practices leads to a tremendous amount of confusion and anxiety for the patient and their families. Hospice personnel have been instructed to work directly with each EMT unit to create a process to address this issue on a patient-by-patient basis rather than having it

1 addressed in the personal home care guidelines. 2 This is another example where better coordination of care focused on the patient could 3 4 help Pennsylvania reach a goal of better quality 5 end-of-life care. Thank you for this opportunity to share 6 7 my insights on just a few opportunities available 8 in Pennsylvania to better coordinate care between 9 providers for the benefit of all Pennsylvanians. 10 And I would be happy to answer any 11 questions. 12 CHAIRMAN MUNDY: Thank you very much for 13 your testimony. I must say I -- as I read what you just 14 read about the EMTs responding or -- or needing to 15 16 be called, I am really confused. 17 Obviously, I don't do this for a living 18 and you do. So maybe you could walk me through

this again.

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

The home must call an EMT in every incidence; but then later on, in -- in accordance with state law, a registered nurse is legally permitted to assess signs of life and pronounce death and EMTs do not need to be called. What?

DIRECTOR GERHART: EMTs do not need to

```
1
      be called for hospice patients when they are
 2
      residing in their own homes or any time, quite
 3
      honestly.
 4
                However --
 5
                CHAIRMAN MUNDY: So in a personal care
      home they do need to be called?
 6
 7
                DIRECTOR GERHART: Correct.
 8
                CHAIRMAN MUNDY: Each and every time?
 9
                DIRECTOR GERHART: That's correct.
10
      That's based on the rules and regulations of the
11
      personal care home.
12
                CHAIRMAN MUNDY: Even when -- even when a
      hospice nurse might be on site?
13
                DIRECTOR GERHART: Yes. That's correct.
14
15
                CHAIRMAN MUNDY: I see.
16
                DIRECTOR GERHART: That is correct. They
17
      must be called.
18
                CHAIRMAN MUNDY: Okay.
                DIRECTOR GERHART: And in --
19
20
                CHAIRMAN MUNDY: Now I understand.
21
                DIRECTOR GERHART: And in some cases, as
22
      I said, we've been able successfully to negotiate,
23
      if you will, an understanding with -- with certain
24
      EMT units who will go, because they have to
25
      respond, they've gotten the call, but they'll sit
```

```
1
      and wait for us to get there rather than
 2
      transport.
 3
                But the majority of them, as I said,
 4
      will -- they go, they've called, they must go, and
 5
      they -- they follow the command given to them back
      at their hospital-based unit, and for the most part
 6
      it is transporting that patient who has ceased to
 7
      breathe back to the ER for pronouncement.
 8
 9
                CHAIRMAN MUNDY: It doesn't make a lot of
10
      sense, huh? And it's expensive.
11
                DIRECTOR GERHART: Yes. That expense is
      then transferred to the patient's family because it
12
      is -- it's not something that's picked up by
13
      insurance. It's paid by the -- I mean the same as
14
      anything in personal care homes, it's paid for by
15
      family.
16
17
                CHAIRMAN MUNDY: I see. Interesting.
18
                DIRECTOR GERHART: And sad.
19
                CHAIRMAN MUNDY: Representative
20
      Samuelson.
21
                REPRESENTATIVE SAMUELSON: Thank you. I
22
      had another meeting so I'm not sure if Secretary
23
      Hall covered this earlier.
24
                But I guess my question is for Secretary
25
      Hall. The issue that's raised about people on the
```

```
1
      hospice benefit also getting aging waiver services
 2
      and whether there's restrictions that need to be
 3
      addressed.
 4
                SECRETARY HALL: Excuse me. Are you
      going to answer that?
 5
                DIRECTOR GERHART: Okay.
 6
 7
                REPRESENTATIVE SAMUELSON: Have you
      addressed that?
 8
 9
                CHAIRMAN MUNDY: Well, we can talk about
10
      it again. Go ahead.
11
                DIRECTOR GERHART: That -- I'm sorry. Do
12
      you want to --
                REPRESENTATIVE SAMUELSON: I'm told you
13
      might have already covered this. Sorry about that.
14
                DIRECTOR GERHART: Yes.
15
                SECRETARY HALL: Well, I think -- I think
16
17
      what Susan just referred to in her testimony is
18
      that we issued a draft policy to remove that
19
      barrier and to have those programs compliment each
20
      other, and it's out for comments with stakeholders
21
      right now.
22
                We -- that will come back in and then we
23
      intend to fix that problem by issuing a final
24
      policy.
25
                REPRESENTATIVE SAMUELSON: The proposal
```

```
1
      from July then?
 2
                SECRETARY HALL: Yes.
 3
                REPRESENTATIVE SAMUELSON: Okay.
 4
                SECRETARY HALL: That's correct.
 5
                REPRESENTATIVE SAMUELSON:
                                            Okay.
                                                   Thank
      you.
 6
                CHAIRMAN MUNDY: Under what --
 7
                DIRECTOR GERHART: And that is what we
 8
 9
      are urging speedy -- speedy resolution to. Because
      that is a much needed coordination of care for
10
11
      the -- Pennsylvanians.
12
                CHAIRMAN MUNDY: As someone who helped
13
      draft this report -- this report and
      recommendations, can you point to things that the
14
15
      legislature might help with?
16
                Again, as I mentioned earlier, I only see
      two specific recommendations for the Pennsylvania
17
18
      legislature.
                But are there other things in here with
19
20
      regard to hospice services that you think might be
21
      moved further along with legislative -- maybe just
22
      recommendations or -- or greater awareness,
23
      promoting awareness as opposed to legislation or
24
      regulation?
25
                DIRECTOR GERHART: I would agree. And I
```

agree with Dr. Straton, what he said this morning.

To put -- you know, this is more than just a

medical issue.

This is an issue for all of us in the -in the Commonwealth, and the more that we can get
public awareness out there and get people talking
about it, the -- the better off we're going to be
to get people to not be afraid of it and to make
decisions when they are able to make decisions. At
least verbalize what they would -- what they would
want should this happen to them or should they be
faced with decisions like you said, to have -- have
your -- your someone know what you would want, you
know, to take place, should you get hit by a car
today or should you be diagnosed with metastatic
cancer.

I -- I do think -- it's everything.
It's -- it's the medical community. It's
legislators. It's activists. It's every one of
us.

We have the responsibility as a citizen of this Commonwealth to -- to broaden access and awareness. And the more that you -- you have your constituents that -- you know, you've got a broad -- broad base of constituency that you could

```
1
      speak to, provide information, even -- even give
      them our information, our resource, the
 2
 3
      Pennsylvania Homecare Association, to numbers and
 4
      names to call for information to present as
 5
      resources.
                CHAIRMAN MUNDY: Other questions from
 6
 7
      committee members?
 8
                Ms. Gerhart, thank you so much for your
 9
      patience with us.
10
                DIRECTOR GERHART: Thank you.
11
                CHAIRMAN MUNDY: And for being here
12
      today.
                DIRECTOR GERHART: You're welcome.
13
14
      you.
                CHAIRMAN MUNDY: And we look forward
15
      to -- I don't know. Maybe the task force is not --
16
17
      is not necessary. Only had one taker so far.
18
      That's two.
                Maybe -- maybe -- I think -- I do think
19
      that we should get together, those of us who are
20
21
      interested, in kind of hashing out some of these
22
      issues and deciding whether -- whether there is any
23
      action we as a committee can take to further
      this -- this discussion.
24
25
                So with that said, I appreciate your
```

```
1
      attendance here, members, and thank you so much to
2
      our testifiers.
3
                 Meeting adjourned.
                 (The proceedings were concluded at
 4
 5
      11:43 p.m.)
 6
 7
 8
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

I hereby certify that the proceedings and evidence are contained fully and accurately in the notes taken by me on the within proceedings and that this is a correct transcript of the same.

Brenda S. Hamilton, RPR Reporter - Notary Public