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Figure 1: Number and Percentage of Rural Hospitals at High Risk of Financial Distress in 2015
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http://www.shepscenter.unc.edu/programs-projects/rural-health/
Good things are happening

- Community endeavors
- FQHCs/RHCs development
- Hospital diversification
- Workforce initiatives
- New and creative state policies
Yet rural hospitals are still at risk

• New policies are helping

• But the infusions of money, loss of tax revenue, and high risk require a further look at hospital authorities and broader governance of healthcare to ensure accountability when tax dollars are involved
Hospital Governance:
Most rural hospitals are owned and governed by hospital authorities

- Authorities are a type of special district
- Singular purpose in law: to promote the public health goals of the state
- Local governments can levy taxes
- Can issue bonds
- Can borrow money
- Enter into multi-year contracts
Special districts: public but with private aspects

**Private Aspects**
- “Less political”
- Allow for expertise and efficiency
- **BUT**
- More opportunities for conflicts of interest, corruption

**Public Aspects**
- Mandates for accountability and transparency
- Benefit from tax dollars and tax expenditures
- Must take Medicare/Medicaid, provide community benefit, charity care
- Have ER
- Some other management requirements spelled out in law
Good reasons why special districts are sometimes called “ghost” or “shadow” governments

2012 U.S. Census of Governments: Georgia had 1378 total governments, 510 of them special districts

Operate with little oversight of citizens or governments

Expenditures are often hidden/unreported
None of the 29 Georgia rural hospitals studied for this research had a budget, audit, or archive of minutes available on their hospital websites or on county websites.

Noncompliance of hospitals with Georgia mandates:
Indebtedness reporting
Pension fund reporting
Authority finances
Community needs assessment

Transparency is virtually non-existent in rural hospital authorities.

International Journal of Organizational Theory and Behavior – March 2018
Co-author, R.P. Yehl, Ph.D., VSU
Georgia’s hospital authorities are not the only special districts lacking in transparency

- http://www.cgjda.com/
- https://www.smyrnacity.com/your-government/boards-commissions-authorities
Improving transparency for hospital authorities and special districts

Current
- DCA doesn’t currently have the ability to publish reports or authority to sanction
- DCH has AHQs on website but info is very dated

Future Options
- State portal for reporting
- Local government portals
- Individual reporting

Mandate web-based reporting with compliance checks for all special districts
Hospital authorities sometimes cross the line between public and private interests as they seek the “silver bullet.” Transparency is lacking.
Health care has changed, but not all rural hospitals have recreated themselves

- Singular purpose to keep hospitals as-is vs. current community needs
- Cost of expansions and facelifts vs. realistic projections
- Right-sizing services to ensure stability vs. layoffs in a difficult economy
- Desire to hire docs vs. nurturing independent physicians
- Best interest of the public vs. private interests of partners, boards
- Democratic governance vs. opaque transactions
Northside Hospital Case: Georgia Supreme Court Decision, 11/2/17

- Georgia Supreme Court decision: As a HA hospital, corporate records for Northside are generally public.
- Northside had argued for privacy because “it doesn’t do anything on behalf of the county agency, and for this reason its records of health-care-related acquisitions aren’t subject to public inspection.”
Big Questions About Hospital Governance, the Regulatory Environment, and Public Purpose

Is health care too complex to be run by citizens without health care backgrounds?

Is there even a need to retain boards where the hospitals are closed or HA roles diminished?

Should hospital authorities be replaced and by what?

Is there still a public purpose for Hospital Authorities or is public purpose only applicable in certain underserved areas?

How do CON laws affect access and cost for vulnerable Georgians?
Changes are on the horizon: state governance and rural hospitals

- 2011 Minnesota repealed CON; retained a “public interest” review when rural hospitals would be at high risk
- 2016 sunset for NH CON, new law:
  - Quality review for high risk cardiac, radiation services
  - New hospitals must have ERs
  - Level playing field for charity/indigent
  - CAH competitors within 15 miles must get OK from HHS Commissioner
  - No hospital closures since sunset
With difficult choices, seek consistent values

- Are HAs and CON laws still working in the public interest?
  - CON laws created to ensure quality, control costs, protect access
  - Hospital authorities established to assure public health goals of the state

- Public interest? Protect access to rural residents and vulnerable populations in inner cities
• Rethink HA (special district) laws to mandate transparent behaviors

• Look at options for planning
  – Study option of regional planning
  – Identify areas of market failure

• Focus on sustainability
  – for primary care infrastructure
  – better deployment of EMS
  – ensure access to ERs
  – maintenance of charity/indigent obligations, Medicare/Medicaid acceptance
  – consider Medicaid options

• Support workforce development

• Rethink CON with “public health care goals of the state” in mind
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