

<p>SUPREME COURT, STATE OF COLORADO 2 East 14th Avenue Denver, CO 80203</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">▲ COURT USE ONLY ▲</p>
<p>Court of Appeals No. 11CA1005 Judges Rothenberg, Casebolt, and Furman</p>	
<p>Appeal from the District Court, City &amp; County of Denver Honorable Ann B. Frick, District Judge Case No. 2010CV7731</p>	
<p><b>Petitioners:</b> COLORADO MEDICAL SOCIETY and COLORADO SOCIETY OF ANESTHESIOLOGISTS</p> <p><b>Respondent:</b> JOHN HICKENLOOPER, in his official capacity as the Governor of Colorado</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Case Number:  12 SC 671</p>
<p>Attorneys for Amicus Curiae: American Hospital Association</p> <p>Christopher O. Murray, #39340 HOGAN LOVELLS US LLP 1200 17th Street, Suite 1500 Denver, CO 80202 Tel: (303) 899-7300 Fax: (303) 899-7333 chris.murray@hoganlovells.com</p> <p><i>Of counsel:</i> Jessica L. Ellsworth David M. Ginn HOGAN LOVELLS US LLP 555 Thirteenth Street, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20004 Tel: (202) 637-5600 Fax: (202) 637-5910</p>	
<p style="text-align: center;"><b>BRIEF OF AMICUS CURIAE AMERICAN HOSPITAL ASSOCIATION IN SUPPORT OF RESPONDENT</b></p>	

## CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE

I hereby certify that this amicus brief complies with all requirements of C.A.R. 28 and C.A.R. 32, including all formatting requirements set forth in these rules. Specifically, the undersigned certifies that:

1. The brief complies with C.A.R. 28(g).

Choose one:

It contains \_\_\_ words.

It does not exceed 30 pages.

2. The brief complies with C.A.R. 28(k).

For the party raising the issue:

It contains under a separate heading (1) a concise statement of the applicable standard of appellate review with citation to authority; and (2) a citation to the precise location in the record, not to an entire document, where the issue was raised and ruled on.

For the party responding to the issue:

It contains, under a separate heading, a statement of whether such party agrees with the opponent's statements concerning the standard of review and preservation for appeal, and if not, why not.

/s/ Christopher O. Murray  
Christopher O. Murray

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

	<u>Page</u>
CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE.....	i
TABLE OF AUTHORITIES .....	iii
STATEMENT OF THE ISSUE PRESENTED AND INTEREST OF AMICUS CURIAE AMERICAN HOSPITAL ASSOCIATION .....	1
STANDARD OF REVIEW .....	5
ARGUMENT .....	5
I.    The Federal Government Permits States To Opt Out Of Medicare’s Physician Supervision Requirement And Make Full Use Of CRNAs’ Authorized Scope Of Practice.....	5
II.   Seventeen States Have Opted Out Of The Physician Supervision Requirement Without Reporting Any Adverse Consequences .....	10
III.  Opting Out Of The Physician Supervision Requirement Allows States To Improve Access To Health Care In Underserved Rural Areas .....	12
IV.  Recent Research Confirms That Opting Out Facilitates The Cost Effective Provision Of Anesthesia Services Without Adversely Affecting Quality Of Care Or Patient Outcomes.....	16
CONCLUSION.....	19
CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE	

## TABLE OF AUTHORITIES

	<u>Page</u>
<b><u>Cases:</u></b>	
<i>Specialty Restaurants Corp. v. Nelson</i> , 231 P.3d 393 (Colo. 2010).....	5
<i>California Soc. of Anesthesiologists v. Superior Court</i> , 204 Cal. App. 4th 390 (Cal. App. 2012), <i>review denied</i> (June 13, 2012).....	9
<b><u>Rule:</u></b>	
C.A.R. 29.....	1
<b><u>Regulations:</u></b>	
42 C.F.R. § 485.610(b)-(c).....	12
48 Fed. Reg. 299,304 (Jan. 4, 1983) .....	6
51 Fed. Reg. 22,010 (June 17, 1986) .....	5, 6
54 Fed. Reg. 3,803 (Jan. 26, 1989) .....	5
62 Fed. Reg. 66,726 (Dec. 19, 1997) .....	6
66 Fed. Reg. 4,674 (Jan. 18, 2001) .....	5, 7, 8, 16
66 Fed. Reg. 56,762 (Nov. 13, 2001).....	6, 7, 8, 9, 16
77 Fed. Reg. 29,034 (May, 16, 2012) .....	10
<b><u>Other Authorities:</u></b>	
AHA Commission on Workforce, <i>Health Care Workforce: New Ways of Working in Hospitals</i> (2003) .....	4
AHA Commission on Workforce, <i>In Our Hands</i> (2002) .....	4

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES—Continued**

	<u>Page</u>
AHA Long-Range Policy Committee, <i>Workforce 2015: Strategy Trumps Shortage</i> (2009) .....	4
AHA, <i>Trendwatch: The Opportunities and Challenges for Rural Hospitals in an Era of Health Reform</i> (Apr. 2011) .....	2, 3, 14
Am. Ass’n of Nurse Anesthetists, <i>Quality of Care in Anesthesia</i> (2009) .....	18
Am. Ass’n of Nurse Anesthetists, <i>Legal Issues in Nurse Anesthesia Practice 1</i> (May 2010) .....	11
Council on Graduate Medical Education, <i>Tenth Report: Physician Distribution and Health Care Challenges in Rural and Inner-City Areas</i> (Feb. 1998) .....	12, 13
Brian Dulisse & Jerry Cromwell, <i>No Harm Found When Nurse Anesthetists Work Without Supervision By Physicians</i> , 29 <i>Health Affairs</i> 1469 (2010) .....	17
Rachel Fields, <i>17 States Opting Out of the Physician Supervision of Anesthesia Rule</i> , <i>Becker’s ASC Review</i> (May 30, 2012) .....	11
Rachel Fields, <i>Top Challenges for Anesthesiologists: 5 Thoughts From ASA Incoming President Dr. Jerry Cohen</i> , <i>Becker’s ASC Review</i> (July 20, 2011) .....	13
Health Res. & Servs. Admin., U.S. Dep’t of Health & Human Servs., <i>Designated Primary Care Health Professional Shortage Areas</i> (as of September 1, 2011) .....	13
Paul F. Hogan <i>et al.</i> , <i>Cost Effectiveness Analysis of Anesthesia Providers</i> , 28 <i>Nursing Economics</i> 159 (2010) .....	18

**TABLE OF AUTHORITIES—Continued**

	<u>Page</u>
Letter from AHA to Appropriations Subcomm. on Labor, Health & Human Servs., and Educ. (May 20, 2011) .....	4
Letter from Gov. Frank Murkowski to Thomas Scully (Sept. 17, 2003) .....	16
Letter from Gov. Thomas Vilsack to Gov. Bill Owens (July 21, 2003) .....	12
Takashi Matsusaki & Tetsuro Sakai, <i>The Role of Certified Registered Nurse Anesthetists in the United States</i> , 25 <i>Journal of Anesthesia</i> 734 (2011).....	15
Jack Needleman & Ann F. Minnick, <i>Anesthesia Provider Model, Hospital Resources, and Maternal Outcomes</i> , 44 <i>Health Services Research</i> 464 (2009) .....	17
Donald E. Pathman <i>et al.</i> , <i>Retention of Primary Care Physicians in Rural Health Professional Shortage Areas</i> , 94 <i>Am. J. Pub. Health</i> 1723 (2004).....	14
RAND Corp., <i>An Analysis of the Labor Markets for Anesthesiology</i> (2010).....	13, 14, 15
RAND Corp., <i>Is There a Shortage of Anesthesia Providers in the United States?</i> (2010) .....	13, 15
Daniel C. Simonson <i>et al.</i> , <i>Anesthesia Staffing and Anesthetic Complications During Cesarean Delivery: A Retrospective Analysis</i> , 56 <i>Nursing Research</i> , Jan.-Feb. 2007 .....	18
<i>The Physician Shortage Crisis in Rural America: Who Will Treat Our Patients?: Hearing Before the S. Comm. on Health, Educ., Labor, and Pensions</i> , 110th Cong. 76 (2007).....	14

Comes now the American Hospital Association (“AHA”), and pursuant to C.A.R. 29 presents this amicus brief in support of Respondent. The Governor of Colorado determined that it was in the best interest of Colorado’s citizens to exercise the opt-out provision of a Medicare rule requiring a certified registered nurse anesthetist (“CRNA”) administering anesthesia to be supervised by a physician. Colorado was the sixteenth state to opt out of this requirement, and since it did so, yet another state has also opted out. Colorado’s Governor exercised the opt-out after conferring with the Colorado Medical Board and Colorado Board of Nursing about access to, and the quality of, anesthesia services in Colorado. The opt-out is limited to Critical Access Hospitals and named rural general hospitals, both of which provide patient care in rural areas. The District Court granted a motion to dismiss in favor of the Governor, and the Court of Appeals affirmed. This Court should likewise affirm the Governor’s efforts to ameliorate gaps in access to care for Coloradans living in rural parts of the State.

**STATEMENT OF THE ISSUE PRESENTED AND INTEREST OF  
AMICUS CURIAE AMERICAN HOSPITAL ASSOCIATION**

AHA submits this amicus brief to address the following issue on which this Court granted certiorari:

Whether the court of appeals erred in determining that Colorado’s Nurse Practice Act allows Colorado’s Governor to request an exemption from the physician-supervision requirement under federal

Medicare reimbursement regulations, so that a certified registered nurse can administer anesthesia without physician supervision and the facility can obtain Medicare reimbursement.

AHA represents nearly 5,000 hospitals, health systems, and other health care organizations, as well as 43,000 individual members. AHA members are committed to improving the health of communities they serve and to helping ensure that care is available to, and affordable for, all Americans. AHA educates its members on health care issues and advocates to ensure that their perspectives are considered in formulating health care policy.

This case is about the Governor's conclusion that it was in the best interest of Colorado's citizens, and consistent with Colorado law, to address the indisputable gap in access to care in rural areas of the State by opting out of the Medicare CRNA physician supervision requirement. In Colorado and across the United States, seventy-two million Americans living in rural areas depend upon the hospital serving their community as an important—and often only—source of health care. *See AHA, Trendwatch: The Opportunities and Challenges for Rural Hospitals in an Era of Health Reform* (Apr. 2011).<sup>1</sup> The nation's nearly 2,000 hospitals serving rural areas frequently act as an anchor for their region's health-

---

<sup>1</sup> Available at <https://aharesourcecenter.wordpress.com/2011/05/02/opportunities-and-challenges-for-rural-hospitals-in-an-era-of-health-reform/> (last visited Jan. 6, 2014).

related services and provide the structural and financial backbone for physician practice groups, health clinics, and post-acute and long-term care services. *Id.*

Rural hospitals, like the Critical Access Hospitals and rural general hospitals to which the Governor's opt-out applies, face a number of challenges due to their more remote locations, small size, limited workforce, and constrained financial resources. Demographic information about both the patient population and rural health care workers demonstrates some of these challenges. The rural hospital patient population is generally older, less healthy, and less wealthy than the general patient population, and rural patients must travel greater distances to seek care with less access to reliable transportation, which can delay treatment and aggravate health problems. *Id.* The combined effect of an older age mix of the population and greater poverty levels in rural areas make rural hospitals highly dependent on public programs like Medicare. Indeed, on average, 60% of gross revenue in rural hospitals comes from these public programs. *Id.* That fact means that reimbursement limitations for these programs have an especially significant impact on rural hospitals. *Id.*

A growing shortage of health care workers has also affected rural areas more than urban or suburban areas. *Id.* This shortage makes it all the more important for available health care workers to use the full extent of their professional training

and capability, as permitted by State law. AHA has attested to the need to respond to workforce shortages, particularly in rural communities. *See* Letter from AHA to Appropriations Subcomm. on Labor, Health & Human Servs., and Educ. (May 20, 2011).<sup>2</sup> Workforce issues are a key strategic priority for AHA. Over the last fifteen years, AHA has been acutely aware of and attentive to the critical importance of developing the workforce of the future. *See* AHA Commission on Workforce, *In Our Hands* (2002) (focused on hospital staff recruitment and retention); AHA Commission on Workforce, *Health Care Workforce: New Ways of Working in Hospitals* (2003) (a practical guide to use hospital staff skills and time more effectively); AHA Long-Range Policy Committee, *Workforce 2015: Strategy Trumps Shortage* (2009) (including recommendations for addressing workforce needs).

After proper consultation with the Colorado Medical Board and the Colorado Board of Nursing, the Governor chose to make use of the latitude provided under Medicare to permit States to make full use of CRNAs without risking their hospitals being found ineligible for reimbursement. Governor Ritter specifically tailored his decision to rural general and Critical Access Hospitals that face the challenges identified above. The opt-out will improve access to health

---

<sup>2</sup> Available at <http://www.aha.org/advocacy-issues/letter/2011/110523-let-pollack-rehberg-deLauro.pdf> (last visited Jan. 6, 2014)

care for rural Coloradans. The Governor’s choice—which, as Respondent explains, is fully consistent with Colorado law—should be upheld by this Court.

### **STANDARD OF REVIEW**

The appeal presents a pure question of law, which was preserved below and which this Court reviews *de novo*. See *Specialty Restaurants Corp. v. Nelson*, 231 P.3d 393, 397 (Colo. 2010).

### **ARGUMENT**

#### **I. The Federal Government Permits States To Opt Out Of Medicare’s Physician Supervision Requirement And Make Full Use Of CRNAs’ Authorized Scope Of Practice.**

The Medicare program has consistently permitted CRNAs to administer anesthesia. The only issue has been whether, and to what extent, CRNAs must be supervised by a physician so that their services are eligible for Medicare reimbursement. From 1986 to 2001, Medicare program requirements for reimbursement required that CRNAs work “under the supervision of the operating practitioner or of an anesthesiologist who is immediately available if needed.” 51 Fed. Reg. 22,010, 22,049 (June 17, 1986) (final rule).<sup>3</sup> Although the former rule

---

<sup>3</sup> The regulations have never required CRNAs to work under the direct medical supervision of an anesthesiologist. Rather, CRNAs have always been permitted to work under the “general supervision” of surgeons. 54 Fed. Reg. 3,803, 3,807 (Jan. 26, 1989); *see also* 66 Fed. Reg. 4,674, 4,679 (Jan. 18, 2001) (final rule, subsequently withdrawn by amended final rule on Nov. 13, 2001)

did not categorically mandate physician supervision, it made such supervision a condition of federal funding. No explanation was given for the supervision requirement when it was first proposed or when it was finalized. *See* 48 Fed. Reg. 299, 304 (Jan. 4, 1983) (proposed rule); 51 Fed. Reg. at 22,028 (final rule).

In the decade after the 1986 supervision requirement took effect, advances in the safety of anesthesia prompted the federal government to reconsider whether physician supervision of CRNAs should be a requirement for Medicare reimbursement. In 1997, the federal government proposed repealing the physician supervision requirement entirely from the Medicare Program. *See* 62 Fed. Reg. 66,726, 66,740 (Dec. 19, 1997) (proposed rule). Based on comments submitted in response to the proposed rule, the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (“CMS”) recognized that some States may have written their laws based on the assumption that Medicare would continue to require supervision of CRNAs. 66 Fed. Reg. 56,762, 56,762 (Nov. 13, 2001) (final rule).<sup>4</sup> Changing course to

---

(“Even under the current regulation CRNAs are not required to be under the supervision of an anesthesiologist; the operating physician can meet the rule’s requirements.”). As a result, the view of the amici anesthesiologists that all anesthetics should be delivered by or under the medical direction of an anesthesiologist (*see* AMA & ASA *amicus* brief at 8-9) has never been supported by the federal government.

<sup>4</sup> The Medicare program is regulated by the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (“HHS”). The agency responsible for the Medicare program

eliminate the federal requirement might therefore have “change[d] supervision practices in [those] States without allowing [the] States to consider their individual situations.” *Id.* CMS was concerned that if there had been no Medicare supervision requirement, “States might have promulgated different laws or different monitoring practices.” *Id.*

When it finalized the change in Medicare policy in 2001, CMS accordingly decided to give States the latitude to voluntarily opt out of the supervision requirement for the Medicare program—to the extent supervision was not required under State law—rather than eliminate the requirement altogether. *Id.* at 56,768-69. The motivation for this latitude was that anesthesia had become significantly safer and there was no evidence that physician supervision of CRNAs resulted in better patient outcomes. *See* 66 Fed. Reg. at 4,678-79 (anesthesia mortality rate declined from two deaths per 10,000 anesthetics administered in the early 1980s to one death per 200,000–300,000 anesthetics administered in 1999); *id.* at 4,675 (CMS concluded that there is “no compelling scientific evidence that an across-the-board Federal physician supervision requirement for CRNAs leads to better outcomes”). Indeed, CMS was worried that the supervision requirement “could

---

within HHS is now called the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, or “CMS.” To avoid confusion, this brief refers to both CMS and its predecessor agency, the Health Care Financing Administration, as CMS.

potentially limit development of new practice models of anesthesia delivery, or interfere with progress in promoting practices that improve patient outcomes.” *Id.* at 4,682. In light of the wide variations in patient types, surgical procedures, technologies, provider settings, and other factors unique to each case, CMS determined that an across-the-board federal requirement was simply “not sensible.” *Id.* at 4,679.

The final rule promulgated by CMS in 2001 therefore sought to enable States to determine the appropriate scope of practice for CRNAs by replacing the Medicare program’s supervision requirement with an optional requirement, dependent on state law. “Under this final rule, State laws will determine which professionals are permitted to administer anesthetics and the level of supervision required, recognizing a State’s traditional domain in establishing professional licensure and scope-of-practice laws.” 66 Fed. Reg. at 56,762. CMS explained how the opt-out worked: The governor of a State, in consultation with the State’s Boards of Medicine and Nursing, could exercise an option of exemption from the physician supervision requirement. *Id.* at 56,763. The opt-out was designed to “give States the flexibility to improve access and address safety issues.” *Id.*<sup>5</sup> And

---

<sup>5</sup> Even if a State exercises the opt-out, individual hospitals can retain a requirement that a physician supervise CRNAs. *Id.* at 56,765 (“The final rule would not require hospitals under any circumstances to eliminate physician

by requiring that a governor consult with both the Boards of Medicine and Nursing, CMS felt that it would “ensure appropriate involvement of parties on both sides of the issue.” *Id.* at 56,764. As CMS recognized, “the particular factors that are pertinent in reaching a sound policy decision will invariably vary from State to State (*for example, access to anesthesia services in rural areas*).” *Id.* (emphasis added).

The 2001 rule, which remains in effect today, thus moves decision-making authority away from the national level and authorizes a governor, in consultation with the Boards of Medicine and Nursing, to determine a policy for CRNAs’ scope of practice that best serves each State and is consistent with State law. The 2001 rule was specifically designed to ensure that “those closest to, and who know the most about, the health care delivery system are accountable for the outcomes of that care.” *Id.* at 56,765.

---

supervision if they deem this appropriate.”). As the California appellate court reviewing a challenge to California’s opt-out explained, “[w]hether physicians should supervise CRNAs, or whether CRNAs should be used at all, are questions that have to be decided by each individual medical facility because ‘hospitals can always exercise stricter standards than required by State law.’ Accordingly, a hospital or other medical facility may require physician supervision of CRNAs if it deems it appropriate, irrespective of the state’s opt out. The Governor’s opt-out decision merely gives California facilities the option of using CRNAs to administer anesthesia without physician supervision without jeopardizing their Medicare reimbursements.” *California Soc. of Anesthesiologists v. Superior Court*, 204 Cal. App. 4th 390, 397-398 (Cal. App. 2012) (quoting (66 Fed. Reg. at 56765 (Nov. 13, 2001), *review denied* (June 13, 2012)).

The opt-out rule has now been in place for over twelve years. CMS has never reconsidered or second-guessed it. To the contrary, CMS has consistently reaffirmed its commitment to eliminating needless structure and process requirements in health care delivery systems. In one recent rulemaking, for example, CMS expanded the scope of practice for non-physician professionals even further. 77 Fed. Reg. 29,034, 29,035 (May 16, 2012) (new rule allows hospitals to “broaden the concept of ‘medical staff’ through the appointment of non-physician practitioners to the medical staff so that they may perform the duties for which they are qualified through training and education and as allowed within their State scope-of-practice laws”). This continued push for flexibility demonstrates that CMS is satisfied that allowing States and hospitals to have increased latitude in using advanced practice nurses like CRNAs can improve access while adequately addressing safety issues like quality of care and patient outcomes.

## **II. Seventeen States Have Opted Out Of The Physician Supervision Requirement Without Reporting Any Adverse Consequences.**

Seventeen States—over one-third of the Nation—have opted out of the federal supervision requirement since the option first become available in 2001: Iowa (in 2001); Nebraska (in 2002); Idaho (in 2002); Minnesota (in 2002); New Hampshire (in 2002); New Mexico (in 2002); Kansas (in 2003); North Dakota (in

2003); Washington (in 2003); Alaska (in 2003); Oregon (in 2003); Montana (in 2004); South Dakota (in 2005); Wisconsin (in 2005); California (in 2009); Colorado (in 2010); and Kentucky (in 2012). None of those States has reported any dissatisfaction with its opt-out experience. And although the federal regulations expressly permit a State to withdraw its opt-out, no State has exercised that option apart from a one-month period in which Montana's new governor temporarily withdrew the State's opt-out. See Rachel Fields, *17 States Opting Out of the Physician Supervision of Anesthesia Rule*, Becker's ASC Review (May 30, 2012).<sup>6</sup> Outside the Medicare program, a majority of States permit CRNAs to administer anesthesia without physician supervision. Am. Ass'n of Nurse Anesthetists, *Legal Issues in Nurse Anesthesia Practice* 1 (May 2010).<sup>7</sup>

The decade-plus experience of these States demonstrates that choosing to opt out of the physician supervision requirement does not adversely affect quality of care or patient outcomes. A 2003 letter from then-Governor of Iowa Tom Vilsack to then-Governor of Colorado Bill Owens summarizes that State's experience well. The decision to opt out, Governor Vilsack wrote, has been a "remarkable success" that has "resulted in an improved outlook for rural Iowa

---

<sup>6</sup> Available at <http://www.beckersasc.com/anesthesia/17-states-opting-out-of-the-physician-supervision-of-anesthesia-rule.html> (last visited Jan. 6, 2014).

<sup>7</sup> Available at <http://www.aana.com/aboutus/documents/legalissuesnap.pdf>.

healthcare.” Letter from Gov. Thomas Vilsack to Gov. Bill Owens (July 21, 2003).<sup>8</sup> Governor Vilsack noted that “[a]bsolutely no reports have been made of problems or changes in the quality of care provided.” *Id.* Quite to the contrary, the Iowa Department of Public Health and the Iowa Board of Nursing had informed the Governor that “the quality of care given by CRNAs has never been higher.” *Id.* And hospital administrators, physicians, and healthcare organizations wrote to the Governor to praise “the overwhelming success of the opt-out.” *Id.*

### **III. Opting Out Of The Physician Supervision Requirement Allows States To Improve Access To Health Care In Underserved Rural Areas.**

Colorado’s opt-out is limited to Critical Access Hospitals<sup>9</sup> and specified rural general hospitals. Like Colorado, most of the other opt-out States have large areas of rural populations. These are not coincidences. Rural areas of the United States have great difficulty recruiting and retaining anesthesiologists and other physicians, and they consequently suffer from acute physician shortages. *See* Council on Graduate Medical Education, *Tenth Report: Physician Distribution and Health Care Challenges in Rural and Inner-City Areas* 11 (Feb. 1998) (shortage of physicians in rural areas is “one of the few constants” in the U.S. health care

---

<sup>8</sup> Available at <http://www.aana.com/advocacy/stategovernmentaffairs/Documents/ia%20gov.pdf> (last visited Jan. 6, 2014).

<sup>9</sup> Critical Access Hospitals offer 24-hour emergency services in remote areas. *See* 42 C.F.R. § 485.610(b)-(c).

system). Approximately twenty percent of Americans live in rural areas, yet only nine percent of American physicians practice in rural areas. *Id.* Colorado alone has dozens of federally-designated “Health Professional Shortage Areas,” which lack a sufficient number of physicians and other health professionals to meet the health care needs of residents. *See* Health Res. & Servs. Admin., U.S. Dep’t of Health & Human Servs., *Designated Primary Care Health Professional Shortage Areas* (as of June 27, 2013), *available at* <http://bhpr.hrsa.gov/shortage/updateddesignations/index.html> (last visited Jan. 6, 2014).

Anesthesiologists are in particularly short supply. According to the former President of the American Society of Anesthesiologists, there is a nationwide shortage of anesthesiologists. Rachel Fields, *Top Challenges for Anesthesiologists: 5 Thoughts From ASA Incoming President Dr. Jerry Cohen*, *Becker’s ASC Review* (July 20, 2011);<sup>10</sup> *see also* RAND Corp., *An Analysis of the Labor Markets for Anesthesiology* 71-72 (2010) (shortage of anesthesiologists is likely to persist through 2020);<sup>11</sup> *id.* at 18, figure 3.1 (showing the lack of anesthesiologists in rural areas) and 55, figure 4.2 (showing Colorado has a

---

<sup>10</sup> *Available at* <http://www.beckersasc.com/anesthesia/the-top-challenges-for-anesthesiologists-5-thoughts-from-asa-incoming-president-dr-jerry-cohen.html> (last visited Jan. 6, 2014).

<sup>11</sup> *Available at* [http://www.rand.org/content/dam/rand/pubs/technical\\_reports/2010/RAND\\_TR688.pdf](http://www.rand.org/content/dam/rand/pubs/technical_reports/2010/RAND_TR688.pdf) (last visited Jan. 6, 2014).

shortage of anesthesiologists). And that shortage is even more pronounced in rural areas. Of the currently practicing anesthesiologists, ninety-five percent practice in urban areas. See RAND Corp., *Is There a Shortage of Anesthesia Providers in the United States?*, at 2-3 (2010).<sup>12</sup> Rural health facilities are consequently much less likely to employ anesthesiologists than their peer facilities in urban areas. RAND Corp., *An Analysis of the Labor Markets*, *supra*, at 71.

This broad mismatch between supply and demand for medical services “threaten[s] health care delivery in many rural communities in the United States.” Donald E. Pathman *et al.*, *Retention of Primary Care Physicians in Rural Health Professional Shortage Areas*, 94 *Am. J. Pub. Health* 1723, 1723 (2004). Among other things, the shortage of rural physicians increases the cost of care for hospitals in those areas and impedes patients’ access to care. See *The Physician Shortage Crisis in Rural America: Who Will Treat Our Patients?: Hearing Before the S. Comm. on Health, Educ., Labor, and Pensions*, 110th Cong. 76 (2007) (report of the Alaska Physician Supply Task Force). These adverse consequences fall on a particularly vulnerable population, for rural residents tend to be older, have lower incomes, and suffer from higher rates of chronic illness than their urban counterparts. AHA, *Trendwatch*, *supra*. Moreover, because anesthesia services

---

<sup>12</sup> Available at [http://www.rand.org/pubs/research\\_briefs/RB9541.html](http://www.rand.org/pubs/research_briefs/RB9541.html) (last visited Jan. 6, 2014).

are typically provided in connection with other medical procedures, the shortage of anesthesiologists has a ripple effect across other medical disciplines.

CRNAs have the professional training needed to alleviate the lack of access to physician-supervised anesthesia care. While Colorado has a shortage of anesthesiologists, it has a surplus of CRNAs. *See* RAND Corp., *Is There a Shortage of Anesthesia Providers*, *supra*, at 2. And because CRNAs are more likely than anesthesiologists to work in rural areas, they have become “a particularly important labor source in rural areas.” RAND Corp., *An Analysis of the Labor Markets*, *supra*, at 3, 17. In fact, more than half of CRNAs practice in rural areas—56%—a statistic that stands in sharp contrast to the contrary suggestion in the AMA and ASA amicus brief. *See id.* at 18 figure 3.1; AMA & ASA Amicus Br. at 27 (suggesting that CRNAs do not routinely practice in rural hospitals). Indeed, in the States that have opted out of the federal physician supervision requirement, CRNAs “tend to be the sole anesthesia providers in the vast majority of rural hospitals . . . .” Takashi Matsusaki & Tetsuro Sakai, *The Role of Certified Registered Nurse Anesthetists in the United States*, 25 *Journal of Anesthesia* 734, 737 (2011). They allow those rural hospitals to offer “surgical and obstetrical services, trauma stabilization, and interventional diagnostic and pain management capabilities” that might not otherwise be available. *Id.*

CMS had these features of the health care labor market in mind when it instituted the opt-out. The new rule was designed in part to “give States the flexibility to improve access” to health care in rural areas. 66 Fed. Reg. at 56,767. As CMS recognized, nurse anesthetists have “increased access to anesthesia care, and thereby, access to medical and surgical procedures that would likely be unavailable if not for a practitioner qualified to administer anesthesia.” 66 Fed. Reg. at 4,682. The new rule encourages that trend by allowing States and hospitals to find new ways to deliver anesthesia services. Indeed, at least one governor concluded that choosing *not* to opt out could “severely limit the ability of rural hospitals to treat emergencies and provide other services requiring anesthesia care to Medicare patients.” Letter from Gov. Frank Murkowski to Thomas Scully (Sept. 17, 2003).<sup>13</sup>

#### **IV. Recent Research Confirms That Opting Out Facilitates The Cost Effective Provision Of Anesthesia Services Without Adversely Affecting Quality Of Care Or Patient Outcomes.**

The passage of time has only reinforced the federal government’s assessment from 2001 that removing the physician supervision requirement would not affect quality of care or patient outcomes. A study published in 2010 reviewed data from 1999 to 2005 to determine whether the federal opt-out provision had led

---

<sup>13</sup> Available at <http://www.aana.com/advocacy/stategovernmentaffairs/Documents/alaska.pdf> (last visited Jan. 6, 2014).

to more inpatient deaths or complications. *See* Brian Dulisse & Jerry Cromwell, *No Harm Found When Nurse Anesthetists Work Without Supervision By Physicians*, 29 *Health Affairs* 1469 (2010). The authors compared outcomes in States that had opted out to outcomes in States that had not opted out, controlling for various factors. *See id.* at 1470–71. They found no increase in adverse outcomes in either opt-out States or non-opt-out States; in fact, mortality rates declined in both groups of States. *Id.* at 1474. Nor did the data suggest that patients are exposed to increased surgical risk when CRNAs work without physician supervision. *See id.* (rate of adverse outcomes for patients treated by CRNAs in opt-out States “did not vary greatly between the period before opting out and the period after”). In other words, “patient safety was not compromised by the opt-out policy.” *Id.* at 1475.

Other recent studies support the basic findings of the *Health Affairs* study. In a 2009 article, for example, two researchers concluded that obstetrical outcomes are not systemically poorer in hospitals that use only CRNAs, or a combination of CRNAs and anesthesiologists, compared to hospitals that use only anesthesiologists. *See* Jack Needleman & Ann F. Minnick, *Anesthesia Provider Model, Hospital Resources, and Maternal Outcomes*, 44 *Health Services Research* 464 (2009). An earlier study reached essentially the same conclusion based on

data from the State of Washington. See Daniel C. Simonson *et al.*, *Anesthesia Staffing and Anesthetic Complications During Cesarean Delivery: A Retrospective Analysis*, 56 *Nursing Research*, Jan.-Feb. 2007, at 15 (“Analysis of the incidence of anesthetic complications in 134,806 cesarean sections over 12 years suggests that hospitals that utilize CRNAs to provide their obstetrical anesthesia have no difference in rate of obstetrical anesthesia complications from those that use anesthesiologists.”).

The insurance markets also seem to be confident that CRNAs are able to deliver anesthesia safely. As the American Association of Nurse Anesthetists has documented, premiums for CRNA professional liability insurance decreased 39% between 1988 and 2004—a drop that is particularly impressive in light of the sharp upward trend in premiums for other types of professional liability insurance. See Am. Ass’n of Nurse Anesthetists, *Quality of Care in Anesthesia* 14, 38–39 (2009). Finally, research has confirmed what is obvious to most observers: It is more cost-effective for CRNAs to work independently than to work under the supervision of an anesthesiologist. See Paul F. Hogan *et al.*, *Cost Effectiveness Analysis of Anesthesia Providers*, 28 *Nursing Economics* 159, 166, 168 (2010).

This new research merely confirms what was evident to the federal government many years ago. Health care providers are well-positioned to

determine what anesthesia delivery arrangements will best serve the local population. Where a governor, in consultation with the Boards of Medicine and Nursing, determines that allowing CRNAs to administer anesthesia without requiring physician supervision is in the best interests of the State and consistent with State law, that exercise of the governor's discretion should be upheld. That is precisely what happened here, and therefore, the Court of Appeals' judgment in this matter should be affirmed.

### **CONCLUSION**

For the foregoing reasons, and those argued by the Respondent, AHA respectfully requests that this Court affirm the judgment of the Court of Appeals.

January 6, 2014

Respectfully submitted,

*[Original Signature on file at the offices  
of Hogan Lovells US LLP]*

*Of counsel:*  
Jessica L. Ellsworth  
David M. Ginn  
HOGAN LOVELLS US LLP  
555 Thirteenth Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20004  
Tel: (202) 637-5886  
Fax: (202) 637-5910

s/ Christopher O. Murray  
Christopher O. Murray, #39340  
HOGAN LOVELLS US LLP  
1200 17th Street, Suite 1500  
Denver, CO 80202  
Tel: (303) 899-7300  
Fax: (303) 899-7333  
chris.murray@hoganlovells.com

Counsel for Amicus Curiae  
American Hospital Association

## CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on this 6th day of January 2014, a true and correct copy of the foregoing was electronically filed and served via U.S. mail on the following:

LeeAnn Morrill, Esq.  
Matthew Grove, Esq.  
Assistant Attorneys General  
Office of the Attorney General  
1525 Sherman Street, 7th Floor  
Denver, CO 80203  
Attorneys for Governor John Hickenlooper

Kari Hershey, Esq.  
Hershey Skinner, LLC  
10463 Park Meadows Drive, Suite 209  
Littleton, CO 80124  
Attorney for Colorado Medical Society

Joseph J. Bronesky, Esq.  
Frederick Y. Yu, Esq.  
Jason C. Miller, Esq.  
Sherman & Howard L.L.C.  
633 Seventeenth Street, Suite 3000  
Denver, CO 80202  
Attorneys for Colorado Society of Anesthesiologists

Gerald A. Niederman, Esq.  
Bennett L. Cohen, Esq.  
Polsineli Shughart, PC  
1515 Wynkoop, Suite 600  
Denver, Co 80202  
Attorneys for Colorado Hospital Association

Dirk W. de Roos  
Faegre & Benson

3200 Wells Fargo Center  
1700 Lincoln Street  
Denver, CO 80203  
Attorney for Colorado Hospital Association

Fred Miles, Esq.  
Peggy E. Kozal, Esq.  
Miles & Peters, P.C.  
450 East 17th Avenue, Suite 220  
Denver, CO 80203-1254  
Attorneys for Colorado Association of Nurse Anesthetists

Linda Siderius, Esq.  
Toni Wehman, Esq.  
Caplan and Earnest LLC  
1800 Broadway, Suite 200  
Boulder, CO 80302-5289  
Attorneys for Colorado Nurses Association

s/ Christopher O. Murray  
Christopher O. Murray  
Counsel for Amicus Curiae  
American Hospital Association

*[Original Signature on file at the  
offices of Hogan Lovells US LLP]*