Grantmakers in Health: Advancing Mental Health and Addiction Solutions

Overview of Behavioral Health Landscape
February 9, 2017

Heather Howard
Agenda

• Role of Medicaid in Addressing Behavioral Health

• Dynamic federal policy environment
  • Impact of proposals to repeal and replace the ACA and restructure the federal role in Medicaid
U.S. Opioid Crisis is Rapidly Worsening

THE FACTS

- As of 2014, 1.9 million Americans had an opioid use disorder
- An additional 19.6 million Americans had a non-opioid substance use disorder (SUD)
- Since 1999, the number of opioid overdoses resulting in death has increased by more than threefold for men and fivefold for women

While Congress Debates, States Can Act

CONGRESS

- In July 2016, the House and Senate passed the Comprehensive Addiction and Recovery Act, which was signed into law by the President.
- The Act authorized spending of $905 million over five years to implement these reforms, but Congress has not yet appropriated any of this funding.
- A September 2016 Senate continuing resolution provided $37 million to fight the opioid epidemic – far short of the $1.1 billion requested by President Obama.

STATES

- Medicaid is the largest payer in most states, with total annual spending of nearly $500 billion nationwide in 2014—including $47.2 billion for the new adult group.
- In 2014, Medicaid spent ~$60 billion on behavioral health services, including SUD services.
- States receive 100% FMAP for expansion adults (decreasing to 95% in 2017); therefore, federal funds pay for all SUD services for the expansion population; for previously eligible populations, states receive 50-74.6% FMAP.

Medicaid’s Imperative to Address the Epidemic

Medicaid is the largest source of coverage and funding for substance use prevention and treatment.

Medicaid expansion has amplified Medicaid’s role in fighting the epidemic.

1.2 million adults with SUD have gained coverage in the 31 Medicaid expansion states.

At least 1.1 million uninsured adults with SUDs live in states that have not expanded Medicaid.*

*These figures includes the states that had expanded as of November 2015. Since November 2015, Montana and Louisiana have implemented Medicaid expansion.

Expansion Group May Have Broader SUD Benefits

In expansion states, new adults gain access to comprehensive insurance, including SUD services

- New adults must receive a benefit plan covering the 10 essential health benefits, which include SUD services
- Mental health and SUD services must also be provided in parity with physical health services

For previously eligible adults, SUD coverage is optional

- Some states offer only limited coverage, for example by limiting SUD coverage to pregnant women
- Some states that have expanded are extending the more comprehensive SUD benefits for new adults to these previously eligible populations.
Medicaid Tools to Address the Epidemic

- Tailor Medicaid benefits to bolster SUD prevention and treatment
- Implement “Health Homes” for those with SUD or opioid disorders
- Leverage Medicaid’s power in the market to ensure providers and plans follow best practices
- Reform SUD delivery system to address SUD across physical, behavioral mental dimensions
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Tailoring Benefit Design to Bolster SUD Services

Prevention Strategies

- Requiring prior authorization for opioid prescriptions
- Instituting quantity limits for opioid prescriptions
- Strengthening utilization review criteria
- Increasing Medicaid’s access to states’ Prescription Drug Monitoring Programs

Treatment Strategies

- Promoting use of medication assisted treatment (MAT)
- Adding naloxone to preferred drug lists

States may amend their Medicaid State Plans to effectuate these changes; no special approvals are required.
Implementing Health Homes

The ACA created a State option to implement Health Homes to improve care coordination and care management for targeted high need Medicaid enrollees.

States receive 90% federal match for Health Home coordination services in the first two years of implementation for previously eligible individuals, and 100% federal match (declining to 95% in 2017) for new adults.

Tailoring Health Homes for SUD

States are designing Health Homes targeted to individuals with opioid use disorders and other SUDs.

Program features may include:

- Intensive care management services, including care plan development, patient navigation services, and outreach and enrollment into treatment
- Enhanced provider and workforce education on evidence-based treatment for opioid use disorders
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Leveraging Medicaid’s Purchasing Power

- Covering case management and home and community based services, targeting the needs of those with SUDs
- Enhancing payment rates for providers meeting best practices in SUD prevention and treatment
- Requiring health plans to contract with certain providers, pay providers more for high-priority services, and provide incentives to plans that meet certain metrics
- Designing special health plans for individuals with serious mental illness and SUD
Reforming the SUD Delivery System

CMS is encouraging states to pursue new SUD-focused 1115 waivers to treat SUD across the continuum of care (including across physical, behavioral and mental dimensions).

CMS issued guidance in July 2015 describing these waivers. Waivers must include the following SUD-specific requirements:

- Appropriate Standards of Care
- Strong Network Development Plan
- Care Coordination Design
- Integration of Physical Health and SUD
- Benefit Management
- Strategies to Address Prescription Drug Abuse
- Strategies to Address Opioid Use Disorder

States implementing SUD delivery system transformation may apply for a waiver of the “Institution for Mental Disease (IMD) exclusion” – this would permit states to receive Medicaid match for services delivered in an IMD, which is not otherwise allowable.
Demonstration Waiver Strategies

States are pursuing a variety of innovations to transform the way SUD care is delivered

- Creating integrated delivery networks of physical health, behavioral health, and social service providers
- Strengthening behavioral health workforce capacity
- Implementing new clinical programs targeted towards treating beneficiaries with SUDs
- Expanding SUD benefits
- Increasing access to care management and care coordination services

California
California is implementing the Drug Medi-Cal Organized Delivery System pilot program, which enables counties to provide an enhanced set of evidence-based benefits to Medicaid beneficiaries with SUDs.

New Hampshire
New Hampshire is implementing a five-year $150 million DSRIP waiver, under which it will create a series of regional integrated delivery networks with a specific focus on improving behavioral healthcare.
Other States to Watch – New Jersey

- Governor Christie signed an executive order declaring the opioid epidemic a public health crisis
- Legislation currently advancing to place 5-day restriction on opioid prescriptions
  - Several other states have set 7-day restrictions
  - Exemptions for active cancer treatment, hospice or palliative care, and residents of long term care facilities.
- 40% increase in available beds for the treatment of behavioral health and substance abuse disorders (first Certificate of Need (CN) call for new adult psychiatric beds in 20 years)
- Through its 1115 waiver, implementing a Medication Assisted Treatment Initiative, making MAT services available to adults with incomes up to 150% FPL who would otherwise not qualify for Medicaid.
- Significant decreases in uncompensated care for the past two years result in reinvesting charity care savings
  - FY 2017 budget included $74 million increase in Medicaid rates for SUD services to increase access to treatment.
Other States to Watch – Rhode Island

- Rhode Island Governor’s Overdose Prevention and Intervention Task Force (November 2015)
- Strategic Plan – Four Strategies
  - Every door is the right one
  - Naloxone as standard of care
  - Safer prescribing and dispensing
  - Expand recovery supports
- Legislation signed in 2016 introduced new limits on initial prescriptions

Medicaid Today
Medicaid is Nation’s Largest Single Source of Coverage

U.S. Health Insurance Enrollment by Source, CY 2015 (millions)

- ESI: 172.2
- Medicaid: 69.3
- Medicare: 54.3
- Uninsured: 29.2
- Direct Purchase: 26.6
- Marketplace: 13.9
- CHIP: 6.1

Medicaid is Major State Budget Item and Largest Source of Federal Revenue for States

State Medicaid Spending as Share of Budget (State Funds Only), FY 2015

Sources of Federal Funds to States, FY 2015

Recent Growth:
31 States and DC Have Expanded Medicaid
Impact of Medicaid Expansion

Coverage Gains and Federal Funding

14.5 million are covered under Medicaid expansion
- 11.26 million newly eligible adults and 3.25 million adults who would have qualified for Medicaid pre-ACA

Adult uninsured rate dropped an average of 8.3 percentage points in expansion states compared to an average of 5.7 percentage points in non-expansion states, 2013-2015
- Largest decrease of 19.9 percentage points in West Virginia

Expansion states received an estimated $72.6 billion in federal funding in 2016 for coverage of newly eligible adults; state share begins in 2017
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3. Data on the uninsured in 2013 was not available for six expansion and two non-expansion states.
4. Manatt analysis based on Dec. 2016 CMS-64 data. $72.6 billion was for the newly eligible adults.
Alternative Financing Structures
Proposals Sharply Reduce Federal Payments to States

Proposal would cut federal Medicaid funds by $1 trillion (or 25%) over ten years, resulting in a combined 33% reduction in federal funds for Medicaid and CHIP.
**Block Grants**

States receive no more than a set amount of federal funds annually

- Amounts typically allocated among states by reference to spending in a base year
- Caps could be frozen (no year-to-year increase), but Medicaid block grant proposals typically allow capped payments to grow based on a national trend rate (e.g., CPI or GDP)
- Provides funding certainty to federal government; shifts risk for enrollment and health care costs to states
- States may or may not have a state spending requirement
- Eligibility and benefit rules set by block grant legislation, generally giving states more flexibility to set eligibility, benefits and other program features; may also impose new obligations on states

**State Health and Value Strategies**
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**Sources:**
Different Block Grant Designs

- **Some guarantee a set amount - no state spending required**
  - For example, the Social Services Block Grant provides a fixed amount of federal funding, not conditioned on state spending.

- **Some guarantee a set amount so long as a state spends a certain amount of state funds**
  - For example, TANF block grant provides federal funding at the capped level so long as the states spends minimum amount of its own dollars on TANF-related initiatives.

- **Some guarantee funding up to set amount; federal payments are provided as match to state spending up to federal cap (sometimes referred to as capped allotment)**
  - For example, CHIP provides federal funding as a match to state spending up to the federal cap.

---

Federal Funding for TANF and Social Services Block Grants

Total dollars of federal funding for TANF and Social Services block grants have declined in value due to inflation.

- **Reductions in Inflation-Adjusted Funding for the Social Services Block Grant**
  - 73% reduction in block grant value between 1982 and 2016 due to inflation, funding freezes, budget cuts and sequestration.

- **Total Spending on TANF and Programs That Preceded It**
  - TANF’s purchasing power has declined 25% since 1998.

Per Capita Caps

States receive fixed amount of federal funds per Medicaid enrollee

- Per capita amount set based on each state’s per enrollee spending in base year; amounts typically grow consistent with a national trend rate
- Under the proposals, caps would vary by eligibility category (e.g., disabled, children)
- Shifts risk of higher health care costs, but not enrollment, to states
  - However, may be subject to national cap, limiting ability for federal funds to grow with enrollment; in which case, both enrollment and cost risk shifted to state
- State match typically required; federal funds provided to states based on actual expenditures up to the cap

Per Capita Cap Proposals Differ from Caps in 1115 Waivers

States operating under 1115 waivers are subject to per person cap on federal funding to assure “budget neutrality”

- Waiver caps are set to reflect state’s expected medical spend without waiver; they are not designed to achieve savings
- Waivers are optional and features, including per capita caps, are negotiated between CMS and state; scope is limited to aspects of the program subject to the waiver
- Waiver caps can be adjusted to reflect unexpected costs and are not subject to an aggregate cap
## Recent Block Grant and Per Cap Proposals

### Most proposals are missing key details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Per capita cap, with option for block grant</td>
<td>Per capita cap</td>
<td>Block grant</td>
<td>Per capita cap</td>
<td>Per capita cap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Match Required</td>
<td>✓ (per capita cap)</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>? (block grant)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National aggregate cap</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Different caps for populations</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Populations covered</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All, except acute care of elderly &amp; disabled</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
<td>All</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base amount</td>
<td>Average Medicaid spend in state during base year</td>
<td>Nat'l Medicaid spend allocated based on state population with income &lt; 100% FPL</td>
<td>Unclear</td>
<td>Average Federal Medicaid spend during base year</td>
<td>Unclear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trend rate</td>
<td>Unclear</td>
<td>CPI + 1</td>
<td>Unclear</td>
<td>GDP + 1</td>
<td>Unclear</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Implications of Alternative Financing
State Risks

Capping federal funds puts states at risk for costs above cap and limits new investments

- All recent proposals to cap federal Medicaid funding would sharply reduce federal payments to states.
  - FY 2013 House Budget plan: $1.7 trillion reduction (-38%) from 2013-2022
  - FY 2017 House Budget Plan: $1 trillion reduction (-25%) from 2017-2026

- Annual growth rates are below estimates
  - FY 2013 House Budget plan included an average 3% growth rate each year, falling short of the estimated 7% annual cost growth

- Capping federal Medicaid dollars locks in funding based on earlier state choices, constraining future state decisions on eligibility, benefits, payment rates and other new investments.

Shifting Risk to States

Capped federal funds constrains states’ ability to respond to events beyond their control

- Neither block grants nor per capita caps account for:
  - Public health crisis such as HIV/AIDS, Opioid epidemic, Zika
  - New block buster drugs or other medical advances
  - Natural disasters such as Hurricane Katrina
  - Manmade disasters such as 9/11 and lead poisoning

- In addition, block grants do not account for:
  - Economic downturns or other causes of higher-than-anticipated enrollment

Capped Funding: Locks in Disparities Across States

Capped funding freezes in historic differences in spending

Spending Per Full Medicaid Enrollee, FY 2011
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How Will the Flexibility Play Out with Reduced, Capped Funding?

- Fewer people served?
- More churning, less continuity of coverage?
- Limited benefits, limited access?
- Greater competition for constrained funding?
- With funding reductions, will new positive programmatic opportunities be more theoretical than real?
Thank you!

Heather Howard  
Lecturer in Public Affairs  
Faculty Affiliate, Center for Health and Wellbeing  
Princeton University  
Director, Advancing Coverage in States and State Health and Value Strategies programs  
heatherh@Princeton.edu  
www.statenetwork.org