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Logistics

• Please mute your line and do not put the line on hold
• Use the chat box on your screen to ask a question or leave comment
  – Note: chat box will not be seen if you are in “full screen” mode
  – Please also exit out of “full screen” mode to participate in polling questions
• Moderated Q&A will be held periodically throughout the webinar
• Please complete the evaluation in the pop-up box after the webinar to help us continue to improve your experience
Facilitator

- Suzanne Fields, MSW, LICSW
- Senior Advisor for Health Care Policy & Financing, University of Maryland
Speakers (1 of 2)

• Barbara Lang, MA
• Behavioral Health Administrator, Arizona Health Care Cost Containment System
Speakers (2 of 2)

- Steven Bentsen, MD, MBA, DFAPA
- Regional Chief Medical Officer, Beacon Health Options
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• Health Plan Perspective: Beacon Health Options
• Wrap Up / Resources
Goals of Webinar

• Participants will learn about and examine different models for incorporating SUD into managed care contracts
• Participants will engage in a discussion the importance of tailoring contract language to a state/region’s specific needs
• Participants will learn about and be able to discuss the potential pros and cons associated with each model
Managed Care Delivery Approaches: ASOs

• Administrative Services Only (ASOs)
  – Contracted to administer or manage claims and benefits for a fixed administrative fee
  – Bears little or no risk for cost of delivering care
  – Can include provider & member services, data reporting, provider network development, care coordination & disease management services

• Examples
  – Connecticut
  – Maryland

Source: Washington State Department of Social & Health Services
Managed Care Delivery Approaches: BHOs

• Specialty Behavioral Health Organizations (BHO)
  – Distinct entity that can either be freestanding or part of a managed care organization
  – Has specific financial resources to provide programs that manage behavioral health care benefits

• Examples
  – Colorado
  – Washington

Source: Washington State Department of Social & Health Services
Managed Care Delivery Approaches: HPs

- Integrated Physical/Behavioral Health Plans (HPs)
  - An entity with defined financial resources that provides for the management of physical and behavioral health care benefits
  - May or may not include subcontracting for behavioral health

- Examples
  - Florida
  - Tennessee

Source: Washington State Department of Social & Health Services
Managed Care Delivery Approaches: Hybrids

• Hybrid of ASO, Specialty BHO and/or Integrated HPs
  – Different populations
  – Different services
  – Regional/county variations

• Examples
  – Massachusetts
  – Michigan
Many SUD Providers Have Limited Managed Care Experience

Insurance

As of 2008, about 40% of nonprofit substance abuse facilities did not accept private insurance or Medicaid. About half had no contracts with managed care plans.


Information Systems

About 20% of substance abuse treatment facilities have no information systems to support appointment scheduling, billing, or medical records functions.

Building Provider Networks Inclusive of SUD

• Credentialing and Education Requirements
  – Recognize lived experience
  – Co-occurring mental health and SUD expertise
  – Examples
    • Arizona
    • Massachusetts
    • Maryland
    • New York
    • Washington
Benefit Array that Supports Home and Community-Based Continuum

- Recovery Focus
- Peer Supports
- Social Supports
- Housing
- Employment
- Transportation

Care Management & Care Coordination

Additional Supports

Location of Care
- Home
- Community
- Telebehavioral Health

Screening & Assessment

Medication Assisted Treatment
Polling Question (1 of 5)

• Which managed care model reflects your method of delivering SUD services? Choose all that apply.
  – Administrative Service Organization
  – Carve-in
  – Carve-out
  – Fully integrated
  – Partially integrated
  – No managed care contracts
Polling Question (2 of 5)

• If your state is not currently using managed care contracts, are you contemplating a move to managed care for SUD services?
  – Yes
  – No
Arizona

Working with Regional Behavioral Health Authorities and Braided Funding Sources

Barbara Lang, MA
Arizona Health Care Cost Containment System
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Timeline of Managed Care

Through 1981

Arizona is the only state to not participate in Medicaid

1982

**Arizona Health Care Cost Containment System is launched**
- Behavioral health services are ‘carved out’ and contracted with the AZ Dept. of Health Services / Division of Behavioral Health Services, which also hold inter-governmental agreements with the TRBHAs
  - Regional Behavioral Health Authorities (RBHAs) serve as MCOs
  - Legislative mandate
  - 1115 waiver ensuring SMI needs are met
- American Indians/Alaska Natives may choose to enroll in acute health care plan or AHCCCS’ fee-for-service American Indian Health Program

2015 & Beyond

**Integrated RBHAs & Duals Integration Project**
- Merging of Department of BH w/ AHCCCS
- As of 10/1/15 RBHAs will be integrated with physical health
- Introduction of value-based payment model
- Duals Project focuses on transferring behavioral and physical health services for dually enrolled members with general mental health and substance abuse conditions from RBHAs to the Acute Health Plans
Regional Behavioral Health Authorities

- RBHAs in Arizona offer behavioral health services
  - Beginning 10/01/2015, RBHAs will also provide physical health services across the state to persons determined to have a serious mental illness
    - Northern Arizona RBHA
    - Mercy Maricopa Integrated Care
    - Cenpatico Behavioral Health of Arizona
    - Community Partnership of Southern Arizona
Regional Behavioral Health Authorities: Key Functions

• While operating primarily like a health plan, there are numerous key distinctions
  – Behavioral health network
  – MAT and SUD services
  – Peer and family support
  – Community reinvestment and training
  – Collaboration with other systems or agencies (i.e. courts, law enforcement, Division of Developmental Disabilities)
  – Engagement
  – Housing and employment services
New Model: Contracting RBHAs Directly through AHCCCS

- Streamlining administrative services
- Cost effectiveness
- Simpler for client
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Core Standards

• Core standards cover both SUD and mental health
  – No carved out SUD language
  – Implementation varies across RBHAs

• Core Standards
  – Services Covered
  – Network Adequacy
  – Performance Measurement
  – Reimbursement
Core Standards: Services Covered

• RBHAs must provide the full continuum of support as outlined in their contracts

• Medication Assisted Treatment Requirement
  – Methadone, Suboxone
  – Non-emergency transportation services
  – Telemedicine

• Significant use of peer professionals
  – Included in Department of Behavioral Health financial matrix of covered services
  – 6-8-week certification program required
# Core Standards: Network Adequacy

## Minimum Network Standards for Behavioral Health

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service Type</th>
<th>Provider Billing Type</th>
<th>Population Served</th>
<th>Geographic Access Requirement</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Central GSA (Maricopa) &amp; Pima County</td>
<td>Northern &amp; Southern GSA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crisis Service Provider (Mobile Crisis Team)</td>
<td>B7</td>
<td>All populations</td>
<td>Meet 60 min. response time to residence</td>
<td>Meet 60 min. response time to their residence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioral Health Inpatient Facility</td>
<td>02, 71, 78, A6, B1, B2, B3, B5, B6</td>
<td>All populations</td>
<td>≤ 15 min. or ≤ 10 miles from their residence</td>
<td>≤ 45 min. or ≤ 30 miles from their residence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioral Health Residential Facility</td>
<td>B8</td>
<td>All populations</td>
<td>≤ 15 min. or ≤ 10 miles from their residence</td>
<td>≤ 45 min. or ≤ 30 miles from their residence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavioral Health Outpatient Clinic</td>
<td>77, IC</td>
<td>All populations</td>
<td>≤ 15 min. or ≤ 10 miles from their residence</td>
<td>≤ 15 min. or ≤ 10 miles from their residence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pharmacy</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>All populations</td>
<td>≤ 15 min. or ≤ 10 miles from their residence</td>
<td>≤ 15 min. or ≤ 10 miles from their residence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCP</td>
<td>08, 18, 19, 31</td>
<td>SMI</td>
<td>≤ 15 min. or ≤ 10 miles from their residence</td>
<td>≤ 45 min. or ≤ 30 miles from their residence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dental Services</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>SMI 18-21 year olds only</td>
<td>≤ 15 min. or ≤ 10 miles from their residence</td>
<td>≤ 45 min. or ≤ 30 miles from their residence</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Maximum travel time for 90% of members...
## Core Standards: Performance Measurement and Reimbursement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Performance Measure</th>
<th>Minimum Standard</th>
<th>Goal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Inpatient Utilization</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED Utilization</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital Readmissions w/in 30 days of discharge</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow-up After Hospitalization w/in 7 days of discharge</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow-up After Hospitalization w/in 30 days of discharge</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to BH Provider w/in 7 days of discharge (encounter for a visit)</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to BH Provider w/in 30 days of discharge (encounter for a visit)</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Move toward value-based payment

– Prior to the merger, the Department of Behavioral Health set reimbursement rates and had a system of block purchase, allowing RBHAs to allocate their funding as they saw fit
– AHCCCS will now set the rate
– RBHAs are evolving with the goal of switching to a value-based payment model with their providers based on patient outcomes.
Tailoring SUD Services to RBHA Catchment Area Needs

- Many different cultures and population groups across Arizona
  - Race and ethnicity
  - Financial eligibility
  - Diagnosis

- Importance of cultural competency
- Attention to specific population needs
Examples Contract Language

• Contracts and Tribal Intergovernmental Agreements, Arizona Department of Health Services Division of Behavioral Health Services
  – AHCCCS/ADHS Contract

• Policy and Procedures Manual, Arizona Department of Health Services Division of Behavioral Health Services
  – Arizona Department of Health Services Division of Behavioral Health Services Policy and Procedures Manual
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## Braided Funding for SUD Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Funding Source</th>
<th>Dollar Amount</th>
<th>Percentage of Total Funding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Medicaid Funding (Title XIX &amp; Proposition 204)</td>
<td>$97,731,218</td>
<td>76.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal: Substance Abuse Prevention &amp; Treatment Block Grant</td>
<td>$19,258,066</td>
<td>15.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Appropriated</td>
<td>$9,499,288</td>
<td>7.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter-governmental Agreements: Maricopa Co; City of Phoenix Local Alcohol Reception Center</td>
<td>$1,689,871</td>
<td>1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liquor Fees</td>
<td>$71,775</td>
<td>0.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Funding</td>
<td>$128,250,218</td>
<td>100.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Grant Funding Opportunities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grant</th>
<th>Primary Goal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Substance Abuse Prevention and Treatment Block Grant</td>
<td>To reduce access barriers to substance abuse prevention, treatment services &amp; community-based MH services for adults with SMI &amp; children with SED  &lt;br&gt; To plan, implement, monitor &amp; evaluate the provision of these services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Projects for Assistance in Transition from Homelessness</td>
<td>Reduce and eliminate homelessness for individuals with SMI or co-occurring SUD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Screening, Brief Intervention and Referral to Treatment</td>
<td>Reduce rate of alcohol-induced deaths &amp; drug related deaths per 100K individuals for 5 northern AZ counties  &lt;br&gt; Decrease the mean combined cost per member for PH &amp; BH services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Youth Treatment Grant</td>
<td>Successfully transition adolescents &amp; transitional-aged youth with SUDs &amp; those w/ co-occurring MH disorders to adult BH system  &lt;br&gt; Improve the use of EBPs in services for adolescents w/ SUD, co-occurring MH disorders &amp; their families</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prevention Framework Partnership for Success</td>
<td>Reduce 30-day alcohol use for ages 12-20  &lt;br&gt; Reduce percentage of youths (ages 12-25) who have misused or abused prescription drugs in last 30 days</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Integrating PH & BH in Managed Care: Maricopa County

- Integrated Service Delivery
  - Treatment services
  - Rehabilitation services
  - Medical & pharmacy services
  - Support services
  - Crisis intervention services
  - Inpatient services
  - Residential services
  - Behavioral health day programs
First Year Results

• Quantifiable Results
  – Integrated Health Homes
    • 13% Whole Health SMI Clinic
    • 18.4% PCMH
    • 68.6% Virtual Health Home
  – Permanent supportive housing
    • 2,724 (7-14) to 3,686 (3-15)
  – Supported employment
    • 473 (7-14) to 670 (3-15)
  – Peer & family support
    • 2,323 (7-14) to 3,854 (3-15)

• New Additions
  – 16 question health risk assessment
  – Value-based purchasing with ACT Teams
  – Medical ACT Team
  – Forensic ACT Team that partners with the Justice System

Medicaid.gov
Keeping America Healthy
GMHSA Dual Project

- Inpatient BH/SA hospitalization(s)
  - Multiple admissions
- BH/SA crisis services
  - Multiple crisis mobile team dispatch & stabilization services
- Residential/supported housing
  - Supportive housing, residential treatment and out of state placement

- Court Ordered Evaluation and Treatment
  - Members under COE and currently on COT
- High risk pharmacology
  - Pharmacy restrictions, multiple prescriptions (6+), high risk for drug interactions
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Challenges & Lessons Learned

• Few challenges related to SUD
  – SUD has always been a part of behavioral health in Arizona

• Constructing a common language
  – Working with behavioral health and SUD providers to develop common ideas about making care person centered

• Working with new providers
  – Dispelling myths about addiction

• Structure readiness

• Operations

• Technology

• Timeframes
Polling Question (3 of 5)

- Using the ReadyTalk platform options, select the 'raise your hand' tool if your state is utilizing or considering using a braided funding model.
Questions and Discussion (1 of 2)
Health Plan Perspective

Steven Bentsen, MD, MBA, DFAPA, Beacon Health Options
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Beacon Health Options (2 of 3)

- Provides behavioral health management for over 40 million lives in 50 states
- Medicaid management history in majority of states
For 30 years, Beacon has been singularly focused on behavioral health care services and its natural extensions, such as EAPs and Work/Life services.
Commitment to Substance Use Disorder Treatment

• Treatment of opiate addiction

• First white paper specifically for policymakers
  – Released June 2015
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Issues Unique to Addiction Treatment

Widest gap between science and clinical practice

- Treatment referrals:
  - 5% from health care providers
  - 44% from legal system

- Most individuals do not receive best practice care

- Quality measures are not standardized

- Only a minority of states monitor treatment

- Many programs are exempt from state regulation or medical oversight
Workforce Issues Unique to Addiction

- Medical professionals receive minimal training in addiction treatment
- Approximately 1 million physicians practicing
  - 1,300 identified as addiction specialists
  - 500 are psychiatrists
- Most treatment is provided by addiction counselors
  - 14 states: no required licensure
  - 6 states: no required degree
  - 14 states: require high school degree or GED
  - Apprentice model, personal experience
  - Not equipped to provide evidenced-based treatment, medical care or treatment of co-occurring conditions

Source: Addiction Medicine Closing the Gap between Science and Practice, NATIONAL Center on Addiction and Substance Use, Columbia University 2012
Medication Assisted Treatment Reduces All-cause Mortality

“...The all-cause mortality rate for patients receiving methadone maintenance treatment was similar to the mortality rate for the general population, whereas the mortality rate of untreated individuals using heroin was more than 15 times higher.”

Modesto-Lowe et al., 2010; Gibson, 2008; Mattick, 2003; Bell and Zador, 2000; Marsch, 1998
MAT as **Part** of Treatment Program

- Four approved medications for treatment of opiate dependency
  - Buprenorphine
  - Methadone
  - Naltrexone oral
  - Naltrexone injectable

- Evidence-based treatment for opioid addiction, but not a stand-alone treatment choice
  - Effective as part of a holistic program that includes
    - Behavioral interventions
    - Cognitive interventions
    - Other recovery-oriented interventions
    - Treatment agreements
    - Urine toxicology
    - Checking of PDMP
## Treating SUD Through a Chronic Disease Model

### Recommended Interventions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Community Resources &amp; Policies</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Make naloxone widely available</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Remove barriers to non-acute provider capacity:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Methadone, Suboxone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Extenders - mid-level administrators under supervision</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Public awareness campaign targeting citizens, prescribers &amp; policymakers about the chronic disease model</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Improve Delivery System Design</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Re-unify the system of care (e.g. Department of Health carve-outs) in accordance with ASAM criteria</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Require case/care management/pain management services to be part of full-service addictions treatment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Treating SUD Through a Chronic Disease Model *(continued)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Recommended Interventions</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Increase Decision Support</strong></td>
<td>• Apply evidence-based clinical practice guidelines to MAT, including real time support for prescribers (e.g. expert staffed support hotline for prescribers treating addictions)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Implement Clinical Information Systems</strong></td>
<td>• Registries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Implement EHR technology to ensure real-time access to pertinent clinical information (i.e., diagnoses, co-morbidities, medications, treatment goals)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Clear interpretation that SA-related personal health information will not be used for prosecutorial purposes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Increase Collaboration Between Payers &amp; Providers</strong></td>
<td>• Encourage bundled payments for high-quality providers to encourage community care instead of institutional care:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Peers, office and home-based formats</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• De-stigmatize long-term treatment options. More than just abstinence.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Value-Based Purchasing Comes In Many Different Forms Outside of Capitation

- **Fee-for-service**
  - One service
  - One payment

- **Pay for Performance**
  - “Upside only”
  - Key process measures

- **Case Rate**
  - Group of services
  - Combined payment
  - Defined time period

- **Episode Bundle**
  - Group of services
  - Combined payment
  - Quality goals
  - Defined coverage set

- **Behavioral Health Capitation**
  - Risk for providers
  - Full behavioral health payment

- **Total Health Outcomes**
  - Shared risk on total member experience

**Incentive-Based Treatment Risk**

- **Overtreatment**
- **Under-treatment**
BHO’s VBP Portfolio Spans Multiple States (1 of 3)

**CALIFORNIA**

- **Objectives:** Reduce medical costs and improve clinical and functional outcomes
- **Population & Intervention:** Care coordination and physical health connector services for commercial members with co-occurring BH and medical diagnoses
- **Provider Type:** Behavioral health outpatient providers
- **Payment Model:** Monthly case rate for care coordination
- **Outcomes:** Improvements in WHOQOL domains for Physical, Psychological as well as PHQ-9 assessment tool
- **Operational Considerations:** Coordination with health plan to ensure consistent communication to members who called general member services line for help

**ILLINOIS**

- **Objectives:** Engage marginalized and complex BH patients to re-integrate them into society via housing, employment, and health care system participation
- **Population & Intervention:** Population enrolled in program to receive mental health services and supplementary services
- **Payment Model:** Outpatient case rate
- **Provider Type:** Community mental health center
- **Outcomes:** Lower total medical expense, high levels of patient satisfaction, better health outcomes for individual patients
- **Operational Considerations:** Staffing and financial resources to assume greater risk
BHO’s VBP Portfolio Spans Multiple States
(2 of 3)

**COLORADO**

**Objectives:** System realignment away from state hospitals and promotion of a statewide community continuum of care

**Population & Intervention:** 10 provider organizations representing more than 50 sites and a population of 685,000 patients

**Provider Type:** Community mental health centers

**Payment Model:** Provider partner outpatient sub-capitation

**Outcomes:** Reduction in inpatient admissions, increased focus on crisis stabilization, peer services and outpatient continuum of care development

**Operational Considerations:** Providers manage money and take on risk. Focus on increased integration between BH/PH - capabilities developed at 200 plus sites.

**NEW HAMPSHIRE**

**Objectives:** Better care coordination around complex populations

**Population & Intervention:** Adults and children with complex mental illness diagnoses receive monthly case management and community-based flexible supports (Assertive Community Treatment)

**Payment Model:** Outpatient behavioral health sub-capitation

**Provider Type:** Community mental health centers

**Outcomes:** Improved transitions of care from state hospital; higher quality care plans; reductions in psychiatric readmissions

**Operational Considerations:** Sub-capitation requires a different provider management model that we call “technical assistance” where Beacon works with provider on evidence-based trainings, clinical rounding, transitions of care and complex case co-management
BHO’s VBP Portfolio Spans Multiple States
(3 of 3)

**KANSAS**

**Objectives:** Give SUD providers opportunity to manage care for patients in innovative ways

**Population & Intervention:** 43 Providers treating 13,000 patients for substance use disorders

**Payment Model:** Block grant

**Provider Type:** Outpatient substance abuse

**Outcomes:** Providers were able to manage substance abuse services within the limited appropriation of federal block grant with no implementation of wait lists or other member care disruptions

**Operational Considerations:** Provider responsible for continuity of care and ensuring access to providers (including emergency call center)

---

**FLORIDA**

**Objectives:** Improve patient engagement and provide opportunity for profit-sharing with providers

**Population & Intervention:** 15+ providers paid under sub-capitation for 300,000 members

**Payment Model:** Outpatient sub-capitation

**Provider Type:** Community mental health centers

**Outcomes:** Reduction of inpatient admissions, increased focus on crisis stabilization and outpatient continuum of care

**Operational Considerations:** Some providers have developed physical health capabilities; portion of reimbursement earned by meeting quality and HEDIS targets; must achieve specific maintenance of effort
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Summary of Challenges & Lessons Learned

- Sensitivity to state regulations, resources, penetration rates require regional implementation
- Changing direction from carve out to carve in has restructuring challenges
- Substance use treatment providers not synergistic with medical provider delivery system
- Outcomes of care lacking, need for uniform measurement
- Social bias and pervasive view of addiction as a moral failing has limited access to effective, evidence-based treatments
Polling Question (4 of 5)

- Using the ReadyTalk platform options, select the 'raise your hand' tool if your state is utilizing a unique approach to providing a continuum of coverage across inpatient detoxification and rehabilitation services including an array of home- and community-based and/or residential options.
Questions and Discussion (2 of 2)
Polling Question (5 of 5)

• Would your state be interested in having a post-webinar discussion with the speakers to address any additional questions or reflections on today’s webinar?
  – Yes
  – No
Resources

- **Coverage and Delivery of Adult Substance Abuse Services in Medicaid Managed Care**, Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services
  - [MEDICAID MANAGED CARE INFORMATION RESOURCE CENTER](#)

- **Increasing Access to Behavioral Healthcare: Managed Care Options and Requirements**, The National Council for Community Behavioral Health
  - [National Council For Community Behavioral HealthCare](#)
Resources (continued)

• *Medicaid Managed Care Profiles, by State*, Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services
  – Some specific states of interest include: Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, New York, Ohio
  – [Managed Care State Profiles and State Data Collections](#)
Contact Information

• Suzanne Fields, MSW, LICSW
  – University of Maryland
  – SuzanneFieldsMSW@gmail.com, 443-610-8770

• Barbara Lang, MA
  – Arizona Health Care Cost Containment System

• Steven Bentsen, MD, MBA, DFAPA
  – Beacon Health Options
  – Steven.Bentsen@valueoptions.com, 919-379-9786