

## ERA OF ACCOUNTABILITY

by Deb Beck, consultant to the National  
Alliance for Model State Drug Laws

Reflecting a growing national consensus on this issue, in the 1970's and 1980's, many states enacted laws requiring commercial group health insurance plans to provide some level of treatment for alcohol and/or drug addiction. Since that time, a few additional laws were enacted and currently 43 states and the District of Columbia have such a law on the books.

In support of enactment of these laws, states marshaled the well-articulated body of research delineating the cost of untreated addiction to the health care system, to the workforce, to the larger society and the cost benefits of provision of addiction treatment.<sup>1</sup>

Over 70% of people with drug and alcohol problems are in the workforce, many with employment-based health plans that fall under the requirements of state laws.<sup>2</sup> For this reason, enactment of these laws represented a major step forward in providing intervention early in the progression of the disease before the advent of job loss, danger to health and other consequences.

However, despite enactment of all of these laws, payment for addiction treatment by commercial insurers has eroded dramatically over the years leaving public payers and charity on the hook for services already paid for by the subscriber through insurance premiums.<sup>3</sup>

### **The Pennsylvania Story**

In 1986, Pennsylvania joined the national movement toward requiring coverage for addiction and enacted a law providing comprehensive treatment for alcoholism in all commercial group health plans. In 1989, the law was re-authorized and amended to include drug addiction.

---

<sup>1</sup> For example, "*Socioeconomic Evaluations of Addictions Treatment*", James W. Langenbucher et al., Center of Alcohol Studies Rutgers University, prepared for the President's Commission on Model State Drug Laws, 1993 and "*Volume IV, Treatment*", The White House, President's Commission on Model State Drug Laws, December 1993.

<sup>2</sup> "*Overview of Findings from the 2002 National Survey on Drug Use and Health*", DHHS Publication No. (SMA) 03-3774, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, Office of Applied Studies, 2003. (page 5)

<sup>3</sup> In an article entitled, "*U.S. Spending for Mental Health and Substance Abuse Treatment, 1991-2001*", Tami L. Mark et al., Health Affairs, March 29, 2005, the authors describe this trend:

--- Over the 1991-2001 period of analysis, "Private insurance payment for SA actually dropped in real dollars, increasing the public share of SA spending." (page W5-133)

--- "During the first five years, private insurance spending for SA fell 2.4% annually; during the second five years, it increased only 0.1% annually." (page W5-138)

Under the law (PA, Act 106 of 1989), treatment benefits are accessed through certification and referral by a licensed physician or a licensed psychologist.

In the mid 1990's, insurers began to subcontract administration of this law out to profit-making behavioral health managed care firms and soon, few could access treatment already paid for and covered in the health plan. In short order, Pennsylvania's nightmare began. Desperate families were blocked from getting help for loved ones. Employee Assistance Programs working for business and industry and Student Assistance Programs working in the schools were no longer able to intervene quickly to refer troubled employees and students for help. Treatment programs became battlegrounds and some were threatened with loss of network status when they dared to fight for treatment for patients. Treatment was delayed, denied or minimized and suffering families already devastated by the addiction of a loved one were forced to beg for treatment from anonymous strangers on a toll-free line.

In summary, in the mid 1990's, families and treatment programs alike encountered an ever changing, labyrinthian process shrouded in procedural and administrative maneuvers all driving to the same result – delay, denial and minimization of needed care.

Soon, we began to learn of deaths of people who were unable to access their own insurance coverage. The first we heard about occurred in our state's capital in Harrisburg, Pennsylvania. A working man and honorably discharged veteran sought treatment for alcoholism under his employer's group health insurance policy. He pleaded with his managed care firm repeatedly for help, was turned away and finally took his own life. Next, we learned about a similar death – this time of a mother of two small children in Lancaster.

These two deaths would foreshadow additional loss of life to come.

Around the same time, workplace Employee Assistance Programs in southeastern Pennsylvania sounded a clarion call. Suddenly, EAPs were no longer allowed to use their skills to assess and place employees directly into treatment. Now they were required to refer the employee outside the workplace to a managed care entity unacquainted with the worksite and its dangers and often with little or no training or actual experience in addictions. In addition, the managed care firms operated with financial incentives to delay, deny or minimize the need for treatment.

It was time to put a stop to violations of law in our state.

With the help of Employee Assistance Professionals, a simple, one page form was developed to assess the problem and begin to collect the data. The form was broadly distributed to groups such as: employee assistance programs, student assistance programs, certified addictions counselors, recovery organizations, licensed drug and alcohol addiction treatment programs, statewide drug and alcohol specific organizations, parent and family groups and others.

Thus began the painstaking and painful process of accumulating complaints from EAPs, SAPs and from families denied life-saving treatment.

In short order, complaint forms and calls poured into our offices often describing extraordinary obstacles blocking access to treatment already paid for in the insurance policy.

Driven by the outpouring of human pain, we dove in and began to implement a comprehensive strategy to ensure enforcement of our law.

Shopping bags full of complaints and stories were sorted and prepared by political subdivisions for meetings with members of the General Assembly.<sup>4</sup> Numerous meetings were held at the Office of the Attorney General and other governmental agencies. Aggrieved families, local treatment programs, Employee Assistance Professionals, Student Assistance Professionals, people in recovery, advocates and others joined in these meetings.

Gradually, the strategy took hold. The General Assembly stood tall, began to raise questions about enforcement and over a five year period kept the Klieg lights burning brightly through multiple, bi-partisan hearings. The Office of the Attorney General began to study the problem, met with advocates, aggrieved families, treatment programs and others. In support of this work, we categorized consumer complaints, conducted facility surveys and provided other material. Together, we worked out and refined a consumer complaint process that we thought might work with our population and within the laws of our state.

At the same time, we provided intensive training for treatment programs, EAPs, SAPs, family and parent groups, recovery organizations and others across the state about Act 106, how to file complaints and how to utilize the newly developed enforcement tools.

---

<sup>4</sup> All confidentiality protections were carefully maintained.

The Attorney General's office investigated consumer complaints and in 2000, opened the Health Care Unit and established a toll-free number to handle consumer complaints about health insurance.<sup>5</sup>

In 2002, we approached the gubernatorial candidates on this issue. Candidate Ed Rendell, now Governor of Pennsylvania, committed to enforcement of the law. In 2003, the Pennsylvania Insurance Department issued a Policy Statement upholding the law and signaling enforcement actions to come.

The enforcement effort is by no means over in Pennsylvania and will require constant vigilance. We expect to watchdog compliance, survey programs, train and re-train groups and policy holders on the law for many years to come – until every insurer operating in the state is brought into compliance with state law.

As part of this ongoing effort, in 2006 the Drug and Alcohol Service Providers Organization of Pennsylvania and the National Alliance for Model State Drug Laws jointly funded an analysis of cost shifting by insurers to public funds and charity. Conducted by attorney Greg Heller and the accounting and consulting firm Parente Randolph LLC, this analysis examined financial and other data from 100% of all admissions to a residential facility for adolescents over a two year period.

Despite the plain requirements of Act 106 of 1989, the study found:

- Over 30% of the young people admitted to the treatment facility had documented evidence of commercial insurance coverage – 30.9% in the first year of the analysis, 37% in the second year.
- Over 12,700 residential treatment days were provided in the course of the two year study.
- Less than 1% of these days were paid for by a commercial insurer.
- Public funding paid for over 95% of the treatment days in FY02-03 and over 82% of the days in FY03-04.
- In addition, costs of treatment were absorbed by the program for almost 4% of the days in FY02-03 and over 14% of the days in FY03-04.

---

<sup>5</sup> This effort has been maintained by three consecutive Attorneys General – Mike Fisher, Gerald Pappert and Thomas Corbett.

Put another way, 99% of the cost of all treatment was provided through public funding and charity.

### **Restoring Public Funding as a Component of Enforcement**

Building on this work, in 2008 the National Alliance for Model State Drug Laws contracted with attorney Greg Heller to further explore the cost shifting by insurers and to provide a companion legal analysis. In his article, “The Cost-Shifting Consequences of Failed Managed Care Regulation: Some Lessons from Pennsylvania’s Experience with Addiction Treatment”, Greg Heller explores the importance of enforcement of state insurance laws providing treatment for addiction, the shift to public funding and potential causes of action that could be brought on behalf of the states to assist with enforcement of state laws and possibly recover lost public funding.

### **Related Articles and Research**

In a Health Affairs article entitled, “*U.S. Spending for Mental Health and Substance Abuse Treatment, 1991-2001*” (March 2005), the authors describe the erosion of insurance payments for addiction treatment and suggest that increased application of managed care techniques may explain this trend.<sup>6</sup> This theory is consistent with the Pennsylvania experience. With the arrival of managed care in our state, use of residential treatment and lengths of stay in both residential and outpatient often dropped below clinical efficacy and best practices. In fact, for a period of time, managed care rendered meaningless the national effort to encourage the use of evidence-based practices regarding the appropriate levels of care and provision of appropriate lengths of stay.

In 2000, in its report to Congress studying the impact of the Mental Health Parity Act of 1996, the General Accounting Office found that despite this new law, mental health benefits remain limited. In this regard, the GAO noted an increase by employers in the use of managed care, as well as other design features limiting use of the benefits.<sup>7</sup> Similar dynamics may also be at work in states that have enacted state parity laws.

---

<sup>6</sup> “*U.S. Spending for Mental Health and Substance Abuse Treatment, 1991-2001*”, Tami L. Mark et al., Health Affairs, March 29, 2005.

<sup>7</sup> “*Mental Health Parity Act - Despite New Federal Standards, Mental Health Benefits Remain Limited*”, United States General Accounting Office, May 2000.

If this pattern holds true, implementation of the Paul Wellstone and Pete Domenici Mental Health Parity and Addiction Equity Act of 2008 is also likely to encounter an increase in use of managed care techniques that will threaten and could limit its promise of increased provision of addiction treatment.

In summary, these articles and our experience in Pennsylvania identify significant problems and obstacles when managed care techniques are applied to the provision of addiction treatment or applied without adequate oversight and enforcement.

### **Discussion**

43 states and the District of Columbia have laws on the books requiring that commercial group health insurance plans provide some level of treatment for alcohol and/or drug addiction.

Over the years, during conferences and meetings held by the National Alliance for Model State Drug Laws around the country, we were startled to learn that many of these state laws are not being utilized or enforced. As a result, people with commercial insurance plans are forced to seek help through public funding and charity.

In this time of revenue shortfalls, freezes and recession, it is unconscionable that any desperate family in any state would be unable to access help already paid for and provided by law and contract.

We must move forward and usher in a new era of accountability and work to ensure that these state laws are enforced and that public dollars are reserved for the destitute and the working poor.

In this regard, the Heller documents on cost shifting by insurers and the companion legal analysis lay significant groundwork for additional enforcement actions and for restoring any ill-gotten gains.

### **Closing**

The enforcement journey has been by turns difficult and exhilarating. We are beholden to many: to courageous families stepping forward to share their pain, to directors and staff in treatment programs speaking out despite the threats, to judges, district attorneys and probation officers who identified the connection between delays in treatment and crime and of course, to

Pennsylvania's strong and loving recovering community that watches over us all while lending to the effort a great treasure of skills and wisdom.

Contact information:

Sherry Green, National Alliance for Model State Drug Laws, e-mail: [sgreen@namsdl.org](mailto:sgreen@namsdl.org)

Deb Beck, e-mail: [dasdbeck@hotmail.com](mailto:dasdbeck@hotmail.com)

Greg Heller, attorney, e-mail: [gheller@yrchlaw.com](mailto:gheller@yrchlaw.com)

May 6, 2009

This article was supported by Grant No. 2007-DC-BX-K008 awarded by the Bureau of Justice Assistance. The Bureau of Justice Assistance is a component of the Office of Justice Programs, which also includes the Bureau of Justice Statistics, the National Institute of Justice, the Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, and the Office for Victims of Crime. Points of view or opinions in this document are those of the author and do not represent the official position or policies of the United States Department of Justice.

© 2009 National Alliance for Model State Drug Laws (NAMSDL). NAMSDL is a 501(c)(3) non-profit organization funded by Congress and the White House Office of National Drug Control Policy to provide legislative and policy services to states, federal officials and Congress. NAMSDL's services offer a comprehensive, balanced and effective continuum of responses to address alcohol, tobacco and other drug abuse problems.