



JUN 28 2019

Administrator
Washington, DC 20201

Matthew A. Van Patton, DHA
Director
Division of Medicaid and Long-Term Care
Department of Health and Human Services
301 Centennial Mall South, 3rd Floor
P.O. Box 95026
Lincoln, NE 68509-5026

Dear Dr. Van Patton:

Under section 1115 of the Social Security Act (the Act), the Secretary of Health and Human Services (HHS) may approve any experimental, pilot, or demonstration project that, in the judgment of the Secretary, is likely to assist in promoting the objectives of certain Act programs including Medicaid. Congress enacted section 1115 of the Act to ensure that federal requirements did not “stand in the way of experimental projects designed to test out new ideas and ways of dealing with the problems of public welfare recipients.” S. Rep. No. 87-1589, at 19 (1962), *as reprinted in* 1962 U.S.C.C.A.N. 1943, 1961. As relevant here, section 1115 of the Act allows the Secretary to waive compliance with the Medicaid program requirements of section 1902 of the Act, to the extent and for the period he finds necessary to carry out the demonstration project. In addition, section 1115 of the Act allows the Secretary to provide federal financial participation for demonstration costs that would not otherwise be considered as federally matchable expenditures under section 1903 of the Act, to the extent and for the period prescribed by the Secretary.

For the reasons discussed below, the Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services (CMS) is approving Nebraska’s request for a new demonstration titled, “Substance Use Disorder Program” (Project Number 11-W-10025/7) (demonstration), in accordance with section 1115(a) of the Act.

This approval is effective July 1, 2019 through June 30, 2024, upon which date, unless extended or otherwise amended, all authorities granted to operate this demonstration will expire. CMS’s approval is subject to the limitations specified in the attached expenditure authorities, Special Terms and Conditions (STCs), and any supplemental attachments defining the nature, character, and extent of federal involvement in this demonstration. The state may deviate from the Medicaid state plan requirements only to the extent those requirements have been specifically listed as not applicable to expenditures or individuals covered by expenditure authority.

Objectives of the Medicaid Program

As noted above, the Secretary may approve a demonstration project under section 1115 of the Act if, in his judgment, the project is likely to assist in promoting the objectives of title XIX. The purposes of Medicaid include an authorization of appropriation of funds to “enabl[e] each

state, as far as practicable under the conditions in such state, to furnish (1) medical assistance on behalf of families with dependent children and of aged, blind, or disabled individuals, whose income and resources are insufficient to meet the costs of necessary medical services, and (2) rehabilitation and other services to help such families and individuals attain or retain capability for independence or self-care.” Act §1901. This provision makes clear that an important objective of the Medicaid program is to furnish medical assistance and other services to vulnerable populations. But there is little intrinsic value in paying for services if those services are not advancing the health and wellness of the individual receiving them, or otherwise helping the individual attain independence. Therefore, we believe an objective of the Medicaid program, in addition to furnishing services, is to advance the health and wellness needs of its beneficiaries, and that it is appropriate for the state to structure its demonstration project in a manner that prioritizes meeting those needs.

Section 1115 demonstration projects present an opportunity for states to experiment with reforms that go beyond just routine medical care and focus on interventions that drive better health outcomes and quality of life improvements, and that may increase beneficiaries’ financial independence. Such policies may include those designed to address certain health determinants and those that encourage beneficiaries to engage in health-promoting behaviors and to strengthen engagement by beneficiaries in their personal health care plans. These tests will necessarily mean a change to the status quo. They may have associated administrative costs, particularly at the initial stage, and section 1115 acknowledges that demonstrations may “result in an impact on eligibility, enrollment, benefits, cost-sharing, or financing.” Act § 1115(d) (1). But in the long term they may create incentives and opportunities that help enable many beneficiaries to enjoy the numerous personal benefits that come with improved health and financial independence.

Section 1115 demonstration projects also provide an opportunity for states to test policies that ensure the fiscal sustainability of the Medicaid program, better “enabling each [s]tate, as far as practicable under the conditions in such [s]tate” to furnish medical assistance, Act §1901, while making it more practicable for states to furnish medical assistance to a broader range of persons in need. For instance, measures designed to improve health and wellness may reduce the volume of services consumed, as healthier, more engaged beneficiaries tend to consume fewer medical services and are generally less costly to cover. Further, measures that have the effect of helping individuals secure employer-sponsored or other commercial coverage or otherwise transition from Medicaid eligibility may decrease the number of individuals who need financial assistance, including medical assistance, from the state. Such measures may enable states to stretch their resources further and enhance their ability to provide medical assistance to a broader range of persons in need, including by expanding the services and populations they cover.¹ By the same

¹ States have considerable flexibility in the design of their Medicaid programs, within federal guidelines. Certain benefits are mandatory under federal law, but many benefits may be provided at state option, such as prescription drug benefits, vision benefits, and dental benefits. Similarly, states have considerable latitude to determine whom their Medicaid programs will cover. Certain eligibility groups must be covered under a state’s program, but many states opt to cover additional eligibility groups that are optional under the Medicaid statute. The optional groups include a new, non-elderly adult population (ACA expansion population) that was added to the Act at section 1902(a) (10) (A) (i) (VIII) by the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (ACA). Coverage of the ACA expansion population became optional as a result of the Supreme Court’s decision in *NFIB v. Sebelius*, 567 U.S. 519 (2012). Accordingly, several months after the *NFIB* decision was issued, CMS informed the states that they “have flexibility to start or stop the expansion.” CMS, *Frequently Asked Questions on Exchanges, Market Reforms, and*

token, such measures may also preserve states' ability to continue to provide the optional services and coverage they already have in place.

Our demonstration authority under section 1115 of the Act allows us to offer states more flexibility to experiment with different ways of improving health outcomes and strengthening the financial independence of beneficiaries. Demonstration projects that seek to improve beneficiary health and financial independence improve the well-being of Medicaid beneficiaries and, at the same time, allow states to maintain the long-term fiscal sustainability of their Medicaid programs and to provide more medical services to more Medicaid beneficiaries. Accordingly, such demonstration projects advance the objectives of the Medicaid program.

Background on Medicaid Coverage in Nebraska

Nebraska's Medicaid program provides health coverage to approximately 240,000 residents. In any given month, 10 to 12 percent of the state's population is eligible for Medicaid. Over 98 percent of Medicaid enrollees are served through the state's managed care delivery system. On January 1, 2017, Nebraska launched Heritage Health, a new managed care program that integrates physical health, behavioral health, and pharmacy services into a single, statewide, comprehensive delivery system. Nebraska's publicly funded behavioral health system is anchored by a network of six local regions. The regions contract with local programs to provide public inpatient, outpatient, emergency community mental health, and substance use disorder services. Medicaid managed care plans are required to collaborate with the Department of Behavioral Health and the local behavioral health regions in the establishment and maintenance of the plans' provider networks.

Extent and Scope of the Demonstration

This approval, once CMS approves the state's SUD Implementation Plan, authorizes Nebraska to receive federal financial participation (FFP) for the provision of all Medicaid state plan services – including a continuum of services to treat addictions to opioids and other substances – for Medicaid enrollees ages 21-64 primarily diagnosed with opioid use disorder (OUD) and/or other substance use disorders (SUD) who are short-term residents in residential and inpatient treatment facilities that meet the definition of an Institution for Mental Diseases (IMD). The approval of this demonstration is just one facet of a comprehensive strategy to combat the nation's opioid epidemic.

Specifically, the demonstration is expected to assist Nebraska in the following:

1. Increasing rates of identification, initiation, and engagement in treatment;
2. Increasing adherence to and retention in treatment;
3. Reducing overdose deaths, particularly those due to opioids;

Medicaid at 11 (Dec. 10, 2012). In addition to expanding Medicaid coverage by covering optional eligibility groups and benefits beyond what the Medicaid statute requires, many states also choose to cover benefits beyond what is authorized by statute by using expenditure authority under section 1115(a) (2) of the Act. For example, recently, many states have been relying on this authority to expand the scope of services they offer to address substance use disorders beyond what the statute explicitly authorizes.

4. Reducing utilization of emergency departments and inpatient hospital settings for treatment where the utilization is preventable or medically inappropriate through improved access to other continuum of care services;
5. Reducing readmissions to the same or higher level of care where the readmission is preventable or medically inappropriate; and
6. Improving access to care for physical health conditions among beneficiaries.

Determination that the Demonstration Project is Likely to Assist in Promoting Medicaid’s Objectives

Under section 1901 of the Act, the Medicaid program provides federal funding to participating states "[f]or the purpose of enabling each state, as far as practicable under the conditions “in such state, to furnish (1) medical assistance on behalf of families with dependent children and of aged, blind, or disabled individuals, whose income and resources are insufficient to meet the costs of necessary medical services, and (2) rehabilitation and other services to help such families and individuals attain or retain capability for independence or self-care.”

As this statutory text makes clear, a basic objective of Medicaid is to enable states to “furnish... medical assistance” to certain vulnerable populations (i.e., payment for certain healthcare services defined at section 1905 of the Act, the services themselves, or both). By paying these costs, the Medicaid program helps vulnerable populations afford the medical care and services they need to attain and maintain health and well-being. In addition, the Medicaid program is supposed to enable states to furnish rehabilitation and other services to vulnerable populations to help them “attain or retain capability for independence or self-care,” per section 1901 of the Act.

For the reasons discussed below, the Secretary has determined that Nebraska’s Substance Use Disorder Program demonstration is likely to assist in promoting the objectives of the Medicaid program and the expenditure authority sought is necessary and appropriate to carry out the demonstration. Under this demonstration, all Medicaid beneficiaries will continue to have access to all current state plan benefits. In addition, through this new section 1115 demonstration, Nebraska will be able to receive FFP for the continuum of services to treat addiction to opioids or other substances, including services provided to Medicaid enrollees residing in residential treatment facilities, subject to the requirements in the STCs. Ordinarily such residential treatment services are not eligible for federal Medicaid reimbursement due to the exclusion in the Medicaid statute of services provided to patients in IMDs.

CMS also expects that implementation of this demonstration in Nebraska is likely to assist in promoting the objectives of the Medicaid program as it is expected to improve health outcomes related to SUD and co-morbidities for those Medicaid beneficiaries by increasing access to high quality SUD, including OUD, care.

Consideration of Public Comments

To increase the transparency of demonstration projects, sections 1115(d)(1) and (2) of the Act direct the Secretary to issue regulations providing for two periods of public comment on a state’s application for a section 1115 demonstration that would result in an impact on eligibility, enrollment, benefits, cost-sharing, or financing. The first comment period occurs at the state

level before submission of the section 1115 application, and the second comment period occurs at the federal level after the application is received by the Secretary.

Section 1115(d)(2)(A) and (C) of the Act further specify that comment periods should be “sufficient to ensure a meaningful level of public input,” but the statute imposes no additional requirement on the states or the Secretary to address those comments, as might otherwise be required under a general rulemaking. Accordingly, the implementing regulations issued in 2012 provide that CMS will review and consider all comments received by the deadline, but will not provide written responses to public comments.²

Consistent with federal transparency requirements, CMS reviewed all of the materials submitted by the state, as well as all of the comments the state received, when evaluating whether the demonstration project as a whole was likely to assist in promoting the objectives of the Medicaid program.

CMS received three written comments during the federal comment period. Although CMS is not legally required to provide written responses to comments, CMS is addressing the comments and summarizing CMS’s analysis of those comments for the benefit of stakeholders. One comment was not related to the proposed demonstration. Another comment encouraged the specific inclusion of provisions related to HIV counseling and education for individuals being treated for SUD in order to promote awareness and prevention of the disease. The same commenter also encouraged HIV testing for patients at intake, consistent with ASAM and CDC guidelines, so that those individuals living with HIV may be connected with care and treatment. CMS considered this comment in its review and analysis of the demonstration application, but notes that these comments are outside of what the state proposed in its demonstration application.

A third commenter urged CMS and the state to work together to ensure that treatment provider assessments for all addiction treatment services, levels of care, and length-of-stay recommendations, as well as methods of residential treatment provider qualification, are performed by an independent third party that has the necessary competencies to use the most recent edition of the ASAM Criteria (or such other evidence-based patient placement assessment tools and nationally-recognized program standards, as applicable). CMS considered this comment in its review and analysis of this demonstration application, and notes that STC 18 requires the state, in its SUD Implementation Plan, to establish a requirement that providers assess treatment needs based on SUD-specific multidimensional assessment tools, such as ASAM Criteria or other assessment and placement tools that reflect evidence-based clinical treatment guidelines within 12-24 months of demonstration approval.

Other Information

CMS’s approval of this demonstration is conditioned upon compliance with the enclosed list of waiver and expenditure authorities and the STCs defining the nature, character and extent of anticipated federal involvement in the project. The award is subject to our receiving your written

² 42 CFR § 431.416(d)(2); see also Medicaid Program; Review and Approval Process for Section 1115 Demonstrations; Application, Review, and Reporting Process for Waivers for State Innovation; Final Rules, 77 Fed. Reg. 11678, 11685 (Feb. 27, 2012) (final rule).

acknowledgement of the award and acceptance of these STCs within 30 days of the date of this letter.

Your project officer is CAPT Lisa Marunycz. CAPT Marunycz's contact information is as follows:

CAPT Lisa Marunycz
Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services
Center for Medicaid & CHIP Services
State Demonstrations Group
7500 Security Boulevard
Mail Stop: S2-24-04
Baltimore, MD 21244-1850
Telephone: (410) 786-1638
E-mail: lisa.marunycz@cms.hhs.gov

Official communications regarding program matters should be sent simultaneously to CAPT Marunycz and to Mr. James Scott, Director, in our Division Of Medicaid Field Operations North. Mr. Scott's address is:

Mr. James Scott
Director, Division of Medicaid Field Operations North
Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services
601 East 12th Street, Suite 355
Kansas City, Missouri 64106-2898
Telephone: (816) 426-5925
E-mail: James.Scott1@cms.hhs.gov

If you have questions regarding this approval, please contact Ms. Judith Cash, Director, State Demonstrations Group, Center for Medicaid & CHIP Services, at (410) 786-9686. We look forward to continuing to work with you and your staff throughout the course of the demonstration.

Sincerely,

A large black rectangular redaction box covering the signature of Seema Verma.

Seema Verma

Enclosures

Page 7 – Dr. Matthew A. Van Patton

cc: James Scott, Director, Division of Medicaid Field Operations North

CENTERS FOR MEDICARE & MEDICAID SERVICES

EXPENDITURE AUTHORITY

NUMBER: 11-W-10024/7

TITLE: Nebraska Substance Use Disorder Program

AWARDEE: Nebraska Department of Health and Human Services, Division of Medicaid and Long-Term Care

Under the authority of section 1115(a)(2) of the Social Security Act (the Act), expenditures made by Nebraska for the items identified below, which are not otherwise included as expenditures under section 1903 of the Act shall, for the period from July 1, 2019 through June 30, 2024, unless otherwise specified, be regarded as expenditures under the state's title XIX plan.

The following expenditure authorities may only be implemented consistent with the approved Special Terms and Conditions (STCs) and shall enable Nebraska to operate the above-identified section 1115(a) demonstration.

Residential Treatment for Individuals with Substance Use Disorder (SUD). Expenditures for otherwise covered services furnished to otherwise eligible individuals who are primarily receiving treatment and withdrawal management services for substance use disorder (SUD) who are short-term residents in facilities that meet the definition of an Institution for Mental Diseases (IMD).

**CENTERS FOR MEDICARE & MEDICAID SERVICES
SPECIAL TERMS AND CONDITIONS (STCs)**

NUMBER: 11-W-10024/7

TITLE: Nebraska Substance Use Disorder

AWARDEE: Nebraska Department of Health and Human Services
Division of Medicaid and Long-Term Care

I. PREFACE

The following are the STCs for the Nebraska Substance Use Disorder section 1115(a) Medicaid demonstration (hereinafter “demonstration”), to enable the Nebraska Department of Health and Human Services, Division of Medicaid and Long-Term Care (hereinafter “state”) to operate this demonstration. The Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services (CMS) has granted expenditure authorities authorizing federal matching of demonstration costs not otherwise matchable, which are separately enumerated. These STCs set forth conditions and limitations on those expenditure authorities, and describe in detail the nature, character, and extent of federal involvement in the demonstration and the state’s obligations to CMS related to the demonstration. These STCs neither grant additional expenditure authorities, nor expand upon those separately granted. These STCs are effective from July 1, 2019 to June 30, 2024 unless otherwise specified.

The STCs have been arranged into the following subject areas:

- I. Preface
- II. Program Description and Objectives
- III. General Program Requirements
- IV. Eligibility and Enrollment
- V. Demonstration Programs and Benefits
- VI. Cost Sharing
- VII. Delivery System
- VIII. General Reporting Requirements
- IX. Monitoring
- X. Evaluation of the Demonstration
- XI. General Financial Requirements under title XIX

XII. Monitoring Budget Neutrality for the Demonstration

XIII. Schedule of Deliverables for the Demonstration Period

Additional attachments have been included to provide supplementary information and guidance for specific STCs.

- Attachment A: Developing the Evaluation Design
- Attachment B: Preparing the Interim and Summative Evaluation Reports
- Attachment C: Reserved for SUD Implementation Plan
- Attachment D: Reserved for SUD Monitoring Protocol
- Attachment E: Reserved for SUD Evaluation Design

II. PROGRAM DESCRIPTION AND OBJECTIVES

The goal of this demonstration is for the state to maintain and enhance access to opioid use disorder (OUD) and other substance use disorder (SUD) services and continue delivery system improvements for these services to provide more coordinated and comprehensive treatment of Medicaid beneficiaries with SUD. This demonstration will provide the state with authority to provide high-quality, clinically appropriate treatment to beneficiaries with SUD while they are short-term residents in residential and inpatient treatment settings that qualify as IMDs. It will also support state efforts to implement models of care focused on increasing support for individuals in the community and home, outside of institutions, and improve access to a continuum of SUD evidence-based services at varied levels of intensity. This continuum of care shall be based on the American Society of Addiction Medicine (ASAM) criteria and/or other nationally recognized assessment and placement tools that reflect evidence-based clinical treatment guidelines.

During the demonstration period, the state seeks to achieve the following goals:

1. Increased rates of identification, initiation, and engagement in treatment for SUD;
2. Increased adherence to and retention in treatment;
3. Reductions in overdose deaths, particularly those due to opioids;
4. Reduced utilization of emergency departments and inpatient hospital settings for treatment where the utilization is preventable or medically inappropriate through improved access to other continuum of care services;
5. Fewer readmissions to the same or higher level of care where the readmission is preventable or medically inappropriate; and,
6. Improved access to care for physical health conditions among beneficiaries with SUD.

III. GENERAL PROGRAM REQUIREMENTS

1. **Compliance with Federal Non-Discrimination Statutes.** The state must comply with all applicable federal statutes relating to non-discrimination. These include, but are not limited to, the Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990 (ADA), Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973 (Section 504), the Age Discrimination Act of 1975, and section 1557 of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (Section 1557).
2. **Compliance with Medicaid and Children’s Health Insurance Program (CHIP) Law, Regulation, and Policy.** All requirements of the Medicaid and CHIP programs expressed in federal law, regulation, and policy statement, not expressly waived or identified as not applicable in the waiver and expenditure authority documents (of which these terms and conditions are part), apply to the demonstration.
3. **Changes in Medicaid and CHIP Law, Regulation, and Policy.** The state must, within the timeframes specified in federal law, regulation, or written policy, come into compliance with any changes in law, regulation, or policy affecting the Medicaid or CHIP programs that occur during this demonstration approval period, unless the provision being changed is expressly waived or identified as not applicable. In addition, CMS reserves the right to amend the STCs to reflect such changes and/or changes as needed without requiring the state to submit an amendment to the demonstration under STC 7. CMS will notify the state 30 business days in advance of the expected approval date of the amended STCs to allow the state to provide comment. Changes will be considered in force upon issuance of the approval letter by CMS. The state must accept the changes in writing.
4. **Impact on Demonstration of Changes in Federal Law, Regulation, and Policy.**
 - a. To the extent that a change in federal law, regulation, or policy requires either a reduction or an increase in federal financial participation (FFP) for expenditures made under this demonstration, the state must adopt, subject to CMS approval, a modified budget neutrality agreement for the demonstration as necessary to comply with such change, as well as a modified allotment neutrality worksheet as necessary to comply with such change. The trend rates for the budget neutrality agreement are not subject to change under this subparagraph. Further, the state may seek an amendment to the demonstration (as per STC 7 of this section) as a result of the change in FFP.
 - b. If mandated changes in the federal law require state legislation, unless otherwise prescribed by the terms of the federal law, the changes must take effect on the earlier of the day such state legislation becomes effective, or on the last day such legislation was required to be in effect under the law, whichever is sooner.
5. **State Plan Amendments.** The state will not be required to submit title XIX or XXI State Plan amendments (SPAs) for changes affecting any populations made eligible solely through the demonstration. If a population eligible through the Medicaid or CHIP State Plan is affected by a change to the demonstration, a conforming amendment to the

appropriate State Plan is required, except as otherwise noted in these STCs. In all such cases, the Medicaid and CHIP State Plans govern.

- 6. Changes Subject to the Amendment Process.** Changes related to eligibility, enrollment, benefits, beneficiary rights, delivery systems, cost sharing, sources of non-federal share of funding, budget neutrality, and other comparable program elements must be submitted to CMS as amendments to the demonstration. All amendment requests are subject to approval at the discretion of the Secretary in accordance with section 1115 of the Act. The state must not implement changes to these elements without prior approval by CMS either through an approved amendment to the Medicaid or CHIP State Plan or amendment to the demonstration. Amendments to the demonstration are not retroactive and no FFP of any kind, including for administrative or medical assistance expenditures, will be available under changes to the demonstration that have not been approved through the amendment process set forth in STC 7 below, except as provided in STC 3.
- 7. Amendment Process.** Requests to amend the demonstration must be submitted to CMS for approval no later than 120 calendar days prior to the planned date of implementation of the change and may not be implemented until approved. CMS reserves the right to deny or delay approval of a demonstration amendment based on non-compliance with these STCs, including but not limited to the failure by the state to submit required elements of a complete amendment request as described in this STC, and failure by the state to submit required reports and other deliverables according to the deadlines specified therein. Amendment requests must include, but are not limited to, the following:

 - a. An explanation of the public process used by the state, consistent with the requirements of STC 12. Such explanation must include a summary of any public feedback received and identification of how this feedback was addressed by the state in the final amendment request submitted to CMS;
 - b. A detailed description of the amendment, including impact on beneficiaries, with sufficient supporting documentation;
 - c. A data analysis which identifies the specific “with waiver” impact of the proposed amendment on the current budget neutrality agreement. Such analysis must include current total computable “with waiver” and “without waiver” status on both a summary and detailed level through the current approval period using the most recent actual expenditures, as well as summary and detailed projections of the change in the “with waiver” expenditure total as a result of the proposed amendment, which isolates (by Eligibility Group) the impact of the amendment;
 - d. An up-to-date CHIP allotment worksheet, if necessary;
 - e. The state must provide updates to existing demonstration reporting and quality and evaluation plans. This includes a description of how the evaluation design and annual progress reports will be modified to incorporate the amendment provisions, as well as the oversight, monitoring and measurement of the provisions.

- 8. Extension of the Demonstration.** States that intend to request an extension of the demonstration must submit an application to CMS from the Governor or Chief Executive Officer of the state in accordance with the requirements of 42 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) 431.412(c). States that do not intend to request an extension of the demonstration beyond the period authorized in these STCs must submit a phase-out plan consistent with the requirements of STC 9.
- 9. Demonstration Phase-Out.** The state may only suspend or terminate this demonstration in whole, or in part, consistent with the following requirements.
- a. Notification of Suspension or Termination: The state must promptly notify CMS in writing of the reason(s) for the suspension or termination, together with the effective date and a transition and phase-out plan. The state must submit a notification letter and a draft transition and phase-out plan to CMS no less than six months before the effective date of the demonstration's suspension or termination. Prior to submitting the draft transition and phase-out plan to CMS, the state must publish on its website the draft transition and phase-out plan for a 30-day public comment period. In addition, the state must conduct tribal consultation in accordance with STC 12, if applicable. Once the 30-day public comment period has ended, the state must provide a summary of the issues raised by the public during the comment period and how the state considered the comments received when developing the revised transition and phase-out plan.
 - b. Transition and Phase-out Plan Requirements: The state must include, at a minimum, in its phase-out plan the process by which it will notify affected beneficiaries, the content of said notices (including information on the beneficiary's appeal rights), the process by which the state will conduct administrative reviews of Medicaid or CHIP eligibility prior to the termination of the demonstration for the affected beneficiaries, and ensure ongoing coverage for eligible beneficiaries, as well as any community outreach activities the state will undertake to notify affected beneficiaries, including community resources that are available.
 - c. Transition and Phase-out Plan Approval. The state must obtain CMS approval of the transition and phase-out plan prior to the implementation of transition and phase-out activities. Implementation of transition and phase-out activities must be no sooner than 14 calendar days after CMS approval of the transition and phase-out plan.
 - d. Transition and Phase-out Procedures: The state must comply with all applicable notice requirements found in 42 CFR, part 431 subpart E, including sections 431.206, 431.210 and 431.213. In addition, the state must assure all applicable appeal and hearing rights are afforded to beneficiaries in the demonstration as outlined in 42 CFR, part 431 subpart E, including sections 431.220 and 431.221. If a beneficiary in the demonstration requests a hearing before the date of action, the state must maintain benefits as required in 42 CFR §431.230. In addition, the state must conduct administrative renewals for all affected beneficiaries in order to determine if they

qualify for Medicaid or CHIP eligibility under a different eligibility category prior to termination, as discussed in October 1, 2010, State Health Official Letter #10-008 and as required under 42 CFR 435.916(f)(1). For individuals determined ineligible for Medicaid, the state must determine potential eligibility for other insurance affordability programs and comply with the procedures set forth in 42 CFR 435.1200(e).

- e. Exemption from Public Notice Procedures 42 CFR Section 431.416(g). CMS may expedite the federal and state public notice requirements under circumstances described in 42 CFR 431.416(g).
- f. Enrollment Limitation during Demonstration Phase-Out. If the state elects to suspend, terminate, or not extend this demonstration, during the last six months of the demonstration, enrollment of new individuals into the demonstration must be suspended. The limitation of enrollment into the demonstration does not impact the state's obligation to determine Medicaid eligibility in accordance with the approved Medicaid State Plan.
- g. Federal Financial Participation (FFP). If the project is terminated or any relevant waivers suspended by the state, FFP must be limited to normal closeout costs associated with the termination or expiration of the demonstration including services, continued benefits as a result of beneficiaries' appeals, and administrative costs of disenrolling beneficiaries.

10. Withdrawal of Waiver or Expenditure Authority. CMS reserves the right to withdraw waivers and/or expenditure authorities at any time it determines that continuing the waiver or expenditure authorities would no longer be in the public interest or promote the objectives of title XIX and title XXI. CMS will promptly notify the state in writing of the determination and the reasons for the withdrawal, together with the effective date, and afford the state an opportunity to request a hearing to challenge CMS' determination prior to the effective date. If a waiver or expenditure authority is withdrawn, FFP is limited to normal closeout costs associated with terminating the waiver or expenditure authority, including services, continued benefits as a result of beneficiary appeals, and administrative costs of disenrolling beneficiaries.

11. Adequacy of Infrastructure. The state will ensure the availability of adequate resources for implementation and monitoring of the demonstration, including education, outreach, and enrollment; maintaining eligibility systems; compliance with cost sharing requirements; and reporting on financial and other demonstration components.

12. Public Notice, Tribal Consultation, and Consultation with Interested Parties. The state must comply with the state notice procedures as required in 42 CFR section 431.408 prior to submitting an application to extend the demonstration. For applications to amend the demonstration, the state must comply with the state notice procedures set forth in 59 Fed. Reg. 49249 (September 27, 1994) prior to submitting such request. The state must also

comply with the Public Notice Procedures set forth in 42 CFR 447.205 for changes in statewide methods and standards for setting payment rates.

The state must also comply with tribal and Indian Health Program/Urban Indian Organization consultation requirements at section 1902(a)(73) of the Act, 42 CFR 431.408(b), State Medicaid Director Letter #01-024, or as contained in the state's approved Medicaid State Plan, when any program changes to the demonstration, either through amendment as set out in STC 7 or extension, are proposed by the state.

13. Federal Financial Participation. No federal matching funds for expenditures for this demonstration, including for administrative and medical assistance expenditures, will be available until the SUD Implementation Plan is approved.

14. Administrative Authority. When there are multiple entities involved in the administration of the demonstration, the Single State Medicaid Agency must maintain authority, accountability, and oversight of the program. The state Medicaid agency must exercise oversight of all delegated functions to operating agencies, MCOs, and any other contracted entities. The single state Medicaid agency is responsible for the content and oversight of the quality strategies for the demonstration.

15. Common Rule Exemption. The state must ensure that the only involvement of human subjects in research activities that may be authorized and/or required by this demonstration is for projects which are conducted by or subject to the approval of CMS, and that are designed to study, evaluate, or otherwise examine the Medicaid or CHIP program – including public benefit or service programs, procedures for obtaining Medicaid or CHIP benefits or services, possible changes in or alternatives to Medicaid or CHIP programs and procedures, or possible changes in methods or levels of payment for Medicaid benefits or services. CMS has determined that this demonstration as represented in these approved STCs meets the requirements for exemption from the human subject research provisions of the Common Rule set forth in 45 CFR 46.101(b)(5).

IV. ELIGIBILITY AND ENROLLMENT

16. Eligibility Groups Affected by the Demonstration. Under the demonstration, there is no change to Medicaid eligibility. Standards and methodologies for eligibility remain set forth under the State Plan and are subject to all applicable Medicaid laws and regulations.

V. DEMONSTRATION PROGRAMS AND BENEFITS

17. Opioid Use Disorder/Substance Use Disorder Program. Under this demonstration, Nebraska Substance Use Disorder Program beneficiaries will have access to high quality, evidence-based SUD treatment services, ranging from medically supervised withdrawal management for SUDs to ongoing care for these conditions in cost-effective community-based settings. The state will work to improve care coordination and care for co-occurring physical and mental health conditions. Nebraska will be expected to achieve a statewide

average length of stay of 30 days in residential treatment settings, to be monitored pursuant to the SUD Monitoring Plan as outlined in STC 18 below.

The coverage of SUD treatment services during short term residential and inpatient stays in IMDs will expand Nebraska’s current SUD benefit package available to all Nebraska Medicaid beneficiaries ages 21-64 as outlined in Table 1 (see unallowable expenditures not eligible for FFP, detailed in STC 45).

The state attests that the services indicated in Table 1 as being covered under the Medicaid State Plan authority are currently covered in the Nebraska Medicaid State Plan.

Table 1: Nebraska Substance Use Disorder Program SUD Benefits Coverage with Expenditure Authority			
Benefit	Type	Medicaid Authority	Expenditure Authority
Outpatient services	SUD	1915(b) (Individual services covered)	N/A
Intensive outpatient services	SUD	1915(b) (Individuals services covered)	N/A
Inpatient services	SUD	1915(b) (Individual services covered)	Services provided to individuals in IMDs
Residential treatment services	SUD	1915(b)(Individual services covered)	Services provided to individuals residing in IMDs
Peer Support Services	SUD	State Plan	N/A
Medically Supervised Withdrawal Management	SUD	State Plan (contingent on anticipated SPA approval)	Services provided to individuals in IMDs
Opioid Treatment Program Services	SUD	State Plan (contingent on anticipated SPA approval)	Services provided to individuals in IMDs
Office Based Opioid Treatment	SUD	State Plan	Services provided to individuals in IMDs

18. SUD Implementation Plan. The state must submit the SUD Implementation Plan within 90 calendar days after approval of this demonstration. The state may not claim FFP for services provided in IMDs to beneficiaries with a primary diagnosis of SUD (e.g., OUD) until CMS

has approved the SUD Implementation Plan. After approval of the SUD implementation plan required by these STCs, FFP will be available prospectively, not retrospectively. Once approved, the SUD Implementation Plan will be incorporated into the STCs as Attachment C and, once incorporated, may be altered only with CMS approval. Failure to submit a SUD Implementation Plan will be considered a material failure to comply with the terms of the demonstration project as described in 42 CFR 431.420(d) and, as such, would be grounds for termination or suspension of the SUD program under this demonstration. Failure to progress in meeting the milestone goals agreed upon by the state and CMS will result in a funding deferral as described in STC 22.

At a minimum, the SUD Implementation Plan must describe the strategic approach and detailed project implementation plan, including timetables and programmatic content where applicable, for meeting the following milestones which reflect the key goals and objectives for the program:

- **Access to Critical Levels of Care for OUD and other SUDs.** Service delivery for new benefits, including residential treatment and withdrawal management, within 12-24 months of SUD demonstration approval;
- **Use of Evidence-based SUD-specific Patient Placement Criteria.** Establishment of a requirement that providers assess treatment needs based on SUD-specific, multidimensional assessment tools, such as ASAM Criteria or other assessment and placement tools that reflect evidence-based clinical treatment guidelines within 12-24 months of demonstration approval;
- **Patient Placement.** Establishment of a utilization management approach such that beneficiaries have access to SUD services at the appropriate level of care and that the interventions are appropriate for the diagnosis and level of care, including an independent process for reviewing placement in residential treatment settings within 12-24 months of demonstration approval;
- **Use of Nationally Recognized SUD-specific Program Standards to set Provider Qualifications for Residential Treatment Facilities.** Currently, residential treatment service providers must be a licensed organization, pursuant to the residential service provider qualifications described in Nebraska administrative code. The state must establish residential treatment provider qualifications in licensure, policy or provider manuals, managed care contracts or credentialing, or other requirements or guidance that meet program standards in the ASAM Criteria or other nationally recognized, SUD-specific program standards regarding in particular the types of services, hours of clinical care, and credentials of staff for residential treatment settings within 12-24 months of demonstration approval;
- **Standards of Care.** Establishment of a provider review process to ensure that residential treatment providers deliver care consistent with the specifications in the ASAM Criteria or other comparable, nationally recognized SUD program standards based on evidence-based clinical treatment guidelines for types of services, hours of clinical care, and

credentials of staff for residential treatment settings within 12-24 months of demonstration approval;

- **Standards of Care.** Establishment of a requirement that residential treatment providers offer MAT on-site or facilitate access to MAT off-site within 12-24 months of demonstration approval;
- **Sufficient Provider Capacity at each Level of Care including Medication Assisted Treatment for SUD/OD.** An assessment of the availability of providers in the critical levels of care throughout the state, or in the regions of the state participating under this demonstration, including those that offer MAT within 12 months of demonstration approval;
- **Implementation of Comprehensive Treatment and Prevention Strategies to Address Opioid Abuse and SUD/OD.** Implementation of opioid prescribing guidelines along with other interventions to prevent prescription drug abuse and expand coverage of and access to naloxone for overdose reversal as well as implementation of strategies to increase utilization and improve functionality of prescription drug monitoring programs;
- **Improved Care Coordination and Transitions between levels of care.** Establishment and implementation of policies to ensure residential and inpatient facilities link beneficiaries with community-based services and supports following stays in these facilities within 24 months of demonstration approval.
- **SUD Health IT Plan.** Implementation of the milestones and metrics as detailed in STC 18(a) or Attachment C.
 - a. **SUD Health Information Technology Plan (“Health IT Plan”).** The SUD Health IT plan applies to all states where the Health IT functionalities are expected to impact beneficiaries within the demonstration. As outlined in SMDL #18-011 and #17-003, *respectively*, states must submit to CMS the applicable Health IT Plan(s), to be included as a section(s) of the associated Implementation Plan (see STC 18), to develop infrastructure and capabilities consistent with the requirements outlined in the SUD demonstration-type.

The SUD Health IT Plan must detail the necessary health IT capabilities in place to support beneficiary health outcomes to address the SUD goals of the demonstration. The plan(s) will also be used to identify areas of health IT ecosystem improvement. The Plan must include implementation milestones and projected dates for achieving them (see Attachment C), and must be aligned with the state’s broader State Medicaid Health IT Plan (SMHP) and, if applicable, the state’s Behavioral Health (BH) IT Health Plan.

The state must include in its Monitoring Protocol (see STC 18.b) an approach to monitoring its SUD Health IT Plan which will include performance metrics to be approved in advance by CMS.

The state must monitor progress, each DY, on the implementation of its SUD Health IT Plan in relationship to its milestones and timelines and report on its progress to CMS in an addendum to its Annual Report (see STC 26).

As applicable, the state should advance the standards identified in the ‘Interoperability Standards Advisory – Best Available Standards and Implementation Specifications’ (ISA) in developing and implementing the state’s SUD Health IT policies and in all related applicable State procurements (e.g., including managed care contracts) that are associated with this demonstration.

Where there are opportunities at the state- and provider-level (up to and including usage in MCO or ACO participation agreements) to leverage federal funds associated with a standard referenced in 45 CFR 170 Subpart B, the state should use the federally-recognized standards, barring another compelling state interest.

Where there are opportunities at the state- and provider-level to leverage federal funds associated with a standard not already referenced in 45 CFR 170 but included in the ISA, the state should use the federally-recognized ISA standards, barring no other compelling state interest.

Components of the Health IT Plan include:

- i. The SUD Health IT Plan must describe the state’s goals, each DY, to enhance the state’s prescription drug monitoring program (PDMP).¹
- ii. The SUD Health IT Plan must address how the state’s PDMP will enhance ease of use for prescribers and other state and federal stakeholders.² This will also include plans to include PDMP interoperability with a statewide, regional or local Health Information Exchange. Additionally, the SUD Health IT Plan must describe ways in which the state will support clinicians in consulting the PDMP prior to prescribing a controlled substance—and reviewing the patients’ history of controlled substance prescriptions—prior to the issuance of a Controlled Substance Schedule II (CSII) opioid prescription.
- iii. The SUD Health IT Plan will, as applicable, describe the state’s capabilities to leverage a master patient index (or master data management service, etc.) in support of SUD care delivery. Additionally, the Health IT Plan must describe current and future capabilities regarding PDMP queries—and the state’s ability to properly match patients receiving opioid prescriptions with patients in the PDMP. The state will also indicate current efforts or plans to develop and/or utilize current patient index capability that supports the programmatic objectives of the demonstration.

¹ Prescription drug monitoring programs (PDMP) are electronic databases that track controlled substance prescriptions in states. PDMPs can provide health authorities timely information about prescribing and patient behaviors that contribute to the “opioid” epidemic and facilitate a nimble and targeted response.

² *Ibid.*

- iv. The SUD Health IT Plan must describe how the activities described in (i), (ii) and (iii) above will support broader state and federal efforts to diminish the likelihood of long-term opioid use directly correlated to clinician prescribing patterns.³
- v. The SUD Health IT Plan must describe the state’s current and future capabilities to support providers implementing or expanding Health IT functionality in the following areas: 1) Referrals, 2) Electronic care plans and medical records, 3) Consent, 4) Interoperability, 5) Telehealth, 6) Alerting/analytics, and 7) Identity management.
- vi. In developing the SUD Health IT Plan, states should use the following resources.
 - 1. States may use federal resources available on Health IT.Gov (<https://www.healthit.gov/topic/behavioral-health>) including but not limited to “Behavioral Health and Physical Health Integration” and “Section 34: Opioid Epidemic and Health IT” (<https://www.healthit.gov/playbook/health-information-exchange/>).
 - 2. States may also use the CMS 1115 Health IT resources available on “Medicaid Program Alignment with State Systems to Advance HIT, HIE and Interoperability” at <https://www.medicaid.gov/medicaid/data-and-systems/hie/index.html>. States should review the “1115 Health IT Toolkit” for health IT considerations in conducting an assessment and developing their Health IT Plans.
 - 3. States may request from CMS technical assistance to conduct an assessment and develop plans to ensure they have the specific health IT infrastructure with regards to *PDMP interoperability*, electronic care plan sharing, care coordination, and behavioral health-physical health integration, to meet the goals of the demonstration.

b. SUD Monitoring Protocol. The state must submit a Monitoring Protocol for the SUD programs authorized by this demonstration within 150 calendar days after approval of the demonstration. The SUD Monitoring Protocol template must be developed in cooperation with CMS and is subject to CMS approval. Once approved, the SUD Monitoring Protocol will be incorporated into the STCs, as Attachment D. Progress on the performance measures identified in the Monitoring Protocol will be reported via the quarterly and annual monitoring reports. Components of the Monitoring Protocol include:

- i. An assurance of the state’s commitment and ability to report information relevant to each of the program implementation areas listed in STC 18, and reporting relevant information to the state’s Health IT plan described in STC 18.a;
- ii. A description of the methods of data collection and timeframes for reporting on the state’s progress on required measures as part of the general reporting requirements described in Section VIII of the demonstration; and
- iii. A description of baselines and targets to be achieved by the end of the demonstration. Where possible, baselines will be informed by state data, and targets will be benchmarked against performance in best practice settings.

³ Shah, Anuj, Corey Hayes and Bradley Martin. *Characteristics of Initial Prescription Episodes and Likelihood of Long-Term Opioid Use — United States, 2006–2015*. MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep 2017;66.

19. Evaluation. The SUD Evaluation will be subject to the same requirements as the overall demonstration evaluation, as described in Sections VIII (General Reporting Requirements) and X (Evaluation of the Demonstration) of these STCs.

VI. COST SHARING

20. Cost Sharing. Cost sharing requirements under the demonstration will not differ from the approved Medicaid State Plan.

VII. DELIVERY SYSTEM

21. Delivery System. Nebraska's delivery system will continue to be the Heritage Health Medicaid managed care program that utilizes capitated Medicaid MCOs to provide State Plan and 1915(b) authorized behavioral health services. Heritage Health will continue to operate as approved in DHHS' 1915(b) waiver.

VIII. GENERAL REPORTING REQUIREMENTS

22. Deferral for Failure to Submit Timely Demonstration Deliverables. CMS may issue deferrals in accordance with 42 CFR part 430 subpart C, in the amount of \$5,000,000 per deliverable (federal share) when items required by these STCs (e.g., required data elements, analyses, reports, design documents, presentations, and other items specified in these STCs) (hereafter singly or collectively referred to as "deliverable(s)") are not submitted timely to CMS or are found to not be consistent with the requirements approved by CMS. A deferral shall not exceed the value of the federal amount for the current demonstration period. The state does not relinquish its rights provided under 42 CFR part 430 subpart C to challenge any CMS finding that the state materially failed to comply with the terms of this agreement. The following process will be used: 1) Thirty (30) days after the deliverable was due if the state has not submitted a written request to CMS for approval of an extension as described in subsection (b) below; or 2) Thirty days after CMS has notified the state in writing that the deliverable was not accepted for being inconsistent with the requirements of this agreement and the information needed to bring the deliverable into alignment with CMS requirements:

- a. CMS will issue a written notification to the state providing advance notification of a pending deferral for late or non-compliant submissions of required deliverable(s).
- b. For each deliverable, the state may submit to CMS a written request for an extension to submit the required deliverable that includes a supporting rationale for the cause(s) of the delay and the state's anticipated date of submission. Should CMS agree to the state's request, a corresponding extension of the deferral process can be provided. CMS may agree to a corrective action plan submitted by the state as an interim step before applying the deferral, if the state proposes a corrective action plan in the state's written extension request.

- c. If CMS agrees to an interim corrective plan in accordance with subsection (b), and the state fails to comply with the corrective action plan or, despite the corrective action plan, still fails to submit the overdue deliverable(s) with all required contents in satisfaction of the terms of this agreement, CMS may proceed with the issuance of a deferral against the next Quarterly Statement of Expenditures reported in Medicaid Budget and Expenditure System/State Children's Health Insurance Program Budget and Expenditure System (MBES/CBES) following a written deferral notification to the state.
- d. If the CMS deferral process has been initiated for state non-compliance with the terms of this agreement with respect to required deliverable(s), and the state submits the overdue deliverable(s), and such deliverable(s) are accepted by CMS as meeting the requirements specified in these STCs, the deferral(s) will be released.
- e. As the purpose of a section 1115 demonstration is to test new methods of operation or service delivery, a state's failure to submit all required reports, evaluations and other deliverables will be considered by CMS in reviewing any application for an extension, amendment, or for a new demonstration.

23. Deferral of Federal Financial Participation (FFP) from IMD Claiming for Insufficient Progress Toward Milestones. Up to \$5,000,000 in FFP for services in IMDs may be deferred if the state is not making adequate progress on meeting the milestones as evidenced by reporting on the milestones in the SUD Implementation Plan and the required performance measures in the Monitoring Protocol agreed upon by the state and CMS. Once CMS determines the state has not made adequate progress, up to \$5,000,000 will be deferred in the next calendar quarter and each calendar quarter thereafter until CMS has determined sufficient progress has been made.

24. Submission of Post-approval Deliverables. The state must submit all deliverables as stipulated by CMS and within the timeframes outlined within these STCs.

25. Compliance with Federal Systems Updates. As federal systems continue to evolve and incorporate additional 1115 demonstration reporting and analytics functions, the state will work with CMS to:

- a. Revise the reporting templates and submission processes to accommodate timely compliance with the requirements of the new systems;
- b. Ensure all 1115, T-MSIS, and other data elements that have been agreed to for reporting and analytics are provided by the state; and
- c. Submit deliverables to the appropriate system as directed by CMS.

IX. MONITORING

26. Monitoring Reports. The state must submit three (3) Quarterly Reports and one (1) Annual Report each DY. The fourth quarter information that would ordinarily be provided in a separate report should be reported as distinct information within the Annual Report. The Quarterly Reports are due no later than sixty (60) calendar days following the end of

each demonstration quarter. The compiled Annual Report is due no later than ninety (90) calendar days following the end of the DY. The reports will include all required elements as per 42 CFR 431.428, and should not direct readers to links outside the report. Additional links not referenced in the document may be listed in a Reference/Bibliography section. The Monitoring Reports must follow the framework provided by CMS, which is subject to change as monitoring systems are developed/evolve, and be provided in a structured manner that supports federal tracking and analysis.

- a. Operational Updates. The operational updates will focus on progress toward meeting the demonstration's milestones. Additionally, per 42 CFR 431.428, the Monitoring Reports must document any policy or administrative difficulties in operating the demonstration. The reports shall provide sufficient information to document key challenges, underlying causes of challenges, how challenges are being addressed, as well as key achievements and to what conditions and efforts successes can be attributed. The discussion should also include any issues or complaints identified by beneficiaries; lawsuits or legal actions; unusual or unanticipated trends; legislative updates; and descriptions of any public forums held. The Monitoring Report should also include a summary of all public comments received through post-award public forums regarding the progress of the demonstration.
- b. Performance Metrics. The performance metrics will provide data to demonstrate how the state is progressing towards meeting the demonstration's milestones. Additionally, per 42 CFR 431.428, the Monitoring Reports must document the impact of the demonstration in providing insurance coverage to beneficiaries and the uninsured population, as well as outcomes of care, quality and cost of care, and access to care. This may also include the results of beneficiary satisfaction surveys, if conducted, grievances and appeals. The required monitoring and performance metrics must be included in writing in the Monitoring Reports, and will follow the framework provided by CMS to support federal tracking and analysis.
- c. Budget Neutrality and Financial Reporting Requirements. Per 42 CFR 431.428, the Monitoring Reports must document the financial performance of the demonstration. The state must provide an updated budget neutrality workbook with every Monitoring Report that meets all the reporting requirements for monitoring budget neutrality set forth in the General Financial Requirements section of these STCs, including the submission of corrected budget neutrality data upon request. In addition, the state must report quarterly and annual expenditures associated with the populations affected by this demonstration on the Form CMS-64. Administrative costs should be reported separately.
- d. Evaluation Activities and Interim Findings. Per 42 CFR 431.428, the Monitoring Reports must document any results of the demonstration to date per the evaluation hypotheses. Additionally, the state shall include a summary of the progress of evaluation activities, including key milestones accomplished, as well as challenges encountered and how they were addressed.

- e. SUD Health IT. The state will include a summary of progress made in regards to SUD Health IT requirements outlined in STC 18.a.

27. SUD Mid-Point Assessment. The state must arrange with an independent assessor to conduct an independent mid-point assessment by January 1, 2022. In the design, planning and conduction of the mid-point assessment, the state must require that the independent assessor consult with key stakeholders including, but not limited to: representatives of managed care organizations (MCO), SUD treatment providers, beneficiaries, and other key partners.

The state must require the assessor to provide a report to the state that includes the methodologies used for examining progress and assessing risk, the limitations of the methodologies, its determinations and any recommendations. The state must provide a copy of the report to CMS no later than 60 days after the mid-point assessment due date. The state must brief CMS on the report.

For milestones and measure targets at medium to high risk of not being achieved, the state must submit to CMS modifications to the SUD Implementation Plan, and the SUD Monitoring Protocol for ameliorating these risks. Modifications to the applicable Implementation Plan and Monitoring Protocol are subject to CMS approval.

Elements of the mid-point assessment include:

- a. An examination of progress toward meeting each milestone and timeframe approved in the SUD Implementation Plans, and toward meeting the targets for performance measures as approved in the SUD Monitoring Protocol;
- b. A determination of factors that affected achievement on the milestones and performance measure gap closure percentage points to date;
- c. A determination of selected factors likely to affect future performance in meeting milestones and targets not yet met and information about the risk of possibly missing those milestones and performance targets;
- d. For milestones or targets at medium to high risk of not being met, recommendations for adjustments in the state's SUD Implementation Plan or to pertinent factors that the state can influence that will support improvement; and
- e. An assessment of whether the state is on track to meet the budget neutrality requirements.

28. Corrective Action. If monitoring indicates that demonstration features are not likely to assist in promoting the objectives of Medicaid, CMS reserves the right to require the state to submit a corrective action plan to CMS for approval. This may be an interim step to withdrawing waivers or expenditure authorities, as outlined in STC 10.

29. Close-Out Report. Within 120 calendar days after the expiration of the demonstration, the state must submit a Draft Close-Out Report to CMS for comments.

- a. The draft close-out report must comply with the most current guidance from CMS.

- b. The state will present to and participate in a discussion with CMS on the close-out report.
- c. The state must take into consideration CMS' comments for incorporation into the final close-out report.
- d. The final close-out report is due to CMS no later than 30 calendar days after receipt of CMS' comments.
- e. A delay in submitting the draft or final version of the close-out report may subject the state to penalties described in STC 22.

30. Monitoring Calls. CMS will convene periodic conference calls with the state.

- a. The purpose of these calls is to discuss ongoing demonstration operation, to include (but not limited to) any significant actual or anticipated developments affecting the demonstration. Examples include implementation activities, trends in reported data on metrics and associated mid-course adjustments, enrollment and access, budget neutrality, and progress on evaluation activities.
- b. CMS will provide updates on any pending actions, as well as federal policies and issues that may affect any aspect of the demonstration.
- c. The state and CMS will jointly develop the agenda for the calls.

31. Post Award Forum. Pursuant to 42 CFR 431.420(c), within six months of the demonstration's implementation, and annually thereafter, the state must afford the public with an opportunity to provide meaningful comment on the progress of the demonstration. At least thirty (30) days prior to the date of the planned public forum, the state must publish the date, time and location of the forum in a prominent location on its website. The state must also post the most recent annual report on its website with the public forum announcement. Pursuant to 42 CFR 431.420(c), the state must include a summary of the comments in the Monitoring Report associated with the quarter in which the forum was held, as well as in its compiled Annual Report.

X. EVALUATION OF THE DEMONSTRATION

32. Cooperation with Federal Evaluators. As required under 42 CFR 431.420(f), the state must cooperate fully and timely with CMS and its contractors in any federal evaluation of the demonstration or any component of the demonstration. This includes, but is not limited to, commenting on design and other federal evaluation documents and providing data and analytic files to CMS, including entering into a data use agreement that explains how the data and data files will be exchanged, and providing a technical point of contact to support specification of the data and files to be disclosed, as well as relevant data dictionaries and record layouts. The state must include in its contracts with entities who collect, produce or maintain data and files for the demonstration, that they must make such data available for the federal evaluation as is required under 42 CFR 431.420(f) to support federal evaluation. The state may claim administrative match for these activities. Failure to comply with this STC may result in a deferral being issued as outlined in STC 22.

33. Independent Evaluator. Upon approval of the demonstration, the state must begin to arrange with an independent party to conduct an evaluation of the demonstration to ensure that the necessary data is collected at the level of detail needed to research the approved hypotheses. The state must require the independent party to sign an agreement that the independent party will conduct the demonstration evaluation in an independent manner in accord with the CMS-approved draft Evaluation Design. When conducting analyses and developing the evaluation reports, every effort should be made to follow the approved methodology. However, the state may request, and CMS may agree to, changes in the methodology in appropriate circumstances.

34. Draft Evaluation Design. The draft Evaluation Design must be developed in accordance with Attachment A (Developing the Evaluation Design) of these STCs. The state must submit, for CMS comment and approval, a draft Evaluation Design with implementation timeline, no later than 180 days after the approval of the demonstration. Any modifications to an existing approved Evaluation Design will not affect previously established requirements and timelines for report submission for the demonstration, if applicable.

The draft Evaluation Design must be developed in accordance with the following CMS guidance (including but not limited to):

- a. All applicable Evaluation Design guidance, including guidance about SUD. Hypotheses applicable to the demonstration as a whole, and to all key policies referenced above, will include (but will not be limited to): the effects of the demonstration on health outcomes; the financial impact of the demonstration (for example, such as an assessment of medical debt and uncompensated care costs).
- b. Attachment A (Developing the Evaluation Design) of these STCs, technical assistance for developing SUD Evaluation Designs (as applicable, and as provided by CMS), and all applicable technical assistance on how to establish comparison groups to develop a Draft Evaluation Design.

35. Evaluation Budget. A budget for the evaluations must be provided with the draft Evaluation Designs. It will include the total estimated cost, as well as a breakdown of estimated staff, administrative and other costs for all aspects of the evaluations such as any survey and measurement development, quantitative and qualitative data collection and cleaning, analyses and report generation. A justification of the costs may be required by CMS if the estimates provided do not appear to sufficiently cover the costs of the design or if CMS finds that the designs are not sufficiently developed, or if the estimates appear to be excessive.

36. Evaluation Design Approval and Updates. The state must submit the revised draft Evaluation Designs within 60 calendar days after receipt of CMS' comments. Upon CMS approval of the draft Evaluation Design(s), the documents will be included as an attachment to these STCs. Per 42 CFR 431.424(c), the state will publish the approved Evaluation Design to the state's website within thirty (30) calendar days of CMS approval. The state must implement the evaluation designs and submit a description of its evaluation

implementation progress in each of the Monitoring Reports, including any required Rapid Cycle Assessments specified in these STCs. Once CMS approves the evaluation designs, if the state wishes to make changes, the state must submit a revised evaluation design to CMS for approval.

37. Evaluation Questions and Hypotheses. Consistent with Attachments A and B (Developing the Evaluation Design and Preparing the Interim and Summative Evaluation Reports) of these STCs, the evaluation documents must include a discussion of the evaluation questions and hypotheses that the state intends to test. Each demonstration component should have at least one evaluation question and hypothesis. The hypothesis testing should include, where possible, assessment of both process and outcome measures. Proposed measures should be selected from nationally-recognized sources and national measures sets, where possible. Measures sets could include CMS's Core Set of Health Care Quality Measures for Children in Medicaid and CHIP, Consumer Assessment of Health Care Providers and Systems (CAHPS), the Initial Core Set of Health Care Quality Measures for Medicaid-Eligible Adults and/or measures endorsed by National Quality Forum (NQF).

38. Interim Evaluation Report. The state must submit an Interim Evaluation Report for each evaluation design, as applicable, and for the completed years of the demonstration, and for each subsequent renewal or extension of the demonstration, as outlined in 42 CFR 431.412(c)(2)(vi). When submitting an application for renewal, the Evaluation Reports should be posted to the state's website with the application for public comment.

- a. The Interim Evaluation Reports will discuss evaluation progress and present findings to date as per the approved evaluation design.
- b. For demonstration authority that expires prior to the overall demonstration's expiration date, the Interim Evaluation Reports must include an evaluation of the authority as approved by CMS.
- c. If the state is seeking to renew or extend the demonstration, draft Interim Evaluation Reports is due when the application for renewal is submitted. If the state made changes to the demonstration in its application for renewal, the research questions and hypotheses and a description of how the design was adapted should be included. If the state is not requesting a renewal for a demonstration, Interim Evaluation reports are due one (1) year prior to the end of the demonstration. For demonstration phase outs prior to the expiration of the approval period, draft Interim Evaluation Reports are due to CMS on the date that will be specified in the notice of termination or suspension.
- d. The state must submit final Interim Evaluation Reports 60 calendar days after receiving CMS comments on the draft Interim Evaluation Reports and post the document to the state's website.
- e. The Interim Evaluation Reports must comply with Attachment B of these STCs.

39. Summative Evaluation Report. The draft Summative Evaluation Reports must be developed in accordance with Attachment B (Preparing the Evaluation Report) of these STCs. The state must submit draft Summative Evaluation Reports for the demonstration's current approval period within 18 months of the end of the approval period represented by

these STCs. The Summative Evaluation Reports must include the information in the approved Evaluation Design.

- a. Unless otherwise agreed upon in writing by CMS, the state must submit the final Summative Evaluation Report within 60 calendar days of receiving comments from CMS on the draft.
- b. The final Summative Evaluation Report must be posted to the state's Medicaid website within 30 calendar days of approval by CMS.

40. Corrective Action Plan Related to Evaluation. If evaluation findings indicate that demonstration features are not likely to assist in promoting the objectives of Medicaid, CMS reserves the right to require the state to submit a corrective action plan to CMS for approval. These discussions may also occur as part of a renewal process when associated with the state's Interim Evaluation Report. This may be an interim step to withdrawing waivers or expenditure authorities, as outlined in STC 10.

41. State Presentations for CMS. CMS reserves the right to request that the state present and participate in a discussion with CMS on the Evaluation Design, the Interim Evaluation Report, and/or the Summative Evaluation Report.

42. Public Access. The state shall post the final documents (e.g., Monitoring Reports, Close out Report, approved Evaluation Design, Interim Evaluation Report, and Summative Evaluation Report) on the state's Medicaid website within 30 calendar days of approval by CMS.

43. Additional Publications and Presentations. For a period of 12 months following CMS approval of the final reports, CMS will be notified prior to presentation of these reports or their findings, including in related publications (including, for example, journal articles), by the state, contractor, or any other third party directly connected to the demonstration. Prior to release of these reports, articles or other publications, CMS will be provided a copy including any associated press materials. CMS will be given ten business days to review and comment on publications before they are released. CMS may choose to decline to comment or review some or all of these notifications and reviews. This requirement does not apply to the release or presentation of these materials to state or local government officials.

XI. GENERAL FINANCIAL REQUIREMENTS UNDER TITLE XIX

44. Allowable Expenditures. This demonstration project is approved for expenditures applicable to services rendered during the demonstration approval period designated by CMS.

45. Unallowable Expenditures. In addition to the other unallowable costs and caveats already outlined in these STCs, the state may not receive FFP under any expenditure authority approved under this demonstration for any of the following:

- a. Room and board costs for residential treatment service providers unless they qualify as inpatient facilities under section 1905(a) of the Act.

- b. Costs for services provided in a nursing facility as defined in section 1919 of the Act that qualifies as an IMD.
- c. Costs for services provided to inmates of a public institution, as defined in 42 CFR 435.1010 and clause A after section 1905(a) except if the individual is admitted for at least a 24 hour stay in a medical institution.

46. Standard Medicaid Funding Process. The standard Medicaid funding process will be used for this demonstration. The state will provide quarterly expenditure reports through the Medicaid and CHIP Budget and Expenditure System (MBES/CBES) to report total expenditures for services provided under this Medicaid section 1115 demonstration following routine CMS-37 and CMS-64 reporting instructions as outlined in section 2500 of the State Medicaid Manual. The state will estimate matchable demonstration expenditures (total computable and federal share) subject to the budget neutrality expenditure limit and separately report these expenditures by quarter for each federal fiscal year on the form CMS-37 for both the medical assistance payments (MAP) and state and local administration costs (ADM). CMS shall make federal funds available based upon the state's estimate, as approved by CMS. Within 30 days after the end of each quarter, the state shall submit form CMS-64 Quarterly Medicaid Expenditure Report, showing Medicaid expenditures made in the quarter just ended. If applicable, subject to the payment deferral process, CMS shall reconcile expenditures reported on form CMS-64 with federal funding previously made available to the state, and include the reconciling adjustment in the finalization of the grant award to the state.

47. Extent of Federal Financial Participation for the Demonstration. Subject to CMS approval of the source(s) of the non-federal share of funding, CMS will provide FFP at the applicable federal matching rate for the demonstration as a whole for the following, subject to the budget neutrality expenditure limits described in section XI:

- a. Administrative costs, including those associated with the administration of the demonstration;
- b. Net expenditures and prior period adjustments of the Medicaid program that are paid in accordance with the approved Medicaid State Plan; and
- c. Medical assistance expenditures and prior period adjustments made under section 1115 demonstration authority with dates of service during the demonstration extension period; including those made in conjunction with the demonstration, net of enrollment fees, cost sharing, pharmacy rebates, and all other types of third party liability.

48. Sources of Non-Federal Share. The state certifies that its match for the non-federal share of funds for this section 1115 demonstration are state/local monies. The state further certifies that such funds must not be used to match for any other federal grant or contract, except as permitted by law. All sources of non-federal funding must be compliant with section 1903(w) of the act and applicable regulations. In addition, all sources of the non-federal share of funding are subject to CMS approval.

- a. The state acknowledges that CMS has authority to review the sources of the non-federal share of funding for the demonstration at any time. The state agrees that all funding sources deemed unacceptable by CMS shall be addressed within the time frames set by CMS.
- b. The state acknowledges that any amendments that impact the financial status of this section 1115 demonstration must require the state to provide information to CMS regarding all sources of the non-federal share of funding.

49. State Certification of Funding Conditions. The state must certify that the following conditions for non-federal share of demonstration expenditures are met:

- a. Units of government, including governmentally operated health care providers, may certify that state or local monies have been expended as the non-federal share of funds under the demonstration.
- b. To the extent the state utilizes certified public expenditures (CPE) as the funding mechanism for the state share of title XIX payments, including expenditures authorized under a section 1115 demonstration, CMS must approve a cost reimbursement methodology. This methodology must include a detailed explanation of the process by which the state would identify those costs eligible under title XIX (or under section 1115 authority) for purposes of certifying public expenditures.
- c. To the extent the state utilizes CPEs as the funding mechanism to claim federal match for expenditures under the demonstration, governmental entities to which general revenue funds are appropriated must certify to the state the amount of such state or local monies that are allowable under 42 CFR §433.51 to satisfy demonstration expenditures. If the CPE is claimed under a Medicaid authority, the federal matching funds received cannot then be used as the state share needed to receive other federal matching funds under 42 CFR §433.51(c). The entities that incurred the cost must also provide cost documentation to support the state's claim for federal match.
- d. The state may use intergovernmental transfers (IGT) to the extent that such funds are derived from state or local monies and are transferred by units of government within the state. Any transfers from governmentally operated health care providers must be made in an amount not to exceed the non-federal share of title XIX payments.
- e. Under all circumstances, health care providers must retain 100 percent of the reimbursement for claimed expenditures. Moreover, consistent with 42 CFR §447.10, no pre-arranged agreements (contractual, voluntary, or otherwise) may exist between health care providers and state and/or local government to return and/or redirect to the state any portion of the Medicaid payments. This confirmation of Medicaid payment retention is made with the understanding that payments that are the normal operating expenses of conducting business, such as payments related to taxes, including health care provider-related taxes, fees, business relationships with governments that are

unrelated to Medicaid and in which there is no connection to Medicaid payments, are not considered returning and/or redirecting a Medicaid payment.

50. Program Integrity. The state must have processes in place to ensure there is no duplication of federal funding for any aspect of the demonstration. The state must also ensure that the state and any of its contractors follow standard program integrity principles and practices including retention of data. All data, financial reporting, and sources of non-federal share are subject to audit.

51. Medicaid Expenditure Groups (MEG). MEGs are defined for the purpose of identifying categories of Medicaid or demonstration expenditures subject to budget neutrality, components of budget neutrality expenditure limit calculations, and other purposes related to monitoring and tracking expenditures under the demonstration. The following table provides a master list of MEGs defined for this demonstration.

Table 2: Master MEG Chart					
MEG	To Which BN Test Does This Apply?	WOW Per Capita	WOW Aggregate	WW	Brief Description
ABD	Hypo 1	X		X	Aged, Disabled and Blind
DUAL	Hypo 2	X		X	Dual Eligibles
FAM	Hypo 3	X		X	Families

52. Reporting Expenditures and Member Months. The state must report all demonstration expenditures claimed under the authority of title XIX of the Act and subject to budget neutrality each quarter on separate forms CMS-64.9 WAIVER and/or 64.9P WAIVER, identified by the demonstration project number assigned by CMS (11-W-XXXXX). Separate reports must be submitted by MEG (identified by Waiver Name) and Demonstration Year (identified by the two digit project number extension). Unless specified otherwise, expenditures must be reported by DY according to the dates of service associated with the expenditure. All MEGs identified in the Master MEG Chart as WW must be reported for expenditures, as further detailed in the MEG Detail for Expenditure and Member Month Reporting table below. To enable calculation of the budget neutrality expenditure limits, the state also must report member months of eligibility for specified MEGs.

- a. Cost Settlements. The state will report any cost settlements attributable to the demonstration on the appropriate prior period adjustment schedules (form CMS-64.9P WAIVER) for the summary sheet line 10b, in lieu of lines 9 or 10c. For any cost settlement not attributable to this demonstration, the adjustments should be reported as otherwise instructed in the State Medicaid Manual. Cost settlements must be reported by DY consistent with how the original expenditures were reported.
- b. Premiums and Cost Sharing Collected by the State. The state will report any premium contributions collected by the state from demonstration enrollees quarterly on the form

CMS-64 Summary Sheet line 9D, columns A and B. In order to assure that these collections are properly credited to the demonstration, quarterly premium collections (both total computable and federal share) should also be reported separately by demonstration year on form CMS-64 Narrative, and on the Total Adjustments tab in the Budget Neutrality Monitoring Tool. In the annual calculation of expenditures subject to the budget neutrality expenditure limit, premiums collected in the demonstration year will be offset against expenditures incurred in the demonstration year for determination of the state's compliance with the budget neutrality limits.

- c. Pharmacy Rebates. Because pharmacy rebates are not included in the base expenditures used to determine the budget neutrality expenditure limit, pharmacy rebates are not included for calculating net expenditures subject to budget neutrality. The state will report pharmacy rebates on form CMS-64.9 BASE, and not allocate them to any form 64.9 or 64.9P WAIVER.
- d. Administrative Costs. The state will separately track and report administrative costs that are directly attributable to the demonstration. All administrative costs must be identified on the forms CMS-64.10 WAIVER and/or 64.10P WAIVER. Unless indicated otherwise on the table below, administrative costs are not counted in the budget neutrality tests.
- e. Member Months. As part of the Quarterly and Annual Monitoring Reports described in section IX, the state must report the actual number of “eligible member months” for all demonstration enrollees for all MEGs identified as WOW Per Capita, and as also indicated in the table below. The term “eligible member months” refers to the number of months in which persons enrolled in the demonstration are eligible to receive services. For example, a person who is eligible for three months contributes three eligible member months to the total. Two individuals who are eligible for two months, each contribute two eligible member months, for a total of four eligible member months. The state must submit a statement accompanying the annual report certifying the accuracy of this information.
- f. Budget Neutrality Specifications Manual. The state will create and maintain a Budget Neutrality Specifications Manual that describes in detail how the state will compile data on actual expenditures related to budget neutrality, including methods used to extract and compile data from the state’s Medicaid Management Information System, eligibility system, and accounting systems for reporting on the CMS-64, consistent with the terms of the demonstration. The Budget Neutrality Specifications Manual will also describe how the state compiles counts of Medicaid member months. The Budget Neutrality Specifications Manual must be made available to CMS on request.

Table 3: MEG Detail for Expenditure and Member Month Reporting								
MEG (Waiver Name)	Detailed Description	Exclusions	CMS-64.9 Line(s) To Use	How Expenditures Are Assigned to DY	MAP or ADM	Report Member Months (Y/N)	MEG Start Date	MEG End Date

ABD	Aged, Blind and Disabled	Refer to STC #45 Unallowable Expenditures	Follow CMS-64.9 Base Category of Service Definitions	Date of service	MAP	Y	July 1, 2019	June 30, 2024
DUAL	Dual Eligibles	Refer to STC #45 Unallowable Expenditures	Follow CMS-64.9 Base Category of Service Definitions	Date of Service	MAP	Y	July 1, 2019	June 30, 2024
FAM	Families	Refer to STC #45 Unallowable Expenditures	Follow CMS-64.9 Base Category of Service Definitions	Date of Service	MAP	Y	July 1, 2019	June 30, 2024

53. Demonstration Years. Demonstration Years (DY) for this demonstration are defined in the table below.

Table 4: Demonstration Years		
Demonstration Year 1	July 1, 2019 to June 30, 2020	12 months
Demonstration Year 2	July 1, 2020 to June 30, 2021	12 months
Demonstration Year 3	July 1, 2021 to June 30, 2022	12 months
Demonstration Year 4	July 1, 2022 to June 30, 2023	12 months
Demonstration Year 5	July 1, 2023 to June 30, 2024	12 months

54. Budget Neutrality Monitoring Tool. The state must provide CMS with quarterly budget neutrality status updates, including established baseline and member months data, using the Budget Neutrality Monitoring Tool provided through the performance metrics database and analytics (PMDA) system. The tool incorporates the “Schedule C Report” for comparing demonstration’s actual expenditures to the budget neutrality expenditure limits described in section XI. CMS will provide technical assistance, upon request.⁴

⁴ 42 CFR §431.420(a)(2) provides that states must comply with the terms and conditions of the agreement between the Secretary (or designee) and the state to implement a demonstration project, and §431.420(b)(1) states that the terms and conditions will provide that the state will perform periodic reviews of the implementation of the demonstration. CMS’s current approach is to include language in STCs requiring, as a condition of demonstration approval, that states provide, as part of their periodic reviews, regular reports of the actual costs which are subject to the budget neutrality limit. CMS has obtained Office of Management and Budget (OMB) approval of the monitoring

55. Claiming Period. The state will report all claims for expenditures subject to the budget neutrality agreement (including any cost settlements) within two years after the calendar quarter in which the state made the expenditures. All claims for services during the demonstration period (including any cost settlements) must be made within two years after the conclusion or termination of the demonstration. During the latter two-year period, the state will continue to identify separately net expenditures related to dates of service during the operation of the demonstration on the CMS-64 waiver forms in order to properly account for these expenditures in determining budget neutrality.

56. Future Adjustments to Budget Neutrality. CMS reserves the right to adjust the budget neutrality expenditure limit:

- a. To be consistent with enforcement of laws and policy statements, including regulations and letters, regarding impermissible provider payments, health care related taxes, or other payments. CMS reserves the right to make adjustments to the budget neutrality limit if any health care related tax that was in effect during the base year, or provider-related donation that occurred during the base year, is determined by CMS to be in violation of the provider donation and health care related tax provisions of section 1903(w) of the Social Security Act. Adjustments to annual budget targets will reflect the phase out of impermissible provider payments by law or regulation, where applicable.
- b. To the extent that a change in federal law, regulation, or policy requires either a reduction or an increase in federal financial participation (FFP) for expenditures made under this demonstration. In this circumstance, the state must adopt, subject to CMS approval, a modified budget neutrality agreement as necessary to comply with such change. The modified agreement will be effective upon the implementation of the change. The trend rates for the budget neutrality agreement are not subject to change under this STC. The state agrees that if mandated changes in the federal law require state legislation, the changes shall take effect on the day such state legislation becomes effective, or on the last day such legislation was required to be in effect under the federal law.
- c. The state certifies that the data it provided to establish the budget neutrality expenditure limit are accurate based on the state's accounting of recorded historical expenditures or the next best available data, that the data are allowable in accordance with applicable federal, state, and local statutes, regulations, and policies, and that the data are correct to the best of the state's knowledge and belief. The data supplied by the state to set the budget neutrality expenditure limit are subject to review and audit, and if found to be inaccurate, will result in a modified budget neutrality expenditure limit.

tool under the Paperwork Reduction Act (OMB Control No. 0938 – 1148) and in states agree to use the tool as a condition of demonstration approval.

XII. MONITORING BUDGET NEUTRALITY FOR THE DEMONSTRATION

- 57. Limit on Title XIX Funding.** The state will be subject to limits on the amount of federal Medicaid funding the state may receive over the course of the demonstration approval. The budget neutrality expenditure limits are based on projections of the amount of FFP that the state would likely have received in the absence of the demonstration. The limit may consist of a Main Budget Neutrality Test, and one or more Hypothetical Budget Neutrality Tests, as described below. CMS’s assessment of the state’s compliance with these tests will be based on the Schedule C CMS-64 Waiver Expenditure Report, which summarizes the expenditures reported by the state on the CMS-64 that pertain to the demonstration.
- 58. Risk.** The budget neutrality expenditure limits are determined on either a per capita or aggregate basis. If a per capita method is used, the state is at risk for the per capita cost of State Plan and hypothetical populations, but not for the number of participants in the demonstration population. By providing FFP without regard to enrollment in the for all demonstration populations, CMS will not place the state at risk for changing economic conditions; however, by placing the state at risk for the per capita costs of the demonstration populations, CMS assures that the demonstration expenditures do not exceed the levels that would have been realized had there been no demonstration. If an aggregate method is used, the state accepts risk for both enrollment and per capita costs.
- 59. Calculation of the Budget Neutrality Limits and How They Are Applied.** To calculate the budget neutrality limits for the demonstration, separate annual budget limits are determined for each DY on a total computable basis. Each annual budget limit is the sum of one or more components: per capita components, which are calculated as a projected without-waiver PMPM cost times the corresponding actual number of member months, and aggregate components, which projected fixed total computable dollar expenditure amounts. The annual limits for all DYs are then added together to obtain a budget neutrality limit for the entire demonstration period. The federal share of this limit will represent the maximum amount of FFP that the state may receive during the demonstration period for the types of demonstration expenditures described below. The federal share will be calculated by multiplying the total computable budget neutrality expenditure limit by the appropriate Composite Federal Share.
- 60. Main Budget Neutrality Test.** This demonstration does not include a Main Budget Neutrality Test. Budget neutrality will consist entirely of Hypothetical Budget Neutrality Tests. Any excess spending under the Hypothetical Budget Neutrality Tests must be returned to CMS.
- 61. Hypothetical Budget Neutrality.** When expenditure authority is provided for coverage of populations or services that the state could have otherwise provided through its Medicaid State Plan or other title XIX authority (such as a waiver under section 1915 of the Act), CMS considers these expenditures to be “hypothetical;” that is, the expenditures would have been eligible to receive FFP elsewhere in the Medicaid program. For these hypothetical expenditures, CMS makes adjustments to the budget neutrality test which effectively treats these expenditures as if they were for approved Medicaid State Plan services. Hypothetical

expenditures, therefore, do not necessitate savings to offset the otherwise allowable services. This approach reflects CMS’s current view that states should not have to “pay for,” with demonstration savings, costs that could have been otherwise eligible for FFP under a Medicaid State Plan or other title XIX authority; however, when evaluating budget neutrality, CMS does not offset non-hypothetical expenditures with projected or accrued savings from hypothetical expenditures. That is, savings are not generated from a hypothetical population or service. To allow for hypothetical expenditures, while preventing them from resulting in savings, CMS currently applies a separate, independent Hypothetical Budget Neutrality Tests, which subject hypothetical expenditures to pre-determined limits to which the state and CMS agree, and that CMS approves, during negotiations. If the state’s WW hypothetical spending exceeds the supplemental test’s expenditure limit, the state agrees (as a condition of CMS approval) to refund the FFP to CMS. The specific Hypothetical Budget Neutrality Test(s) which is/are applicable to this demonstration is/are detailed in STC(s) 62 below.

62. Hypothetical Budget Neutrality Test 1: SUD Initiative. This includes expenditures for the costs of all *current State Plan* medical assistance that could be covered, were it not for the Institution for Mental Diseases (IMD) prohibition and provided to otherwise-eligible individuals receiving SUD treatment while residing in an IMD setting. The table below identifies the MEGs that are used for Hypothetical Budget Neutrality Test 1. MEGs that are designated “WOW Only” or “Both” are the components used to calculate the budget neutrality expenditure limit. The Composite Federal Share for the Hypothetical Budget Neutrality Test is calculated based on all MEGs indicated as “WW Only” or “Both.” MEGs that are indicated as “WW Only” or “Both” are counted as expenditures against this budget neutrality expenditure limit. Any expenditures in excess of the limit from Hypothetical Budget Neutrality Test are counted as WW expenditures under the Main Budget Neutrality Test.

Table 6: Hypothetical Budget Neutrality Test									
MEG	PC or Agg*	WOW Only, WW Only, or Both	BASE YEAR 2017	TREND	DY 1	DY 2	DY 3	DY 4	DY 5
ABD	PC	Both	\$1,824	3.6%	\$2,028	\$2,101	\$2,176	\$2,255	\$2,336
DUAL	PC	Both	\$289	3.6%	\$321	\$333	\$345	\$357	\$370
FAM	PC	Both	\$524	3.7%	\$584	\$606	\$628	\$652	\$676

63. Composite Federal Share. The Composite Federal Share is the ratio that will be used to convert the total computable budget neutrality limit to federal share. The Composite Federal Share is the ratio calculated by dividing the sum total of FFP received by the state on actual demonstration expenditures during the approval period by total computable demonstration expenditures for the same period, as reported through MBES/CBES and summarized on Schedule C. Since the actual final Composite Federal Share will not be known until the end of the demonstration’s approval period, for the purpose of interim monitoring of budget

neutrality, a reasonable estimate of Composite Federal Share may be developed and used through the same process or through an alternative mutually agreed to method. Each Main or Hypothetical Budget Neutrality Test has its own Composite Federal Share, as defined in the paragraph pertaining to each particular test.

64. Exceeding Budget Neutrality. CMS will enforce the budget neutrality agreement over the life of the demonstration approval period, which extends from July 1, 2019 to June 30, 2024. If at the end of the demonstration approval period the budget neutrality limit has been exceeded, the excess federal funds will be returned to CMS. If the demonstration is terminated prior to the end of the demonstration period, the budget neutrality test will be based on the time period through the termination date.

65. Mid-Course Correction. If at any time during the demonstration approval period CMS determines that the demonstration is on course to exceed its budget neutrality expenditure limit, CMS will require the state to submit a corrective action plan for CMS review and approval. CMS will use the threshold levels in the tables below as a guide for determining when corrective action is required.

Hypothetical Budget Neutrality Test(s)

Table 10: Hypothetical Budget Neutrality Test Mid-Course Correction Calculations		
	Cumulative Target Definition	Percentage
DY 1	Cumulative budget neutrality limit plus:	2.0 percent
DY 1 through DY 2	Cumulative budget neutrality limit plus:	1.5 percent
DY 1 through DY 3	Cumulative budget neutrality limit plus:	1.0 percent
DY 1 through DY 4	Cumulative budget neutrality limit plus:	0.5 percent
DY 1 through DY 5	Cumulative budget neutrality limit plus:	0.0 percent

XIII. SCHEDULE OF DELIVERABLES FOR THE DEMONSTRATION

Date	Deliverable	STC
30 calendar days after approval date	State acceptance of demonstration Waivers, STCs, and Expenditure Authorities	Approval letter
90 calendar days after SUD program approval date	SUD Implementation Protocol	#18

150 calendar days after SUD implementation approval date	SUD Monitoring Protocol	#18.b
180 calendar days after approval date	Evaluation Design	#34
30 calendar days after CMS Approval	Approved Evaluation Design published to state's website	#36
June 30, 2023, or with renewal application	Draft Interim Evaluation Report	#38.c
60 days after receipt of CMS comments	Final Interim Evaluation Report	#38
Within 18 months after June 30, 2024	Summative Evaluation Report	#39
60 calendar days after receipt of CMS comments	Final Summative Evaluation Report	#39
Monthly Deliverables	Monitoring Call	#30
Quarterly monitoring reports due 60 calendar days after end of each quarter, except 4 th quarter, beginning November 2019.	Quarterly Progress Reports, including implementation updates	#26
	Quarterly Expenditure Reports	#26
Annual Deliverables - Due 90 calendar days after end of each 4 th quarter	Annual Reports	#26

ATTACHMENT A

Developing the Evaluation Design

Introduction

For states that are testing new approaches and flexibilities in their Medicaid programs through section 1115 demonstrations, evaluations are crucial to understand and disseminate what is or is not working and why. The evaluations of new initiatives seek to produce new knowledge and direction for programs and inform both Congress and CMS about Medicaid policy for the future. While a narrative about what happened during a demonstration provides important information, the principal focus of the evaluation of a section 1115 demonstration should be obtaining and analyzing data on the process (e.g., whether the demonstration is being implemented as intended), outcomes (e.g., whether the demonstration is having the intended effects on the target population), and impacts of the demonstration (e.g., whether the outcomes observed in the targeted population differ from outcomes in similar populations not affected by the demonstration). Both state and federal governments could benefit from improved quantitative and qualitative evidence to inform policy decisions. Additional technical assistance is available from CMS, and resources are also available here: <https://www.medicaid.gov/medicaid/section-1115-demo/evaluation-reports/evaluation-designs-and-reports/index.html>

Expectations for Evaluation Designs


All states with Medicaid section 1115 demonstrations are required to conduct an evaluation, and the Evaluation Design is the roadmap for conducting the evaluation. The roadmap begins with the stated goals for the demonstration followed by the measurable evaluation questions and quantifiable hypotheses, all to support a determination of the extent to which the demonstration has achieved its goals.

The format for the Evaluation Design is as follows:

General Background Information;
Evaluation Questions and Hypotheses;
Methodology;
Methodological Limitations;
Attachments.

Submission Timelines

There is a specified timeline for the state's submission of Evaluation Design and Reports. (The graphic below depicts an example of this timeline). In addition, the state should be aware that section 1115 evaluation documents are public records. The state is required to publish the Evaluation Design to the state's website within thirty (30) days of CMS approval, as per 42 CFR 431.424(e). CMS will also publish a copy to the Medicaid.gov website.



Required Core Components of All Evaluation Designs

The Evaluation Design sets the stage for the Interim and Summative Evaluation Reports. It is important that the Evaluation Design explain the goals and objectives of the demonstration, the hypotheses related to the demonstration, and the methodology (and limitations) for the evaluation. A copy of the state’s Driver Diagram (described in more detail in paragraph B2 below) should be included with an explanation of the depicted information.

A. General Background Information – In this section, the state should include basic information about the demonstration, such as:

1. The issue/s that the state is trying to address with its section 1115 demonstration and/or expenditure authorities, the potential magnitude of the issue/s, and why the state selected this course of action to address the issue/s (e.g., a narrative on why the state submitted an 1115 demonstration proposal).
2. The name of the demonstration, approval date of the demonstration, and period of time covered by the evaluation;
3. A brief description of the demonstration and history of the implementation, and whether the draft Evaluation Design applies to an amendment, extension, renewal, or expansion of, the demonstration;
4. For renewals, amendments, and major operational changes: A description of any changes to the demonstration during the approval period; the primary reason or reasons for the change; and how the Evaluation Design was altered or augmented to address these changes.
5. Describe the population groups impacted by the demonstration.

B. Evaluation Questions and Hypotheses – In this section, the state should:

1. Describe how the state’s demonstration goals are translated into quantifiable targets for improvement, so that the performance of the demonstration in achieving these targets could be measured.
2. Include a Driver Diagram to visually aid readers in understanding the rationale behind the cause and effect of the variants behind the demonstration features and intended outcomes. A driver diagram is a particularly effective modeling tool when working to improve health and health care through specific interventions. The diagram includes information about the goal of the demonstration, and the features

of the demonstration. A driver diagram depicts the relationship between the aim, the primary drivers that contribute directly to achieving the aim, and the secondary drivers that are necessary to achieve the primary drivers for the demonstration. For an example and more information on driver diagrams:

<https://innovation.cms.gov/files/x/hciatwoaimsdrvrs.pdf>

3. Identify the state's hypotheses about the outcomes of the demonstration;
4. 4. Discuss how the evaluation questions align with the hypotheses and the goals of the demonstration;
5. 5. Address how the research questions / hypotheses of this demonstration promote the objectives of Titles XIX and/or XXI.

C. Methodology – In this section, the state is to describe in detail the proposed research methodology.

The focus is on showing that the evaluation meets the prevailing standards of scientific and academic rigor, and the results are statistically valid and reliable, and that where appropriate it builds upon other published research (use references).

This section provides the evidence that the demonstration evaluation will use the best available data; reports on, controls for, and makes appropriate adjustments for the limitations of the data and their effects on results; and discusses the generalizability of results. This section should provide enough transparency to explain what will be measured and how. Specifically, this section establishes:

1. *Evaluation Design* – Provide information on how the evaluation will be designed. For example, will the evaluation utilize a pre/post comparison? A post-only assessment? Will a comparison group be included?
2. *Target and Comparison Populations* – Describe the characteristics of the target and comparison populations, to include the inclusion and exclusion criteria. Include information about the level of analysis (beneficiary, provider, or program level), and if populations will be stratified into subgroups. Additionally discuss the sampling methodology for the populations, as well as support that a statistically reliable sample size is available.
3. *Evaluation Period* – Describe the time periods for which data will be included.
4. *Evaluation Measures* – List all measures that will be calculated to evaluate the demonstration. Include the measure stewards (i.e., the organization(s) responsible for the evaluation data elements/sets by “owning”, defining, validating; securing; and submitting for endorsement, etc.) Include numerator and denominator information.

Additional items to ensure:

- a. The measures contain assessments of both process and outcomes to evaluate the effects of the demonstration during the period of approval.
- b. Qualitative analysis methods may be used, and must be described in detail.
- c. Benchmarking and comparisons to national and state standards, should be used, where appropriate.
- d. Proposed health measures could include CMS's Core Set of Health Care Quality

Measures for Children in Medicaid and CHIP, Consumer Assessment of Health Care Providers and Systems (CAHPS), the Initial Core Set of Health Care Quality Measures for Medicaid-Eligible Adults and/or measures endorsed by National Quality Forum (NQF).

- e. Proposed performance metrics can be selected from nationally recognized metrics, for example from sets developed by the Center for Medicare and Medicaid Innovation or for meaningful use under Health Information Technology (HIT).
 - f. Among considerations in selecting the metrics shall be opportunities identified by the state for improving quality of care and health outcomes, and controlling cost of care.
5. *Data Sources* – Explain where the data will be obtained, and efforts to validate and clean the data. Discuss the quality and limitations of the data sources. If primary data (data collected specifically for the evaluation) – The methods by which the data will be collected, the source of the proposed question/responses, the frequency and timing of data collection, and the method of data collection. (Copies of any proposed surveys must be reviewed with CMS for approval before implementation).
6. *Analytic Methods* – This section includes the details of the selected quantitative and/or qualitative measures to adequately assess the effectiveness of the demonstration. This section should:
- a. Identify the specific statistical testing which will be undertaken for each measure (e.g., t-tests, chi-square, odds ratio, ANOVA, regression). Table A is an example of how the state might want to articulate the analytic methods for each research question and measure.
 - b. Explain how the state will isolate the effects of the demonstration (from other initiatives occurring in the state at the same time) through the use of comparison groups.
 - c. A discussion of how propensity score matching and difference in differences design may be used to adjust for differences in comparison populations over time (if applicable).
 - d. The application of sensitivity analyses, as appropriate, should be considered.
7. *Other Additions* – The state may provide any other information pertinent to the Evaluation Design of the demonstration.

Table A. Example Design Table for the Evaluation of the Demonstration

Research Question	Outcome measures used to address the research question	Sample or population subgroups to be compared	Data Sources	Analytic Methods
Hypothesis 1				
Research question 1a	-Measure 1 -Measure 2 -Measure 3	-Sample e.g. All attributed Medicaid beneficiaries -Beneficiaries with diabetes diagnosis	-Medicaid fee-for-service and encounter claims records	-Interrupted time series
Research question 1b	-Measure 1 -Measure 2	-sample, e.g., PPS patients who meet	-Patient survey	Descriptive statistics

	-Measure 3 -Measure 4	survey selection requirements (used services within the last 6 months)		
Hypothesis 2				
Research question 2a	-Measure 1 -Measure 2	-Sample, e.g., PPS administrators	-Key informants	Qualitative analysis of interview material

D. Methodological Limitations – This section provides detailed information on the limitations of the evaluation. This could include the design, the data sources or collection process, or analytic methods. The state should also identify any efforts to minimize the limitations. Additionally, this section should include any information about features of the demonstration that effectively present methodological constraints that the state would like CMS to take into consideration in its review. For example:

1. When the state demonstration is:
 - a. Long-standing, non-complex, unchanged, or
 - b. Has previously been rigorously evaluated and found to be successful, or
 - c. Could now be considered standard Medicaid policy (CMS published regulations or guidance)
2. When the demonstration is also considered successful without issues or concerns that would require more regular reporting, such as:
 - a. Operating smoothly without administrative changes; and
 - b. No or minimal appeals and grievances; and
 - c. No state issues with CMS-64 reporting or budget neutrality; and
 - d. No Corrective Action Plans (CAP) for the demonstration.

E. Attachments

1. **Independent Evaluator.** This includes a discussion of the state’s process for obtaining an independent entity to conduct the evaluation, including a description of the qualifications that the selected entity must possess, and how the state will assure no conflict of interest. Explain how the state will assure that the Independent Evaluator will conduct a fair and impartial evaluation, prepare an objective Evaluation Report, and that there would be no conflict of interest. The evaluation design should include “No Conflict of Interest” signed by the independent evaluator.
2. **Evaluation Budget.** A budget for implementing the evaluation shall be provided with the draft Evaluation Design. It will include the total estimated cost, as well as a breakdown of estimated staff, administrative, and other costs for all aspects of the evaluation. Examples include, but are not limited to: the development of all survey and measurement instruments; quantitative and qualitative data collection; data

cleaning and analyses; and reports generation. A justification of the costs may be required by CMS if the estimates provided do not appear to sufficiently cover the costs of the draft Evaluation Design or if CMS finds that the draft Evaluation Design is not sufficiently developed.

3. **Timeline and Major Milestones.** Describe the timeline for conducting the various evaluation activities, including dates for evaluation-related milestones, including those related to procurement of an outside contractor, if applicable, and deliverables. The Final Evaluation Design shall incorporate an Interim and Summative Evaluation. Pursuant to 42 CFR 431.424(c)(v), this timeline should also include the date by which the Final Summative Evaluation report is due.

ATTACHMENT B

Preparing the Interim and Summative Evaluation Reports

Introduction

For states that are testing new approaches and flexibilities in their Medicaid programs through section 1115 demonstrations, evaluations are crucial to understand and disseminate what is or is not working and why. The evaluations of new initiatives seek to produce new knowledge and direction for programs and inform Medicaid policy for the future. While a narrative about what happened during a demonstration provide important information, the principal focus of the evaluation of a section 1115 demonstration should be obtaining and analyzing data on the process (e.g., whether the demonstration is being implemented as intended), outcomes (e.g., whether the demonstration is having the intended effects on the target population), and impacts of the demonstration (e.g., whether the outcomes observed in the targeted population differ from outcomes in similar populations not affected by the demonstration). Both state and federal governments could benefit from improved quantitative and qualitative evidence to inform policy decisions.

Expectations for Evaluation Reports

Medicaid section 1115 demonstrations are required to conduct an evaluation that is valid (the extent to which the evaluation measures what it is intended to measure), and reliable (the extent to which the evaluation could produce the same results when used repeatedly). To this end, the already approved Evaluation Design is a map that begins with the demonstration goals, then transitions to the evaluation questions, and to the specific hypotheses, which will be used to investigate whether the demonstration has achieved its goals. States should have a well-structured analysis plan for their evaluation. As these valid analyses multiply (by a single state or by multiple states with similar demonstrations) and the data sources improve, the reliability of evaluation findings will be able to shape Medicaid policy in order to improve the health and welfare of Medicaid beneficiaries for decades to come. When submitting an application for renewal, the interim evaluation report should be posted on the state's website with the application for public comment. Additionally, the interim evaluation report must be included in its entirety with the application submitted to CMS.

Intent of this Guidance


The Social Security Act (the Act) requires an evaluation of every section 1115 demonstration. In order to fulfill this requirement, the state's submission must provide a comprehensive written presentation of all key components of the demonstration, and include all required elements specified in the approved Evaluation Design. This Guidance is intended to assist states with organizing the required information in a standardized format and understanding the criteria that CMS will use in reviewing the submitted Interim and Summative Evaluation Reports.

The format for the Interim and Summative Evaluation reports is as follows:

- A. Executive Summary;
- B. General Background Information;
- C. Evaluation Questions and Hypotheses;
- D. Methodology;
- E. Methodological Limitations;
- F. Results;
- G. Conclusions;
- H. Interpretations, and Policy Implications and Interactions with Other State Initiatives;
- I. Lessons Learned and Recommendations; and
- J. Attachment(s).

Submission Timelines

There is a specified timeline for the state’s submission of Evaluation Designs and Evaluation Reports. These dates are specified in the demonstration Special Terms and Conditions (STCs). (The graphic below depicts an example of this timeline). In addition, the state should be aware that section 1115 evaluation documents are public records. In order to assure the dissemination of the evaluation findings, lessons learned, and recommendations, the state is required to publish to the state’s website the evaluation design within thirty (30) days of CMS approval, and publish reports within thirty (30) days of submission to CMS , pursuant to 42 CFR 431.424. CMS will also publish a copy to Medicaid.gov.



Required Core Components of Interim and Summative Evaluation Reports

The section 1115 Evaluation Report presents the research about the section 1115 Demonstration. It is important that the report incorporate a discussion about the structure of the Evaluation Design to explain the goals and objectives of the demonstration, the hypotheses related to the demonstration, and the methodology for the evaluation. A copy of the state's Driver Diagram (described in the Evaluation Design guidance) must be included with an explanation of the depicted information. The Evaluation Report should present the relevant data and an interpretation of the findings; assess the outcomes (what worked and what did not work); explain the limitations of the design, data, and analyses; offer recommendations regarding what (in hindsight) the state would further advance, or do differently, and why; and discuss the implications on future Medicaid policy. Therefore, the state's submission must include:

- A. Executive Summary** – A summary of the demonstration, the principal results, interpretations, and recommendations of the evaluation.

- B. General Background Information about the Demonstration** – In this section, the state should include basic information about the demonstration, such as:
 - 1. The issues that the state is trying to address with its section 1115 demonstration and/or expenditure authorities, how the state became aware of the issue, the potential magnitude of the issue, and why the state selected this course of action to address the issues.
 - 2. The name of the demonstration, approval date of the demonstration, and period of time covered by the evaluation;
 - 3. A brief description of the demonstration and history of the implementation, and if the evaluation is for an amendment, extension, renewal, or expansion of, the demonstration;
 - 4. For renewals, amendments, and major operational changes: A description of any changes to the demonstration during the approval period; whether the motivation for change was due to political, economic, and fiscal factors at the state and/or federal level; whether the programmatic changes were implemented to improve beneficiary health, provider/health plan performance, or administrative efficiency; and how the Evaluation Design was altered or augmented to address these changes.
 - 5. Describe the population groups impacted by the demonstration.

- C. Evaluation Questions and Hypotheses** – In this section, the state should:
 - 1. Describe how the state's demonstration goals were translated into quantifiable targets for improvement, so that the performance of the demonstration in achieving these targets could be measured. The inclusion of a Driver Diagram in the Evaluation Report is highly encouraged, as the visual can aid readers in understanding the rationale behind the demonstration features and intended outcomes.
 - 2. Identify the state's hypotheses about the outcomes of the demonstration;
 - a. Discuss how the goals of the demonstration align with the evaluation questions and hypotheses;
 - b. Explain how this Evaluation Report builds upon and expands earlier demonstration evaluation findings (if applicable); and

- c. Address how the research questions / hypotheses of this demonstration promote the objectives of Titles XIX and XXI.

D. Methodology – In this section, the state is to provide an overview of the research that was conducted to evaluate the section 1115 demonstration consistent with the approved Evaluation Design.

The evaluation design should also be included as an attachment to the report. The focus is on showing that the evaluation builds upon other published research (use references), and meets the prevailing standards of scientific and academic rigor, and the results are statistically valid and reliable.

An interim report should provide any available data to date, including both quantitative and qualitative assessments. The Evaluation Design should assure there is appropriate data development and collection in a timely manner to support developing an interim evaluation. This section provides the evidence that the demonstration evaluation used the best available data and describes why potential alternative data sources were not used; reported on, controlled for, and made appropriate adjustments for the limitations of the data and their effects on results; and discusses the generalizability of results. This section should provide enough transparency to explain what was measured and how. Specifically, this section establishes that the approved Evaluation Design was followed by describing:

1. *Evaluation Design* – Will the evaluation be an assessment of: pre/post, post-only, with or without comparison groups, etc.?
2. *Target and Comparison Populations* – Describe the target and comparison populations; include inclusion and exclusion criteria.
3. *Evaluation Period* – Describe the time periods for which data will be collected
4. *Evaluation Measures* – What measures are used to evaluate the demonstration, and who are the measure stewards?
5. *Data Sources* – Explain where the data will be obtained, and efforts to validate and clean the data.
6. *Analytic methods* – Identify specific statistical testing which will be undertaken for each measure (t-tests, chi-square, odds ratio, ANOVA, regression, etc.).
7. *Other Additions* – The state may provide any other information pertinent to the evaluation of the demonstration.

A. Methodological Limitations - This section provides sufficient information for discerning the strengths and weaknesses of the study design, data sources/collection, and analyses.

B. Results – In this section, the state presents and uses the quantitative and qualitative data to show to whether and to what degree the evaluation questions and hypotheses of the demonstration were achieved. The findings should visually depict the demonstration results (tables, charts, graphs). This section should include information on the statistical tests conducted.

- C. Conclusions** – In this section, the state will present the conclusions about the evaluation results.
1. In general, did the results show that the demonstration was/was not effective in achieving the goals and objectives established at the beginning of the demonstration?
 2. Based on the findings, discuss the outcomes and impacts of the demonstration and identify the opportunities for improvements. Specifically:
 - a. If the state did not fully achieve its intended goals, why not? What could be done in the future that would better enable such an effort to more fully achieve those purposes, aims, objectives, and goals?

D. Interpretations, Policy Implications and Interactions with Other State Initiatives – In this section, the state will discuss the section 1115 demonstration within an overall Medicaid context and long range planning. This should include interrelations of the demonstration with other aspects of the state’s Medicaid program, interactions with other Medicaid demonstrations, and other federal awards affecting service delivery, health outcomes and the cost of care under Medicaid. This section provides the state with an opportunity to provide interpretation of the data using evaluative reasoning to make judgments about the demonstration. This section should also include a discussion of the implications of the findings at both the state and national levels.

- E. Lessons Learned and Recommendations** – This section of the Evaluation Report involves the transfer of knowledge. Specifically, the “opportunities” for future or revised demonstrations to inform Medicaid policymakers, advocates, and stakeholders is just as significant as identifying current successful strategies. Based on the evaluation results:
1. What lessons were learned as a result of the demonstration?
 2. What would you recommend to other states which may be interested in implementing a similar approach?

F. Attachment - Evaluation Design: Provide the CMS-approved Evaluation Design