 

**AB 361: Reducing Costs & Health Disparities Among**

# High-Cost Medi-Cal Beneficiaries

**The Problem**

California spends significant Medi-Cal resources on a small group of beneficiaries. In fact, 4% of disabled Medi-Cal beneficiaries drive almost 50% of Medi-Cal costs.[[1]](#footnote-1) Many among this group experience a combination of chronic medical, mental health, and substance abuse conditions, as well as social determinants that negatively impact their ability to access care, like homelessness.

* People who frequently use hospitals for reasons that could have been avoided through better access to care (“frequent users”) incur disproportionate resources; about 1,000 accumulate Medi-Cal costs of over $100,000 a year.[[2]](#footnote-2)
* Medical homes are unable to address factors that lead to frequent hospital use, such as homelessness and social isolation. Homeless frequent users continue to *increase* their inpatient costs, for example, despite medical home services because they cannot obtain sufficient rest, follow a healthy diet, store medications, or regularly attend appointments so long as they are unhoused.[[3]](#footnote-3)
* Two-thirds of frequent users have both medical and behavioral health conditions. Most are homeless[[4]](#footnote-4) and will die 30 years younger than average.[[5]](#footnote-5)

**The Solution**

Assembly Bill 361 would tap into an Affordable Care Act option offering **90% federal funding for “health home services”**—comprehensive case management, hospital discharge planning, connection to social services—*proven* to reduce high-cost care among the most vulnerable Californians.

* Social services interventions, like connecting participants to housing, are a critical step to reducing the costs and improving the care of homeless frequent users.[[6]](#footnote-6)
* Programs offering health home services to frequent users integrate primary and behavioral health care, and foster a “whole person” approach, reducing health disparities.[[7]](#footnote-7)

**A Solution Without Cost**

AB 361 would give the state the authority to apply for the option for ***any*** population with chronic conditions, while ensuring the state specifically targets frequent hospital users and chronically homeless individuals. It offers the state authority to apply for the option in the most cost-effective way.

* County investment in frequent user and supportive housing programs, Proposition 63 funds, and philanthropic investment *existing or already committed,* could fund non-federal share of costs of programs serving the most vulnerable Californians. **The California Endowment, in fact, offered to pay the state’s share of administrative and services costs for the first two years of an ACA health home program.**
* The state would also have the authority to create risk sharing pools, social impact bond programs, and other incentives to fund the program should it result in Medi-Cal savings that could be applied to ongoing funding after the enhanced federal match ends.

**A Cost-Savings Approach for Counties and the State**

AB 361 would **decrease Medi-Cal costs** resulting from dramatic improvements in clinical outcomes.

* Medi-Cal beneficiaries participating in foundation-funded frequent user programs reduced Medi-Cal hospital costs by $3,841 per beneficiary after one year and $7,519 per beneficiary per year after two years over and above the costs of these programs.[[8]](#footnote-8)
* A Washington study showed homeless chronic inebriates connected to intensive case management incurred $2,449 less in Medicaid costs per person, per month than control group participants after six months beyond the costs of the program.[[9]](#footnote-9)
* Two randomized studies of chronically homeless frequent users receiving health home services showed participants decreased hospital days by a third within a year and 46% after 18 months, and decreased nursing home days by over 60% within a year compared to groups getting usual care.[[10]](#footnote-10)
* The Massachusetts Office of Medicaid reported decreased costs of over $17,500 per member from a state program offering comprehensive case management in housing.[[11]](#footnote-11)

**Without any state investment, Assembly Bill 361 Would Bring More Federal Resources to California, while decreasing costs and improving health among people with chronic and complex health conditions.**
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