



March 24, 2019

**Clackamas County Board of Commissioners**  
**Policy Position**  
**SB 137: Related to Contracting by Coordinated Care Organizations**

**Clackamas County Opposes SB 137:** The Board of County Commissioners opposes SB 137, which prohibits Coordinated Care Organizations (CCO) from contracting with any entity to assume risk of providing behavioral health services or to assume responsibility for utilization management, care coordination, denials of service grievances, or appeals.

Coordinated Care Organizations were developed on the foundation of integrating care across physical, behavioral, and dental health. A great deal of flexibility was provided so that local communities could leverage existing systems, relationships, and regional assets to best serve their area. SB 137 would limit the ability of local areas to determine how to best serve their region by prohibiting CCOs from partnering with existing systems to manage the behavioral health benefit.

Clackamas County has an exceptional partnership with our local CCO. They provide a committed investment in our crisis safety net and public health services. We are able to use this partnership to leverage scarce resources as we manage both the Medicaid behavioral benefit and the indigent behavioral health benefit for those not on Medicaid. This allows us to contract with a delivery system that can serve individuals when they roll on and off Medicaid with no disruption to services and no risk of lack of payment for the providers. Clackamas County is uniquely positioned to understand the needs of the local community. Many systems that impact social determinants of health such as juvenile services, housing, law enforcement, corrections, public health, aging and disability services, and developmental disabilities are also operated by the counties. This allows close partnership, coordinated efforts, and shared vision to occur.

CCO 2.0 addresses the responsibility that CCOs will have in ensuring that they are accountable for the Behavioral Health benefit while not limiting the ability to have some flexibility in who manages the benefit. This accountability will be in contract, it does not belong in law.

**We strongly urge a “NO” vote on SB 137.**

Please contact Chris Lyons at [clyons@clackamas.us](mailto:clyons@clackamas.us) for more information.