Behavioral Health Provider Perspectives

When Mental Health Treatment Meets Administrative Requirements

Behavioral health providers face unique tensions in work requirement implementation: confidentiality requirements, episodic conditions, and therapeutic relationships that administrative gatekeeping can undermine.

Dr. Angela Morrison has worked at Centerpoint Community Mental Health for fourteen years. Her caseload includes forty-three clients, most with serious mental illness: schizophrenia, bipolar disorder, major depressive disorder, severe anxiety. She knows their patterns intimately, has walked with them through hospitalizations and recoveries, has celebrated their victories and helped them survive their crises.

One of her clients, Tamara, has bipolar I disorder. During stable periods, which Angela has helped extend through careful medication management and therapy, Tamara works twenty-five hours weekly at a grocery store, maintains her apartment, and manages her life capably. During manic or depressive episodes, which still occur despite excellent treatment adherence, Tamara cannot function. She might not leave her apartment for weeks. She might make impulsive decisions that jeopardize her employment. She might require hospitalization.

Tamara clearly qualifies for work requirement exemption during episodes. The problem is that episodes don't announce themselves on schedules that match exemption application timelines. Tamara might be stable when her six-month exemption review comes due, demonstrating capacity that suggests she should return to work requirements. Three weeks later, an episode begins. By the time Angela can document the changed capacity and submit new exemption paperwork, Tamara has missed verification deadlines. Her coverage terminates during a period when she most needs psychiatric care.

Angela dreads the paperwork the new system requires. The exemption forms ask for detailed documentation of functional limitations, requiring her to reduce Tamara's complex humanity to checkbox categories. The renewal requirements demand reassessment at intervals that don't match how bipolar disorder actually works. And increasingly, Angela feels that her clinical relationship with Tamara is being transformed into something else: she's becoming a gatekeeper whose documentation determines whether Tamara keeps her healthcare, rather than a therapist whose role is helping Tamara live well.

When the state's work requirement exemption training described providers as "key partners in program integrity," Angela felt something shift in her understanding of her role. She became a mental health professional to help people heal, not to verify their eligibility for government benefits.

The Confidentiality Constraint

Behavioral health providers operate under confidentiality requirements more stringent than standard medical privacy protections, and these requirements create fundamental tensions with work requirement exemption documentation.

42 CFR Part 2 governs confidentiality of substance use disorder treatment records with protections exceeding HIPAA requirements. Under Part 2, SUD treatment information cannot be disclosed without specific written patient consent, even to other healthcare providers, even for treatment purposes. The regulations exist because the stigma associated with addiction has historically

Syam Adusumilli, Chief Evangelist, *syam.a@groundgame.health*

deterred people from seeking treatment when they feared their treatment status would be disclosed. Protecting treatment records encourages treatment entry.

The distinction between HIPAA and Part 2 matters enormously for work requirement exemptions. Under HIPAA, healthcare providers can generally share treatment information for treatment, payment, and healthcare operations purposes. A primary care physician documenting a physical disability for exemption purposes operates under this framework. But a substance use disorder treatment program documenting treatment engagement for exemption purposes operates under Part 2's stricter requirements.

Patient consent requirements under Part 2 are highly specific. A general authorization to disclose treatment information is insufficient. The consent must identify the specific recipient, the specific information to be disclosed, the purpose of disclosure, and an expiration date. For work requirement exemptions, this means SUD treatment programs must obtain specific consent from each patient authorizing disclosure to the state Medicaid agency, specifying that the disclosure is for work requirement exemption purposes.

The consent requirement might seem like a minor administrative step, but it intersects with the therapeutic relationship in complex ways. Asking patients to consent to disclosure reminds them that their treatment status is being reported to government agencies. For patients with histories of involvement with criminal justice systems, child welfare systems, or immigration enforcement, this reminder can trigger fear and mistrust. Some patients will decline consent, preferring to lose coverage rather than have their treatment status documented in government systems.

When exemption documentation requires protected information, providers face genuine dilemmas. A counselor who believes their patient qualifies for exemption cannot simply document that belief; they must navigate consent requirements that the patient may resist. The provider committed to their patient's wellbeing may find that the administrative pathway to protecting coverage requires disclosures the patient finds threatening.

The recent modifications to Part 2 regulations have created additional complexity. The 2024 final rule aligned Part 2 more closely with HIPAA in some respects while maintaining distinct protections in others. Providers must navigate these evolving requirements while ensuring they do not inadvertently violate patient rights. ***Many community behavioral health providers lack dedicated compliance staff to track regulatory changes, meaning frontline clinicians must somehow stay current on complex federal regulations while managing full caseloads.***

For patients in ***medication-assisted treatment for opioid use disorder,*** the confidentiality concerns are particularly acute. MAT patients face persistent stigma, employment discrimination, and sometimes child custody consequences if their treatment status becomes known. Asking these patients to consent to disclosure for work requirement exemption purposes forces them to weigh coverage protection against exposure risks they may consider unacceptable. Some will choose coverage loss over disclosure, a choice that may lead to treatment discontinuation and relapse.

Episodic Conditions and Categorical Exemptions

Mental health conditions frequently fluctuate in ways that exemption systems designed for stable conditions cannot accommodate. The mismatch between how behavioral health conditions

actually work and how exemption categories are structured creates systematic failures for precisely the populations exemptions are meant to protect.

Bipolar disorder exemplifies the episodic challenge. Someone with well-managed bipolar disorder might work successfully for months, demonstrating capacity that appears inconsistent with exemption eligibility. When an episode occurs, that capacity disappears rapidly, but the administrative process for obtaining exemption takes time that the person doesn't have. The condition cycles faster than the exemption system responds.

Major depressive disorder presents similar challenges. Depression often involves periods of relative functionality interspersed with episodes of severe impairment. During a depressive episode, the executive function deficits that characterize depression make navigating exemption applications particularly difficult. The person most needing exemption is least capable of completing the paperwork required to obtain it.

Anxiety disorders can impair work capacity in ways that don't fit neat diagnostic categories. Someone with severe social anxiety might be unable to work jobs requiring customer interaction but capable of solitary work. Someone with panic disorder might function well most days but become incapacitated unpredictably. These nuanced impairments don't translate easily into the binary categories that exemption systems typically employ.

The problem with point-in-time assessment is that it captures a snapshot that may not represent typical functioning. Someone assessed during a good period appears more capable than their overall pattern suggests. Someone assessed during a crisis appears less capable than they will be when stabilized. Neither snapshot accurately represents the fluctuating capacity that characterizes many mental health conditions.

Documentation that captures capacity variation requires more sophisticated assessment than standard exemption forms typically allow. Rather than asking "can this person work?" the question should be "what is this person's typical capacity for work, and what triggers decompensation?" The answer might be: capable of part-time work during stable periods, incapable of any work during episodes, with episodes occurring unpredictably two to four times annually. Translating this clinical reality into exemption categories that assume stable conditions creates systematic errors.

The Therapeutic Relationship at Risk

Behavioral health treatment depends on therapeutic alliance between provider and patient. When providers become gatekeepers controlling access to benefits, that alliance faces pressures that can undermine treatment effectiveness.

The distinction between provider as healer and provider as gatekeeper reflects fundamentally different relationships. A healer works with the patient toward the patient's goals, offering expertise and support in service of the patient's wellbeing. A gatekeeper determines whether the patient qualifies for something they need, applying external criteria that may not align with the patient's interests. These roles can conflict directly when a provider believes their patient needs exemption but documentation requirements demand evidence the provider cannot honestly provide.

Trust erosion occurs when patients perceive that their providers control their benefits. A patient who knows their therapist's assessment determines their coverage status may shape what they share in therapy, presenting themselves as more impaired when exemptions are at stake and less impaired when they fear exemption denial might lead to other consequences. The therapeutic

space, which depends on honest communication, becomes contaminated by strategic considerations about how disclosures might affect benefits.

Maintaining therapeutic alliance amid administrative demands requires providers to navigate tensions they were not trained to manage. A therapist completing exemption documentation must somehow remain their patient's advocate while fulfilling obligations to accurately represent the patient's condition. When the provider believes the patient is manipulating presentation to obtain exemption, the therapeutic relationship is already compromised. When the provider suspects the patient is minimizing symptoms out of pride or fear, documenting accurate assessment becomes clinically complicated.

Some providers resolve these tensions by refusing to complete exemption documentation at all, referring patients elsewhere for administrative paperwork while preserving the therapeutic relationship from gatekeeping contamination. ***This approach protects the therapy but creates access barriers when alternative documentation sources are unavailable.***

SMI and SUD Population Complexity

Serious mental illness and substance use disorder populations present particular complexities that work requirement implementation must navigate.

Treatment engagement often qualifies as an exemption pathway for these populations. States may exempt people actively engaged in behavioral health treatment, recognizing that treatment itself requires time and energy that competes with work requirements. This approach makes clinical sense: someone in intensive outpatient treatment for opioid use disorder, attending group sessions daily, is doing the work of recovery even if they're not doing paid employment.

But this creates a paradox: treatment counts as qualifying activity but requires exemption. The framing matters. Treating treatment as a qualifying activity equivalent to work validates recovery as productive engagement. Treating treatment as exemption from work implies that treatment recipients are excused from the obligations others must meet. The same policy choice carries different messages depending on how it's framed, and the framing affects how patients experience the system.

Integrated care coordination opportunities emerge when behavioral health treatment intersects with work requirements. Care coordinators at community mental health centers already help patients navigate complex systems. ***Adding work requirement navigation to their responsibilities leverages existing relationships and expertise.*** A case manager who helps a client access housing, apply for disability benefits, and coordinate medical care can also help navigate work requirement verification or exemption documentation.

The question is whether behavioral health systems have capacity for this expanded role. Community mental health centers are chronically underfunded, with provider shortages, high caseloads, and limited administrative support. Adding work requirement responsibilities to already-stretched systems risks degrading core clinical services unless additional resources accompany expanded expectations.

Behavioral Health Workforce Constraints

The behavioral health workforce shortage predates work requirements and will shape how exemption documentation functions in practice.

Syam Adusumilli, Chief Evangelist, *syam.a@groundgame.health*

Provider shortages amplify documentation burden by concentrating exemption responsibilities on fewer providers. In areas with adequate psychiatrist supply, exemption documentation distributes across multiple providers with manageable per-provider volume. In shortage areas, a single psychiatrist might serve an entire region, with every patient needing exemption competing for that psychiatrist's limited time. Wait times for psychiatric appointments often exceed three months; adding exemption documentation demand to existing appointment scarcity creates impossible backlogs.

Time spent on documentation competes directly with treatment time. A psychiatrist completing exemption paperwork for fifteen patients weekly loses hours that could otherwise provide medication management or therapy to other patients. The administrative burden doesn't create new capacity; it reallocates existing capacity from clinical care to documentation. Patients not requiring exemption receive less care because their providers are busy documenting exemptions for others.

Rural behavioral health access intersects with work requirement implementation in particularly challenging ways. Rural areas face the most severe behavioral health shortages, with many counties having no psychiatrists and few licensed therapists. Telehealth has expanded access somewhat, but exemption documentation often requires in-person assessment or at minimum established treatment relationships that telehealth-only encounters may not support. Rural patients needing behavioral health exemptions face barriers obtaining both treatment and documentation.

The community mental health center workforce illustrates these challenges concretely. CMHC staff often include case managers, peer support specialists, licensed counselors, and a limited number of psychiatrists or psychiatric nurse practitioners. High turnover characterizes the sector, with burnout driving many clinicians to private practice or other settings. Adding exemption documentation to CMHC responsibilities falls on a workforce already struggling with caseloads exceeding recommended levels.

Peer support specialists represent a potential resource for work requirement navigation but typically cannot complete clinical exemption documentation. A peer specialist might help a patient understand exemption categories, gather supporting documentation, and navigate application processes. But the actual clinical attestation that a condition renders someone unable to work requires licensed clinical judgment that peer specialists are not authorized to provide. This division of labor makes sense clinically but requires coordination that stretched systems may struggle to maintain.

Licensed clinical social workers, professional counselors, and psychiatric nurse practitioners can provide behavioral health treatment and could potentially complete exemption documentation within their scopes of practice. Expanding who can document exemptions reduces bottlenecks but requires clear state authorization and guidance. Some states limit exemption documentation to physicians, creating unnecessary barriers when other qualified professionals could serve the function.

Building Supportive Systems

If work requirements are proceeding regardless of the challenges they create for behavioral health populations, how might systems be designed to minimize harm?

EHR integration for exemption documentation could reduce administrative burden significantly. Rather than completing separate exemption forms, providers could document clinical information in standard EHR workflows with automated extraction for exemption purposes. Diagnosis codes, functional assessments, and treatment plans already documented for clinical purposes could populate exemption applications without duplicative data entry. This requires technical development and state system connectivity that most behavioral health EHRs currently lack.

Consent management workflows must accommodate Part 2 requirements for SUD treatment while enabling exemption documentation for patients who consent. Template consent forms specific to work requirement exemption disclosure could standardize what is currently an ad hoc process. Electronic consent capture and management within EHR systems could track which patients have consented, when consent expires, and when renewal is needed.

Training and technical assistance must reach behavioral health providers who may have limited familiarity with Medicaid eligibility requirements. Exemption categories, documentation standards, and submission processes require explanation before providers can fulfill their roles effectively. Training should address the therapeutic relationship tensions that exemption gatekeeping creates, offering strategies for maintaining alliance while meeting documentation obligations.

Streamlined exemption renewal for conditions with predictable chronicity could reduce documentation burden. Someone with chronic schizophrenia requiring ongoing antipsychotic treatment is unlikely to suddenly not need exemption. Rather than requiring full reassessment at arbitrary intervals, renewal could involve brief confirmation that the underlying condition persists rather than comprehensive redocumentation.

Automatic exemption identification through pharmacy data offers another possibility. Certain medications strongly indicate conditions qualifying for exemption: clozapine for treatment-resistant schizophrenia, long-acting injectable antipsychotics, medication-assisted treatment for opioid use disorder. States could flag patients filling these medications for presumptive exemption eligibility, reducing documentation burden while maintaining clinical accuracy. This approach requires pharmacy claims data integration and clear protocols for which medications trigger presumptive eligibility.

Provider payment for exemption documentation deserves serious consideration. Currently, exemption documentation is typically uncompensated administrative work that providers perform because their patients need it. Creating billing codes for exemption assessment and documentation would legitimate this work as a healthcare service rather than unfunded mandate. Payment rates need not be high; even modest reimbursement signals that the healthcare system values this function and expects providers to allocate time accordingly.

Care coordination models integrating work requirement support with behavioral health treatment offer the most promising approach for populations with complex needs. Rather than separating clinical care from administrative navigation, integrated models ensure that the same team addressing someone's mental health also addresses their work requirement compliance. The psychiatrist adjusting medication knows about the patient's exemption status. The case manager coordinating housing also coordinates verification documentation. The peer specialist supporting

recovery also supports administrative navigation. This integration requires investment but produces coherent support rather than fragmented services.

The Provider's Dilemma

Angela Morrison will complete Tamara's exemption paperwork. She will document the bipolar disorder diagnosis, the functional limitations during episodes, the treatment plan that has helped Tamara maintain stability. She will do this because Tamara needs the exemption and Angela is the provider positioned to document it.

But Angela will do this work knowing that it changes something about her relationship with Tamara. She will wonder whether Tamara shapes what she shares in therapy based on how it might affect her exemption status. She will feel the tension between her role as healer and her role as gatekeeper, and she will manage that tension as best she can while knowing it cannot be fully resolved.

Across the country, behavioral health providers face similar dilemmas. They treat populations with conditions that clearly warrant exemption from work requirements. They operate under confidentiality frameworks that complicate exemption documentation. They struggle with episodic conditions that don't fit categorical systems. They worry about therapeutic relationships contaminated by administrative gatekeeping. They work in shortage areas where documentation burden competes with treatment capacity.

Work requirement policy assumes that exemptions will protect people who cannot work. For that assumption to hold, behavioral health providers must document exemptions accurately and efficiently. The barriers to accurate, efficient documentation, from confidentiality constraints to episodic conditions to workforce shortages, mean that many people qualifying for exemption will not obtain it. They will lose coverage not because they can work but because the systems designed to protect them failed.

The policy question is whether states will invest in behavioral health exemption infrastructure sufficient to make exemptions accessible, or whether they will implement exemption categories knowing that barriers will prevent many eligible people from accessing protection. The behavioral health providers caught between their clinical obligations and administrative demands will experience that policy choice in their daily practice regardless of how it's decided.

References

1. Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration. "42 CFR Part 2: Confidentiality of Substance Use Disorder Patient Records." Federal Register, 2024.
2. U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. "Fact Sheet: 42 CFR Part 2 Final Rule." HHS.gov, 2024.
3. Legal Action Center. "The Fundamentals of 42 CFR Part 2 and SUD Treatment Privacy." LAC.org, 2024.
4. National Council for Mental Wellbeing. "Behavioral Health Workforce: Challenges and Solutions." TheNationalCouncil.org, 2024.
5. SAMHSA. "Behavioral Health Workforce Report to Congress." SAMHSA.gov, 2024.
6. Health Resources and Services Administration. "Behavioral Health Workforce Projections." HRSA.gov, 2024.

Syam Adusumilli, Chief Evangelist, *syam.a@groundgame.health*

7. American Psychiatric Association. "The Psychiatrist Shortage: Challenges and Solutions." Psychiatry.org, 2024.
8. Kaiser Family Foundation. "Mental Health Care in Medicaid: Utilization and Workforce Challenges." KFF.org, 2024.
9. National Alliance on Mental Illness. "State Mental Health Legislation: Work Requirements and Exemptions." NAMI.org, 2025.
10. American Psychological Association. "Guidelines for the Practice of Telepsychology." APA.org, 2023.
11. Center on Budget and Policy Priorities. "How Work Requirements Affect People with Mental Health Conditions." CBPP.org, 2024.
12. Medicaid and CHIP Payment and Access Commission. "Behavioral Health in Medicaid: Policy Considerations." MACPAC.gov, 2024.
13. National Association of Social Workers. "NASW Standards for Clinical Social Work Practice." NASW.org, 2024.
14. American Association for Marriage and Family Therapy. "Practice Guidelines for Exemption Documentation." AAMFT.org, 2024.
15. Bazelon Center for Mental Health Law. "Work Requirements and Mental Health: Legal and Policy Analysis." Bazelon.org, 2025.

Syam Adusumilli, Chief Evangelist, *syam.a@groundgame.health*