

**Medicaid Analytic Extract  
Eligibility Anomaly Tables, 2007**

April 30, 2012



**MATHEMATICA**  
Policy Research

Contract Number:  
HHSM-500-2005-00025I

Mathematica Reference Number:  
06759.220

Submitted to:  
Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services  
7500 Security Blvd  
CSP, Mail Stop C3-19-16  
Baltimore, MD 21244-1850  
Project Officer: Cara Petroski

Submitted by:  
Mathematica Policy Research  
1100 First Street, NE  
12th Floor  
Washington, DC 20002-4221  
Telephone: (202) 484-9220  
Facsimile: (202) 863-1763  
Project Director: Julie Sykes

**Medicaid Analytic Extract  
Eligibility Anomaly Tables, 2007**

April 30, 2012

**MATHEMATICA**  
**Policy Research**

## ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS IN THE ANOMALY REPORTS

### Abbreviations

ID = identifier or identification number or Idaho

Pharm = pharmacy

Psych = psychiatric

### State Abbreviations

AL = Alabama

AK = Alaska

AZ = Arizona

AR = Arkansas

CA = California

CO = Colorado

CT = Connecticut

DE = Delaware

DC = District of Columbia

FL = Florida

GA = Georgia

HI = Hawaii

ID = Idaho

IL = Illinois

IN = Indiana

IA = Iowa

KS = Kansas

KY = Kentucky

LA = Louisiana

ME = Maine

MD = Maryland

MA = Massachusetts

MI = Michigan

MN = Minnesota

MS = Mississippi

MO = Missouri

MT = Montana

NE = Nebraska

NV = Nevada

NH = New Hampshire

NJ = New Jersey

NM = New Mexico

NY = New York

NC = North Carolina

ND = North Dakota

OH = Ohio

OK = Oklahoma

OR = Oregon

### State Abbreviations (continued)

PA = Pennsylvania  
RI = Rhode Island  
SC = South Carolina  
SD = South Dakota  
TN = Tennessee  
TX = Texas  
UT = Utah  
VT = Vermont  
VA = Virginia  
WA = Washington  
WV = West Virginia  
WI = Wisconsin  
WY = Wyoming

### Acronyms

ACF = Administration for Children and Families  
AFDC = Aid to Families with Dependent Children  
AIDS = acquired immunodeficiency syndrome  
ASO = administrative services only  
BCCPT = Breast and Cervical Cancer Prevention and Treatment program  
BCCPTA = Breast and Cervical Cancer Prevention and Treatment Act  
BHO = behavioral health organization  
BHP = behavioral health plan  
CAP = Community Alternatives Program  
CDM = chronic disease management  
CMS = Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services  
COBOL = Common Business-Oriented Language  
DME = durable medical equipment  
DMIE = Demonstration to Maintain Independence and Employment  
DMO = disease management organization  
DMP = disease management plan  
DMR = Department of Mental Retardation  
DOB = date of birth  
DOD = date of death  
DMF = Death Master File  
DRG = diagnosis related group  
DYFS = Division of Youth and Family Services  
DX = diagnosis code  
EDB = Medicare Enrollment Database  
EPSDT = Early Periodic Screening, Diagnosis, and Treatment program  
ESI = employer-sponsored insurance  
FAIM = Family Assets for Independence in Minnesota  
FCN = Family Care Network  
FFS = fee-for-service  
FFY = federal fiscal year

Acronyms (continued)

FIPS = Federal Information Processing Standards  
FP = family planning  
FPACT = Family Planning, Access, Care and Treatment program  
FPL = federal poverty line  
FQHC = Federally Qualified Health Center  
FY = fiscal year  
HCBS = home- and community-based care services  
HCBW = Home and Community Based Waiver programs  
HCFA = Health Care Financing Administration  
HCPC = Health Care Common Procedure Code  
HCPCS = Health Care Common Procedure Coding System  
HIFA = Health Insurance Flexibility and Accountability  
HIO = health insuring organization  
HIPAA = Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act  
HIV/AIDS = human immunodeficiency virus/acquired immunodeficiency syndrome  
HMO = health maintenance organization  
ICF/DD = intermediate care facility for people with developmental disabilities  
ICF/MR = intermediate care facility for the mentally retarded  
IFS = Individual and Family Support waiver  
IHS = Indian Health Service  
IP = inpatient hospital claims file; inpatient  
ISSH = Idaho State School and Hospital  
KFF = Kaiser Family Foundation  
LT = institutionalized long-term care claims file  
LTC = long-term care  
MAX = Medicaid Analytic Extract  
MAXTOS = MAX type of service  
MC = managed care  
MCCN = Managed Care Community Networks  
M-CHIP = Medicaid-expansion Children's Health Insurance Program  
MH = mental hospital  
MH/MR = mental hospital for people with mental retardation  
MMIS = Medicaid Management Information System  
MR/DD = mental retardation/developmental disability  
MPAP = Maryland Pharmacy Assistance Program  
MPDP = Maryland Pharmacy Discount Program  
MSIS = Medicaid Statistical Information System  
NDC = National Drug Code  
NET = non-emergency transportation  
NF = nursing facility  
NYC = New York City  
OPD = Outpatient department  
OT = other, non-institutional claims file; occupational therapy  
PACE = Program of All-Inclusive Care for the Elderly  
PAHP = Prepaid Ambulatory Health Plans

Acronyms (continued)

PASRR = Pre-admission Screening and Resident Review  
PCCM = primary care case management  
PCN = primary care network  
PEP = Physician's Enhanced Program  
PHP = prepaid health plan  
PIHP = prepaid inpatient health plan  
PMAP = Prepaid Medical Assistance Project  
PSN = provider service network  
QDWI = Qualified Disabled and Working Individuals  
QI = Qualified Individuals  
QI-1 = Qualified Individuals 1  
QI-2 = Qualified Individuals 2  
QMB = Qualified Medicare Beneficiary  
RHC = Rural Health Clinic  
RID = recipient identification number  
RNIP = Relief to Needy Indian Persons  
RX = prescription drug claims file  
S-CHIP = Separate State Children's Health Insurance Program  
SED = serious emotional disturbance  
SLF = supportive living facilities  
SLMB = Specified Low-Income Medicare Beneficiary  
SSA = Social Security Administration  
SSI = Supplemental Security Income  
SSN = Social Security Number  
TANF = Temporary Assistance for Needy Families  
TBI = traumatic brain injury  
TEFRA = Tax Equity and Fiscal Responsibility Act of 1982  
TMA = transitional medical assistance  
TOC = type of claim  
TOS = type of service  
TPL = Third-Party Liability  
UB = uniform billing form/code  
UEG = uniform eligibility group  
UHN = Universal Health Network  
VHAP = Vermont Health Access Plan

Table 1. Missing Medicaid Eligibility Information and S-CHIP Only Enrollment in MAX 2007

Missing Medicaid Eligibility Information <sup>a</sup> and S-CHIP Only Enrollment in MAX 2007										
	Total Number of MAX PS File Records	Total Expenditures	Number of Records Missing Medicaid Eligibility Information <sup>b</sup>	Percent of Records Missing Medicaid Eligibility Information <sup>b c</sup>	Total Medicaid Paid for People Missing Medicaid Eligibility <sup>b</sup>	Avg Medicaid Paid for People Missing Medicaid Eligibility <sup>b</sup>	Number of S-CHIP Only Enrollees	Percent of Records for S-CHIP Only Enrollees	Total Number of Medicaid Enrollees	Total Medicaid Paid for Medicaid Enrollees
Alabama	919,048	\$ 3,208,719,452	8,322	0.9	\$ 7,368,248	\$ 885	0	0.0	910,726	\$ 3,201,351,204
Alaska	126,886	\$ 946,708,684	683	0.5	\$ 4,401,062	\$ 6,444	0	0.0	126,203	\$ 942,307,622
Arizona	1,572,541	\$ 3,661,723,513	17,093	1.1	\$ 17,275,406	\$ 1,011	65,333	4.2	1,490,115	\$ 3,644,448,107
Arkansas	786,248	\$ 3,226,689,910	20,066	2.6	\$ 28,306,808	\$ 1,411	0	0.0	766,182	\$ 3,198,383,102
California	10,987,805	\$ 30,271,579,114	329,273	3.0	\$ 213,437,172	\$ 648	0	0.0	10,658,532	\$ 30,058,141,942
Colorado	640,071	\$ 2,639,902,458	14,377	2.2	\$ 15,105,540	\$ 1,051	64,794	10.1	560,900	\$ 2,624,796,918
Connecticut	539,182	\$ 3,983,834,169	778	0.1	\$ 1,643,710	\$ 2,113	0	0.0	538,404	\$ 3,982,190,459
Delaware	188,695	\$ 1,064,698,019	1,119	0.6	\$ 292,926	\$ 262	0	0.0	187,576	\$ 1,064,405,093
District of Columbia	171,417	\$ 1,429,296,738	1,805	1.1	\$ 6,896,122	\$ 3,821	0	0.0	169,612	\$ 1,422,400,616
Florida	2,935,675	\$ 11,848,582,992	101,916	3.5	\$ 210,427,881	\$ 2,065	0	0.0	2,833,759	\$ 11,638,155,111
Georgia	2,014,312	\$ 6,352,714,826	39,699	2.0	\$ 137,198,520	\$ 3,456	306,497	15.2	1,668,116	\$ 6,215,516,306
Hawaii	240,375	\$ 989,229,755	7,441	3.1	\$ 3,745,594	\$ 503	0	0.0	232,934	\$ 985,484,161
Idaho	236,261	\$ 1,159,209,722	955	0.4	\$ 995,426	\$ 1,042	5,828	2.5	229,478	\$ 1,158,214,296
Illinois	2,671,131	\$ 9,109,610,108	2,226	0.1	\$ 3,842,726	\$ 1,726	221,378	8.3	2,447,527	\$ 9,105,767,382
Indiana	1,085,057	\$ 4,736,880,073	1,108	0.1	\$ 2,048,046	\$ 1,848	15,140	1.4	1,068,809	\$ 4,734,832,027
Iowa	484,526	\$ 2,482,034,194	1,047	0.2	\$ 1,806,674	\$ 1,726	0	0.0	483,479	\$ 2,480,227,520
Kansas	356,752	\$ 2,114,848,116	3,988	1.1	\$ 7,634,417	\$ 1,914	0	0.0	352,764	\$ 2,107,213,699
Kentucky	901,094	\$ 4,281,835,674	3,167	0.4	\$ 13,835,872	\$ 4,369	18,590	2.1	879,337	\$ 4,267,999,802
Louisiana	1,161,542	\$ 4,539,775,277	3,845	0.3	\$ 1,462,351	\$ 380	2,457	0.2	1,155,240	\$ 4,538,312,926
Maine	361,555	\$ 200,829,137	775	0.2	\$ 885,006	\$ 1,142	3,880	1.1	356,900	\$ 199,944,131
Maryland	856,476	\$ 5,298,636,946	1,469	0.2	\$ 3,939,007	\$ 2,681	1,292	0.2	853,715	\$ 5,294,697,939
Massachusetts	1,363,950	\$ 8,475,507,985	4,377	0.3	\$ 11,702,612	\$ 2,674	59,069	4.3	1,300,504	\$ 8,463,805,373
Michigan	1,982,608	\$ 6,640,859,706	25,118	1.3	\$ 41,605,683	\$ 1,656	0	0.0	1,957,490	\$ 6,599,254,023
Minnesota	823,723	\$ 5,871,327,887	3,145	0.4	\$ 5,047,760	\$ 1,605	21,496	2.6	799,082	\$ 5,866,280,127
Mississippi	746,010	\$ 2,994,643,535	467	0.1	\$ 3,432,334	\$ 7,350	0	0.0	745,543	\$ 2,991,211,201
Missouri	1,078,266	\$ 4,976,431,669	1,999	0.2	\$ 2,838,505	\$ 1,420	1,293	0.1	1,074,974	\$ 4,973,593,164
Montana	128,821	\$ 629,379,096	2,135	1.7	\$ 1,883,064	\$ 882	16,229	12.6	110,457	\$ 627,496,032
Nebraska	262,022	\$ 1,453,234,898	455	0.2	\$ 1,891,266	\$ 4,157	0	0.0	261,567	\$ 1,451,343,632
Nevada	259,843	\$ 1,076,671,041	1,557	0.6	\$ 4,610,133	\$ 2,961	169	0.1	258,117	\$ 1,072,060,908
New Hampshire	151,043	\$ 899,627,761	118	0.1	\$ 287,102	\$ 2,433	6,559	4.3	144,366	\$ 899,340,659
New Jersey	1,227,083	\$ 7,317,171,704	11,469	0.9	\$ 54,728,018	\$ 4,772	108,229	8.8	1,107,385	\$ 7,262,443,686

Table 1. Missing Medicaid Eligibility Information and S-CHIP Only Enrollment in MAX 2007

Missing Medicaid Eligibility Information <sup>a</sup> and S-CHIP Only Enrollment in MAX 2007											
	Total Number of MAX PS File		Number of Records Missing Medicaid Eligibility	Percent of Records Missing Medicaid Eligibility	Total Medicaid Paid for People Missing Medicaid Eligibility	Avg Medicaid Paid for People Missing Medicaid Eligibility	Number of S-CHIP Only Enrollees	Percent of Records for S-CHIP Only Enrollees	Total Number of Medicaid Enrollees	Total Medicaid Paid for Medicaid Enrollees	
	Records	Total Expenditures	Information <sup>b</sup>	Information <sup>b c</sup>	Eligibility <sup>b</sup>	Eligibility <sup>b</sup>					
New Mexico	532,636	\$ 2,484,562,580	4,208	0.8	\$ 9,169,922	\$ 2,179	0	0.0	528,428	\$ 2,475,392,658	
New York	5,038,798	\$ 40,399,057,097	33,231	0.7	\$ 501,123,977	\$ 15,080	0	0.0	5,005,567	\$ 39,897,933,120	
North Carolina	1,822,975	\$ 8,923,388,761	2,811	0.2	\$ 4,599,483	\$ 1,636	112,817	6.2	1,707,347	\$ 8,918,789,278	
North Dakota	80,594	\$ 522,895,505	988	1.2	\$ 1,207,448	\$ 1,222	6,157	7.6	73,449	\$ 521,688,057	
Ohio	2,173,685	\$ 11,897,187,200	436	0.0	\$ 1,149,796	\$ 2,637	0	0.0	2,173,249	\$ 11,896,037,404	
Oklahoma	786,992	\$ 3,210,433,151	3,657	0.5	\$ 13,552,885	\$ 3,706	0	0.0	783,335	\$ 3,196,880,266	
Oregon	545,787	\$ 2,238,890,702	1,848	0.3	\$ 1,134,278	\$ 614	34,972	6.4	508,967	\$ 2,237,756,424	
Pennsylvania	2,134,737	\$ 12,372,060,329	43,517	2.0	\$ 110,421,908	\$ 2,537	0	0.0	2,091,220	\$ 12,261,638,421	
Rhode Island	222,340	\$ 1,674,023,788	4,391	2.0	\$ 25,954	\$ 6	0	0.0	217,949	\$ 1,673,997,834	
South Carolina	917,726	\$ 3,231,620,801	452	0.0	\$ 741,934	\$ 1,641	0	0.0	917,274	\$ 3,230,878,867	
South Dakota	133,795	\$ 637,446,442	69	0.1	\$ 1,196	\$ 17	1,802	1.3	131,924	\$ 637,445,246	
Tennessee	1,494,749	\$ 5,756,020,428	27,154	1.8	\$ 54,909,716	\$ 2,022	0	0.0	1,467,595	\$ 5,701,110,712	
Texas	4,313,350	\$ 15,295,163,190	63,655	1.5	\$ 24,000,119	\$ 377	0	0.0	4,249,695	\$ 15,271,163,071	
Utah	327,812	\$ 1,068,491,818	2,803	0.9	\$ 447,820	\$ 160	36,590	11.2	288,419	\$ 1,068,043,998	
Vermont	164,339	\$ 841,317,239	3,017	1.8	\$ 5,169,117	\$ 1,713	2,117	1.3	159,205	\$ 836,148,122	
Virginia	965,390	\$ 4,525,998,623	1,446	0.1	\$ 7,223,105	\$ 4,995	51,862	5.4	912,082	\$ 4,518,775,518	
Washington	1,227,878	\$ 4,748,877,948	47,371	3.9	\$ 154,068,173	\$ 3,252	0	0.0	1,180,507	\$ 4,594,809,775	
West Virginia	397,462	\$ 2,040,307,034	589	0.1	\$ 6,687,157	\$ 11,353	0	0.0	396,873	\$ 2,033,619,877	
Wisconsin	1,053,300	\$ 4,496,216,973	13,632	1.3	\$ 15,164,925	\$ 1,112	0	0.0	1,039,668	\$ 4,481,052,048	
Wyoming	78,360	\$ 470,186,632	578	0.7	\$ 2,085,681	\$ 3,608	0	0.0	77,782	\$ 468,100,951	
Total	61,672,723	\$ 270,716,340,400	867,845	1.4	\$ 1,723,459,585	\$ 1,986	1,164,550	1.9	59,640,328	\$ 268,992,880,815	

<sup>a</sup> MAX PS file includes records for persons who may not be Medicaid enrollees, including S-CHIP only enrollees. This table summarizes these records.

<sup>b</sup> Excludes S-CHIP only enrollees.

<sup>c</sup> Values greater than 2.0 percent are above the expected level and are considered anomalous.



Table 2. SSN Reporting in MAX 2007

	Total Number of Medicaid Enrollee Records	Number of Enrollee Records with Invalid or Missing SSNs <sup>a</sup>	Percent of Enrollee Records with Invalid or Missing SSNs <sup>a</sup>	Duplicate SSNs	
				Number of SSNs with More Than One MSIS ID	Percent of Enrollee Records with Duplicate SSNs <sup>b</sup>
Alabama	910,726	36,406	4.0	298	0.07
Alaska	126,203	4,050	3.2	34	0.05
Arizona	1,490,115	151,551	10.2	280	0.04
Arkansas	766,182	31,487	4.1	2,704	0.71
California	10,658,532	3,861,725 <sup>c</sup>	36.2	0	0.00
Colorado	560,900	41,709	7.4	149	0.05
Connecticut	538,404	17,466	3.2	973	0.36
Delaware	187,576	18,723	10.0	65	0.07
District of Columbia	169,612	7,375	4.3	79	0.09
Florida	2,833,759	105,750	3.7	233	0.02
Georgia	1,668,116	161,756	9.7	66	0.01
Hawaii	232,934	4,082	1.8	182	0.16
Idaho	229,478	10,611	4.6	15	0.01
Illinois	2,447,527	59,282	2.4	26,255 <sup>d</sup>	2.15
Indiana	1,068,809	30,645	2.9	355	0.07
Iowa	483,479	7,783	1.6	662	0.27
Kansas	352,764	6,194	1.8	22	0.01
Kentucky	879,337	13,687	1.6	0	0.00
Louisiana	1,155,240	45,274	3.9	0	0.00
Maine	356,900	2,679	0.8	0	0.00
Maryland	853,715	31,794	3.7	405	0.09
Massachusetts	1,300,504	118,261 <sup>e</sup>	9.1	326	0.05
Michigan	1,957,490	152,882	7.8	33	0.00
Minnesota	799,082	19,024	2.4	0	0.00
Mississippi	745,543	25,158	3.4	3,173	0.85
Missouri	1,074,974	31,623	2.9	421	0.08
Montana	110,457	7,551 <sup>f</sup>	6.8	0	0.00
Nebraska	261,567	11,768	4.5	28	0.02
Nevada	258,117	26,072	10.1	0	0.00
New Hampshire	144,366	1,615	1.1	12	0.02
New Jersey	1,107,385	68,571	6.2	0	0.00
New Mexico	528,428	12,463	2.4	0	0.00
New York	5,005,567	379,327 <sup>g</sup>	7.6	69,128	2.76

Table 2. SSN Reporting in MAX 2007

	Total Number of Medicaid Enrollee Records	Number of Enrollee Records with Invalid or Missing SSNs <sup>a</sup>	Percent of Enrollee Records with Invalid or Missing SSNs <sup>a</sup>	Duplicate SSNs	
				Number of SSNs with More Than One MSIS ID	Percent of Enrollee Records with Duplicate SSNs <sup>b</sup>
North Carolina	1,707,347	52,865	3.1	497	0.06
North Dakota	73,449	737	1.0	75 <sup>h</sup>	0.20
Ohio	2,173,249	39,188	1.8	12,825 <sup>i</sup>	1.18
Oklahoma	783,335	42,415	5.4	2,921	0.75
Oregon	508,967	44,828	8.8	543	0.21
Pennsylvania	2,091,220	24,227	1.2	54	0.01
Rhode Island	217,949	2,595	1.2	0	0.00
South Carolina	917,274	46,698	5.1	64	0.01
South Dakota	131,924	4,059	3.1	2,175	3.30
Tennessee	1,467,595	24,667	1.7	530	0.07
Texas	4,249,695	234,630	5.5	9,035	0.43
Utah	288,419	12,048	4.2	9	0.01
Vermont	159,205	521	0.3	0	0.00
Virginia	912,082	47,622	5.2	269	0.06
Washington	1,180,507	31,902	2.7	173	0.03
West Virginia	396,873	1,532	0.4	251	0.13
Wisconsin	1,039,668	35,818	3.4	8,709	1.68
Wyoming	77,782	3,034	3.9	19	0.05
Total	59,640,328	6,153,728	10.3	144,047	0.48

<sup>a</sup> Records with missing SSNs tend to be children and aliens who only qualified for emergency services. Values greater than 5 percent are above the expected level and are considered anomalous.

<sup>b</sup> Records with duplicate SSNs tend to be children.

<sup>c</sup> Over 60 percent of those with missing SSNs in CA only qualified for family planning benefits.

<sup>d</sup> In IL, more than one enrollee record can have the same SSN due to the state's system of assigning Medicaid ID numbers for uninsured children who are provided emergency services. These children are initially assigned temporary ID numbers; a permanent ID is assigned once they are enrolled in Medicaid for full benefits. Thus, two records may exist with the same SSN. SSN duplication can also occur when an individual's Medicaid coverage is cancelled and later renewed with a different ID number.

<sup>e</sup> MA does not require enrollees to provide SSN data.

<sup>f</sup> MT's SSN information is not fully reliable. Many individuals had their Medicaid ID numbers or other numbers entered in the SSN field by mistake. The state estimates that up to 30 percent of the SSNs may not be reliable.

<sup>g</sup> About 25 percent of enrollees missing SSNs in NY did not have a date of birth and were probably in the newborn group.

<sup>h</sup> In ND, the Medicaid and S-CHIP programs use different ID formats, causing children in both programs during the year to have multiple IDs.

<sup>i</sup> Part of the SSN duplication in OH occurs because several thousand children in foster care have two records with different MSIS IDs and the same SSNs; researchers may want to combine these records.

Table 3. Personal Identifiers and Demographic Characteristics for Medicaid Enrollees in MAX 2007

	Date of Birth and Date of Death					Sex		Race and Ethnicity			County Code		
	Number of Enrollees Missing Date of Birth	Percent of Enrollees Missing Date of Birth <sup>a</sup>	No Medicaid Date of Death Data Reported in MAX	Number of MAX Reported Deaths Prior to 2007	Number of DMF Reported Deaths Prior to 2007 <sup>b</sup>	Number of Enrollees with Missing Sex	Percent of Enrollees with Missing Sex <sup>a</sup>	Percent of Enrollees with Missing Race <sup>c</sup>	Percent of Enrollees Who are Hispanic/Latino	Percent of Hispanic/Latino Enrollees with Missing Race	Inconsistency Between Separate and Combined Race and Ethnicity Variables	Percent of Enrollees with Missing Code <sup>a</sup>	Unusual Reporting
Alabama	0	0.0		3	679	7,178	0.8	7.2	4.3	100.0		0.0	100 = some foster children
Alaska	1	0.0		38	64	2	0.0	6.2	3.7	100.0		0.5	County codes are correct but not 3-digit odd numbers
Arizona	4	0.0		0	117	0	0.0	50.3	46.6	100.0		0.0	012 = La Paz county
Arkansas	2	0.0		486	1,461	228	0.0	16.9 <sup>d</sup>	5.8	100.0		0.0	
California	11	0.0	X	0	2,086	0	0.0	62.1	56.0	100.0		0.0	
Colorado	5	0.0		0	380	1	0.0	63.5	29.9	100.0		0.0	014 = Broomfield county
Connecticut	0	0.0		0	274	0	0.0	0.0	30.9	0.0	X	0.5	
Delaware	0	0.0		0	42	1	0.0	15.1	15.1	100.0		1.0	
District of Columbia	6	0.0		52	235	4	0.0	11.8	9.2	100.0		0.3	
Florida	0	0.0		0	831	2,009	0.1	35.5	27.8	100.0		0.4	
Georgia	0	0.0		10	852	130	0.0	6.5	0.7	100.0		0.7	
Hawaii	0	0.0		4	176	0	0.0	5.1	5.1	100.0		0.0	
Idaho	0	0.0		0	55	0	0.0	0.6	0.6	100.0		2.3	
Illinois	32	0.0		0	1,969	0	0.0	22.3	20.8	77.9		0.5	
Indiana	0	0.0		0	70	0	0.0	10.9	9.6	100.0		0.0	
Iowa	0	0.0		455	565	0	0.0	38.5	6.0	100.0		0.0	
Kansas	0	0.0		0	620	6	0.0	4.1	16.4	7.8		0.0	
Kentucky	0	0.0		717	890	1	0.0	5.3	2.6	3.1		0.0	
Louisiana	1	0.0		0	269	143	0.0	7.4	1.8	100.0		0.0	
Maine	9	0.0	X	0	1,474	3	0.0	14.4	0.2	39.8		1.5	
Maryland	13	0.0		20	448	0	0.0	14.7	10.0	100.0		0.2	510 = city of Baltimore
Massachusetts	0	0.0		0	723	0	0.0	39.7	16.5	100.0		0.9	
Michigan	149	0.0	X	0	1,949	159	0.0	6.9	5.6	100.0		0.0	
Minnesota	10	0.0		3	122	0	0.0	9.1	8.1	41.6		0.0	
Mississippi	2	0.0		0	1,610	1,315	0.2	9.1	1.5	100.0		1.1	
Missouri	6	0.0		0	395	3	0.0	2.5	0.5	100.0		0.1	510 = city of St. Louis; 186 = city of St. Genevieve
Montana	0	0.0		118	75	0	0.0	3.2	3.2	100.0		0.0	
Nebraska	6,829	2.6 <sup>e</sup>		4	15	4,327	1.7	17.0	14.6	91.1		1.6	
Nevada	87	0.0		12	120	894	0.3	2.7	30.5	4.2		2.5	510 = Carson City
New Hampshire	1	0.0		200	209	0	0.0	5.4	4.5	100.0		2.9	

Table 3. Personal Identifiers and Demographic Characteristics for Medicaid Enrollees in MAX 2007

	Date of Birth and Date of Death					Sex		Race and Ethnicity			County Code		
	Number of Enrollees Missing Date of Birth	Percent of Enrollees Missing Date of Birth <sup>a</sup>	No Medicaid Date of Death Data Reported in MAX	Number of MAX Reported Deaths Prior to 2007	Number of DMF Reported Deaths Prior to 2007 <sup>b</sup>	Number of Enrollees with Missing Sex	Percent of Enrollees with Missing Sex <sup>a</sup>	Percent of Enrollees with Missing Race <sup>c</sup>	Percent of Enrollees Who are Hispanic/Latino	Percent of Hispanic/Latino Enrollees with Missing Race	Inconsistency Between Separate and Combined Race and Ethnicity Variables	Percent of Enrollees with Missing Code <sup>a</sup>	Unusual Reporting
New Jersey	3	0.0		1	779	0	0.0	29.2	18.6	100.0		0.2	
New Mexico	0	0.0		0	381	1	0.0	56.1	53.5	100.0		0.1	006 = Cibola; 028 = Los Alamos
New York	91,982	1.8 <sup>e</sup>		0	4,863	76,996 <sup>f</sup>	1.5	10.4	26.9	10.9		0.4	061 = New York City boroughs, including Bronx County (005), Kings County (047), Queens County (081), and Richmond County (085)
North Carolina	3	0.0		2,323	2,340	0	0.0	13.8	9.4	78.9		0.0	
North Dakota	0	0.0		0	1	2	0.0	0.0	3.4	0.0	X	0.0	
Ohio	39	0.0		8	3,589	9	0.0	3.3	3.2	100.0		0.0	
Oklahoma	0	0.0		42	470	0	0.0	0.4	10.6	0.3		0.4	
Oregon	3	0.0		80	102	0	0.0	23.3	0.9	100.0	X	0.1	
Pennsylvania	92	0.0		3,798	3,521	0	0.0	11.1	11.3	74.5		0.0	
Rhode Island	1	0.0		0	51	0	0.0	53.5	17.7	100.0		8.7	000 = enrollees living out of state
South Carolina	10	0.0		925	947	13	0.0	9.3	4.6	100.0		0.0	
South Dakota	2	0.0		0	42	0	0.0	0.0	3.2	0.1		1.7	
Tennessee	0	0.0		0	276	1	0.0	8.3	4.3	100.0		1.0	
Texas	0	0.0		9	2,828	106	0.0	55.9	53.5	100.0		0.0	
Utah	0	0.0		1	35	437	0.2	1.0	19.5	0.1		0.1	
Vermont	1	0.0		2	28	0	0.0	34.1	0.4	100.0		3.9	
Virginia	1	0.0	X <sup>g</sup>	126	198	8	0.0	11.6	9.9	100.0		1.1	Even-numbered 510-840 = residents of independent cities
Washington	20	0.0		66	424	96	0.0	30.7	9.4	100.0	X	0.1	
West Virginia	0	0.0		11	104	0	0.0	1.4	0.0	100.0		5.7	
Wisconsin	40	0.0		16	105	0	0.0	27.5	7.8	100.0		1.2	078 = Menominee County
Wyoming	2	0.0		41	70	18	0.0	0.7	12.1	0.0		0.0	
Total	99,369	0.2	4	9,571	39,929	94,092	0.2	27.6	24.3	86.7	4	0.3	

<sup>a</sup> Values greater than 2 percent are above the expected level and are considered anomalous.

<sup>b</sup> The date of death came from the SSA Death Master File, version August 9, 2008.

<sup>c</sup> Values greater than 10 percent are above the expected level and are considered anomalous.

<sup>d</sup> A transition in AR's system for race/ethnicity reporting resulted in more people being reported with an unknown race/ethnicity.

<sup>e</sup> Enrollees with missing date of birth are probably newborns with MSIS IDs, but no date of birth yet reported.

<sup>f</sup> Enrollees with missing sex in NY are probably in the newborn group.

<sup>g</sup> VA reported only about 0.2 percent of enrollees as having died during 2007, a much lower percentage than in most states. VA date of death data are probably incomplete.

Table 4. Children's Health Insurance Program (CHIP) Reporting in MAX 2007 <sup>a</sup>

	Medicaid Expansion CHIP (M-CHIP)		Separate CHIP (S-CHIP)		Inconsistencies Between MAX and SEDS Reporting	
	Child	Adult	Child <sup>a</sup>	Adult <sup>a</sup>	Program	Reason for Inconsistencies
Alabama			NR			
Alaska	X					
Arizona			X	NR		
Arkansas	X	NR	NR <sup>b</sup>			
California	X					
Colorado			X	X		
Connecticut			NR			
Delaware	X		NR			
District of Columbia	X					
Florida	X		NR		S-CHIP	Underreported in MAX
Georgia			X			
Hawaii	X					
Idaho	X		X	NR	S-CHIP	Underreported in MAX
Illinois	X		X	X <sup>b</sup>	S-CHIP children and adults	Unborn children counted as adults in MAX, children in SEDS
Indiana	X		X			
Iowa	X		NR			
Kansas			NR			
Kentucky	X		X		S-CHIP children	Cause unknown
Louisiana	X			X <sup>b</sup>		
Maine	X		X			
Maryland	X		X <sup>c</sup>			
Massachusetts	X		X		All CHIP children	Underreported in SEDS
Michigan	X	X <sup>d</sup>	NR <sup>b</sup>		M-CHIP children	Underreported in MAX
Minnesota	X		X	X <sup>b</sup>	S-CHIP children and adults	Unborn children counted as adults in MAX, children in SEDS
Mississippi			NR			
Missouri	X		X <sup>e</sup>			
Montana			X			
Nebraska	X					
Nevada			NR	X		
New Hampshire	X		X			
New Jersey	X	X	X	X		
New Mexico	X	X				
New York			NR			
North Carolina	X		X			

Table 4. Children's Health Insurance Program (CHIP) Reporting in MAX 2007 <sup>a</sup>

	Medicaid Expansion CHIP (M-CHIP)		Separate CHIP (S-CHIP)		Inconsistencies Between MAX and SEDS Reporting	
	Child	Adult	Child <sup>a</sup>	Adult <sup>a</sup>	Program	Reason for Inconsistencies
North Dakota	X		X		S-CHIP	Underreported in SEDS
Ohio	X					
Oklahoma	X					
Oregon			X	NR		
Pennsylvania			NR			
Rhode Island	X	X	NR <sup>b</sup>	NR		
South Carolina	X					
South Dakota	X		X			
Tennessee	X <sup>f</sup>		NR		M-CHIP	Not reported in SEDS
Texas			NR			
Utah			X			
Vermont			X			
Virginia	X		X	X		
Washington			NR			
West Virginia			NR			
Wisconsin	X	X	NR <sup>b</sup>	NR	M-CHIP adults	Overreported in SEDS
Wyoming			NR			
Total X	33	5	22	7		
Total NR	0	1	19	5		
Total with Program	33	6	41	12		

<sup>a</sup> All states receive enhanced federal matching funds to extend health care coverage to uninsured low-income children under the Children's Health Insurance Program (CHIP). Some states have also opted to cover adults under their CHIP programs. States have the option of using CHIP funding to expand Medicaid coverage (M-CHIP), to set up separate CHIP (S-CHIP) programs, or to provide both. S-CHIP children and adults, although sometimes reported in MSIS and MAX, are not Medicaid enrollees. Researchers may want to exclude S-CHIP only enrollees from their Medicaid analyses.

<sup>b</sup> S-CHIP program covering the unborn.

<sup>c</sup> Effective June 2007, MD ended its S-CHIP program and moved all CHIP children to M-CHIP.

<sup>d</sup> MI's adult M-CHIP program periodically opens and closes enrollment.

<sup>e</sup> MO enacted its S-CHIP program for children in October.

<sup>f</sup> TN previously over-reported M-CHIP enrollment. This has been fixed as of January 2007.

NR = not reported

Table 5. Reporting of Dual Enrollment in Medicaid and Medicare in MAX 2007

	Indicators of Potential Reporting Anomalies						Dual-related Coverage Options		
	Total Number of EDB Duals <sup>a</sup>	Number of Non-EDB Duals (Duals Reported in MAX, Not Found in EDB)	Percent of EDB Duals with Restricted Benefits (EDB DUAL=51,53, 55,56) <sup>b</sup>	Percent of Enrollees >64 Who Were Not EDB Duals <sup>c</sup>	Percent EDB Only Duals (Duals not Reported in MAX, Found in EDB ) <sup>d</sup>	Other Known Reporting Anomalies	Missing Data	Full Benefit Poverty-Related Expansion for Aged and Disabled (FPL %) <sup>e</sup>	Pharm Plus Program <sup>f</sup>
Alabama	204,572	2,956	51.4	2.4	1.2				
Alaska	13,873	151	2.1	10.7	6.7				
Arizona	147,098	1,207	21.1	8.4	1.4			100	
Arkansas	119,244	2,014	37.2	4.4	6.7	State reports some duals in the 'other' classification because they do not have the income information needed to classify them properly.	Some SLMB only (dual code 53) duals through September	80 <sup>g</sup>	
California	1,177,512	13,853	2.0	13.3	1.0			100	
Colorado	82,603	1,077	23.3	9.2	3.2				
Connecticut	101,838	956	22.8	6.0	0.7				
Delaware	24,156	260	50.0	4.9	4.9				
District of Columbia	21,829	640	13.6	11.5	2.0			100	
Florida	565,686	3,824	41.9	6.1	1.1			88	
Georgia	263,156	4,314	42.7	4.2	2.7				
Hawaii	32,080	375	8.1	4.2	1.3			100	
Idaho	31,775	400	28.3	2.2	2.4				
Illinois	330,811	6,118	10.9	9.1	7.7	Some Pharm Plus waiver enrollees reported to dual code 59		85	X
Indiana	157,759	802	34.1	3.5	3.9				
Iowa	79,408	1,165	16.2	2.8	1.0				
Kansas	63,749	400	23.7	5.4	2.7				
Kentucky	170,404	7,685	37.4	3.4	0.5				
Louisiana	176,162	2,510	39.8	3.0	0.5				
Maine	88,280	2,903	39.0	4.8	1.4			100	
Maryland	109,044	865	30.9	11.0	1.4				
Massachusetts	250,158	3,342	3.8	14.3	0.6		QI-1s (dual code 56)	100 <sup>h</sup>	
Michigan	261,113	4,959	11.3	5.5	2.0			100	
Minnesota	147,126	405	8.0	5.4	11.5			95	

Table 5. Reporting of Dual Enrollment in Medicaid and Medicare in MAX 2007

	Indicators of Potential Reporting Anomalies						Dual-related Coverage Options		
	Total Number of EDB Duals <sup>a</sup>	Number of Non- EDB Duals (Duals Reported in MAX, Not Found in EDB)	Percent of EDB Duals with Restricted Benefits (EDB DUAL=51,53, 55,56) <sup>b</sup>	Percent of Enrollees >64 Who Were Not EDB Duals <sup>c</sup>	Percent EDB Only Duals (Duals not Reported in MAX, Found in EDB ) <sup>d</sup>	Other Known Reporting Anomalies	Missing Data	Full Benefit Poverty-Related Expansion for Aged and Disabled (FPL %) <sup>e</sup>	Pharm Plus Program <sup>f</sup>
Mississippi	154,966	2,949	46.0	3.0	4.9	No SLMB Plus duals (dual code 54) reported			
Missouri	176,611	948	9.1	4.8	1.5				
Montana	18,174	116	10.0	1.5	1.3	Underreported partial duals (Dual codes 51, 53, 56) by at least 5,000			
Nebraska	41,771	155	8.8	5.8	1.0	No SLMB Plus full duals (dual code 54) reported		100	
Nevada	39,731	323	43.3	2.8	2.3				
New Hampshire	28,059	328	26.1	6.8	1.4				
New Jersey	205,322	21,375	13.8	8.8	1.0	Medically needy duals in nursing homes (3-4,000) reported to dual code 59		100	
New Mexico	54,453	999	28.0	4.9	3.4		SLMB-only and QI-1 (dual codes 53 and 56) enrollees		
New York	742,789	16,672	10.2	10.1	2.2	Underreported partial duals trying to spend down to full benefits			
North Carolina	312,376	5,655	18.1	2.4	2.2			100	
North Dakota	15,508	29	24.4	1.1	0.4	Reported vast majority of full duals to dual code 58			
Ohio	305,877	4,817	32.7	8.3	5.2				
Oklahoma	110,901	1,044	15.7	3.0	1.3			100	
Oregon	89,037	594	29.9	3.7	1.5				
Pennsylvania	382,224	4,467	14.9	6.7	1.1			100	
Rhode Island	40,199	375	13.1	5.6	1.3	Reported <100 enrollees to dual code 59; fewer full duals reported to UEG 31- 32 than expected		100	
South Carolina	147,976	5,491	12.3	2.8	1.1	Mistakenly reported ~100 full benefit duals to restricted benefits flag 3		100	
South Dakota	20,509	116	31.9	1.1	1.1				
Tennessee	282,898	2,074	23.5	2.7	2.8	Reported QI-1 duals to dual code 53 (SLMB only)			
Texas	619,983	20,992	34.2	3.3	1.4				
Utah	31,345	113	9.1	3.8	3.3			100	



Table 5. Reporting of Dual Enrollment in Medicaid and Medicare in MAX 2007

	Indicators of Potential Reporting Anomalies						Dual-related Coverage Options		
	Total Number of EDB Duals <sup>a</sup>	Number of Non-EDB Duals (Duals Reported in MAX, Not Found in EDB)	Percent of EDB Duals with Restricted Benefits (EDB DUAL=51,53, 55,56) <sup>b</sup>	Percent of Enrollees >64 Who Were Not EDB Duals <sup>c</sup>	Percent EDB Only Duals (Duals not Reported in MAX, Found in EDB ) <sup>d</sup>	Other Known Reporting Anomalies	Missing Data	Full Benefit Poverty-Related Expansion for Aged and Disabled (FPL %) <sup>e</sup>	Pharm Plus Program <sup>f</sup>
Vermont	31,839	163	22.3	2.0	1.4	Some Pharm Plus waiver enrollees reported to dual code 59			X
Virginia	169,441	1,317	29.4	5.4	1.0			80	
Washington	150,994	1,237	22.6	8.8	3.4	Some shifts across dual codes 8 and 2 (in byte 2 of the code)			
West Virginia	77,708	731	37.2	1.7	0.1				
Wisconsin	216,203	886	7.1	1.7	0.7	Most Pharm Plus wavier enrollees reported to dual code 59			X
Wyoming	10,033	66	31.0	1.7	2.3				
Total	9,096,363	157,213	21.3	7.1	2.2				3

<sup>a</sup> EDB duals are Medicaid enrollees whose enrollment in Medicare has been confirmed with a link to the Medicare Enrollment Data Base (EDB).

<sup>b</sup> Many duals are eligible for only restricted Medicaid benefits related to Medicare cost sharing (states with over 40 percent are flagged). Some of these so-called "partial duals" only qualify for payment of Part B premiums, while others also qualify for Medicare copays and deductibles.

<sup>c</sup> The vast majority of aged Medicaid enrollees are also enrolled in Medicare. However, sometimes aged individuals do not qualify for Medicare, or they are entitled, but not enrolled. States with over 10 percent of enrollees age 65 and older not identified as EDB duals are flagged as potentially anomalous.

<sup>d</sup> Values greater than 5 percent are above the expected level and are considered anomalous.

<sup>e</sup> States have the option to extend full Medicaid benefits to aged and disabled persons (including nonduals) whose income does not exceed the federal poverty level. Some states have opted to use levels somewhat below the full federal poverty level.

<sup>f</sup> A few states had 1115 waivers in 2007 that extended prescription drug coverage (so-called Pharm Plus states) to some partial duals, in addition to covering Medicare cost-sharing expenses.

<sup>g</sup> AR only extended this optional coverage to the aged, not the disabled.

<sup>h</sup> MA used 133 percent FPL for the disabled.

Table 6. Other Key Medicaid Eligibility Provisions Related to Uniform Eligibility Group (UEG) Reporting in MAX 2007 <sup>a</sup>

	Medicaid Eligibility For SSI Recipients							Reporting Anomalies
	Automatic Eligibility <sup>b</sup>	SSI Criteria <sup>b</sup>	Section 209(b) <sup>b</sup>	State-Administered SSI Supplement <sup>c</sup>	Medically Needy Eligibility <sup>d</sup>	Full Benefit Poverty-Related Expansion for Aged and Disabled (FPL percent) <sup>e</sup>	Special Income Level for Institutionalized <sup>f</sup>	
Alabama	X			X			X	Few enrollees reported to UEG 44-45 due to state coding limitations.
Alaska		X		X			X	
Arizona	X			X		100		
Arkansas	X				X	80 <sup>g</sup>	X	
California	X				X	100		
Colorado	X			X			X	
Connecticut			X	X	X		X	Not all SSI recipients reported to UEG 11-12, as expected.
Delaware	X						X	1931 coverage continued to expand in 2007, contributing to shift from UEG 44-45 to UEG 14-15 and 34.
District of Columbia	X				X	100		Noticeable shifts of enrollees from UEG 12 and 15 to 41-42 in January.
Florida	X			X	X	88	X	
Georgia	X				X		X	
Hawaii			X		X	100		Poverty-related pregnant women reported to UEG 55 instead of UEG 35 due to state coding limitations. Decline in enrollment in UEG 44-45 in July 2007 due to new citizenship verification requirements.
Idaho		X		X			X	Continuous shift from UEG 14 and 44 to 34 as ID implemented its Medicaid Modernization Plan.
Illinois			X	X	X	85		
Indiana			X	X				
Iowa	X				X		X	
Kansas		X			X		X	
Kentucky	X			X	X		X	
Louisiana	X			X	X		X	Most low-income infants are reported to UEG 44 because the state deems these newborns eligible for Medicaid until age 1.
Maine	X			X	X	100	X	ME used poverty-related and M-CHIP expansions (UEG 34) to establish Medicaid eligibility for most children. In April, enrollment in UEG 31-32 increased when ME increased its income disregard for QMB coverage (the number of dual eligibles also increased at this time).
Maryland	X			X	X		X	MD reports individuals who receive refugee medical assistance to MAX although these enrollees may not be covered through Title XIX.
Massachusetts	X				X	100 <sup>h</sup>		
Michigan	X				X	100	X	MI revised its reporting to UEGs in October 2007 causing about 100,000 enrollees to move from UEGs 44-45 to UEGs 14-15.
Minnesota			X	X	X	95		

Table 6. Other Key Medicaid Eligibility Provisions Related to Uniform Eligibility Group (UEG) Reporting in MAX 2007 <sup>a</sup>

	Medicaid Eligibility For SSI Recipients							
	Automatic Eligibility <sup>b</sup>	SSI Criteria <sup>b</sup>	Section 209(b) <sup>b</sup>	State- Administered SSI Supplement <sup>c</sup>	Medically Needy Eligibility <sup>d</sup>	Full Benefit Poverty- Related Expansion for Aged and Disabled (FPL percent) <sup>e</sup>	Special Income Level for Institutionalized <sup>f</sup>	Reporting Anomalies
Mississippi	X						X	Section 1931 and TMA enrollees reported to UEG 14-15 due to state coding limitations.
Missouri			X	X				Section 1931 and TMA enrollees reported to UEG 14-15 due to state coding limitations. Some children moved from UEG 54 to 34 due to the ending of an 1115 waiver.
Montana	X				X		X	
Nebraska		X		X	X	100	X	
Nevada		X					X	Enrollment in UEG 16-17 dropped in October 2007, cause unknown.
New Hampshire			X	X	X		X	
New Jersey	X				X	100	X	
New Mexico	X			X			X	The UEG assignment for enrollees in state-specific group '074' (working disabled) was corrected starting in January 2007 causing a shift of about 1,600 enrollees from UEG 32 to 42. Reporting to UEG 44 increased temporarily from April - June to address a problem with the state's recertification process.
New York	X			X	X			
North Carolina	X			X	X	100		
North Dakota			X		X			ND has a BCCPTA program but these enrollees are not reported to UEG 3A.
Ohio			X	X			X	Some Section 1931 children and adults may be reported to UEG 44-45 in error, instead of UEG 14-15. In January, aged and disabled enrollment in UEG 31-32 and 41-42 shifted when OH corrected reporting for full benefit duals. Also in January, enrollment shifted from UEG 35 to 34 when reporting for children improved. Enrollment also shifted from UEG 31-32 and 41-42 to 11-12 when OH fixed its SSI indicator in October 2007.
Oklahoma			X	X		100	X	
Oregon		X		X			X	
Pennsylvania	X				X	100	X	
Rhode Island	X				X	100	X	Some Section 1931 enrollees reported to UEG 44-45 instead of UEG 14-15, as expected, due to state coding limitations.
South Carolina	X			X		100	X	
South Dakota	X			X			X	
Tennessee	X				X		X	UEG 11-12 enrollment greater than expected due to long-standing court case requiring TN to maintain Medicaid eligibility for persons leaving SSI.

Table 6. Other Key Medicaid Eligibility Provisions Related to Uniform Eligibility Group (UEG) Reporting in MAX 2007 <sup>a</sup>

Medicaid Eligibility For SSI Recipients								Reporting Anomalies
Automatic Eligibility <sup>b</sup>	SSI Criteria <sup>b</sup>	Section 209(b) <sup>b</sup>	State-Administered SSI Supplement <sup>c</sup>	Medically Needy Eligibility <sup>d</sup>	Full Benefit Poverty-Related Expansion for Aged and Disabled (FPL percent) <sup>e</sup>	Special Income Level for Institutionalized <sup>f</sup>		
Texas	X		X	X		X	Enrollment in UEG 35 increases more than 50 percent during 2007 due to an expansion of coverage for pregnant women in two-parent families. Also, TX has a so-called 1929(b) waiver group reported to UEG 41-42 for enrollees who only qualify for limited set of personal services and no prescription drugs.	
Utah		X		X	100	X		
Vermont	X			X		X	Starting in January 2007, VT started reporting some partial duals to UEG 31-32 when the state was able to include new enrollees in its reporting that received cost-sharing benefits, but no Pharm Plus.	
Virginia			X	X	X	80	X	VA used poverty-related expansions (UEG 34) to establish Medicaid eligibility for most children. Also, both Section 1931 and TMA adults are reported to UEG 45 due to state coding limitations.
Washington	X		X	X		X	Enrollment in UEG 55 declined throughout 2007 due to recertifications of family planning benefits that found duplicated clients who were subsequently removed.	
West Virginia	X			X		X		
Wisconsin	X		X	X		X		
Wyoming	X		X			X		
Total	33	7	11	30	34	20	39	

<sup>a</sup> Medicaid eligibility expansions that result from 1115 waivers are reported in Table 7. CHIP eligibility provisions are presented in Table 4.

<sup>b</sup> States have three options with regard to Medicaid eligibility for SSI recipients. In most states, SSI recipients are automatically enrolled in Medicaid without a separate Medicaid application. In SSI criteria states, SSI recipients are eligible for Medicaid but have to apply separately for the program. Section 209(b) states require a separate Medicaid application for SSI recipients and use more restrictive Medicaid eligibility requirements for SSI recipients than those of the SSI program. In Section 209(b) and SSI criteria states, the number of SSI enrollees reported to UEG 11-12 may be lower than the number of SSI recipients reported by SSA.

<sup>c</sup> Source: State Assistance Program for SSI Recipients, January 2007, SSA Publication No 13-11975. In states with state-administered SSI supplements, the number of enrollees reported to UEG 11-12 may be higher than the number of SSI recipients reported by SSA. SSI recipients should be reported to UEG 11-12.

<sup>d</sup> States can expand Medicaid eligibility by opting to implement medically needy programs that allow higher income and/or resource standards for persons otherwise eligible for Medicaid. In determining countable income, medically needy programs must allow individuals to "spend down" income on incurred medical expenses. Medically needy enrollees should be reported to UEG 21-25.

<sup>e</sup> States have the option to extend full Medicaid benefits to aged and disabled persons whose income does not exceed the federal poverty level. Some states have opted to use levels somewhat below the full federal poverty level. Persons using this eligibility pathway should be reported to UEG 31-32.

<sup>f</sup> States have the option to set a special income standard at up to 300 percent of the SSI level (\$1869 per month in 2007) for individuals in nursing facilities and other institutions. Persons using this eligibility pathway should be reported to UEG 41-42.

<sup>g</sup> AR only extended this optional coverage to the aged, not the disabled.

<sup>h</sup> MA used 133 percent FPL for the disabled.

Table 7. Section 1115 Waiver Reporting and Eligibility Expansions in MAX 2007

[illegible]

Table 7. Section 1115 Waiver Reporting and Eligibility Expansions in MAX 2007

State	MAX 1115 Waiver ID(s)	June 2007 Enrollment	December 2007 Enrollment	Waiver Expands Eligibility and/or Extends Targeted Coverage to a Special Population									
				Aged Expansion	Disabled Expansion	Children Expansion	Pregnant Women Expansion	Parents/ Caretakers Expansion	Childless Adult Expansion	Special Population: Hurricane Katrina Evacuees	Special Population: Family Planning Only Enrollees	Special Population: HIV Positive Individuals	Special Population: Prescription Drug Only Enrollees
Florida	23 <sup>c</sup>	22,562	23,321	X	X								
Hawaii	H1	149,574	148,161		X	X	X	X	X				
Idaho	No ID	NR	NR										
Illinois	A1	0	0										X
Illinois	A2	18,888	0			X	X	X					
Illinois	A3	38,680	38,923								X		
Indiana	No 1115 waiver	NA	NA							X			
Iowa	W1	21,484	22,782								X		
Iowa	X1, H1	18,716	21,608			X	X	X	X				
Kansas	No 1115 waiver	NA	NA										
Kentucky	MC	0 <sup>d</sup>	137,663										
Louisiana	FP	19,085	36,195								X		
Maine	10	285	278									X	
Maine	11	20,618	19,151						X				
Maryland	HC	539,166	559,901		X			X	X		X		
Massachusetts	B, C, D, E, F, G, H, I, M, 1, 2, 3 <sup>e</sup>	849,964	872,559		X	X	X	X	X			X	
Michigan	AB	52,538	50,050						X				
Michigan	FP	36,196	27,279								X		
Minnesota	B1 <sup>f</sup>	326,882	324,610			X	X	X					

Table 7. Section 1115 Waiver Reporting and Eligibility Expansions in MAX 2007

[illegible]

Table 7. Section 1115 Waiver Reporting and Eligibility Expansions in MAX 2007

State	MAX 1115 Waiver ID(s)	June 2007 Enrollment	December 2007 Enrollment	Waiver Expands Eligibility and/or Extends Targeted Coverage to a Special Population									
				Aged Expansion	Disabled Expansion	Children Expansion	Pregnant Women Expansion	Parents/ Caretakers Expansion	Childless Adult Expansion	Special Population: Hurricane Katrina Evacuees	Special Population: Family Planning Only Enrollees	Special Population: HIV Positive Individuals	Special Population: Prescription Drug Only Enrollees
Oklahoma	WF	413,981	411,259		X			X	X				
Oklahoma	WH	19,772	20,287								X		
Oregon	A2	268	238										
Oregon	A7	345,548	347,436			X	X	X	X				
Oregon	AC	0	0								NR		
Pennsylvania	FP	0	6								X		
Rhode Island	RC	120,306	117,477			X	X	X			X		
South Carolina	WF	54,034	52,008								X		
South Dakota	No 1115 waiver	NA	NA										
Tennessee	01	1,257,927	1,289,761	X	X	X		X	X				
Texas	H1	0	0								NR		
Utah	06	18,622	19,603				X	X	X				
Vermont	L1, L2, L3, L4	4,465	4,932	X	X								
Vermont	G1, G2, G3, G4, G5, G6, G7	98,551	101,001		X	X	X	X	X				X



Table 7. Section 1115 Waiver Reporting and Eligibility Expansions in MAX 2007

State	MAX 1115 Waiver ID(s)	June 2007 Enrollment	December 2007 Enrollment	Waiver Expands Eligibility and/or Extends Targeted Coverage to a Special Population									
				Aged Expansion	Disabled Expansion	Children Expansion	Pregnant Women Expansion	Parents/ Caretakers Expansion	Childless Adult Expansion	Special Population: Hurricane Katrina Evacuees	Special Population: Family Planning Only Enrollees	Special Population: HIV Positive Individuals	Special Population: Prescription Drug Only Enrollees
Virginia	F1	10,736	9,886								X		
Washington	TC	75,306	66,736								X	<sup>z</sup>	
West Virginia	No 1115 waiver	NA	NA										
Wisconsin	A1, B1	98,684	99,745			X		X					
Wisconsin	C1	68,223	65,290										X
Wisconsin	D1	52,123	53,396								X		
Wisconsin	E1	2,527	2,802										
Wyoming	No 1115 waiver	NA	NA										
Total X				4	10	13	10	17	16	1	25	3	3
Total NR/incomplete/				74	68	65	68	61	62	77	53	75	75
Total				78	78	78	78	78	78	78	78	78	78

Note: Some 1115 waivers have multiple waiver IDs to identify various waiver components. See the MAX 2007 waiver crosswalk for additional details of state waiver reporting in MAX.

<sup>a</sup> Enrollment in the childless adults waiver increased in March due to the transfer of enrollee's in DC's Alliance program.

<sup>b</sup> FL indicated that some individuals in its missing Medicaid Reform waiver may have been reported to the state's 1915(b) Medipass waiver (waiver ID 05).

<sup>c</sup> Enrollment in FL's MEDS AD may be undercounted.

<sup>d</sup> KY's 1115 Healthcare Partnership waiver was active but not reported in MAX from September 2005 through September 2007.

<sup>e</sup> Enrollment may be under-reported in 2007. Individuals who received premium-assistance toward the purchase of private health insurance through the Commonwealth Care program were not reported in MAX 2007.

<sup>f</sup> About 1,500 persons in MN each month with RBF 2 (emergency services for aliens) were incorrectly assigned to the PMAP plus waiver.

<sup>g</sup> About 10 percent of enrollees in this MS waiver for aged and disabled nonduals in 2007 were reported as dual eligibles, probably related to issues of timely Medicare enrollment information.

<sup>h</sup> MO moved its family planning enrollees to a separate waiver beginning in October 2007.

<sup>i</sup> Waiver enrollment in NJ for CHIP parents/caretakers aged 21 and over previously reported to waiver ID '10' now reported to waiver ID '08'.

NR = not reported

NA = not applicable

Table 8. Reporting of Medicaid Enrollees with Restricted Medicaid Benefits in MAX 2007

	Aliens with Emergency Coverage Only (RBF=2)	Duals with Medicare Cost- Sharing Only (RBF=3)	Pregnancy Related Services Only (RBF=4)	Family Planning Only (RBF=6)	Alternative Benchmark Plan (RBF=7)	Pharm Plus Non-Duals (RBF=X)	Pharm Plus Duals with Medicare Cost Sharing (RBF=Y)	Pharm Plus Duals Without Medicare Cost Sharing (RBF=Z)	Other (RBF=5)	Description of Other (RBF=5) Group
Alabama	X	X	X	X						
Alaska		X	X							
Arizona	X	X		X						
Arkansas		X		X						
California	X	X	X	X					X	Hospice enrollees with some restrictions
Colorado	X	X								
Connecticut		X								
Delaware	X	X		X						
District of Columbia	X	X	X							
Florida	X	X	X	X					X	Many medically needy enrollees with slightly reduced benefits
Georgia	X	X	X <sup>a</sup>						X	Presumptively eligible women in UEG 3A
Hawaii	X	X								
Idaho		X	X		X					
Illinois	X	X	X	X		X		X		
Indiana	X	X	X							
Iowa	X	X	X	X <sup>b</sup>						
Kansas	X	X			NR <sup>c</sup>					
Kentucky	X	X	X		NR <sup>d</sup>					
Louisiana	X	X	X	X					X	Many medically needy eligibles and some poverty-related pregnant women with substance abuse care restrictions
Maine	X	X	X							
Maryland	X	X		X					X	1115 adults with limited benefits
Massachusetts	X	X	X <sup>e</sup>						X	Enrollees in UEG 44-45 and 54-55 with slightly reduced benefits package
Michigan	X	X		X					X	Adult M-CHIP enrollees, with no inpatient coverage
Minnesota	X	X		X					X	Aged in UN2854 with "access" services only and some children and adults with unknown benefits
Mississippi	X	X	X	X					X	Low-income infants in UEG 34 with no dental or eyeglass coverage
Missouri		X	X	X						
Montana		X							X	1115 parents and caretaker relatives, BCCTA enrollees, "Team Care" recipients with some benefit restrictions
Nebraska	X <sup>f</sup>	X								
Nevada	X	X	X						X	<15 enrollees each month, benefit restrictions unknown
New Hampshire		X								
New Jersey	X	X	X						X	1915(c) waiver enrollees and nursing home recipients with dual code 59 not eligible for Rx benefits
New Mexico	X	X	X	X <sup>g</sup>					X	M-CHIP adults with slightly reduced benefits
New York	X	X	X	X					X	State groups 68-69 (Family Health Plus) with no LTC coverage and other enrollees with some capitated services
North Carolina	X	X	X	X					X	Many medically needy enrollees with slightly reduced benefits
North Dakota	X	X								
Ohio		X								
Oklahoma	X	X	X	X					X	<25 enrollees each month, benefit restrictions unknown
Oregon	X	X		NR					X	1115 expansion adults with slightly reduced benefits
Pennsylvania	X	X	X	X					X	Many medically needy enrollees with slightly reduced benefits
Rhode Island	X	X	X	X					X	Many medically needy enrollees with slightly reduced benefits
South Carolina	X	X		X						<5 enrollees each month, benefit restrictions unknown
South Dakota	X	X	X							
Tennessee	X	X	X							

Table 8. Reporting of Medicaid Enrollees with Restricted Medicaid Benefits in MAX 2007

	Aliens with Emergency Coverage Only (RBF=2)	Duals with Medicare Cost- Sharing Only (RBF=3)	Pregnancy Related Services Only (RBF=4)	Family Planning Only (RBF=6)	Alternative Benchmark Plan (RBF=7)	Pharm Plus Non-Duals (RBF=X)	Pharm Plus Duals with Medicare Cost Sharing (RBF=Y)	Pharm Plus Duals Without Medicare Cost Sharing (RBF=Z)	Other (RBF=5)	Description of Other (RBF=5) Group
Texas	X	X	X						X	1929(b) waiver enrollees using LTC at home and some medically needy with slightly reduced benefits
Utah	X	X <sup>h</sup>							X	Some Primary Care Network 1115 waiver enrollees with slightly reduced benefits
Vermont		X				X	X	X	X	Small number of 1115 LTC waiver enrollees only eligible for 3 home health services; some persons in UEG 55 with some benefit restrictions
Virginia	X	X		X	NR <sup>i</sup>				X	Many medically needy enrollees with slightly reduced benefits
Washington		X		X					X	Many medically needy enrollees with slightly reduced benefits
West Virginia		X			X					
Wisconsin	X	X	X	X		X	X	X	X	TB enrollees eligible for only TB-related services
Wyoming	X	X	X						X	<10 enrollees each month, benefit restrictions unknown
Total X	40	51	29	24	2	3	2	3	26	
Total NR/incomplete	0	0	0	1	3	0	0	0	0	
Total	40	51	29	25	5	3	2	3	26	

<sup>a</sup> In GA, only presumptively eligible pregnant women were assigned RBF 4.

<sup>b</sup> In IA, some people covered under the Family Planning waiver also receive other Medicaid coverage. These enrollees do not receive restricted benefits flag 6.

<sup>c</sup> Starting in September 2007, KS offered an alternative benefit package to enrollees in the working disabled group; however, these enrollees were reported to RBF 1 (full Medicaid benefits) through 2007.

<sup>d</sup> In May 2006, KY began to use 4 alternative benefit packages; however, all enrollees continued to be assigned RBF 1 (full Medicaid benefits) through 2007.

<sup>e</sup> MA stopped reporting to RBF 4 (pregnancy-related services) in October 2007, cause unknown.

<sup>f</sup> NE underreports RBF 2 (emergency services for aliens) due to a problem with the state's reporting system.

<sup>g</sup> In NM, a few persons (<80 each month) are reported to waiver type F (family planning only) but were not assigned RBF 6 (family planning only).

<sup>h</sup> In UT, several hundred persons with RBF 3 were reported as full benefit duals (2, 4 or 8 in the second byte of the dual code), and some were not reported as duals (0 in the second byte of the dual code).

<sup>i</sup> VA has a disease management program that was approved by CMS as an alternative benefit package; however, these enrollees are reported to RBF 1 (full Medicaid benefits) through 2007.

Table 9. Reporting of Managed Care Enrollment in MAX 2007

	Percent with HMO/HIO or PACE Enrollment							Other Managed Care Enrollment Reporting							Inconsistencies Between MAX and CMS June 2007 Managed Care Data
	All Full- Benefit Enrollees	Aged	Disabled	Child	Adult	EDB Duals	1915(c) Waiver Enrollees	Dental (MC=2)	BHO (MC=3)	LTC MC (MC=5)	PACE (MC=6)	PCCM (MC=7)	Other (MC=8)	Other Plan (MC=8) Description	
Alabama	1.0	6.0	2.8	0.0	0.0	6.9 <sup>a</sup>	4.1					X	X	PHP Network - inpatient care for those without Medicare Part A	Global fee prenatal/ delivery plan not reported in MAX; PCCM reporting 18% lower in CMS data; United Medicare Complete HMO for duals not reported in CMS data
Alaska	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0								
Arizona	87.5 <sup>b</sup>	60.3	71.9	92.2	89.1	68.7	NA		X	X					CMS data underreports BHO by 11% and has 12% fewer in LTC; LTC plans reported as HMOs in CMS data
Arkansas	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0					X	X	Transportation	PCCM reporting is 23% lower than in CMS data
California	58.3	16.9	24.2	70.7	73.7	17.9	21.8	X			X		X	Hybrid PCCM	Senior Care Action Network reported as HMO in MAX but "Other" in CMS data; hybrid FFS/ PHP dental plans and hybrid PCCM plans reported in MAX but not CMS
Colorado	11.8 <sup>c</sup>	11.0	10.8	12.5	10.3	9.1	4.8		X		X	X			PCCM enrollment is 89% greater than in CMS data
Connecticut	72.6	0.0	1.3	94.5	87.9	1.2	0.4								
Delaware	81.3	5.4	60.6	87.0	87.9	12.8	3.8					X	X	Transportation	CMS data does not include Transportation plan and DE's non- capitated PCCM reported as Other
District of Columbia	69.0	0.3	12.2	91.3	93.6	2.3	0.8						X <sup>d</sup>	Transportation	"Health Services for Children with Special Needs" reported as HMO in MAX but PIHP in CMS data
Florida	43.7	16.1	30.9	53.3	38.7	14.2	29.9	X	X		X	X <sup>e</sup>	X	DMP	Transportation plan not reported in MAX data; Provider Service Network reported as Other in CMS data but as PCCM in MAX
Georgia	72.7 <sup>f</sup>	0.0	4.2	91.5	86.9	1.2	0.6		X <sup>g</sup>			X <sup>g</sup>	X <sup>h</sup>		Transportation plan not reported in CMS data
Hawaii	79.4	1.1	13.1	98.4	95.4	2.7	0.6		X			<sup>i</sup>			

Table 9. Reporting of Managed Care Enrollment in MAX 2007

	Percent with HMO/HIO or PACE Enrollment							Other Managed Care Enrollment Reporting							Inconsistencies Between MAX and CMS June 2007 Managed Care Data
	All Full- Benefit Enrollees	Aged	Disabled	Child	Adult	EDB Duals	1915(c) Waiver Enrollees	Dental (MC=2)	BHO (MC=3)	LTC MC (MC=5)	PACE (MC=6)	PCCM (MC=7)	Other (MC=8)	Other Plan (MC=8) Description	
Idaho	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	X				X	X	Medicaid- Medicare Coordinated Plan	
Illinois	7.1	0.1	0.1	9.2	7.5	0.1	0.1				X	X	X	Primary Health Providers & Managed Care Community Networks	MAX MC=8 plans reported as HMOs in CMS data. PCCM counts in MSIS are about 30 percent higher than counts in CMS June 2007 report (cause unknown)
Indiana	74.9	0.1	14.4	91.8	88.0	1.3	0.7					X <sup>j</sup>			
Iowa	1.7	0.0	0.1	2.4	1.8	0.0	0.0		X			X			
Kansas	57.6	0.7	2.1	77.0	78.1	1.2	1.6		NR <sup>k</sup>		X	X			
Kentucky	21.7	8.7	17.5	25.0	21.6	13.5	2.7					X	X	Transportation	Transportation plan not reported in CMS June 2007 report
Louisiana	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0				X	X			
Maine	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0					X			
Maryland	84.4	1.6	60.7	97.0	87.3	8.2	35.0				X				PAC program is reported as HMO in MAX but as PAHP in CMS June 2007 report
Massachusetts	39.9	9.1	15.8	60.7	40.0	6.3	3.3		X		X	X			Senior Care Options plans are reported as PACE plans in MAX but as HMO in CMS June 2007 report. Behavioral Health Partnership plan is reported as a BHO in MAX but as a PIHP in CMS report
Michigan	70.0 <sup>l</sup>	2.7	51.9	81.9	72.9	7.4	2.9	X	X		X				Dental plan not reported in CMS data
Minnesota	70.8	64.4	8.3	86.1	80.9	40.8	61.5								
Mississippi	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0								
Missouri	45.5	0.2	1.7	61.9	56.6	0.6	0.9				X		NR	Transportation	Transportation plan not reported in MAX data
Montana	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0					X			
Nebraska	16.9	1.4	9.7	19.7	19.7	0.9	0.3		X			X			
Nevada	57.8	0.0	1.8	72.1	70.8	0.9	0.0						X	Transportation	
New Hampshire	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0						NR		DMP plan not reported in MAX data
New Jersey	73.8	7.6	37.9	92.0	90.1	11.0	16.6								

Table 9. Reporting of Managed Care Enrollment in MAX 2007

	Percent with HMO/HIO or PACE Enrollment							Other Managed Care Enrollment Reporting							Inconsistencies Between MAX and CMS June 2007 Managed Care Data
	All Full- Benefit Enrollees	Aged	Disabled	Child	Adult	EDB Duals	1915(c) Waiver Enrollees	Dental (MC=2)	BHO (MC=3)	LTC MC (MC=5)	PACE (MC=6)	PCCM (MC=7)	Other (MC=8)	Other Plan (MC=8) Description	
New Mexico	74.7	1.7	52.9	81.3	79.7	6.3	29.7		X						PACE plan not reported in MAX data
New York	69.2	10.5	29.4	80.8	85.4	6.3	3.6		X	X	X	X			
North Carolina	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0		X			X			
North Dakota	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0					X	NR	Disease Management	In October 2007, ND implemented Experience Health plan. This plan is not reported in MAX data
Ohio	76.5 <sup>m</sup>	5.2	43.3	89.6	90.0	5.2	2.5				NR				PACE plan not reported in MAX data but reported in CMS June 2007 report
Oklahoma	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0					X	X	Hybrid PCCM & transportation	
Oregon	76.8	51.3	67.4	81.3	82.2	57.1	52.8	X	X		X	X	NR	Transportation	Transportation plan not reported in MAX data as managed care plan but does appear as 1915(b) waiver. Plan is reported in CMS June 2007 report
Pennsylvania	63.4	6.9	55.0	75.5	73.7	6.9	24.6		X	X	X	X			DMP reported separately in CMS but combined with HMO in MAX data
Rhode Island	70.0	0.4	12.7	94.5	93.2	2.1	2.1				X <sup>n</sup>				Dental plan not reported in MAX data
South Carolina	17.0	0.6	8.1	22.8	14.8	0.8	0.3				X	X	X	Physician's Enhanced Program (PEP) hybrid (PCP + gatekeeper); Transportation <sup>o</sup>	PEP reported as ambulatory plan in CMS data; transportation reported in MAX but not CMS data
South Dakota	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	X <sup>p</sup>				X			
Tennessee	30.1 <sup>q</sup>	30.7	23.5	32.3	32.0	29.0	29.8		X		X				Non-risk bearing plans reported in CMS but not MAX data
Texas	50.7	19.4	31.7	59.5	42.4	21.1	10.5		X			X			PACE plan not reported in MAX data
Utah	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0		X <sup>r</sup>	X		X	X	Transportation <sup>s</sup>	LTC not reported in CMS data; PIHP plans are reported in CMS data but are considered non-risk based plans and not included in MAX data

Table 9. Reporting of Managed Care Enrollment in MAX 2007

	Percent with HMO/HIO or PACE Enrollment							Other Managed Care Enrollment Reporting							Inconsistencies Between MAX and CMS June 2007 Managed Care Data
	All Full- Benefit Enrollees	Aged	Disabled	Child	Adult	EDB Duals	1915(c) Waiver Enrollees	Dental (MC=2)	BHO (MC=3)	LTC MC (MC=5)	PACE (MC=6)	PCCM (MC=7)	Other (MC=8)	Other Plan (MC=8) Description	
Vermont	0.0	0.2	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.1	NA				X	X			Global Commitment to Health program is reported as HMO in CMS data but as FFS in MAX
Virginia	64.6	3.8	41.1	77.1	77.0	3.4	3.2					X			Uncapitated transportation reported in CMS but not MAX data
Washington	65.4	1.6	6.1	84.4	79.8	2.4	NA		X		X	X			DMP reported as PCCM in MAX but PAHP in CMS data
West Virginia	52.5	0.0	2.6	79.9	70.4	0.9	0.6					X			
Wisconsin	59.4	4.5	2.9	77.7	74.7	3.7	NA		X	X	X		X	Voluntary "Independent Care Plan"	Independent Care Plan reported as HMO in CMS data
Wyoming	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0								
Total X	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	6	19	5	19	31	15		
Total NR	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	0	1	0	1	0	4		
Total	48.8	11.1	23.1	57.4	60.3	10.7	13.1	6	20	5	20	31	19		

<sup>a</sup> AL's United Medicare Complete covers copays and deductibles for dual eligibles.

<sup>b</sup> AZ's managed care data included some reporting errors. Family planning only capitated plans were erroneously reported as HMOs; Indian Health Service (Plan ID '999998') should have been reported as fee-for-service, not managed care; and all HMO enrollees should also have had enrollment in the state's BHO plan (Plan ID '079999', plan type 3).

<sup>c</sup> Managed care enrollment decreased in CO in 2007 when Medicaid HMO coverage ended.

<sup>d</sup> Reporting in DC's transportation plan did not begin until October 2007.

<sup>e</sup> Persons in both plan type 07 (PCCM) and plan type 3 (BHO) are shown only having the latter, resulting in FL's undercounting of PCCM enrollment during 2007.

<sup>f</sup> Managed care enrollment among full-benefit enrollees in GA increased in 2007, cause unknown.

<sup>g</sup> GA reported its Mental Health 1915(b) program (preadmission screening and annual resident review/PASRR) to plan type 07 (PCCM) instead of plan type 03 (BHO) by mistake.

<sup>h</sup> Reporting of GA's transportation plan began in MAX 2007 even though the program was incorporated via state plan in July 2006 and had existed previously via 1915(b) waiver.

<sup>i</sup> HI has a pre-PACE program that is correctly reported as an HMO/HIO in MAX.

<sup>j</sup> In November 2007, PCCM enrollment was interrupted when IN implemented Care Select, a new PCCM program.

<sup>k</sup> In July 2007, KS implemented BHO plans. These plans are reported in MAX 2007 claims but not enrollment data.

<sup>l</sup> Managed care enrollment among full-benefit enrollees in MI declined in 2007, cause unknown.

<sup>m</sup> Managed care enrollment in OH increased in 2007 when the state expanded coverage for SSI-eligibles and introduced new plans.

<sup>n</sup> Pace reporting in RI started in January but is not reliable until October 2007.

<sup>o</sup> Reporting in SC's transportation plan did not begin until May 2007.

<sup>p</sup> SD misreported partial duals as belonging to its dental program.

<sup>q</sup> TN introduced Medicaid HMO coverage on a regional basis in 2007.

<sup>r</sup> UT's BHO reporting was unreliable from January - June 2007.

<sup>s</sup> Reporting in UT's transportation plan did not begin in MAX until October 2007.

NR = not reported

Table 10. Private Health Insurance Coverage and TANF Status in MAX 2007

Private Health Insurance Coverage among Medicaid Enrollees			TANF Status	
	June Percent Enrollees with Private Health Insurance (PVT INS CD = 2-4) <sup>a</sup>	Other Reporting Anomalies	TANF code 9- Filled <sup>b</sup>	Inconsistencies between MAX and ACF TANF December 2007 Data
Alabama	8.9		X	
Alaska	62.3	Higher rate due to Native Americans with Indian Health Service coverage and erroneous reporting of Medicare as private health insurance	X	
Arizona	4.0			
Arkansas	5.0	AR data not reliable	X	
California	4.1		Partial <sup>c</sup>	MAX lower due to L.A. County data
Colorado	2.8		X	
Connecticut	4.9	CT data 9-filled for duals	X	
Delaware	4.4		X	
District of Columbia	2.2			MAX higher due to inclusion of state- funded TANF enrollees
Florida	6.2		X	
Georgia	4.0		X	
Hawaii	10.8		X	
Idaho	10.4	ID data 9-filled for duals	X	
Illinois	7.0			MAX higher due to inclusion of TANF "0-grant" enrollees
Indiana	7.7		X	
Iowa	13.1		X	
Kansas	11.0		X	
Kentucky	7.4		X <sup>d</sup>	
Louisiana	5.2		X	
Maine	8.1		X	
Maryland	4.8		X	
Massachusetts	11.4			
Michigan	8.4		X	
Minnesota	10.4		X	
Mississippi	4.8		X	
Missouri	5.8			
Montana	9.0		X	



Table 10. Private Health Insurance Coverage and TANF Status in MAX 2007

	Private Health Insurance Coverage among Medicaid Enrollees		TANF Status	
	June Percent Enrollees with Private Health Insurance (PVT INS CD = 2-4) <sup>a</sup>	Other Reporting Anomalies	TANF code 9-Filled <sup>b</sup>	Inconsistencies between MAX and ACF TANF December 2007 Data
Nebraska	2.6			MAX higher due to inclusion of state-funded TANF enrollees
Nevada	8.9			MAX TANF enrollment unreliable Oct-Dec 2007
New Hampshire	7.6			MAX higher (cause unknown)
New Jersey	7.7			
New Mexico	4.7		X	
New York	6.2			
North Carolina	7.2			
North Dakota	19.1			MAX higher (cause unknown)
Ohio	13.5			
Oklahoma	7.5		X	
Oregon	5.2			
Pennsylvania	8.7			MAX higher (cause unknown)
Rhode Island	22.1	RI data 9-filled for duals; insurance data not reliable until October 2007	X	
South Carolina	6.2		X	
South Dakota	13.2		X	
Tennessee	1.5		X	
Texas	6.2			MAX higher (cause unknown)
Utah	12.7		X	
Vermont	12.9	October 2007 VT implemented ESI program as part of Global Commitment 1115 waiver		
Virginia	7.2		X	
Washington	9.2			
West Virginia	7.3	Most enrollees 9-filled are partial duals	X	
Wisconsin	22.3	High percent of insurance primarily due to Pharm Plus enrollees with coverage	X	
Wyoming	8.0		X	
Total	7.0		33	

<sup>a</sup> Values less than 2 or greater than 15 percent are outside of the expected range and are considered anomalous.

<sup>b</sup> The majority of states do not report TANF status information for Medicaid enrollees in MAX (TANF code is 9-filled).

<sup>c</sup> CA 9-filled the TANF code for enrollees in L.A. County.

<sup>d</sup> KY 9-filled TANF through September 2007 but started reporting TANF enrollment in MAX in October 2007.

Table 11. Section 1915(c) Home and Community-Based Services (HCBS) Waiver Reporting in MAX 2007 <sup>a</sup>

State	Number Enrolled in 1915(c) Waiver, by Waiver Type (Most Recent)											Percent of HCBS Service Recipients with no 1915(c) Waiver Enrollment <sup>b</sup>	Percent of 1915 (c) Waiver Enrollees with No Waiver claim (PGM TYPE = 6 or 7) <sup>c</sup>	Waiver Type/ID for Active 1915 (c) Waivers Not Reported in MAX 2007	Reporting Anomalies
	Number Ever Enrolled in a 1915(c) Waiver	Aged and Disabled (WVR TYPE = G)	Aged (WVR TYPE = H)	Physically Disabled (WVR TYPE = I)	People with Brain Injuries (WVR TYPE = J)	People with HIV/ AIDS (WVR TYPE = K)	People with MR/ DD (WVR TYPE = L)	People with MI/SED (WVR TYPE = M)	Technologically Dependent/ Medically Fragile (WVR TYPE = N)	People with Autism/ Spectrum Disorder (WVR TYPE = P)					

Alabama	15,149	8,963	0	611	0	36	5,535	0	4	0	0.8	2.1		
Alaska	3,900	0	1,518	1,087	0	0	1,063	0	232	0	18.6	3.1		
Arizona	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0.0	0.0		
Arkansas	13,408	346	7,285	2,209	0	0	3,568	0	0	0	0.5	20.9		
California	93,932	311	13,666	1,369	0	2,471	76,115	0	0	0	1.7	6.4	G(18) <sup>d</sup>	
Colorado	29,830	18,280	5	1,236	275	69	7,673	2,292	0	0	2.8	4.1	<sup>e</sup>	I(KB) dropped dramatically from June to July due to administrative change
Connecticut	20,897	0	11,587	822	387	0	8,101	0	0	0	1.0	3.3		
Delaware	2,871	1,337	0	0	0	687	847	0	0	0	0.9	3.9		
District of Columbia	3,292	2,163	0	0	0	2	1,127	0	0	0	6.3	16.8		
Florida	59,075	12,805	15,918	4	314	303	29,731	0	0	0	17.6	25.1	G(13), K(14), L (16) <sup>f</sup>	Seeming underreporting of several 1915(c) waivers at beginning of month
Georgia	24,529	12,530	0	831	0	0	10,343	0	825	0	0.6	8.4		
Hawaii	4,943	2,317	0	0	0	60	2,509	0	57	0	5.1	8.8		
Idaho	10,884	8,618	0	0	0	0	2,266	0	0	0	0.3	8.5		L(06) active waiver with no enrollment
Illinois	104,741	5,008	40,261	36,992	4,984	1,971	14,915	0	610	0	8.9	31.4	L(D1, D2)	H(B2) aged waiver covers 60-64 year olds
Indiana	17,382	7,033	0	0	134	0	9,840	23	0	352	2.2	3.0		
Iowa	26,911	0	11,616	3,580	1,173	56	10,486	0	0	0	3.2	3.3		<sup>g</sup>
Kansas	28,659	0	8,168	8,094	273	0	8,037	4,033	54	0	0.5	8.7		
Kentucky	15,810	12,543	0	0	147	0	3,053	0	67	0	62.8	3.0		G(HC) should be reported as G(HB)
Louisiana	12,090	4,226	0	0	0	0	7,864	0	0	0	45.2	17.4		
Maine	4,302	851	0	622	0	0	2,829	0	0	0	0.0	100.0		
Maryland	16,478	3,635	0	470	30	0	11,218	0	222	903	1.8	5.7		
Massachusetts	19,735	0	7,665	0	102	0	11,968	0	0	0	3.5	1.0	P(No ID)	
Michigan	9,916	9,340	0	0	0	0	546	30	0	0	0.7	4.1	M(SD) <sup>h</sup>	

Table 11. Section 1915(c) Home and Community-Based Services (HCBS) Waiver Reporting in MAX 2007 <sup>a</sup>

State	Number Enrolled in 1915(c) Waiver, by Waiver Type (Most Recent)										Percent of HCBS Service Recipients with no 1915(c) Waiver Enrollment <sup>b</sup>	Percent of 1915 (c) Waiver Enrollees with No Waiver claim (PGM TYPE = 6 or 7) <sup>c</sup>	Waiver Type/ID for Active 1915 (c) Waivers Not Reported in MAX 2007	Reporting Anomalies
	Number Ever Enrolled in a 1915(c) Waiver	Aged and Disabled (WVR TYPE = G)	Aged (WVR TYPE = H)	Physically Disabled (WVR TYPE = I)	People with Brain Injuries (WVR TYPE = J)	People with HIV/AIDS (WVR TYPE = K)	People with MR/DD (WVR TYPE = L)	People with MI/SED (WVR TYPE = M)	Technologically Dependent/ Medically Fragile (WVR TYPE = N)	People with Autism/ Spectrum Disorder (WVR TYPE = P)				
Minnesota	80,074	42,921	7,423	13,844	1,486	0	14,400	0	0	0	0.7	51.5		i
Mississippi	14,713	12,078	0	0	632	0	2,003	0	0	0	0.0	2.1		
Missouri	24,045	20,229	0	622	0	110	3,084	0	0	0	72.2	90.7		
Montana	4,439	2,092	0	0	0	0	2,347	0	0	0	36.2	10.0	M(MH) j	MT reports non-disabled children and adults to waivers G (MD) and L(ME, MF) L(09) not reported, implementation date unknown
Nebraska	9,193	5,478	0	0	22	0	3,693	0	0	0	0.3	3.8		
Nevada	4,415	0	2,113	669	0	0	1,633	0	0	0	1.8	1.4		
New Hampshire	7,511	3,494	0	0	156	0	3,861	0	0	0	0.3	5.7	L(C1)	
New Jersey	22,373	10,472	0	280	341	443	10,837	0	0	0	0.6	2.8		
New Mexico	7,988	3,960	0	0	0	14	3,815	0	199	0	12.2	1.8	G(10), L(11)	
New York	90,848	23,202	0	440	2,653	0	64,553	0	0	0	3.1	34.3	M(03), G(11)	
North Carolina	24,303	13,556	0	0	0	0	9,935	0	812	0	3.9	3.3		
North Dakota	4,042	373	0	0	1	0	3,667	0	1	0	29.6	3.8		G(91) and J(93) combined to create G (93) in April 2007
Ohio	59,784	32,015	0	7,966	0	0	19,803	0	0	0	9.4	3.6		
Oklahoma	28,870	23,211	0	0	0	0	5,659	0	0	0	0.2	3.8		
Oregon	35,665	26,402	0	0	0	0	9,172	0	91	0	15.4	20.6	k	
Pennsylvania	58,496	19,916	0	9,132	492	0	28,860	0	96	0	0.3	54.1		
Rhode Island	6,780	2,349	650	213	0	0	3,555	13	0	0	17.1	58.6	G (W8) l	Overreporting of I(W4) m
South Carolina	22,067	14,485	0	0	631	1,150	5,763	0	38	0	0.6	5.4	P(WD)	
South Dakota	4,134	1,151 <sup>n</sup>	0	116	0	0	2,867	0	0	0	0.3	43.6		
Tennessee	11,750	3,517	0	0	0	0	8,233	0	0	0	0.1	12.5		o
Texas	69,468	46,547	0	152	0	0	19,170	0	3,599	0	39.0	3.8		
Utah	6,128	546	826	127	102	0	4,400	0	127	0	0.2	12.5	k	
Vermont	0 <sup>p</sup>	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	100.0	0.0		z
Virginia	24,854	16,149	22	0	0	101	8,185	0	397	0	36.5	2.6		
Washington	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	100.0	0.0	G, L, O (All Waiver IDs)	
West Virginia	8,714	4,693	0	0	0	0	4,021	0	0	0	8.9	4.2		

Table 11. Section 1915(c) Home and Community-Based Services (HCBS) Waiver Reporting in MAX 2007<sup>a</sup>

State	Number Enrolled in 1915(c) Waiver, by Waiver Type (Most Recent)										Percent of HCBS Service Recipients with no 1915(c) Waiver Enrollment <sup>b</sup>	Percent of 1915 (c) Waiver Enrollees with No Waiver claim (PGM TYPE = 6 or 7) <sup>c</sup>	Waiver Type/ID for Active 1915 (c) Waivers Not Reported in MAX 2007	Reporting Anomalies
	Number Ever Enrolled in a 1915(c) Waiver	Aged and Disabled (WVR TYPE = G)	Aged (WVR TYPE = H)	Physically Disabled (WVR TYPE = I)	People with Brain Injuries (WVR TYPE = J)	People with HIV/AIDS (WVR TYPE = K)	People with MR/DD (WVR TYPE = L)	People with MI/SED (WVR TYPE = M)	Technologically Dependent/ Medically Fragile (WVR TYPE = N)	People with Autism/ Spectrum Disorder (WVR TYPE = P)				
Wisconsin	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	100.0	0.0	G, I, J, L, M (All Waiver IDs)	
Wyoming	4,085	1,780	0	0	181	0	2,116	8	0	0	0.2	3.2		
Total	1,173,473	440,922	128,723	91,488	14,516	7,473	475,266	6,399	7,431	1,255	q	19.4		

NOTE: Section 1915(c) home and community-based service waivers enable states to waive certain Medicaid restrictions to provide long-term care to people in the community who would otherwise be eligible for Medicaid nursing home care. Reported enrollment in this table reflects the most recent waiver in which a person was enrolled during the year. No individuals were reported to WVR TYPE = O (unspecified or unknown 1915(c) populations) in 2006.

<sup>a</sup> See the MAX 2007 waiver crosswalk for additional details on state waiver reporting in MAX.

<sup>b</sup> Values greater than 10 percent are above the expected level and are considered anomalous.

<sup>c</sup> Values greater than 15 percent are above the expected level and are considered anomalous.

<sup>d</sup> CA did not begin reporting this waiver until April 2007.

<sup>e</sup> This CO waiver was approved in 2004 but was not reported until March 2007.

<sup>f</sup> FL indicated that it underreported to these waivers in 2007.

<sup>g</sup> IA also extended HCBS services to emotionally disturbed children as part of its 1115 waiver, type 1, waiver ID 'H1'.

<sup>h</sup> MI added reporting for this waiver starting in October 2007.

<sup>i</sup> MN Enrollment counts in waiver ID 'M1' (type G) include individuals enrolled in waiver IDs 'M3' (type I) and 'M4' (type J). As a result, enrollment in waiver ID 'M1' is overstated and enrollment in waiver ID 'M3' and 'M4' is understated. Also, MN reports many 1915(c) enrollees as also enrolled in 1915(b/c). These individuals may be double-counted.

<sup>j</sup> MT acknowledged that reporting to its 1915(c) waivers may be incorrect in 2007 due to the way it transfers information from its eligibility system. For example, the state does not report any individuals classified as disabled to its 1915(c) waivers targeting individuals with mental retardation or developmental disabilities.

<sup>k</sup> For individuals enrolled in more than three waivers during a month, the state does not report enrollment according to the CMS recommended hierarchy. This may cause underreporting of 1915(c) waiver enrollment if there were people enrolled in more than three waivers in a month.

<sup>l</sup> RI Waiver IDs 16, 17, and 18 were implemented in May but did not begin reporting until August.

<sup>m</sup> RI's over-reported enrollment of waiver ID 'W4' may explain why there was some inconsistency between reported Section 1915(c) waiver enrollment and service use in RI.

<sup>n</sup> SD's 1915(c) Elderly waiver (waiver ID 01) switched from a waiver type of H in 2006 to a waiver type of G in 2007.

<sup>o</sup> TN indicated that it underreported 1915(c) enrollment in 2006.

<sup>p</sup> VT transitioned the state's 1915(c) waivers to 1115 waivers in 2006. No 1915(c) enrollment was reported after September 2006.

<sup>q</sup> Total value for percent of HCBS Service Recipients with no 1915(c) waiver enrollment will be available in future versions.

Table 12. Section 1915(b) and Section 1915(b/c) Waiver Reporting in MAX 2007

State	Number with any 1915(b) Waiver Enrollment <sup>a</sup>		Number with any 1915(b/c) Waiver Enrollment <sup>a</sup>	
	1915(b) (WVR TYPE = 2)	Reporting Anomalies	1915(b/c) Combination (WVR TYPE = 4)	Reporting Anomalies
Alabama	600,059		0	
Alaska	0	Transportation enrollment not reported	0	
Arizona	0		0	
Arkansas	549,847		0	
California	8,177,345		0	
Colorado	527,176		0	
Connecticut	375,675		0	
Delaware	0		0	
District of Columbia	0		0	
Florida	2,578,128	Enrollment overreported for IDs = 05 and 18	225	Enrollment underreported for IDs = 17 and 20
Georgia	2,245	Non-Emergency Transportation enrollment not reported	0	
Hawaii	0		0	
Idaho	0		0	
Illinois	0		0	
Indiana	835,554	In October 2007, waiver IDs 2A-F became 3A-F	0	
Iowa	370,494		0	
Kansas	0	Children & Family Services Behavioral & Rehabilitative Treatment Services enrollment not reported	0	
Kentucky	0		0	
Louisiana	0		0	
Maine	0		0	
Maryland	0		0	
Massachusetts	0		0	
Michigan	1,786,969	Specialty Services and Supports waiver 2(MH) was reported as type 4 waiver previously	8,024	Habilitation Supports waiver 4(HS) was reported as type L waiver previously
Minnesota	7,430		54,918	Enrollment in the Case Management waiver (No ID) was not reported in MAX data. Some Senior Care Plus enrollees (ID = SC) do not receive HCBS
Mississippi	0		0	
Missouri	464,148		0	
Montana	59,799		0	
Nebraska	226,909		0	
Nevada	0		0	
New Hampshire	0		0	
New Jersey	22,186		0	
New Mexico	349,065		0	
New York	0		0	
North Carolina	90,812		582	

Table 12. Section 1915(b) and Section 1915(b/c) Waiver Reporting in MAX 2007

State	Number with any 1915(b) Waiver Enrollment <sup>a</sup>		Number with any 1915(b/c) Waiver Enrollment <sup>a</sup>	
	1915(b) (WVR TYPE = 2)	Reporting Anomalies	1915(b/c) Combination (WVR TYPE = 4)	Reporting Anomalies
North Dakota	0	Experience Health 1915(b) program was implemented in October 2007 but is not reported in MAX	0	
Ohio	0		0	
Oklahoma	0		0	
Oregon	450,173		0	
Pennsylvania	1,445,629		628	HIV/AIDS waiver 4(80) was reported as type K waiver previously
Rhode Island	0	Dental enrollment not reported	0	
South Carolina	0		0	
South Dakota	0		0	
Tennessee	0		0	
Texas	1,937,383	Disease Management enrollment (ID = H2) not reported. Many 1915(b) enrollees are not reported with managed care enrollment (cause unknown)	149,918	Individuals without HCBS are reported to the STAR PLUS waiver (ID = E9)
Utah	286,452		0	
Vermont	0		0	
Virginia	614,855	Non-Emergency Transportation enrollment not reported	0	
Washington	1,060,687	Disease Management enrollment (ID - DM) not reported	0	
West Virginia	223,686		0	
Wisconsin	0		0	Family Care waivers (IDs = M1 and N1 ) not reported
Wyoming	0		0	
Total	23,042,706		214,295	

Note: Section 1915(b) waivers enable states to waive statewide, comparability of services, and/or freedom of choice. Section 1915(b/c) waivers are used to implement mandatory managed care programs that include HCBS services. See the MAX 2007 waiver crosswalk for a listing of 1915(b) and 1915(b/c) waivers and additional details on waiver reporting in 2007.

<sup>a</sup> Individuals may be enrolled in up to three waivers during the year in MAX data and may be enrolled in more than one 1915(b) or 1915(b/c) waiver. Thus, individuals may be counted more than once in the enrollment numbers.

# **MATHEMATICA** Policy Research

[www.mathematica-mpr.com](http://www.mathematica-mpr.com)

Improving public well-being by conducting high-quality, objective research and surveys

Princeton, NJ ■ Ann Arbor, MI ■ Cambridge, MA ■ Chicago, IL ■ Oakland, CA ■ Washington, DC

Mathematica® is a registered trademark of Mathematica Policy Research