

Comments on Oregon Family Planning Budget Neutrality

Response to questions

7. You state, “However, due to state budget challenges, we are expected to make every effort to maintain costs within the \$239/client budgeted for the current biennium.” In your expenditure worksheets you have also kept per capita costs at \$239 for years 5-8. Since this is a fee for service program, how do you expect to restrict per person costs? Are you going to cap enrollment? In a fee for service program, per person costs should be represented by total expenditures/persons served. Please trend per person costs forward using the rate of growth for expenditures and persons from previous years and provide information on these trend rates.

Narrative attachment to BN- worksheet 1

Expanded FP Expenditures- persons- What is straight line trending? Please tell us the actual trend rate and the source of information.

Narrative attachment- base rate calculation – In the table the rate per 1,000 is not correct. Please change to match your excel spreadsheets.

Participant fertility rates – The numerator should include **all** births to persons in a demonstration enrolled in the demonstration during that demonstration year, not just those who had a birth paid for by Medicaid after their FPEP participation.

Births averted calculation worksheet

- Please explain how you calculated the preliminary birth rates for 2001.
- For 2002, the state should continue their previous methodology and use the same birth rate as 2001.
- The number of clients for 2004-2006 should be the same as what is provided in the expanded family planning worksheet. They do not currently match.

Total Costs Model budget neutrality worksheet

- The expanded fp expenditures total does not match up with the CMS 64 report. Please explain.

In addition, please provide information on the number of persons, per capita costs, and total costs for family planning services under your general Medicaid program for years 1-8.