

From: Ulbee, Gretchen (DHS) [REDACTED]
Sent: Wednesday, June 08, 2011 11:46 AM
To: Schubel, Jessica (CMS/CMCS)
Cc: Garner, Angela D. (CMS/CMCS); Sheer, Jennifer L. (CMS/CMCS); Kooistra, Jan M (DHS); R5MNMD (CMS contact)
Subject: RE: PMAP waiver data
Attachments: 2011 6-8 MC Budget Neutrality February 2011 plus adults over 133% FPG with projections summary.xlsx

Categories: Minnesota - 2011 Renewal

Jessica – attached is the updated spreadsheet. The reason for the difference in PMPM between the two groups of adults (75-133 FPL vs. 133-250 FPL) is because it is a different mix of enrollees.

Managed care capitation rates in this program do not differ based on income level, but different rates are paid for men vs. women, older vs. younger and metro vs. rural. PMPM variations will occur if two groups of enrollees have different gender, age and geographic characteristics.

The attached spreadsheet shows PMPM and member month projections for the 133-250 FPL group. We did not propose a PMPM cap or add them into the cumulative budget neutrality totals. Please let me know (and cc Jan Kooistra) if you'd like us to do that.

Thanks,
Gretchen

Gretchen Ulbee
Minnesota Department of Human Services

From: Schubel, Jessica (CMS/CMCS) [mailto:[REDACTED]]
Sent: Monday, June 06, 2011 9:43 AM
To: Ulbee, Gretchen (DHS)
Cc: Garner, Angela D. (CMS/CMCS); Sheer, Jennifer L. (CMS/CMCS)
Subject: RE: PMAP waiver data

Gretchen,

I was just looking over the BN spreadsheet you sent on with the historical info for the childless adults 133-250% group. I'm attaching it for your reference, but could you please include member month projections (similar to what you did for the 75-133 group) for the renewal period?

Thanks,
Jessica

From: Ulbee, Gretchen (DHS) [<mailto:> [REDACTED]]
Sent: Thursday, June 02, 2011 6:39 PM
To: Schubel, Jessica (CMS/CMCS)
Cc: R5MNMD (CMS contact); Godfrey, David W (DHS)
Subject: PMAP waiver data

Jessica ,

Thank you for providing copies of the correspondence CMS has received concerning Minnesota's PMAP+ waiver renewal.

As we discussed, attached please find a comparison of PMAP (our Medicaid managed care program for state plan groups) PMPM expenditures for PMAP pregnant women, PMAP parents and PMAP children for waiver years 2006 through 2010. This is compared to the budget neutrality figures provided for the following waiver groups: MinnesotaCare pregnant women, MinnesotaCare parents and MinnesotaCare children. (We have not included the MA one year old waiver group in these totals.) (The comparison is begun in the waiver year ending in 2006, because the state plan amendment providing authority for managed care enrollment under PMAP was effective July 1, 2005).

As you will see, there is over \$260 million difference in expenditures over the five year period. However, we have concerns about using this comparison as a basis for budget neutrality discussions concerning the MinnesotaCare adults without children with incomes 133-250% FPG because the savings is not due primarily to reduced benefits in MinnesotaCare as compared to the prepaid medical assistance program. Rather, the difference in expenditures is more likely due to the mix of enrollees and the differences in program experience underlying the rate setting in the two programs. For example, the state plan group utilization patterns have been different than the utilization patterns for higher income MinnesotaCare enrollees. We remain very interested in resolving the budget neutrality question concerning the waiver expansion for MinnesotaCare Adults without children with incomes 133-250% FPG, but do not want the attached data to be misunderstood.

Please feel free to give me a call with any questions. We look forward to meeting with you next week to discuss the STCs.

Thanks,
Gretchen

Gretchen Ulbee

Federal Relations

Minnesota Department of Human Services ° 540 Cedar Street ° St. Paul, MN 55155

mailing address: P.O. Box 64983 ° St. Paul, MN 55164-0983

email:

phone:

fax:

Caution: This e-mail and attached documents, if any, may contain information that is protected by state or federal law. E-mail containing private or protected information should not be sent over a public (non secure) Internet unless it is encrypted pursuant to DHS standards. This e-mail should be forwarded only on a strictly need-to-know basis. If you are not the intended recipient, please: (1) notify the sender immediately, (2) do not forward the message, (3) do not print the message and (4) erase the message from your system.