

**Peters, Deborah J. (CMS/OSORA)**

---

**From:** Schubel, Jessica (CMS/CMCS)  
**Sent:** Monday, June 06, 2011 10:41 AM  
**To:** Boben, Paul J. (CMS/CMCS)  
**Cc:** Garner, Angela D. (CMS/CMCS); Sheer, Jennifer L. (CMS/CMCS)  
**Subject:** FW: PMAP waiver data  
**Attachments:** 2011 6-2 MC Budget Neutrality plus MNCare to PMAP comparison.xlsx

Paul,

Here's the spreadsheet (and email) from the State re: the historical expenditures for the State plan groups in the demo. [REDACTED] Let me know your thoughts.

(b)(5)

Thanks,  
Jessica

---

**From:** Ulbee, Gretchen (DHS) [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: [REDACTED]

phone: [REDACTED] fax: [REDACTED]

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.