



Analyzing the Impact of Adjusting the Federal Medical Assistance Percentage to Improve the Countercyclical Impact

Prepared by

Vic Miller
Economic and Management Consulting

For

NATIONAL ACADEMY
for STATE HEALTH POLICY

Executive Summary

The Medicaid program has grown to dominate federal-state financial interactions, and the federal share of costs (the federal medical assistance percentage—FMAP) has become an increasingly important parameter for states. The FMAP is designed to provide higher federal shares to states with weaker tax bases, ranging from 50 percent (one federal dollar for each state dollar) to almost 80 percent (one federal dollar for each four state dollars). Unfortunately, the FMAP system uses data that is outdated when applied. Additionally, the overall system is unresponsive to changes in the economy, and can require increased state shares just when states can least afford them.

This paper presents three groups of alternatives that would amend the present FMAP structure.

- The first focuses on the data itself and suggests methods to decrease the lag between the time period reflected in the data and the timing of the Medicaid service for which it reimburses.
- The second group suggests certain methodologies for helping individual states with demonstrated problems as reflected in their unemployment data, the data stream providing the most current look at state economies.
- The third group presents alternatives that would help many or all states during periods of national economic stress.

The options analyzed in this paper are not mutually exclusive and can be combined. In addition, it should be noted that these options are intended to modify the FMAP calculation to better reflect changes in the economy, not to provide large-scale fiscal relief. This analysis concludes that the current FMAP system could be improved within the current policy context by utilizing more current data in its calculations. It further provides useful options for amending the system to assist a limited number of states on an annual basis and many or all states during periods of substantial economic downturns.

Background

The federal share of costs for the joint federal-state Medicaid program (the federal medical assistance percentage—FMAP) varies by state and is recalculated annually. FMAPs are published in the fall preceding the fiscal year to which they apply. For example, the federal fiscal year (FY) 2005 FMAPs, which are valid for October 2004 through September 2005, were published in December 2003.

A state's FMAP is based on a three-year average of its per capita personal income compared to the comparable national average, with the formula structured to provide 55 percent FMAPs to those states with national average incomes. No state may receive less than 50 percent or more than 83 percent. In addition, the District of Columbia FMAP is permanently fixed at 70 percent, and Alaska's FMAP has been temporarily increased through FY 2005.

The FMAP or a variant is also used to determine the federal share for programs under Title IV of the Social Security Act (foster care, adoption assistance) and Title XXI (State Children's Health Insurance Program—SCHIP). Together, the share grants-in-aid from Medicaid and these programs is approaching 50 percent of total federal grants to the states. As such, the FMAP level and annual change are extremely important to state finances.

Per capita personal income is actually two variables: personal income, which is calculated and published by the Bureau of Economic Analysis (BEA), and population, which is published annually by the Census Bureau. Major changes in either data series can have a substantial impact. For example, decennial censuses regularly produce major FMAP shifts when the new population data are inserted in the denominator. Similarly, personal income data are produced as part of the national income and product accounts, and the periodic rebenchmarking of those accounts by BEA (as now occurring) can produce a major if unintended shift in Medicaid grant flows.

The publication schedule and three-year average necessarily mean that data used in calculating FMAPs are substantially outdated at the time the FMAPs become effective. Thus, calendar year 2000-2002 personal income data were used in calculating the FY 2005 FMAPs. States can find themselves receiving FMAP increases as their economies improve and decreases as they decline. States experiencing long-term economic *or* population shifts can experience substantial lags before those shifts are reflected in FMAPs.

For example:

- Hawaii went through a long-term economic decline in the late 1990s; the state's FMAP began to rise years later and will continue to rise through FY 2005 even though Hawaii's per capita income in 2002 grew at twice the national average.

- The 2000 census found that California’s population had not been as undercounted as the rest of the nation. Using the new population data made the national economy look less robust on a per capita basis than the state’s, and California’s FMAP fell back to 50 percent in FY 2003 (costing the state about \$0.4 billion annually).
- BEA tells us that Nevada has had one of the more robust economies in the country in recent years. However, the Census Bureau tells us that Nevada’s population is growing at triple the national rate. The net result of these two effects has been an ongoing decline in the state’s per capita income, and an ongoing increase in its FMAP.

Table 1 provides a history of recent FMAP levels and shifts. As can be seen, Mississippi has received the highest state FMAP each year ranging from 76.09 percent to 77.08 percent. At the other end of the spectrum, 12 states will be at the minimum 50 percent for FY 2005.¹

A number of proposals have been made to better structure the system of calculating and publishing FMAPs to improve its responsiveness to economic changes in states. Two such changes have been enacted during the program’s existence. In 1981, the FY 1982-1984 FMAP reductions from the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act (OBRA 81) were partially ameliorated for states with unemployment rates 150 percent of the national average. In 1986, the previous system of biennial FMAPs was legislatively amended to the current system of annual updates. This change was designed to reduce the data lag in the second year of the biennium.

This paper will look at three sets of potential changes:

- **Using more current data to calculate the FMAP.** The paper considers two options: (1) calculating FMAPs using the current methodology and publication timing but using only the latest *two years* of per capita income data, and (2) calculating FMAPs using the current methodology and using two years of per capita income data, but basing the calculation on *preliminary* state personal income data published by BEA each spring.
- **Increasing FMAPs for selected high unemployment states.** Two options are explored: (1) increasing FMAPs to states with global unemployment rates exceeding 120 percent of the national average, and (2) increasing FMAPs for one fiscal quarter for states with high or increasing insured unemployment rates².
- **Increasing FMAPs for all or many states during periods of high unemployment.** The paper considers two alternatives. The first would

¹ Table 1 also displays the temporary “fiscal relief” FMAPs that resulted from Public Law 108-27, which temporarily increased levels for the last two quarters of FY 2003 and the first three quarters of FY 2004.

² The insured unemployed are those unemployed who are receiving unemployment insurance benefits.

automatically add FMAP to states with global unemployment rates exceeding the national average when the national level exceeded 6 percent. The second would automatically provide one additional percentage point in FMAP to all states when the national average unemployment rate equals or exceeds 6 percent.

Two data anomalies should be noted before proceeding.

1. The rebenchmarking of the national income and product accounts³ published in April 2004 changed the accounts and, therefore, also changed states' personal income data relative to national averages. This means that it had an effect on all state FMAPs except for those at the 50 percent minimum.
2. Calendar year 2000 happened to be a year in which robust personal income was reported for many wealthy states: California, New York, Illinois, etc. Eliminating that year's income from the calculation will not affect these states' 50 percent FMAPs but will have the effect of making most other states appear wealthier.

Under current law, this will first happen for FY 2006. Table A-1 of Appendix A provides a projection of what might happen to FMAPs in that year under current law. Thirty-one states are projected to lose, many substantially, while only seven would gain, most of them minimally.⁴ This impact is reflected in any of the following proposals that eliminate calendar year 2000 from an FMAP calculation.

Using More Current Data to Calculate the FMAPs

Federal grant programs have used a wide variety of techniques to try to use the most current data for allocating funds. At one extreme, the general revenue sharing program of the 1970s and 1980s distributed funds based on preliminary calculations. Differences between final and preliminary calculations were either subtracted from or added to a jurisdiction's allocation for the following year. The two alternatives analyzed in this section are substantially less complex.

Option 1: Calculate based on a two-year average

The first alternative would amend the FMAP system by using only the two most recent years of personal income rather than the current three. (For example, under current policies a state's FMAP for FY 2005 would be calculated based on personal income from 2000, 2001, and 2002; under this proposal the 2005 FMAP would instead be calculated

³ The national income and product accounts provide an aggregated view of the final uses of the nation's output and the income derived from its production; two of its most widely known measures are gross domestic product and gross domestic income. Source: U.S. Department of Commerce, BEA website http://www.bea.doc.gov/bea/about/AcctIntros/Overview_Nat.htm. Retrieved January 20, 2005

⁴ This calculation has been made with three years' of population data and ten quarters' of personal income data.

based only on 2001 and 2002 data.) This eliminates a year that is almost five years before the year for which the FMAP is effective, making the FMAP more closely reflect current economic conditions.

Table 2 displays calculations of FY 2003-2005 FMAPs based on averaging the two most recent years of personal income data instead of three. It then compares the resulting shifts to the most relevant Index of State Economic Momentum, an index published by *State Policy Reports* that blends data on income, population, and employment growth to produce quarterly estimates of relative state economic vitality. An index of zero represents the national average.

It appears clear that a larger share of Medicaid dollars would have gone to states with low momentum if the FY 2003 FMAP had used this methodology. Of the thirteen states with the lowest indices, seven would have benefited and the remainder would have experienced no change. The impact is not as clear for FY 2004 and FY 2005, but it does appear to move in the right direction. Of the twenty-six states with below average economic momentum in September 2003, thirteen would receive an increase in FY 2004 and nine would experience no change. Only four would lose. The experience for FY 2005 is confounded by the loss of calendar year 2000 in the calculation. (See page 4.) It is interesting to note that most of the states that would gain in FY 2005 under this proposal are those with the fastest growing populations: Nevada, Arizona, Georgia, and Texas.

Overall, this adjustment would have increased federal grants on net \$222 million in FY 2003 and \$290 million in FY 2004 and would have reduced them \$188 million in FY 2005.

Option 2: Delay publication

The second option for reducing data lags would delay the timing of the FMAP by six months. Each year, BEA publishes preliminary personal income data in April for the just completed calendar year and revises those data in October. Each time it publishes, it upgrades all recent prior year data. Since the FMAP is statutorily required to be published by November 15th for the following fiscal year⁵, in most years it is the October data that are used to determine the FMAP.

An option that would appear to improve the sensitivity of a state's FMAP to the state of its economy would be to delay publication until April of each year. This would permit the use of the new preliminary data. Using the preliminary data would reduce the lag between the personal income data and the year to which the FMAP applies by one year. For example, under the current methodology, the FY 2005 FMAP would be calculated based on 2000, 2001, and 2002 data. Changing the methodology to use the preliminary data would allow the FMAP calculation to instead be based on 2001, 2002, and 2003

⁵ The U.S. Department of Health and Human Services has not always met this statutory requirement. The FMAPs for FY 2005 were published in December 2003; publication has been as late as March.

data. Implementation of this policy change would delay the publication of the FMAP by six months.

Further, combining both option 1 and option 2 (changing the methodology to both use the preliminary data *and* reduce the number of years considered in the calculation from three to two) would result in the 2005 FMAP being calculated based on calendar year 2002 and 2003 data rather than calendar year 2000, 2001, and 2002 data. Table 3 presents FMAP calculations that would have resulted in FYs 2003-2004 from using a two-year personal income average *and* the preliminary data in April.

The results for FY 2003 are substantially positive. Of the fourteen states with the slowest economic momentum, nine would have received increased FMAPs; the other five are all at the 50 percent minimum. The experience at the other end of the spectrum is more mixed, with a number of high momentum states receiving increases. Overall, the shifts would have increased federal Medicaid grants to states by an estimated \$658 million.

The results for FY 2004 are approximately a wash for the federal government. High momentum states would generally have lost, while slightly more low momentum states would have lost rather than gained. Again, the loss of calendar year 2000 data from the calculation again depresses FY 2004 FMAPs for many states. Again, fast-growing states (*e.g.*, Nevada, Florida, Arizona) would benefit.

In general, there is no question that using this methodology for FY 2003 would have had the net impact of providing not insubstantial FMAP increases in the fiscal year of the highest economic stress. This would have been especially true for those states with the most declining economic fortunes, thereby substantially increasing Medicaid grants during the year in which the states most needed them.

Discussions with state budget officers and legislative fiscal officers indicate an interest in a system that would better target funds to states in need but a reluctance to delay the publication of the FMAP until April. This structure would make a final FMAP unavailable to governors preparing their budgets, and even to some state legislatures working to enact their budgets. However, the states that would lose FMAP should be those best able to generate additional revenues from their own tax bases.

Increasing FMAPs for Selected High Unemployment States

An argument is made that personal income changes alone inadequately capture the needs of fiscally distressed states and that using unemployment data to supplement the personal income information would permit additional funds to be directed to those states most in need during their economic downturns. In particular, these adjustments would be targeted to adding FMAP to specific states during the current fiscal year, thereby adding funds on a limited basis using the most current data. These adjustments would be made every year.

While a wide variety of structures could be used to accomplish this, this analysis limits itself to two. Average unemployment rates for a calendar year (e.g., 2003) would be used to provide additional assistance to states for the then current fiscal year (e.g., 2004).

- *Option 1: Provide an additional 0.10 of FMAP for each one-tenth of a percentage point a state's global unemployment rate exceeded 120 percent of the national average.*⁶
- *Option 2: Provide aid for the final quarter of a fiscal year only. It would add 0.10 percentage points to the extent that a state's **insured** unemployment rate exceeded 3 percent, and an additional 1.0 percentage point if the rate had increased more than 50 percent above the previous year's.*

The impact of the latter provision is informative in that it provides assistance to smaller states with lower unemployment rates. Many rural states maintain low levels of formally measured unemployment even during very difficult economic and fiscal times, reflecting the structure of their economies. As such, adjusting for both unemployment level and change is useful in assisting both them and their more urban counterparts.

The current impacts of these two options are presented in Table 4. Both options are extremely well targeted, reaching states during the year in which their economies are failing. Obviously, the cost of the program is very much a function of how many states it is thought useful to assist, and by how much. In FY 2004, option one would assist Alaska, Michigan, Oregon, and Washington at a federal cost of almost \$57 million; option two would aid twenty-one states at a federal cost of \$206 million.

⁶ This is substantially less than the 150 percent used for OBRA 81. In most years, no state's unemployment rate approaches the 150 percent level.

Increasing FMAPs for Many or All States During Periods of High Unemployment

This set of options uses mechanisms similar to those above but starts from a different premise. These options would expand the federal government's role as the countercyclical balance wheel in the economy, automatically providing higher levels of FMAP to many or all states during periods of high unemployment.

Both the federal government's tax and spending structures automatically respond to changes in the economy, providing fiscal stimulus during downturns and fiscal restraint during boom periods. Tax burdens decline; spending for programs such as unemployment insurance and Food Stamps expands. While the federal government has responded to states' fiscal needs in most recessions, it has no formal mechanism for doing so. In some years, new programs are created to assist states or provide fiscal stimulus; at times, additional funds are added to current programs; at other times, nothing is done.

Options presented here would permanently amend Medicaid to play that countercyclical role. They would automatically increase FMAPs during periods when the national average global unemployment rate equals or exceeds 6 percent—as it did in calendar year 2003—for the then current fiscal year (FY 2004). Two options are explored. Option 1 provides 0.10 in FMAP for each 0.10 that a state's unemployment rate exceeds the national average. Option 2 would provide assistance to all states. The current impact of these options is presented in Table 5.

Option 1: Provide 0.10 in FMAP for each 0.10 that a state's unemployment rate exceeds the national average

Eighteen states would benefit from option one in FY 2004 at a federal cost of \$1.0 billion. Option two, which benefits all states, would cost the federal government an estimated \$2.9 billion. Again, the parameters could be reset depending on the extent of desired fiscal stimulus. The parameters presented here have been chosen as those which will generate limited but not insubstantial fiscal assistance for those states most affected.

Option 2: Provide assistance to all states

Option 2 is similar to but different from the fiscal relief provided in TRRA. TRRA provided approximately \$10 billion in Medicaid fiscal relief to all states over the last two quarters of FY 2003 and the first three quarters of FY 2004. It added 2.95 percentage points to the FMAPs for all states for these five quarters. It further aided all states whose base FMAPs otherwise declined in FY 2003 or FY 2004. For the five affected quarters, these states' base FMAPs were held harmless to the previous year's level. While this fits the federal pattern of one-time amendments to assist states during a given recession, the language could be structured into a permanent amendment to the Social Security Act triggered at a certain level.

Concluding Observations

Much can be done to improve the countercyclical relevance for FMAP levels both within the current policy context and in expanding that context. There are clearly many different influences on both the personal income and the population data, and their variance from year to year means that an analysis of the impact of any proposed FMAP change will frequently be specific to a given year. Nonetheless, some general observations can be noted.

1. The loss of calendar year 2000 income data will produce major losses in most states FMAPs when that loss occurs.⁷ Any proposals for FMAP revision should consider holding states harmless in the first year that loss occurs, FY 2006 under current law. Attention should be given to that impact even if nothing is done vis-à-vis any other adjustments.
2. Both the “two-year” and “preliminary data” options appear to have real value in making the FMAP more responsive to state economic conditions with no change in basic Medicaid policy. These could be accomplished with simple amendments to the Social Security Act.
3. Many potential adjustments have no impact on states currently at the 50 percent minimum. Given the impact of the economic cycle on all states’ budgets, consideration should focus on options that potentially aid any state.
4. Given the increasing importance of the FMAP, serious consideration should be given to building in permanent countercyclical adjustments. These could assist a relatively few states with the most serious current problems and be structured to all states during period of significant economic stress.
5. It is possible and worthwhile to make all three types of adjustments described in this paper.

⁷ As noted earlier, calendar year 2000 happened to be a year in which robust personal income was reported for many wealthy states. Eliminating that year’s income from the calculation will not affect these states’ 50 percent FMAPs but will have the effect of making most other states appear wealthier. Under current law, the elimination of calendar year 2000 data will first happen for FY 2006. Table A-1 of Appendix A provides a projection of what might happen to FMAPs in that year under current law. Thirty-one states are projected to lose, many substantially, while only seven would gain, most of them minimally.

**Table 1. Recent History of State FMAPs
(federal fiscal years)**

State	2000	2001	2002	2003 2/		2004 2/		2005	% Change 2000-2005
				Base	Fiscal Relief	Base	Fiscal Relief		
Alabama	69.57	69.99	70.45	70.60	73.55	70.75	73.70	70.83	1.8%
Alaska 1/	59.80	60.13	57.38	58.27	61.22	58.39	61.34	57.58	-3.7%
Arizona	65.92	65.77	64.98	67.25	70.20	67.26	70.21	67.45	2.3%
Arkansas	72.85	73.02	72.64	74.28	77.23	74.67	77.62	74.75	2.6%
California	51.67	51.25	51.40	50.00	54.35	50.00	52.95	50.00	-3.2%
Colorado	50.00	50.00	50.00	50.00	52.95	50.00	52.95	50.00	0.0%
Connecticut	50.00	50.00	50.00	50.00	52.95	50.00	52.95	50.00	0.0%
Delaware	50.00	50.00	50.00	50.00	52.95	50.00	52.95	50.38	0.8%
District of Columbia 1/	70.00	70.00	70.00	70.00	72.95	70.00	72.95	70.00	0.0%
Florida	56.52	56.62	56.43	58.83	61.78	58.93	61.88	58.90	4.2%
Georgia	59.88	59.67	59.00	59.60	62.55	59.58	62.55	60.44	0.9%
Hawaii	51.01	53.85	56.34	58.77	61.72	58.90	61.85	58.47	14.6%
Idaho	70.15	70.76	71.02	70.96	73.97	70.46	73.91	70.62	0.7%
Illinois	50.00	50.00	50.00	50.00	52.95	50.00	52.95	50.00	0.0%
Indiana	61.74	62.04	62.04	61.97	64.99	62.32	65.27	62.78	1.7%
Iowa	63.06	62.67	62.86	63.50	66.45	63.93	66.88	63.55	0.8%
Kansas	60.03	59.85	60.20	60.15	63.15	60.82	63.77	61.01	1.6%
Kentucky	70.55	70.39	69.94	69.89	72.89	70.09	73.04	69.60	-1.3%
Louisiana	70.32	70.53	70.30	71.28	74.23	71.63	74.58	71.04	1.0%
Maine	66.22	66.12	66.58	66.22	69.53	66.01	69.17	64.89	-2.0%
Maryland	50.00	50.00	50.00	50.00	52.95	50.00	52.95	50.00	0.0%
Massachusetts	50.00	50.00	50.00	50.00	52.95	50.00	52.95	50.00	0.0%
Michigan	55.11	56.18	56.36	55.42	59.31	55.89	58.84	56.71	2.9%
Minnesota	51.48	51.11	50.00	50.00	52.95	50.00	52.95	50.00	-2.9%
Mississippi	76.80	76.82	76.09	76.62	79.57	77.08	80.03	77.08	0.4%
Missouri	60.51	61.03	61.06	61.23	64.18	61.47	64.42	61.15	1.1%
Montana	72.30	73.04	72.83	72.96	75.91	72.85	75.91	71.90	-0.6%
Nebraska	60.88	60.38	59.55	59.52	62.50	59.89	62.84	59.64	-2.0%
Nevada	50.00	50.36	50.00	52.39	55.34	54.93	57.88	55.90	11.8%
New Hampshire	50.00	50.00	50.00	50.00	52.95	50.00	52.95	50.00	0.0%
New Jersey	50.00	50.00	50.00	50.00	52.95	50.00	52.95	50.00	0.0%
New Mexico	73.32	73.80	73.04	74.56	77.51	74.85	77.80	74.30	1.3%
New York	50.00	50.00	50.00	50.00	52.95	50.00	52.95	50.00	0.0%
North Carolina	62.49	62.47	61.46	62.56	65.51	62.85	65.80	63.63	1.8%
North Dakota	70.42	69.99	69.87	68.36	72.82	68.31	71.31	67.49	-4.2%
Ohio	58.67	59.03	58.78	58.83	61.78	59.23	62.18	59.68	1.7%
Oklahoma	71.09	71.24	70.43	70.56	73.51	70.24	73.51	70.18	-1.3%
Oregon	59.96	60.00	59.20	60.16	63.11	60.81	63.76	61.12	1.9%
Pennsylvania	53.82	53.62	54.65	54.69	57.64	54.76	57.71	53.84	0.0%
Rhode Island	53.77	53.79	52.45	55.40	58.35	56.03	58.98	55.38	3.0%
South Carolina	69.95	70.44	69.34	69.81	72.76	69.86	72.81	69.89	-0.1%
South Dakota	68.72	68.31	65.93	65.29	68.88	65.67	68.62	66.03	-3.9%
Tennessee	63.10	63.79	63.64	64.59	67.54	64.40	67.54	64.81	2.7%
Texas	61.36	60.57	60.17	59.99	63.12	60.22	63.17	60.87	-0.8%
Utah	71.55	71.44	70.00	71.24	74.19	71.72	74.67	72.14	0.8%
Vermont	62.24	62.40	63.06	62.41	66.01	61.34	65.36	60.11	-3.4%
Virginia	51.67	51.85	51.45	50.53	54.40	50.00	53.48	50.00	-3.2%
Washington	51.83	50.70	50.37	50.00	53.32	50.00	52.95	50.00	-3.5%
West Virginia	74.78	75.34	75.27	75.04	78.22	75.19	78.14	74.65	-0.2%
Wisconsin	58.78	59.29	58.57	58.43	61.52	58.41	61.38	58.32	-0.8%
Wyoming	64.04	64.60	61.97	61.32	64.92	59.77	64.27	57.90	-9.6%

1/ The FMAPs for the District of Columbia and Alaska were statutorily set in the BBA of 1997; Alaska's was later reset for FYs 2001-2005 by the omnibus budget bill of 2000.

2/ P.L. 108-27 increased all state FMAPs for the last two quarters of FY 2003 (April-September) and the first three quarters of FY 2004 (October-June).

**Table 2. Impact in Three Years of Calculating FMAPs Using Two Years of Income
(federal fiscal years; dollars in thousands)**

State	Index DEC 02	2003				State	Index SEPT 03	2004				State	Index DEC 04	2005			
		Current Law	Alternative	Change	Impact 1/			Current Law	Alternative	Change	Impact 1/			Current Law	Alternative	Change	Impact 1/
New York	-1.07	50.00	50.00	0.00	\$0	Connecticut	-1.08	50.00	50.00	0.00	\$0	50.00	50.00	0.00	\$0		
Massachusetts	-1.02	50.00	50.00	0.00	0	Massachusetts	-0.89	50.00	50.00	0.00	0	50.00	50.00	0.00	0		
Illinois	-0.74	50.00	50.00	0.00	0	New York	-0.65	50.00	50.00	0.00	0	50.00	50.00	0.00	0		
West Virginia	-0.64	75.04	75.57	0.53	9,930	Ohio	-0.61	59.23	59.69	0.46	54,099	59.68	59.62	-0.06	-7,056		
Washington	-0.63	50.00	50.00	0.00	0	West Virginia	-0.58	75.19	75.18	-0.01	-191	74.65	74.07	-0.58	-11,092		
Missouri	-0.62	61.23	61.62	0.39	22,535	Missouri	-0.57	61.47	61.56	0.09	5,378	61.15	60.94	-0.21	-12,548		
Colorado	-0.61	50.00	50.00	0.00	0	Illinois	-0.53	50.00	50.00	0.00	0	50.00	50.00	0.00	0		
Michigan	-0.60	55.42	56.25	0.83	67,862	Indiana	-0.51	62.32	62.47	0.15	7,618	62.78	62.71	-0.07	-3,555		
Connecticut	-0.52	50.00	50.00	0.00	0	Pennsylvania	-0.47	54.76	54.71	-0.05	-6,765	53.84	53.26	-0.58	-78,479		
Ohio	-0.49	58.83	59.43	0.60	64,229	Oklahoma	-0.45	70.24	70.08	-0.16	-4,226	70.18	69.91	-0.27	-7,131		
Iowa	-0.42	63.50	63.83	0.33	7,207	South Carolina	-0.44	69.86	70.03	0.17	6,285	69.89	69.72	-0.17	-6,285		
Alabama	-0.40	70.60	71.13	0.53	18,982	Delaware	-0.43	50.00	50.00	0.00	0	50.38	50.13	-0.25	-1,904		
Indiana	-0.39	61.97	62.44	0.47	21,160	Kansas	-0.31	60.82	60.97	0.15	2,819	61.01	60.65	-0.36	-6,765		
Utah	-0.30	71.24	70.88	-0.36	-3,973	Iowa	-0.30	63.93	63.97	0.04	915	63.55	63.23	-0.32	-7,320		
Virginia	-0.17	50.53	50.45	-0.08	-2,941	Alabama	-0.26	70.75	71.01	0.26	8,968	70.83	70.52	-0.31	-10,693		
Minnesota	-0.17	50.00	50.00	0.00	0	Minnesota	-0.23	50.00	50.00	0.00	0	50.00	50.00	0.00	0		
New Hampshire	-0.16	50.00	50.00	0.00	0	Colorado	-0.21	50.00	50.00	0.00	0	50.00	50.00	0.00	0		
North Dakota	0.13	68.36	69.05	0.69	3,203	North Carolina	-0.15	62.85	63.07	0.22	16,687	63.63	63.88	0.25	18,963		
Idaho	0.09	70.96	71.10	0.14	1,155	Michigan	-0.12	55.89	56.39	0.50	41,685	56.71	57.03	0.32	26,678		
Tennessee	0.11	64.59	64.58	-0.01	-655	Kentucky	-0.11	70.09	70.02	-0.07	-2,742	69.60	69.36	-0.24	-9,402		
Pennsylvania	0.14	54.69	54.78	0.09	11,574	New Jersey	-0.11	50.00	50.00	0.00	0	50.00	50.00	0.00	0		
North Carolina	0.18	62.56	62.63	0.07	4,909	Louisiana	-0.10	71.63	71.71	0.08	3,578	71.04	70.22	-0.82	-36,671		
California	0.18	50.00	50.00	0.00	0	New Hampshire	-0.10	50.00	50.00	0.00	0	50.00	50.00	0.00	0		
Georgia	0.22	59.60	59.33	-0.27	-17,116	Utah	-0.04	71.72	71.84	0.12	1,461	72.14	72.14	0.00	0		
Texas	0.24	59.99	60.14	0.15	23,092	Mississippi	-0.02	77.08	77.32	0.24	7,991	77.08	76.75	-0.33	-10,988		
Vermont	0.27	62.41	62.71	0.30	2,129	Tennessee	-0.02	64.40	64.70	0.30	20,579	64.81	64.78	-0.03	-2,058		
South Carolina	0.33	69.81	69.81	0.00	0	Maine	0.01	66.01	65.95	-0.06	-1,134	64.89	64.16	-0.73	-13,798		
New Jersey	0.39	50.00	50.00	0.00	0	Oregon	0.05	60.81	61.13	0.32	8,046	61.12	61.36	0.24	6,035		
Louisiana	0.42	71.28	71.83	0.55	26,797	Wisconsin	0.06	58.41	58.66	0.25	11,431	58.32	57.97	-0.35	-16,003		
Oregon	0.42	60.16	60.01	-0.15	-4,054	California	0.20	50.00	50.00	0.00	0	50.00	50.00	0.00	0		
Wisconsin	0.44	58.43	58.85	0.42	20,447	Texas	0.28	60.22	60.25	0.03	4,941	60.87	61.20	0.33	54,353		
Mississippi	0.44	76.62	76.91	0.29	8,652	Washington	0.28	50.00	50.00	0.00	0	50.00	50.00	0.00	0		
Delaware	0.47	50.00	50.00	0.00	0	Idaho	0.41	70.46	70.57	0.11	998	70.62	70.55	-0.07	-635		
South Dakota	0.49	65.29	65.15	-0.14	-766	Nebraska	0.47	59.89	60.22	0.33	4,893	59.64	59.08	-0.56	-8,303		
Arkansas	0.50	74.28	73.87	-0.41	-9,836	Arkansas	0.54	74.67	74.89	0.22	6,219	74.75	74.43	-0.32	-9,045		
Kentucky	0.54	69.89	70.07	0.18	7,007	Rhode Island	0.56	56.03	56.14	0.11	1,697	55.38	54.83	-0.55	-8,486		
Oklahoma	0.63	70.56	71.02	0.46	11,115	Montana	0.59	72.85	72.77	-0.08	-427	71.90	71.25	-0.65	-3,468		
Kansas	0.65	60.15	60.65	0.50	8,882	Virginia	0.61	50.00	50.00	0.00	0	50.00	50.00	0.00	0		
Maryland	0.67	50.00	50.00	0.00	0	Georgia	0.64	59.58	59.79	0.21	14,403	60.44	60.71	0.27	18,519		
Montana	0.68	72.96	73.43	0.47	2,404	North Dakota	0.66	68.31	67.86	-0.45	-2,239	67.49	67.10	-0.39	-1,940		
Maine	0.75	66.22	66.55	0.33	5,564	Wyoming	0.72	59.77	59.45	-0.32	-1,163	57.90	56.69	-1.21	-4,398		
Nebraska	0.87	59.52	59.96	0.44	6,077	Maryland	0.81	50.00	50.00	0.00	0	50.00	50.00	0.00	0		
Arizona	1.00	67.25	66.31	-0.94	-40,188	Vermont	0.88	61.34	61.16	-0.18	-1,352	60.11	59.34	-0.77	-5,783		
Florida	1.02	58.83	58.61	-0.22	-24,242	Arizona	1.06	67.26	67.46	0.20	10,323	67.45	67.52	0.07	3,613		
Hawaii	1.05	58.77	58.99	0.22	1,673	Florida	1.07	58.93	59.38	0.45	51,233	58.90	58.79	-0.11	-12,524		
Wyoming	1.15	61.32	61.23	-0.09	-304	New Mexico	1.09	74.85	74.90	0.05	1,147	74.30	73.51	-0.79	-18,119		
New Mexico	1.27	74.56	74.41	-0.15	-3,084	Alaska	1.24	58.39	58.36	-0.03	-269	57.58	57.06	-0.52	-4,668		
Rhode Island	1.27	55.40	54.15	-1.25	-18,504	South Dakota	1.41	65.67	65.84	0.17	977	66.03	65.97	-0.06	-345		
Alaska	1.51	58.27	58.93	0.66	5,378	Hawaii	1.74	58.90	59.28	0.38	2,997	58.47	58.14	-0.33	-2,602		
Nevada	2.36	52.39	50.91	-1.48	-14,612	Nevada	1.94	54.93	55.96	1.03	12,709	55.90	56.38	0.48	5,923		
District of Columbia	N/A	70.00	70.00	0.00	0	District of Columbia	N/A	70.00	70.00	0.00	0	70.00	70.00	0.00	0		
United States					\$221,685	United States					\$289,568				-\$187,981		

1/ Impact based on expected FY 2003 and 2004 state Medicaid vendor payments, as estimated by states in August 2003.

**Table 3. Impact in Two Years of Estimating FMAPs Using Preliminary Personal Income Data
(federal fiscal years; dollars in thousands)**

State	2003					State	2004				
	Index DEC 02	Current Law	Alternative	Change	Impact I/ 1/		Index SEPT 03	Current Law	Alternative	Change	Impact I/ 1/
New York	-1.07	50.00	50.00	0.00	\$0	Connecticut	-1.08	50.00	50.00	0.00	\$0
Massachusetts	-1.02	50.00	50.00	0.00	0	Massachusetts	-0.89	50.00	50.00	0.00	0
Illinois	-0.74	50.00	50.00	0.00	0	New York	-0.65	50.00	50.00	0.00	0
West Virginia	-0.64	75.04	75.07	0.03	574	Ohio	-0.61	59.23	59.64	0.41	48,219
Washington	-0.63	50.00	50.25	0.25	14,002	West Virginia	-0.58	75.19	74.10	-1.09	-20,846
Missouri	-0.62	61.23	61.53	0.30	17,926	Missouri	-0.57	61.47	60.94	-0.53	-31,669
Colorado	-0.61	50.00	50.00	0.00	0	Illinois	-0.53	50.00	50.00	0.00	0
Michigan	-0.60	55.42	56.60	1.18	98,377	Indiana	-0.51	62.32	62.83	0.51	25,900
Connecticut	-0.52	50.00	50.00	0.00	0	Pennsylvania	-0.47	54.76	53.33	-1.43	-193,492
Ohio	-0.49	58.83	59.61	0.78	91,733	Oklahoma	-0.45	70.24	69.49	-0.75	-19,808
Iowa	-0.42	63.50	63.62	0.12	2,745	South Carolina	-0.44	69.86	69.83	-0.03	-1,109
Alabama	-0.40	70.60	71.01	0.41	14,142	Delaware	-0.43	50.00	50.00	0.00	0
Indiana	-0.39	61.97	62.59	0.62	31,486	Kansas	-0.31	60.82	60.37	-0.45	-8,456
Utah	-0.30	71.24	71.39	0.15	1,826	Iowa	-0.30	63.93	63.17	-0.76	-17,385
Virginia	-0.17	50.53	50.00	-0.53	-22,707	Alabama	-0.26	70.75	70.58	-0.17	-5,864
Minnesota	-0.17	50.00	50.00	0.00	0	Minnesota	-0.23	50.00	50.00	0.00	0
New Hampshire	-0.16	50.00	50.00	0.00	0	Colorado	-0.21	50.00	50.00	0.00	0
North Dakota	-0.13	68.36	68.17	-0.19	-945	North Carolina	-0.15	62.85	63.81	0.96	72,817
Idaho	0.09	70.96	70.97	0.01	91	Michigan	-0.12	55.89	57.07	1.18	98,377
Tennessee	0.11	64.59	64.98	0.39	26,752	Kentucky	-0.11	70.09	69.56	-0.53	-20,763
Pennsylvania	0.14	54.69	54.42	-0.27	-36,533	New Jersey	-0.11	50.00	50.00	0.00	0
North Carolina	0.18	62.56	62.82	0.26	19,721	Louisiana	-0.10	71.63	70.23	-1.40	-62,609
California	0.18	50.00	50.00	0.00	0	New Hampshire	-0.10	50.00	50.00	0.00	0
Georgia	0.22	59.60	60.13	0.53	36,351	Utah	-0.04	71.72	72.07	0.35	4,261
Texas	0.24	59.99	60.12	0.13	21,412	Mississippi	-0.02	77.08	76.83	-0.25	-8,324
Vermont	0.27	62.41	62.08	-0.33	-2,478	Tennessee	-0.02	64.40	64.52	0.12	8,232
South Carolina	0.33	69.81	70.23	0.42	15,528	Maine	0.01	66.01	64.36	-1.65	-31,187
New Jersey	0.39	50.00	50.00	0.00	0	Oregon	0.05	60.81	61.22	0.41	10,309
Louisiana	0.42	71.28	71.94	0.66	29,516	Wisconsin	0.06	58.41	58.22	-0.19	-8,687
Oregon	0.42	60.16	60.94	0.78	19,613	California	0.20	50.00	50.00	0.00	0
Wisconsin	0.44	58.43	59.02	0.59	26,977	Texas	0.28	60.22	61.13	0.91	149,883
Mississippi	0.44	76.62	77.18	0.56	18,646	Washington	0.28	50.00	50.03	0.03	1,680
Delaware	0.47	50.00	50.00	0.00	0	Idaho	0.41	70.46	70.63	0.17	1,543
South Dakota	0.49	65.29	65.56	0.27	1,551	Nebraska	0.47	59.89	58.90	-0.99	-14,678
Arkansas	0.50	74.28	74.57	0.29	8,197	Arkansas	0.54	74.67	74.42	-0.25	-7,067
Kentucky	0.54	69.89	69.55	-0.34	-13,319	Rhode Island	0.56	56.03	54.67	-1.36	-20,984
Oklahoma	0.63	70.56	70.42	-0.14	-3,698	Montana	0.59	72.85	71.22	-1.63	-8,696
Kansas	0.65	60.15	60.62	0.47	8,832	Virginia	0.61	50.00	50.00	0.00	0
Maryland	0.67	50.00	50.00	0.00	0	Georgia	0.64	59.58	60.69	1.11	76,132
Montana	0.68	72.96	73.26	0.30	1,600	North Dakota	0.66	68.31	66.70	-1.61	-8,009
Maine	0.75	66.22	66.21	-0.01	-189	Wyoming	0.72	59.77	56.73	-3.04	-11,050
Nebraska	0.87	59.52	60.18	0.66	9,785	Maryland	0.81	50.00	50.00	0.00	0
Arizona	1.00	67.25	67.88	0.63	32,517	Vermont	0.88	61.34	59.33	-2.01	-15,095
Florida	1.02	58.83	60.09	1.26	143,453	Arizona	1.06	67.26	67.60	0.34	17,549
Hawaii	1.05	58.77	59.88	1.11	8,753	Florida	1.07	58.93	58.89	-0.04	-4,554
Wyoming	1.15	61.32	60.20	-1.12	-4,071	New Mexico	1.09	74.85	73.57	-1.28	-29,358
New Mexico	1.27	74.56	74.36	-0.20	-4,587	Alaska	1.24	58.39	56.72	-1.67	-14,991
Rhode Island	1.27	55.40	55.96	0.56	8,641	South Dakota	1.41	65.67	65.83	0.16	919
Alaska	1.51	58.27	57.95	-0.32	-2,872	Hawaii	1.74	58.90	58.34	-0.56	-4,416
Nevada	2.36	52.39	55.56	3.17	39,114	Nevada	1.94	54.93	56.52	1.59	19,619
District of Columbia	N/A	70.00	70.00	0.00	0	District of Columbia	N/A	70.00	70.00	0.00	0
United States					\$658,462	United States					-\$33,657

1/ Impact based on expected FY 2003 and 2004 state Medicaid vendor payments, as estimated by states in August 2003.

**Table 4. Options for Aiding Selected States with High Unemployment Rates
(federal fiscal year 2004; dollars in thousands)**

State	2003 Global Unemployment Rate	Aid States with Unemployment Rates Above 120% of U.S. Average		Assist States with High or Growing Insured Unemployment Rates				
		FMAP Change	Impact	2003 Insured Unemployment Rate	Increase FMAP for One Fiscal Quarter		Total Increase	Impact
					Rate Above 3 Percent	Increase >5 Percent		
Alabama	5.8	0.00	\$0	2.2	0.00	0.00	0.00	\$0
Alaska	8.0	0.80	7,181	5.2	2.20	0.00	2.20	4,937
Arizona	5.6	0.00	0	2.2	0.00	1.00	1.00	12,904
Arkansas	6.2	0.00	0	3.2	0.20	0.00	0.20	1,413
California	6.7	0.00	0	3.6	0.60	0.00	0.60	48,999
Colorado	6.0	0.00	0	2.0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0
Connecticut	5.5	0.00	0	3.3	0.30	1.00	1.30	11,930
Delaware	4.4	0.00	0	2.5	0.00	1.00	1.00	1,904
District of Columbia	7.0	0.00	0	1.6	0.00	0.00	0.00	0
Florida	5.1	0.00	0	1.7	0.00	0.00	0.00	0
Georgia	4.7	0.00	0	1.9	0.00	0.00	0.00	0
Hawaii	4.3	0.00	0	1.9	0.00	0.00	0.00	0
Idaho	5.4	0.00	0	3.5	0.50	0.00	0.50	1,135
Illinois	6.7	0.00	0	3.2	0.20	0.00	0.20	5,085
Indiana	5.1	0.00	0	2.3	0.00	0.00	0.00	0
Iowa	4.5	0.00	0	2.3	0.00	0.00	0.00	0
Kansas	5.4	0.00	0	2.4	0.00	1.00	1.00	4,698
Kentucky	6.2	0.00	0	2.4	0.00	0.00	0.00	0
Louisiana	6.6	0.00	0	2.1	0.00	0.00	0.00	0
Maine	5.1	0.00	0	2.3	0.00	0.00	0.00	0
Maryland	4.5	0.00	0	2.1	0.00	0.00	0.00	0
Massachusetts	5.8	0.00	0	3.5	0.50	0.00	0.50	12,284
Michigan	7.3	0.10	8,337	3.6	0.60	0.00	0.60	12,506
Minnesota	5.0	0.00	0	2.4	0.00	0.00	0.00	0
Mississippi	6.3	0.00	0	2.5	0.00	0.00	0.00	0
Missouri	5.6	0.00	0	2.7	0.00	0.00	0.00	0
Montana	4.7	0.00	0	2.6	0.00	0.00	0.00	0
Nebraska	4.0	0.00	0	1.7	0.00	1.00	1.00	3,707
Nevada	5.2	0.00	0	2.7	0.00	0.00	0.00	0
New Hampshire	4.3	0.00	0	1.6	0.00	0.00	0.00	0
New Jersey	5.9	0.00	0	3.5	0.50	0.00	0.50	9,906
New Mexico	6.4	0.00	0	2.1	0.00	0.00	0.00	0
New York	6.3	0.00	0	3.0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0
North Carolina	6.5	0.00	0	2.9	0.00	0.00	0.00	0
North Dakota	4.0	0.00	0	1.5	0.00	0.00	0.00	0
Ohio	6.1	0.00	0	2.5	0.00	0.00	0.00	0
Oklahoma	5.7	0.00	0	2.1	0.00	1.00	1.00	6,603
Oregon	8.2	1.00	25,144	4.5	1.50	0.00	1.50	9,429
Pennsylvania	5.6	0.00	0	4.0	1.00	0.00	1.00	33,827
Rhode Island	5.3	0.00	0	3.1	0.10	0.00	0.10	386
South Carolina	6.8	0.00	0	2.8	0.00	0.00	0.00	0
South Dakota	3.6	0.00	0	1.0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0
Tennessee	5.8	0.00	0	2.3	0.00	0.00	0.00	0
Texas	6.8	0.00	0	2.2	0.00	0.00	0.00	0
Utah	5.6	0.00	0	1.8	0.00	0.00	0.00	0
Vermont	4.6	0.00	0	2.9	0.00	0.00	0.00	0
Virginia	4.1	0.00	0	1.5	0.00	0.00	0.00	0
Washington	7.5	0.30	16,803	4.0	1.00	0.00	1.00	14,002
West Virginia	6.1	0.00	0	2.9	0.00	1.00	1.00	4,781
Wisconsin	5.6	0.00	0	3.4	0.40	0.00	0.40	4,572
Wyoming	4.4	0.00	0	1.8	0.00	1.00	1.00	909
United States	6.0		\$57,465	2.8				\$205,916

**Table 5. Options for Assisting All Or Many States in Times of High Unemployment
(federal fiscal year 2004; dollars in thousands)**

State	2003 Global Unemployment Rate	Aid States with Unemployment Rates Above U.S. Average		Assist All States	
		FMAP Change	Impact	FMAP Change	Impact
Alabama	5.8	0.00	\$0	1.00	\$34,493
Alaska	8.0	2.00	17,953	1.00	8,976
Arizona	5.6	0.00	0	1.00	51,614
Arkansas	6.2	0.20	5,653	1.00	28,267
California	6.7	0.70	228,662	1.00	326,660
Colorado	6.0	0.00	0	1.00	26,710
Connecticut	5.5	0.00	0	1.00	36,708
Delaware	4.4	0.00	0	1.00	7,614
District of Columbia	7.0	1.00	12,536	1.00	12,536
Florida	5.1	0.00	0	1.00	113,852
Georgia	4.7	0.00	0	1.00	68,587
Hawaii	4.3	0.00	0	1.00	7,886
Idaho	5.4	0.00	0	1.00	9,077
Illinois	6.7	0.70	71,197	1.00	101,710
Indiana	5.1	0.00	0	1.00	50,784
Iowa	4.5	0.00	0	1.00	22,875
Kansas	5.4	0.00	0	1.00	18,791
Kentucky	6.2	0.20	7,835	1.00	39,175
Louisiana	6.6	0.60	26,833	1.00	44,721
Maine	5.1	0.00	0	1.00	18,901
Maryland	4.5	0.00	0	1.00	48,950
Massachusetts	5.8	0.00	0	1.00	98,269
Michigan	7.3	1.30	108,381	1.00	83,370
Minnesota	5.0	0.00	0	1.00	55,232
Mississippi	6.3	0.30	9,989	1.00	33,296
Missouri	5.6	0.00	0	1.00	59,753
Montana	4.7	0.00	0	1.00	5,335
Nebraska	4.0	0.00	0	1.00	14,826
Nevada	5.2	0.00	0	1.00	12,339
New Hampshire	4.3	0.00	0	1.00	10,957
New Jersey	5.9	0.00	0	1.00	79,252
New Mexico	6.4	0.40	9,174	1.00	22,936
New York	6.3	0.30	147,752	1.00	492,506
North Carolina	6.5	0.50	37,926	1.00	75,851
North Dakota	4.0	0.00	0	1.00	4,975
Ohio	6.1	0.10	11,761	1.00	117,607
Oklahoma	5.7	0.00	0	1.00	26,411
Oregon	8.2	2.20	55,318	1.00	25,144
Pennsylvania	5.6	0.00	0	1.00	135,309
Rhode Island	5.3	0.00	0	1.00	15,430
South Carolina	6.8	0.80	29,577	1.00	36,972
South Dakota	3.6	0.00	0	1.00	5,744
Tennessee	5.8	0.00	0	1.00	68,596
Texas	6.8	0.80	131,765	1.00	164,707
Utah	5.6	0.00	0	1.00	12,175
Vermont	4.6	0.00	0	1.00	7,510
Virginia	4.1	0.00	0	1.00	42,843
Washington	7.5	1.50	84,014	1.00	56,009
West Virginia	6.1	0.10	1,912	1.00	19,124
Wisconsin	5.6	0.00	0	1.00	45,724
Wyoming	4.4	0.00	0	1.00	3,635
United States	6.0		\$998,238		\$2,910,722

**Table A-1. Potential Medicaid and SCHIP Impact of FY 2006 FMAs
(federal fiscal years; dollars in thousands)**

State	FMAs		Enhanced FMAs		2005 Medicaid Vendor Payments		2005 SCHIP Expenditures		Illustrative FY 2006 Grant Impacts 1/		
	2005	2006	2005	2006	Total	Grants	Total	Grants	Medicaid	SCHIP	Total
Alabama	70.83	69.51	79.58	78.66	\$3,754,930	\$2,665,633	\$90,756	\$71,688	-\$53,530	-\$1,294	-\$54,824
Alaska	57.58	50.16	70.31	65.11	\$942,281	598,508	25,600	18,144	-75,511	-2,051	-77,562
Arizona	67.45	66.98	77.22	76.89	5,548,095	3,809,057	236,778	182,846	-28,162	-1,202	-29,364
Arkansas	74.75	73.77	82.33	81.64	3,008,355	2,253,259	35,726	29,414	-31,840	-378	-32,219
California	50.00	50.00	65.00	65.00	33,910,127	17,074,450	1,331,792	842,177	0	0	0
Colorado	50.00	50.00	65.00	65.00	2,795,004	1,399,664	74,600	48,490	0	0	0
Connecticut	50.00	50.00	65.00	65.00	4,030,755	2,020,863	36,589	23,783	0	0	0
Delaware	50.38	50.09	65.27	65.06	814,537	425,563	8,096	5,264	-2,551	-25	-2,576
District of Columbia	70.00	70.00	79.00	79.00	1,237,999	889,631	8,692	6,867	0	0	0
Florida	58.90	58.89	71.23	71.22	13,201,598	7,782,016	420,707	299,753	-1,426	-45	-1,471
Georgia	60.44	60.60	72.31	72.42	7,166,466	4,349,524	311,448	225,208	12,384	538	12,922
Hawaii	58.47	58.81	70.93	71.17	921,013	539,097	14,248	10,107	3,382	52	3,434
Idaho	70.62	69.91	79.43	78.94	1,017,131	719,474	26,576	21,110	-7,799	-204	-8,003
Illinois	50.00	50.00	65.00	65.00	10,079,994	5,060,545	397,332	258,268	0	0	0
Indiana	62.78	62.98	73.95	74.09	5,413,531	3,403,941	99,600	73,478	11,693	215	11,908
Iowa	63.55	63.61	74.49	74.53	2,350,020	1,495,772	62,656	46,673	1,523	41	1,563
Kansas	61.01	60.41	72.71	72.29	2,030,156	1,239,678	59,287	43,107	-13,155	-384	-13,540
Kentucky	69.60	69.26	78.72	78.48	4,075,918	2,836,836	99,289	78,498	-14,967	-365	-15,331
Louisiana	71.04	69.79	79.73	78.85	5,156,653	3,663,288	140,622	112,147	-69,615	-1,898	-71,513
Maine	64.89	62.90	75.42	74.03	2,141,376	1,390,223	30,697	23,091	-46,022	-660	-46,682
Maryland	50.00	50.00	65.00	65.00	4,953,251	2,477,468	225,056	146,283	0	0	0
Massachusetts	50.00	50.00	65.00	65.00	9,091,514	4,558,977	165,000	106,200	0	0	0
Michigan	56.71	56.59	69.70	69.61	8,767,058	4,974,310	322,888	225,052	-11,362	-418	-11,781
Minnesota	50.00	50.00	65.00	65.00	5,497,792	2,791,685	125,455	81,478	0	0	0
Mississippi	77.08	76.00	83.96	83.20	3,480,616	2,683,502	136,000	113,736	-40,598	-1,586	-42,184
Missouri	61.15	61.93	72.81	73.35	6,673,476	4,092,569	122,395	89,120	56,217	1,031	57,248
Montana	71.90	70.54	80.33	79.38	715,525	514,602	17,600	14,256	-10,510	-259	-10,768
Nebraska	59.64	59.68	71.75	71.78	1,539,151	917,948	46,680	33,492	665	20	685
Nevada	55.90	54.76	69.13	68.33	1,257,983	703,696	37,024	25,595	-15,488	-456	-15,944
New Hampshire	50.00	50.00	65.00	65.00	1,274,948	637,474	9,352	7,957	0	0	0
New Jersey	50.00	50.00	65.00	65.00	8,452,437	4,231,040	406,864	264,461	0	0	0
New Mexico	74.30	71.15	82.01	79.81	2,397,568	1,805,436	27,257	25,737	-81,565	-927	-82,493
New York	50.00	50.00	65.00	65.00	51,228,941	25,666,770	958,648	623,123	0	0	0
North Carolina	63.63	63.49	74.54	74.44	8,639,915	5,511,392	244,358	181,738	-13,064	-369	-13,433
North Dakota	67.49	65.85	77.24	76.10	534,379	364,442	10,799	8,320	-9,465	-191	-9,656
Ohio	59.68	59.88	71.78	71.92	12,649,373	7,549,146	239,310	171,774	27,323	517	27,840
Oklahoma	70.18	67.91	79.13	77.54	2,754,284	1,932,957	59,208	46,853	-67,524	-1,452	-68,976
Oregon	61.12	61.57	72.78	73.10	2,595,627	1,593,309	37,000	26,928	12,615	180	12,795
Pennsylvania	53.84	55.05	67.69	68.54	16,458,475	8,883,731	229,743	155,513	215,079	3,002	218,082
Rhode Island	55.38	54.45	68.77	68.12	1,743,318	965,448	27,000	18,569	-17,510	-271	-17,781
South Carolina	69.89	69.32	78.92	78.52	4,008,852	2,803,749	81,760	64,520	-24,678	-503	-25,182
South Dakota	66.03	65.07	76.22	75.55	652,137	446,416	20,000	15,244	-6,761	-207	-6,969
Tennessee	64.81	63.99	75.37	74.79	7,163,836	4,642,883	0	0	-63,443	0	-63,443
Texas	60.87	60.66	72.61	72.46	17,458,243	10,647,132	370,000	268,657	-39,595	-839	-40,434
Utah	72.14	70.76	80.50	79.53	1,406,702	1,014,794	37,477	30,139	-20,965	-559	-21,524
Vermont	60.11	58.49	72.08	70.94	826,474	498,658	4,422	3,187	-14,460	-77	-14,537
Virginia	50.00	50.00	65.00	65.00	4,619,814	2,309,903	118,412	76,967	0	0	0
Washington	50.00	50.00	65.00	65.00	5,680,586	2,878,187	39,895	43,276	0	0	0
West Virginia	74.65	72.99	82.26	81.09	2,043,673	1,525,905	39,800	32,886	-36,639	-714	-37,353
Wisconsin	58.32	57.65	70.82	70.36	4,698,132	2,740,468	150,141	106,332	-33,996	-1,086	-35,082
Wyoming	57.90	54.23	70.53	67.96	389,647	225,605	8,112	5,723	-15,444	-322	-15,766
Puerto Rico	50.00	50.00			359,497	184,397	59,926	38,952	0	0	0
Territories	50.00	50.00			33,710	17,012	5,165	3,025	0	0	0
Total	---	---			\$309,642,873	\$176,408,033	\$7,893,838	\$5,475,206	-\$526,766	-\$13,147	-\$539,914

1/ Assumes each state's FY 2006 Medicaid program will cost 8% more than FY 2005 projected levels.

Sources: FFIS calculations and CMS-37 August 2004 report.

Copyright © 2004 FFIS Federal Funds Information for States. All rights reserved.

Background References

Linda Blumberg, John Holahan, Marilyn Moon, Options for Reforming the Medicaid Matching Formula, The Urban Institute, February 18, 1993.

John Holahan and Bowen Garrett, Rising Unemployment and Medicaid, Urban Institute, October 16, 2001.

Vic Miller, Recent Changes in Federal Grants and State Budgets, The Health Policy Agenda: Some Critical Questions, Chapter 3, American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy, 1985.

Vic Miller, Fiscal Federalism and Medicaid, Spectrum: The Journal of State Government, Spring 2003.

Vic Miller, States to Receive Fiscal Relief from Federal Government, FFIS, Issue Brief 03-24, May 23, 2003.

United States General Accounting Office, Medicaid: Alternatives for Improving the Distribution of Funds, GAO, Report No. GAO/HRD-91-66FS, May 1991.

United States General Accounting Office, Medicaid Formula Alternative, Report No. GAO/HRD-93-17R, March 2 1993.

United States General Accounting Office, Medicaid Formula: Differences in Funding Ability Among States are Often Widened, Report No. GAO-03-620, July 10, 2003.