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State Medicaid programs in FY 2011. Medicaid is financed jointly by federal and state funds, with the majority of policies and administrative responsibilities in the hands of the states. Even as the overall economy begins to recover, Medicaid caseload and spending growth in most states remain high, state revenue growth remains weak and almost all states are likely to continue to face budget gaps and shortfalls heading into state FY 2011 and beyond. It is often projected that it could take several years for revenues to return to pre-recession levels. For 2009-2011, extra Medicaid funds became a central part of states’ access to recovery funding, with a final 50-state share totaling $87 billion. As a result of preliminary congressional votes and broad state support, more than half of the states, as of June 2010, assumed an extension of the ARRA enhanced FMAP through June 30, 2011 (an additional six months) in the SFY 2011 budget.

State-created health provider taxes, also called provider “assessments” or “fees,” have been a staple part of state fiscal strategies for almost 20 years, using a 1991 federal law which authorized such state-to-federal matching fund arrangements for Medicaid. Especially in times of fiscal downturns or crisis, states frequently turn to provider taxes to raise non-federal dollars to support Medicaid programs. This state money is matched with federal money, which increases funds for Medicaid operations or expansions and allows for higher provider reimbursement. This can offset parts of the tax providers pay.

FMAP matching demystified. The percentage and amount of federal fund contribution to each state is known as “FMAP”. The recent economic downturn prompted the federal government to increase their match rate. This rate is calculated on an increasingly complex formula and always varies by state. The 15-17 more financially affluent states traditionally received a basic match rate of 50 percent federal (to 50 percent state). Less affluent states receive a higher rate.

The Children's Health Insurance Program (CHIP) provides insurance for certain children who are ineligible for Medicaid but cannot afford private insurance. States receive a higher federal match to pay for CHIP coverage than for their Medicaid programs. This match can either be used to create a separate CHIP program or to create an expansion of the state's Medicaid program, which raises the Medicaid eligibility level for children.
Three southwest state examples, for comparison --

- **For 2010** the base FMAP is  
  - NM = 71.35%  
  - CO = 50%  
  - AZ = 65.75%

- Base CHIP FMAP  
  - NM = 79.95  
  - CO = 65%  
  - AZ = 76.03%

- The ARRA "enhanced FMAP" increased to  
  - NM = 80.49%  
  - CO = 61.59%  
  - AZ = 75.93%

On October 1, 2010, the rates change ---

- **For 2011** (to 10/1/11) the base FMAP ii is  
  - NM = 69.78%  
  - CO = 50%  
  - AZ = 65.85%

- The ARRA "enhanced FMAP" changes to  
  - NM = 78.85%  
  - CO = 65%  
  - AZ = 76.10%

(Changed to a phased reduction as of 1/1/2011, by US Congress)

**UPDATE:** On August 10, 2010 the U.S. House voted (247/161) to approve H.R. 1586 containing a six-month extension of the ARRA enhanced match for the Medicaid (FMAP) programs. In particular, the legislation will provide states $16.1 billion through a phased-down enhanced match--providing 3.1 percent beginning the first calendar quarter of FY2011, then drop to 1.2 percent in the second calendar quarter (4/1/11 to 6/30/11).

Some expenses have separate matching rates:

- CHIP (Children’s Health) receive  
  - Up to 30% higher, varies by state  
  (CHIP is not subject to ARRA increase)

- HIT claims upgrades receive  
  - 90% (all states)

- Administrative expenses receive  
  - 50% (all states)

---

**Expanded Use of Provider Taxes** In a majority of cases, states have designed their provider tax as part of a rate or reimbursement adjustment for health providers, including those paying the new tax.

The number of states and DC taxing at least one provider category reached 44 at the end of FY 2008, and increased to 45 states & DC for FY 2009 and FY 2010. 33 of these taxed more than one category of providers in FY 2009, by FY 2010 36 have more than one provider tax.

New Mexico is included in this tally  [Figure 27 below]
State examples:

- California proposed a 2010 hospital tax that would generate up to $2 billion in federal funds to be used to help finance Medi-Cal.
- Colorado’s new hospital provider fee law, 2009. [See "A Colorado Story"]

Also see the attached two 50-state tables + NCSL 2009 & 2010 New Laws for state-specific information on provider taxes.

Compared to FY 2008, in FY 2010 approximately . . .

- an additional seven states were set to have hospital taxes,
- four more states will have taxes on nursing facilities, and
- four more states will have taxes on Intermediate Care Facilities for the Developmentally Disabled (ICF/MR-DD).

In their effort to find additional revenue sources for Medicaid, states not only increased the number of provider groups that were taxed, but also increased the size of some of those taxes. For FY 2010 the rate of provider taxes were increased for seven nursing facility taxes, five hospital taxes, three ICF/MR-DD taxes and two Managed Care (MCO) taxes. The only taxes being reduced in FY 2010 are two MCO taxes that are being reduced to meet the new federal limits.

Federal Limits on Use. There also are limits on a state’s ability to use provider-specific taxes to fund their state share of Medicaid expenditures. The Voluntary Contribution and Provider-Specific Tax Amendments of 1991 places restrictions (known as "provider-specific caps") on states' use of provider-generated revenues (from provider taxes) as a source of state matching funds. Under the legislation, the federal match available to a state can be denied, unless the taxes were:

1) "Broad-based." A tax was judged to be broad-based if it met two criteria; it must apply to all items or services within the same class of providers and it must apply uniformly, meaning that the tax was imposed on all gross revenues of the providers that were subject to it.
2) "Permissible." Under federal law and regulations, there are eight classes of health care on which states may impose a provider tax and another nine that have been approved by federal regulation. iv [See list at Appendix A”]

3) Contain no "hold-harmless" provisions. A tax was deemed to hold providers harmless (and therefore be impermissible) if it in any way guaranteed that providers subject to the tax would not be liable for its true burden.

4) The rate of state taxation frequently is set at not more than 5.5% of receipts, a standard federal maximum. Any provider tax at a higher rate must meet a much closer set of federal tests, which most states avoid invoking. This nominal maximum rate had been 6% until January 1, 2008, and will go back to 6% on September 30, 2011.v

Managed Care Organization (MCO) Taxes. Federal Medicaid law was changed effective July 1, 2009 to restrict the use of Medicaid provider taxes on managed care organizations such as HMOs.

- As a result the number of states reporting a Medicaid provider tax on HMOs decreased from 16 states to 11 states for FY 2010.
- Several of those 11 states report that their HMO taxes were already broad-based taxes that were not limited to just Medicaid HMOs. Four states of the 11 states report that they are replacing taxes that applied only to Medicaid HMOs with new taxes that apply to all HMOs or they are removing provisions that previously exempted Medicaid HMOs from broad-based insurance or premium taxes.

Federal proposed regulations were issued on May 6, 2009. [See 42 CFR Part 433]vi

It delayed enforcement of certain portions of the February 22, 2008, final rule on Medicaid Provider Taxes until June 30, 2010. Among those provisions was a change in the definition of the class of managed care provider which had been mandated in the Deficit Reduction of 2005. The managed care provision had a compliance date of October 1, 2009. The final enforcement deadline was June 30, 2010.

Approximately eight states were out of compliance with the managed care provisions when these regulations were issued. The states include CA, KY, MI, MO, OH, OR and PA.

- Pennsylvania resolved this non-compliance by enacting a gross receipts tax on the managed care plans tied to the amount of revenue they received from Medicaid. A tax of 59 mills is imposed on each dollar of gross receipts received by managed care organizations pursuant to a contract with the PA Department of Public Welfare. Effective October 1, 2009.

During the federal health reform discussions and during other Congressional discussions, there was a push to allow them to retain their managed care provider tax plans as "grandfathered" plans. No such provision was included in the health reform law.
Expected Impacts of Federal Health Reform

One of the major changes enacted in the federal Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (PPACA) law is the expansion of Medicaid to most people with incomes up to 133 percent of the federal poverty guidelines ($14,404 for an individual and $29,327 for a family of four in 2009-10). This will remove the state-by-state variability for the lowest income people in the nation and will, for the first time, require states to extend eligibility to childless adults. The new federal law will provide federal financing (FMAP) for all newly eligible individuals according to the following schedule:

- 100 percent FMAP for 2014 to 2016; (0 percent state funds)
- 95 percent FMAP for 2017;
- 94 percent FMAP for 2018; and
- 90 percent FMAP for 2020 and beyond.

A number of states are concerned that the 2017 and beyond required state spending will be a financial burden with uncertain or unknown impact.
**Medicaid reform policy examples** as presented by Cindy Mann, CMS Deputy Administrator, Director, Center for Medicaid, CHIP & Survey & Certification, Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services, HHS.

Presented at NCSL meetings, April 9, 2010 and July 25, 2010.

**Notes and Sources:**

1. State Medicaid Agencies Prepare for Health Care Reform While Continuing to Face Challenges from the Recession - KCMU, August 2, 2010

2. HHS Regulation in Federal Register http://aspe.hhs.gov/health/fmap11.htm


4. Eight provider classes exist and include inpatient and outpatient hospital services, nursing homes, intermediate care facilities for the mentally retarded, physician services, home health, prescription drugs, and health maintenance organizations. Additional provider classes that may be taxed include dentistry, podiatry, chiropractic, optometry, psychological, therapeutic, nursing, laboratory and radiology services. [See Appendix A, reprinted from California analysis, Nov. 2008.]


6. CMS–2275–P2] RIN 0938–AP74 federal rule revised the threshold levels under the regulatory indirect guarantee hold harmless arrangement test to reflect the provisions of the Tax Relief and Health Care Act of 2006, amended the definition of the “class of managed care organization services.”
## 2010 Health Care Provider Tax Changes

### Appendix F. Health Taxes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>FY 2011 Amount (in millions)</th>
<th>FY 2012 Amount (in millions)</th>
<th>Effective Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>$20.9</td>
<td>$20.9</td>
<td></td>
<td>Raised the nursing home bed tax.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>$18.0</td>
<td>$18.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>Approved the Idaho Hospital Assessment Act, which calls for calls for private hospitals to pay an extra hospital tax for Idaho’s Medicaid program for two years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>$15.3</td>
<td>$15.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Created a new assessment on skilled nursing facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>$4.2</td>
<td>$15.6</td>
<td></td>
<td>Approved a one-time hospital assessment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>$45.2</td>
<td>$45.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Lifted the cap on hospital and ambulatory facilities assessments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>$32.4</td>
<td>$32.4</td>
<td></td>
<td>Raised the tax assessed on hospitals for one year from 1.52 percent to 1.61 percent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>$286.0</td>
<td>$286.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>Adopted a new hospital assessment fee of 3.52 percent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>$30.9</td>
<td>$30.9</td>
<td></td>
<td>Imposed new assessments on hospitals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>$352.0</td>
<td>$352.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>Increased the hospital safety net assessment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>$10.6</td>
<td>$10.6</td>
<td></td>
<td>Created a 1.6 percent assessment on gross inpatient revenues of critical access hospitals.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## 2009 Health Care Provider Tax Changes

### Appendix F. Health Taxes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>FY 2010 Amount (in millions)</th>
<th>FY 2011 Amount (in millions)</th>
<th>Effective Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>$200.0</td>
<td>$200.0</td>
<td>10/1/2009</td>
<td>Establishes a hospital tax.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>Adds insurance providers to the existing corporate income tax credit for contributions made to school tuition organizations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>$336.5</td>
<td>$389.8</td>
<td>4/21/2009</td>
<td>Authorizes collection of provider fees from hospitals to obtain federal financial participation for the state’s medical assistance programs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>$8.0</td>
<td>$12.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Provides for a quality assessment to be imposed upon privately operated intermediate care facilities for the developmentally disabled.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>$101.0</td>
<td>$99.9</td>
<td>7/1/2009</td>
<td>Extends the Medicaid health facility quality assessment fee.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 2009 Health Care Provider Tax Changes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>FY 2010 Amount (in millions)</th>
<th>FY 2011 Amount (in millions)</th>
<th>Effective Date</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>$33.0</td>
<td>$33.0</td>
<td>TY 2009</td>
<td>Creates a nursing facility quality assurance fee (requires federal approval before implementation).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>$60.0</td>
<td>$60.0</td>
<td>7/1/2009</td>
<td>Provides a hospital assessment tax.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>-$11.0**</td>
<td>-$16.1**</td>
<td>Phases in the hospital gross receipts tax credit (phased in completely in FY 2012, from 2007 session).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>$124.3</td>
<td>$135.6</td>
<td>4/1/2009</td>
<td>Changes the hospital assessment tax.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$99.0</td>
<td>$108.0</td>
<td>4/1/2009</td>
<td>Raises the hospital surcharge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$240.0</td>
<td>$120.0</td>
<td>10/1/2008</td>
<td>Adjusts a covered lives assessment (insurance surcharge).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$5.0</td>
<td>$5.0</td>
<td>4/7/2009</td>
<td>Changes an out-of-state covered lives assessment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>$100.0</td>
<td>$100.0</td>
<td>7/1/2009</td>
<td>Raises the franchise fee for nursing facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$338.5</td>
<td>$370.9</td>
<td>10/1/2009</td>
<td>Changes the hospital assessment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$3.0</td>
<td>$3.0</td>
<td>8/1/2009</td>
<td>Increases the franchise fee for intermediate care facilities for the mentally retarded.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>$102.0</td>
<td>$204.0</td>
<td>10/1/2009</td>
<td>Raises the hospital assessment tax.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$85.0</td>
<td>$78.0</td>
<td>10/1/2009</td>
<td>Changes to insurance premium for Medicaid managed care.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>$528.0</td>
<td>$529.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>Changes the gross receipts tax on managed care to draw additional federal matching funds for medical assistance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>-$12.7</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>Changes the Medicaid global waiver and eliminates the group home tax.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island,</td>
<td>$13.6</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
<td>1/1/2009</td>
<td>Increases health industry gross premiums tax and base expansion to managed care health plans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continued</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
<td>$0.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sets the recurring hospital license fee for FY 2010.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>$31.8</td>
<td>$40.0</td>
<td>7/1/2009</td>
<td>Raises the nursing home bed assessment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$103.2</td>
<td>$139.1</td>
<td>7/1/2009</td>
<td>Imposes a hospital assessment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$22.0</td>
<td>$22.0</td>
<td>7/1/2009</td>
<td>Imposes a tax on ambulatory surgical centers.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>