This document is made available electronically by the Minnesota Legislative Reference Library as part of an ongoing digital archiving project. http://www.leg.state.mn.us/lrl/lrl.asp



990.174

### **Minnesota Department of Human Services Health Care**

Mission Statement The Department of Human Services. in partnership with the federal government, county and other public, private, and community agencies throughout Minnesota, is a state agency directed by law to assist those citizens whose personal or family resources are not adequate to meet ieir basic human needs. It is committed to helping them attain the maximum degree of selfsufficiency consistent with their individual capabilities. To these ends, the Department will promote the dignity, safety, and rights of the individual, and will assure

public accountability and trust through responsible use of

available resources.

An Addendum to the Dental Services Access Report to the 1999 Minnesota Legislature as required by Laws of Minnesota 1998, Chapter 407, article 4, section 67(b)

# Addendum to the Dental Services Access Report

This addendum provides additional information unavailable when the original Dental Services Access Report was submitted.

June 1999

### **Executive Summary**

### Addendum to Report: Expanding Access to Dental Services for Recipients of the Medical Assistance, General Assistance Medical Care and MinnesotaCare Programs

The 1998 Legislature mandated that the Department of Human Services report on dental services to enrollees of the three Minnesota Health Care Programs (MHCP): Medical Assistance (MA), General Assistance Medical Care (GAMC) and MinnesotaCare. This is an addendum to that report, which dealt with how to expand access to dental services, including recommendations and a determination of which areas of the state are experiencing a significant access problem.

The 1998 legislation states:

Laws of Minnesota, 1998, Chapter 407, Article 4, Section 67(b)

The commissioner of human services shall present recommendations to the Legislature by February 1, 1999, on how access to dental services for Medical Assistance, General Assistance Medical Care, and MinnesotaCare recipients can be expanded. The commissioner shall also determine which areas of the state are experiencing a significant access problem. In developing recommendations, the commissioner shall evaluate the feasibility of a disproportionate share adjustment for dental services.

#### The problem

In the Report "Dental Service Access Report," fee-for-service enrollees were looked at in two groups: those who would be eligible for managed-care MA and GAMC (managed care look-alikes) and those in the non-managed care cohort. That report gave an analysis of the "managed care look-alikes" and the managed care groups. This report has the final analysis for the "non-managed-care cohort."

The percent of Minnesota Health Care Program enrollees who received at least one dental service in 1997 was 25.8% in the fee-for-service program for "managed care look-alikes," and 37.3% under managed care. At the time of that report data analysis was not completed for the fee-forservice group who are excluded from managed' care, or the "non-managed-care cohort." Analysis of this data is now complete. The percent of Minnesota Health Care Program enrollees in that group who received at least one dental service in 1997 was 34.4% - higher than the "managed care look-alike" group, but less than the managed care group.

The "non-managed-care cohort" includes the following groups:

- Persons who are excluded from managed care because they are in the blind or disabled categories of Medical Assistance (MA)
- Children under 21 who are in foster care placement
- MA recipients through an adoption subsidy

- MA and General Assistance Medical Care (GAMC) recipients through the Refugee Assistance Program
- MA and GAMC recipients residing in a state institution
- MA and GAMC recipients with private health care coverage
- MA and GAMC recipients who are terminally ill
- Qualified Medicare Beneficiaries
- Service Limited Medicare Beneficiaries
- Non-documented aliens receiving emergency MA only
- Recipients receiving MA or GAMC on a non-institutional spenddown basis
- Children in need of protection
- American Indians living on the Indian reservation
- Children who are severely emotionally disturbed (SED)<sup>1</sup>

DHS has not yet looked at this data stratified into sub-populations.

#### Areas of the state experiencing a significant access problem

As part of this report, DHS was asked to determine the areas of the state which are experiencing a significant dental access problem. DHS looked at its dental fee-for-service claims utilization data on a statewide and county-by-county basis for 1997 - the most recent year in which DHS has complete claims and encounter data.

While dental access is below national norms in all areas of the state, some areas have worse problems than others. According to utilization data reviewed by DHS, the following counties have the lowest utilization in fee-for-service for the "non-managed-care cohort" population:

- Mahnomen
- Sherburne
- Rock

Within the seven-county metro area, Hennepin County has the lowest dental utilization for this population.

The original Dental Access Report concluded that there is a problem with insufficient access to dental services for MHCP enrollees, at least for those in managed care and in the "managed care look-alike" populations. It is clear that there is also a problem with insufficient access to dental services for persons in the non-managed-care cohort.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Minnesota Statutes Sections 256B.69, Subd. 2(c); 256B.055; 256B.056; and 256B.06, Minnesota Rules, Part 9500.1452, Subd.2.

### **Table of Contents**

α

Executive summary
The problem 2   Areas of the state experiencing a significant access problem 3
Table of contents
Introduction
Which areas of Minnesota are experiencing a significant access problem for MHCP enrollees?
Appendix

### Introduction

The Department of Human Services, the Legislature, Minnesota health care plans, enrollees, advocates, dentists, hygienists and other stakeholders have been concerned about insufficient access to dental care for enrollees in Minnesota Health Care Programs since the early 1990s. Minnesota Health Care Programs (MHCP) consist of: Medical Assistance or MA, General Assistance Medical Care or GAMC, and MinnesotaCare.

DHS' Performance Measurement and Quality Improvement division produced dental utilization data for calendar years 1995 to 1997. In determining where there are significant dental access problems, DHS used 1997 data, the most recent year for which DHS has complete dental claims, in both fee-for-service and in managed care. The fee-for service enrollees were broken into two groups - those who would be eligible for managed care if PMAP and PGAMC were in their counties (managed-care look-alikes), and those who currently are excluded from managed care, or who would be excluded if managed care were in their counties (non-managed-care cohort). This addendum reports the final data for the non-managed-care cohort.

The "non-managed-care cohort" includes the following groups:

- Persons who are excluded from managed care because they are in the blind or disabled categories of Medical Assistance (MA)
- Children under 21 who are in foster care placement
- MA recipients through an adoption subsidy
- MA and General Assistance Medical Care (GAMC) recipients through the Refugee Assistance Program
- MA and GAMC recipients residing in a state institution
- MA and GAMC recipients with private health care coverage
- MA and GAMC recipients who are terminally ill
- Qualified Medicare Beneficiaries
- Service Limited Medicare Beneficiaries
- Non-documented aliens receiving emergency MA only
- Recipients receiving MA or GAMC on a non-institutional Spenddown basis
- Children in need of protection
- American Indians living on the Indian reservation
- Children who are severely emotionally disturbed (SED)<sup>2</sup>

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Minnesota Statutes Sections 256B.69, Subd. 2(c); 256B.055; 256B.056; and 256B.06, Minnesota Rules, Part 9500.1452, Subd. 2.

# Which areas of Minnesota are experiencing a significant access problem for MHCP enrollees?

DHS reviewed utilization data on a county-by-county basis. The analysis was done by breaking MHCP enrollees into three groups: 1) those in managed care, including MinnesotaCare, PMAP, and PGAMC; 2) those in fee-for-service who would be in managed care if PMAP and PGAMC were implemented in their counties, called "managed care look-alikes"; and 3) those in fee-for-service who are currently excluded from managed care in counties with PMAP and PGAMC, and those who would be excluded from managed care if PMAP and PGAMC were implemented in their counties, called "non-managed-care cohort".<sup>3</sup> This grouping allowed for an "apples to apples" comparison of the managed care group and the managed care look-alike group, which were reported in the original dental access report.

DHS also speculated that utilization might be different and worse for the non-managed-care cohort, due to more difficult dental problems, a more difficult time communicating their dental concerns, problems complying with dental care recommendations, and transportation issues.

In the original report, "Dental Services Access Report," the percent of Minnesota Health Care Program enrollees who received a dental service in 1997 was 25.8% in the fee-for-service program for "managed care look-alikes" and 37.3% under managed care. DHS did not have data analysis completed for the group in the fee-for-service program who are excluded from managed care, or the "non-managed-care cohort." Analysis of that data is now complete. The percent of Minnesota Health Care Program who received a dental service in 1997 in this group was 34.4%.

The results show that utilization is better for the non-managed-care cohort than for the fee-forservice "managed care look-alikes". Utilization for this population still lags behind the managed care population. It is possible that some groups within the non-managed-care cohort (for example, persons with a developmental disability) are more likely to have a case manager who will work to ensure that the person gets annual dental care. DHS has not analyzed the data by sub-populations, so there is no data to support this supposition.

<sup>3</sup> Minnesota Statutes Sections 256B.69, Subd. 2(c); 256B.055; 256B.056; and 256B.06, Minnesota Rules, Part 9500.1452, Subd. 2.

#### Dental utilization in fee-for-service: non-managed-care cohort

Map 1, Dental Service Provision in Public Health Care Programs 1997, fee for service (nonmanaged-care cohort) utilization rates, all services, all ages, displays the percent of eligibles in fee-for-service who received any dental service in 1997 among those persons who currently are excluded from managed care in PMAP/PGAMC counties, or who would be excluded from managed care if PMAP/PGAMC were established in their counties.

Dental utilization in the non-managed-care cohort appears to be lowest in Mahnomen, Lake of the Woods, Sherburne and Rock counties, measured as the percent of eligibles receiving dental services. The lowest utilization in the seven-county metro area is in Hennepin County.

Dental utilization in the managed care look-alikes appears to be highest in Blue Earth, Cottonwood, Kandiyohi, Wabasha and Stevens counties, measured as the percent of eligibles receiving dental services.

DHS still hears complaints about lack of access to dental care from managed care counties. Part of these concerns could be difficulty finding fee-for-service dentists willing to serve this population.

### Map 1

Dental Service Provision in Public Health Care Programs 1997 Fee-For-Service (Non Managed Care Cohort) Utilization Rates Services, All Ages, Percent of Eligibles Receiving Dental Services



Map 2: Dental service provision in public health care programs 1997: Fee-for-service (nonmanaged-care cohort), all services, all programs, displays the number of recipients per 1,000 eligibility months for the non-managed-care cohort in fee-for-service in 1997. This measurement of utilization takes into consideration the number of months that each person is eligible for coverage.

The transition to managed care affected 10 counties in 1997, as far as the data analysis for the managed care group and the fee-for-service managed care look-alike group is concerned, and it was necessary to look at a second utilization measure-the number of recipients per 1,000 eligibility months-to get a true picture of dental utilization in those counties. By definition, the transition to managed care should not significantly affect this population, and the second measure of utilization should reflect similar results.

Of the four counties which had low utilization using the percent of eligibles receiving dental services measure, three of them continue to show low dental utilization using this measure: Mahnomen, Sherburne, and Rock counties. Hennepin County also remains in the lowest dental utilization group. Lake of the Woods County appears to have similar utilization to surrounding counties using this measure.

Using this measure, Wabasha, Yellow Medicine, Nicollet, Blue Earth, and Pope counties have the highest dental utilization for this population.

Otherwise, this measure shows a utilization pattern consistent with the first measure.

### Map 2

Dental Service Provision in Public Health Care Programs 1997 Fee-For-Service (Non Managed Care Cohort) Utilization Rates All Services, All Ages, Recipients per 1,000 Eligibility Months



### Appendix

## Table 1CY97 comparison of managed care utilization rates to fee-for-service<br/>utilization rates, by county--non-managed-care cohort

- (1) Programs included are MA, GAMC, MinnesotaCare.
- (2) Counts are for fee-for-service eligibles who do not meet managed care criteria.
- (3) "County" is the recipient's county of residence.
- (4) "All age group" is additive if age group is missing.

Non-managed-care cohort of FFS

Year: 1997

ę

	2	ક	4	5	6	7 **	8	9
							% Eligibles	# Recipients
					#	#	Who	per 1,000
	Service	Payment	Age	#	Eligibility	Service	Received	Eligibility
County	Category	System	Group	Eligibles	Months	Recipients	Service	Months
061	All	FFS	0-20	109	608	49	45.0	80.6
007	All	FFS	0-20	594	3431	247	41.6	72.0
037	All	FFS	0-20	68	420	28	41.2	66.7
017	All	FFS	0-20	152	886	62	40.8	70.0
079	All	FFS	0-20	145	741	58	40.0	78.3
085	All	FFS	0-20	396	2288	153	38.6	66.9
029	All	FFS	0-20	259	1403	94	36.3	67.0
018	All	FFS	0-20	693	3344	249	35.9	74.5
052	All	FFS	0-20	248	1398	89	35.9	63.7
074	All	FFS	0-20	308	1940	108	35.1	55.7
081	All	FFS	0-20	174	998	60 77	34.5 34.4	60.1 59.6
040	All	FFS	0-20	224 67	1292 396	77 23	34.4 34.3	59.0 58.1
084 050	All	FFS FFS	0-20 0-20	492	2564	23 168	34.3	65.5
050 083	All	FFS	0-20	492 165	2504 746	56	33.9	75.1
080	All	FFS	0-20	230	1258	50 78	33.9	62.0
023	All	FFS	0-20	230 170	865	57	33.5	65.9
023 001	All	FFS	0-20	209	1009	70	33.5	69.4
034	All	FFS	0-20	597	3279	199	33.3	60.7
046	All	FFS	0-20	322	1964	107	33.2	54.5
064	All	FFS	0-20	204	1111	67	32.8	60.3
078	All	FFS	0-20	58	241	19	32.8	78.8
036	All	FFS	0-20	126	653	41	32.5	62.8
066	All	FFS	0-20	566	3252	183	32.3	56.3
076	All	FFS	0-20	147	697	47	32.0	67.4
028	All	FFS	0-20	144	862	46	31.9	53.4
049	All	FFS	0-20	404	1815	128	31.7	70.5
031	All	FFS	0-20	594	3536	188	31.6	53.2
039	All	FFS	0-20	61	248	19		76.6
024	All	FFS	0-20	352	1812	109	31.0	60.2
087	All	FFS	0-20	152		47	30.9	66.8
059	All	FFS	0-20	104	489	32	30.8	65.4
073	All	FFS	0-20	940	5901	288	30.6	48.8
015	All	FFS	0-20	144	754	44	30.6	
054	All	FFS	0-20	72	359	22	30.6	61.3
032	All	FFS	0-20	132	744	40	30.3	53.8
030	All	FFS	0-20	304	1569	92	30.3	58.6
086	All	FFS	0-20	682	4135	206	30.2	49.8
051	All	FFS	0-20	67 165	385	20	29.9 20.7	51.9 70.9
068 000	All	FFS	0-20	165	691 764	49	29.7 29.6	70.9 62.8
020 042	All	FFS	0-20	162 308		48 91	29.0 29.5	51.9
042 056	All	FFS	0-20	308 742				
056	All	FFS	0-20	742	3405	219	29.5	04.3

Non-managed-care cohort of FFS

Year: 1997

California (California)	$2$ . The $2$ -scalar $\epsilon$	3	4	5	5	7	8	9
Second 10	1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1	Section C.					·····································	
						1.	%	#
							Eligibles	Recipients
		2.00			#	#	Who	per 1,000
	Service	Payment	Age	#	Eligibility	Service	Received	Eligibility
County	Category	System	Group	Eligibles	Months		Service	Months
021	All	FFS	0-20	382	1811	109	28.5	60.2
077	All	FFS	0-20	345	1664	98	28.4	58.9
075	All	FFS	0-20	85	439	24	28.2	54.7
033	All	FFS	0-20	217	797	61	28.1	76.5
003	All	FFS	0-20	548	2805	154	28.1	54.9
004	All	FFS	0-20	766	3969	215	28.1	54.2
069	All	FFS	0-20	2174	12797	610	28.1	47.7
055	All	FFS	0-20	1054	5643	294	27.9	52.1
005	All	FFS	0-20	346	1870	95	27.5	50.8
025	All	FFS	0-20	356	1909	96	27.0	50.3
011	All	FFS	0-20	437	2372	117	26.8	49.3
019	All	FFS	0-20	2062	14860	551	26.7	37.1
072	All	FFS	0-20	137	602	36	26.3	59.8
026	All	FFS	0-20	77	320	20	26.0	62.5
070	All	FFS	0-20	410	2611	106	25.9	40.6
062	All	FFS	0-20	5552	36995	1425	25.7	38.5
057	All	FFS	0-20	159	572	40	25.2	69.9
022	All	FFS	0-20	177	775	44	24.9	56.8 59.7
045	All	FFS	0-20	113	469	28	24.8 24.5	59.7 58.8
065	All	FFS	0-20	208	867	51	24.5 24.4	58.8 58.7
012	All	FFS	0-20	164 284	681 1554	40 69	24.4 24.3	44.4
048	All	FFS FFS	0-20 0-20	204 482	2513	116	24.3	46.2
060 010	All	FFS	0-20	338	2313	81	24.1	35.7
009	All	FFS	0-20	356	2200	84	23.6	38.4
009 014		FFS	0-20	607	3568	143	23.6	40.1
002	All	FFS	0-20	2395	15497	557	23.3	35.9
013		FFS	0-20	396	2208	92	23.2	41.7
010	All	FFS	0-20	11139	74610	2572	23.1	34.5
008	All	FFS	0-20	250	1376	57	22.8	41.4
043	All	FFS	0-20	313	1347	70		52.0
058	All	FFS	0-20	337	1671	74	22.0	44.3
082	All	FFS	0-20	1003	6621	217	21.6	32.8
047	All	FFS	0-20	190	797	41	21.6	51.4
041	All	FFS	0-20	66	259	14		54.1
038	All	FFS	0-20	88	499	18	(	36.1
053	All	FFS	0-20	299		59		42.5
067	All	FFS	0-20	123	585	23		39.3
071	All	FFS	0-20	436	2615	81		31.0
006	All	FFS	0-20	81	402	15		37.3
016	All	FFS	0-20	38	154	7		45.5
035	All	FFS	0-20	43	143	7		49.0
		FFS	0-20	145				34.3

Non-managed-care cohort of FFS

Year: 1997

Service: All (sorted by age group, ranked by % eligibles)

13.	2	3.	4	5	6		8	9
	a state of the second							
							%	#
					#	#	Eligibles Who	Recipients per 1,000
	Service	Payment	Age	#	# Eligibility #	# Service	Received	Eligibility
County	Category	System	Group	Eligibles	Months		Service	Months
063	All	FFS	0-20	51	139	7	13.7	50.4
			0-20 Aver	age			28.5	55.6
007	All	FFS	21-64	1121	9593	621	55.4	64.7
034	All	FFS	21-64	1036	8757	572	55.2	65.3
075	All	FFS	21-64	160	1432	88	55.0	61.5
074	All	FFS	21-64	394	3335	206	52.3	61.8
087	All	FFS	21-64	198	1504	103	52.0	68.5
042	All	FFS	21-64	465	3669	241	51.8	65.7
040	All	FFS	21-64	284	2297	147	51.8	64.0
052	All	FFS	21-64	329	2443	170	51.7 51.4	69.6 62.3
066	All	FFS FFS	21-64 21-64	765 263	6311 2311	393 135	51.4 51.3	58.4
017 008	All	FFS	21-64 21-64	366	2881	135	51.5	64.9
008 079	All	FFS	21-64	268	2067	135	50.4	65.3
079 051	All	FFS	21-64	119	936	58	48.7	62.0
050	All	FFS	21-64	853	6984	415	48.7	59.4
024	All	FFS	21-64	558	4578	268	48.0	58.5
021	All	FFS	21-64	559	4345	266	47.6	61.2
012	All	FFS	21-64	196	1422	93	47.4	65.4
057	All	FFS	21-64	268	2150	127	47.4	59.1
085	All	FFS	21-64	719	5883	337	46.9	57.3
061	All	FFS	21-64	156	1126	73	46.8	64.8
053	All	FFS	21-64	431	3291	200	46.4	60.8
049	All	FFS	21-64	552	4359	256	46.4	58.7
028	All	FFS	21-64	249	2091	115	46.2	55.0
064	All	FFS	21-64	304	2463	138	45.4	56.0
010	All	FFS	21-64	421	3500	190	45.1	54.3
023	All	FFS	21-64	275	2052	124	45.1	60.4
046	All	FFS	21-64	446		201	45.1 44.5	58.7 54.3
036	All	FFS	21-64	335			44.5 44.3	54.5 54.5
080	All	FFS	21-64 21-64	386 183			44.3	66.4
076	All	FFS FFS	21-64	105			43.4	60.8
041 063	All	FFS	21-64	81	603		43.2	58.0
003	All	FFS	21-64	158	1299	68	43.0	52.3
038	All	FFS	21-64	861	6953	369	42.9	53.1
081	All	FFS	21-64	248	1788		42.7	59.3
055	All	FFS	21-64	1844	15050		42.6	52.2
077	All	FFS	21-64	508	3888		42.3	55.3
082	All	FFS	21-64	1178	9495		41.9	52.0
035	All	FFS	21-64	77	1		41.6	52.8
019	All	FFS	21-64	2797				
069	All	FFS	21-64	5174	43250	2126	41.1	49.2

MNDHS - PMQI || JWT:0026 || 5/13/1999

Non-managed-care cohort of FFS

Year: 1997

Service: All (sorted by age group, ranked by % eligibles)

) General Berger	2	3.8	4	5	6	~~ <b>7</b> ~~~	8	9
200 - 200 - 200 - 200 - 200 - 200 - 200 - 200 - 200 - 200 - 200 - 200 - 200 - 200 - 200 - 200 - 200 - 200 - 200	River and a state of the state of the state	1953						and a survey of the set
							%	#
	E.						Eligibles	Recipients
					#	#	Who	per 1,000
	Service	Payment	Age	# Elicibica	Eligibility Months	Service	Received Service	Eligibility Months
County	Category	System	Group	Eligibles			40.9	49.5
025	All	FFS FFS	21-64 21-64	607 1129	5013 8326	248 460	40.9	49.5 55.2
056 065	All	FFS	21-64	240	1621	400 97	40.7	59.8
085 031	All	FFS	21-64	1021	7866	411	40.3	52.3
059	All	FFS	21-64	175		70	40.0	50.5
033	All	FFS	21-64	289		115	39.8	57.7
013	All	FFS	21-64	458		182	39.7	52.6
029	All	FFS	21-64	345		137	39.7	52.1
022	All	FFS	21-64	247	1871	98	39.7	52.4
006	All	FFS	21-64	149	1093	59	39.6	54.0
018	All	FFS	21-64	1187	8832	469	39.5	53.1
020	AII	FFS	21-64	162	1180	64	39.5	54.2
068	All	FFS	21-64	159		62	39.0	51.9
005	All	FFS	21-64	657	5009	254	38.7	50.7
083	All	FFS	21-64	176	1230	68	38.6	55.3
073	All	FFS	21-64	1861	14446	719	38.6	49.8
001	All	FFS	21-64	387	2719	149	38.5	54.8
072	All	FFS	21-64	133		51	38.3	54.7
043	All	FFS	21-64	387	2862	147	38.0	51.4
014	All	FFS	21-64	984		373	37.9	46.1
060	All	FFS	21-64	736		276	37.5	50.7
058	All	FFS	21-64	564		211	37.4	49.9 59.7
037	All	FFS	21-64	107		40	37.4 37.4	49.7
070	All	FFS	21-64 21-64	463 1124	3479 8620	173 416	37.4	49.7
004	All	FFS FFS	21-64	124		410	36.8	52.1
026	All	FFS	21-64	125		40	36.5	48.3
084 047	All	FFS	21-64	325	1	118	1	49.5
047 048	All	FFS	21-64	394			1	
048 062		FFS	21-64	11414		4133	1	
002	All	FFS	21-64	726			1	1
015	All	FFS	21-64	228	1			
009	All	FFS	21-64	615			1	
027	All	FFS	21-64	23016		8071	1	
016	All	FFS	21-64	63		22	1	
045	All	FFS	21-64	158		55	1	45.4
030	All	FFS	21-64	410		142		45.5
054	All	FFS	21-64	139		48		52.5
002	AII	FFS	21-64	3117		1061		
032	AII	FFS	21-64	131		44	1	1
067	All	FFS	21-64	135		1		
078	All	FFS	21-64	73		1	1	
011	All	FFS	21-64	603	4512	198	32.8	43.9

MNDHS - PMQI || JWT:0026 || 5/13/1999

Non-managed-care cohort of FFS

Year: 1997

	2	3	- 4	5	6		8	9
		A CALCULAT						S. 1967.5
2010						1	%	#
							Eligibles	Recipients
					#	#	Who	per 1,000
	Service	Payment	Age	#	Eligibility	Service	Received	Eligibility
County	Category	System	Group	Eligibles		Recipients		Months
071	All	FFS	21-64	523	3590	160	30.6	44.6
044	All	FFS	21-64	164	1133	46	28.0	40.6
039	All	FFS	21-64	71	356	12	16.9	33.7
			21-64 Ave				41.5	54.5
075	All	FFS	65 +	68	661	26	38.2	39.3
051	All	FFS	65 +	53	352	20	37.7	56.8
087 064	All	FFS	65 +	47	324	17	36.2 35.9	52.5 55.9
064 008	All	FFS	65 + 65 +	78	501 720	28 39	35.9	55.9 54.2
008 017	All	FFS FFS	65 + 65 +	110 70	720 579	39 24	35.5	41.5
017 083	All	FFS	65 +	51	320	17	34.3	53.1
063	All	FFS	65 +	31	218	10	32.3	45.9
065	All	FFS	65 +	50	339	16	32.0	47.2
066	All	FFS	65 +	184	1310	58	31.5	44.3
040	All	FFS	65 +	74	534	23	31.1	43.1
061	All	FFS	65 +	94	692	29	30.9	41.9
080	All	FFS	65 +	108	699	33	30.6	47.2
042	All	FFS	65 +	88	493	26	29.5	52.7
085	All	FFS	65 +	150	898	44	29.3	49.0
043	All	FFS	65 +	113	848	33	29.2	38.9
060	All	FFS	65 +	183	1221	53	29.0	43.4
011	All	FFS	65 +	142	941	41	28.9	43.6
078	All	FFS	65 +	25	179	7	28.0	39.1
047	All	FFS	65 +	97	653	26	26.8	39.8
054	All	FFS	65 +	50	311	13	26.0	41.8
025	All	FFS	65 +	131	943	33	25.2	35.0
062	All	FFS	65 +	1212	8028	305	25.2	38.0
016	All	FFS	65 +	24	171	6	25.0	35.1
034	All	FFS	65 +	160		40		36.8
037	All	FFS	65 + 65 -	57	408	14		34.3 36.3
086	All	FFS	65 + 65 :	196		48		40.0
077	All	FFS	65 + 65 +	117 67	700 391	28 16		40.0 40.9
052	All	FFS	65 +	63		15		40.9 34.6
045	All	FFS FFS	65 + 65 +	220		52		33.0
049 022	All	FFS	65 +	115		27		35.8
022 070	All	FFS	65 + 65 +	107	623	25		40.1
070 036	All	FFS	65 +	60	401	14		34.9
036 055	All	FFS	65 +	281	1989	65		32.7
035 038	All	FFS	65 +	52	279	12	1	43.0
079	All	FFS	65 +	48	258	11		42.6
005	All	FFS	65 +	145		33	1	36.3
010	All	FFS	65 +	88				
	I' '''						,	

Non-managed-care cohort of FFS

Year: 1997

.

	9	5. 1. 1. 1. <b>1.</b> 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1.	4	5	6	7	S	9
are sold and								
-220 $p = 21$						a second	%	#
	A PARTY			1997 - 1997 -			Eligibles	Recipients
					#	#	Who	per 1,000
	Service	Payment	Age	#	Eligibility	Service	Received	Eligibility
County	Category	System	Group	Eligibles	Months		Service	Months
002	All	FFS	65 +	335	2054	76	22.7	37.0
072	All	FFS	65 +	45	322	10	22.2	31.1
058	All	FFS	65 +	109	814	24	22.0	29.5
044	All	FFS	65 +	55	286	12	21.8	42.0
018	All	FFS	65 +	282	1971	61	21.6	30.9
084	All	FFS	65 +	37	281	8	21.6	28.5
027	All	FFS	65 +	2619	18555	563	21.5	30.3
001	All	FFS	65 +	80	601	17	21.3	28.3
035	All	FFS	65 +	57	406	12	21.1	29.6
056	All	FFS	65 +	304	2041	64	21.1	31.4
015	All	FFS	65 +	106	813	22	20.8	27.1
031	All	FFS	65 +	223	1420	46	20.6	32.4
021	All	FFS	65 +	160	1064	33	20.6	31.0
019	All	FFS	65 +	296	1720	61	20.6	35.5
057	All	FFS	65 +	73	485	15	20.5	30.9 27.5
076	All	FFS	65 +	98 <sup>.</sup>	726	20	20.4 20.0	27.5 34.2
041	All	FFS	65 +	50	292	10 30	20.0	34.2
050	All	FFS	65 + 65 +	150 72	932 493	14	19.4	28.4
020	All	FFS FFS	65 +	860	5804	14	19.4	28.6
069	All All	FFS	65 +	73	469	100	19.0	29.9
012 007	All	FFS	65 +	141	831	27	19.1	32.5
073	All	FFS	65 +	280	1906	53	18.9	27.8
013	All	FFS	65 +	102	606	19	18.6	31.4
006	All	FFS	65 +	70	509	13	1	25.5
003	All	FFS	65 +	146	958	27	18.5	28.2
028	All	FFS	65 +	92	697	17	18.5	24.4
023	All	FFS	65 +	141	966	26	18.4	26.9
026	All	FFS	65 +	49	337	9	18.4	26.7
071	All	FFS	65 +	116	664	21		31.6
082	All	FFS	65 +	190	1195	34	17.9	28.5
024	AII	FFS	65 +	130	814	23	17.7	28.3
081	AII	FFS	65 +	46	302	8	17.4	26.5
039	All	FFS	65 +	18	114	3	16.7	26.3
053	All	FFS	65 +	117	925			20.5
046	All	FFS	65 +	76	522	12		23.0
074	All	FFS	65 +	89	573			24.4
032	All	FFS	65 +	51	268	8		29.9
004	All	FFS	65 +	211	1322			25.0
067	All	FFS	65 +	48	363		and the second	19.3
029	All	FFS	65 +	93	614			21.2
048	All	FFS	65 +	108				18.5
014	All	FFS	65 +	145	991	20	13.8	20.2

Non-managed-care cohort of FFS

Year: 1997

	2		4	5	6	7	8	9
1000-100 X-1-9-1-9-1-9-1-9-1-9-1-9-1-9-1-9-1-9-1-		0.4			1		a	
							%	#
							Eligibles	Recipients
	The second second				#	#	Who	per 1,000
	Service	Payment	Age	#	Eligibility	Service	Received	Eligibility
County	Category	System	Group	Eligibles	Months	Recipients		Months
068	All	FFS	65 +	58	394	7	12.1	17.8
033	All	FFS	65 +	54	356	6	11.1	16.9
059	All	FFS	65 +	54	380	6	11.1	15.8
009	All	FFS	65 +	109	558	10	9.2	17.9
030	All	FFS	65 +	57	267	4	7.0	15.0
			65 + Aver		10055	005	22.5	33.8
007	All	FFS	All	1856	13855	895	48.2	64.6 58.5
017	All	FFS	All	485	3776	221	45.6	
034 070	All	FFS	All	1793 461	13123 3066	811 204	45.2 44.3	61.8 66.5
079 075	All	FFS FFS	All All	313	2532	204 138	44.3 44.1	54.5
075 052	All	FFS	All	644	4232	275	44.1	65.0
032 040	All	FFS	All	582	4123	247	42.4	59.9
040	All	FFS	All	1265	9069	534	42.2	58.9
087	All	FFS	All	397	2532	167	42.1	66.0
061	All	FFS	All	359	2426	151	42.1	62.2
066	All	FFS	All	1515	10873	634	41.8	58.3
042	All	FFS	All	861	5916	358	41.6	60.5
074	All	FFS	All	791	5848	328	41.5	56.1
051	All	FFS	All	239	1673	98	41.0	58.6
050	All	FFS	All	1495	10480	613	41.0	58.5
064	All	FFS	All	586	4075	233	39.8	57.2
036	All	FFS	All	521	3800	204	39.2	53.7
008	All	FFS	All	726	4977	283	39.0	56.9
080	All	FFS	All	724	5093	282	39.0	55.4
024	All	FFS	All	1040	7204	400	38.5	55.5
046	All	FFS	All	844	5911	320	37.9	54.1
081	All	FFS	All	468	3088	174	37.2	56.3
049	All	FFS	All	1176			37.1	56.3
021	All	FFS	All	1101			37.1	56.5
028	All	FFS	All	485	1		36.7	48.8
057	All	FFS	All	500	1		36.4	56.8
018	All	FFS	All	2162				55.1 50.5
055	All	FFS	All	3179				61.4
083	All	FFS	All	392			36.0 35.8	50.2
086 060	All	FFS	All	1739 8208	1	2902	35.0	
069 037	All	FFS	All	232	1		35.3	40.9 54.7
037 022	All	FFS	All	586			35.3	
023 077	All	FFS	All	970			35.2	54.5
077	All	FFS	All All	1838			1	
031 020	All	FFS	All	697				
029 001	All	FFS FFS	All	676				
001	All	ILL2	1~"	I 070	1 4529	1 200	1 04.0	

Non-managed-care cohort of FFS

Year: 1997

	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
					an da ang		% Eligibles	# Recipients
	Service	Payment	Age	#	# Eligibility	# Service	Who Received	per 1,000 Eligibility
County	Category	System	Group	Eligibles	Months	Recipients		Months
025	All	FFS	All	1094	7865	377	34.5	47.9
073	All	FFS	All	3081	22253	1060	34.4	47.6
010	All	FFS	All	847	6361	291	34.4	45.7
019	All	FFS	All	5155	39256	1771	34.4	45.1
076	All	FFS	All	428	2628	147	34.3	55.9
056	All	FFS	All	2175	13772	743	34.2	54.0
012	All	FFS	All	433	2572	147	33.9	57.2
084	All	FFS	All	219	1547	73	33.3	47.2
005	All	FFS	All	1148	7788	382	33.3	49.0
065	All	FFS	All	498	2827	164	32.9	58.0
038	All	FFS	All	298	2077	98	32.9	47.2
053	All	FFS	All	847	5603	278	32.8	49.6
033	All	FFS	All	560	3147	182	32.5	57.8
059	All	FFS	All	333	2255	108	32.4	47.9
062	All	FFS	All	18178	146043	5863	32.3	40.1
078	All	FFS	All	156	846	50	32.1	59.1
063	All	FFS	All	163	960	52	31.9	54.2
020	All	FFS	All	396	2437	126	31.8	51.7
054	All	FFS	All	261	1584	83	31.8	52.4
060	All	FFS	All	1401	9183	445	31.8	48.5
004	All	FFS	All	2101	13911	664	31.6	47.7
041	All	FFS	All	222	1307	70	31.5	53.6
082	All	FFS	All	2371	17311	745	31.4	43.0
022	All	FFS	All	539	3401	169	31.4	49.7
003	All	FFS	All	1420	9127	442	31.1	48.4
070	All	FFS	All	980	6713	304	31.0	45.3
068	All	FFS	All	382	2279	118	30.9	51.8
014	All	FFS	All	1736		536		42.4
030	All	FFS	All	771				
072	All	FFS	All	315		97	30.8	52.2
015	All	FFS	All	478		1		44.9
043	All	FFS	All	813				
013	All	FFS	All	956		293		
058	All	FFS	All	1010			1	
027	All	FFS	All	36774		11206		39.8
047	All	FFS	All	612	3835		•	48.2
011	All	FFS	All	1182			1	45.5
026	All	FFS	All	251	1540			48.7
045	All	FFS	All	334				46.4
032	All	FFS	All	314		1		47.3
006	All	FFS	All	300		1	1	
002	All	FFS	All	5847				
048	All	FFS	All	786	5246	227	28.9	43.3

Non-managed-care cohort of FFS

Year:	1997	97 Service: All (sorted by age group, ranked by % eligibles)						
William Ballion	2	3	4	5 <b>5</b> 5	. 6	<b>7</b>	8	9
County	Service Category	Payment System	Age Group	# Eligibles	# Eligibility Months	# Service Recipients		# Recipients per 1,000 Eligibility Months
035	All	FFS	All	177	1155	51	28.8	44.2
009	All	FFS	All	1080	7340	310	28.7	42.2
016	All	FFS	All	125	703	35	28.0	49.8
067	All	FFS	All	306	1907	75	24.5	39.3
071	All	FFS	All	1075	6869	262	24.4	38.1
039	All	FFS	All	150	718	34	22.7	47.4
044	All	FFS	All	364	2090	81	22.3	38.8
J		•	All ages av	/erage			34.4	51.6
Grand average							31.7	48.9
					1,039,189 2,078,378			

### Cost of completing this report:

Minnesota Statutes, section 3.197, requires the disclosure of the cost of preparing this report.

Staff time:	\$900
Administrative costs	\$ 50 (copying, postage etc.)
Total	\$950

Submitted by the Minnesota Department of Human Services June 1999