

**Grooms**

**v.**

**Maram**

**Expert Witness Report**

Signed: \_\_\_\_\_

*Todd Menenberg*

**Todd D. Menenberg  
Navigant Consulting, Inc.**

**March 19, 2007**

---

**Grooms v. Maram**  
**Expert Report of Todd D. Menenberg**  
**March 19, 2007**

---

## **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

- I. Introduction**
- II. Background on the Illinois Medicaid Program**
- III. Nature of the Dispute**
- IV. Scope of Work**
- V. Process and Results**

**Exhibit 1: Additional Cost if Individuals Move from Nursing Facilities  
to the Community**

**Exhibit 2: Additional Cost if Utilization Review Function Removed  
– Persons with Disabilities Waiver**

**Attachment 1: Resume of Todd D. Menenberg**

**Attachment 2: Testimony of Todd D. Menenberg**

**Attachment 3: Documents Considered by Todd D. Menenberg**

---

**Grooms v. Maram**  
**Expert Report of Todd D. Menenberg**  
**March 19, 2007**

---

**I. Introduction**

This report was prepared by Todd D. Menenberg of Navigant Consulting, Inc. ("Navigant"). Navigant is an international consulting firm providing litigation, financial and other services to clients. I am a Managing Director of Navigant. I am a certified public accountant. I have provided consulting services on a wide variety of health care-related financial and economic matters, including Medicaid disputes involving lost profits, damages, and economic projections. My experience is summarized in my resume, included as Attachment 1.

A listing of cases in which I have testified as an expert witness during the past four years is included as Attachment 2 to this report. My hourly billing rate in this matter is \$180. I have no publications during the last ten years. Navigant's work on this matter was performed by me or under my supervision.

Navigant has been retained by legal counsel for the Illinois Department of Healthcare and Family Services (HFS) to provide expert testimony related to the cost and financial issues relevant to this matter.

I have considered certain documents in forming the opinions contained in this report. A list of these documents is attached to my report in Attachment 3. My opinions have been formed based on the information now available to me. As additional information becomes available (such as newly produced data and documents, expert reports, and testimony) or additional analyses are performed, I may evaluate and consider that information. As a result, I reserve the right to modify or supplement my opinions.

---

**Grooms v. Maram**  
**Expert Report of Todd D. Menenberg**  
**March 19, 2007**

---

## **II. Background on the Illinois Medicaid Program**

The Illinois Department of Healthcare and Family Services (HFS) is responsible for providing health care coverage for adults and children who qualify for Medicaid, and for providing Child Support Enforcement services to help ensure that Illinois children receive financial support from both parents. The Division of Medical Programs within HFS administers the Medical Assistance Programs, which provide health care coverage to low-income families lacking health insurance, children who are wards of the state, low-income senior citizens, individuals with disabilities, elderly in nursing facilities and people struggling with catastrophic medical bills.

Illinois has a Medicaid State Plan, approved by the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS) that specifies the healthcare services available to all Medicaid eligible individuals. In addition to services in the State Plan, Illinois operates several Medicaid home- and community-based (HCBS) "waiver" programs. Medicaid HCBS waiver programs allow qualified individuals to receive care in their own home or other community setting as an alternative to a nursing facility or other institutional setting. Individuals in a waiver program have access to specified services that are not generally included in Medicaid State Plans, including services such as homemaker, personal assistant, and home delivered meals, among others. In addition to these services, waiver recipients are able to access Medicaid State Plan services, such as physician visits, hospital stays, etc. For state waiver programs to be eligible for Federal matching funds, Federal regulations require that waiver programs be cost neutral, that is, services provided to waiver recipients must cost no more than services that would be provided to the same individuals were they to be served in institutional settings.

Physically disabled persons in the Illinois Medicaid program who require a nursing facility level of care generally receive services in one of two ways: 1) care is provided in a nursing facility or similar type of institutional setting; or, 2) care is provided at home or in a

**Grooms v. Maram**  
**Expert Report of Todd D. Menenberg**  
**March 19, 2007**

community-based setting through an HCBS waiver program. Disabled children may receive services in either an institutional or an HCBS setting and are eligible to receive additional services through the Early Periodic Screening, Diagnosis, and Treatment (EPSDT) program. Under the EPSDT program, children can receive services that are not included in the Illinois Medicaid State Plan, but that are deemed medically necessary for the child's treatment.

**Illinois' Medicaid HCBS Waiver Programs**

Illinois' Medicaid HCBS waiver programs are administered by HFS as the Medicaid agency, but several of the waiver programs are operated by the Division of Rehabilitation Services (DRS), a division of the Illinois Department of Human Services (DHS).

Illinois has seven HCBS waiver programs:

<b>TABLE I</b>		
<b>Waiver</b>	<b>Level of Institutional Care Required by Waiver Recipients</b>	<b>Operating State Agency</b>
1) Medically Fragile/ Technology Dependent Children (MFTD)	Hospital / Skilled Pediatric Facility	University of Illinois, Division of Specialized Care for Children (DSCC)
2) Persons with Disabilities	Nursing Facility	DHS-DRS
3) Persons with Brain Injury	Nursing Facility	DHS-DRS
4) Adults with Developmental Disabilities	Intermediate Care Facility for the Mentally Retarded (ICF/MR)	DHS-Division of Developmental Disabilities Services
5) Persons Who are Elderly	Nursing Facility	Department of Aging
6) Persons with HIV or AIDS	Hospital	DHS-DRS
7) Supported Living Facilities	Assisted Living	HFS-Bureau of Long Term Care

---

**Grooms v. Maram**  
**Expert Report of Todd D. Menenberg**  
**March 19, 2007**

---

Following is a more detailed description of the MFTD Waiver and the Persons with Disabilities Waiver.

*MFTD Waiver*

The MFTD Waiver is for individuals under age 21. To qualify for this waiver, individuals must need a level of care equivalent to that provided in a skilled pediatric facility (licensed as an ICF/MR) or a hospital. Participants in the waiver program have a dollar limit on the amount of services they can receive. This limit, which applies to each waiver recipient, is equal to 125% of the average per diem expenditure for hospital care in the previous fiscal year.<sup>1</sup> Approximately 530 children participated in the MFTD Waiver during the time period September 1, 2003 through August 31, 2004. During that same period, it cost approximately \$2 million to provide waiver services and the EPSDT program spent an additional \$49 million to provide nursing services to children in the MFTD Waiver.

*Persons with Disabilities Waiver*

The Persons with Disabilities Waiver is for Medicaid-eligible individuals under age 60. To qualify for this program, individuals must need a level of care equivalent to that provided in a nursing facility. Participants in the waiver program also have a dollar limit, which is generally referred to as a Service Cost Maximum (SCM). The SCM limits the cost of the service plan a waiver recipient can receive. The SCM is determined for each waiver applicant by way of an assessment tool, referred to as the Determination of Need (DON). Higher DON scores generally correspond with higher SCMs. A service plan, which sets out the allowed waiver services, is developed by DRS for each waiver recipient. The service plans are tailored to the specific medical conditions and needs of the recipients. These service plans are designed to

---

<sup>1</sup> The limit for ventilator dependent children is equal to the greater of: 1) 125% of the average per diem expenditure for hospital care in the previous fiscal year, or 2) 100% of the average per diem cost of the institution from which they were placed.

---

**Grooms v. Maram**  
**Expert Report of Todd D. Menenberg**  
**March 19, 2007**

---

economically provide the necessary services within the recipient's SCM. Approximately 20,000 adults participated in the Persons with Disabilities Waiver during the time period October 1, 2003 through September 30, 2004. During that same period, it cost approximately \$175 million to provide waiver services to persons in the Persons with Disabilities Waiver.

### Illinois Nursing Facilities

There are over 700 nursing facilities participating in the Illinois Medicaid program. HFS reimburses nursing facilities on a per diem basis for days of care provided to Medicaid recipients. The per diem rates vary by facility and averaged approximately \$95 per day as of Fall 2006, however, Illinois recently revised its rate setting methodology for nursing facilities, which resulted in new per diem rates effective January 1, 2007.<sup>2</sup> The average of these new rates increased to approximately \$100 per day.

### **III. Nature of the Dispute**

The Plaintiff in this matter is David Grooms. I understand that David has quadriplegia and is ventilator dependent. David received services through Illinois' MFTD Waiver program until he reached age 21 in October 2005. I understand that through the MFTD Waiver, David received nursing services at home from RNs and LPNs that cost approximately \$16,000 per month as well as respite care costing approximately \$1,000 per month. Nursing services in the MFTD Waiver are generally funded by EPSDT, which was described in Section II above.

Once David reached age 21, he was no longer eligible for the MFTD Waiver. In late 2005, DRS developed a service plan for David under the Persons with Disabilities Waiver. The Persons with Disabilities Waiver has different (lower) SCM levels (as a result of different cost

---

<sup>2</sup> Prior to the rate setting change, nursing facilities could receive "exceptional care rates" for services provided to certain individuals with special needs. The \$95 per day average rate does not include consideration of individuals receiving exceptional care rates. With the change in the rate setting system, exceptional care rates were eliminated.

---

**Grooms v. Maram**  
**Expert Report of Todd D. Menenberg**  
**March 19, 2007**

---

neutrality measures) than the MFTD Waiver.<sup>3</sup> The service plan developed for David under the Persons with Disabilities Waiver contained fewer nursing hours than he had received under the MFTD Waiver.<sup>4</sup> I understand that David has been receiving nursing services at the level approved by the service plan developed under the Persons with Disabilities Waiver; however, David now seeks to receive his "pre-age 21 levels of funding for home nursing services."<sup>5</sup> These additional requested nursing services would result in the cost of David's services exceeding his cost limitation in the Persons with Disabilities Waiver.<sup>6</sup>

#### IV. Scope of Work

I was asked by counsel to HFS to quantify the economic impact on the cost of the State's current Persons with Disabilities Waiver program, assuming David were to prevail on his request for additional home nursing services and other individuals were then also able to access additional waiver services. The two populations I was asked to evaluate are:

- 1) Current nursing facility residents who potentially would move from nursing facilities to community-based settings and receive services through the Persons with Disabilities Waiver program; and,
- 2) Current Persons with Disabilities Waiver recipients who currently use services at a cost that is less than their SCM.

---

<sup>3</sup> The cost neutrality comparison for the MFTD Waiver is based on the cost of hospital or skilled pediatric facility services, whereas the comparison for the Persons with Disabilities Waiver is based on the cost of nursing facility services.

<sup>4</sup> The service plan contained, on average, approximately 12 hours per day of RN / LPN services and approximately 1 hour per day of personal assistance. The total cost of the plan was \$8,660, which is under the SCM (based on an exceptional care rate) of \$8,840 per month. Exceptional care rates are extended to waiver recipients on a case-by-case basis when the recipient would have qualified for an exceptional care rate in a nursing facility.

<sup>5</sup> Defendant's Amended Answer and Affirmative Defenses to Complaint, paragraph 45.B.

<sup>6</sup> The costs for David's pre-21 services were approximately \$17,000 per month, which is approximately twice the cost of his service plan (\$8,660) under the Persons with Disabilities Waiver.



---

**Grooms v. Maram**  
**Expert Report of Todd D. Menenberg**  
**March 19, 2007**

---

If David prevails on his request for additional home nursing services, the cost of David's care would exceed his cost limitation under the Persons with Disabilities Waiver and would exceed the cost of his approved service plan for the waiver. Therefore, if David were to prevail, it is reasonable to believe that some current nursing facility residents that have been unable to access HCBS services through the Persons with Disabilities Waiver (because the cost of their home-based service needs exceeded their SCM) would then be able to receive services through the Persons with Disabilities Waiver. Similarly, if David prevails, it is reasonable to believe that current Persons with Disabilities Waiver recipients would likely access additional HCBS services up to (and potentially in excess of) their SCMs.<sup>7</sup>

The process I used to evaluate the two populations above and the results of my analyses are explained in more detail in the following section.

#### **V. Process and Results**

My colleagues and I had a series of discussions in early 2007 with a number of State personnel, including attorneys and executives with HFS and DHS. Our work included discussions with the following individuals:

- Matt Werner – HFS, Bureau of Rate Development and Analysis
- Barbara Ginder – HFS, Bureau of Interagency Coordination
- Kelly Cuningham – HFS, Bureau of Long Term Care
- Nancy Becker – HFS, Bureau of Rate Development and Analysis
- Sue Coonrod – HFS, Bureau of Long Term Care
- Teri Dederer – DHS, Division of Rehabilitation Services
- John Huston – Office of the Attorney General
- Karen Konieczny – Office of the Attorney General
- Joseph Howard – HFS, Office of General Counsel

---

<sup>7</sup> My analyses of nursing facility residents and individuals currently served under the Persons with Disabilities Waiver are not limited to individuals with quadriplegia or that are ventilator dependent. If David were to prevail in this matter, individuals with various medical conditions (not only those with quadriplegia or that are ventilator dependent) would likely access additional services.

---

**Grooms v. Maram**  
**Expert Report of Todd D. Menenberg**  
**March 19, 2007**

---

As part of our discussions, we requested and received information relevant to this matter including:

- Medicaid HCBS waiver documents
- CMS 372 reports detailing HCBS waiver expenditures
- Statistical data on services and costs for individuals in the HCBS waiver programs
- Medicaid fee schedule for HCBS waiver services
- Statewide nursing facility utilization statistics
- Statewide nursing facility Medicaid per diem rate schedules
- Summary MDS data for selected nursing facility residents
- David's plan of care developed for the Persons with Disabilities Waiver
- Summary of the costs of David's services since October 2005
- General description of the process used to develop service plans for HCBS waiver recipients
- Selected depositions, pleadings, and court rulings in this and related matters

After our discussions with State personnel and our review of the information listed above, we were asked to specifically quantify the following:

- 1) the cost for additional individuals that would move from nursing facilities into the community, who would access Medicaid services through the Persons with Disabilities Waiver; and,
- 2) the additional cost for current Persons with Disabilities Waiver recipients that would access additional HCBS services up to (and potentially in excess of) their SCMs.

Due to the nature of this dispute, the elements needed to analyze these costs include financial, economic, and cost data, both historical and projected. The framework basically compares financial estimates of: (a) the cost of care for Medicaid recipients under the current programs, with (b) the estimated costs assuming changes to the programs. I have been asked to take various assumptions and data and design an appropriate cost model based on my experience and general practices of computing costs, which would determine a reasonable

---

**Grooms v. Maram**  
**Expert Report of Todd D. Menenberg**  
**March 19, 2007**

---

estimate of costs at issue in this matter. The rest of this report describes the process I have undertaken and the results of my analyses.

Cost to Move Nursing Facility Residents into the Community

The objective of this part of my analysis was to estimate the additional cost related to nursing facility residents that would move from the nursing facility into the community and access Medicaid services through the Persons with Disabilities Waiver, if there were no SCM limitations.

This analysis relied on data from the September 30, 2006 MDS database<sup>8</sup> used for nursing facility rate setting. We worked with HFS personnel to identify Medicaid-eligible individuals under age 60 in nursing facilities. There were approximately 9,000 individuals meeting these criteria. We then identified individuals that were not scheduled to be discharged from the nursing facility in the next 90 days.<sup>9</sup> From this group of individuals, we then identified how many individuals had expressed a desire to leave the nursing facility<sup>10</sup> and had a support person "positive towards" their discharge from the nursing facility.<sup>11</sup> 216 individuals met all these criteria. Therefore, these individuals would potentially move from the nursing facility to the community and be served under the Persons with Disabilities Waiver were the SCM limitations removed.

---

<sup>8</sup> HFS has access to data from assessments of nursing facility residents. This data is commonly referred to as Minimum Data Set (MDS) information. Resident assessments are completed periodically over the course of a year. The database used for our analysis included MDS information for residents in nursing facilities on September 30, 2006. The MDS information was based on the most recently completed assessment as of September 30, 2006. For certain residents who had recently been admitted to a nursing facility (or for those in a hospital or otherwise temporarily out of the nursing facility), there was a two week "grace period" to complete MDS assessments.

<sup>9</sup> The MDS assessment instrument includes question Q1c, which indicates whether or not the resident is expected to be discharged within 90 days.

<sup>10</sup> The MDS assessment instrument includes question Q1a, which asks whether the resident desires to return to the community.

<sup>11</sup> The MDS assessment instrument includes question Q1b, which indicates whether or not there is a person who is "positive towards" the resident's discharge from the nursing facility.

---

**Grooms v. Maram**  
**Expert Report of Todd D. Menenberg**  
**March 19, 2007**

---

As part of this process, we observed that a number of the Medicaid nursing facility residents under age 60 *did not respond* to all three questions discussed above. Assuming that these non-responding individuals would have answered the three questions in a similar manner as those who *did respond* to all three questions, there would be a total of approximately 1,100 Medicaid residents (including the 216 individuals above) under age 60 that were not scheduled to be discharged within the next 90 days, desired to return to the community, and had a person positive towards their discharge. Therefore, for purposes of my analysis, I have determined that approximately 1,100 current nursing facility residents would potentially move from nursing facilities into the community and be served under the Persons with Disabilities Waiver were the SCM limitations removed.

We sorted the MDS data for the 216 individuals described above by their activities of daily living (ADL) scores.<sup>12</sup> The ADL scores ranged from 7 to 28. The largest group of individuals had an ADL score of 7. From the 216 MDS assessments, 28 were judgmentally selected for detailed clinical review. The sample was selected with the goal of obtaining residents whose ADL scores were distributed in a similar fashion to the ADL scores of the 216 identified residents.

The table on the following page details the number of MDS assessments by ADL score and the number selected for review.

---

<sup>12</sup> The ADL score indicates the level of support needed to accomplish activities of daily living, such as eating, bathing, grooming, transfer, etc. Lower scores indicate less need for assistance and higher scores indicate greater need for assistance.

---

**Grooms v. Maram**  
**Expert Report of Todd D. Menenberg**  
**March 19, 2007**

---

<b>TABLE 2</b>		
<b>ADL Score</b>	<b>Number of MDS Assessments</b>	<b>Number Selected for Review</b>
7	67	8
8	8	1
9	8	1
10	5	1
11	8	1
12	8	1
13	0	0
14	6	1
15	3	1
16	6	1
17	7	1
18	2	1
19	6	1
20	6	1
21	8	1
22	13	1
23	9	1
24	10	1
25	11	1
26	13	1
27	9	1
28	3	1
<b>Total</b>	<b>216</b>	<b>28</b>

Sue Coonrod, an HFS nurse,<sup>13</sup> performed a detailed clinical review based on the MDS data for the 28 selected MDS assessments. From this information, she developed a medical

---

<sup>13</sup> Roberta Sue Coonrod is a Registered Nurse currently employed by the HFS as the Supervisor of the Carlinville Region for the Bureau of Long Term Care. She has been with HFS (formerly the Illinois Department of Public Aid) since January 1985 and in her current position since May 1999. Sue has maintained her Determination of Need (DON) certification as well as her certification in gerontological nursing. Throughout her career with HFS, she has completed waiver reviews for the Illinois Department on Aging (IDoA) and the DRS including care plan and provider reviews. She has also participated in facility and individual exceptional care reviews and has been the lead

---

**Grooms v. Maram**  
**Expert Report of Todd D. Menenberg**  
**March 19, 2007**

---

description of each resident and created a plan of services that would potentially be used by the resident if they were to move from the nursing facility to the community. From the plan of care and the Medicaid fee schedule, we were able to estimate the cost to care for each individual in the community.

Exhibit 1 shows the Medicaid rate paid for each of the 28 individuals to the nursing facility as of Fall 2006 and the current rate (effective January 1, 2007), the estimated cost to care for the individual in the community, and the difference between the nursing facility rates and the estimated cost to care for the individual in the community. The average difference between the nursing facility rate as of Fall 2006 and the estimated cost to care for the individual in the community is \$79.94 per day. The difference using the January 2007 nursing facility rates is \$83.01 per day.

Assuming that the 28 assessments are representative of the 216 assessments, the additional cost for all 216 assessments would be approximately \$17,000 per day or approximately \$6.3 million annually ( $\$79.94 \text{ per day} \times 216 \text{ individuals} \times 365 \text{ days}$ ) using the Fall 2006 nursing facility rates. A similar calculation based on the January 2007 rates results in an additional cost of approximately \$6.5 million annually.

An extrapolation to account for the non-response issue discussed above, results in an additional annual cost for the approximately 1,100 individuals (including the 216 individuals above) of approximately \$32 million using the Fall 2006 rates or approximately \$33 million using the January 2007 rates.

---

supervisor for the DRS Brain Injury waiver. She has assisted facilities with their on-line MDS submissions. She has participated in MDS training and directs staff regarding the new rate system based on the MDS.

---

**Grooms v. Maram**  
**Expert Report of Todd D. Menenberg**  
**March 19, 2007**

---

Cost to Provide Additional Services to Current Waiver Recipients

The objective of this part of my analysis was to estimate the potential additional cost if the limitations imposed by the DRS utilization review and service plan development process were eliminated and the Persons with Disabilities Waiver recipients were able to receive services up to their SCMs, and beyond.

We obtained data from the DRS program for fiscal year 2006 with the monthly costs of service for each individual, grouped by SCM. The monthly cost information was provided in \$100 increments. We have been asked to determine the difference between the cost of the Persons with Disabilities Waiver recipients' service plans and their respective SCMs. We were also asked to perform similar calculations assuming each SCM were increased by 10% and 20%. Finally, we were asked to calculate the cost that would be incurred if each service plan were increased by 196%<sup>14</sup>, which represents the difference between the cost of services that David requested and the cost of the service plan developed for David for the Persons with Disabilities Waiver.

The results (see Exhibit 2 for calculations) of these analyses indicate:

- The difference between the cost of the Persons with Disabilities Waiver recipients' service plans and their respective SCMs would be approximately \$206 million annually.
- The difference between the cost of the Persons with Disabilities Waiver recipients' service plans and their respective SCMs increased by 10% would be approximately \$258 million annually.

---

<sup>14</sup> The cost model is set up so that similar calculations can easily be done for varying percentages.

---

**Grooms v. Maram**

**Expert Report of Todd D. Menenberg**

**March 19, 2007**

---

- The difference between the cost of the Persons with Disabilities Waiver recipients' service plans and their respective SCMs increased by 20% would be approximately \$310 million annually.
- The cost of increasing each Persons with Disabilities Waiver recipient's service plan by 196% would be approximately \$302 million annually.

**Total Cost Impact**

When the cost impacts related to nursing facility residents moving into the community are added to the cost impacts related to additional services that would be provided to current Persons with Disabilities Waiver recipients, the total annual costs range from approximately \$238 million to \$343 million annually.

**Other Considerations**

In addition to the costs described above, there are a number of potential additional costs should David prevail, which I have not attempted to quantify at this time. These include:

- Costs are only for the first year of the potential change; costs in future years would continue to be substantial
- Children currently in the MFTD Waiver will reach age 21, move into the Persons with Disabilities Waiver, and may access services at David's level of care
- The costs of developing and administering a significantly revised Persons with Disabilities Waiver program
- The initial costs incurred when a new Persons with Disabilities Waiver recipient moves from a nursing facility into the waiver program, e.g., home modifications, durable medical equipment, developing service plan, etc.
- The costs of increasing nursing facility rates



---

**Grooms v. Maram**

**Expert Report of Todd D. Menenberg**

**March 19, 2007**

---

- The costs related to an increase in demand for nursing and a resulting increase in nursing wages and State payments for nursing services
- The costs related to other Medicaid-eligible people moving to Illinois to avail themselves of the Persons with Disabilities Waiver benefits

## **EXHIBITS**

**Additional Cost if Individuals  
Move from Nursing Facilities to the Community**

EXHIBIT 1

Assessment #	Nursing Facility Rates (Per Diems)		HCBS Services Cost	Difference	
	Rate as of	Rate as of	Average Cost	HCBS Cost	HCBS Cost
	Fall 2006	January 2007	Per Day	Compared to NF Rate as of Fall 2006	Compared to NF Rate as of January 2007
	A	B	C	D=C-A	E=C-B
1	\$101.54	\$103.01	\$14.72	(\$86.82)	(\$88.29)
2	101.91	106.82	91.92	(9.99)	(14.90)
3	84.44	87.48	183.10	98.66	95.62
4	81.63	90.56	193.76	112.13	103.20
5	101.91	106.82	190.12	88.21	83.30
6	108.15	111.15	183.50	75.35	72.35
7	101.52	105.14	213.48	111.96	108.34
8	81.63	90.56	210.13	128.50	119.57
9	101.88	104.23	23.79	(78.09)	(80.44)
10	103.13	106.13	46.54	(56.59)	(59.59)
11	102.10	105.46	161.80	59.70	56.34
12	105.08	108.71	180.45	75.37	71.74
13	272.17	102.13	279.07	6.90	176.94
14	94.71	95.78	256.43	161.72	160.65
15	121.70	128.12	223.27	101.57	95.15
16	107.70	109.18	239.31	131.61	130.13
17	111.15	126.74	236.15	125.00	109.41
18	97.99	99.25	267.35	169.36	168.10
19	97.96	163.80	248.60	150.64	84.80
20	89.92	93.03	217.92	128.00	124.89
21	81.79	85.62	224.71	142.92	139.09
22	107.03	147.17	235.18	128.15	88.01
23	112.04	115.77	259.44	147.40	143.67
24	155.32	102.82	194.24	38.92	91.42
25	105.26	109.22	226.90	121.64	117.68
26	87.39	90.50	173.90	86.51	83.40
27	104.48	106.61	105.44	0.96	(1.17)
28	171.23	104.92	249.79	78.56	144.87
<b>TOTALS</b>	<b>\$3,092.76</b>	<b>\$3,006.73</b>	<b>\$5,331.01</b>	<b>\$2,238.25</b>	<b>\$2,324.28</b>
<b>AVERAGES</b>				<b>\$79.94</b>	<b>\$83.01</b>

Note:

The average HCBS cost per day amounts were calculated as monthly cost divided by 30.5 days (average of 30- and 31-day months in a year). If the average HCBS cost per day amounts were calculated by dividing the monthly costs by 31 days, the \$79.94 and \$83.01 average differences would decrease by less than 4%.







**EXHIBIT 2**  
**Additional Cost if Utilization Review Function Removed**  
**Persons with Disabilities Waiver**

SCM	Current Service Plans										Calculation of Additional Cost if Utilization Review Function Removed									
	Projected Monthly Costs Per Person					Assume Cost at Full SCM					Assume Cost at SCM + 10%					Assume Cost at SCM + 20%				
	Low	High	Midpoint	Number of People	Total Projected	Total Projected	Monthly Additional Cost	Annual Additional Cost	Total Projected	Monthly Additional Cost	Annual Additional Cost	Total Projected	Monthly Additional Cost	Annual Additional Cost	Total Projected	Monthly Additional Cost	Annual Additional Cost	Total Projected	Monthly Additional Cost	Annual Additional Cost
B	C	Davg@C	E	F-D'E	G-A'E	H-G-F	I-H'I2	J-(A',I)'E	K-J-F	L-K'I2	M-(A',I)'2'E	N-H-F	O-N'I2	P-(F',I,2)	Q-P-F	R-Q'I2				
2.612	2.000	2.099	37	75,832	96,644	20,812	249,744	106,308	30,476	365,712	115,975	40,141	481,692	148,631	72,799	873,588				
2.612	2.100	2.199	62	133,269	161,944	28,675	344,100	178,138	44,869	538,428	194,333	61,064	732,768	261,207	127,938	1,595,256				
2.612	2.200	2.299	54	121,473	141,048	19,575	234,900	155,153	33,680	404,160	169,258	47,785	573,420	238,087	116,614	1,399,368				
2.612	2.300	2.399	77	180,912	201,124	20,212	242,544	221,236	40,324	483,888	241,349	60,437	725,244	354,588	175,676	2,084,112				
2.612	2.400	2.499	132	323,334	344,784	21,450	257,400	379,262	55,928	671,136	413,741	90,407	1,084,884	633,735	310,401	3,724,812				
2.612	2.500	2.599	112	285,544	292,544	7,000	84,000	321,798	36,254	435,048	351,053	65,509	786,108	559,666	274,122	3,289,464				
2.612	2.600	2.699	84	218,904	219,408	504	6,048	241,349	22,445	269,340	263,290	44,386	532,632	429,052	210,148	2,521,776				
<b>Totals</b>					<b>\$26,197,059</b>	<b>\$43,351,119</b>	<b>\$17,154,060</b>	<b>\$205,848,720</b>	<b>\$47,686,235</b>	<b>\$71,489,176</b>	<b>\$257,870,112</b>	<b>\$52,021,345</b>	<b>\$25,824,286</b>	<b>\$309,891,432</b>	<b>\$51,346,217</b>	<b>\$25,749,168</b>	<b>\$301,790,016</b>			
<b>Rounded</b>								<b>206,000,000</b>			<b>258,000,000</b>		<b>310,000,000</b>			<b>302,000,000</b>				

Note: The data indicated that service plans for 38 individuals had projected monthly cost per person in excess of the SCM. Based on discussions with DRS staff, we understand that these are cases where additional services were temporarily authorized for special circumstances. For purposes of this analysis, we have excluded these 38 service plans and their projected costs.

For projected cost intervals (above) where the monthly SCM fell within the monthly projected cost range, the midpoint (col. D) is calculated as the average between the Low (col. B) and the SCM (col. A).