ILLUSTRATIVE ESTIMATE OF THE IMPACT ON STATES OF DISCOUNT DRUG CREDIT FOR LOW INCOME OF THE MEDICARE PRESCRIPTION DRUG, IMPROVEMENT, AND MODERNIZATION ACT OF 2003

| State | Medicare Beneficiary Population ¹ | People Without Current Coverage ² | People Eligible for \$600 Drug Card ³ | Potential Drug Card Subsidies ('04 & '05) ⁴ (millions) | (65% of) Beneficiaries Participating in TAP ⁵ | TAP State Savings at 65% Uptake Rate ⁶ (millions) |
|-------------------------|--|---|---|---|---|--|
| Alabama | 720,000 | 195,000 | 169,000 | \$203 | 110,000 | \$132 |
| Alaska | 47,000 | 10,000 | 8,000 | \$10 | 5,000 | \$6 |
| Arizona | 729,000 | 202,000 | 106,000 | \$127 | 69,000 | \$83 |
| Arkansas | 453,000 | 127,000 | 103,000 | \$124 | 67,000 | \$80 |
| California | 4,076,000 | 933,000 | 643,000 | \$772 | 418,000 | \$502 |
| Colorado | 493,000 | 112,000 | 72,000 | \$86 | 47,000 | \$56 |
| Connecticut | 523,000 | 123,000 | 82,000 | \$98 | 53,000 | \$64 |
| Delaware | 120,000 | 24,000 | 18,000 | \$22 | 12,000 | \$14 |
| DC | 74,000 | 16,000 | 16,000 | \$19 | 10,000 | \$12 |
| Florida | 2,931,000 | 797,000 | 490,000 | \$588 | 319,000 | \$382 |
| Georgia | 975,000 | 219,000 | 198,000 | \$238 | 129,000 | \$154 |
| Hawaii | 175,000 | 36,000 | 27,000 | \$32 | 18,000 | \$21 |
| Idaho | 178,000 | 51,000 | 31,000 | \$37 | 20,000 | \$24 |
| Illinois | 1,665,000 | 448,000 | 140,000 | \$168 | 91,000 | \$109 |
| Indiana | 881,000 | 237,000 | 179,000 | \$215 | 116,000 | \$140 |
| lowa | 485,000 | 144,000 | 77,000 | \$92 | 50,000 | \$60 |
| Kansas | 397,000 | 117,000 | 59,000 | \$71 | 38,000 | \$46 |
| Kentucky | 649,000 | 146,000 | 112,000 | \$134 | 73,000 | \$87 |
| Louisiana | 623,000 | 159,000 | 165,000 | \$198 | 107,000 | \$129 |
| Maine | 227,000 | 59,000 | 38,000 | \$46 | 25,000 | \$30 |
| Maryland | 675,000 | 142,000 | 116,000 | \$139 | 75,000 | \$90 |
| Massachusetts | 970,000 | 257,000 | 169,000 | \$203 | 110,000 | \$132 |
| Michigan | 1,448,000 | 322,000 | 201,000 | \$241 | 131,000 | \$157 |
| Minnesota | 677,000 | 187,000 | 109,000 | \$131 | 71,000 | \$85 |
| Mississippi | 438,000 | 104,000 | 86,000 | \$103 | 56,000 | \$67 |
| Mantana | 888,000 | 215,000 | 159,000 | \$191 | 103,000 | \$124 |
| Montana | 143,000 | 41,000 | 26,000 | \$31 | 17,000 | \$20 |
| Nepraska | 259,000 | 90,000 | 63,000 | \$70 \$50 | 41,000 | \$49 \$24 |
| Nevada New Hompshire | 273,000 | 66,000 | 44,000 | დენ | 29,000 | ູ ຈຸວ4 ¢ວວ |
| New largov | 1 225 000 | 40,000 | 29,000 | φου \$204 | 19,000 | φ23 \$146 |
| New Mexico | 250,000 | 56,000 | 45,000 | ψ224 \$5/ | 29,000 | \$35 |
| New York | 2 768 000 | 611 000 | 455,000 | \$546 | 29,000 | \$355 \$355 |
| North Carolina | 1 207 000 | 315,000 | 273 000 | \$328 | 177 000 | \$213 |
| North Dakota | 104 000 | 36,000 | 24 000 | <u>ψ320</u> \$29 | 16,000 | <u>ψ213</u> \$19 |
| Ohio | 1 734 000 | 400,000 | 302 000 | \$362 | 196,000 | \$236 |
| Oklahoma | 523,000 | 133 000 | 98,000 | \$118 | 64 000 | \$76 |
| Oregon | 514,000 | 129,000 | 70,000 | \$84 | 46,000 | \$55 |
| Pennsylvania | 2.123.000 | 558,000 | 371,000 | \$445 | 241.000 | \$289 |
| Rhode Island | 173.000 | 49.000 | 41.000 | \$49 | 27.000 | \$32 |
| South Carolina | 607.000 | 148.000 | 80.000 | \$96 | 52.000 | \$62 |
| South Dakota | 122.000 | 40.000 | 28.000 | \$34 | 18.000 | \$22 |
| Tennessee | 873.000 | 238.000 | 199.000 | \$239 | 129.000 | \$155 |
| Texas | 2,392,000 | 592,000 | 497.000 | \$596 | 323,000 | \$388 |
| Utah | 220.000 | 56.000 | 41.000 | \$49 | 27,000 | \$32 |
| Vermont | 93,000 | 22,000 | 17,000 | \$20 | 11,000 | \$13 |

ILLUSTRATIVE ESTIMATE OF THE IMPACT ON STATES OF DISCOUNT DRUG CREDIT FOR LOW INCOME OF THE MEDICARE PRESCRIPTION DRUG, IMPROVEMENT, AND MODERNIZATION ACT OF 2003

| State | Medicare Beneficiary Population ¹ | People Without Current Coverage ² | People Eligible for \$600 Drug Card ³ | Potential Drug Card Subsidies ('04 & '05) ⁴ (millions) | (65% of) Beneficiaries Participating in TAP ⁵ | TAP State Savings at 65% Uptake Rate ⁶ (millions) |
|---------------|--|---|---|---|---|--|
| Virginia | 947,000 | 187,000 | 162,000 | \$194 | 105,000 | \$126 |
| Washington | 775,000 | 187,000 | 83,000 | \$100 | 54,000 | \$65 |
| West Virginia | 348,000 | 72,000 | 57,000 | \$68 | 37,000 | \$44 |
| Wisconsin | 806,000 | 234,000 | 70,000 | \$84 | 46,000 | \$55 |
| Wyoming | 69,000 | 20,000 | 15,000 | \$18 | 10,000 | \$12 |
| Total | 40,245,000 | 10,030,000 | 6,850,000 | \$8,220 | 4,543,000 | 5,343 |

(Estimates were developed prior to passage and enactment.)*

These estimates are not a comprehensive analysis of the entire bill or all of its provisions. The estimates were limited by data and time constraints.

¹Estimates were made of the total population potentially affected by the Medicare reform bill's prescription drug provisions using the March 2003 Current Population Survey (CPS) data. Because the CPS does not contain institutionalized individuals, the March 2003 CPS counts of Medicare enrollment was prorated to match the "control" totals of the actual Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS) administrative enrollment data from the 1st Quarter 2003 "Denominator File." To produce State-level estimates, the March 2003 CPS file was tabulated to produce counts of Medicare recipients by State by poverty level, controlling to total CMS enrollment figures.

²To estimate the number of previously uncovered Medicare enrollees who would gain access to drugs that they would not otherwise have, the starting point was the March 2003 CPS file by State, tabulated by poverty and by supplemental insurance type, e.g., employer-sponsored, Medicaid. Control totals by type of supplemental insurance were based on tabulations of the Medicare Current Beneficiary Survey, adjusted to 2002 levels (including Tricare). Poverty controls (from CMS) and insurance controls were then used to create the specific estimates of insurance type by poverty. The CPS information was used to distribute these controls by State (within poverty band), but again matched to total enrollment from the 1st Quarter 2003 "Denominator File." The newly covered were defined as those without current drug coverage. This estimate was reduced slightly by the CMS Office of the Actuary's (OACT) assumption of 99 percent participation.

³To estimate the total population potentially eligible for the \$600 drug provision, the same file as indicated above was used. The file was tabulated to identify in each state those under 135% of poverty without Medicaid, employersponsored insurance (ESI) or other insurance, e.g., Tricare. In addition, a conversion factor of .9145 was applied to correct for model assumptions. This number has been revised to reflect the impact of Pharmacy Plus waivers in Florida, Illinois, South Carolina, and Wisconsin.

⁴To calculate the amount of potential drug card subsidies, the total number of people eligible for the \$600 annual drug card subsidy was multiplied by \$1,200 which represents the total amount of subsidy available for 2004 and 2005.

⁵ To calculate the number of beneficiaries who will participate in the Transitional Assistance Program, the CMS OACT estimated take-up rate of 65% was applied to (multiplied by) the number of eligible beneficiaries.

⁶ To calculate the estimated State savings rate for participation of beneficiaries in the Transitional Assistance Program, the number of beneficiaries expected to take up the program was multiplied by \$1,200 (\$600 per year for 2004 and 2005). (OACT estimates that drug card take-up rates will result in subsidy costs of \$5.3 billion for 2004-2005.)