



## TESTIMONY: TEXAS MEDICAID FUNDING IN FILED VERSION OF HB 1

Medicaid funding proposed in HB 1 is estimated by the Legislative Budget Board (LBB) as falling \$18 billion (All Funds) below the amount need to maintain current benefits, provider fees, and eligibility standards. This underfunding would be more than 7 times the depth of the disastrous 2003 Medicaid and CHIP cuts. While delivery reforms and best practices can and should be aggressively implemented, the best program improvements combined cannot achieve savings anywhere near the \$7.6 billion GR shortfall. The Legislature should begin immediately looking for ways to mitigate the damage to our state's most vulnerable through a balanced approach to balancing the budget that looks to savings and new revenues, not a cuts-only approach.

### Overall Medicaid Funding

Article II (Health and Human Services) funding at \$49.4 billion All Funds is \$16.1 billion below 2010-2011, a 24.6% reduction (*LBB summary, p. 73*). The Department of Aging and Disabilities' (DADS) proposed funding is 37.9% below 2010-2011 levels, and the Health and Human Services Commission (HHSC) is 24.3% below current spending.

The Article II Medicaid funding shortfall in HB 1 has 3 components:

1. Medicaid funding in HB 1 assumes Medicaid and CHIP 10% provider rate cuts, to be added to the cuts already taken in 2010-2011. For Medicaid only, this rate cut reduces spending by \$1.6 billion GR, losing another \$2.2 billion federal match (**\$3.8 billion, All Funds**).

These cuts affect virtually every kind of health care professional and provider, and all agencies that use any part of Medicaid.

2. HB 1 does not fund caseload growth or cost increases/inflation, estimated by the LBB at \$1.7 billion GR, losing another \$2.5 billion federal funds (**\$4.2 billion, All Funds**).
3. HB 1 does not replace \$4.3 billion GR from stimulus law, causing loss of another \$5.7 billion in federal funds (**\$10 billion All Funds**).

Total GR funding below LBB-estimated current services need is \$7.6 billion, with another \$10.4 billion federal matching dollars lost as a result (**\$18 billion All Funds**).

### HB 1 Proposed Medicaid Cuts are 7 times the size of 2003 Session Medicaid & CHIP cuts

Texas has cut Medicaid rates before, and has adopted "extremely optimistic" caseload and cost assumptions many times before. What is different today?

**The scope of Medicaid cuts and underfunding proposed today is much larger than in the 2003 Session:**

- 
- When the 2004-2005 budget was first adopted in the 2003 session, the total All-Funds impact of Medicaid and CHIP cuts combined was just under \$2.6 billion, and the GR cut was \$950 million.
  - The current budget proposal would cut \$18 Billion All Funds, and \$7.6 billion GR: All Funds, the impact is 7 times the Medicaid/CHIP combined cuts in the adopted 2004-2005 budget (and 8 times the 2003 GR cuts).
  - After initial adoption, LBB-Governor's office actions were taken during the 2004-05 biennium to reduce the cuts to \$1.6 billion All Funds and \$620 million GR; the cuts we are considering today are 11 to 12 times larger than 2003.

## Enrollment and Inflation Growth

In the last decade, HHSC and LBB enrollment and cost-per-client assumptions have often been quite different, and it has been common to adopt very low assumptions, understanding that corrections can be made in the next session's supplemental appropriations bill.

- In the 2005 session, caseload/cost assumptions adopted in April reduced the GR gap between HHSC and LBB assumptions by nearly \$1 billion (\$930 million GR).
- At \$1.7 billion GR, not funding caseload or cost growth would be leaving a gap of unprecedented size—but more importantly, another \$5.9 billion in GR is missing in SB 1, **beyond** this current-services cost gap.

Use of “highly optimistic” growth assumptions remains a usable tool for this budget, but even if NO growth were funded in the adopted budget for 2012-2013, we would still need to fill another \$5.9 billion GR hole.

## Eligibility Cuts are No “Solution” for Medicaid

Some elected officials have suggested that Texas would benefit from repealing the federal Affordable Care Act health reform law requirement that prevents states from cutting eligibility in Medicaid or CHIP (maintenance of effort or “MOE”). This focus on MOE poses a false choice, suggesting our only choices are between cutting provider rates deeply or cutting kids and seniors off of coverage. In truth, Texans have a much wider range of choices besides relying solely on cuts to balance this budget, and all of those choices must be on the table.

All Medicaid cuts will hurt vulnerable Texans: kids, seniors, Texans with disabilities, and pregnant women. No vulnerable Texan, health care provider, or taxpayer would be better off (or hurt less) under eligibility cuts than they would if you cut their benefits or fees.

- Suggesting that eligibility cuts are better than rate and benefit cuts is like saying you'd rather die by firing squad than by starvation. Either way, you are dead. We need to be looking for all the ways we can make the smallest cuts possible—not asking for the firing squad as an alternative to starvation.

## All Health Care Spending Must be Controlled, Not Medicaid Alone

The U.S. health care spending growth rate is “unsustainable,” and must be controlled to keep within population, general inflation, and GDP growth. Texas must aggressively promote delivery payment reforms across the entire health care system, not just Medicaid but also your private insurance and mine—and Medicare. Medicaid is NOT uniquely troubled by rising care costs:

- 
- The Congressional Budget Office reports that growth rates for Medicare, Medicaid, and “All Other” (private insurance and self-pay) U.S. health spending have outstripped GDP growth consistently since 1975.
  - Medicare logged the highest cost growth in excess of GDP, and
  - Medicaid “tied” with “All Other” U.S. health spending over that entire period, despite having grown at a much slower rate than the rest of the system since 1990.

The changes needed to reduce federal deficits and debt can’t be achieved simply by cutting or eliminating Medicaid. Real solutions to our country’s health care spending woes will only come from hard work that looks across all of the population and every source of coverage.

### **Delivery Reforms & Best Practices Must be Sought, But Cannot fill a \$7.7 Billion Hole**

Federal maintenance of effort “floors” are not Texas’ problem. Our revenue shortage, resulting roughly 2/3 from the global recession and 1/3 from our structural deficit is the problem. Texas has great flexibility under federal law to reform service delivery, but our options are also balanced with protections to ensure we impose reforms thoughtfully. As an example, Texas already has authority to impose Medicaid cost-sharing. For non-emergency ER visits, we are limited by the requirement that we must ensure access to alternative urgent care before adding those costs to the ER. But, even if we maximize our ability to add co-payments to Medicaid, it would only reduce our \$7.6 billion underfunding by a very modest amount. We must recognize that even an aggressive pursuit of program changes cannot yield savings even close to the magnitude of this \$7.6 billion gap.

### **Size of Proposed Cuts is Crippling and Unsustainable—a Balanced Approach is our Only Real Choice**

We are not asking for special protections for Article II, even though cuts here do bring on the added damage of losing federal funds. We know that virtually every part of state government—including our public schools—is facing a 25% or greater reduction if this budget is not balanced in a balanced way.

These enormous cuts to investments in our future prosperity and essential services needed by all Texans—especially the families struggling the hardest in this recession—are unsustainable. In the real world, a family that has lost income does not just decide to stop feeding the kids. Real families look to their savings and figure out how they can make more money and replace some of their lost income!

Our budget discussion going forward should set aside the cuts-only approach right now, and allow for a full discussion about what Texans’ spending priorities and options are. A better alternative is a balanced approach that looks both to our Rainy Day Fund savings and new revenues, and not just to cuts.

We pledge to work with you on real practice and delivery reforms, the Quality Assurance Fee ideas that have already been aired in these hearings, and other options to help balance the budget without relying on cuts alone.

Anne Dunkelberg, Assoc. Director, [dunkelberg@cphp.org](mailto:dunkelberg@cphp.org)  
Center for Public Policy Priorities, 900 Lydia Street - Austin, Texas 78702  
Phone (512) 320-0222 (ext.102) – [www.cphp.org](http://www.cphp.org)

<b>County</b>	<b>2009 All-Funds Medicaid Spending (million \$)</b>	<b>Medicaid 2012- 13 biennial TOTAL loss at full \$18 billion cut (million \$)</b>	<b>Medicaid 2012-13 loss, 10% rate cut ONLY (-\$3.8 billion All Funds) (million \$)</b>	<b>Medicaid 2012-13 loss, No funding for caseload or Inflation ONLY (-\$4.2 billion All Funds) (million \$)</b>	<b>Medicaid 2012-13 loss, No Replacing Federal Stimulus funding ONLY (-\$10 billion All Funds) (million \$)</b>
State total	\$18,398.4	\$ 18,000.0	\$ 3,800.0	\$ 4,200.0	\$10,000.0
Anderson	40.1	39.3	8.3	9.2	21.8
Andrews	6.9	6.7	1.4	1.6	3.7
Angelina	126.4	123.6	26.1	28.8	68.7
Aransas	20.6	20.1	4.2	4.7	11.2
Archer	2.8	2.7	0.6	0.6	1.5
Armstrong	1.6	1.6	0.3	0.4	0.9
Atascosa	45.1	44.2	9.3	10.3	24.5
Austin	15.9	15.6	3.3	3.6	8.7
Bailey	5.2	5.1	1.1	1.2	2.8
Bandera	7.9	7.7	1.6	1.8	4.3
Bastrop	52.5	51.4	10.8	12.0	28.5
Baylor	3.8	3.7	0.8	0.9	2.1
Bee	31.4	30.8	6.5	7.2	17.1
Bell	153.5	150.2	31.7	35.0	83.4
Bexar	1,446.1	1,414.8	298.7	330.1	786.0
Blanco	4.0	3.9	0.8	0.9	2.2
Borden	0.080	0.078	0.017	0.018	0.043
Bosque	13.6	13.3	2.8	3.1	7.4
Bowie	70.8	69.3	14.6	16.2	38.5
Brazoria	143.5	140.4	29.6	32.8	78.0
Brazos	74.4	72.8	15.4	17.0	40.5
Brewster	4.5	4.4	0.9	1.0	2.4
Briscoe	0.6	0.6	0.1	0.1	0.3
Brooks	17.5	17.1	3.6	4.0	9.5
Brown	38.5	37.7	7.9	8.8	20.9
Burleson	10.2	10.0	2.1	2.3	5.5
Burnet	25.8	25.2	5.3	5.9	14.0
Caldwell	35.8	35.0	7.4	8.2	19.5
Calhoun	17.6	17.2	3.6	4.0	9.6
Callahan	8.1	7.9	1.7	1.9	4.4
Cameron	621.2	607.7	128.3	141.8	337.6
Camp	11.8	11.6	2.4	2.7	6.4
Carson	1.8	1.8	0.4	0.4	1.0
Cass	31.0	30.3	6.4	7.1	16.8
Castro	5.8	5.7	1.2	1.3	3.2
Chambers	10.7	10.4	2.2	2.4	5.8
Cherokee	50.4	49.4	10.4	11.5	27.4
Childress	6.0	5.9	1.2	1.4	3.3
Clay	4.4	4.3	0.9	1.0	2.4
Cochran	2.1	2.0	0.4	0.5	1.1
Coke	2.5	2.4	0.5	0.6	1.3

<b>County</b>	<b>2009 All-Funds Medicaid Spending (million \$)</b>	<b>Medicaid 2012-13 biennial TOTAL loss at full \$18 billion cut (million \$)</b>	<b>Medicaid 2012-13 loss, 10% rate cut ONLY (-\$3.8 billion All Funds) (million \$)</b>	<b>Medicaid 2012-13 loss, No funding for caseload or Inflation ONLY (-\$4.2 billion All Funds) (million \$)</b>	<b>Medicaid 2012-13 loss, No Replacing Federal Stimulus funding ONLY (-\$10 billion All Funds) (million \$)</b>
Coleman	\$8.5	\$8.3	\$1.7	\$1.9	\$4.6
Collin	161.5	158.0	33.4	36.9	87.8
Collingsworth	2.7	2.7	0.6	0.6	1.5
Colorado	14.8	14.5	3.1	3.4	8.1
Comal	58.3	57.0	12.0	13.3	31.7
Comanche	10.4	10.2	2.1	2.4	5.6
Concho	2.2	2.2	0.5	0.5	1.2
Cooke	23.5	23.0	4.9	5.4	12.8
Coryell	24.8	24.3	5.1	5.7	13.5
Cottle	1.7	1.7	0.4	0.4	0.9
Crane	2.9	2.8	0.6	0.7	1.6
Crockett	2.4	2.4	0.5	0.6	1.3
Crosby	5.8	5.6	1.2	1.3	3.1
Culberson	1.9	1.8	0.4	0.4	1.0
Dallam	3.4	3.4	0.7	0.8	1.9
Dallas	1,607.1	1,572.3	331.9	366.9	873.5
Dawson	9.7	9.5	2.0	2.2	5.3
Deaf Smith	14.9	14.6	3.1	3.4	8.1
Delta	5.4	5.3	1.1	1.2	2.9
Denton	256.8	251.2	53.0	58.6	139.6
DeWitt	19.2	18.8	4.0	4.4	10.4
Dickens	1.4	1.4	0.3	0.3	0.8
Dimmit	17.1	16.7	3.5	3.9	9.3
Donley	2.7	2.6	0.6	0.6	1.4
Duval	20.7	20.3	4.3	4.7	11.3
Eastland	21.4	21.0	4.4	4.9	11.6
Ector	101.9	99.7	21.0	23.3	55.4
Edwards	1.4	1.4	0.3	0.3	0.8
Ellis	81.7	79.9	16.9	18.6	44.4
El Paso	654.3	640.2	135.1	149.4	355.7
Erath	24.6	24.1	5.1	5.6	13.4
Falls	16.4	16.1	3.4	3.8	8.9
Fannin	27.7	27.1	5.7	6.3	15.0
Fayette	20.0	19.5	4.1	4.6	10.8
Fisher	2.8	2.8	0.6	0.6	1.5
Floyd	5.3	5.1	1.1	1.2	2.9
Foard	1.4	1.4	0.3	0.3	0.8
Fort Bend	246.1	240.7	50.8	56.2	133.7
Franklin	8.6	8.4	1.8	2.0	4.7
Freestone	12.8	12.5	2.6	2.9	7.0
Frio	20.0	19.6	4.1	4.6	10.9
Gaines	9.9	9.7	2.0	2.3	5.4

<b>County</b>	<b>2009 All-Funds Medicaid Spending (million \$)</b>	<b>Medicaid 2012-13 biennial TOTAL loss at full \$18 billion cut (million \$)</b>	<b>Medicaid 2012-13 loss, 10% rate cut ONLY (-\$3.8 billion All Funds) (million \$)</b>	<b>Medicaid 2012-13 loss, No funding for caseload or Inflation ONLY (-\$4.2 billion All Funds) (million \$)</b>	<b>Medicaid 2012-13 loss, No Replacing Federal Stimulus funding ONLY (-\$10 billion All Funds) (million \$)</b>
Galveston	\$163.5	\$159.9	\$33.8	\$37.3	\$88.9
Garza	4.1	4.0	0.8	0.9	2.2
Gillespie	13.2	12.9	2.7	3.0	7.2
Glasscock	0.079	0.077	0.016	0.018	0.043
Goliad	5.0	4.9	1.0	1.2	2.7
Gonzales	18.3	17.9	3.8	4.2	9.9
Gray	13.8	13.5	2.8	3.1	7.5
Grayson	91.9	89.9	19.0	21.0	50.0
Gregg	134.4	131.5	27.8	30.7	73.1
Grimes	15.4	15.0	3.2	3.5	8.3
Guadalupe	66.4	65.0	13.7	15.2	36.1
Hale	28.6	27.9	5.9	6.5	15.5
Hall	3.1	3.1	0.6	0.7	1.7
Hamilton	9.1	8.9	1.9	2.1	4.9
Hansford	2.1	2.0	0.4	0.5	1.1
Hardeman	3.6	3.5	0.7	0.8	1.9
Hardin	35.7	35.0	7.4	8.2	19.4
Harris	2,782.1	2,721.8	574.6	635.1	1,512.1
Harrison	52.9	51.7	10.9	12.1	28.7
Hartley	2.6	2.5	0.5	0.6	1.4
Haskell	5.5	5.4	1.1	1.3	3.0
Hays	66.7	65.2	13.8	15.2	36.2
Hemphill	1.0	1.0	0.2	0.2	0.5
Henderson	61.5	60.2	12.7	14.0	33.4
Hidalgo	1,277.8	1,250.1	263.9	291.7	694.5
Hill	25.4	24.9	5.2	5.8	13.8
Hockley	19.7	19.3	4.1	4.5	10.7
Hood	26.0	25.5	5.4	5.9	14.1
Hopkins	27.7	27.1	5.7	6.3	15.0
Houston	21.8	21.4	4.5	5.0	11.9
Howard	27.3	26.8	5.6	6.2	14.9
Hudspeth	1.8	1.7	0.4	0.4	1.0
Hunt	58.4	57.2	12.1	13.3	31.8
Hutchinson	10.2	10.0	2.1	2.3	5.6
Irion	0.4	0.4	0.1	0.1	0.2
Jack	4.1	4.0	0.8	0.9	2.2
Jackson	11.4	11.1	2.3	2.6	6.2
Jasper	31.7	31.0	6.6	7.2	17.2
Jeff Davis	0.6	0.6	0.1	0.1	0.3
Jefferson	209.9	205.4	43.4	47.9	114.1
Jim Hogg	8.2	8.0	1.7	1.9	4.5
Jim Wells	72.2	70.6	14.9	16.5	39.2

<b>County</b>	<b>2009 All-Funds Medicaid Spending (million \$)</b>	<b>Medicaid 2012-13 biennial TOTAL loss at full \$18 billion cut (million \$)</b>	<b>Medicaid 2012-13 loss, 10% rate cut ONLY (-\$3.8 billion All Funds) (million \$)</b>	<b>Medicaid 2012-13 loss, No funding for caseload or Inflation ONLY (-\$4.2 billion All Funds) (million \$)</b>	<b>Medicaid 2012-13 loss, No Replacing Federal Stimulus funding ONLY (-\$10 billion All Funds) (million \$)</b>
Johnson	\$91.6	\$89.6	\$18.9	\$20.9	\$49.8
Jones	18.1	17.7	3.7	4.1	9.8
Karnes	15.7	15.4	3.3	3.6	8.6
Kaufman	59.7	58.5	12.3	13.6	32.5
Kendall	15.3	14.9	3.2	3.5	8.3
Kenedy	0.4	0.4	0.1	0.1	0.2
Kent	0.8	0.8	0.2	0.2	0.4
Kerr	27.6	27.0	5.7	6.3	15.0
Kimble	3.1	3.0	0.6	0.7	1.7
King	0.010	0.010	0.002	0.002	0.005
Kinney	2.3	2.2	0.5	0.5	1.2
Kleberg	41.2	40.3	8.5	9.4	22.4
Knox	4.4	4.3	0.9	1.0	2.4
Lamar	47.6	46.6	9.8	10.9	25.9
Lamb	13.0	12.7	2.7	3.0	7.1
Lampasas	13.3	13.0	2.7	3.0	7.2
La Salle	6.8	6.7	1.4	1.6	3.7
Lavaca	20.4	20.0	4.2	4.7	11.1
Lee	13.5	13.2	2.8	3.1	7.3
Leon	10.5	10.2	2.2	2.4	5.7
Liberty	54.3	53.2	11.2	12.4	29.5
Limestone	72.6	71.0	15.0	16.6	39.5
Lipscomb	1.2	1.2	0.3	0.3	0.7
Live Oak	8.2	8.0	1.7	1.9	4.5
Llano	12.2	12.0	2.5	2.8	6.6
Loving	0.1	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.1
Lubbock	240.9	235.6	49.7	55.0	130.9
Lynn	3.2	3.1	0.7	0.7	1.7
Madison	8.8	8.6	1.8	2.0	4.8
Marion	11.1	10.9	2.3	2.5	6.0
Martin	3.3	3.2	0.7	0.7	1.8
Mason	1.9	1.8	0.4	0.4	1.0
Matagorda	31.3	30.6	6.5	7.1	17.0
Maverick	83.0	81.2	17.1	18.9	45.1
McCulloch	8.4	8.2	1.7	1.9	4.6
McLennan	188.5	184.4	38.9	43.0	102.4
McMullen	0.2	0.2	0.0	0.0	0.1
Medina	42.8	41.8	8.8	9.8	23.2
Menard	1.8	1.8	0.4	0.4	1.0
Midland	75.9	74.2	15.7	17.3	41.2
Milam	26.9	26.4	5.6	6.2	14.6
Mills	5.1	5.0	1.1	1.2	2.8

<b>County</b>	<b>2009 All-Funds Medicaid Spending (million \$)</b>	<b>Medicaid 2012-13 biennial TOTAL loss at full \$18 billion cut (million \$)</b>	<b>Medicaid 2012-13 loss, 10% rate cut ONLY (-\$3.8 billion All Funds) (million \$)</b>	<b>Medicaid 2012-13 loss, No funding for caseload or Inflation ONLY (-\$4.2 billion All Funds) (million \$)</b>	<b>Medicaid 2012-13 loss, No Replacing Federal Stimulus funding ONLY (-\$10 billion All Funds) (million \$)</b>
Mitchell	\$6.3	\$6.1	\$1.3	\$1.4	\$3.4
Montague	14.1	13.8	2.9	3.2	7.7
Montgomery	189.8	185.7	39.2	43.3	103.2
Moore	9.2	9.0	1.9	2.1	5.0
Morris	14.9	14.5	3.1	3.4	8.1
Motley	0.8	0.8	0.2	0.2	0.4
Nacogdoches	49.9	48.9	10.3	11.4	27.1
Navarro	48.5	47.4	10.0	11.1	26.3
Newton	11.2	11.0	2.3	2.6	6.1
Nolan	16.7	16.3	3.4	3.8	9.1
Nueces	418.6	409.6	86.5	95.6	227.5
Ochiltree	2.9	2.9	0.6	0.7	1.6
Oldham	0.7	0.6	0.1	0.2	0.4
Orange	55.3	54.1	11.4	12.6	30.1
Palo Pinto	23.9	23.3	4.9	5.4	13.0
Panola	18.0	17.6	3.7	4.1	9.8
Parker	44.9	43.9	9.3	10.2	24.4
Parmer	5.5	5.3	1.1	1.2	3.0
Pecos	10.1	9.9	2.1	2.3	5.5
Polk	37.2	36.4	7.7	8.5	20.2
Potter	115.0	112.5	23.7	26.2	62.5
Presidio	6.2	6.1	1.3	1.4	3.4
Rains	6.0	5.8	1.2	1.4	3.2
Randall	39.9	39.0	8.2	9.1	21.7
Reagan	1.6	1.5	0.3	0.4	0.8
Real	3.2	3.2	0.7	0.7	1.8
Red River	14.8	14.5	3.1	3.4	8.0
Reeves	13.7	13.4	2.8	3.1	7.4
Refugio	7.4	7.2	1.5	1.7	4.0
Roberts	0.2	0.2	0.0	0.0	0.1
Robertson	15.6	15.3	3.2	3.6	8.5
Rockwall	28.9	28.3	6.0	6.6	15.7
Runnels	8.8	8.6	1.8	2.0	4.8
Rusk	37.4	36.6	7.7	8.5	20.3
Sabine	8.2	8.0	1.7	1.9	4.5
San Augustine	14.9	14.6	3.1	3.4	8.1
San Jacinto	15.2	14.9	3.1	3.5	8.3
San Patricio	74.1	72.5	15.3	16.9	40.3
San Saba	5.5	5.3	1.1	1.2	3.0
Schleicher	1.7	1.6	0.3	0.4	0.9
Scurry	10.4	10.1	2.1	2.4	5.6
Shackelford	1.8	1.7	0.4	0.4	1.0



<b>County</b>	<b>2009 All-Funds Medicaid Spending (million \$)</b>	<b>Medicaid 2012-13 biennial TOTAL loss at full \$18 billion cut (million \$)</b>	<b>Medicaid 2012-13 loss, 10% rate cut ONLY (-\$3.8 billion All Funds) (million \$)</b>	<b>Medicaid 2012-13 loss, No funding for caseload or Inflation ONLY (-\$4.2 billion All Funds) (million \$)</b>	<b>Medicaid 2012-13 loss, No Replacing Federal Stimulus funding ONLY (-\$10 billion All Funds) (million \$)</b>
Shelby	\$25.1	\$24.6	\$5.2	\$5.7	\$13.6
Sherman	1.6	1.6	0.3	0.4	0.9
Smith	145.8	142.6	30.1	33.3	79.2
Somervell	5.7	5.5	1.2	1.3	3.1
Starr	146.7	143.5	30.3	33.5	79.7
Stephens	8.7	8.5	1.8	2.0	4.7
Sterling	0.7	0.7	0.1	0.2	0.4
Stonewall	1.2	1.1	0.2	0.3	0.6
Sutton	1.9	1.9	0.4	0.4	1.1
Swisher	4.1	4.0	0.8	0.9	2.2
Tarrant	957.0	936.3	197.7	218.5	520.2
Taylor	169.2	165.6	34.9	38.6	92.0
Terrell	0.4	0.4	0.1	0.1	0.2
Terry	13.3	13.0	2.7	3.0	7.2
Throckmorton	1.0	1.0	0.2	0.2	0.5
Titus	26.3	25.7	5.4	6.0	14.3
Tom Green	118.3	115.7	24.4	27.0	64.3
Travis	658.3	644.1	136.0	150.3	357.8
Trinity	12.2	11.9	2.5	2.8	6.6
Tyler	16.3	15.9	3.4	3.7	8.8
Upshur	31.1	30.5	6.4	7.1	16.9
Upton	2.4	2.3	0.5	0.5	1.3
Uvalde	30.6	29.9	6.3	7.0	16.6
Val Verde	47.9	46.9	9.9	10.9	26.1
Van Zandt	40.1	39.3	8.3	9.2	21.8
Victoria	96.7	94.6	20.0	22.1	52.6
Walker	26.4	25.8	5.4	6.0	14.3
Waller	25.2	24.6	5.2	5.7	13.7
Ward	8.0	7.9	1.7	1.8	4.4
Washington	71.5	69.9	14.8	16.3	38.8
Webb	281.6	275.5	58.2	64.3	153.1
Wharton	33.4	32.7	6.9	7.6	18.2
Wheeler	3.0	2.9	0.6	0.7	1.6
Wichita	106.5	104.2	22.0	24.3	57.9
Wilbarger	14.9	14.6	3.1	3.4	8.1
Willacy	42.9	42.0	8.9	9.8	23.3
Williamson	137.0	134.0	28.3	31.3	74.5
Wilson	30.8	30.2	6.4	7.0	16.8
Winkler	4.5	4.4	0.9	1.0	2.4
Wise	29.2	28.5	6.0	6.7	15.9
Wood	32.3	31.6	6.7	7.4	17.6
Yoakum	5.0	4.9	1.0	1.1	2.7

<b>County</b>	<b>2009 All-Funds Medicaid Spending (million \$)</b>	<b>Medicaid 2012-13 biennial TOTAL loss at full \$18 billion cut (million \$)</b>	<b>Medicaid 2012-13 loss, 10% rate cut ONLY (-\$3.8 billion All Funds) (million \$)</b>	<b>Medicaid 2012-13 loss, No funding for caseload or Inflation ONLY (-\$4.2 billion All Funds) (million \$)</b>	<b>Medicaid 2012-13 loss, No Replacing Federal Stimulus funding ONLY (-\$10 billion All Funds) (million \$)</b>
Young	\$16.5	\$16.2	\$3.4	\$3.8	\$9.0
Zapata	17.9	17.6	3.7	4.1	9.8
Zavala	20.2	19.7	4.2	4.6	11.0
Unknown/ unallocated	109.3	106.9	22.6	24.9	59.4

Sources: Medicaid Expenditure Data by County for 2009 is from Texas Health and Human Services Commission, Strategic Decision Support. September 2009. Data do not include Disproportionate Share Hospital (DSH) Payments or Upper Payment Limit payments.

Aggregate proposed budget cut amounts for 2012-2013 are from Legislative Budget Board, "Summary of Legislative Budget Estimates, House Version," January 2011, pp. 80-81.

Calculations of funding loss by county were performed by CPPP.