

Introduction and National Summary Tables

Medicaid and the Children's Health Insurance Program (CHIP) are publicly funded health insurance programs that provide coverage to almost 60 million low-income children, parents, pregnant women, and elderly and disabled adults. These programs have a major impact on the U.S. health care system: Nearly one of every six dollars spent on personal health care comes from Medicaid alone.^{1,2,3}

In many ways, these programs play a bigger role in rural than in urban America. Nationally, Medicaid provides health insurance to a larger share of the population in rural areas.⁴ Further, these programs are critical sources of income for rural health care providers, and they contribute to economic development in rural communities.⁵

There are many resources on Medicaid and CHIP at the national and state level that provide important information to policymakers, advocates, researchers, and others. However, despite the impact of these programs in rural America, it is difficult to obtain state-specific information on characteristics of Medicaid and CHIP in rural areas. There is no easily-accessible national source of Medicaid or CHIP administrative data that differentiates between rural and urban areas, and surveys of health insurance coverage and expenditures often lack the sample size to analyze individual states or smaller geographic areas within them.

To address this information gap for state officials and others interested in how Medicaid and CHIP are operating in different geographic areas of a state, we collected data from a number of sources with an emphasis on program characteristics relevant to rural areas. State-specific information and data can be found in the State Profiles. This document provides a summary of the data found in these profiles, focusing on the comparison of Medicaid enrollment and expenditures in rural and urban counties.

A common source of information on health insurance coverage in the United States is the Census Bureau's Current Population Survey (CPS). The CPS is the most widely used source of state-level estimates of insurance status. During March of each year, the CPS asks respondents a series of questions about their health insurance over the previous calendar year, including whether they were covered by Medicaid at any point during that time.

An analysis of CPS data shows that in 23 states the share of total residents covered by Medicaid was higher in rural counties than in urban counties at a statistically significant level (Table 1). Nationwide, 16.1 percent of rural residents reported being enrolled in Medicaid, compared to 13.2 percent of urban residents. Among children ages 18 and younger, Medicaid coverage was statistically significantly higher in rural areas in 19 states. Among non-elderly adults ages 19 to 65, Medicaid coverage was statistically significantly higher in rural areas in 13 states. There are fewer (4) statistically significant differences among elderly adults; this may be due in part to the small number of rural elderly adults included in the survey.

Table 1: Percent of Residents with Any Medicaid Coverage During the Past Year in Rural and Urban Counties by State and Age
Current Population Survey, 2008-2009

| <i>State</i> | 0-18 | | 19-64 | | 65 and over | | Total | |
|----------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|--------------------|--------------|--------------|--------------|
| | <i>Rural</i> | <i>Urban</i> | <i>Rural</i> | <i>Urban</i> | <i>Rural</i> | <i>Urban</i> | <i>Rural</i> | <i>Urban</i> |
| United States | 34.7* | 27.6 | 10.1* | 7.9 | 8.6 | 9.1 | 16.1* | 13.2 |
| Alabama | 35.6 | 29.1 | 10.6 | 7 | 15.1 | 11.7 | 17.7* | 13.3 |
| Alaska | 25.3 | 19.9 | 7.1 | 7.3 | 13.8 | 9.1 | 12.4 | 11.2 |
| Arizona | 46.0* | 30.6 | 23.3* | 10 | 11.4 | 6.7 | 28.5* | 15.3 |
| Arkansas | 54.6* | 39.2 | 8.3* | 4.7 | 9.7 | 6.5 | 20.8* | 14.2 |
| California | 46.3 | 32.7 | 11.6 | 9.4 | 4.5* | 16.5 | 19.3 | 16.6 |
| Colorado | N/A | 16.6 | N/A | 5.2 | N/A | 10.8 | N/A | 8.7 |
| Connecticut | 27.7 | 23.5 | 13 | 7.7 | 3.6 | 5 | 15.6 | 11.3 |
| Delaware | 40.2* | 22.1 | 11.8 | 9 | 1.7* | 6.4 | 15.2 | 12.3 |
| District of Columbia | N/A | 41.7 | N/A | 15.7 | N/A | 10.2 | N/A | 20.3 |
| Florida | 37.6* | 22.6 | 16.3* | 5.4 | 11.1 | 7.3 | 19.8* | 9.8 |
| Georgia | 37.1 | 28.8 | 7 | 4.7 | 8.5 | 6.4 | 14.8 | 11.7 |
| Hawaii | 33.5* | 24 | 9.4 | 6.1 | 5.4 | 10.6 | 15.4* | 11 |
| Idaho | 22.9 | 22.9 | 4.8 | 5.4 | 4.4 | 9.6 | 9.9 | 11.1 |
| Illinois | 34.5 | 28.4 | 11.7* | 6.6 | 4.2 | 4.6 | 16.3* | 12.2 |
| Indiana | 28.3 | 32.2 | 5.3 | 6.7 | 3.2 | 4.9 | 11.2 | 13.4 |
| Iowa | 29.8 | 21.9 | 6.3 | 7.7 | 5.8 | 9.3 | 11.9 | 11.6 |
| Kansas | 27.3 | 26.3 | 5.2 | 6 | 3.5 | 3.5 | 10.4 | 11.7 |
| Kentucky | 33.9 | 34.2 | 12.9* | 6.8 | 11.4 | 10 | 18.0* | 14 |
| Louisiana | N/A | 32 | N/A | 6.3 | N/A | 10.2 | N/A | 13.8 |
| Maine | 40.7* | 28.8 | 18.6* | 12 | 19.3 | 16.1 | 23.4* | 16.5 |
| Maryland | 47.3* | 20.8 | 8 | 5.3 | 7.3 | 7.6 | 18.6* | 9.6 |
| Massachusetts | 10.5* | 27.8 | 2.3* | 16 | 0.0* | 9.6 | 4.4* | 18 |
| Michigan | 36.9* | 27.7 | 9.8 | 8.6 | 3.7 | 4.7 | 15.7 | 13.1 |
| Minnesota | 33.2* | 16.7 | 15.4* | 7 | 6.7 | 5.3 | 19.2* | 9.2 |
| Mississippi | 46.2* | 35.2 | 12.3 | 10.9 | 20 | 24.1 | 23.1* | 19 |
| Missouri | 50.2* | 22.8 | 13.2* | 6 | 8.5 | 8.4 | 21.6* | 10.7 |
| Montana | 31.3 | 24.6 | 7.4 | 7.2 | 6.2 | 3.8 | 13.3 | 10.5 |
| Nebraska | 28.4* | 19.8 | 8.2 | 5.1 | 6.8 | 5.7 | 13.4* | 9.1 |
| Nevada | N/A | 15.9 | N/A | 4.5 | N/A | 7.1 | N/A | 7.9 |
| New Hampshire | 25.1* | 14.4 | 3.8 | 3 | 2.1 | 5.1 | 8.5 | 6 |
| New Jersey | N/A | 17.3 | N/A | 6.1 | N/A | 7.1 | N/A | 9.1 |
| New Mexico | 45.1* | 30.2 | 10.7 | 8.1 | 7 | 10 | 19.9* | 14.2 |
| New York | 24.8* | 35.2 | 11.9 | 14.8 | 8.2* | 16.3 | 14.5* | 20 |
| North Carolina | 36.4* | 27.1 | 10.8* | 6.5 | 9.1 | 7.7 | 17.1* | 12.1 |
| North Dakota | 23.1 | 17.5 | 5.5 | 3.6 | 6.4 | 5.5 | 10.1* | 7.2 |
| Ohio | 23 | 28.4 | 8 | 7.7 | 3.4 | 3.8 | 10.9 | 12.7 |
| Oklahoma | 37.8 | 33.3 | 10.1* | 5.6 | 8.5 | 4.5 | 17.5* | 13 |
| Oregon | 31.3 | 24 | 8.1 | 6.8 | 8.2 | 5 | 13.4 | 10.8 |
| Pennsylvania | 28 | 25.8 | 9.4 | 9.3 | 8.5 | 5.1 | 13.6 | 12.7 |
| Rhode Island | N/A | 28.3 | N/A | 11.1 | N/A | 7.5 | N/A | 14.8 |
| South Carolina | 37.8* | 22 | 11.5* | 6.6 | 14 | 7.7 | 18.8* | 10.6 |
| South Dakota | 27.3 | 20.4 | 7.2* | 3.8 | 4.9 | 9.3 | 11.9* | 9.1 |
| Tennessee | 40.7 | 32.5 | 13.7 | 10 | 11.7 | 12 | 20.0* | 15.9 |
| Texas | 35.7 | 30.1 | 6.6 | 5.6 | 11.8 | 8.8 | 15.4 | 13.2 |

| | | | | | | | | |
|---------------|-------|------|------|------|------|-----|-------|------|
| Utah | N/A | 13.3 | N/A | 3.9 | N/A | 7.1 | N/A | 7.2 |
| Vermont | 39.1 | 34 | 15.5 | 12.4 | 13.9 | 8.4 | 20.4 | 16.7 |
| Virginia | 32.4* | 17.2 | 8.0* | 3.8 | 9.1 | 6.3 | 14.4* | 7.5 |
| Washington | 32.2 | 25.4 | 10.9 | 8.4 | 6.7 | 6.1 | 15.8 | 12.5 |
| West Virginia | 41.6 | 34.3 | 9.6 | 8.1 | 7 | 4.4 | 16.5 | 13.6 |
| Wisconsin | 28.5 | 25.2 | 10.2 | 9.4 | 4 | 6.2 | 14 | 13 |
| Wyoming | 24.4 | 18.9 | 5.9 | 5.8 | 6.2 | 3.7 | 10.7 | 9.1 |

*Significantly different than urban at the 5% level.

Source: Current Population Survey, 2008 and 2009 pooled.

Notes: Figures include individuals who report having any Medicaid coverage during the past year. Individuals with SCHIP are not included. Standard errors were calculated using the generalized variance estimation procedures outlined in the CPS Technical Documentation. Urban counties are those designated as a Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA). Individuals with suppressed MSA status (0.6% of respondents) are not included.

Despite its wide use, there are concerns about the accuracy of CPS estimates of Medicaid coverage—they are consistently lower than estimates from other surveys and enrollment numbers from the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services. Several factors may explain this discrepancy, including the long period of time that the CPS asks respondents to recall and the possibility that Medicaid recipients may identify their insurance by a state-specific program name or the name of a Medicaid managed care organization, rather than “Medicaid.”⁶ Further, certain population groups, including those in rural areas and those likely to be eligible for Medicaid, may be underrepresented in the CPS sample.⁷

Given these concerns, we also collected county-level administrative data from official state web sites to gain another perspective on Medicaid enrollment in rural and urban areas. Note that in the Medicaid program, the term “eligibles” refers to individuals who are actually enrolled, rather than the larger population that could potentially enroll. We were able to obtain county-level data on eligibles for 35 states and the District of Columbia (Table 2). In 31 of these states, Medicaid enrollment as a share of the population was higher in rural than in urban areas. Medicaid enrollment as a share of the population was higher in urban than in rural areas in 3 states. (The remaining areas, New Jersey and the District of Columbia, have no rural counties). For 13 states, the variation between rural and urban areas was at least five percentage points.

Table 2. Medicaid Eligibles in Rural and Urban Counties by State
Administrative Data from State Web Sites

| State | Rural | | Urban | | Time Period of Data |
|----------------------|---------------------|------------------------------|---------------------|------------------------------|---------------------|
| | Number of Eligibles | Eligibles as % of Population | Number of Eligibles | Eligibles as % of Population | |
| Alabama | 290,012 | 21.6% | 560,873 | 16.6% | Apr 2010 |
| Arizona | 202,927 | 30.3% | 1,156,124 | 19.5% | May 2010 |
| Arkansas | 354,008 | 30.8% | 420,497 | 24.6% | FY 2009 |
| California | 159,929 | 19.1% | 6,957,692 | 19.2% | May 2010 |
| Colorado | 76,640 | 11.1% | 435,610 | 10.0% | Mar 2010 |
| District of Columbia | NA | NA | 144,910 | 24.5% | FY 2008 |
| Florida | 203,965 | 17.3% | 2,713,023 | 15.6% | Feb 2010 |
| Georgia | 332,098 | 18.4% | 928,385 | 11.7% | FY 2008 |
| Hawaii | 92,075 | 23.7% | 157,800 | 17.3% | Jan 2010 |
| Idaho | 72,600 | 13.6% | 134,246 | 13.2% | Dec 2009 |
| Indiana | 193,362 | 13.9% | 674,035 | 13.6% | Dec 2007 |
| Iowa | 198,453 | 15.2% | 244,094 | 14.3% | Mar 2010 |
| Kentucky | 419,942 | 23.0% | 328,340 | 13.1% | FY 2009 |
| Louisiana | 344,598 | 30.3% | 800,015 | 23.8% | Apr 2010 |
| Maine | 111,411 | 20.4% | 120,355 | 15.5% | Feb 2010 |
| Maryland | 40,346 | 13.2% | 586,758 | 10.0% | SFY 2009 |
| Michigan | 357,544 | 19.4% | 1,512,731 | 18.5% | Mar 2010 |
| Minnesota | 174,560 | 13.2% | 431,092 | 10.9% | Dec 2009 |
| Missouri | 271,936 | 18.3% | 544,019 | 12.6% | FY 2008 |
| Montana | 56,728 | 8.5% | 29,605 | 9.0% | Mar 2010 |
| Nebraska | 90,833 | 12.1% | 110,403 | 10.7% | FY 2007 |
| New Jersey | NA | NA | 902,080 | 10.3% | Apr 2010 |
| New Mexico | 183,113 | 27.1% | 298,575 | 22.3% | Jan 2010 |
| New York | 281,364 | 18.2% | 4,238,825 | 23.5% | Sep 2009 |
| North Carolina | 522,637 | 18.9% | 925,653 | 13.9% | Jul 2010 |

| | | | | | |
|----------------|---------|-------|-----------|-------|----------|
| Ohio | 379,004 | 21.4% | 1,704,509 | 18.4% | SFY 2006 |
| Oklahoma | 336,190 | 25.5% | 467,074 | 20.0% | SFY 2009 |
| Oregon | 118,492 | 14.1% | 317,577 | 10.7% | Dec 2008 |
| South Carolina | 270,865 | 25.4% | 632,532 | 18.4% | FY 2008 |
| South Dakota | 67,342 | 15.5% | 44,064 | 11.7% | Apr 2010 |
| Tennessee | 371,528 | 22.3% | 813,184 | 17.6% | Feb 2010 |
| Texas | 428,234 | 14.3% | 2,582,567 | 11.9% | May 2010 |
| Vermont | 105,399 | 25.2% | 38,349 | 18.6% | Jan 2008 |
| Washington | 182,258 | 22.4% | 1,059,073 | 18.1% | FY 2009 |
| West Virginia | 147,942 | 18.3% | 140,168 | 13.8% | Feb 2010 |
| Wisconsin | 218,163 | 14.3% | 545,196 | 13.2% | Apr 2010 |

Source: Eligibles data collected from state web sites. Individual citations are included in each state's profile at www.shepscenter.unc.edu/medicaidprofiles. Population data are from the U.S. Census.

Notes: The term "eligibles" refers to individuals who are enrolled in Medicaid (and therefore eligible to use Medicaid services), rather than the larger population that is potentially qualified to enroll in Medicaid. States are not shown if data from 2006 or a more recent time period were not found in a search of the state's Medicaid web sites. Counties are defined as rural and urban based on the Core Based Statistical Area (CBSA) designations from the Office of Management and Budget. Rural counties are those defined as micropolitan and those not in a CBSA. FY is fiscal year; CY is calendar year.

We were able to obtain information on Medicaid expenditures by the recipient's county of residence for 19 states (Table 3). It is important to note that differences in the characteristics of Medicaid eligibles in rural and urban areas may account for some of the geographic differences in expenditures per eligible. For example, per eligible expenditures in rural areas may be higher than those in urban areas if a higher proportion of the rural Medicaid eligibles are elderly or people with disabilities. These groups use more intense acute and long-term care services and therefore have much higher per capita spending than other adults and children.⁸ For this reason, comparisons of expenditures across rural and urban areas should be interpreted with caution.

Table 3. Medicaid Expenditures in Rural and Urban Counties by State
Administrative Data from State Web Sites

| State | Rural | | Urban | | Year |
|----------------|--------------------|--------------|--------------------|--------------|------------|
| | Total Expenditures | Per Eligible | Total Expenditures | Per Eligible | |
| Alabama | \$1,377,700,000 | \$4,366 | \$2,885,900,000 | \$4,785 | Apr 2010 |
| Arkansas | \$1,455,418,259 | \$4,111 | \$1,721,019,687 | \$4,092 | FY 2009 |
| California | \$609,051,609 | \$4,060 | \$16,142,582,147 | \$2,452 | FY 2008 |
| Georgia | \$1,772,734,649 | \$5,338 | \$4,636,367,881 | \$4,994 | FY 2008 |
| Indiana | \$86,258,935 | \$446 | \$261,972,383 | \$388 | Dec 2007 |
| Iowa | \$120,681,362 | \$608 | \$138,699,413 | \$568 | Mar 2010 |
| Louisiana | \$1,220,384,705 | \$3,197 | \$2,715,029,064 | \$3,172 | FY 2007/08 |
| Minnesota | \$1,947,646,930 | \$11,157 | \$5,061,599,070 | \$11,741 | Dec 2009 |
| Missouri | \$1,887,000,000 | \$6,939 | \$3,285,600,000 | \$6,039 | FY 2008 |
| Montana* | \$39,527,765 | \$696 | \$20,089,644 | \$678 | Mar 2010 |
| Nebraska | \$626,888,000 | \$6,902 | \$653,117,000 | \$5,916 | FY 2007 |
| New York | \$161,188,733 | \$572 | \$3,038,353,135 | \$716 | May 2008 |
| North Carolina | \$3,061,495,133 | | \$4,845,776,702 | | CY 2006 |
| Ohio | \$2,394,429,946 | \$5,478 | \$9,337,836,552 | \$4,998 | FY 2006 |
| Oklahoma | \$1,543,192,335 | \$4,590 | \$1,970,376,226 | \$4,218 | FY 2009 |
| South Carolina | \$1,056,972,871 | \$3,902 | \$2,677,798,466 | \$4,233 | FY 2008 |
| Tennessee | \$2,043,100,040 | \$1,224 | \$4,072,099,639 | \$879 | Feb 2010 |
| Virginia | \$778,103,434 | | \$1,505,365,337 | | FY 2006 |
| Washington | \$480,283,150 | \$2,517 | \$2,684,677,950 | \$2,535 | FY 2007 |

Source: Expenditures and eligibles data collected from state web sites. Individual citations are included in each state's profile at www.shepscenter.unc.edu/medicaidprofiles.

Notes: The term "eligible" refers to individuals who are enrolled in Medicaid (and therefore eligible to use Medicaid services), rather than the larger population that is potentially qualified to enroll in Medicaid. Expenditures are allocated to rural and urban areas based on the eligibles' counties of residence, which are not necessarily the counties in which the expenditures are made. States are not shown if data from 2006 or a more recent time period were not found in a search of the state's Medicaid web sites. Counties are defined as urban and rural based on the Core Based Statistical Area (CBSA) designations from the Office of Management and Budget. Rural counties are those defined as micropolitan and those not in a CBSA. FY is fiscal year; CY is calendar year.

Caveat: The expenditure comparisons across rural and urban need to be interpreted with caution. Differences in the composition of the Medicaid eligibles may account for some of the geographic differences in expenditures per eligible. For example, per eligible expenditures in rural areas may be higher than those in urban areas if a higher proportion of rural Medicaid eligibles are elderly and people with disabilities than in urban areas.

*Montana data are spending per recipient (eligibles who used at least one service), not all eligibles.

County-level data on Medicaid managed care enrollment were available on 11 state web sites (Table 4). States operate several different managed care arrangements for their Medicaid enrollees, including use of commercial or Medicaid managed care organizations, health insuring organizations, primary care case management programs, prepaid inpatient health plans, prepaid ambulatory health plans, or Programs of All-Inclusive Care for the Elderly.⁹ Individual states may operate multiple types of managed care programs. The figures in Table 4 may include individuals in any of these arrangements.

Table 4. Medicaid Managed Care Enrollment in Rural and Urban Counties by State
Administrative Data from State Web Sites

| State | Rural | | Urban | | Time Period of Data |
|----------------|------------------|----------------|------------------|----------------|---------------------|
| | Total Enrollment | % of Eligibles | Total Enrollment | % of Eligibles | |
| Arizona | 119,250 | 62.0% | 859,817 | 81.0% | May 2009 |
| Florida | 342,255 | NA | 473,201 | NA | May 2009 |
| Hawaii | 64,611 | NA | 113,614 | NA | Nov 2008 |
| Indiana | 113,801 | 64.0% | 422,030 | 68.0% | Dec 2007 |
| Michigan | 141,465 | NA | 818,804 | NA | May 2009 |
| New York | 75,775 | 45.0% | 2,423,283 | 86.0% | June 2009 |
| North Carolina | 392,636 | 82.0% | 711,341 | 82.0% | May 2010 |
| Ohio | 277,239 | 95.1% | 1,096,758 | 97.4% | July 2009 |
| Oregon | 100,298 | 77.9% | 297,243 | 83.9% | Apr 2010 |
| Pennsylvania | 53,455 | NA | 1,023,980 | NA | Dec 2007 |
| Wisconsin | 71,859 | 39.2% | 446,236 | 66.8% | Oct 2008 |

Source: Managed care enrollment and eligibles data collected from state web sites. Individual citations are included in each state's profile at www.shepscenter.unc.edu/medicaidprofiles.

Notes: The term "eligibles" refers to individuals who are enrolled in Medicaid (and therefore eligible to use Medicaid services), rather than the larger population that is potentially qualified to enroll in Medicaid. See individual state profiles for notes on each state's managed care plans. In general, enrollment figures include all forms of managed care: commercial and Medicaid managed care organizations, health insuring organizations, primary care case management plans, prepaid inpatient health plans, and prepaid ambulatory health plans. States are not shown if data from 2006 or a more recent time period were not found in a search of the state's Medicaid web sites. Counties are defined as urban and rural based on the Core Based Statistical Area (CBSA) designations from the Office of Management and Budget. Rural counties are those defined as micropolitan and those not in a CBSA. FY is fiscal year; CY is calendar year.

Comparisons between states in Tables 2-4 should be made with caution: data are from varying time periods and there may be slight differences in the way some data elements (e.g., expenditures) were calculated by each state. The purpose of these summary tables is to show the variation between rural and urban areas *within* each state.

This study was conducted by the North Carolina Rural Health Research & Policy Analysis Center, with funding from a cooperative agreement with the federal Office of Rural Health Policy, Health Resources and Services Administration, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Grant Number U1GRH07633.

¹ “The Medicaid Program at a Glance.” Kaiser Commission on Medicaid and the Uninsured, November 2008.

² “State Children’s Health Insurance Program (SCHIP) at a Glance.” Kaiser Commission on Medicaid and the Uninsured, January 2007.

³ Medicaid covers both children and adults who meet specific eligibility requirements, whereas the SCHIP program is primarily limited to uninsured children with family incomes that are too high to qualify for Medicaid but not sufficient to cover private insurance. Both programs are funded jointly by the federal and state governments. The federal government establishes the broad program guidelines, and states have flexibility to set specific eligibility criteria within these guidelines.

⁴ Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality. Medical Expenditure Panel Survey Household Component 2004 public use data. Accessed via MEPSnet Query Tool, July 2007.

http://www.meps.ahrq.gov/mepsweb/data_stats/meps_query.jsp

⁵ Silberman P, Rudolf M, D’Alpe C, Randolph R, Slifkin R. “The Impact of the Medicaid Budgetary Crisis on Rural Communities.” Working Paper No 77. North Carolina Rural Health Research & Policy Analysis Center, Cecil G. Sheps Center for Health Services Research, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 2003.

⁶ Holahan J, Hoffman C. “What is the Current Population Survey Telling Us about the Number of Uninsured?” Kaiser Commission on Medicaid and the Uninsured. August 2005.

⁷ Blewett LA, Davern M. “Meeting the Need for State-Level Estimates of Health Insurance Coverage: Use of State and Federal Survey Data.” *Health Services Research* 41(3 pt 1): 946-975. 2006.

⁸ “The Medicaid Program at a Glance.” Kaiser Commission on Medicaid and the Uninsured, March 2007.

⁹ The Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services (CMS) describes these managed care arrangements as follows: A commercial managed care organization (MCO) is “a health maintenance organization, an eligible organization with a contract under Section 1876 or a Medicare+Choice organization, a provider sponsored organization or any other private or public organization, which meets the requirements of Section 1902(w).” A Commercial MCO provides comprehensive services to Medicaid and commercial and/or Medicare populations; a Medicaid MCO provides comprehensive services to only Medicaid beneficiaries, not to commercial or Medicare populations; a Health Insuring Organization is “a managed care entity which, by law, is exempt from certain rules governing MCO program operation such as the requirement for beneficiaries to have a choice of at least two managed care entities in mandatory programs”; a Primary Care Case Management provider is “a provider (usually a physician, physician group practice, or an entity employing or having other arrangements with such physicians, but sometimes with such physicians, but sometimes also including nurse practitioners, nurse midwives, or physician assistants who contracts directly with the State to locate, coordinate, and monitor covered primary care (and sometimes additional services). This category also includes those PIHPs that contract with the State as “primary care case managers”; a Prepaid Inpatient Health Plan is a plan that “provides less than comprehensive services on an at-risk or other than state plan reimbursement basis, and provides, arranges for, or otherwise have responsibility for provision of any inpatient hospital institutional services.” States can offer PIHPs for medical services, mental health, substance abuse disorders, or long-term care services; a Prepaid Ambulatory Health Plans is a plan that “provides less than comprehensive services on an at-risk or other than state plan reimbursement basis; and does not provide, arrange for, or otherwise have responsibility for provision of any inpatient hospital or institutional services.” States may offer PAHPs for medical services, mental health, substance abuse disorders, dental, transportation or disease management; the Program for All-inclusive Care for the Elderly (PACE) is a “program that provides prepaid, capitated comprehensive, health care services to the frail elderly.”