THE CASE FOR Inclusion 2007

An Analysis of Medicaid for Americans with Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities



Table of Contents

About UCP	2
About the Author	2
Introduction	3
What We Don't Know But Should	4
Using This Report	
What the Rankings Revealed – More Work Needs to Be Done	
States' Ranking of Medicaid for Americans with Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities	
Map of Best and Worst Performing States	
Facts about the Top Ten States	7
Subrankings of States in Four Key Outcomes And Data Elements	8
How the Rankings Were Developed	9
Enhancements Made for This Year's Ranking	9
Ranking Methodology	10
Appendix I – Key Data on States' Medicaid Programs for Those with Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities	

About UCP

United Cerebral Palsy is one of the nation's leading organizations serving and advocating for the more than 54 million Americans with disabilities. Most UCP consumers are people with disabilities other than cerebral palsy. Through its nationwide network, United Cerebral Palsy assists over 170,000 individuals, as well as their families and communities, with services such as job training and placement, physical therapy, individual and family support, early intervention, social and recreation programs, community living, state and local referrals, and instruction on how to use technology to perform everyday tasks. For more information, visit www.ucp.org or call (800) 872-5827.

About the Author

Tarren Bragdon has been involved in healthcare policy research and analysis for over a decade. His work has been featured in dozens of newspapers and media outlets nationwide including the Wall Street Journal, New York Post, New York Sun and PBS. Past and present clients include United Cerebral Palsy; the MELMAC Education Foundation; the Maine Heritage Policy Center; the Heritage Foundation in Washington, DC; the Manhattan Institute's Empire Center for New York State Policy; the Home Care Alliance of Maine; and the National College Access Network. He has testified before the US Senate's Committee on Small Business and Entrepreneurship and presented to numerous legislative committees and physician, hospital, Medicaid, business, social service and policy research organizations. He served two terms in the Maine House of Representatives on the Health and Human Services Committee. He serves on the board of directors of Spurwink Corporation, one of the largest social service providers in Maine with over 850 employees.

The *Case for Inclusion* is made possible, in part, through a generous grant from the Centene Foundation for Quality Healthcare www.Centene.com/corporate/citizenship.





Introduction

In state budgets, fiscal stress from Medicaid has subsided somewhat as of late, but a rapidly aging population, significant waiting lists, and related long term care spending will soon renew Medicaid budget pressures.

Too often, states focus just on how much is spent for various Medicaid services or populations, rather than on what outcomes that spending is achieving.

"The promise of access to and support for integrated community lives and roles for persons with [intellectual and developmental disabilities] is clearly expressed in national legislative, judicial, administrative and other sources that make four basic commitments:

- People with disabilities will live in and participate in their communities;
- People with disabilities will have satisfying lives and valued social roles;
- People with disabilities will have sufficient access to needed support, and control over that support so that the assistance they receive contributes to lifestyles they desire; and
- People will be safe and healthy in the environments in which they live.

These commitments have been articulated in a number of legislative, administrative and judicial statements describing national policy."¹

Medicaid is the safety net program that can assist in supporting individuals with intellectual and developmental disabilities with their acute and long term care service needs. Other state programs can assist in providing other comprehensive supports to individuals. However, some Medicaid long term care policies and state programs can play a negative role by promoting isolation and seclusion.

In early 2006, United Cerebral Palsy (UCP) conducted its first analysis of how Medicaid is serving people with intellectual and developmental disabilities. The 2006 report, entitled the *Case for Inclusion* - 2006, clearly showed that for those throughout the 50 states and the District of Columbia, the reality does not always match the goal of independence, productivity and community inclusion. This second annual *Case for Inclusion* ranking has expanded the number of data elements considered, and streamlined the ranking process.

United Cerebral Palsy conducts this holistic analysis each year to chart each state's ranking and progress in creating a

quality, meaningful and community-inclusive life for those Americans with intellectual and developmental disabilities served by that state's Medicaid program.

Nationwide, Medicaid serves almost 545,000 individuals with intellectual and developmental disabilities, spending \$28.8 billion in 2005 or almost \$53,000 per person per year. Although this is a tiny portion of the 52.7 million individuals enrolled in Medicaid and the total \$305 billion spent in 2005, Americans with intellectual and developmental disabilities are some of the most vulnerable Medicaid recipients. Individuals with intellectual and developmental disabilities make up just one percent of all Medicaid recipients, but a disproportionate 9.4 percent of Medicaid spending. Despite these figures, too often this population is glossed over in the larger Medicaid discussion.

The state rankings in this report are a snapshot in time. Most data is from 2005, although all data is the most recent available from credible national sources. Unfortunately, the data sourced is only as good as that provided directly by the states to the federal government or in response to surveys. Therefore, one can only analyze a state as precisely as that state has supplied accurate and complete information on services provided to those with intellectual and developmental disabilities. Hopefully, in response to this report and future surveys, states will be even more detailed and forthcoming in their reporting regarding key outcomes and data elements for individuals served (or on a waiting list), thus allowing more complete analysis and more detailed comparisons.

There were a few major changes for the 2007 rankings. This year's rankings are more comprehensive and broader in scope than the initial state rankings completed in 2006, as noted in detail later in this report. These changes were made to make the rankings even more holistic, but, unfortunately, do not neatly allow a comparison of performance by states between last year's *Case for Inclusion* and the 2007 rankings.

Although some states rank better than others, every state has room for improvement. The *Case for Inclusion* uses data and outcomes to clearly show where states' Medicaid programs are performing well and where improvement is needed.

¹ The University of Minnesota Research and Training Center on Community Living. "Medicaid Home and Community Based Services for Persons with Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities - Interim Report." September 26, 2005. Page 3. Available at: http://www.cms.hhs.gov/reports/downloads/UnivOMinn.pdf

What We Don't Know but Should

Unfortunately, some of the most important outcome data is not nationally collected or reported regularly. For example, to more completely assess key outcomes, states should report regularly and be scored on:

- Are services self-directed and how many individuals are participating in self-directed services?
- Are individual budgets used?
- What is the pay and turnover rate of direct support staff?
- What school-to-work transition programming exists for this population?
- What are the detailed results of standard client satisfaction surveys?
- What is each state's long term plan is to close large institutions, if any?

But advocates should always be looking at quality of life for the individual, irrespective of rankings and overall scoring. Aggregate data is important, but the true key to a state's performance is what quality of life each individual is living. The ideal is for outcomes to be reviewed at the individual level.

Hopefully, this *Case for Inclusion* report, coupled with other advocacy initiatives, will encourage national groups to begin collecting and reporting on the above data measures so that a more complete picture can be presented and scored in future rankings.

Using This Report

This report is intended to help advocates and policymakers understand:

- How their state performs overall in serving individuals with intellectual and developmental disabilities
- What services and outcomes need attention and improvement in their state
- Which states are top performers in key areas, so that advocates and officials in those top performing states can be a resource for those desiring to improve

This report puts into a national context how each individual state is doing. Advocates should use this information to educate other advocates, providers, families and individuals, policymakers and their state administration on key achievements and areas needing improvement within their own state. These facts and figures can support policy reforms and frame debates about resource allocation for this population. Advocates can also use these facts to prioritize those areas that need the most immediate attention. Lastly, advocates can use these facts to support adequate and



necessary ongoing funding and increasing resources in order to maintain their high quality outcomes, eliminate waiting lists, and close large institutions.

Elected officials should use this report as a guiding document on what needs time and attention and, possibly, additional resources or more inclusive state policies in order to improve outcomes for individuals with intellectual and developmental disabilities.

Those within federal and state administrations should use this report to put their work and accomplishments in context and to chart the course for the next focus area in the quest for continuous improvement and improved quality of life. The state should replicate this data reporting in more detail at the state and county level to identify areas of excellence and target critical issues needing attention.



What the Rankings Revealed – More Work Needs to Be Done

1) All states have room to improve outcomes and services for individuals with intellectual and developmental disabilities.

2) Too many Americans with intellectual and developmental disabilities still do not live in the community:

- Only two states Vermont and Alaska have more than 95 percent of individuals served living in home-like settings (at home, in their family's home or in settings with three or fewer residents).
- Only 16 states have more than 80 percent of those served living in home-like settings (positively, these include some very large states making the US average 78.6 percent).
- Positively, 40 states have more than 80 percent of those served living in small residential settings (six or fewer residents per setting).
- Sadly, 176 large public facilities (16 or more residents) still remain open in 41 states warehousing over 39,000 people – Texas alone has 13 large state facilities housing almost 5,000 individuals with intellectual and developmental disabilities.
- Nine states Alaska, Hawaii, Maine, New Hampshire, New Mexico, Rhode Island, Vermont and West Virginia, and the District of Columbia - have no large state institutions. Thirteen states have only one large state facility remaining.

3) Too much money is still spent isolating people in large institutions:

- Nationally, the 19 percent of those living in institutions consume over a third of all funding spent on those with intellectual and developmental disabilities.
- Seven states Alaska, Vermont, New Hampshire, Oregon, Rhode Island, Arizona and Michigan – direct more than 95 percent of all related funds to those <u>not</u> living in large. institutions.
- Nationally, only 16 states direct more than 80 percent of funding to those living in the community.

4) More work is needed in keeping families with members with intellectual and developmental disabilities together through sufficient family support programs, which provide cash and other assistance:

- Only 10 states Arizona, California, Connecticut, Massachusetts, Montana, New Hampshire, New York, South Carolina, South Dakota and Vermont – report providing family support to at least 200 families per 100,000 of state population.
- Twenty-nine states do not provide direct cash subsidies to families. Flexible direct cash subsidies are an important component of assisting families, whom incur numerous costly expenses associated with raising a child with intellectual and developmental disabilities.

5) More states are supporting those with intellectual and developmental disabilities as they go to work and earn wages:

• Thirty-three states have a Medicaid buy-in program that allows individuals to go to work, earn wages and still purchase comprehensive Medicaid coverage. By 2005, over 79,000 individuals received Medicaid this way.

6) Much more needs to be done in supporting meaningful work for those with intellectual and developmental disabilities:

- Only three states Connecticut, Oklahoma and Washington report more than half of those served participating in meaningful work through supportive or competitive employment.
- Only 18 states report over a third of those served participating in supportive or competitive employment.

7) Most states are not serving all those in need:

- Only eight states California, Hawaii, Idaho, Michigan, North Dakota, Rhode Island, Vermont and Wyoming, and the District of Columbia report maintaining a waiting list <u>and</u> having no one waiting for residential services.
- Only 20 states report maintaining a waiting list <u>and</u> having no one waiting for Home and Community-Based Services (HCBS).
- Sixteen states report having a residential services waiting list so large that their programs would have to grow by at least 25 percent to accommodate the need.
- Thirteen states report having a HCBS waiting list so large that their programs would have to grow by at least 25 percent to accommodate the need.




States' Ranking of Medicaid for Americans with Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities

Best performing state ranks #1

alphabetical	
	Rank
Alabama	32
Alaska	2
Arizona	1
Arkansas	46
California	5
Colorado	8
Connecticut	6
Delaware	14
Dist. of Columbia	49
Florida	18
Georgia	30
Hawaii	12
Idaho	25
Illinois	47
Indiana	37
lowa	39
Kansas	22
Kentucky	40
Louisiana	44
Maine	24
Maryland	33
Massachusetts	4
Michigan	9
Minnesota	7
Mississippi	51
Missouri	41
Montana	19
Nebraska	43
Nevada	27
New Hampshire	11
New Jersey	23
New Mexico	13
New York	10
North Carolina	34
North Dakota	38
Ohio	48
Oklahoma	35
Oregon	21
Pennsylvania	29
Rhode Island	28
South Carolina	15
South Dakota	26
Tennessee	42
Texas	50
Utah	36
Vermont	3
Virginia	45
Washington	20
West Virginia	16
Wisconsin	31
Wyoming	17


by rank	
	Rank
Arizona	1
Alaska	2
Vermont	3
Massachusetts	4
California	5
Connecticut	6
Minnesota	7
Colorado	88
Michigan	9
New York	10
New Hampshire	11
Hawaii	12
New Mexico	13
Delaware	14
South Carolina	15
West Virginia	16
Wyoming	17
Florida	18
Montana	19
Washington	20
Oregon	21
Kansas	22
New Jersey	23
Maine	24
Idaho	25
South Dakota	26
Nevada	27
Rhode Island	28
Pennsylvania	29
Georgia	30
Wisconsin	31
Alabama	32
Maryland	33
North Carolina	34
Oklahoma	35
Utah	36
Indiana	37
North Dakota	38
Iowa	39
	40
Kentucky Missouri	41
Tennessee	42
Nebraska Louisiana	43
Louisiana	44
Virginia	45
Arkansas	46
Illinois	47
Ohio District Columbia	48
Dist. of Columbia	49
Texas	50
Mississippi	51

Scoring of States





Map of Best and Worst Performing States



Facts about the Top Ten States

Further examining the top 10 states shows that a state does not need to look a certain way in order to best serve individuals with intellectual and developmental disabilities through Medicaid. What matters is how a state acts and what is achieved.

In fact, the top 10 states are quite diversified. Consider these facts about the top ten states:

Large and Small Population

• Includes the most populous - California (most populous), New York (#3) and Michigan (#8) – as well as the least populous states – Alaska (#47) and Vermont (#49)

Rich and Poor

 Includes some of the wealthiest states in median household income – Alaska (fourth wealthiest), Connecticut (#5), Minnesota (#6) and Massachusetts (#8) – and one of the poorer states – Arizona (#31)

High and Low Tax

• Includes high tax burden states – New York (#3), Vermont (#7), Minnesota (#11) and Connecticut (#13) – and low tax burden states – Massachusetts (#33), Colorado (#38) and Alaska (#51)

High and Low Spenders (spending per individual with intellectual and developmental disabilities served)

- Includes states with some of the highest spending per person served by the HCBS waiver Connecticut (#5), Alaska (#7) and New York (#9) as well as some that spend considerably less Colorado (#34), Arizona (#45) and California (#49)
- Includes states that maximize federal Medicaid match for almost every dollar spent on those with intellectual and developmental disabilities –Vermont and New York – as well as states with significant non-Medicaid spending for these individuals – Connecticut (38% of all related spending), California (33%) and Massachusetts (26%)



Subrankings of States in Four Key Outcomes And Data Elements

Allocating Resource	es to
Those in the Comm	unity
(Non-ICF-MR)	

	e in the Communi -ICF-MR)	ty
% of I	•	
	ditures n-ICF-MR	Rank
100%	Alaska	1
99%	Vermont	2
98%	New Hampshire	3
98%	Oregon	3
97%	Rhode Island	5
96%	Arizona	6
95%	Michigan	7
92%	New Mexico	8
91%	Hawaii	9
89%	Alabama	10
88%	Maryland	11
85%	Montana	12
84%	Minnesota	13
83%	Colorado	14
81%	Wyomina	15
81%	Massachusetts	15
79%	Connecticut	17
79%	South Dakota	17
78%	Maine	19
78%	Kansas	19
78%	Delaware	19
77%	West Virginia	22
77%	Washington	22
76%	California	24
73%	Georgia	25
72%	Wisconsin	26
72%	Nebraska	26
70%	Florida	28
70%	Pennsylvania	28
68%	Nevada	30
67%	Oklahoma	31
66%	Utah	32
66%	Virginia	32
63%	Kentucky	34
61%	Tennessee	35
59%	Indiana	36
59%	Missouri	36
58%	New Jersey	38
56 %	lowa	39
55%	South Carolina	40
54%	New York	41
51%	Idaho	42
50%	Ohio	43
50%	North Carolina	43
49%	Illinois	45
47%	North Dakota	46
44%	Texas	47
41%	Louisiana	48
37%	Arkansas	49
31%	Dist. of Columbia	50
25%	Mississippi	51
65%	US Average	

Supporting Individuals in the Community and Home-like **Settings**

Settin	ing in ngs with esidents	Rank
	ะงเนษาแง	Halik
97%	Vermont	1
95%	Alaska	2
95%	Arizona	2
95%	Nevada	2
94%	New Hampshire	5
92%	ldaho .	6
88%	New Mexico	7
87%	California	8
85%	Hawaii	9
84%	Washington	10
84%	Colorado	10
83%	Kentucky	12
82%	West Virginia	13
82%	South Carolina	13
81%	Delaware	15
80%	Georgia	16
80%	Montana	16
80%	New Jersey	16
79%	Florida	19
77%	Alabama	20
76%	Massachusetts	21
75%	Oklahoma	22
75%	Tennessee	22
75%	Indiana	22
75%	Missouri	22
74%	New York	26
74%	Maryland	26
73%	lowa	28
73%	Utah	28
73%	Kansas	28
72%	Oregon	31
71%	North Carolina	32
71%	Connecticut	32
69%	Minnesota	34
67%	Wisconsin	35
66%	Maine	
64%	Ohio	36
64%	Rhode Island	37 37
64%	North Dakota	
64%	South Dakota	37 37
63%		37 41
	Wyoming	
62%	Nebraska	42
62%	Michigan	42
61%	Virginia	44
61%	Louisiana	44
58%	Pennsylvania	46
52%	Arkansas	47
48%	Dist. of Columbia	48
48%	Illinois	48
42%	Texas	50
40%	Mississippi	51
79%	US Average	

Keeping Families Together through Family Support

Famili	ies Supported	
per 10	Family Support 00k of Population	Rank
326	Arizona	1
301	Montana	2
281	New Hampshire	3
267	New York	4
251	Connecticut	5
230	South Dakota	6
227	California	7
223	Massachusetts	8
204	South Carolina	9
		10
203	Vermont	
198	North Carolina Delaware	11
183		12
183	Pennsylvania	12
179	Wisconsin	14
171	Hawaii	15
170	Louisiana	16
156	Wyoming	17
154	Alaska	18
147	Maryland	19
132	Washington	20
128	New Mexico	21
124	Kansas	22
112	Ohio	23
108	Mississippi	24
107	West Virginia	25
106	Michigan	26
106	New Jersey	26
103	Oklahoma	28
99	Florida	29
98	Georgia	30
98	Rhode Island	30
89	Minnesota	32
85	Illinois	33
80	Nevada	34
80	North Dakota	34
78	Colorado	36
74	Missouri	37
66	Utah	38
65	lowa	39
63	Tennessee	40
62	Alabama	41
61	Idaho	42
42	Maine	43
35	Kentucky	44
32	Arkansas	45
32	Texas	45
31	Oregon	47
30	Virginia	48
26	Indiana	49
24	Nebraska	50
0	Dist. of Columbia	51

135

US Average

Supporting Meaningful Work

or Cor	Supportive mpetitive syment	Rank
71%	Oklahoma	1
55 %	Washington	2
51 %	Connecticut	3
49%	New Hampshire	4
48%	Indiana	5
		6
46%	Louisiana	
43%	Massachusetts	7
43%	Vermont	7
41%	Alaska	9
40%	Pennsylvania	10
39%	Maryland	11
38%	Georgia	12
36%	Colorado	13
36%	New Mexico	
		13
35%	Oregon	15
34%	South Dakota	16
34%	Utah	16
33%	Nevada	18
30%	Delaware	19
29%	lowa	20
29%	Nebraska	20
27%	Minnesota	22
25%		
	Wyoming	23
23%	Kentucky	24
23%	Michigan	24
23%	O hio	24
22%	Mississippi	27
22%	North Carolina	27
22%	Texas	27
22%	Virginia	27
21%	Florida	31
21%	Maine	31
	North Dakota	
20%		33
18%	California	34
18%	Rhode Island	34
17%	South Carolina	36
16%	Tennessee	37
16%	Wisconsin	37
15%	Montana	39
15%	New York	39
14%	Idaho	41
		41
14%	New Jersey	
13%	Illinois	43
11%	Kansas	44
10%	Arizona	45
10%	Hawaii	45
10%	West Virginia	45
9%	Missouri	48
6%	Dist. of Columbia	49
4%	Alabama	50
4%	Arkansas	50
7/0	Alkulisus	30
24%	US Average	



How the Rankings Were Developed

These rankings were developed through a broad, data-driven effort. Demographic, cost, utilization, key data elements, and outcomes statistics were assembled for all 50 states and the District of Columbia. Ninety-nine individual data elements from numerous governmental non-profit and advocacy organizations were reviewed. Dozens of Medicaid, disability and intellectual and developmental disability policy experts, were consulted as well as members of national advocacy and research organizations. They were asked to consider the attributes of top performing Medicaid programs and offer opinions and recommendations on the project in general.

To comprehensively determine the top-performing states, a weighted scoring methodology was developed. Twenty key outcome measures and data elements were selected and individually scored in five major categories on a total 100-point scale. If a person is living in the community, it is a key indicator of inclusion; therefore the "Promoting Independence" category received a majority of the points, as noted in the table on page 10.

In general, the top-performing state for each measure was assigned the highest possible score in that category. The worst-performing state was assigned a zero score in that category. All other states were apportioned accordingly based on their outcome between the top and worst-performing.

As noted, most data is from 2005, but all data is the most recent available from credible national sources. Therefore, these state rankings are a snapshot in time. Changes and reforms enacted or beginning in 2006 or later have not been considered. When reviewing an individual state's ranking, it is important to consider action taken since 2005, if any, to accurately understand both where that state was and where it is presently. Also, it is important to note that not all individuals with disabilities were considered. To limit the scope of the effort and to focus subsequent initiatives on meaningful, achievable improvement, only individuals with intellectual and developmental disabilities served were considered.

A note of caution: Although over 60 points separate the top performing state from the poorest performing state, less than 12 points separate the top ten states, about 19 points separate the top 25 states but only 10 points separate the 25 states in the middle. Therefore, minor changes in state policy or outcomes could significantly affect how a state ranks on future or past *Case for Inclusion* reports.

Enhancements Made for This Year's Ranking

There were a few major changes for the 2007 rankings. This year states were not ranked by how much they spent per recipient served. Instead, the rankings were based on outcomes with analysis provided on how much top performing states spent compared to others. This year much more weight was placed on a larger share of resources dedicated to those living in the community and on the portion of people with intellectual and developmental disabilities living in the community - defined as living in their own home, a family home or residence with six or fewer residents.

This year additional data measures were considered including self-directed services through 1915 waivers; the number of individuals that required protection or where instances of abuse were reported; additional sources of waiting list statistics; and the ratio of clients served to estimated prevalence of intellectual and developmental disabilities and the income threshold for eligibility for the 1915 waiver.

These changes were made to make the rankings even more comprehensive, but, unfortunately, do not allow a neat comparison of states' performance between last year's *Case for Inclusion* and the 2007 ranking.





Ranking Methodology

Major Category	Data Element	Weight	Total Weight of all Measures in the Category				
Promoting Independence	Community-based	Percent of recipients with ID/DD on HCBS	9	24			
		Percent of ID/DD expenditures on HCBS	7				
		Percent of ID/DD expenditures on non-ICF-MR	8				
	Residential services	Percent living in 1-3 residents settings	13	24			
	in the sommunity (includes all types)	Percent living in 1-6 residents settings	11				
		Percent living in 16+ residents settings (negative)	-4				
		Percent living in large state facilities (negative)	-3				
	Waivers promoting s	2	2				
Tracking Quality and Safety	Noted quality assura	Noted quality assurance program					
	Percent of clients wi	6					
Keeping Families Together	Family support per 10	6	12				
	Percent served living	6					
Promoting Productivity	Medicaid buy-in prog	Medicaid buy-in program operating					
	Percent in supported	Percent in supported or competitive employment					
	Vocational rehab	per 100k of population	1				
		Percent VR wages to state average					
		Mean weekly hours worked	.25				
Reaching Those in Need	Average percent gro	Average percent growth of program for residential and HCBS waiting list					
	Individuals with ID/D	Individuals with ID/DD served per 100,000 of population					
	Ratio of prevalence t	o individuals served	4				
TOTAL	20 measures		100				



Appendix I

Key Data on States' Medicaid Programs for Those with Intellectual and Developmental Disabilities

						P	Promoti	ng Inde	ependence	e					
State	Cor	nmunity-	based	Residential											
	State	nts ID/DD Expendit ID/DD ures on ures of		D/DD Expendit ures on HCBS non-ICF-	Moof ID/DD Expenditures on non-ICF.	Own Home	Family Home	Famil	ly Foster (Care		Cong	rregate Care (includes ICF	-MR)
				1	1	1-3	4-6	Total	1-3	4-6	1-6	7-15	16+	Total	
Alabama	95%	89%	89%	222	3,441	247	0	247	1,202	399	1,601	897	214	2,712	
Alaska	100%	100%	100%	224	3,700	162	10	172	239	201	440	0	0	440	
Arizona	99%	95%	96%	434	20,914	749	0	749	1,342	1,058	2,400	40	181	2,621	
Arkansas	68%	35%	37%	534	1,567	436	0	436	184	61	245	835	1,580	2,660	
California	86%	65%	76%	17,671	149,386	3,901	0	3,901	4319	19,675	23,994	1,487	5,820	31,301	
Colorado	98% 85%	80%	83% 79%	865 850	5,628 7,546	0 542	0	0 542	33 742	646 2.685	679 3.427	499 472	105	1,283	
Connecticut Delaware	85%	66% 68%	79% 78%	859 25	7,546	206	0	206	742 207	2,685 340	3,427 547	0	839 172	4,738 719	
Dist. of Columbia	44%	10%	31%	25	1,691 540	82	0	82	168	765	933	118	0	1,051	
Florida	89%	69%	70%	4,012	31,173	0	0	0	236	4,515	4,751	1,286	3,347	9,384	
Georgia	88%	69%	73%	2,228	4,123	348	15	363	1,004	598	1,602	0	1,300	2,902	
Hawaii	96%	89%	91%	150	2,108	435	305	740	3	164	167	8	0	175	
Idaho	75%	48%	51%	1,228	8,992	1,215	0	1,215	38	205	243	507	280	1,030	
Illinois	52%	34%	49%	3,775	11,324	230	15	245	76	3,640	3,716	6,463	6,660	16,839	
Indiana	70%	54%	59%	6,553	5,048	316	0	316	0	3,254	3,254	0	736	3,990	
lowa	83%	47%	56%	4,866	4,145	6	0	6	125	569	694	1,060	1,724	3,478	
Kansas	91%	76%	78%	1,774	1,590	141	0	141	1,873	1,275	3,148	327	427	3,902	
Kentucky	79%	59%	63%	770	1,073	512	0	512	1,850	44	1,894	114	703	2,711	
Louisiana	49%	36%	41%	1,891	6,512	53	0	53	37	2,026	2,063	1,030	2,470	5,563	
Maine	92%	78%	78%	568	599	593	135	728	939	996	1,935	202	49	2,186	
Maryland	96%	86%	88%	1,509	2,139	251	0	251	2,819	1,663	4,482	313	392	5,187	
Massachusetts	91%	74%	81%	1,308	19,665	934	0	934	1,725	5,334	7,059	885	1,092	9,036	
Michigan	98%	94%	95%	2,612	9,421	766	0	766	1931	8,798	10,729	0	190	10,919	
Minnesota	85%	83%	84%	2,092	15,231	1,507	0	1,507	833	6,909	7,742	1,027	838	9,607	
Mississippi	42%	15%	25%	127	1,378	0	0	0	437	123	560	718	2,036	3,314	
Missouri	88%	50%	59%	2,391	7,644	41	0	41	330	983	1,313	1,224	1,351	3,888	
Montana	96%	82%	85%	586	2,068	177	4	181	226	286	512	398	79	989	
Nebraska	83%	67%	72%	779	210	244	0	244	933	494	1,427	213	607	2,247	
Nevada	87%	62%	68%	1,293	2,418	23	16	39	0	90	90	0	107	197	
New Hampshire	99%	98%	98%	334	424	1,001	0	1,016	283	78	361	22	25	408	
New Jersey	75%	41%	58%	782	23,095	1,432	0	1,432	1,403	2,956	4,359	782	3,144	8,285	
New Mexico	94%	91%	92%	471	942	383	8	391	737	206	943	130	0	1,073	
New York	86%	54%	54%	7,690	79,476	2,582	733	3,322	3,234	8,796	12,030	19,032	3,348	34,410	
North Carolina	61%	37%	50%	2,292	17,058	295	0	295	1047	4,768	5,815	1,062	2,468	9,345	
North Dakota	84%	47%	47%	1,070	569	27	0	27	0	192	192	536	194	922	
Ohio	63%	32%	50%	3,110	12,831	908	0	908	479	2,181	2,660	2,609	4,752	10,021	
Oklahoma	73%	64% 97%	67%	2,300 697	4,460	542	0	542	21	802	823	326 434	1,270	2,419	
Oregon Pennsylvania	100% 86%	64%	98% 70%	1,519	3,468 13,699	1967 1,600	0	1,967 1,600	182 236	1,924 8,065	2,106 8,301	1,296	143 3,224	2,683 12,821	
	000/	070/	97%	757	696		4		224	045	4.440	4.77	23	1,348	
South Carolina	74%	49%	55%	569	13,306	141	0	141	517	1,436	1,148	910	933	3,796	
South Dakota	94%	77%	79%	597	761	7	0	7	568	304	872	586	185	1,643	
l'ennessee	78%	55%	61%	2,420	3,363	236	4	240	309	371	680	892	806	2,378	
Texas	51%	34%	44%	2,396	3,277	3,158	0	3,158	1468	6,685	8,153	689	6,568	15,410	
Jtah	83%	64%	66%	612	1,614	247	0	247	816	311	1,127	160	754	2,041	
Vermont	100%	99%	99%	184	1,285	979	0	979	42	73	115	0	0	115	
/irginia	79%	56%	66%	1,735	3,213	351	0	351	522	1344	2920	1031	1278	5,335	
Washington	92%	73%	77%	3,724	12,994	214	0	214	42	1,711	1,753	307	1,201	3,261	
West Virginia	88%	76%	77%	737	2,343	335	0	335	128	170	298	555	59	912	
Wisconsin	88%	69%	72%	5,677	2,152	2,260	1,130	3,390	0	1,016	1,016	1,083	1,755	3,854	
Wyoming	95%	80%	81%	102	748	138	4	142	107	393	500	125	120	745	
United States	81%	59%		101,143	533,048	24,893	2,383	35,386	26,264	67,610	146,852	51,836	64,271	268,294	
United States - Est.	1			101,143	533,048	32,274	3,090	35,386	49,037	107,573	156,610	52,888	65,575	275,073	

Source

Research and Training Center on Community Timing

Coleman
Institute

Research and Training Center on Community Living

T. 3.9, P. 81 Calculated T. 2.8, P. 48 T. 2.9, P. 49 T. 2.7, P. 47 Table/Page 2005 2005 2005 Year of Data

T. 2.6, P. 46 2005



Appendix I Continued

								Prom	oting Ind	lependenc	ce					
	All Individuals by Size of Residence								Large State Facilities							
State	То	Totals (includes own home, family home, family foster care and congregate care)							% in Large State Facilities	Residents in Large State Facilities per 100,000 population		Residents at Large State Facilities	FY2005 Aver pe diem		Persons with ID/DD in Specialized Nursing Facilities	
	1-3	%	4-6	1-6	%	7-15	16+	%	Total	16+						
Alabama	5,112	77%	399	5,511	83%	897	214	3%	6,622	3.2%	4.7	1	214	\$ 38	33 100%	971
Alaska	4,325	95%	211	4,536	100%	0	0	0%	4,536	0.0%	0	0	0	NA	N/A	8
Arizona	23,439	95%	1,058	24,497	99%	40	181	1%	24,718	0.6%	2.3	1	136	\$ 37		53
Arkansas	2,721	52%	61	2,782	54%	835	1,580	30%	5,197	20.4%	38.4	6	1,059	\$ 25		900
California	175,277	87%	19,675	194,952	96%	1,487	5,820	3%	202,259	1.6%	9.2	7	3,144	\$ 61		6,902
Colorado	6,526	84%	646	7,172	92%	499	105	1%	7,776	1.2%	2.3	2	96	\$ 52		161
Connecticut	9,689	71%	2,685	12,374	90%	472	839	6%	13,685	6.1%	23.9	7	838	\$ 58		411
Delaware	2,129	81%	340 765	2,469	93%	0	172 0	7%	2,641	4.2%	13.2	0	111 0	\$ 50 NIA		60
Dist. of Columbia Florida	812 35,421	48% 79%	765 4,515	1,577 39,936	93% 90%	118 1,286	3,347	0% 8%	1,695 44,569	0.0% 3.0%	7.5	6	1,331	NA \$ 31	N/A .7 43%	284
Georgia	7,703	80%	613	8,316	86%	0	1,300	14%	9,616	12.3%	13.1	6	1,180	\$ 30		1,576
Hawaii	2,696	85%	469	3,165	100%	8	0	0%	3,173	0.0%	0	0	0	NA NA	N/A	1,370
Idaho	11,473	92%	205	11,678	94%	507	280	2%	12,465	0.7%	6.3	1	90	\$ 57		125
Illinois	15,405	48%	3,655	19,060	59%	6,463	6,660	21%	32,183	8.6%	21.6	9	2,763	\$ 34		635
Indiana	11,917	75%	3,254	15,171	95%	0	736	5%	15,907	2.4%	6.6	5	381	\$ 58		1,697
Iowa	9,142	73%	569	9,711	78%	1,060	1,724	14%	12,495	5.0%	21.1	2	626	\$ 41	.5 N/A	808
Kansas	5,378	73%	1,275	6,653	90%	327	427	6%	7,407	5.0%	13.4	2	368	\$ 37	74 86%	0
Kentucky	4,205	83%	44	4,249	84%	114	703	14%	5,066	9.8%	11.9	3	495	\$ 44	8 70%	450
Louisiana	8,493	61%	2,026	10,519	75%	1,030	2,470	18%	14,019	10.9%	33.7	8	1,525	\$ 35	66 63%	677
Maine	2,699	66%	1,131	3,830	94%	202	49	1%	4,081	0.0%	0	0	0	NA	0%	112
Maryland	6,718	74%	1,663	8,381	92%	313	392	4%	9,086	4.0%	6.6	4	367	\$ 49		843
Massachusetts	23,632	76%	5,334	28,966	94%	885	1,092	4%	30,943	3.4%	16.8	6	1,046	\$ 50		1,056
Michigan	14,730	62%	8,798	23,528	99%	0	190	1%	23,718	0.8%	1.9	1	190	\$ 52		357
Minnesota	19,663	69%	6,909	26,572	93%	1,027	838	3%	28,437	0.1%	0.5	5	28	\$ 82		246
Mississippi	1,942 10,406	40% 75%	123 983	2,065 11,389	43% 82%	718 1,224	2,036 1,351	42% 10%	4,819 13,964	28.4% 7.7%	46.8 18.9	9	1,371 1,082	\$ 22 \$ 29		172 878
Missouri Montana	3,057	80%	290	3,347	88%	398	79	2%	3,824	2.1%	8.4	1	79	\$ 51		163
Nebraska	2,166	62%	494	2,660	76%	213	607	17%	3,480	10.8%	21.3	1	375	\$ 30		117
Nevada	3,734	95%	106	3,840	97%	0	107	3%	3,947	2.3%	3.7	2	89	\$ 49		31
New Hampshire	2,042	94%	78	2,120	98%	22	25	1%	2,167	0.0%	0	0	0	NA	0%	87
New Jersey	26,712	80%	2,956	29,668	88%	782	3,144	9%	33,594	9.0%	35.2	7	3,040	\$ 50		714
New Mexico	2,533	88%	214	2,747	95%	130	0	0%	2,877	0.0%	0	0	0	NA	N/A	110
New York	92,982	74%	9,529	102,511	82%	19,032	3,348	3%	124,891	1.2%	11.6	10	1,516	\$ 64		1,215
North Carolina	20,692	71%	4,768	25,460	88%	1,062	2,468	9%	28,990	5.9%	19.7	5	1,714	\$ 38	30 71%	531
North Dakota	1,666	64%	192	1,858	72%	536	194	7%	2,588	5.4%	22	1	140	\$ 39	95 82%	118
Ohio	17,328	64%	2,181	19,509	73%	2,609	4,752	18%	26,870	6.0%	14.5	11	1,609	\$ 33		DNF
Oklahoma	7,323	75%	802	8,125	84%	326	1,270	13%	9,721	3.7%	10.3	2	364	\$ 44		805
Oregon	6,314	72%	1,924	8,238	93%	434	143	2%	8,815	0.5%	1.2	1	43	\$ 66		168
Pennsylvania	17,054	58%	8,065	25,119	85%	1,296	3,224	11%	29,639	4.9%	11.7	6	1,450	\$ 51		DNF
Rhode Island	1,845	64%	821	2,666	93%	177	23	1%	2,866	0.0%	0	0	0	NA	0%	91
South Carolina	14,533	82%	1,436	15,969	90%	910	933	5%	17,812	5.4%	21.9	5	966	\$ 29		223
South Dakota Tennessee	1,933	64% 75%	304	2,237	74%	586	185	6% 10%	3,008	5.6%	21.8	3	169	\$ 30 \$ 76		185 895
Texas	6,328 10,299	75% 42%	375 6,685	6,703 16,984	80% 70%	892 689	806 6,568	10% 27%	8,401 24,241	7.9%	11.1 21.8	13	665 4,996	\$ 76 \$ 25		1,145
Utah	3,289	73%	311	3,600	80%	160	754	17%	4,514	5.1%	9.3	13	230	\$ 25 \$ 35		1,145
Vermont	2,490	97%	73	2,563	100%	0	0	0%	2,563	0.0%	0	0	0	NA NA	N/A	240
Virginia	5,821	61%	1,344	7,165	76%	1,031	1,278	13%	9,474	16.0%	19.8	5	1,517	\$ 38		762
Washington	16,974	84%	1,711	18,685	93%	307	1,201	6%	20,193	5.0%	15.3	5	1,012	\$ 42		365
West Virginia	3,543	82%	170	3,713	86%	555	59	1%	4,327	0.0%	0	0	0	NA	0%	DNF
Wisconsin	10,089	67%	2,146	12,235	81%	1,083	1,755	12%	15,073	3.9%	10.5	2	581	\$ 63		89
Wyoming	1,095	63%	397	1,492	86%	125	120	7%	1,737	5.9%	18.8	1	102	\$ 52		45
United States	685,348	79%	69,993	755,341	87%	51,836	64,271	7%	871,448	4.5%	13.5	176	39,098	\$ 41		27,620
United States - Est.	715,502	76%	110,663	826,165	87%	52,888	65,575	7%	944,628							30,027

Source Research and Training Center on Community Living

 Table/Page
 T. 1.5, P. 10
 T. 1.13, P. 33
 T. 3.2, P. 64
 T. 3.13, P. 88

 Year of Data
 2005



State	Promot	ing Indep	endence	Ensuring Community Involvement and Safety							
	1	that Can Pro Determinati		Q	uality Assur	Abuse					
	Independence Plus Waivers	Other Self- Directed - 1115 or 1915(c) Waiver for ID/DD	Money Follows the Person - Award or Apply	Council on Quailty and Leadership	National Core Indicators (HSRI)	Noteworthy State QA Initiatives	Protection and Advocacy Clients	% of all those served			
Alabama					Yes		391	6%			
Alaska					100	Yes	145	3%			
Arizona		Yes			Yes	103	475	2%			
Arkansas		105	Yes		Yes		113	2%			
California	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes		2,256	1%			
Colorado	Yes	108	168		168	Yes	2,236	3%			
			Yes		Yes		95				
Connecticut	Yes Yes					Yes	171	1%			
Delaware	1 es		Yes		Yes			6%			
Dist. of Columbia	37	X7	Yes	N/			252				
Florida	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	3.7		433	1%			
Georgia	Yes		Yes		Yes		348	4%			
Hawaii			Yes	Yes	Yes		475				
Idaho	Yes						102	1%			
Illinois			Yes				586	2%			
Indiana			Yes		Yes	Yes	156	1%			
Iowa			Yes				305	2%			
Kansas			Yes			Yes	156	2%			
Kentucky			Yes		Yes		234	5%			
Louisiana	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes	213	2%			
Maine	Yes		Yes		Yes		226	6%			
Maryland	Yes	Yes	Yes				126	1%			
Massachusetts	Yes				Yes	Yes	168	1%			
Michigan		Yes	Yes			Yes	373	2%			
Minnesota		Yes		Yes		Yes	654	2%			
Mississippi			Yes				138	3%			
Missouri	Yes		Yes				270	2%			
Montana	Yes		Yes				101	3%			
Nebraska			Yes				188	5%			
Nevada			Yes				221	6%			
New Hampshire	Yes	Yes	Yes				230				
New Jersey	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes	791	2%			
New Mexico	100	100	Yes	100	Yes	100	91	3%			
New York		Yes	Yes		100	Yes	3,113	2%			
North Carolina	Yes	163	Yes		Yes	163	228	1%			
North Dakota	Yes	Yes	Yes		103	Yes	294	11%			
Ohio	Yes	103	Yes			163	741	3%			
Oklahoma	165		Yes		Yes		511	5%			
		Yes	1 08		1 08		152	2%			
Oregon Pennsylvania		1 68	Voc		Ves	Vaa		7%			
Pennsylvania			Yes		Yes	Yes	2,110	9%			
Rhode Island	37			37	Yes Yes		268				
South Carolina	Yes			Yes			211	1%			
South Dakota			37		Yes		147	5%			
Tennessee			Yes	37	37		138				
Texas			Yes	Yes	Yes		805				
Utah		V		Yes	V	V	230				
Vermont		Yes	3.7		Yes	Yes	450				
Virginia			Yes				75				
Washington			Yes		Yes		48	0%			
West Virginia			Yes		Yes	Yes	191	4%			
Wisconsin			Yes	Yes			420				
Wyoming			Yes		Yes	Yes	157	9%			
United States	19	13	38	9	24	16	22,838	3%			

Source	CMS	PAS Center	CMS	Council on Quality and Leadership	Human Services Research Institute	QualityMall.org	Administration on Developmental Disabilities
Table/Page				Map			Outcomes
Year of Data		Nov-06	2007	2007	Oct-06	2006	2004



Appendix I Continued

	Keeping Families Together													
	Family	Sup	port		Cash S	Su	bsidy	Other Sub						
State	Families		ending Family	Families Supported per 100k of Populatio n	Families	Spending per Family		Families	SI	pending r Family	% Individuals Living in Family Home			
Alabama	2,800	S	235	62	0	N	N/A	2,800	\$	235	52%			
Alaska	1,003		3,120	154	1,003				\$	15,000	82%			
Arizona	18,436		8,723	326	442			17,994		8,854	85%			
Arkansas	864		478	32	120			744		430	30%			
California	81,074		4,615	227			N/A	81,074		4,615	74%			
Colorado	3,567	\$	892	78			N/A	3,567	\$	892	72%			
Connecticut	8,758	\$	4,031	251	3,188	9	1,028	5,570	\$	5,749	55%			
Delaware	1,510	\$	902	183	74	9	2,379	1,510	\$	785	64%			
Dist. of Columbia		\$	-	-	0	1	N/A	0	N/	A	32%			
Florida	17,108	\$	13,014	99	137	9	3,886	17,108	\$	12,983	70%			
Georgia	8,585	\$	2,520	98	0	1	N/A	8,585	\$	2,520	43%			
Hawaii	2,146	\$	10,733	171	0	1	N/A	2,146	\$	10,733	66%			
Idaho	840	\$	290	61	0	1	N/A	840	\$	290	72%			
Illinois	10,720	\$	4,766	85	2,360	9	11,739	8,360	\$	2,797	35%			
Indiana	1,600	\$	16,238	26	0	1	N/A	1,600	\$	16,238	32%			
Iowa	1,922	\$	4,955	65	378	9	4,239	1,544	\$	5,131	33%			
Kansas	3,372	\$	10,932	124	1,422	\$	2,291	1,950	\$	17,233	21%			
Kentucky	1,445	\$	2,214	35	0	1	N/A	1,445	\$	2,214	21%			
Louisiana	7,644	\$	19,635	170	1,793	\$	2,738	5,851	\$	24,813	46%			
Maine	545	\$	1,101	42	0	1	N/A	545	\$	1,101	15%			
Maryland	8,125		4,338	147			N/A	8,125	\$	4,338	24%			
Massachusetts	14,312	\$	3,041	223	0		N/A	14,312	\$	3,041	64%			
Michigan	10,696		3,822	106	6,307				\$	5,600	40%			
Minnesota	4,538		4,771	89	1,653			2,885		6,084	54%			
Mississippi	3,120	\$	2,273	108	0	1	N/A	3,120	\$	2,273	29%			
Missouri	4,261	\$	3,191	74			N/A	4,261	\$	3,191	55%			
Montana	2,774		3,760	301			N/A	2,774		3,760	54%			
Nebraska	422	\$	9,971	24			N/A	422	\$	9,971	6%			
Nevada	1,835		1,378	80	386				\$	770	61%			
New Hampshire	3,633		1,752	281			N/A	3,633		1,752	20%			
New Jersey	9,167	\$	6,243	106	6,485			9,167	\$	5,249	69%			
New Mexico	2,413		8,806	128	80			2,333		9,019	33%			
New York	51,231		1,053	267			N/A	51,231		1,053	64%			
North Carolina	16,788		13,721	198			N/A		\$	13,721	59%			
North Dakota	508		8,007	80	94			414		8,394	22%			
Ohio	12,795		869	112			N/A	12,795	\$	869	48%			
Oklahoma	3,617		12,288	103	1,735			1,882		21,387	46%			
Oregon	1,119	\$	3,415	31			N/A		\$	3,415	39%			
Pennsylvania	22,629		2,348	183			N/A		\$	2,348	46%			
Rhode Island	1,062		9,676	98	50 725			1,009	\$	10,011	24%			
South Carolina	8,532		3,443	204	735			7,797 1,768		3,334	75%			
South Dakota Tennessee	1,768 3,713		1,718	230 63			N/A			1,718	25% 40%			
Texas	7,239		1,739 4,485	32	2,674		N/A 1,870	3,713 6,892		1,739 3,986	14%			
Utah	1,567		4,485	66	2,674			1,450		4,667	36%			
Vermont	1,258		10,921	203			N/A	1,450		10,921	50%			
Virginia	2,212		997	30			N/A N/A	2,212		997	34%			
Virginia Washington	8,135		6,428	132	2,101			7,081		6,749	64%			
West Virginia	1,938		3,796	107			N/A	1,938		3,796	54%			
Wisconsin	9,847		2,100	107			N/A N/A	9,847		2,100	14%			
Wyoming	785		10,420	179			N/A N/A	785		10,420	43%			
Wyoming United States	395,978		5,005	135	33,334			372,719		5,062	61%			
Omited States	1 393,978	D	2 002	1.35	22 224	- 3		2/2/19			01%			

Source Coleman Institute

Table/Page T. 11, P. 46 Year of Data

2004



	Promoting Productivity														
	Medicai	d Buy-In	Sup	-	or Comp			Voc Rehab							
State	Has?	Enrollm ent	Participa nts	Utiliza tion	Spend	ling	%	Total Number in Competitive Employmen t	per 100k of population	% VR Wages to State Aver	Mean Weekly Hours Worked				
Alabama			196	4	\$ 1,8	346,012	4%	7,499	167	50%	34				
Alaska	Yes	214	311	48		379,514	41%	517	81	67%	33				
Arizona	Yes	683	813	14	\$ 3,9	34,569	10%	1,567	27	55%	33				
Arkansas	Yes	44	192	7	\$ 2	239,382	4%	2,702	99	64%	36				
California	Yes	1,263	9,297	26	\$ 75,5	579,770	18%	10,948	31	51%	32				
Colorado			1,930	42	DNF		36%	1,465	32	53%	31				
Connecticut	Yes	3,617	3,840	110	\$ 54,4	133,903	51%	1,441	41	59%	30				
Delaware			385	47		784,124	30%	803	97	43%	33				
Dist. of Columbia			81	15		599,222	6%	734	136	36%	38				
Florida			2,958	17		061,702	21%	9,556	54	61%	33				
Georgia			3,371	39		323,573	38%	4,045	46	46%	34				
Hawaii			126	10		84,608	10%	724	58	59%	30				
Idaho		=00	745	54		572,574	14%	1,800	128	71%	31				
Illinois Indiana	Yes	700	3,461	27		225,794	13%	7,943	63	43%	30				
Indiana Iowa	Yes	5,811 8,098	4,778	77 68		554,969	48% 29%	4,761	78 74	66% 81%	31 32				
Kansas	Yes Yes	865	1,993 416	15		382,139 108,100	11%	2,143 1,619	61	53%	30				
Kentucky	1 cs	003	1,121	27		084,829	23%	4,995	124	64%	34				
Louisiana	Yes	529	887	20		019,282	46%	1,728	41	72%	36				
Maine	Yes	681	775	59		537,700	21%	756	58	70%	28				
Maryland	100	001	3,385	61		41,933	39%	2,871	52	46%	32				
Massachusetts	Yes	7,414	5,586	87		341,222	43%	3,086	49	60%	30				
Michigan	Yes	176	4,649	46		592,930	23%	7,084	71	60%	31				
Minnesota	Yes	6,339	4,081	80		228,288	27%	2,767	54	56%	30				
Mississippi	Yes	1,460	398	14	\$ 2,2	241,845	22%	4,360	153	71%	36				
Missouri	Yes	18,654	398	7	\$ 1,0	584,218	9%	5,263	93	66%	32				
Montana			247	27	\$ 2,1	75,959	15%	873	95	67%	30				
Nebraska	Yes	83	909	52	\$ 6,0	58,476	29%	1,278	73	61%	33				
Nevada	Yes	11	529	23	\$ 7	793,500	33%	964	40	55%	34				
New Hampshire	Yes	1,319	435	34	\$ 4,2	246,835	49%	1,168	90	54%	29				
New Jersey	Yes	1,436	1,349	16	\$ 11,1	66,363	14%	4,128	48	53%	31				
New Mexico	Yes	1,241	1,128	60		110,800	36%	1,523	80	96%	32				
New York	Yes	2,864	8,336	43		344,000	15%	13,362	70	51%	31				
North Carolina			2,059	24		371,318	22%	9,586	114	55%	32				
North Dakota	Yes	275	343	54		003,085	20%	770	124	69%	35				
Ohio			9,524	83		318,495	23%	7,829	69	61%	33				
Oklahoma	V	505	2,778	79		030,748	71%	1,952	57	64%	35 29				
Oregon Pennsylvania	Yes Yes	585 5,007	1,236 9,007	35 73		196,063	35% 40%	2,714 10,523	75 86	73% 54%	33				
Rhode Island	1 cs	3,007	550	51		166,650	18%	577	55	55%	27				
South Carolina	Yes	52	1,236	30		324,985	17%	9,094	219	63%	34				
South Dakota	100	32	747	97		330,025	34%	830	110	67%	32				
Tennessee			941	16		294,500	16%	3,439	59	59%	34				
Texas	Yes		3,121	14		598,558	22%	19,941	89	58%	32				
Utah	Yes	283	876	37		590,000	34%	2,765	113	65%	36				
Vermont	Yes	553	766	123		39,416	43%	1,372	222	68%	31				
Virginia			2,460	33		36,402	22%	3,792	52	53%	33				
Washington	Yes	495	3,878	63		082,773	55%	2,177	35	67%	31				
West Virginia	Yes	118	342	19	\$ 1,4	142,836	10%	2,063	115	62%	35				
Wisconsin	Yes	8,265	2,802	51		359,365	16%	3,193	59	61%	30				
Wyoming	Yes	5	252	50	\$ 1,3	861,127	25%	497	99	60%	31				
wyoming						310,455									

 Source
 CMS
 Coleman Institute
 US Dept of Education, Office of Special Education and Rehabilitation Services

 Table/Page
 P. 2
 T. 10, P. 42

 Year of Data
 Mar-05
 2004
 2004

15



Appendix I Continued

	Reaching Those in Need														
State	List	iting t for	% Growt Residen Service Require	h in tial	Waiting List Waiting List - ID/DD HCBS -	% Growth in	Waiting List - Average	Preva % Children with Mental		Individua ls with ID/DD served per 100k of	Ratio of Prevalenc e to Individua				
	Serv		Meet Waiting		Kaiser	Meet Waiting List	9	Disability	Disability	populatio n	ls Served				
Alabama		807		50%	Yes, Unknow	Ves Unknow	25%	6.6%	6.3%	147	2%				
Alaska		1,400		8%	1233	125%	146%	4.3%	5.0%	707	14%				
Arizona		173		5%	0	0%	2%	4.9%	4.2%	420	10%				
Arkansas	DNF		DNF		558	18%	18%	7.8%	6.9%	190	3%				
California		0		0%	0	0%	0%	3.7%	3.7%	565	15%				
Colorado		940	1	9%	0	0%	9%	3.9%	3.5%	171	5%				
Connecticut		680	1	1%	1670	26%	18%	4.8%	3.3%	393	12%				
Delaware		7		1%	0	0%	0%	6.6%	3.8%	318	8%				
Dist. of Columbia		0		0%	0	0%	0%	6.4%	3.8%	313	8%				
Florida		3,100		3%	14537	58%	41%	5.3%	4.5%	253	6%				
Georgia		1,441			Unknown	Unknown	26%	4.5%	4.3%	109	3%				
Hawaii		0		0%	0	0%	0%	3.0%	3.1%	256	8%				
Idaho		0		0%	0	0%	0%	5.5%	5.0%	885	18%				
Illinois	DNF		DNF		0	0%	0%	4.8%	3.3%	256	8%				
Indiana	DNF		DNF		26861	289%	289%	6.1%	4.6%	259	6%				
Iowa		79		1%	0	0%	0%	5.1%	4.3%	431	10%				
Kansas		1,194	2		Yes, Unknow		21%	4.3%	4.2%	277	7%				
Kentucky	D. 177	288	T-1 TF	7%	2568	101%	54%	7.0%	7.1%	125	2%				
Louisiana	DNF	405	DNF	201		Yes, Unknow:	DNF	7.3%	5.9%	330	6%				
Maine		105	4.0	3%	111	4%	4%	9.0%	6.0%	314	5%				
Maryland		7,710 372		1% 3%	0	0% 0%	56% 2%	5.5% 5.9%	3.4% 4.1%	164 488	5% 12%				
Massachusetts Michigan		0		0%	0	0%	0%	6.4%	5.0%	238	5%				
Minnesota		3,855			Unknown	Unknown	28%	4.9%	3.5%	555	16%				
Mississippi	DNF	3,033	DNF	.0 /0	Unknown	Unknown	DNF	6.1%	7.2%	169	2%				
Missouri	DIVI	491	DIVI	80/0	Unknown	Unknown	8%	5.9%	5.6%	247	4%				
Montana		560		2%	1372	70%	51%	6.3%	4.7%	417	9%				
Nebraska		1,227		8%	0	0%	19%	5.4%	3.7%	200	5%				
Nevada		407		7%	298	23%	25%	3.9%	3.2%	163	5%				
New Hampshire		119			Unknown	Unknown	7%	7.2%	4.1%	167	4%				
New Jersey		3,384	3	0%	0	0%	15%	3.8%	3.1%	387	12%				
New Mexico		3,359	17	4%	Unknown	Unknown	174%	4.6%	5.3%	151	3%				
New York		5,273	1	2%	0	0%	6%	4.9%	3.8%	656	17%				
North Carolina	DNF		DNF		0	0%	0%	5.9%	4.9%	344	7%				
North Dakota		0		0%	0	0%	0%	4.5%	3.6%	416	12%				
Ohio	DNF		DNF		Unknown	Unknown	DNF	6.5%	5.0%	238	5%				
Oklahoma		3,853	7	3%	9534	221%	147%	5.8%	5.9%	282	5%				
Oregon		1,570	2	9%	3500	41%	35%	5.6%	5.0%	245	5%				
Pennsylvania		5,149	3	2%	22910	91%	62%	6.1%	4.6%	243	5%				
Rhode Island		0		0%		0%	0%	7.6%	5.2%	272	5%				
South Carolina		1,768				Yes, Unknown		5.4%	5.6%	430	8%				
South Dakota		5		0%	16	1%	0%	3.7%	4.2%	397	9%				
Tennessee	D	1,491		0%		Yes, Unknown		5.9%	6.5%	144	2%				
Texas	DNF	241	DNF	007	43479	369%	369%	5.2%	4.2%	108	3%				
Utah		244		8%		42%	25%	5.3%	4.4%	184	4%				
Vermont		2.029		0%		0%	0%	7.5%	5.1%	415	8%				
Virginia Washington	DNF	2,028	DNF	7%		57% Vec Unknown	42% DNE	5.2%	3.7% 5.3%	129 329	3%				
West Virginia	DNF	210		10/		Yes, Unknowr Yes, Unknowr		5.4% 6.6%	5.3% 8.2%	242	6% 3%				
Wisconsin	DNF	210	DNF	1 70	Yes, Unknow:	Yes, Unknowr	31%	5.4%	3.9%	242	3% 7%				
Wyoming	DINI	0		0%	0	0%	0%	5.8%	4.6%	346	8%				
United States		53,289		8%		32%	25%	5.2%	4.4%	297	7%				
United States - Est.		73,828		8%		5270	2070	5.270			. 70				

 Source
 Research and Training Center on Community Living
 Kaiser Family Foundation
 US Census Bureau, ACS

 Table/Page
 T. 2.5, P. 43
 Waiting List
 T. B18005

 Year of Data
 2005
 2005
 2005



							Serving at a	a Reason	ab	ole Cos	t						
		IC	F-MR		I	ICBS	Unmatched State ID/DD Funds				Overall Spending						
State	Tot	tal Expenditures	Residents		Cost per Resident		Total Expenditures	Residents		Cost per Resident		Total Expenditures	% of total ID/D D Spendi ng	Sp F pe	D/DD ending er 1k ersonal acome	Sp	D/DD endin g per apita
Alatama		27.240.074	022	6	447.406	0	240 (2(770	4066	0	44.024	6	0.070.744	20/	6	2.10	0	
Alabama Alaska	\$	27,248,061	233	\$	117,196	\$	219,626,770 63,010,000	4,966 988	\$	44,231 63,775	\$ \$	8,870,711 10,131,049	3% 14%	\$	2.10 3.85	\$	57 114
Arizona	\$	19,122,854	194		98,571	\$	399,131,874	16,192		24,651	\$	42,343,646	9%	\$		\$	78
Arkansas	s	140,908,587	1,587		88,789	\$	75,597,335	3,145		24,041	\$	6,863,771	3%	\$	4.76	\$	82
California	\$	649,831,934	10,477		62,025	\$	1,185,664,000	59,560		19,907	\$	920,663,219	33%	\$		\$	77
Colorado	\$	58,726,134	118		499,797	\$	237,868,301	6,753		35,227	\$	41,975,062	12%	\$	2.27	S	74
Connecticut	\$	219,690,073	1,169		187,930	\$	421,312,866	6,470		65,123	\$	399,777,448	38%	\$	7.03	\$	299
Delaware	\$	25,821,497	183	\$	141,101	\$	53,848,211	710		75,843	\$	37,992,582	32%	\$	4.16	\$	142
Dist. of Columbia	\$	79,196,025	757	\$	104,687	\$	9,082,366	538	\$	16,897	\$	26,634,156	23%	\$	6.65	\$	212
Florida	\$	301,190,366	3,366	\$	89,480	\$	664,000,000	25,041	\$	26,517	\$	45,162,688	4%	\$	2.40	\$	57
Georgia	\$	100,254,754	1,239	\$	80,916	\$	220,234,051	8,480	\$	25,973	\$	50,539,064	14%	\$	2.30	\$	42
Hawaii	\$	8,605,505	79	\$	108,930	\$	71,968,525	2,014	\$	35,743	\$	12,021,581	13%	\$	2.61	\$	75
Idaho	\$	54,588,955	565	\$	96,618	\$	50,531,285	1,602		31,552	\$	5,465,862	5%	\$		\$	79
Illinois	\$	688,155,342	9,658		71,256	\$	359,100,000	10,092		35,583	\$	304,729,432	23%	\$	3.33	\$	107
Indiana	\$	318,265,018	4,189		75,976	\$	378,412,692	9,296		40,707	\$	80,935,822	10%	\$	4.56	\$	127
Iowa	\$	248,752,217	2,197		113,224	\$	221,483,437	9,468		23,394	\$	101,561,322	18%	\$	6.58	\$	197
Kansas	\$	66,999,732	638		105,015	\$	217,398,124	6,614		32,869	\$	22,328,587	7%	\$		\$	115
Kentucky	\$	107,747,087	760		141,772	\$	156,788,232	2,543		61,655	\$	27,985,158	10%	\$	2.62	\$	72
Louisiana	\$	425,679,479	5,451		78,092	\$	242,183,270	5,262		46,029	\$	54,190,856	8%	\$	6.29	\$	170
Maine	\$	55,769,276	231		241,949	\$		2,577 9,096		75,751 40,866	\$	7,739,272	3% 17%	\$	7.44	\$	199 95
Maryland Massachusetts	\$	63,085,684 213,106,263	379 1,083		166,453 196,865	\$	371,692,848 619,925,467	11,257		55,070	\$	88,155,156 290,326,046	26%	\$	2.60 4.87	\$	177
Michigan	\$	20,778,960	1,063		130,276	\$	330,688,723	8,429		39,235	\$	74,016,379	17%	\$	3.09	\$	43
Minnesota	\$	171,455,673	2,521		68,024	\$	848,406,374	14,534		58,376	\$	49,725,549	5%	\$	7.07	\$	209
Mississippi	\$	209,110,070	2,648		78,984	\$	36,500,000	1,985		18,388	\$	33,380,539	12%	\$	4.01	\$	98
Missouri	s	256,706,484	1,236		207,775	\$	259,443,990	8,244		31,473	\$	104,626,538	17%	S	3.27	\$	110
Montana	\$	12,350,308	86		143,608	\$	57,896,772	1,970		29,389	\$	10,785,535	13%	\$	4.55	S	88
Nebraska	s	59,443,762	612		97,130	\$	118,702,909	2,946		40,300	\$	33,656,031	16%	s	4.68	S	122
Nevada	\$	26,472,598	203	\$	130,407	\$	42,934,783	1,310	\$	32,775	\$	12,680,602	15%	\$	1.28	\$	34
New Hampshire	\$	2,348,269	25	\$	93,931	\$	127,314,000	3,104	\$	41,023	\$	4,460,106	3%	\$	3.51	\$	104
New Jersey	\$	565,546,561	3,089	\$	183,114	\$	399,258,000	8,765	\$	45,551	\$	395,351,043	29%	\$	3.56	\$	157
New Mexico	\$	21,123,412	223	\$	94,724	\$	222,738,154	3,429	\$	64,967	\$	12,851,299	5%	\$	5.45	\$	134
New York	\$	2,719,055,847	8,889		305,890	\$	3,159,343,756	51,457	\$	61,398	\$	-	0%	\$	7.49	\$	309
North Carolina	\$	446,972,145	4,091		109,271	\$	266,945,320	6,382		41,828	\$	171,349,541	19%	\$	4.42	\$	105
North Dakota	\$	65,278,839	609		107,278	\$	57,488,528	2,873		20,013	\$	-	0%	\$		\$	198
Ohio	\$	1,005,053,573	7,016		143,262	\$	476,750,084		\$	43,028	\$	532,812,492	26%	\$	5.66	\$	179
Oklahoma	\$	121,544,040	1,687		72,069	\$	211,693,575	4,319		49,014	\$	32,820,990	9%	\$		\$	106
Oregon	\$	10,835,819	47		233,028	\$	332,591,000	8,572		38,802	\$	212,986,339	38%	\$	5.45	\$	155
Pennsylvania Phodo Joland	\$	577,222,902	4,091	\$	141,096	\$	1,040,866,233 215,543,542	25,185 2,913		41,329	\$	282,802,425	15% 3%	\$	5.33	\$	156 218
Rhode Island South Carolina	\$	7,067,988 161,433,481	40 1,766		178,936 91,412	\$		4,908		74,006 32,000	\$	6,954,142 37,211,428	10%	\$	7.56 3.90	\$	86
South Dakota	\$	21,296,554	1,766		123,458	\$		2,440		29,953	\$	5,034,275	5%	\$	4.82	\$	131
Tennessee	\$	289,361,481	1,331		217,402	\$		4,676		76,226	\$	97,331,728	13%	\$		\$	127
Texas	s	805,708,216	12,112		66,521	\$		11,782		35,678	\$	214,758,607	15%	\$	2.20	\$	64
Utah	s	57,513,532	786		73,172	\$		3,795		27,120	\$	9,149,362	5%	s		\$	69
Vermont	\$	944,808	6		157,468	\$		1,980		46,551	\$	1,041,201	1%	\$	5.29	\$	152
Virginia	\$	228,819,663	1,821		125,656	\$		6,326		46,099	\$	143,937,638	22%	\$		\$	90
Washington	\$	126,200,726	804		156,966	\$		9,543		36,391	\$	69,950,137	13%	\$	3.35		89
West Virginia	\$	55,100,628	515		106,992	\$		3,622		47,881	\$	14,440,364	6%	\$		\$	136
Wisconsin	\$	197,374,367	1,952	\$	101,114	\$	429,489,581	12,075	\$	35,568	\$	89,233,341	12%	\$	5.41	\$	131
Wyoming	\$	18,335,225	91	\$	202,599	\$	75,441,712	1,707	\$	44,208	\$	2,918,000	3%	\$	6.16	\$	193
United States	\$	12,133,200,774	103,174	\$	117,600	\$	17,158,367,282	433,002	\$	39,627	\$	5,242,658,120	15%	\$	4.11	\$	118
United States - Est.																	

Source Research and Training Center on Community Living Coleman Institute

 Table/Page
 T. 34, P. 70
 T. 37, P. 77
 T. 8, P. 30
 T. 10, P. 42
 Calculated

 Year of Data
 2005
 2004
 2004
 2004
 2005
 2004
 2005
 2004
 2005
 2005
 2005
 2005
 2005
 2005
 2005
 2005
 2005
 2005
 2005
 2005
 2005
 2005
 2005
 2005
 2005
 2005
 2005
 2005
 2005
 2005
 2005
 2005
 2005
 2005
 2005
 2005
 2005
 2005
 2005
 2005
 2005
 2005
 2005
 2005
 2005
 2005
 2005
 2005
 2005
 2005
 2005
 2005
 2005
 2005
 2005
 2005
 2005
 2005
 2005
 2005
 2005
 2005
 2005
 2005
 2005
 2005
 2005
 2005
 2005
 2005
 2005
 2005
 2005
 2005
 2005
 2005
 2005
 2005
 2005
 2005
 2005
 2005



Report Data Sources

Organization

Council on Quality and Leadership
Research and Training Center on Community Living
Administration on Children and Families
Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services
Coleman Institute
Department of Education
Human Services Research Institute
PAS Center
Kaiser Family Foundation
US Census Bureau
Quality Mall

Link for Data Referenced

map.c-q-l.org/about
rtc.umn.edu/misc/pubcount.asp?publicationid=135
www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/add/reports/Clients05.html
www.cms.hhs.gov/TWWIA/downloads/BuyInEnrollment.pdf
www.colemaninstitute.org/
www.ed.gov/rschstat/eval/rehab/statistics.html
www.hsri.org/nci/
www.pascenter.org/demo_waivers/demoWaiverTable_2006.php
www.statehealthfacts.org
www.Census.gov
www.QualityMall.org



United Cerebral Palsy 1660 L Street NW, Suite 700 Washington, DC 20036

Phone: (800) 872-5827 Web: www.ucp.org