

Table 6
MAGI Eligibility Systems
January 2016

State	Able to Make Real-Time Determinations (<24 Hours) ¹	Share of MAGI-Based Applications With a Determination Completed in Real-Time ¹				Integrated with CHIP (Total = 36) ²	Integrated with Non-MAGI Medicaid ²	Integrated with: ²		
		<25%	25%-50%	50%-75%	75%+			SNAP	TANF	Child Care Subsidy
Total	37	12	4	2	9	34	24	17	17	7
Alabama	Y				Y	Y				
Alaska						N/A (M-CHIP)				
Arizona	Y	Y				Y	Y			
Arkansas	Y	Y				Y				
California ³	Y		Y			N/A (M-CHIP)				
Colorado ⁴	Y				Y	Y	Y			
Connecticut	Y				Y	Y				
Delaware	Y	Y				Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
District of Columbia	Y	Y				N/A (M-CHIP)				
Florida ⁵	Y		Y			Y	Y			
Georgia							Y	Y	Y	
Hawaii	Y		Not Reported			N/A (M-CHIP)	Y			
Idaho						Y	Y	Y	Y	
Illinois						Y	Y	Y	Y	
Indiana						Y	Y	Y	Y	
Iowa	Y		Not Reported			Y				
Kansas	Y	Y				Y	Y			
Kentucky	Y			Y		Y				
Louisiana	Y	Y				Y	Y			
Maine						Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Maryland	Y		Not reported			N/A (M-CHIP)				
Massachusetts ⁶	Y				Y	Y				
Michigan	Y		Y			N/A (M-CHIP)				
Minnesota	Y		Y			N/A (M-CHIP)				
Mississippi						Y				
Missouri	Y		Not Reported			Y				
Montana	Y				Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	
Nebraska ⁵	Y		Not Reported			N/A (M-CHIP)	Y	Y	Y	Y
Nevada	Y		Not Reported			Y	Y	Y	Y	
New Hampshire	Y	Y				N/A (M-CHIP)	Y	Y	Y	Y
New Jersey						Y				
New Mexico						N/A (M-CHIP)	Y	Y	Y	
New York	Y				Y	Y				
North Carolina	Y		Not Reported			Y	Y	Y	Y	
North Dakota	Y		Not Reported			Y				
Ohio	Y	Y				N/A (M-CHIP)				
Oklahoma	Y				Y	N/A (M-CHIP)				
Oregon	Y			Y		Y				
Pennsylvania	Y	Y				Y	Y	Y	Y	
Rhode Island	Y				Y	N/A (M-CHIP)				
South Carolina	Y	Y				N/A (M-CHIP)				
South Dakota						Y				
Tennessee										
Texas						Y	Y	Y	Y	
Utah						Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Vermont	Y		Not Reported			N/A (M-CHIP)				
Virginia ⁵	Y	Y				Y	Y			Y
Washington	Y				Y	Y				
West Virginia						Y	Y	Y	Y	
Wisconsin	Y		Not Reported			Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Wyoming	Y	Y				Y				

SOURCE: Based on a national survey conducted by the Kaiser Commission on Medicaid and the Uninsured with the Georgetown University Center for Children and Families, 2016.

Table presents rules in effect as of January 1, 2016.

Table 6 Notes

1. Under the ACA, states must seek to verify eligibility criteria based on electronic data matches with reliable sources of data. These columns reflect whether the state system is able to make real-time eligibility determinations, defined as within 24 hours, and the share of MAGI-based applications that are determined eligible in real-time.
2. These columns indicate whether the state MAGI-based Medicaid eligibility system is integrated with CHIP, non-MAGI Medicaid, and certain non-health programs.
3. California's statewide-integrated Marketplace and Medicaid system, CALHEERS, is not integrated with other programs. However, counties in California use different Medicaid eligibility systems that are integrated with non-health programs.
4. Colorado integrated its Medicaid eligibility with its SBM system and delinked the Medicaid eligibility system from other non-health programs during 2015.
5. Florida, Nebraska and Virginia integrated non-MAGI Medicaid eligibility into their MAGI-based system during 2015.
6. In Massachusetts, the share of applications completed in real-time is among online applications.

Table 7
Coordination between Medicaid and Marketplace Systems
January 2016

State	Marketplace Structure ¹	FFM Conducts Assessment or Final Determination for Medicaid Eligibility ²	State is Receiving Electronic Account Transfers from FFM ³	State is Sending Electronic Account Transfers to FFM ³	State is Experiencing Delays or Problems with Transfers ³
(Total = 38)					
Total	FFM: 28 Partnership: 6 SBM: 17	Assessment: 30 Determination: 8	38	36	20
Alabama	FFM	Determination	Y	Y	Y
Alaska ⁵	FFM	Determination	Y	Y	Y
Arizona	FFM	Assessment	Y	Y	Y
Arkansas	Partnership	Determination	Y	Y	Y
California	SBM	N/A (SBM)	N/A (SBM)	N/A (SBM)	N/A (SBM)
Colorado	SBM	N/A (SBM)	N/A (SBM)	N/A (SBM)	N/A (SBM)
Connecticut	SBM	N/A (SBM)	N/A (SBM)	N/A (SBM)	N/A (SBM)
Delaware	Partnership	Assessment	Y	Y	
District of Columbia	SBM	N/A (SBM)	N/A (SBM)	N/A (SBM)	N/A (SBM)
Florida	FFM	Assessment	Y	Y	Y
Georgia	FFM	Assessment	Y	Y	
Hawaii ⁴	Federally-supported SBM	Assessment	Y	Y	Not reported
Idaho	SBM	N/A (SBM)	N/A (SBM)	N/A (SBM)	N/A (SBM)
Illinois	Partnership	Assessment	Y	Y	Y
Indiana	FFM	Assessment	Y	Y	
Iowa	FFM	Assessment	Y	Y	Y
Kansas	FFM	Assessment	Y	Y	Y
Kentucky	SBM	N/A (SBM)	N/A (SBM)	N/A (SBM)	N/A (SBM)
Louisiana ⁵	FFM	Assessment	Y	Y	
Maine	FFM	Assessment	Y	Y	Y
Maryland	SBM	N/A (SBM)	N/A (SBM)	N/A (SBM)	N/A (SBM)
Massachusetts	SBM	N/A (SBM)	N/A (SBM)	N/A (SBM)	N/A (SBM)
Michigan	Partnership	Assessment	Y	Y	
Minnesota	SBM	N/A (SBM)	N/A (SBM)	N/A (SBM)	N/A (SBM)
Mississippi	FFM	Assessment	Y	Y	
Missouri	FFM	Assessment	Y	Y	Y
Montana	FFM	Determination	Y	Y	
Nebraska	FFM	Assessment	Y	Y	
Nevada	Federally-supported SBM	Assessment	Y	Y	Y
New Hampshire	Partnership	Assessment	Y	Y	Y
New Jersey	FFM	Determination	Y		
New Mexico	Federally-supported SBM	Assessment	Y	Y	
New York	SBM	N/A (SBM)	N/A (SBM)	N/A (SBM)	N/A (SBM)
North Carolina	FFM	Assessment	Y	Y	Y
North Dakota ⁵	FFM	Assessment	Y	Y	Y
Ohio	FFM	Assessment	Y	Y	Y
Oklahoma	FFM	Assessment	Y	Y	
Oregon ⁵	Federally-supported SBM	Assessment	Y	Y	Y
Pennsylvania	FFM	Assessment	Y	Y	Y
Rhode Island	SBM	N/A (SBM)	N/A (SBM)	N/A (SBM)	N/A (SBM)
South Carolina	FFM	Assessment	Y	Y	Y
South Dakota	FFM	Assessment	Y	Y	
Tennessee	FFM	Determination	Y		
Texas	FFM	Assessment	Y	Y	
Utah	FFM	Assessment	Y	Y	
Vermont	SBM	N/A (SBM)	N/A (SBM)	N/A (SBM)	N/A (SBM)
Virginia	FFM	Assessment	Y	Y	
Washington	SBM	N/A (SBM)	N/A (SBM)	N/A (SBM)	N/A (SBM)
West Virginia	Partnership	Determination	Y	Y	Y
Wisconsin	FFM	Assessment	Y	Y	Y
Wyoming	FFM	Determination	Y	Y	

SOURCE: Based on a national survey conducted by the Kaiser Commission on Medicaid and the Uninsured with the Georgetown University Center for Children and Families, 2016.

Table presents rules in effect as of January 1, 2016.

TABLE 7 NOTES

1. This column indicates whether a state has elected to establish and operate its own State-based Marketplace (SBM), establish a State-based Marketplace with federal support, use the Federally-facilitated Marketplace (FFM), or establish a Marketplace in partnership with the federal government (Partnership). States running a SBM are responsible for performing all Marketplace functions, except for four SBM states (Hawaii, Nevada, New Mexico, and Oregon) that rely on the FFM information technology (IT) platform for application processing and certain eligibility and enrollment activities. In a Federally-facilitated Marketplace (FFM), the US Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) conducts all Marketplace functions. States with a Partnership Marketplace may administer plan management functions, in-person consumer assistance functions, or both, and HHS is responsible for the remaining Marketplace functions.
2. This column indicates whether states using the FFM IT platform for eligibility activities (including FFM, Partnership, and Federally-supported SBM states) have elected to allow the FFM to make assessments or final determinations of Medicaid/CHIP eligibility for MAGI-based groups. In assessment states, applicants' accounts must be transferred to the state Medicaid/CHIP agency for a final determination. In determination states, the FFM makes a final Medicaid/CHIP eligibility determination and transfers the account to the state Medicaid/CHIP agency for enrollment. States marked as N/A do not rely on the FFM for eligibility functions.
3. These columns indicate whether states are receiving and sending electronic accounts transfers from and to the FFM, and whether they are experiencing delays or problems with the account transfer process.
4. Hawaii transitioned from a SBM to a Federally-Supported SBM during 2015. Hawaii did not report whether it is experiencing problems or delays with transfers to and from the FFM because it had not begun transfers at the time of the survey interview.
5. During 2015, Louisiana, North Dakota, and Oregon transitioned to rely on the FFM to make assessments rather than final determinations for Medicaid eligibility, while Alaska transitioned to rely on the FFM to make final determinations rather than assessments.

Table 9
Online Account Capabilities for Medicaid
January 2016

State	Online Medicaid Account ¹	Online Account Allows Individuals to:							
		Report Changes	Review Application Status	Renew Coverage	View Notices	Authorize Third-Party Access	Upload Verification Documentation	Go Paperless and Receive Notices Electronically	Pay Premiums
Total	39	37	36	35	31	30	29	25	6
Alabama	Y	Y	Y	Y		Y			
Alaska									N/A
Arizona	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Arkansas									
California	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		
Colorado	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y
Connecticut	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	
Delaware ²	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y			
District of Columbia	Y	Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	N/A
Florida	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		Y	Y	N/A
Georgia ³	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		Y
Hawaii ^{2,3,4,5,6}	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N/A
Idaho ^{3,4,5}	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		
Illinois									
Indiana ⁷	Y	Y	Y			Y			
Iowa									
Kansas									
Kentucky	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N/A
Louisiana ⁴	Y	Y		Y					
Maine	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y			Y	
Maryland	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	
Massachusetts ⁴	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y				
Michigan	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		
Minnesota									N/A
Mississippi									N/A
Missouri									
Montana	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	
Nebraska	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N/A
Nevada									
New Hampshire	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N/A
New Jersey									
New Mexico	Y	Y	Y	Y			Y		N/A
New York	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	
North Carolina									
North Dakota ^{2,3,4,5,6,8}	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N/A
Ohio	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N/A
Oklahoma	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N/A
Oregon	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N/A
Pennsylvania	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		Y	Y	
Rhode Island	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N/A
South Carolina ^{6,8}	Y		Y						N/A
South Dakota ^{3,4,8}	Y	Y		Y			Y		N/A
Tennessee									N/A
Texas ⁹	Y	Y	Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y
Utah	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y		Y	Y
Vermont ⁴	Y	Y	Y		Y	Y			Y
Virginia	Y	Y	Y	Y		Y	Y		N/A
Washington ^{2,3,4}	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	
West Virginia	Y		Y	Y	Y			Y	
Wisconsin ^{2,5}	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	
Wyoming	Y	Y		Y	Y	Y	Y	Y	N/A

SOURCE: Based on a national survey conducted by the Kaiser Commission on Medicaid and the Uninsured with the Georgetown University Center for Children and Families, 2016.

Table presents rules in effect as of January 1, 2016.

TABLE 9 NOTES

1. This column indicates whether individuals can create an online account for ongoing management of their MAGI-based Medicaid coverage at the state level, either through the Medicaid agency or a case management system that is integrated with the SBM.
2. Delaware, Hawaii, North Dakota, Washington, and Wisconsin added functionality to allow enrollees to authorize third party access to their account during 2015.
3. Georgia, Hawaii, Idaho, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Washington added functionality to allow enrollees to upload verification documents if needed during 2015.
4. Hawaii, Idaho, Louisiana, Massachusetts, North Dakota, South Dakota, Vermont, and Washington added functionality to allow enrollees to report changes through their online account during 2015.
5. Hawaii, Idaho, North Dakota, and Wisconsin added functionality to allow enrollees to view notices during 2015.
6. Hawaii, North Dakota, and South Carolina added functionality to allow applicants to review their application status during 2015.
7. In Indiana, individuals can manage their case online, but there is no account to set up.
8. North Dakota, South Carolina, and South Dakota implemented online accounts during 2015 or as of January 1, 2016.
9. In Texas, only certain notices can be viewed from a client's online account if the client does not elect to receive electronic notices.

Table 10
Income Verification Procedures Used by Medicaid Agencies at Application
January 2016

State	Pre-Enrollment Verification ¹	Post-Enrollment Verification ¹	If attestation is <u>below</u> and data are <u>above</u> the income standard ²			If attestation is <u>above</u> and data are <u>below</u> the income standard ²			
			Reasonable Compatibility Standard	If not reasonably compatible, state first:		Reasonable Compatibility Standard	If not reasonably compatible, state first:		
				Asks for a Reasonable Explanation	Requires Paper Documentation		Asks for a Reasonable Explanation	Requires Paper Documentation	Transfers to Marketplace
Total	43	8	34	30	21	3	7	9	35
Alabama	Y		10%	Y		None			Y
Alaska	Y		10%	Y		None			Y
Arizona	Y		None		Y	None			Y
Arkansas	Y		10%		Y	None			Y
California	Y		None		Y	None		Y	
Colorado ³		Y	10%	Y		10%			Y
Connecticut ^{4,5}	Y		10%	Y		None			Y
Delaware		Y	10%	Y		None			Y
District of Columbia	Y		10%		Y	None		Y	
Florida ^{3,6}	Y		10%	Y		10%	Y		
Georgia	Y		None		Y	None			Y
Hawaii		Y	10%	Y		None			Y
Idaho	Y		None		Y	None		Y	
Illinois	Y		5%	Y		None			Y
Indiana	Y		None		Y	None			Y
Iowa	Y		10%	Y		None			Y
Kansas	Y		20%	Y		None			Y
Kentucky	Y		10%	Y		None			Y
Louisiana	Y		25%	Y		None			Y
Maine	Y		None	Y		None			Y
Maryland	Y		10%		Y	None			Y
Massachusetts ⁴	Y		10%		Y	None			Y
Michigan	Y		10%	Y		None			Y
Minnesota	Y		10%	Y		None			Y
Mississippi	Y		\$50	Y		None	Y		
Missouri ⁷	Y		10%		Y	None	Y		
Montana		Y	10%	Y		None			Y
Nebraska	Y		10%		Y	None			Y
Nevada	Y		None	Y		None			Y
New Hampshire		Y	10%	Y		None			Y
New Jersey ⁶	Y		10%	Y		10%	Y		
New Mexico	Y		None		Y	None		Y	
New York	Y		10%		Y	None			Y
North Carolina	Y		None	Y		None	Y		
North Dakota	Y		None	Y		None	Y		
Ohio	Y		5%		Y	None			Y
Oklahoma		Y	5%		Y	None			Y
Oregon ^{5,8}	Y		10%	Y		None			Y
Pennsylvania	Y		5%	Y		None		Y	
Rhode Island	Y		10%	Y		None			Y
South Carolina	Y		10%	Y		None			Y
South Dakota ⁶	Y		None	Y		None	Y		
Tennessee	Y		10%		Y	None			Y
Texas	Y		None		Y	None		Y	
Utah ⁹	Y		None		Y	None		Y	
Vermont		Y	None		Y	None		Y	
Virginia	Y		10%	Y		None			Y
Washington		Y	None	Y		None			Y
West Virginia	Y		10%	Y		None			Y
Wisconsin	Y		None		Y	None			Y
Wyoming	Y		None		Y	None		Y	

SOURCE: Based on a national survey conducted by the Kaiser Commission on Medicaid and the Uninsured with the Georgetown University Center for Children and Families, 2016. Table presents rules in effect as of January 1, 2016.

TABLE 10 NOTES

1. States are expected to attempt to verify income through an electronic source; they can verify information prior to enrollment or enroll based on an individual's self-attestation and conduct a post-enrollment verification. Only in cases where there is no electronic data source for a type of income are states able to accept self-attestation of income without verification.
2. If the information obtained from electronic data sources and the information provided by or on behalf of the individual are both above, at, or below the applicable income standard, the state must determine the applicant eligible or ineligible for Medicaid/CHIP. In these cases, any difference does not impact eligibility. If the data are not consistent, states have the option to apply a reasonable compatibility standard by establishing a threshold (e.g., a percentage or dollar figure) in which they will still consider the data to be reasonably compatible. States have the option to set different standards based on whether the applicant's attestation is above or below the eligibility threshold. In both cases, if the difference between the attested income and the electronic data source are within the reasonable compatibility standard, the state will process eligibility based on the individual's attestation. If the applicant reports income below the standard and the electronic source indicates income above the standard, and the difference is not reasonably compatible, the state may accept a reasonable explanation and/or request paper documentation. If the applicant reports income above the Medicaid or CHIP limit but the electronic source reflects income below, and the data are not reasonably compatible, the state may accept a reasonable explanation, request paper documentation, or determine the individual ineligible and transfer the application to the Marketplace.
3. Colorado and Florida implemented a reasonable compatibility standard of 10% when the applicant's income attestation is above but the data source reflects income below the Medicaid standard during 2015.
4. In Connecticut and Massachusetts, if the state is not able to verify income with electronic data, an individual will be enrolled based on self-attestation and income will be verified post-enrollment.
5. Connecticut and Oregon transitioned to verifying income prior to enrollment rather than relying on post-enrollment verification during 2015.
6. Florida, New Jersey, and South Dakota transitioned to rely on a reasonable explanation rather than transferring the account to the Marketplace when self-attested income is above the Medicaid standard but electronic data show income below the standard and the data are not reasonably compatible.
7. Missouri changed to request paper documentation when an individual's self-attestation is below the Medicaid income standard but electronic data show income above the standard during 2015.
8. Oregon added a reasonable compatibility standard of 10% when the applicant's income attestation is below but the data source reflects income above the Medicaid standard during 2015. Oregon also transitioned to rely on a reasonable explanation rather than paper documentation when data are not reasonably compatible.
9. In Utah, if an individual reports income above the Medicaid cutoff but a reliable data source qualifies the individual, Utah will approve the application.

Table 11
Non-Financial Eligibility Criteria Verification Procedures Used by Medicaid Agencies^{1,2}
January 2016

State	Age/Date of Birth			State Residency				Household Composition			
	Self-Attestation	Pre-Enrollment Verification	Post-Enrollment Verification	Self-Attestation	Pre-Enrollment Verification	Post-Enrollment Verification	If Do Not Use Self-Attestation, Verify at Renewal	Self-Attestation	Pre-Enrollment Verification	Post-Enrollment Verification	If Do Not Use Self-Attestation, Verify at Renewal
Total	27	23	1	41	6	4	4	44	6	1	4
Alabama	Y			Y				Y			
Alaska	Y			Y				Y			
Arizona	Y				Y			Y			
Arkansas		Y		Y				Y			
California		Y		Y				Y			
Colorado	Y			Y				Y			
Connecticut	Y			Y				Y			
Delaware	Y			Y				Y			
District of Columbia	Y			Y				Y			
Florida	Y			Y				Y			
Georgia	Y			Y				Y			
Hawaii	Y			Y				Y			
Idaho	Y				Y				Y		
Illinois		Y			Y		Y	Y			
Indiana		Y			Y		Y		Y		Y
Iowa		Y		Y					Y		Y
Kansas	Y			Y				Y			
Kentucky		Y			Y				Y		
Louisiana	Y			Y				Y			
Maine	Y			Y				Y			
Maryland		Y		Y				Y			
Massachusetts	Y					Y		Y			
Michigan	Y			Y				Y			
Minnesota		Y		Y				Y			
Mississippi		Y		Y				Y			
Missouri	Y			Y				Y			
Montana	Y			Y				Y			
Nebraska		Y		Y				Y			
Nevada		Y		Y				Y			
New Hampshire			Y	Y				Y			
New Jersey	Y			Y				Y			
New Mexico		Y		Y				Y			
New York	Y			Y				Y			
North Carolina	Y				Y			Y			
North Dakota		Y		Y				Y			
Ohio	Y			Y				Y			
Oklahoma		Y		Y				Y			
Oregon	Y			Y				Y			
Pennsylvania		Y		Y				Y			
Rhode Island		Y		Y					Y		
South Carolina		Y		Y				Y			
South Dakota	Y			Y				Y			
Tennessee		Y				Y		Y			
Texas ³		Y		Y				Y			
Utah	Y			Y				Y			
Vermont	Y			Y				Y			
Virginia	Y			Y				Y			
Washington		Y		Y				Y			
West Virginia		Y		Y				Y			
Wisconsin		Y				Y	Y			Y	Y
Wyoming		Y				Y	Y		Y		Y

SOURCE: Based on a national survey conducted by the Kaiser Commission on Medicaid and the Uninsured with the Georgetown University Center for Children and Families, 2016. Table presents rules in effect as of January 1, 2016.

TABLE 11 NOTES

1. In addition to the eligibility criteria shown in the table, all states must verify citizenship and immigration status through electronic data matches with the Social Security Administration (SSA) or the Department of Homeland Security (DHS).
2. States have the option to accept self-attestation for the non-financial eligibility criteria listed. If states verify non-financial eligibility criteria at application or renewal, they are expected to use electronic data and eliminate or minimize requirements for paper documentation. In states accepting self-attestation without further verification, the state may have access to electronic data for some applicants (for example, if the consumer is also enrolled in SNAP), which may be used to confirm eligibility. Verification is required if a state has any information on file that conflicts with the self-attestation. In states noted as conducting pre-enrollment verification, the state will confirm eligibility prior to enrolling an individual into coverage. States conducting post-enrollment verification enroll an individual based on their self-attested information and confirm the criteria after enrollment.
3. Texas accepts self-attestation for children, but verifies state residency for parents.