Medicaid:

A Lifeline for Blacks and Latinos With Serious Health Care Needs

American Diabetes Association • American Lung Association • Families USA Joint Center for Political and Economic Studies National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) National Council of La Raza (NCLR) • National Medical Association National Urban League Policy Institute

American Diabetes Association

1701 North Beauregard Street Alexandria, VA 22311 Phone: 1-800-DIABETES www.diabetes.org

American Lung Association

1301 Pennsylvania Avenue NW, Suite 800 Washington, DC 20004 Phone: 1-800-LUNG-USA (1-800-586-4872) www.LungUSA.org

Families USA

1201 New York Avenue NW, Suite 1100 Washington, DC 20005 Phone: 202-628-3030 www.familiesusa.org

Joint Center for Political and Economic Studies

1090 Vermont Avenue NW, Suite 1100 Washington, DC 20005 Phone: 202-789-3500 www.jointcenter.org

National Association for the

Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) 1156 15th Street NW Suite 915 Washington, DC 20005 Phone: 202-463-294 www.naacp.org

National Council of La Raza (NCLR)

1126 16th Street NW, Suite 600 Washington, DC 20036 Phone: 202-785-1670 www.nclr.org

National Medical Association

8403 Colesville Road, Suite 920 Silver Spring, MD 20910 Phone: 202-207-1541 www.nmanet.org

National Urban League Policy Institute

1101 Connecticut Avenue NW, Suite 810 Washington, DC 20036 Phone: 202-898-1604 www.nul.org/content/national-urban-league-policy-institute or decades, researchers have documented that black and Latino people in the United States bear a disproportionate burden of chronic diseases.¹ Not only are they more likely than whites to suffer from chronic diseases such as diabetes, asthma, and certain cancers, they are also more likely to get sicker from some of these conditions—to experience complications, to have poorer health outcomes, and even to die prematurely.²

Medicaid, the state and federally funded health insurance program for lowincome people, has historically played a critical role for people of color, providing coverage for millions of blacks and Latinos of all ages. While Medicaid covers many more white people, because blacks and Latinos tend to have lower incomes than whites,³ they are more than twice as likely to rely on Medicaid for health coverage. In both black and Latino communities, a little more than one in four people relies on Medicaid for their health care; in contrast, Medicaid covers fewer than one in eight whites.⁴ Medicaid helps roughly half of all black and Latino children get a healthy start in life. And it helps black and Latino seniors and people with disabilities who need long-term care.

Medicaid's critical role in providing access to health care for blacks and Latinos, coupled with the heavy burden of chronic disease borne by these groups, means that Medicaid coverage can truly mean the difference between life and death for blacks and Latinos with serious health care needs.

To get a sense of how important Medicaid is for blacks and Latinos with serious health care needs, this report looks at subsets of those groups: blacks and Latinos with cancer, diabetes, chronic lung disease, or heart disease or stroke who rely on Medicaid for their health coverage. (All of the individuals whose conditions are captured in the data in this report have received a diagnosis of their condition from a health care professional.) The conditions were defined as follows:

- Cancer: Includes all cancers except for non-melanoma skin cancers;
- Diabetes: Includes type 1 and type 2 diabetes;
- Chronic lung disease: Includes a range of lung diseases, such as asthma, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (COPD), and cystic fibrosis; and
- Heart disease or stroke: Includes a range of cardiovascular conditions, such as heart attacks, heart valve disorders, and stroke.

These are people whose health care needs require regular medical attention. Often, these conditions can be managed, or sometimes even cured, if treated in a timely manner. Medicaid helps make it possible for these individuals to see a doctor, to fill prescriptions, and to keep up with screenings and other preventive care so that they can act quickly and avoid life-threatening complications if their illness gets worse or recurs. Without Medicaid, many of these seriously ill people would not be able to afford the care they need. For them, Medicaid coverage is critical. Federal or state cuts to the Medicaid program would truly put them at risk.

To better understand the importance of Medicaid for people with serious health care needs, Families USA contracted with The Lewin Group to develop national and state-level estimates of the number of blacks and Latinos with the health conditions listed above, as well as their insurance status. For this analysis, The Lewin Group analyzed data from the Medical Expenditure Panel Survey (MEPS), which is administered by the Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality, and the Census Bureau's Current Population Survey (CPS).⁵ (A detailed methodology is available online at <u>http://familiesusa2.org/assets/pdfs/medicaids-impact/Methodology.pdf</u>.)

A Note on Terminology

In this report, the term "black" refers to those who report their race as "black" and their ethnicity as being "non-Hispanic" to the Census Bureau. The term "Latino" refers to people of all races who report being of "Hispanic origin" to the Census Bureau. And the term "white" refers to those who report their race as "white" and their ethnicity as "non-Hispanic" to the Census Bureau. In addition, "national" data do not include the 4.2 million residents of the U.S. territories, the vast majority of whom are people of color.

Key Findings

The Black Community

Among blacks, Medicaid provides coverage for a significant portion of people with serious health care needs.

- Among blacks with cancer (Table1):
 - More than one in five (21.9 percent) is covered by Medicaid.
 - Nearly 141,000 rely on Medicaid coverage.
- Among blacks with diabetes (Table 2):
 - Nearly one in four (24.4 percent) is covered by Medicaid.
 - Nearly 778,000 rely on Medicaid coverage.
- Among blacks with chronic lung disease (Table 3):
 - Well over one-third (37.0 percent) are covered by Medicaid.
 - More than 1.4 million rely on Medicaid coverage.
- Among blacks with heart disease or stroke (Table 4):
 - More than one in five (21.6 percent) is covered by Medicaid.
 - Nearly 1.9 million rely on Medicaid coverage.

The Latino Community

Among Latinos, Medicaid provides coverage for a significant portion of people with serious health care needs.

- Among Latinos with cancer (Table 5):
 - Nearly one in four (24.5 percent) is covered by Medicaid.
 - Nearly 105,000 rely on Medicaid.
- Among Latinos with diabetes (Table 6):
 - More than one-quarter (25.6 percent) are covered by Medicaid.
 - More than 692,000 rely on Medicaid.
- Among Latinos with chronic lung disease (Table 7):
 - Nearly two in five (39.8 percent) are covered by Medicaid.
 - Nearly 1.4 million rely on Medicaid.
- Among Latinos with heart disease or stroke (Table 8):
 - Nearly one-quarter (23.2 percent) are covered by Medicaid.
 - More than 1.4 million rely on Medicaid.

State	Total Number	Individuals Who Rely on Medicaid		Individuals Who Are Uninsured		
		Number	Percent	Number	Percent	
Alabama	23,530	5,760	24.5%	1,180	5.0%	
Alaska	420	, 60	15.3%	30	7.9%	
Arizona	4,480	1,210	27.0%	450	10.2%	
Arkansas	7,040	1,510	21.4%	820	11.7%	
California	49,620	14,280	28.8%	3,490	7.0%	
Colorado	3,710	540	14.6%	290	7.8%	
Connecticut	5,380	990	18.3%	360	6.7%	
Delaware	2,810	570	20.3%	160	5.7%	
D.C.	7,070	1,650	23.4%	260	3.7%	
Florida	42,370	8,200	19.4%	3,740	8.8%	
Georgia	41,140	6,550	15.9%	4,280	10.4%	
Hawaii	41,140	*	*	4,200	*	
Idaho	*	*	*	*	*	
Illinois	29,670	4,990	16.8%	2,190	7.4%	
Indiana	8,140	1,730	21.2%	610	7.5%	
lowa	910	230	25.1%	60	6.7%	
	2,310	350	15.2%	150	6.6%	
Kansas						
Kentucky	5,050	1,070	21.2%	310	6.1%	
Louisiana	23,300	5,530	23.7%	2,180	9.4%	
Maine	220	80	35.5%	1 710	4.004	
Maryland	28,260	3,350	11.9%	1,710	6.0%	
Massachusetts	6,950	2,540	36.6%	1 700		
Michigan	23,780	5,380	22.6%	1,720	7.2%	
Minnesota	2,210	780	35.5%	130	5.8%	
Mississippi	18,950	5,260	27.8%	1,640	8.7%	
Missouri	11,190	2,200	19.7%	770	6.9% *	
Montana						
Nebraska	1,080	190	17.5%	80	7.4%	
Nevada	3,520	700	19.8%	290	8.3%	
New Hampshire	290	30	10.9%	*	*	
New Jersey	22,060	4,190	19.0%	1,330	6.1% *	
New Mexico				*		
New York	54,140	16,240	30.0%	4,490	8.3%	
North Carolina	34,850	7,750	22.2%	2,530	7.3%	
North Dakota	*	*	*	*	*	
Ohio	23,060	5,030	21.8%	1,550	6.7%	
Oklahoma	4,350	690	15.8%	390	8.9%	
Oregon	1,450	450	30.8%	*	*	
Pennsylvania	23,500	4,960	21.1%	1,190	5.1%	
Rhode Island	690	190	27.1%	60	9.1%	
South Carolina	25,200	5,670	22.5%	1,580	6.3%	
South Dakota	50	10	20.2%	*	*	
Tennessee	17,120	3,770	22.0%	1,050	6.1%	
Texas	45,710	10,200	22.3%	4,490	9.8%	
Utah	*	*	*	*	*	
Vermont	70	20	34.0%	*	*	
Virginia	25,030	3,300	13.2%	1,710	6.8%	
Washington	3,370	730	21.5%	230	6.7%	
West Virginia	1,200	230	19.0%	60	5.2%	
Wisconsin	5,250	1,440	27.4%	350	6.6%	
Wyoming	*	*	*	*	*	
U.S. Total * *	642,900	140,940	21.9%	48,370	7.5%	

Table 1. Blacks with Cancer, by State

* Data are not reportable due to sample size.

State	Total Number	Individuals Who Rely on Medicaid		Individuals Who Are Uninsured		
		Number	Percent	Number	Percent	
Alabama	123,110	34,080	27.7%	8,230	6.7%	
Alaska	1,830	290	16.1%	190	10.3%	
Arizona	18,520	5,280	28.5%	2,610	14.1%	
Arkansas	38,470	8,390	21.8%	5,890	15.3%	
California	208,250	67,710	32.5%	19,570	9.4%	
Colorado	14,490	2,450	16.9%	1,600	11.0%	
Connecticut	24,720	5,220	21.1%	2,220	9.0%	
Delaware	14,480	3,380	23.3%	1,100	7.6%	
D.C.	33,120	9,410	28.4%	1,860	5.6%	
Florida	211,770	45,910	21.7%	25,910	12.2%	
Georgia	215,180	37,850	17.6%	29,890	13.9%	
Hawaii	*	*	*	*	*	
Idaho	*	*	*	*	*	
Illinois	158,060	28,760	18.2%	17,140	10.8%	
Indiana	41,130	9,830	23.9%	4,290	10.4%	
lowa	5,460	1,490	27.4%	510	9.4%	
Kansas	13,140	2,370	18.0%	1,130	8.6%	
Kentucky	27,600	6,430	23.3%	2,540	9.2%	
Louisiana	120,140	32,100	26.7%	15,600	13.0%	
Maine	900	400	44.2%	*	*	
Maryland	132,680	18,510	14.0%	11,340	8.5%	
Massachusetts	30,480	11,890	39.0%	*	*	
Michigan	128,010	33,510	26.2%	12,830	10.0%	
Minnesota	12,150	4,400	36.2%	810	6.7%	
Mississippi	103,540	30,520	29.5%	12,250	11.8%	
Missouri	61,560	13,930	22.6%	5,750	9.3%	
Montana	*	*	*	*	*	
Nebraska	5,770	1,130	19.5%	640	11.0%	
Nevada	15,010	3,350	22.3%	1,480	9.9%	
New Hampshire	1,090	140	12.9%	*	*	
New Jersey	98,660	21,650	21.9%	7,720	7.8%	
New Mexico	*	*	*	*	*	
New York	246,380	80,110	32.5%	26,830	10.9%	
North Carolina	184,950	46,060	24.9%	18,600	10.1%	
North Dakota	*	*	*	*	*	
Ohio	124,350	29,620	23.8%	11,470	9.2%	
Oklahoma	23,170	4,430	19.1%	2,650	11.4%	
Oregon	6,420	2,040	31.8%	*	*	
Pennsylvania	111,000	27,140	24.5%	8,060	7.3%	
Rhode Island	3,370	1,030	30.7%	360	10.6%	
South Carolina	130,300	33,660	25.8%	12,010	9.2%	
South Dakota	320	70	23.0%	*	*	
Tennessee	87,760	21,470	24.5%	8,230	9.4%	
Texas	230,810	56,860	24.6%	30,530	13.2%	
Utah	*	*	*	*	*	
Vermont	330	140	41.2%	*	*	
Virginia	122,900	19,410	15.8%	10,550	8.6%	
Washington	15,580	3,460	22.2%	1,400	9.0%	
West Virginia	6,230	1,330	21.3%	430	6.9%	
Wisconsin	30,250	8,880	29.3%	2,930	9.7%	
Wyoming	*	*	*	*	*	
U.S. Total**	3,193,410	777,750	24.4%	329,610	10.3%	

Table 2. Blacks with Diabetes, by State

* Data are not reportable due to sample size.

State	Total Number	Individuals Who Rely on Medicaid		Individuals Who Are Uninsured		
		Number	Percent	Number	Percent	
Alabama	140,630	55,180	39.2%	12,170	8.7%	
Alaska	2,280	630	27.6%	260	11.4%	
Arizona	21,020	8,660	41.2%	2,690	12.8%	
Arkansas	48,130	19,070	39.6%	8,000	16.6%	
California	218,060	83,880	38.5%	20,860	9.6%	
Colorado	1 <i>7</i> ,000	4,600	27.0%	2,620	15.4%	
Connecticut	34,200	11,080	32.4%	3,130	9.1%	
Delaware	17,050	5,960	34.9%	1,270	7.4%	
D.C.	33,200	14,530	43.8%	1,810	5.4%	
Florida	257,440	82,340	32.0%	39,150	15.2%	
Georgia	261,830	80,740	30.8%	38,060	14.5%	
Hawaii	*	*	*	*	*	
Idaho	*	*	*	*	*	
Illinois	189,480	68,130	36.0%	22,400	11.8%	
Indiana	58,920	29,610	50.3%	5,570	9.4%	
lowa	7,030	3,230	46.0%	690	9.8%	
Kansas	16,390	5,810	35.4%	1,820	11.1%	
Kentucky	33,850	13,760	40.7%	3,540	10.4%	
Louisiana	142,280	59,650	41.9%	20,520	14.4%	
Maine	1,640	1,120	68.1%	*	*	
Maryland	150,000	35,350	23.6%	14,740	9.8%	
Massachusetts	45,220	22,040	48.7%	*	*	
Michigan	159,850	71,480	44.7%	16,990	10.6%	
Minnesota	22,160	11,630	52.5%	1,580	7.1%	
Mississippi	126,740	57,560	45.4%	16,890	13.3%	
Missouri	71,760	26,790	37.3%	7,690	10.7%	
Montana Nebraska	7050	2,400	34.0%	900	12.8%	
Nevada	7,050 18,230	2,400 6,890	37.8%		12.0%	
New Hampshire	1,430	420	29.1%	2,120	11.0 ⁄₀ *	
New Jersey	123,570	35,670	28.9%	15,110	12.2%	
New Mexico	*	*	20.778	*	*	
New York	332,690	144,460	43.4%	37,940	11.4%	
North Carolina	213,250	82,480	38.7%	25,210	11.8%	
North Dakota	*	*	*	*	*	
Ohio	145,730	60,080	41.2%	14,660	10.1%	
Oklahoma	28,660	10,530	36.7%	3,890	13.6%	
Oregon	7,310	2,380	32.6%	*	*	
Pennsylvania	148,950	55,440	37.2%	12,000	8.1%	
Rhode Island	5,660	2,410	42.6%	610	10.8%	
South Carolina	136,280	46,840	34.4%	16,600	12.2%	
South Dakota	760	340	45.1%	*	*	
Tennessee	108,690	43,420	39.9%	11,030	10.2%	
Texas	275,450	90,580	32.9%	39,740	14.4%	
Utah	*	*	*	*	*	
Vermont	590	330	56.6%	*	*	
Virginia	139,420	36,270	26.0%	13,810	9.9%	
Washington	22,810	9,910	43.5%	2,200	9.7%	
West Virginia	7,000	2,890	41.3%	590	8.5%	
Wisconsin	37,570	16,250	43.2%	4,080	10.9%	
Wyoming	*	*	*	*	*	
U.S. Total**	3,847,680	1,424,630	37.0%	446,080	11 .6 %	

Table 3. Blacks with Chronic Lung Disease, by State

Source: Estimates for Families USA by The Lewin Group. See the methodology for details.

* Data are not reportable due to sample size.

State	Total Number	Individuals Who Rely on Medicaid		Individuals Who Are Uninsured		
		Number	Percent	Number	Percent	
Alabama	333,740	81,820	24.5%	26,510	7.9%	
Alaska	4,850	690	14.3%	,500	10.4%	
Arizona	48,510	12,800	26.4%	7,160	14.8%	
Arkansas	105,810	21,220	20.1%	18,860	17.8%	
California	525,510	150,190	28.6%	53,030	10.1%	
Colorado	38,760	5,770	14.9%	4,350	11.2%	
Connecticut	66,380	12,590	19.0%	6,450	9.7%	
Delaware	43,870	9,020	20.6%	3,670	8.4%	
D.C.	97,250	25,420	26.1%	6,060	6.2%	
Florida	621,830	115,810	18.6%	88,060	14.2%	
Georgia	635,150	101,550	16.0%	98,430	15.5%	
Hawaii	*	*	*	*	*	
Idaho	*	*	*	*	*	
Illinois	421,850	70,190	16.6%	48,930	11.6%	
Indiana	108,490	25,230	23.3%	11,890	11.0%	
lowa	14,300	3,690	25.8%	1,420	9.9%	
Kansas	34,220	5,660	16.6%	3,030	8.9%	
Kentucky	77,250	16,480	21.3%	8,540	11.1%	
Louisiana	333,940	78,420	23.5%	50,560	15.1%	
Maine	2,470	960	39.1%	*	*	
Maryland	404,620	49,300	12.2%	38,160	9.4%	
Massachusetts	84,380	30,420	36.1%	*	*	
Michigan	330,280	79,570	24.1%	34,880	10.6%	
Minnesota	32,640	11,510	35.3%	2,410	7.4%	
Mississippi	274,190	73,740	26.9%	38,150	13.9%	
Missouri	152,800	31,120	20.4%	15,760	10.3%	
Montana	*	*	*	*	*	
Nebraska	15,530	2,730	17.6%	1,780	11.5%	
Nevada	39,880	7,710	19.3%	4,120	10.3%	
New Hampshire	3,050	360	11.7%	*	*	
New Jersey	260,370	48,540	18.6%	22,900	8.8%	
New Mexico	*	*	*	*	*	
New York	656,010	193,970	29.6%	<i>77</i> ,880	11.9%	
North Carolina	519,630	117,400	22.6%	60,380	11.6%	
North Dakota	*	*	*	*	*	
Ohio	314,000	68,710	21.9%	31,350	10.0%	
Oklahoma	65,540	11,510	17.6%	8,570	13.1%	
Oregon	15,810	4,460	28.2%	*	*	
Pennsylvania	293,200	64,710	22.1%	23,060	7.9%	
Rhode Island	9,090	2,580	28.4%	980	10.8%	
South Carolina	351,100	78,110	22.2%	38,040	10.8%	
South Dakota	900	180	19.7%	0/ 510		
Tennessee	254,930	57,480	22.5%	26,510	10.4%	
Texas	656,220 *	134,670	20.5%	98,450 *	15.0%	
Utah Vanna ant	050	240	20.0%	*	*	
Vermont	950	360	38.0%			
Virginia Martinatan	368,680	51,340	13.9%	35,950	9.8%	
Washington West Virginia	40,520	8,710	21.5%	3,720	9.2%	
West Virginia Wisconsin	17,180	3,380	19.7% 26.7%	1,510	8.8% 10.6%	
Wisconsin Wyoming	75,780 *	20,260	20.7 /0	8,010 *	10.0%	
	0 777 000	1 002 / 70	21 49/	1 014 040		
U.S. Total * *	8,777,080	1,893,670	21.6%	1,016,940	11.6%	

Table 4. Blacks with Heart Disease or Stroke, by State

* Data are not reportable due to sample size.

Table 5. Latinos with Cancer, by State

State	Total Number	Individuals Who Rely on Medicaid		Individuals Who Are Uninsured	
		Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Alabama	580	80	12.9%	120	20.7%
Alaska	310	40	13.8%	30	9.4%
Arizona	19,040	4,190	22.0%	2,730	14.3%
Arkansas	480	, 50	9.6%	, 110	22.6%
California	134,120	36,700	27.4%	18,970	14.1%
Colorado	8,350	1,910	22.8%	1,290	15.4%
Connecticut	3,720	1,050	28.2%	390	10.5%
Delaware	310	, 80	27.6%	50	17.3%
D.C.	480	120	24.1%	60	12.7%
Florida	45,310	9,060	20.0%	5,410	11.9%
Georgia	3,380	380	11.3%	910	27.0%
Hawaii	890	140	15.5%	60	6.4%
Idaho	950	200	21.1%	180	18.9%
Illinois	10,570	1,610	15.2%	1,500	14.2%
Indiana	1,660	, 90	5.6%	210	12.8%
lowa	630	130	20.5%	120	19.1%
Kansas	1,240	180	14.8%	210	16.7%
Kentucky	410	60	14.1%	120	30.1%
Louisiana	1,160	*	*	190	16.1%
Maine	170	40	21.6%	*	*
Maryland	2,750	270	9.7%	600	21.8%
Massachusetts	4,190	2,250	53.7%	150	3.6%
Michigan	2,950	420	14.1%	230	7.7%
Minnesota	920	140	15.3%	140	14.7%
Mississippi	370	*	*	80	22.3%
Missouri	1,020	100	9.8%	170	16.4%
Montana	240	40	16.8%	20	7.7%
Nebraska	740	120	16.2%	100	13.1%
Nevada	4,870	550	11.2%	720	14.8%
New Hampshire	230	50	21.1%	40	16.5%
New Jersey	13,700	3,040	22.2%	1,960	14.3%
New Mexico	12,120	2,650	21.9%	1,050	8.7%
New York	36,670	14,530	39.6%	3,180	8.7%
North Carolina	2,580	250	9.6%	900	34.7%
North Dakota	50	10	21.1%		*
Ohio	2,120	370	17.3%	180	8.4%
Oklahoma	1,600	390	24.1%	400	24.9%
Oregon	2,450	410	16.6%	710	29.1%
Pennsylvania	5,200	1,850	35.7%	390	7.6%
Rhode Island	890	390	44.2%	120	13.5%
South Carolina	940	220	23.6%	180	18.7%
South Dakota	130	20 170	12.2% 14.1%	20 280	14.6%
Tennessee Texas	1,200	170 17,980	21.7%		23.3%
Utah	82,860 2,190	230	10.5%	13,150 390	15.9% 17.8%
Vermont	2,170	*	*	*	*
Virginia	2,810	220	7.9%	530	18.8%
Washington	4,910	1,290	26.3%	940	19.0%
West Virginia	*	*	*	*	*
Wisconsin	2,060	660	32.0%	200	9.6%
Wyoming	440	30	6.9%	40	8.9%
U.S. Total**	427,230	104,780	24.5%	59,540	13.9%
0.5. Iolui	427,230	104,700	2 4. J /0	37,340	13.7 /0

* Data are not reportable due to sample size.

State	Total Number	Individuals Who Rely on Medicaid		Individuals Who Are Uninsured		
		Number	Percent	Number	Percent	
Alabama	4,110	570	13.9%	940	23.0%	
Alaska	1,660	250	15.2%	230	14.0%	
Arizona	115,670	27,030	23.4%	22,660	19.6%	
Arkansas	4,190	390	9.3%	1,060	25.4%	
California	796,260	225,860	28.4%	151,440	19.0%	
Colorado	49,700	12,160	24.5%	10,000	20.1%	
Connecticut	24,380	7,220	29.6%	3,740	15.4%	
Delaware	2,350	640	27.1%	530	22.8%	
D.C.	3,150	920	29.1%	630	20.0%	
Florida	274,910	58,790	21.4%	47,870	17.4%	
Georgia	24,250	2,830	11.7%	8,780	36.2%	
Hawaii	5,120	940	18.3%	460	8.9%	
Idaho	6,000	1,150	19.2%	1,430	23.8%	
Illinois			15.5%		18.8%	
Indiana	82,610	12,810 1,030	8.0%	15,510	16.5%	
	12,780			2,110		
lowa	5,810	1,170	20.1%	1,230	21.2%	
Kansas	9,850	1,560	15.9%	2,310	23.4%	
Kentucky	3,380	520	15.3%	1,150	33.9%	
Louisiana	8,010			2,030	25.4%	
Maine	980	250	25.2%		*	
Maryland	18,930	1,850	9.8%	6,030	31.9%	
Massachusetts	29,290	16,720	57.1%	1,420	4.8%	
Michigan	20,110	3,480	17.3%	2,430	12.1%	
Minnesota	7,540	1,380	18.3%	1,480	19.7%	
Mississippi	2,900	*	*	920	31.6%	
Missouri	7,640	880	11.6%	1,830	23.9%	
Montana	1,300	250	19.1%	160	12.0%	
Nebraska	6,070	1,070	17.6%	1,120	18.4%	
Nevada	29,430	3,650	12.4%	5,680	19.3%	
New Hampshire	1,420	310	22.0%	330	23.5%	
New Jersey	85,660	19,910	23.2%	16,340	19.1%	
New Mexico	67,110	16,210	24.2%	8,460	12.6%	
New York	221,410	92,880	42.0%	26,970	12.2%	
North Carolina	20,520	2,250	11.0%	8,520	41.5%	
North Dakota	370	90	25.2%	*	*	
Ohio	14,670	2,920	19.9%	1,850	12.6%	
Oklahoma	11,690	2,800	24.0%	3,720	31.8%	
Oregon	16,180	2,670	16.5%	5,960	36.9%	
Pennsylvania	34,220	13,520	39.5%	3,650	10.7%	
Rhode Island	6,290	2,850	45.3%	1,060	16.8%	
South Carolina	6,290	1,420	22.6%	1,590	25.3%	
South Dakota	980	130	13.2%	210	21.5%	
Tennessee	9,050	1,240	13.7%	2,670	29.5%	
Texas	573,350	130,840	22.8%	125,350	21.9%	
Utah	13,610	1,500	11.0%	2,960	21.7%	
Vermont	*	*	*	*	*	
Virginia	18,890	1,500	7.9%	4,960	26.3%	
Washington	29,450	8,120	27.6%	7,650	26.0%	
West Virginia	*	*	*	*	*	
Wisconsin	16,230	5,140	31.7%	2,280	14.0%	
Wyoming	2,430	200	8.2%	310	12.7%	
U.S. Total**	2,709,790	692,390	25.6%	520,360	19.2%	

Table 6. Latinos with Diabetes, by State

* Data are not reportable due to sample size.

Number Percent Number Percent Alaka 7,860 2,520 32.0% 1,920 24.3% Alaxka 1,960 550 28.3% 220 11.6% Arkanas 8,480 3,490 41.2% 1,760 20.8% California 986,170 41.5,270 42.1% 169,620 17.2% Colorado 61,000 21,520 33.3% 12,390 20.3% Colorado 61,000 1,590 41.5% 850 22.1% Deleware 3,830 1,590 41.5% 850 22.1% Georgia 64,940 14,450 32.2% 13,500 30.0% Hawaii 6,740 2,240 32.2% 13,500 30.0% Illinois 124,860 46,050 30.9% 1,850 16.3% Kansos 15,540 5,730 36.9% 3,170 20.4% Konsos 15,540 5,730 36.9% 2,240 1.3% <tr< th=""><th>State</th><th>Total Number</th><th colspan="2">Individuals Who Rely on Medicaid</th><th colspan="3">Individuals Who Are Uninsured</th></tr<>	State	Total Number	Individuals Who Rely on Medicaid		Individuals Who Are Uninsured		
Alaska 1,960 550 28.3% 220 11.6% Arizona 140,630 56,840 40.4% 27,470 19,5% Arkansas 8,480 3,490 41,2% 1,760 20.8% Calleroina 986,170 415,270 42,1% 169,620 23,3% Connecticut 36,680 17,020 46,4% 5,130 14.0% Dc. 3,900 1,550 39.9% 730 18.6% Florida 251,350 67,830 27.0% 51,120 20.3% Georgia 64,940 14,450 32.2% 13,500 30.0% Hawaii 6,740 2,240 33.2% 3,500 15.5% Idoho 9,330 3,530 37.8% 1,990 21.4% Illinois 124,860 46,050 36.9% 3,150 16.3% Kansos 15,540 5,730 36.9% 3,170 20.4% Kansos 15,540 47.9% 188.00 15,			Number	Percent	Number	Percent	
Alaska 1960 550 28.3% 220 11.6% Arizona 140,630 56,840 40.4% 27,470 19.5% Arkansas 8,480 3,490 41.2% 1,760 20.8% California 986,170 415,270 42.1% 169,620 23.3% Connecticut 36,680 17,220 45.3% 530 22.1% D.C. 3,900 1,550 39.9% 730 18.6% Florida 251,350 67,830 27.0% 51,120 20.3% Georgia 64,4940 14,450 32.2% 13,500 30.0% Hawaii 6,740 2,240 33.2% 350 5.2% Idaho 9,330 3,530 37.8% 1,990 21.4% Illinois 124,860 46,050 36.9% 3,150 16.3% Kansos 15,540 5,730 36.9% 3,170 20.4% Kansos 15,540 47.9% 188.03 1,5% <td>Alabama</td> <td>7,880</td> <td>2,520</td> <td>32.0%</td> <td>1,920</td> <td>24.3%</td>	Alabama	7,880	2,520	32.0%	1,920	24.3%	
Arizona 140,30 56,840 40.4% 27,470 19.5% Arkansas 8,480 3,490 41.2% 1,750 20.8% California 986,170 415,270 42.1% 169,620 17.2% Colorado 61,000 21,520 33.3% 12,390 20.3% Connecticut 36,680 170,20 46.4% 5,130 14.0% Deleware 3,830 1,590 41.5% 850 22.1% D.C. 3,900 1,550 39.9% 730 18.6% Florida 251,350 67,830 22.2% 13,500 30.0% Ideation 9,330 3,530 37.8% 1,990 21.4% Indiana 22,550 8,920 39.6% 3,480 15.5% Iowa 11,370 4.540 39.9% 1,850 16.3% Kanacs 15,540 5,730 36.9% 3,170 20.4% Kentucky 7,220 3,540 49.1% <td< td=""><td>Alaska</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></td<>	Alaska						
Arkmass 8,480 3,490 41,2% 1,700 20.8% California 986,170 415,270 42.1% 169,620 17,2% Colorado 61,000 21,520 33.3% 12,340 20.3% Connecticut 36,680 17,020 46.4% 5,130 14.0% Delaware 3,830 1,550 39.9% 730 18.6% Floida 251,350 67,830 27.0% 51,120 20.3% Georgia 44.940 14,450 32.2% 13,500 30.0% Hawaii 6,740 2,240 33.2% 13,500 30.0% Idaha 9,330 3,530 37.8% 1,990 21.4% Illinois 124,860 46,050 36.9% 1,850 16.3% Kantocky 7,220 3,540 49.1% 1,830 15.5% Iowa 11,370 4,540 39.9% 1,850 1.6.3% Kantocky 7,220 3,540 4.1%				40.4%			
California 986,170 415,270 42.1% 169,620 17.2% Colorado 61,000 21,520 35.3% 12,390 20.3% Connecticut 36,680 17,020 46.4% 5,130 14.0% Delaware 3,830 1,590 41.5% 850 22.1% D.C. 3,900 1,550 39.9% 730 18.6% Florida 251,350 67,830 22.0% 51,120 20.3% Georgia 44,940 14,450 32.2% 350 5.2% Idaha 9,330 3,530 37.8% 1,990 21.4% Illinois 124,860 46,050 36.6% 34,90 15.5% Idwa 11,370 4,540 39.9% 1,8130 25.4% Iowa 11,370 4,540 39.9% 3,170 20.4% Kentocky 7220 3,540 49.1% 1,830 25.4% Iowa 1,570 670 42.5% *							
Colorado 61,000 21,520 35.3% 12,390 20.3% Connecticut 36,680 17,020 46.4% 5,130 14.0% DcC. 3,900 1,550 39.9% 730 18.6% Florida 251,350 67,830 22.7% 51,120 20.3% Georgia 44.940 14.450 32.2% 13,500 30.0% Haweii 6,740 2,240 33.2% 13,500 30.0% Idaho 9,330 3,530 37.8% 1,990 21.4% Illinois 124,860 46,050 36.9% 3,470 15.5% Iowa 11,370 4,540 39.9% 1,830 15.5% Kansas 15,540 5,730 36.9% 3,170 20.4% Kentocky 7,220 3,540 49.1% 1,830 25.4% Morine 1,570 670 42.5% * * * Masicalpait 5,160 49.90 19.8%							
Connecticut 36,680 17,020 46,4% 5,130 14.0% Deloware 3,830 1,590 41,5% 850 22,1% D.C. 3,900 1,550 39.9% 730 18,6% Florida 251,350 67,830 27.0% 51,120 20.3% Georgia 44,940 14,450 32.2% 13,500 30.0% Hawaii 6,740 2,240 33.2% 350 5.2% Ideho 9,330 3,530 37.8% 1,990 21.4% Illinois 124,860 46,050 36.9% 18,830 15.5% Iowa 11,370 4,540 39.9% 1,850 16.3% Kantocky 7,220 3,540 49.1% 1,830 25.4% Louisiana 8,040 * * 2,210 27.5% Maine 1,570 670 42.5% * * * Marine 1,520 39.280 69.5% 2,240							
Deleware 3.830 1,590 41.5% 850 22.1% D.C. 3,900 1,550 39.9% 730 18.6% Florida 251,350 67,830 27.0% 51,120 20.3% Georgia 44,940 14,450 32.2% 13,500 30.0% Hawaii 6,740 2,240 33.2% 350 5.2% Idaho 9,330 3,530 37.8% 1,990 21.4% Illinois 124,860 46,050 36.9% 18.830 15.1% Iowa 11,370 4,540 39.9% 1,850 16.3% Kentucky 7,220 3,540 49.1% 1,830 25.4% Iovisinan 8,040 * * 2,210 22.75% Marine 1,570 670 42.5% * * * Maryland 25,160 4,990 19.8% 7,580 30.1% Michigan 25,020 9,870 39.4% 2,740							
D.C. 3,900 1,550 39,9% 730 18,6% Florida 251,350 67,830 27,0% 51,120 20.3% Georgia 44,940 14,450 32,2% 13,500 30.0% Howaii 6,740 2,240 33,2% 350 5.2% Idaho 9,330 3,530 37,8% 1,990 21,4% Illinois 124,860 46,050 36,9% 18,830 15,1% Indiana 22,550 8,920 39,6% 3,170 20,4% Kansas 15,540 5,730 36,9% 3,170 20,4% Kansas 15,540 5,730 36,9% 3,170 20,4% Kantas 1,570 670 42,5% * * * Maine 1,570 670 42,5% 2,240 4,3% Michigan 25,160 4,990 19,8% 7,580 30,1% Massachusetts 52,180 36,280 69,5% 2,240<							
Florida 251,350 67,830 27.0% 51,120 20.3% Georgia 44,940 14,450 32.2% 13,500 30.0% Idaha 9,330 3,530 37.8% 1990 21.4% Illinois 124,860 46,050 36.9% 18,830 15.5% Iowa 11,370 4,540 39.9% 3,850 16.3% Kensas 15,540 5,730 36.9% 3,170 20.4% Kentucky 7,220 3,540 49.1% 1,830 25.4% Louisiana 8,040 * * 2,210 2,75% Maripend 25,160 4,990 19.8% 7,580 30.1% Michigan 25,020 9,870 39.4% 2,740 1.0% Minesota 14,030 5,010 35.7% 2,380 19.8% Mississipi 3,920 9,110 23.2% 7,910 20.1% Mississipi 3,920 3,946 34.660 12.0% </td <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>							
Georgia 44,940 14,450 32,2% 13,500 30,0% Howaii 6,740 2,240 33,2% 350 5,2% Idaho 9,330 3,530 37,8% 1,990 21,4% Illinois 124,860 46,050 36,9% 18,830 15,1% Indiana 22,550 8,920 39,6% 3,490 15,5% Iowa 11,370 4,540 39,9% 1,850 16,3% Kensos 15,540 5,730 36,9% 3,170 20,4% Kentucky 7,220 3,540 49,1% 1,830 25,4% Louisiana 8,040 * * 2,210 2,75% Maire 1,570 670 42,5% * * * Maryland 25,180 36,280 69,5% 2,240 4,3% Minesota 14,030 5,010 35,7% 2,380 17,0% Mississippi 3,990 * * 1,400							
Hawaii 6,740 2,240 33.2% 350 5.2% Idaho 9,330 3,530 37.8% 1,990 21.4% Illinois 124,860 46,050 36.9% 18,830 15.1% Indiana 22,550 8,920 39.6% 3,490 15.5% Iowa 11,370 4,540 39.9% 1,810 15.5% Kansas 15,540 5,730 36.9% 3,170 20.4% Kantucky 7,220 3,540 49.1% 1,830 25.4% Louisiana 8,040 * * 2,210 2.7.5% Marine 1,570 670 42.5% * * Maryland 25,160 4,990 19.8% 7,580 30.1% Michigan 25,020 9,870 39.4% 2,740 11.0% Missouri 11,990 4,650 38.8% 2,380 19.8% Montana 1,850 730 39.8% 260 14.2%							
Idaho 9,330 3,530 37.8% 1,990 21.4% Illinois 124,860 46,050 36.9% 18,830 15.1% Indiana 22,550 8,920 39.6% 3,490 15.5% Iowa 11,370 4,540 39.9% 1,850 16.3% Kansos 15,540 5,730 36.9% 3,170 20.4% Kansos 15,540 5,730 36.9% 3,170 20.4% Kantucky 7,220 3,540 49.1% 1,830 25.4% Iouisiana 8,040 * * 2,210 27.5% Maire 1,570 670 42.5% * * * Maryland 25,160 4,990 19.8% 7,800 30.1% Missouri 11,990 4,650 38.8% 2,380 17.0% Missouri 11,990 4,650 38.8% 2,380 17.6% Nevada 39,290 9,110 23.2% 7,910	-						
Illinois 124,860 46,050 36,9% 18,830 15,1% Indiana 22,550 8,920 39,6% 3,490 15,5% Iowa 11,370 4,540 39,9% 1,850 15,5% Kansas 15,540 5,730 36,9% 3,170 20,4% Kentucky 7,220 3,540 49,1% 1,830 25,4% Louisiana 8,040 * * 2,210 2,75% Maine 1,570 670 42,5% * * Maryland 25,160 4,990 19,8% 7,580 30,1% Massachusetts 52,180 36,280 69,5% 2,240 4,3% Michigan 25,020 9,870 39,4% 2,740 11.0% Minsissippi 3,990 * * 1,400 35,0% Missisipi 3,920 9,110 23,2% 1,8130 17,6% Newada 39,290 9,110 23,2% 7,910 2							
Indiana 22,550 8,920 39.6% 3,490 15.5% Iowa 11,370 4,540 39.9% 1,850 16.3% Kansas 15,540 5,730 36.9% 3,170 20.4% Kentucky 7,220 3,540 49.1% 1,830 25.4% Louisiana 8,040 * * 2,210 27.5% Maine 1,570 670 42.5% * * Maine 1,570 670 42.5% * * Mainesota 1,570 670 42.5% 2,240 4.3% Michigan 25,020 9,870 39.4% 2,740 11.0% Minesota 14,030 5,010 35.7% 2,380 17.0% Missisippi 3,990 * * 1,400 35.0% Mesouri 1,1990 4,650 38.8% 2,380 17.0% Nebraska 10,370 3,960 38.2% 1,830 17.6% <t< td=""><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></t<>							
Iowa 11,370 4,540 39.9% 1,850 16.3% Kansas 15,540 5,730 36.9% 3,170 20.4% kentucky 7,220 3,540 49.1% 1,830 25.4% Louisiana 8,040 * * 2,210 27.5% Marine 1,570 670 42.5% * * Maryland 25,160 4.990 19.8% 7,580 30.1% Massachusetts 52,180 36,280 69.5% 2,240 4.3% Michigan 25,020 9,870 39.4% 2,740 11.0% Missisopi 3,990 * * 1,400 35.0% Missisopi 3,990 * * 1,400 35.0% Missisopi 3,990 * * 1,400 35.0% Netraska 10,370 3,660 38.8% 2,380 17.6% Newda 39,290 9,110 23.2% 7910 20.1%							
Kansas 15,540 5,730 36,9% 3,170 20.4% Kentucky 7,220 3,540 49.1% 1,830 25.4% Louisiana 8,040 * * 2,210 27.5% Marine 1,570 670 42.5% * * Maryland 25,160 4,990 19.8% 7,580 30.1% Massachusetts 52,180 36,280 69.5% 2,240 4.3% Michigan 25,020 9,870 39.4% 2,740 11.0% Minnesota 14,030 5,010 35.7% 2,380 17.0% Missouri 11,990 4,650 38.8% 2,380 18.8% Montana 1,850 730 39.6% 260 14.2% Nebraska 10,370 3,960 38.2% 1,830 17.6% New Hampshire 2,270 790 34.8% 400 17.8% New Mexico 65,110 25,210 38.7% 2,130							
Kentucky 7,220 3,540 49.1% 1,830 25.4% Louisiana 8,040 * * 2,210 27.5% Maine 1,570 670 42.5% * * Maryland 25,160 4,990 19.8% 7,580 30.1% Massachusetts 52,180 36,280 69.5% 2,240 4.3% Michigan 25,020 9,870 39.4% 2,740 11.0% Minnesota 14,030 5,010 35.7% 2,380 17.0% Mississippi 3,990 * * 1,400 35.0% Missisori 11,990 4,650 38.8% 2,380 17.0% Montana 1,850 730 39.8% 260 14.2% New Ada 10,370 3,960 38.2% 1,830 17.6% Nevada 39,290 9,110 23.2% 7910 20.1% New Hampshire 2,270 790 34.8% 400 17.8							
Louisiana 8,040 * * * 2,210 27.5% Marine 1,570 670 42.5% * * * Maryland 25,160 36,280 69.5% 2,240 4.3% Michigan 25,020 9,870 39.4% 2,740 11.0% Minensota 14,030 5,010 35.7% 2,380 17.0% Mississippi 3,990 * * 14.00 35.0% Mississippi 3,990 * * 14.00 35.0% Mississippi 3,990 * * 14.00 35.0% Montana 1,850 730 39.8% 260 14.2% Nebraska 10,370 3,960 38.2% 1830 17.6% New Hampshire 2,270 790 34.8% 400 17.8% New Hompshire 2,270 790 34.8% 400 17.8% New Mexico 65,110 25,210 38.7% <td< td=""><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></td<>							
Maine 1,570 670 42.5% * * Maryland 25,160 4,990 19.8% 7,580 30.1% Massachusetts 52,180 36,280 69.5% 2,240 4.3% Michigan 25,020 9,870 39.4% 2,740 11.0% Minesota 14,030 5,010 35.7% 2,380 17.0% Mississippi 3,990 * * 1,400 35.0% Missouri 11,990 4,650 38.8% 2,380 19.8% Montana 1,850 730 39.8% 260 14.2% Nebraska 10,370 3,960 38.2% 1,830 17.6% New dar 39,290 9,110 23.2% 7910 20.1% New darska 10,370 3,960 38.2% 1,830 17.6% New darska 400 17.8% 400 17.8% 18.6% New Jersey 118,820 42,380 35.7% 22,130			*	*			
Maryland 25,160 4,990 19.8% 7,580 30.1% Massachusetts 52,180 36,280 69.5% 2,240 4.3% Michigan 25,020 9,870 39.4% 2,740 11.0% Minnesota 14,030 5,010 35.7% 2,380 17.7% Mississippi 3,990 * * 1,400 35.0% Missisouri 11,990 4,650 38.8% 2,380 19.8% Montana 1,850 730 39.8% 260 14.2% Nebraska 10,370 3,960 38.2% 1,830 17.6% Nevada 39,290 9,110 23.2% 7,910 20.1% New Hampshire 2,270 790 34.8% 400 17.8% New Mexico 65,110 25,210 38.7% 9,190 14.1% New Mexico 65,110 25,210 38.7% 33,390 15.3% Ohio 22,090 8,680 39.3% <t< td=""><td></td><td></td><td>670</td><td>12 5%</td><td>*</td><td>×</td></t<>			670	12 5%	*	×	
Massachusetts 52,180 36,280 69,5% 2,240 4.3% Michigan 25,020 9,870 39,4% 2,740 11.0% Minnesota 14,030 5,010 35.7% 2,380 17.0% Mississippi 3,990 * * 1,400 35.0% Mississippi 3,990 * * 1,400 35.0% Mississippi 3,990 * * 1,400 35.0% Mississippi 11,990 4,650 38.8% 2,380 19.8% Montana 1,850 730 39.8% 260 14.2% Nebraska 10,370 3,960 38.2% 1,830 17.6% New data 39,290 9,110 23.2% 7,910 20.1% New Hampshire 2,270 790 34.8% 400 17.8% New Mexico 65,110 25,210 38.7% 9,190 14.1% New York 288,920 13,820 35.5% 12,64					7580	30.1%	
Michigan 25,020 9,870 39.4% 2,740 11.0% Minnesota 14,030 5,010 35.7% 2,380 17.0% Mississippi 3,990 * * 1,400 35.0% Missouri 11,990 4,650 38.8% 2,380 19.8% Montana 1,850 730 39.8% 260 14.2% Nebraska 10,370 3,960 38.2% 1,830 17.6% Newda 39,290 9,110 23.2% 7,910 20.1% New dampshire 2,270 790 34.8% 400 17.8% New Hampshire 2,270 790 38.7% 9,190 14.1% New Harsey 118,820 42,380 55.7% 22,130 18.6% New Horse 288,920 154,360 53.4% 34,660 12.0% North Dakota 830 500 60.6% * * Ohio 22,090 8,680 39.3% 3,390							
Minnesota 14,030 5,010 35.7% 2,380 17.0% Mississippi 3,990 * * * 1,400 35.0% Mississippi 3,990 * * * 1,400 35.0% Mississippi 11,990 4,650 38.8% 2,380 19.8% Montana 1,850 730 39.8% 260 14.2% Nebraska 10,370 3,960 38.2% 1,830 17.6% Nevada 39,290 9,110 23.2% 7,910 20.1% New Hampshire 2,270 790 34.8% 400 17.8% New Jersey 118,820 42,380 35.7% 22,130 18.6% New Mexico 65,110 25,210 38.7% 9,190 14.1% New York 288,920 154,360 53.4% 34,660 12.0% North Carolina 38,920 13,820 35.5% 12,640 32.5% Ohio 22,090 8,8							
Mississippi 3,990 * * 1,400 35.0% Missouri 11,990 4,650 38.8% 2,380 19.8% Montana 1,850 730 39.8% 260 14.2% Nebraska 10,370 3,960 38.2% 1,830 17.6% Nevada 39,290 9,110 23.2% 7,910 20.1% New Hampshire 2,270 790 34.8% 400 17.8% New Jersey 118,820 42,380 35.7% 22,130 18.6% New Mexico 65,110 25,210 38.7% 9,190 14.1% New York 288,920 154,360 53.4% 34,660 12.0% North Carolina 38,920 13,820 35.5% 12,640 32.5% North Dakota 830 500 60.6% * * Ohio 22,090 8,680 39.3% 3,390 15.3% Oklahoma 19,490 8,370 43.0% 4,	-						
Missouri 11,990 4,650 38.8% 2,380 19.8% Montana 1,850 730 39.8% 260 14.2% Nebraska 10,370 39,60 38.2% 1,830 17.6% Nevada 39,290 9,110 23.2% 7,910 20.1% New Hampshire 2,270 790 34.8% 400 17.8% New Jersey 118,820 42,380 35.7% 22,130 18.6% New Mexico 65,110 25,210 38.7% 9,190 14.1% New York 288,920 154,360 53.4% 34,660 12.0% North Carolina 38,920 13,820 35.5% 12,640 32.5% North Dakota 830 500 6.6% * * * Ohio 22,090 8,680 39.3% 3,390 15.3% Oktahoma 19,490 8,370 43.0% 4,240 21.7% Oregon 27,840 12,460 44			*	*			
Montana 1,850 730 39.8% 260 14.2% Nebraska 10,370 3,960 38.2% 1,830 17.6% Nevada 39,290 9,110 23.2% 7,910 20.1% New Hampshire 2,270 790 34.8% 400 17.8% New Hampshire 2,270 790 38.7% 22,130 18.6% New Jersey 118,820 42,380 35.7% 22,130 18.6% New Mexico 65,110 25,210 38.7% 9,190 14.1% New York 288,920 154,360 53.4% 34,660 12.0% North Dakota 830 500 60.6% * * * Ohio 22,090 8,680 39.3% 3,390 15.3% 0hio 22,090 8,680 39.3% 4,240 21.7% Oregon 27,840 12,460 44.7% 7,250 26.0% Pennsylvania 60,200 31,110 51.7% 6			1650	38.8%			
Nebraska 10,370 3,960 38.2% 1,830 17.6% Nevada 39,290 9,110 23.2% 7,910 20.1% New Hampshire 2,270 790 34.8% 400 17.8% New Jersey 118,820 42,380 35.7% 22,130 18.6% New Mexico 65,110 25,210 38.7% 9,190 14.1% New York 288,920 154,360 53.4% 34,660 12.0% North Carolina 38,920 13,820 35.5% 12,640 32.5% North Dakota 830 500 60.6% * * Ohio 22,090 8,680 39.3% 3,390 15.3% Oklahoma 19,490 8,370 43.0% 4,240 21.7% Oregon 27,840 12,460 44.7% 7,250 26.0% Pennsylvania 60,200 31,110 51.7% 6,040 10.0% Rhode Island 11,400 6,450 1,620							
Nevada 39,290 9,110 23.2% 7,910 20.1% New Hampshire 2,270 790 34.8% 400 17.8% New Jersey 118,820 42,380 35.7% 22,130 18.6% New Mexico 65,110 25,210 38.7% 9,190 14.1% New York 288,920 154,360 53.4% 34,660 12.0% North Carolina 38,920 13,820 35.5% 12,640 32.5% North Dakota 830 500 60.6% * * Ohio 22,090 8,680 39.3% 3,390 15.3% Oklahoma 19,490 8,370 43.0% 4,240 21.7% Oregon 27,840 12,460 44.7% 7,250 26.0% Pennsylvania 60,200 31,110 51.7% 6,040 10.0% South Carolina 6,950 1,990 28.6% 2,120 30.5% South Carolina 1,370 440 3							
New Hampshire 2,270 790 34.8% 400 17.8% New Jersey 118,820 42,380 35.7% 22,130 18.6% New Mexico 65,110 25,210 38.7% 9,190 14.1% New York 288,920 154,360 53.4% 34,660 12.0% North Carolina 38,920 13,820 35.5% 12,640 32.5% North Dakota 830 500 60.6% * * Ohio 22,090 8,680 39.3% 3,390 15.3% Oklahoma 19,490 8,370 43.0% 4,240 21.7% Oregon 27,840 12,460 44.7% 7,250 26.0% Pennsylvania 60,200 31,110 51.7% 6,040 10.0% Rhode Island 11,400 6,420 56.4% 1,620 14.2% South Carolina 6,950 1,990 28.6% 2,120 30.5% South Dakota 1,370 440 <							
New Jersey 118,820 42,380 35.7% 22,130 18.6% New Mexico 65,110 25,210 38.7% 9,190 14.1% New York 288,920 154,360 53.4% 34,660 12.0% North Carolina 38,920 13,820 35.5% 12,640 32.5% North Dakota 830 500 60.6% * * Ohio 22,090 8,680 39.3% 3,390 15.3% Oklahoma 19,490 8,370 43.0% 4,240 21.7% Oregon 27,840 12,460 44.7% 7,250 26.0% Pennsylvania 60,200 31,110 51.7% 6,040 10.0% Rhode Island 11,400 6,420 56.4% 1,620 14.2% South Carolina 6,950 1,990 28.6% 2,120 30.5% South Carolina 6,950 1,990 28.6% 2,120 30.5% South Carolina 1,3,430 266,930 </td <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>							
New Mexico 65,110 25,210 38.7% 9,190 14.1% New York 288,920 154,360 53.4% 34,660 12.0% North Carolina 38,920 13,820 35.5% 12,640 32.5% North Dakota 830 500 60.6% * * Ohio 22,090 8,680 39.3% 3,390 15.3% Oklahoma 19,490 8,370 43.0% 4,240 21.7% Oregon 27,840 12,460 44.7% 7,250 26.0% Pennsylvania 60,200 31,110 51.7% 6,040 10.0% Rhode Island 11,400 6,420 56.4% 1,620 14.2% South Carolina 6,950 1,990 28.6% 2,120 30.5% South Dakota 1,370 440 32.3% 270 19.7% Tennessee 15,830 5,120 32.4% 4,360 27.5% Texas 713,430 266,930 37.							
New York 288,920 154,360 53.4% 34,660 12.0% North Carolina 38,920 13,820 35.5% 12,640 32.5% North Dakota 830 500 60.6% * * Ohio 22,090 8,680 39.3% 3,390 15.3% Oklahoma 19,490 8,370 43.0% 4,240 21.7% Oregon 27,840 12,460 44.7% 7,250 26.0% Pennsylvania 60,200 31,110 51.7% 6,040 10.0% Rhode Island 11,400 6,420 56.4% 1,620 14.2% South Carolina 6,950 1,990 28.6% 2,120 30.5% South Dakota 1,370 440 32.3% 270 19.7% Tennessee 15,830 5,120 32.4% 4,360 27.5% Texas 713,430 266,930 37.4% 162,260 22.7% Utah 19,610 4,090 20.8% <td>,</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>	,						
North Carolina 38,920 13,820 35.5% 12,640 32.5% North Dakota 830 500 60.6% * * Ohio 22,090 8,680 39.3% 3,390 15.3% Oklahoma 19,490 8,370 43.0% 4,240 21.7% Oregon 27,840 12,460 44.7% 7,250 26.0% Pennsylvania 60,200 31,110 51.7% 6,040 10.0% Rhode Island 11,400 6,420 56.4% 1,620 14.2% South Carolina 6,950 1,990 28.6% 2,120 30.5% South Dakota 1,370 440 32.3% 270 19.7% Tennessee 15,830 5,120 32.4% 4,360 27.5% Texas 713,430 266,930 37.4% 162,260 22.7% Utah 19,610 4,090 20.8% 4,180 21.3% Vermont * * * * </td <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>							
North Dakota83050060.6%**Ohio22,0908,68039.3%3,39015.3%Oklahoma19,4908,37043.0%4,24021.7%Oregon27,84012,46044.7%7,25026.0%Pennsylvania60,20031,11051.7%6,04010.0%Rhode Island11,4006,42056.4%1,62014.2%South Carolina6,9501,99028.6%2,12030.5%South Carolina1,37044032.3%27019.7%Tennessee15,8305,12032.4%4,36027.5%Texas713,430266,93037.4%162,26022.7%Utah19,6104,09020.8%4,18021.3%Vermont*****Wisgonia26,7405,33019.9%6,41024.0%West Virginia*****Wisconsin26,04011,61044.6%3,30012.7%							
Ohio22,0908,68039.3%3,39015.3%Oklahoma19,4908,37043.0%4,24021.7%Oregon27,84012,46044.7%7,25026.0%Pennsylvania60,20031,11051.7%6,04010.0%Rhode Island11,4006,42056.4%1,62014.2%South Carolina6,9501,99028.6%2,12030.5%South Carolina1,37044032.3%27019.7%Tennessee15,8305,12032.4%4,36027.5%Texas713,430266,93037.4%162,26022.7%Utah19,6104,09020.8%4,18021.3%Vermont*****Virginia26,7405,33019.9%6,41024.0%West Virginia*****Wisconsin26,04011,61044.6%3,30012.7%					*	*	
Oklahoma 19,490 8,370 43.0% 4,240 21.7% Oregon 27,840 12,460 44.7% 7,250 26.0% Pennsylvania 60,200 31,110 51.7% 6,040 10.0% Rhode Island 11,400 6,420 56.4% 1,620 14.2% South Carolina 6,950 1,990 28.6% 2,120 30.5% South Dakota 1,370 440 32.3% 270 19.7% Tennessee 15,830 5,120 32.4% 4,360 27.5% Texas 713,430 266,930 37.4% 162,260 22.7% Utah 19,610 4,090 20.8% 4,180 21.3% Vermont * * * * * Virginia 26,740 5,330 19.9% 6,410 24.0% Washington 40,060 17,790 44.4% 7,500 18.7% West Virginia * * * *					3,390	15.3%	
Oregon27,84012,46044.7%7,25026.0%Pennsylvania60,20031,11051.7%6,04010.0%Rhode Island11,4006,42056.4%1,62014.2%South Carolina6,9501,99028.6%2,12030.5%South Carolina1,37044032.3%27019.7%Tennessee15,8305,12032.4%4,36027.5%Texas713,430266,93037.4%162,26022.7%Utah19,6104,09020.8%4,18021.3%Vermont*****Virginia26,7405,33019.9%6,41024.0%West Virginia*****Wisconsin26,04011,61044.6%3,30012.7%							
Pennsylvania 60,200 31,110 51.7% 6,040 10.0% Rhode Island 11,400 6,420 56.4% 1,620 14.2% South Carolina 6,950 1,990 28.6% 2,120 30.5% South Dakota 1,370 440 32.3% 270 19.7% Tennessee 15,830 5,120 32.4% 4,360 27.5% Texas 713,430 266,930 37.4% 162,260 22.7% Utah 19,610 4,090 20.8% 4,180 21.3% Vermont * * * * * Virginia 26,740 5,330 19.9% 6,410 24.0% Washington 40,060 17,790 44.4% 7,500 18.7% West Virginia * * * * * Wisconsin 26,040 11,610 44.6% 3,300 12.7%							
Rhode Island 11,400 6,420 56.4% 1,620 14.2% South Carolina 6,950 1,990 28.6% 2,120 30.5% South Dakota 1,370 440 32.3% 270 19.7% Tennessee 15,830 5,120 32.4% 4,360 27.5% Texas 713,430 266,930 37.4% 162,260 22.7% Utah 19,610 4,090 20.8% 4,180 21.3% Vermont * * * * * Virginia 26,740 5,330 19.9% 6,410 24.0% Washington 40,060 17,790 44.4% 7,500 18.7% West Virginia * * * * * Wisconsin 26,040 11,610 44.6% 3,300 12.7%	-						
South Carolina 6,950 1,990 28.6% 2,120 30.5% South Dakota 1,370 440 32.3% 270 19.7% Tennessee 15,830 5,120 32.4% 4,360 27.5% Texas 713,430 266,930 37.4% 162,260 22.7% Utah 19,610 4,090 20.8% 4,180 21.3% Vermont * * * * * Virginia 26,740 5,330 19.9% 6,410 24.0% Washington 40,060 17,790 44.4% 7,500 18.7% West Virginia * * * * * Wisconsin 26,040 11,610 44.6% 3,300 12.7%							
South Dakota 1,370 440 32.3% 270 19.7% Tennessee 15,830 5,120 32.4% 4,360 27.5% Texas 713,430 266,930 37.4% 162,260 22.7% Utah 19,610 4,090 20.8% 4,180 21.3% Vermont * * * * * Virginia 26,740 5,330 19.9% 6,410 24.0% Washington 40,060 17,790 44.4% 7,500 18.7% West Virginia * * * * * Wisconsin 26,040 11,610 44.6% 3,300 12.7%							
Tennessee 15,830 5,120 32.4% 4,360 27.5% Texas 713,430 266,930 37.4% 162,260 22.7% Utah 19,610 4,090 20.8% 4,180 21.3% Vermont * * * * * Virginia 26,740 5,330 19.9% 6,410 24.0% Washington 40,060 17,790 44.4% 7,500 18.7% West Virginia * * * * * Wisconsin 26,040 11,610 44.6% 3,300 12.7%							
Texas 713,430 266,930 37.4% 162,260 22.7% Utah 19,610 4,090 20.8% 4,180 21.3% Vermont * * * * * Virginia 26,740 5,330 19.9% 6,410 24.0% Washington 40,060 17,790 44.4% 7,500 18.7% West Virginia * * * * * Wisconsin 26,040 11,610 44.6% 3,300 12.7%							
Utah 19,610 4,090 20.8% 4,180 21.3% Vermont * * * * * Virginia 26,740 5,330 19.9% 6,410 24.0% Washington 40,060 17,790 44.4% 7,500 18.7% West Virginia * * * * * Wisconsin 26,040 11,610 44.6% 3,300 12.7%							
Vermont * * * * Virginia 26,740 5,330 19.9% 6,410 24.0% Washington 40,060 17,790 44.4% 7,500 18.7% West Virginia * * * * * Wisconsin 26,040 11,610 44.6% 3,300 12.7%							
Virginia 26,740 5,330 19.9% 6,410 24.0% Washington 40,060 17,790 44.4% 7,500 18.7% West Virginia * * * * * Wisconsin 26,040 11,610 44.6% 3,300 12.7%		*	*	*	*	*	
Washington 40,060 17,790 44.4% 7,500 18.7% West Virginia * <td></td> <td>26,740</td> <td>5,330</td> <td>19.9%</td> <td>6,410</td> <td>24.0%</td>		26,740	5,330	19.9%	6,410	24.0%	
West Virginia * * * * Wisconsin 26,040 11,610 44.6% 3,300 12.7%							
Wisconsin 26,040 11,610 44.6% 3,300 12.7%		*	*	*	*	*	
	U U	26,040	11,610	44.6%	3,300	12.7%	
vvyoming 2,780 690 24.8% 370 13.2%	Wyoming	2,780	690	24.8%	370	13.2%	
U.S. Total** 3,448,470 1,373,310 39.8% 640,040 18.6%			1,373,310		640,040		

Table 7. Latinos with Chronic Lung Disease, by State

Source: Estimates for Families USA by The Lewin Group. See the methodology for details.

* Data are not reportable due to sample size.

State	Total Number	Individuals Who Rely on Medicaid		Individuals Who Are Uninsured	
		Number	Percent	Number	Percent
Alabama	11,110	1,490	13.4%	2,500	22.5%
Alaska	3,510	510	14.5%	480	13.8%
Arizona	244,880	54,040	22.1%	46,160	18.9%
Arkansas	10,650	1,050	9.9%	2,680	25.2%
California	1,686,600	447,510	26.5%	308,300	18.3%
Colorado	105,250	24,050	22.9%	19,890	18.9%
Connecticut	51,650	14,480	28.0%	7,430	14.4%
Delaware	5,890	1,540	26.2%	1,310	22.2%
D.C.	8,140	2,240	27.5%	1,600	19.7%
Florida	697,960	126,910	18.2%	128,270	18.4%
Georgia	63,880	7,240	11.3%	22,980	36.0%
Hawaii	11,150	1,820	16.3%	950	8.5%
Idaho	12,790	2,270	17.8%	2,890	22.6%
Illinois	176,050	25,640	14.6%	31,520	17.9%
Indiana	27,750	2,150	7.8%	4,110	14.8%
lowa	11,850	2,240	18.9%	2,540	21.4%
Kansas	21,290	3,200	15.1%	4,710	22.1%
Kentucky	8,680	1,410	16.3%	2,810	32.4%
Louisiana	21,440	500		5,070	23.6%
Maine	2,120	500	23.5%	15.070	
Maryland	49,450	4,370	8.8%	15,070	30.5%
Massachusetts	61,120	33,300	54.5%	2,900	4.7%
Michigan	45,740	7,150	15.6%	4,980	10.9%
Minnesota	16,170	2,860	17.7%	2,930	18.1%
Mississippi Missouri	7,560 16,680	1 750	10.5%	2,310	30.6% 22.4%
Montana	2,890	1,750 500	17.3%	3,740 280	9.7%
Nebraska	13,020	2,140	16.5%	2,210	16.9%
Nevada	62,100	6,950	11.2%	11,390	18.3%
New Hampshire	3,260	620	19.0%	720	22.2%
New Jersey	192,530	40,440	21.0%	35,600	18.5%
New Mexico	140,830	30,140	21.4%	17,140	12.2%
New York	489,150	192,010	39.3%	57,920	11.8%
North Carolina	51,180	5,850	11.4%	21,490	42.0%
North Dakota	790	190	24.5%	*	*
Ohio	31,860	5,900	18.5%	3,570	11.2%
Oklahoma	30,050	6,490	21.6%	9,590	31.9%
Oregon	33,220	5,420	16.3%	11,820	35.6%
Pennsylvania	73,360	26,890	36.7%	7,380	10.1%
Rhode Island	13,160	5,600	42.6%	2,200	16.7%
South Carolina	16,210	3,100	19.1%	4,210	25.9%
South Dakota	2,220	300	13.4%	440	19.7%
Tennessee	22,750	3,100	13.6%	6,510	28.6%
Texas	1,390,800	282,080	20.3%	315,840	22.7%
Utah	28,740	3,050	10.6%	5,980	20.8%
Vermont	*	*	*	*	*
Virginia	49,600	3,620	7.3%	12,460	25.1%
Washington	61,350	15,610	25.4%	15,460	25.2%
West Virginia	*	*	*	*	*
Wisconsin	33,450	10,060	30.1%	4,410	13.2%
Wyoming	5,220	380	7.2%	640	12.3%
U.S. Total * *	6,131,260	1,421,450	23.2%	1,176,240	1 9.2 %

Table 8. Latinos with Heart Disease or Stroke, by State

* Data are not reportable due to sample size.

Discussion

Communities at Risk: Blacks and Latinos Are Besieged by Chronic Diseases

The critical role that Medicaid coverage plays in the black and Latino communities must be understood within the context of the persistent disparities in health and health care that these groups struggle with every day. Blacks and Latinos are more likely than whites to have many chronic and serious conditions, such as those profiled in this report, and they are also more likely to get sicker from the same diseases.⁶

While there are many causes for these disparities, one important factor is that blacks and Latinos are more likely to have low incomes. People with low incomes are more likely to have poorer health, even when educational levels and health behaviors are taken into account.⁷ There are many reasons for this: Low-income people often have greater exposure to occupational and environmental health hazards, the stresses of being poor exact a physical toll, and their health coverage is frequently sporadic.⁸ In addition, lowincome people are more likely to live in neighborhoods with limited access to the healthy foods that are recommended to prevent and manage many of the conditions covered in this report at an affordable price.⁹ Given the concentration of blacks and Latinos in poor neighborhoods, these social determinants have a disproportionate impact on these groups, fueling health disparities.

The lack of health insurance can also contribute to poorer health outcomes for blacks and Latinos: In 2010, 20.8 percent of blacks and 30.7 percent of Latinos did not have insurance, compared to 11.7 percent of whites.¹⁰ When diseases like cancer, diabetes, asthma, and heart disease aren't detected early and managed appropriately, poor outcomes—like complications and even untimely death—are harder to prevent. In fact, serious racial and ethnic disparities have been documented for each category of health conditions studied in this report. For example:

Cancer: Compared with white men, black men are 50 percent more likely to be diagnosed with prostate cancer and 2.4 times as likely to die from it. Black women are 36 percent more likely to be diagnosed with cervical cancer than white women and more than twice as likely to die from it. While Latinos overall have a slightly lower risk of getting cancer than whites, they are twice as likely to have liver cancer and 80 percent more likely to die from it. Latinas are roughly 1.5 times as likely as white women to be diagnosed with and die from cervical cancer. ^{11,12}

- Diabetes: Black adults are more than twice as likely as white adults to be diagnosed with diabetes.¹³ In 2006, blacks were also more than twice as likely as whites to end up with amputations,¹⁴ to suffer kidney failure,¹⁵ and to die¹⁶ as a result of poorly managed diabetes. Compared to whites, Latinos are 55 percent more likely to report having diabetes.¹⁷ In 2006, they were roughly 70 percent more likely to have kidney failure caused by diabetes¹⁸ and 50 percent more likely to die from complications of diabetes ¹⁹ compared to whites.
- Chronic Lung Diseases: Blacks are 35 percent more likely than whites to have asthma,²⁰ and in 2006, they were more than three times as likely to die due to asthma.²¹ While Latinos have an overall lower rate of asthma than whites, Puerto Ricans are significantly more likely to suffer from asthma: One in six has been diagnosed with asthma—a rate that is more than twice that of whites.²² In addition, in 2003, Puerto Ricans were four times as likely to die due to asthma as whites.²³ The disparities in asthma rates among children are even greater than the disparities among these groups overall. Black children are 78 percent more likely than white children to have asthma. And, while asthma rates for Latino children are lower than they are for white children, they are 2.2 times higher for Puerto Rican children.²⁴
- Heart Disease and Stroke: Blacks are 50 percent more likely than whites to report having had a stroke²⁵ and about 30 percent more likely to die from heart disease.²⁶ And while Latinos overall have lower rates of heart disease and stroke than whites, Mexican American women are 20 percent more likely than white women to have high blood pressure.²⁷

These grim statistics paint a picture of two communities that are besieged by serious chronic diseases and that have a great need for access to high-quality health care to survive.

Medicaid Helps Blacks and Latinos Get the Care They Need

Millions of blacks and Latinos with serious health care needs rely on Medicaid for their health coverage, making it possible for them to get the care they need. People with Medicaid have better access to health care than do the uninsured. A recent study that used a randomized, controlled design—the gold standard in medical research—found that, compared to the uninsured, people with Medicaid had better access to outpatient and hospital care and prescription drugs.²⁸ They were also more likely to have a regular source of care.²⁹ For people with serious health care needs, having access to care and having a regular source of care can improve health and lower rates of costly, and sometimes deadly, complications, or it can keep a disease from progressing.

- Uninsured adults with cancer have poorer outcomes and die sooner than those with insurance.³⁰
- Adults with diabetes who have health insurance and a regular source of care are much more likely to receive all the recommended preventive services than people with diabetes who do not have insurance or a regular source of care.³¹ And higher use of recommended screenings among seniors with diabetes is associated with reduced rates of hospitalization.³²
- Children with asthma who have access to a primary care doctor are more likely to get asthma-controlling medications and to have fewer asthma-associated emergency room visits.³³
- Insured people with hypertension who have a regular source of care are more likely to be aware of their condition, to receive treatment, and to have their hypertension controlled than those without insurance.³⁴ Treating and controlling hypertension reduces the risk of stroke, coronary heart disease, congestive heart failure, and premature death.³⁵

Medicaid Enables Low-Income Seniors and People with Disabilities To Get the Care They Need through Medicare

Most black and Latino seniors with Medicaid also have Medicare coverage. Likewise, some of the adults in Medicaid who are under the age of 65 and who have a disability may also qualify for Medicare. People with both Medicare and Medicaid, who are referred to as "dual eligibles," generally have greater health care needs and lower incomes than those who are covered by either program alone.³⁶

The standard premium for Medicare's outpatient insurance, Medicare Part B, is \$1,385 a year.³⁷ Patients may also have to pay 20 percent of the cost of doctor visits.³⁸ And the deductible for a hospital stay is \$1,132.³⁹

Most people with Medicare purchase Medicare supplemental policies to help cover these out-of-pocket costs. It would be nearly impossible for a very low-income person with a serious medical condition to be able to afford all the premiums, cost-sharing, and deductibles that are associated with Medicare without the help of Medicaid. Such a person would also be very unlikely to be able to afford a Medicare supplemental policy. By helping cover cost-sharing and premiums, Medicaid makes it possible for residents to get the care they need through Medicare.

The Medicaid Program: A State-Federal Partnership That Is of Vital Importance to Communities of Color

Medicaid is the national health insurance program for low-income people. It is jointly funded by states and the federal government through a unique partnership. Each state administers its own Medicaid program, building on minimum requirements set by the federal government. Every state must cover certain low-income children, pregnant women, parents with dependent children, and seniors and people with disabilities. States may—but do not have to—cover childless adults. In addition to covering certain groups, states must also provide Medicaid enrollees with a set of basic health care benefits. States have broad authority to expand their programs and to determine what kinds of services will be covered and how those services will be delivered.

The federal government "matches" every dollar that states invest in Medicaid according to a formula that varies depending on the state's per capita income. This formula is designed to provide lower-income states with proportionally more support. On average, for every dollar states put into their Medicaid programs, the federal government puts in \$1.60.* When state Medicaid expenditures go up or down, the federal contribution does as well. This federal matching structure makes it easier for state Medicaid programs to cover more people if they need it, such as during tough economic times, or when health crises or natural disasters strike. Without a guaranteed federal match that moves in tandem with state spending, states would have more difficulty operating their Medicaid programs in hard times, making Medicaid a much less reliable health care safety net.

Cuts to Medicaid, whether at the state or federal level, would mean the loss of essential health care for people of color who rely on Medicaid, including millions of blacks and Latinos with serious health care needs. Proportionally, cuts to the program have a much wider and deeper impact on the black and Latino communities than on whites because a significantly higher share of these communities depends on the Medicaid lifeline, including roughly half of all black and Latino children.

^{*} Families USA calculation of the average federal Medicaid match for the 50 states and the District of Columbia in fiscal year 2011 based on data from the Kaiser Family Foundation's State Health Facts online, available online at http://statehealthfacts.org/comparetable.jsp?typ=2&ind=184&cat=4&sub=47.

Cutting Medicaid: A Bad Idea

• Cutting Medicaid Would Put Blacks and Latinos with Serious Health Care Needs At Risk and Increase Racial and Ethnic Health Inequality

Cuts to the Medicaid program would put blacks and Latinos with serious health care needs at risk—at risk of not being able to get the care they need when they need it, at risk of incurring higher medical costs when they do get care, at risk of getting sicker, and even at risk of dying prematurely.

It's easy to understand how cutting Medicaid eligibility would mean that many blacks and Latinos with serious illnesses like diabetes would lose coverage and not be able to afford medical care. But even reducing benefits or passing more out-of-pocket costs on to patients can affect their ability to get the care they need.

When states increase Medicaid cost-sharing or reduce benefits, people who depend on the program report having difficulties getting the care they need. When one state increased its Medicaid cost-sharing by adding sliding-scale premiums and other outof-pocket costs, 31 percent of the adults who were enrolled in Medicaid lost their coverage entirely, and another 15 percent reported experiencing disruptions in their care. Those who lost coverage had greater unmet health care needs, including an inability to get needed medications.⁴⁰ For those with serious medical conditions such as those profiled in this report, unmet medical needs can carry a high price—both physically and financially.

Given the high burden of serious conditions in the black and Latino communities, as well as these communities' reliance on Medicaid as their lifeline for necessary care, an increase in unmet medical needs will very likely result in increasing racial and ethnic health disparities and widening inequality.

Cutting Medicaid Shifts Costs—It Doesn't Reduce Them

While cutting Medicaid might offer some short-term savings for government budgets, there is a clear human cost. Moreover, it does not reduce overall health care costs in the long term—it merely shifts costs to other health care consumers, who often end up paying higher premiums to cover a share of the cost of care that is provided to the uninsured.

Cutting Medicaid does not make anyone's health care needs go away: The people with heart disease and diabetes who lose Medicaid coverage will still need to fill the same prescriptions, those with cancer will still need treatment, and those with chronic lung disease will still need medication so that they can breathe more easily. Cutting Medicaid just shifts the cost of care to the people who had depended on the program and who suddenly find themselves uninsured. Without insurance, they will not be able to afford much of the care they need. Critical cancer treatments may be delayed. Manageable health problems may deteriorate and ultimately lead to costly emergency room visits and hospitalizations that could have been prevented.⁴¹ These treatment costs will be higher when those who've lost coverage finally do get care. Often, a portion of those costs goes unpaid.

Even at public hospitals and other safety net providers, the uninsured may receive substantial bills for their medical care.⁴² For the low-income uninsured, paying those bills can be impossible. To make up for the cost of this uncompensated care, hospitals and doctors charge insurers more for services that are provided to patients with health coverage. Insurers then pass those costs on by charging higher premiums to consumers and to businesses that purchase health insurance. It is estimated that, in 2008, family coverage cost \$1,017 more because of higher premium charges that resulted from insurers passing along the costs of uncompensated care.⁴³

Cutting Medicaid Would Hurt the Economic Futures of Blacks and Latinos

Because Medicaid is such an important lifeline for a significant proportion of black and Latino families, the impact of Medicaid cuts on these communities extends far beyond the effects on the individuals who will end up with no way to get care, and even beyond the higher premiums that families that do have insurance will have to pay. Medicaid cuts will have a disproportionate economic effect on already struggling black and Latino communities and on their futures.

Cutting Children's Opportunities Short

Children who lose Medicaid coverage pay the price not only in terms of going without needed health care, but also in terms of facing limitations on their future opportunities. Currently, roughly half of all black and Latino children rely on Medicaid to get the care they need to stay healthy and thrive—from getting vaccinations to seeing a doctor when they are sick to paying for necessary medication. Children with health insurance are generally healthier throughout their childhood and into their teens.⁴⁴ Better health correlates with better school performance and greater success later in life.⁴⁵ For children without health insurance, health problems may interfere with school performance, which, in turn, may result in fewer employment opportunities as an adult.

For children with serious health conditions like asthma, losing insurance can have very serious consequences. Asthma is a leading cause of school absences. In 2008 alone, children with asthma missed 10.5 million school days.⁴⁶ With regular medical care and medication, persistent asthma can be managed.⁴⁷ However, when children lose Medicaid coverage, they often lose their regular source of medical care. That can lead to more frequent asthma-related school absences and poorer school performance, which can ultimately affect overall educational attainment and employment opportunities.⁴⁸ Losing Medicaid can also mean that these children have a greater likelihood of dying from what is a highly manageable disease. Asthma is just one example of how losing health coverage can interfere with education, limit employment opportunities, and even cut futures short. The same holds true for a host of other childhood diseases. Governments that cut Medicaid may save money today, but such cuts will come at a substantial cost to children and their futures, especially in black and Latino communities.

Lost Worker Productivity

Many people with Medicaid work.⁴⁹ For them, having access to medical care leads to better health, which can mean fewer days lost from work, better job performance, and higher productivity.

For the diseases profiled in this report, there are many ways that access to health care can improve people's health and work productivity. Diabetes management is just one example. Appropriate management of diabetes can reduce the incidence of vascular disease (also called hardening of the arteries), a complication that is associated with an increase in missed work days and lost productivity.⁵⁰ However, a person needs access to medical care to manage diabetes optimally.⁵¹ For more than 1 million blacks and Latinos with diabetes, Medicaid makes that possible. Having Medicaid can mean that workers with diabetes are healthier and have fewer complications. This is especially important for blacks, who have a higher risk for disabling diabetes complications such as kidney failure and leg amputations, and for Latinos, who also have a higher risk of kidney failure.

Pushing People into Debt and Hurting Communities

When people lose Medicaid coverage, they are more likely to incur medical debt.⁵² The burden of medical debt is particularly hard on those with serious health care needs.

Medical debt is a leading cause of bankruptcies and home foreclosures.⁵³ But even if they don't go as far as declaring bankruptcy, people with medical debt must often make gut-wrenching decisions about the basic necessities: They may be forced to delay making rent or utility payments, may accumulate credit card debt, or may be unable to pay for food.⁵⁴ Low-income people who lose Medicaid, especially those with serious health care needs, can quickly reach the point where they have to make these tough choices—choices that have an effect on communities as well. When more individuals in a community miss paying bills, accumulate debt, and curtail spending, it is a drag on local economies.

Cutting Medicaid would hurt black and Latino communities in other ways, too. The federal Medicaid matching funds that flow into states represent new money that generates economic activity and creates jobs. Cuts at either the state or federal level would reduce the federal dollars that flow into states, and that would place jobs at risk. The black and Latino communities are already struggling with unemployment rates that are significantly higher than whites,⁵⁵ and they can't afford to lose even more jobs.

The Affordable Care Act: More Help Is on the Way for Blacks and Latinos

As this report shows, many blacks and Latinos rely on Medicaid. Unfortunately, under current rules, not everyone who is low-income is eligible for the program. Income eligibility levels for adults in some states can often be quite low; the median eligibility level for parents is 64 percent of the federal poverty level (about \$14,000 for a family of four in 2011). These very low eligibility levels exclude many parents from Medicaid, even if their children do qualify for coverage. Furthermore, in most states, an adult with no dependent children can literally be penniless and not qualify for Medicaid.

In addition, lower-income individuals are less likely to have an offer of job-based health coverage than higher-income individuals, and they are less likely to be able to afford the high cost of coverage in the individual health insurance market. As a result, millions of low-income Americans, including a disproportionate share of lowincome Latinos and black Americans, remain uninsured.

Fortunately, in 2014, the Affordable Care Act will provide affordable, quality coverage to millions of currently uninsured Americans. The new law extends coverage through two provisions: an expansion of the Medicaid program, and new premium tax credits that will be available to help families pay for the cost of coverage in the new health insurance exchanges.

Beginning in 2014, all state Medicaid programs will cover people with incomes at or below 133 percent of poverty (about \$30,000 for a family of four in 2011), whether or not they have dependent children, as long as they are citizens or have been legally present in the United States for five years or more.⁵⁶ For the first three years, the federal government will pay for all of the associated costs for those who are newly eligible for Medicaid. The percentage that the federal government covers will gradually decline until, by 2019, the federal government will pay 90 percent of these costs and states will pay 10 percent.

In addition, robust new premium tax credits will be available to people with incomes between 134 and 400 percent of poverty (between about \$30,000 and \$90,000 for a family of four in 2011). These new tax credits have a few important advantages over many other tax credits: They will be available at the time the person enrolls in a plan (no need to wait until he or she files a tax return to get the help), and people who don't owe taxes will still be able to receive the tax credit. Because blacks and Latinos tend to have lower incomes relative to the U.S. average, these two provisions will have an enormous impact on helping them afford coverage. In particular, the provisions will help those who work and have no offer of coverage from an employer, and they will help those who've lost a job and lost their health insurance too. For blacks and Latinos with serious health care needs, the Affordable Care Act will extend a lifeline of insurance coverage that many lack today.

- In the black community, the uninsured include:
 - One out of every 13 (7.5 percent of) blacks with cancer, or more than 48,000 people (Table 1 on page 4);
 - More than one in 10 (10.3 percent of) blacks with diabetes, or nearly 330,000 people (Table 2 on page 5);
 - One in nine (11.6 percent of) blacks with chronic lung disease, or more than 446,000 people (Table 3 on page 6); and
 - One in nine (11.6 percent of) blacks with heart disease or stroke, or more than 1.0 million people (Table 4 on page 7).
- In the Latino community, the situation is even more grim, with the uninsured including:
 - Nearly one in seven (13.9 percent of) Latinos who have cancer, or nearly 60,000 people (Table 5 on page 8);
 - Nearly one in five (19.2 percent of) Latinos who have diabetes, or more than 520,000 people (Table 6 on page 9);
 - Nearly one in five (18.6 percent of) Latinos with chronic lung disease, or approximately 640,000 people (Table 7 on page 10); and
 - Nearly one in five (19.2 percent of) Latinos who have heart disease or stroke, or nearly 1.2 million people (Table 8 on page 11).

The Medicaid expansion and the premium tax credits in the Affordable Care Act could literally be lifesavers for millions of blacks and Latinos who are uninsured and who have serious health conditions.

Conclusion

Medicaid is a critically important source of health coverage for a significant share of blacks and Latinos who would otherwise have no access to the health care they need. The Medicaid lifeline is even more crucial for the millions of blacks and Latinos with serious health care needs who rely on the program to treat and manage their potentially lifethreatening conditions. For children, not only can that mean better performance in school and greater success later in life, but it can also mean the difference between having a bright future and having no future at all. For workers, that can mean not only better job performance, but the ability to stay in the workforce and provide for their families. For everyone with Medicaid, it can mean a chance at leading a longer, healthier life.

Blacks and Latinos are already struggling with disproportionately higher rates of serious and chronic diseases, complications, poor health outcomes, and lack of insurance. Medicaid has been the saving grace for these communities, especially for the one in every two black and Latino children who depends on it for access to care. Cuts to Medicaid would yank this lifeline away from those who most need it.

Cuts would even affect those in the black and Latino communities who don't directly rely on the program. For example, an increase in the amount of uncompensated care (a likely consequence of a rise in the number of uninsured) would translate into higher premiums for those with health insurance. Lost worker productivity, worse performance in school for sick children who can't get the care they need, and more medical debt would all be byproducts of cutting Medicaid—byproducts that would be a drag on the economy, and, more importantly, that would threaten the future of these communities.

Medicaid is vital to all the black and Latino people it covers, but its benefits are particularly clear to people with conditions like cancer, heart disease, diabetes, and chronic lung disease who need ongoing medical care. Unfortunately, because of current limits on Medicaid eligibility, millions of low-income blacks and Latinos with serious health care needs remain uninsured. The Affordable Care Act will expand Medicaid eligibility in 2014, and that will give many of these individuals an opportunity to get Medicaid and to afford the care they need. The law will also provide tax credits to help low- and middle-income families afford health insurance. Because the black and Latino communities have lower incomes and are more likely to be uninsured, they potentially have the most to gain from these provisions.

Keeping Medicaid intact and fully implementing the Affordable Care Act are clearly important to low-income black and Latino people with serious health care needs—but they're vitally important to the larger black and Latino communities as well.

Endnotes

¹ Health disparities among Asian and Pacific Islander Americans and American Indians have also been well documented. Unfortunately, we could not include those groups in this report because data for them are not widely reportable, especially at the state level.

² Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, *CDC Health Disparities and Inequality Report—United States, 2011* (Atlanta: Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 2011), available online at http://www.cdc.gov/mmwr/pdf/other/su6001.pdf; National Cancer Institute, *SEER Cancer Statistics Review, 1975-2007* (Bethesda, MD: National Cancer Institute, 2010), available online at http://seer.cancer.gov/csr/1975_2007/results_single/sect_01_table.20_2pgs.pdf; and National Center for Health Statistics, *Asthma Prevalence, Health Care Use, and Mortality: United States, 2005-2009* (Hyattsville, MD: National Center for Health Statistics, January 12, 2011).

³ Carmen DeNavas-Walt, Bernadette D. Proctor, and Jessica C. Smith, *Income, Poverty, and Health Insurance Coverage in the United States: 2010* (Washington: U.S. Census Bureau, September 2011), available online at http://www.census.gov/prod/2011pubs/p60-239.pdf. Median income for blacks is \$32,100, and for Latinos it is \$37,800, compared to \$54,600 for whites.

⁴ Ibid.

⁵ For this analysis, The Lewin Group took national Medical Expenditure Panel Survey (MEPS) data to the state level by running a logistic regression to U.S. Census Bureau Current Population Survey (CPS) data. Because the CPS provides a conservative estimate of Medicaid enrollment compared to other estimates, such as those that use data from the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services Medicaid Statistical Information System (MSIS), these disease-specific estimates for Medicaid are conservative.

⁶ Kaiser Family Foundation, Key Facts: Race, Ethnicity, and Medical Care (Washington: Kaiser Family Foundation, 2007).

⁷ Paula Lantz et al., "Socioeconomic Factors, Health, Behaviors, and Mortality," *JAMA* 279, no. 21 (1998): 1,703-1,708; Anne Case and Christina Paxson, "Children's Health and Social Mobility," *The Future of Children* 16, no. 2 (2006): 151-173.

⁸ Paula Lantz et al., op. cit.; Ann Case and Christina Paxson, op. cit.; G. W. Evans and P. Kim, "Childhood Poverty and Health: Cumulative Risk Exposure and Stress Dysregulation," *Psychological Science* 18, no. 11 (November 2007): 953-957.

⁹ Robert Wood Johnson Foundation Commission to Build a Healthier America, *Where We Live Matters for Our Health: Neighborhoods and Health* (Princeton, NJ: Robert Wood Johnson Foundation, May 2011), available online at <u>http://www.rwjf.org/files/research/sdohseries2011neighborhood.pdf</u>.

¹⁰ Carmen DeNavas-Walt, Bernadette D. Proctor, and Jessica C. Smith, op. cit.

¹¹ Cancer rates for 2004-2008 were calculated by Families USA using the Fast Stats table creator from National Cancer Institute, *SEER Cancer Statistics Review, 1975-2008* (Bethesda, MD: National Cancer Institute, 2010). For these data, "blacks" includes Hispanic blacks.

¹² National Cancer Institute, SEER Cancer Statistics Review, 1975-2007, op. cit., Table 1.20

¹³ National Center for Health Statistics, *Health, United States, 2010: With Special Feature on Death and Dying,* Table 50 (Hyattsville, MD: Department of Health and Human Services, 2011), available online at http://www.cdc.gov/nchs/data/hus/hus10.pdf.

¹⁴ Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, *Age-Adjusted Hospital Discharge Rates for Non-Traumatic Lower Extremity Amputation per 1,000 Diabetic Population, by Race, United States, 1988–2006* (Atlanta: Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 2011), available online at <u>http://www.cdc.gov/diabetes/statistics/lea/fig6.htm</u>. Data for blacks and whites include Hispanics of those races. Data cited are for 2006.

¹⁵ Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, *Age-Adjusted Incidence of End-Stage Renal Disease Related to Diabetes Mellitus (ESRD-DM) per 100,000 Diabetic Population, by Race/Ethnicity and Sex, United States, 1980–2006* (Atlanta: Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 2011), available online at <u>http://www.cdc.gov/diabetes/statistics/esrd/fig5.htm</u>. Data for blacks and whites includes Hispanics of those races. Data cited are for 2006.

¹⁶ National Center for Health Statistics, *Deaths: Final Data for 2006*, Table 17 (Hyattsville, MD: National Center for Health Statistics, April 17 2009), available online at <u>http://www.cdc.gov/nchs/data/nvsr/nvsr57_14.pdf</u>.

¹⁷ Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, *Summary Health Statistics for U.S. Adults: National Health Interview Survey, 2008*, Table 8 (Atlanta: Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 2011), available online at <u>http://www.cdc.gov/nchs/data/series/</u> <u>sr 10/sr10_242.pdf</u>.

¹⁸ Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, *Age-Adjusted Incidence of End-Stage Renal Disease Related to Diabetes Mellitus* (ESRD-DM) per 100,000 Diabetic Population, by Race/Ethnicity and Sex, United States, 1980–2006, op. cit.

¹⁹ National Center for Health Statistics, *Deaths: Final Data for 2006*, op. cit.

²⁰ National Center for Health Statistics, Asthma Prevalence, Health Care Use, and Mortality: United States, 2005-2009, op. cit.

²¹ National Center for Health Statistics, *Deaths: Final Data for 2006*, op. cit.

²² National Center for Health Statistics, Asthma Prevalence, Health Care Use, and Mortality: United States, 2005-2009, op. cit.

²³ Lara Akinbami, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, *Asthma Prevalence, Health Care Use and Mortality: United States,* 2003-05 (Atlanta: Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 2010), available online at <u>http://www.cdc.gov/nchs/data/</u> <u>hestat/asthma03-05/asthma03-05.htm</u>.

²⁴ Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, *CDC Health Disparities and Inequality Report—United States*, 2011, op. cit. Supplement Table: Prevalence of Current Asthma among Children and Adults, by Sex, Race/Ethnicity, and Poverty Level—United States, National Health Interview Survey, 2006-2008, available online at <u>http://www.cdc.gov/mmwr/pdf/other/su6001.pdf</u>.

²⁵ National Center for Health Statistics, *Summary Health Statistics for U.S. Adults: National Health Interview Survey, 2009*, Table 2 (Hyattsville, MD: National Center for Health Statistics, 2010), available online at http://www.cdc.gov/nchs/data/series/sr_10/sr10_249.pdf.

²⁶ National Center for Health Statistics, *National Vital Statistics Reports*, Table 17 (Hyattsville, MD: National Center for Health Statistics, 2010), available online at <u>http://www.cdc.gov/nchs/data/nvsr/nvsr58/nvsr58_19.pdf</u>.

²⁷ National Center for Health Statistics, *Health, United States, 2009 with Special Feature on Medical Technology*, Table 68 (Hyattsville, MD: National Center for Health Statistics, 2011), available online at http://www.cdc.gov/nchs/data/hus/hus09.pdf.

²⁸ Amy Finkelstein et al., *The Oregon Health Insurance Experiment: Evidence from the First Year*, July 7, 2011, available online at <u>http://econ-www.mit.edu/files/6796</u>.

29 Ibid.

³⁰ Institute of Medicine, Committee on Health Insurance Status and Its Consequences, *America's Uninsured Crisis: Consequences for Health and Health Care* (Washington: National Academies Press, 2009).

³¹ Jennifer DeVoe, "Usual Source of Care as a Health Insurance Substitute for U.S. Adults with Diabetes?" *Diabetes Care* 32, no. 6 (June 2009): 983-989.

³² Frank Sloan et al., "Adherence to Guidelines and Its Effect on Hospitalizations with Complications of Type 2 Diabetes," *The Review of Diabetic Studies* 1, no. 1 (2004): 29-38.

³³ Sharon Smith et al., "Relationship between Pediatric Primary Provider Visits and Acute Asthma ED Visits," *Pediatric Pulmonology* 42, no. 11 (2007): 1,041-1,047.

³⁴ Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, "Vital Signs: Prevalence, Treatment, and Control of Hypertension—United States, 1999-2002 and 2005-2008," *Morbidity and Mortality Weekly* 60, no. 4 (February 4, 2011): 103-108; Erica Spatz et al., "Beyond Insurance Coverage: Usual Source of Care in the Treatment of Hypertension and Hypercholesterolemia, Data from the 2003-2006 National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey," *American Health Journal* 160, no. 1 (July 2010): 115-121.

³⁵ Thomas J. Wang et al., "Contemporary Reviews in Cardiovascular Medicine: Epidemiology of Uncontrolled Hypertension in the United States," *Circulation* 112, no. 11 (2005): 1,651-1,662.

³⁶ Kaiser Commission on Medicaid and the Uninsured, *Dual Eligibles: Medicaid's Role for Low-Income Medicare Beneficiaries* (Washington: Kaiser Family Foundation, May 2011), available online at http://www.kff.org/medicaid/upload/4091-08.pdf.

³⁷ Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, *Medicare and You, 2011* (Washington: Department of Health and Human Services, 2011).

³⁸ Ibid. The 20 percent cost-sharing applies to individuals in the original Medicare program. The amount is based on Medicare-approved charges and applies to physicians who accept Medicare. Patients in Medicare Advantage plans may have different cost-sharing.

³⁹ Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, op. cit.

⁴⁰ Matthew Carlson, "Short-Term Impacts of Coverage Loss in a Medical Population: Early Results from a Prospective Cohort Study of the Oregon Health Plan," *Annals of Family Medicine* 4, no. 5 (September/October 2006): 391-398.

⁴¹ A. Bindman et al., "Interruptions in Medicaid Coverage and Risk for Hospitalization for Ambulatory Care-Sensitive Conditions," *Annals of Internal Medicine* 149, no. 12 (2008): 854-860.

⁴² John Billings and Robin Weinick, *Monitoring the Health Care Safety Net, Book 1: A Data Book for Metropolitan Areas* (Washington: Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality and the Health Resources and Services Administration, August 2003).

⁴³ Kathleen Stoll and Kim Bailey, Hidden Health Tax: Americans Pay a Premium (Washington: Families USA, May 2009).

⁴⁴ Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, *Insurekidsnow.gov*, available online at http://www.insurekidsnow.gov/qa/index. html, accessed on July 21, 2011.

⁴⁵ Anne Case and Christina Paxson, op. cit.

⁴⁶ Lara J. Akinbami, Jeanne E. Moorman, and Xiang Liu, "Asthma Prevalence, Health Care Use, and Mortality: United States, 2005-2009," *National Health Statistics Reports* no. 32 (January 12, 2011): 1-15; see also Sheniz Moonie et al., "The Relationship between School Absence, Academic Performance, and Asthma Status," *Journal of School Health* 78, no. 3 (March 2008): 140-148.

⁴⁷ Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality, "Table 4.1. Dimensions of Asthma Care Management," *Asthma Care Quality Improvement: Resource Guide*, available online at <u>http://www.ahrq.gov/qual/asthmacare/asthmatab4_1.htm</u>, accessed on July 22, 2011.

⁴⁸ Anne Case and Christina Paxson, op. cit.

⁴⁹ Kaiser Commission on Medicaid and the Uninsured, *Medicaid: A Primer, 2010* (Menlo Park, CA: Kaiser Family Foundation, June 2010).

⁵⁰ Managing blood glucose can reduce the incidence of macrovacsular disease, a type of vascular disease that affects the large blood vessels. Coronary artery disease is an example of macrovascular disease. C. Stettler et al., "Glycemic Control and Macrovascular Disease in Types 1 and 2 Diabetes Mellitus: Meta-Analysis of Randomized Trials," *American Heart Journal* 152, no. 1 (July 2006): 27-38; Alex Z. Fu et al., "Health Care and Productivity Costs Associated with Diabetic Patients with Macrovascular Comorbid Conditions," *Diabetes Care* 32, no. 12 (December 2009): 2,187-2,192, available online at http://care. diabetesjournals.org/content/32/12/2187.full. This study focuses on the productivity losses and economic costs associated with macrovascular disease.

⁵¹ Patients need access to medical care and must be able to work with a health professional to optimally manage blood glucose. American Diabetes Association, "Third Party Reimbursement for Diabetes Care, Self-Management Education, and Supplies," *Diabetes Care* 34, Supplement 1 (January 2010): S87-S88; M. K. Rhee et al., "Limited Access to Health Care Impairs Glycemic Control in Low Income Urban Blacks with Type 2 Diabetes," *Journal of Healthcare for the Poor and Underserved* 16, no. 4 (November 2005): 734-746.

⁵² Amy Finkelstein et al., op. cit.

⁵³ David Himmelstein et al., "Medical Bankruptcy in the United States, 2007: Results of a National Study," *The American Journal of Medicine* 122, no. 8 (June 2009): 741-746; Christopher Tarver et al., "Get Sick, Get Out: The Medical Causes of Home Mortgage Foreclosures," *Health Matrix* 18, no.1 (Winter 2008): 65-105.

⁵⁴ Sara Collins et al., *Losing Ground: How the Loss of Adequate Health Insurance Is Burdening Working Families* (New York: The Commonwealth Fund, August 2008).

⁵⁵ U.S. Census Bureau, *Statistical Abstract of the United States: 2011*, Table 626, "Unemployed and Unemployment Rates by Educational Attainment, Sex, Race, and Hispanic Origin: 1992 to 2009," available online at <u>http://www.census.gov/compendia/statab/2011/tables/11s0626.pdf</u>.

⁵⁶ Under the Affordable Care Act, individuals with a modified adjusted gross income that is at or below 133 percent of the federal poverty level will be eligible for Medicaid. Adjusted gross income is based on the Internal Revenue Code definition, modified to disregard 5 percent of income, which essentially increases income eligibility to 138 percent of poverty.

Acknowledgments

This report was written by:

Sinsi Hernández-Cancio Director, Health Equity

with

Kim Bailey Senior Health Policy Analyst and Dee Mahan Director, Medicaid Advocacy

The following Families USA staff assisted in the preparation of this report:

Ron Pollack, Executive Director Kathleen Stoll, Deputy Executive Director, Director, Health Policy Sherice Perry, Program Manager, Health Equity Peggy Denker, Director, Publications Ingrid VanTuinen, Deputy Director, Publications Nancy Magill, Senior Graphic Designer Amaerican Diabetes Association www.diabetes.org

American Lung Association www.LungUSA.org

> Families USA www.familiesusa.org

Joint Center for Political and Economic Studies www.jointcenter.org

National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) www.naacp.org

National Council of La Raza (NCLR) www.nclr.org

National Medical Association www.nmanet.org

National Urban League Policy Institute www.nul.org/content/national-urban-league-policy-institute

Medicaid: A Lifeline for Blacks and Latinos with Serious Health Care Needs © October 2011 by Families USA

This publication is available online at www.familiesusa.org.

A complete list of Families USA publications is available online at www.familiesusa.org/resources/publications.