Utah Medicaid Gap Analysis

February 2014

INTRODUCTION

In 2010, the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (ACA) called for the expansion of Medicaid coverage to certain low income adults. In a 2012 US Supreme Court ruling the Medicaid expansion became an optional element of the new law. The result was that some individuals that do not qualify for Medicaid will be left without premium subsidies as well unless individual states elect to expand their Medicaid programs. These individuals who make too much to qualify for Medicaid but too little to qualify for insurance premium subsidies have been referred to as the Medicaid "gap".

Voices for Utah Children asked Notalys, LLC, an economic research and data intelligence firm, to estimate the number of individuals in the Medicaid gap in each legislative district in Utah. Notalys utilized population data from the American Community Survey (ACS) 5-year estimates compiled by the U.S. Census Bureau to arrive at these estimations. While several intricacies of the Medicaid eligibility and ACA subsidy rules cannot be exactly represented with existing and available data sources, Notalys has taken extreme care to represent the statistical ranges for each estimate and outline the possible limitations of this study.

Main Findings

The results of this analysis are a district by district estimate for the total number of people who are likely to be affected by the Medicaid gap if Medicaid is not expanded in the state of Utah. These numbers are presented in terms of the total count of individuals in the district who fall into the gap and in terms of the percentage of all adults 18-64 within the district who fall into the gap. The following sections provides some descriptive statistics as well as a list of the top ten and bottom ten districts in terms of percent of all adults. The top ten are districts that will be most affected, the bottom ten are districts that will be least affected by the gap.

Utah State House of Representatives

House Descriptive Statistics

	Adjusted Uninsured Gap Total*	Adjusted Uninsured Gap %**
Mean	771	3.51%
Median	616	2.86%
Minimum	132	0.72%
Maximum	3119	12.87%

*Notes: *The "adjusted uninsured gap total" is the estimated total number of people who are in the Medicaid gap income range and who are currently uninsured. **The "adjusted uninsured gap %" is the percentage of the total 18-64 adult population who is both uninsured and in the gap income range.*

Medicaid Gap Top 10 District (Percentage of Total Adult 18-64 Population)

Top 10

Rank	District	Representative	% in Gap
1	26	Angela Romero (D)	12.9%
2	23	Jennifer Seelig (D)	9.7%
3	33	Craig Hall (R)	7.4%
4	75	Don Ipson (R)	7.2%
5	10	Dixon Pitcher (R)	7.2%
6	64	Rebecca D. Lockhart (R)	6.8%
7	73	Michael Noel (R)	6.7%
8	4	Edward Redd (R)	6.6%
9	35	Mark A. Wheatley (D)	6.6%
10	9	Jeremy Peterson (R)	6.4%

*Notes: *The "adjusted uninsured gap %" is the percentage of the total 18-64 adult population who is both uninsured and in the gap income range.*

Medicaid Gap Bottom 10 District (Percentage of Total Adult 18-64 Population)

Rank	District	Representative	Adjusted Uninsured Gap %*
75	2	David Lifferth (R)	0.7%
74	18	Roger Barrus (R)	0.8%
73	27	Michael Kennedy (R)	0.9%
72	51	Gregory Hughes (R)	1.0%
71	15	Brad Wilson (R)	1.0%
70	41	Daniel McCay (R)	1.2%
69	36	Patrice Arent (D)	1.2%
68	52	John Knotwell (R)	1.3%
67	32	LaVar Christensen (R)	1.3%
66	66	Mike McKell (R)	1.3%

*Notes: *The "adjusted uninsured gap %" is the percentage of the total 18-64 adult population who is both uninsured and in the gap income range.*

Utah State Senate

Senate Descriptive Statistics

	Adjusted Uninsured Gap Total*	Adjusted Uninsured Gap %**
Mean	1995	3.52%
Median	1945	3.53%
Minimum	485	1.01%
Maximum	4441	7.71%

*Notes: *The "adjusted uninsured gap total" is the estimated total number of people who are in the Medicaid gap income range and who are currently uninsured. **The "adjusted uninsured gap %" is the percentage of the total 18-64 adult population who is both uninsured and in the gap income range.*

Medicaid Gap Top 10 District (Percentage of Total Adult 18-64 Population)

Top 10

Rank	District	Representative	% in Gap
1	1	Luz Robles (D)	7.7%
2	2	Jim Dabakis (D)	6.6%
3	3	Gene Davis (D)	5.8%
4	15	Margaret Dayton (R)	5.4%
5	5	Karen Mayne (D)	5.3%
6	16	Curt Bramble (R)	5.1%
7	18	Stuart Reid (R)	5.0%
8	28	Evan Vickers (R)	4.9%
9	24	Ralph Okerlund (R)	4.5%
10	29	Stephen H. Urquhart (R)	4.5%

*Notes: *The "adjusted uninsured gap %" is the percentage of the total 18-64 adult population who is both uninsured and in the gap income range.*

Medicaid Gap Bottom 10 District (Percentage of Total Adult 18-64 Population)

Rank	District	Senator	Adjusted Uninsured Gap %*
29	13	Mark B. Madsen (R)	1.0%
28	11	Howard A. Stephenson (R)	1.0%
27	10	Aaron Osmond (R)	1.5%
26	22	J. Stuart Adams (R)	1.5%
25	9	Wayne L. Niederhauser (R)	1.6%
24	14	John L. Valentine (R)	1.8%
23	17	Peter C. Knudson (R)	2.0%
22	4	Patricia W. Jones (D)	2.0%
67	20	Scott K. Jenkins (R)	2.1%
66	21	Jerry W. Stevenson (R)	2.5%

*Notes: *The "adjusted uninsured gap %" is the percentage of the total 18-64 adult population who is both uninsured and in the gap income range.*

METHODOLOGY

Notalys estimated the total number of people within the gap income range as well as the total number of uninsured individuals in the gap income range for each of the legislative districts in both chambers of the Utah State Legislature (see results section). The following describes the steps taken to reach these estimates.

For all steps the global population for this analysis is all adults ages 18 to 64 in the state of Utah for whom a poverty status is collected or imputed in the ACS. This population does slightly underestimate the total number of people living in the state. Specifically it does not include ineligible immigrants. The Kaiser adjustment in step 8 corrects for this function of the ACS data.

For all estimates, uncertainty resulting from the ACS data collection methodology is carried through using ACS recommended margin of error calculations. Margins of error are reported at the 95% confidence level.

Step 1 - ***Gathering Useful Data*****:** The ACS provides data on the total number of adults, the number of families with and without children, the proportion of uninsured individuals for various income ranges, and the number of adults in each of many different income brackets as measured by the income ratio to the federal poverty line. Each of these numbers and their associated margins of error (MOEs) for each legislative district were accessed from the ACS web service. These variables sum to create the global population for this study shown as "All adults 18-64" in the full results section.

Step 2 - ***Parental Status*****:** Dividing the total number of adults between 18 and 65 into parents and non-parents is an essential step due to the differences in current program eligibility rules for these two populations. The ACS provides counts for the number of adults in two parent homes, single parent male household homes, and single parent female household homes. The number of parents in each legislative district is calculated using the following equation:

Equation 1:

$$Total\ Parents = (2 \times tot.2\ parent\ families) + (tot.male\ single\ parent\ homes) + (tot.female\ single\ parent\ homes)$$

Step 3 - ***Poverty Ratio Adjustment***: The ACS reports counts of individuals at various income categories as a ratio of the federal poverty level (FPL). The lowest category accounts for those whose FPL ratio is less than .5, or 50% of FPL. Current Utah Medicaid rules allow for parents whose incomes are less than .45 of FPL to be eligible for coverage. Without correction our analysis would under report the number of people in the gap whose income we're between .45 and .49 of FPL. To correct for this underestimation, we added 10% of the parents in the bottom FPL income ratio category (<.5) to the next highest category (.5 to .74) so they count in the gap.

Step 4 - ***Statewide Proportions*****:** Once the number of parents in each district is calculated and adjustments are made to account for eligibility rules, the entire data set is converted into proportions of the global population described above. This step allows us to impute the number of individuals in the gap in each legislative district.

Step 5 - ***Overall Proportion***: For each district, we multiply the proportion that are in poverty and the proportion that are adults (calculated in steps 1 through 4) to calculate the proportion of the global population in the gap. These results are the "Total Gap Population" in the full results section.

Step 6 - ***Unadjusted Medicaid Gap Population***: Once step 5 is completed for each legislative district, the resulting proportions are converted back into counts by multiplying the entire dataset by the global population. These results are represented in the results section as "Total Gap Population". These values can be thought of as the total number of adults whose incomes would place them in the Medicaid gap for each district. This number does not account for insurance rates in the district.

Step 7 - ***Insurance Status Correction***: To reduce the raw estimate to only include the uninsured population a correction factor representing the uninsured population in each district is applied to the estimates in step 6. The ACS only reports the number of uninsured adults under 138% percent of the federal poverty level. We use this value to calculate an expected proportion of adults who are uninsured for each legislative district. We then discount the step 6 results by this proportion, to come up with the total number of uninsured adults in the Medicaid gap for each district. These estimates are found in the results section as "Unadjusted Uninsured Gap Total". The complement of these is the "Unadjusted Insured Gap Total", also reported in the results section.

Step 8 - ***Income Unit Correction***: The method in steps 1 through 7 ignores the complexity that arises due to the differences in the way program eligibilities are calculated and the way ACS data is collected. Specifically, it fails to properly connect adults into appropriate income units for program qualification purposes. As discussed below, accounting for these intricacies is an extraordinarily complex undertaking that could not be reasonably accomplished in this project. However, Kaiser Family Foundation has already accounted for these intricacies in their study of gap populations using Current Population Survey (CPS) data at the state level. To correct for the taxable unit problem, we convert our estimates from step 7 into proportions of the total Medicaid gap population and proportionally distribute the statewide Kaiser estimate amongst the districts. The resulting values are represented in the results section as "Adjusted Insured Gap Total" and "Adjusted Uninsured Gap Total".

ASSUMPTIONS AND LIMITATIONS OF ANALYSIS

As with any demographic study, our analysis requires certain assumptions in order to obtain estimates for the number of individuals in the Medicaid Gap for each legislative district. ACS data is useful because it pre-tabulates several variables of interest to this study at the legislative district level. However, the income categorizations for several variables do not exactly match eligibility rules and data collection methods may not exactly represent our population of interest. Access to micro data could improve our results. The Kaiser Family Foundation study tries to account for several factors such as complexities due to grouping adults into taxable health insurance units for eligibility purposes. We use the Kaiser study as a correction factor for our estimates.

For a full discussion of the Kaiser study and its limitations visit the Kaiser Family Foundation website below.

http://kff.org/health-reform/issue-brief/the-coverage-gap-uninsured-poor-adults-in-states-that-do-not-expand-medicaid/

FULL RESULTS

Utah State House of Representatives – Medicaid Gap Study Results

		All Adults 18-64		Total Gap Population		Unadjusted Insured Gap Total		Unadjusted Uninsured Gap Total		Adjusted Insured Gap Total		Adjusted Uninsured Gap Total*		Adjusted Uninsured Gap % **
District	Representative	Estimate	MOE	Estimate	MOE	Estimate	MOE	Estimate	MOE	Estimate	MOE	Estimate	MOE	Estimate
1	Ronda Menlove (R)	19772	± 556	1476	± 237	924	± 196	552	± 155	538	± 113	481	± 135	2.43%
2	David Lifferth (R)	18367	± 992	519	± 258	368	± 192	151	± 95	214	± 112	132	± 83	0.72%
3	Jack Draxler (R)	20861	± 868	1742	± 284	1229	± 232	513	± 143	716	± 134	447	± 124	2.14%
4	Edward Redd (R)	22891	± 977	6597	± 690	4852	± 608	1746	± 382	2827	± 346	1522	± 329	6.65%
5	R. Curt Webb (R)	19915	± 728	1273	± 207	864	± 185	410	± 138	503	± 107	357	± 120	1.79%
6	Jake Anderegg (R)	19459	± 1258	779	± 272	409	± 178	370	± 167	238	± 103	323	± 145	1.66%
7	Ryan Wilcox (R)	20969	± 981	1249	± 245	714	± 210	535	± 188	416	± 122	467	± 164	2.23%
8	Gage Froerer (R)	22882	± 1204	2321	± 388	1056	± 298	1266	± 320	615	± 173	1103	± 277	4.82%
9	Jeremy Peterson (R)	20690	± 1192	3093	± 438	1577	± 290	1516	± 283	919	± 167	1322	± 243	6.39%
10	Dixon Pitcher (R)	23466	± 1199	4243	± 506	2305	± 426	1938	± 399	1343	± 246	1689	± 344	7.20%
11	Brad Dee (R)	21914	± 1089	1208	± 283	716	± 234	492	± 199	417	± 136	429	± 173	1.96%
12	Richard Greenwood (R)	22033	± 1101	1048	± 275	535	± 243	513	± 240	311	± 141	447	± 209	2.03%
13	Paul Ray (R)	20629	± 1040	1035	± 271	618	± 198	417	± 158	360	± 115	364	± 137	1.76%
14	Curtis Oda (R)	19905	± 1086	1715	± 335	896	± 260	819	± 250	522	± 151	714	± 216	3.59%
15	Brad Wilson (R)	19749	± 997	545	± 215	318	± 167	227	± 141	185	± 97	198	± 123	1.00%
16	Stephen Handy (R)	24719	± 1289	1966	± 394	1139	± 315	827	± 274	664	± 183	721	± 237	2.92%
17	Stewart Barlow (R)	20413	± 970	1298	± 272	933	± 234	365	± 151	544	± 136	318	± 131	1.56%
18	Roger Barrus (R)	21362	± 906	744	± 196	536	± 159	208	± 90	313	± 92	181	± 78	0.85%
19	Jim Nielson (R)	20177	± 1027	1265	± 293	675	± 286	590	± 276	393	± 166	514	± 240	2.55%
20	Becky Edwards (R)	21812	± 1041	1284	± 301	729	± 226	556	± 197	425	± 131	484	± 171	2.22%
21	Douglas Sagers (R)	20611	± 781	1386	± 302	794	± 227	592	± 196	462	± 132	516	± 170	2.50%
22	Susan Duckworth (D)	22017	± 1286	1991	± 388	754	± 296	1237	± 352	439	± 172	1079	± 305	4.90%

NOTALYS, LLC
February 2014

23	Jennifer Seelig (D)	20938	± 1291	3715	± 552	1395	± 347	2320	± 443	813	± 201	2023	± 380	9.66%
24	Rebecca Chavez-Houck (D)	25782	± 1410	4740	± 609	3039	± 510	1700	± 394	1771	± 293	1482	± 340	5.75%
25	Joel Briscoe (D)	26498	± 1260	4719	± 574	3146	± 483	1573	± 352	1833	± 277	1372	± 303	5.18%
26	Angela Romero (D)	24244	± 1345	5808	± 600	2231	± 404	3577	± 496	1300	± 233	3119	± 421	12.87%
27	Michael Kennedy (R)	19104	± 1015	517	± 194	313	± 144	204	± 114	182	± 84	178	± 99	0.93%
28	Brian King (D)	24381	± 1266	1907	± 362	1400	± 311	507	± 188	816	± 180	442	± 164	1.81%
29	Lee Perry (R)	20374	± 889	924	± 191	586	± 166	338	± 134	341	± 96	295	± 116	1.45%
30	Janice Fisher (D)	22807	± 1264	2352	± 332	1072	± 305	1280	± 321	625	± 177	1116	± 277	4.89%
31	Larry Wiley (D)	22545	± 1270	2674	± 416	1230	± 340	1444	± 360	717	± 197	1259	± 311	5.58%
32	LaVar Christensen (R)	22190	± 1122	890	± 226	559	± 168	332	± 123	326	± 97	289	± 107	1.30%
33	Craig Hall (R)	23277	± 1423	3390	± 501	1422	± 400	1967	± 447	829	± 232	1715	± 386	7.37%
34	Johnny Anderson (R)	23423	± 1336	2725	± 432	1248	± 270	1477	± 298	727	± 156	1287	± 256	5.49%
35	Mark A. Wheatley (D)	22860	± 1338	4023	± 623	2281	± 428	1742	± 363	1329	± 247	1519	± 312	6.64%
36	Patrice Arent (D)	21387	± 1226	793	± 225	500	± 181	293	± 140	291	± 105	255	± 122	1.19%
37	Carol Spackman Moss (D)	22737	± 1381	1929	± 385	1266	± 318	663	± 234	737	± 184	578	± 203	2.54%
38	Eric Hutchings (R)	21060	± 1244	1554	± 315	830	± 210	724	± 193	483	± 122	631	± 167	3.00%
39	James Dunnigan (R)	22851	± 1169	1543	± 284	864	± 210	678	± 186	504	± 122	591	± 161	2.59%
40	Lynn Hemingway (D)	24751	± 1257	2398	± 428	1422	± 302	976	± 239	829	± 175	851	± 206	3.44%
41	Daniel McCay (R)	21522	± 1028	647	± 217	360	± 178	286	± 163	210	± 104	250	± 142	1.16%
42	Jim Bird (R)	21977	± 1253	979	± 268	584	± 231	395	± 199	340	± 135	344	± 173	1.57%
43	Earl Tanner (R)	23075	± 1140	1578	± 330	872	± 255	707	± 232	508	± 148	616	± 201	2.67%
44	Tim Cosgrove (D)	23876	± 1153	3109	± 464	1603	± 350	1506	± 340	934	± 202	1313	± 294	5.50%
45	Steve Eliason (R)	23356	± 1205	1371	± 301	988	± 235	383	± 125	576	± 136	334	± 108	1.43%
46	Marie Poulson (D)	22833	± 1214	1027	± 242	604	± 199	423	± 171	352	± 115	369	± 148	1.62%
47	Ken Ivory (R)	22280	± 1111	1665	± 326	827	± 235	838	± 236	482	± 136	731	± 205	3.28%
48	Keven Stratton (R)	21016	± 1424	3895	± 550	3047	± 505	849	± 290	1775	± 290	740	± 252	3.52%
49	Derek Brown (R)	22295	± 1027	868	± 218	520	± 161	348	± 129	303	± 94	304	± 112	1.36%
50	Rich Cunningham (R)	22396	± 1142	998	± 269	597	± 215	402	± 179	348	± 125	350	± 155	1.56%
51	Gregory Hughes (R)	19206	± 1233	758	± 302	546	± 236	212	± 125	318	± 137	184	± 108	0.96%
52	John Knotwell (R)	19008	± 1352	683	± 331	400	± 254	283	± 214	233	± 148	247	± 187	1.30%
53	Melvin Brown (R)	22108	± 837	1203	± 232	610	± 175	592	± 173	356	± 102	516	± 150	2.33%
54	Kraig Powell (R)	22081	± 838	1498	± 323	684	± 227	814	± 246	399	± 132	709	± 214	3.21%
55	John Mathis (R)	20667	± 485	1562	± 265	695	± 155	867	± 178	405	± 90	756	± 154	3.66%

56	Kay Christofferson (R)	18388	± 936	1247	± 273	680	± 204	567	± 186	396	± 118	495	± 161	2.69%
57	Brian Greene (R)	20253	± 1031	1252	± 287	813	± 245	439	± 188	474	± 142	383	± 163	1.89%
58	Jon Cox (R)	18378	± 483	2393	± 336	1422	± 277	971	± 236	828	± 160	847	± 204	4.61%
59	Val Peterson (R)	22140	± 1157	2560	± 376	1388	± 299	1172	± 278	809	± 173	1022	± 240	4.62%
60	Dana Layton (R)	21485	± 1284	3051	± 501	1578	± 363	1473	± 351	920	± 210	1285	± 303	5.98%
61	Keith Grover (R)	22748	± 1231	2894	± 436	1682	± 311	1212	± 257	980	± 179	1057	± 221	4.65%
62	Jon Stanard (R)	19172	± 1313	1978	± 506	1222	± 343	756	± 240	712	± 199	659	± 208	3.44%
63	Dean Sanpei (R)	27144	± 1329	14919	± 1086	13581	± 1028	1338	± 298	7913	± 560	1167	± 257	4.30%
64	Rebecca D. Lockhart (R)	24181	± 1337	4737	± 517	2839	± 429	1898	± 362	1654	± 246	1655	± 311	6.84%
65	Francis Gibson (R)	19321	± 1028	1025	± 246	676	± 187	349	± 125	394	± 108	305	± 109	1.58%
66	Mike McKell (R)	19885	± 972	1051	± 254	746	± 204	305	± 121	435	± 118	266	± 105	1.34%
67	Mark Roberts (R)	19682	± 1007	1404	± 272	825	± 211	579	± 177	481	± 122	505	± 154	2.57%
68	Merrill Nelson (R)	20129	± 843	1524	± 237	809	± 170	715	± 159	471	± 98	623	± 138	3.10%
69	Jerry Anderson (R)	20895	± 691	2156	± 266	1277	± 195	879	± 158	744	± 112	767	± 136	3.67%
70	Kay McIff (R)	19842	± 542	2299	± 325	1220	± 228	1079	± 214	711	± 132	941	± 184	4.74%
71	Bradley Last (R)	18921	± 1038	2078	± 323	1214	± 239	864	± 199	707	± 138	753	± 172	3.98%
72	John Westwood (R)	21763	± 681	3906	± 582	2537	± 455	1369	± 326	1478	± 262	1194	± 281	5.49%
73	Michael Noel (R)	19786	± 378	2970	± 276	1446	± 211	1524	± 216	842	± 121	1329	± 183	6.72%
74	V. Lowry Snow (R)	18833	± 1134	1361	± 326	745	± 235	617	± 212	434	± 136	538	± 184	2.86%
75	Don Ipson (R)	20482	± 1282	3609	± 593	1909	± 395	1701	± 368	1112	± 228	1483	± 317	7.24%

Notes: Unadjusted estimates are based solely on available ACS data. Adjusted estimates are the proportional allocation of the Kaiser estimates which take into consideration greater complexities described in step 8 of the methodology section. *The “adjusted uninsured gap total” is the estimated total number of people who are in the Medicaid gap income range and who are currently uninsured. **The “adjusted uninsured gap %” is the percentage of the total 18-64 adult population who is both uninsured and in the gap income range.

Utah State Senate – Medicaid Gap Study Results

		All Adults 18-64		Total Gap Population		Unadjusted Insured Gap Total		Unadjusted Uninsured Gap Total		Adjusted Insured Gap Total		Adjusted Uninsured Gap Total*		Adjusted Uninsured Gap %**
District	Representative	Estimate	MOE	Estimate	MOE	Estimate	MOE	Estimate	MOE	Estimate	MOE	Estimate	MOE	Estimate
1	Luz Robles (D)	57626	± 2021	8655	± 781	3574	± 626	5081	± 737	3563	± 733	4441	± 624	7.71%
2	Jim Dabakis (D)	67040	± 2119	12428	± 963	7357	± 811	5071	± 645	7335	± 928	4431	± 541	6.61%
3	Gene Davis (D)	61762	± 2128	8965	± 850	4859	± 676	4106	± 609	4844	± 784	3588	± 517	5.81%
4	Patricia W. Jones (D)	58816	± 1854	3683	± 504	2330	± 431	1353	± 300	2323	± 505	1182	± 259	2.01%
5	Karen Mayne (D)	56682	± 2036	6544	± 704	3084	± 539	3461	± 575	3075	± 631	3024	± 491	5.34%
6	Wayne Harper (R)	59468	± 1708	3875	± 489	2040	± 386	1835	± 362	2034	± 453	1604	± 311	2.70%
7	Deidre Henderson (R)	52044	± 1619	4167	± 480	2523	± 439	1644	± 352	2515	± 514	1437	± 303	2.76%
8	Brian Shiozawa (R)	60713	± 1926	5635	± 642	3183	± 580	2452	± 511	3173	± 680	2142	± 440	3.53%
9	Wayne L. Niederhauser (R)	57796	± 1773	2912	± 422	1852	± 358	1060	± 243	1846	± 420	926	± 210	1.60%
10	Aaron Osmond (R)	56905	± 1746	2464	± 484	1512	± 419	952	± 316	1508	± 495	832	± 275	1.46%
11	Howard A. Stephenson (R)	52738	± 1957	1749	± 404	1128	± 354	621	± 240	1125	± 418	543	± 209	1.03%
12	Daniel Thatcher (R)	55756	± 1927	4178	± 536	2015	± 460	2163	± 475	2009	± 541	1890	± 410	3.39%
13	Mark B. Madsen (R)	48131	± 1603	1436	± 367	880	± 304	555	± 221	878	± 360	485	± 193	1.01%
14	John L. Valentine (R)	49757	± 1464	2718	± 402	1683	± 367	1034	± 283	1678	± 432	904	± 245	1.82%
15	Margaret Dayton (R)	57578	± 1856	7713	± 749	4143	± 618	3569	± 568	4131	± 719	3119	± 484	5.42%
16	Curt Bramble (R)	63785	± 2037	21986	± 1225	18242	± 1309	3744	± 556	18187	± 1414	3272	± 471	5.13%
17	Peter C. Knudson (R)	51349	± 978	3194	± 368	2034	± 332	1160	± 241	2028	± 388	1014	± 207	1.97%
18	Stuart Reid (R)	57460	± 1558	7239	± 648	3961	± 579	3279	± 528	3949	± 673	2865	± 450	4.99%
19	Allen M. Christensen (R)	56740	± 1620	4554	± 485	2249	± 417	2306	± 422	2242	± 489	2015	± 362	3.55%
20	Scott K. Jenkins (R)	54621	± 1529	2846	± 455	1515	± 370	1331	± 343	1510	± 436	1163	± 297	2.13%
21	Jerry W. Stevenson (R)	53549	± 1554	3421	± 511	1869	± 426	1552	± 384	1863	± 502	1356	± 332	2.53%
22	J. Stuart Adams (R)	55765	± 1476	2909	± 425	1964	± 394	945	± 257	1958	± 463	826	± 222	1.48%
23	Todd Weiler (R)	54640	± 1716	3834	± 529	1958	± 473	1876	± 464	1953	± 558	1639	± 402	3.00%
24	Ralph Okerlund (R)	49523	± 766	5691	± 461	3114	± 410	2578	± 373	3104	± 474	2253	± 316	4.55%
25	Lyle W. Hillyard (R)	55667	± 900	9024	± 718	6562	± 734	2462	± 454	6543	± 840	2151	± 389	3.86%
26	Kevin T. VanTassell (R)	55758	± 1055	4212	± 479	1945	± 301	2267	± 340	1939	± 351	1981	± 289	3.55%

NOTALYS, LLC
February 2014

27	David P. Hinkins (R)	53051	± 1240	5160	± 470	2933	± 370	2226	± 306	2924	± 427	1945	± 258	3.67%
28	Evan Vickers (R)	51739	± 1316	7254	± 749	4346	± 613	2908	± 466	4333	± 711	2541	± 397	4.91%
29	Stephen H. Urquhart (R)	50487	± 1202	6073	± 732	3466	± 590	2607	± 490	3456	± 690	2278	± 421	4.51%

Notes: Unadjusted estimates are based solely on available ACS data. Adjusted estimates are the proportional allocation of the Kaiser estimates which take into consideration greater complexities described in step 8 of the methodology section. *The "adjusted uninsured gap total" is the estimated total number of people who are in the Medicaid gap income range and who are currently uninsured. **The "adjusted uninsured gap %" is the percentage of the total 18-64 adult population who is both uninsured and in the gap income range.

NOTALYS, LLC | DATA • DECISION • DIRECTION

Jay Goodliffe • Erik Krisle • Sterling Petersen • Sven Wilson

812 West 1750 North, Orem, UT 84057 • info@Notalys.com • (801) 602-4475