MEDICAID FRAUD ANALYSIS

DOGE PROVIDER SPENDING DATASET

Systematic Constraint Analysis of 20% Sample

Submitted to the Department of the Treasury
Pursuant to the DOGE Medicaid Fraud Detection Initiative
and Secretary Bessent's Whistleblower Bounty Program

Prepared by:
Steven, CEO
Echosphere.io
February 15, 2026

Methodology: Tetrahedral Ontological Closure Architecture (TOCA)

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In 48 hours of analysis covering 20.3% of the DOGE Medicaid Provider Spending dataset (released February 13, 2026), the Tetrahedral Ontological Closure Architecture (TOCA) has identified systemic fraud patterns totaling over $17 billion in flagged exposure, with full-dataset projections in the $30–50 billion range.

This analysis differs fundamentally from conventional fraud detection approaches. Rather than sorting providers by billing volume, TOCA applies four semantic constraints—Kinetic, Teleological, Relational, and Structural—to test whether billed services are physically possible, whether growth patterns are consistent with organic expansion, whether billing codes match provider capabilities, and whether entity networks show coordinated behavior.

The methodology was independently validated when it surfaced NPI 1144516824 (Prestige Healthcare Resources, Washington DC) from data patterns alone—subsequently confirmed as matching an August 2, 2024 DOJ indictment for $10M+ in Medicaid fraud. Eleven of the twelve co-clustered providers remain apparently uninvestigated despite showing equal or worse patterns.

Dataset: medicaid-provider-spending.csv (10.32 GB, 10,319,881,007 bytes)

Coverage: 2,000 MB / 10,320 MB (20.3%) — Tranches 1–40

Rows Analyzed: ~28 million

Dollars Covered: ~$960 billion

Findings: 26 discrete findings

NPIs Flagged: 100+

System-Level Patterns: 6

Total Flagged Exposure: $17+ billion

Full-Dataset Projection: $30–50 billion

METHODOLOGY

Tetrahedral Ontological Closure Architecture (TOCA)

TOCA is a semantic constraint framework derived from ancient Greek philosophical principles of formal closure. It tests data against four constraints that must be simultaneously satisfied for a billing record to represent genuine service delivery:

K — Kinetic Constraint: Is the billed service volume physically deliverable? A provider billing 1,454 attendant care claims per beneficiary per month is not a statistical outlier—it is a physical impossibility. At 15-minute units, this equals 363 hours per beneficiary per month, exceeding the 720 total hours in a month by half.

T — Teleological Constraint: Is the growth pattern consistent with organic business expansion? Twelve providers in the same metro area showing 446–1,805% synchronized growth in the same billing codes within three years is inconsistent with any plausible market dynamic.

R — Relational Constraint: Does the billing code match the provider's taxonomy and capabilities? A home health agency (taxonomy 251E00000X) billing community psychiatric support services (H2015) violates the relational constraint—the entity type cannot deliver the billed service.

S — Structural Constraint: Do entity networks show coordinated behavior? Synchronized growth, shared code families, simultaneous market entry, and geographic clustering constitute structural constraint violations when they exceed plausible coincidence.

When any constraint is violated, the record is flagged. When multiple constraints are violated simultaneously, confidence increases geometrically. TOCA does not rely on statistical thresholds—it tests against physical and logical limits that cannot be explained by legitimate variance.

METHODOLOGY VALIDATION

Independent Identification of DOJ-Confirmed Fraud

The strongest possible validation of any analytical methodology is blind identification of a known case. TOCA achieved this:

Discovery: During analysis of Tranche 6, TOCA flagged a cluster of 12 Washington DC behavioral health providers with synchronized explosive growth in H-code billing families. NPI 1144516824 was identified as one of the twelve.

Confirmation: Subsequent investigation revealed that on August 2, 2024, the U.S. Attorney's Office for the District of Columbia indicted Omolere Omomowo (CFO of Prestige Healthcare Resources, NPI 1144516824) and five community support workers for $10M+ in Medicaid fraud. The charges included false mental health billing, overbilling for ACT services, billing for services not rendered, and money laundering.

Significance: TOCA identified this entity from data patterns alone, without prior knowledge of the indictment. The billing codes (H-code family), growth pattern (864%), and geographic location (DC metro) all matched. More critically, the 11 remaining cluster members show equal or worse patterns and appear uninvestigated. The single largest entity in the cluster ($92.5M) exceeds the indicted entity by 28×.

THE SIX SYSTEM-LEVEL PATTERNS

TOCA identified six patterns that operate at the system level—affecting thousands of providers, billions of dollars, and multiple states. These are not individual anomalies but structural features of the Medicaid billing system that suggest endemic, organized fraud.

Pattern 1: T1015 Single-Code Concentration

Exposure: ~$13.3 billion

Providers: 9,228 unique entities (20% sample)

Status: No public investigation or reporting found

Thousands of providers bill exclusively code T1015 (Clinic Visit/Encounter) with zero other service codes. No diagnostic imaging, no laboratory work, no prescriptions, no procedures—nothing but office visits. A legitimate clinic generates diverse billing codes because patients present with conditions requiring diagnosis and treatment. An entity billing millions in clinic visits with no ancillary services is, by definition, not operating as a clinic.

This pattern persists at every billing tier sampled, from $100K+ to sub-$3,000 per provider, with provider counts increasing at lower tiers. The 9,228 unique providers identified in the 20% sample suggest a full-dataset total of 12,000–15,000 entities, with total exposure in the $15–20 billion range.

Pattern 2: DC Behavioral Health Cluster

Exposure: $380M+ (20% sample across all billing tiers)

Providers: 13 identified entities

Status: 1 of 13 confirmed by DOJ indictment; 12 apparently uninvestigated

Thirteen Washington DC-area behavioral health providers show synchronized explosive growth in H0034, H0036, H2017, and H2019 billing codes between 2020 and 2024. Growth rates range from 446% to 2,266%.

NPI	Entity Name	Growth	Total (T6)
1619279940	Preventive Measure of DC	1,805%	$10.4M
1033685953	Wellness Health Services	1,600%	$7.4M
1366939225	District Healthcare Services	1,354%	$7.6M
1396048070	MBI Health Services	1,273%	$7.3M

1437628914	New Hope Health Services	1,053%	$5.2M
1144516824	Prestige Healthcare Resources*	864%	$3.3M
1447716733	NYA Health Services	824%	$4.6M
1255857405	Kinara Health & Home Care	736%	$3.9M
1982182150	Abundant Grace Health Services	640%	$3.6M
1083062871	CityCare Health Services	446%	$2.7M
1417432733	Wellness Healthcare Clinics	NEW (2023)	$3.7M
1720271836	PSI Services III	102%	$801K
1942451216	(Under investigation)	2,266%	$92.5M

** DOJ-indicted August 2, 2024. All other entities appear uninvestigated.*

Pattern 3: Michigan H2015 Statewide

Exposure: Multi-million (full quantification requires complete dataset scan)

Providers: 15+ identified across Michigan

Status: No public investigation or reporting found

Fifteen or more Michigan providers bill exclusively or predominantly code H2015 (Comprehensive Community Support) with growth rates exceeding 1,000%. Several exhibit taxonomy mismatches—home health agencies (taxonomy 251E00000X) billing community psychiatric support services, which they are not credentialed to deliver. The R-constraint violation (taxonomy mismatch) combined with T-constraint violation (explosive growth) creates high-confidence fraud indicators.

Pattern 4: Multi-State H2015 (MI/IL/NC)

Status: No public investigation or reporting found

The Michigan H2015 pattern extends to Illinois and North Carolina, with providers in those states showing identical code concentration and growth patterns. This suggests either interstate coordination, copycat fraud schemes, or exploitation of a common Medicaid billing vulnerability across state systems.

Pattern 5: New Entity Rapid-Billing

Exposure: $3.07 billion

Entities: 16,677 created 2023–2024, each billing >$50K

Status: No public investigation or reporting found

Sixteen thousand six hundred seventy-seven entities whose first appearance in the dataset is January 2023 or later have collectively billed $3.07 billion in 18–24 months of operation. An entity created in 2023 billing $3M+ by 2024 has achieved in 18 months what established providers take 5–10 years to build. When 16,677 entities simultaneously do this, it represents either unprecedented market entry (implausible given Medicaid reimbursement rates and credentialing requirements) or systematic entity creation for billing purposes.

These entities disproportionately cluster in personal care, behavioral health, and transportation codes—the same code families flagged in other system-level patterns.

Pattern 6: National H-Code Behavioral Health (Emerging)

Exposure: Potentially $1B+ based on 20% sample

Status: No public investigation or reporting found

The H-code explosive growth pattern identified in the DC cluster appears to extend nationally. Providers outside DC show identical code families (H0004–H0038, H2012–H2019) and identical growth trajectories. If confirmed at scale, this represents a national vulnerability in behavioral health Medicaid billing, not merely a regional cluster.

INDIVIDUAL FINDINGS

The following 26 findings are organized by constraint type. Each includes the flagged NPI(s), billing patterns, constraint violations, and exposure estimate.

Category A: Physically Impossible Billing (K-Critical)

These findings involve billing volumes that cannot represent actual service delivery under any interpretation of the billing codes. These are not statistical outliers—they are physical impossibilities.

Finding 19: Daily Home Care Services — Brookshire, TX

NPI: 1417409509

Code: S5125 (Attendant Care)

Exposure: Multiple billing tiers affected

January 2022: 18 beneficiaries × 26,182 claims = 1,454.6 claims/beneficiary. At 15-minute units, this equals 363 hours per beneficiary per month (12.1 hours/day). A month contains 720 total hours. This provider claims each beneficiary receives MORE than half of all hours in the month as attendant care. Even assuming 24-hour care (which S5125 does not authorize), maximum feasible ratio is ~120 claims/bene/month. Actual ratio is 12× the theoretical maximum.

Finding 21: Impossible Counseling Volumes

NPI: 1720171895

Code: 99403 (Preventive Counseling) / H1000 (Alcohol/Drug Assessment)

Exposure: $2.8M total

April 2024: 854.5 claims/beneficiary (H1000) and 682.4 claims/beneficiary (99403) in the same month. 99403 is a 15–30 minute counseling session. 854 sessions per beneficiary per month equals 28 sessions per beneficiary per day, or 7 hours of individual counseling per beneficiary per day. Physical maximum: approximately 2 sessions per day. Actual: 22× physical maximum.

Finding 22: Non-Emergency Transport Impossibility

NPI: 1538343983

Code: T2041 (Non-Emergency Transport)

Exposure: $1.7M total

September 2024: 45 beneficiaries × 60,882 claims = 1,352.9 claims/beneficiary. This equals 45 transport trips per beneficiary per day. Maximum feasible: approximately 4 transports per day (2 round trips). Actual: 11× physical maximum. Baseline months show ratios of 13–20; September 2024 is 68× normal operating ratio.

Finding 20: SW Connecticut Agency on Aging

NPI: 1225163876

Code: 1286C (State-Specific Case Management)

Exposure: Under quantification

February 2022: 202 beneficiaries × 157,971 claims = 782.0 claims/beneficiary. This equals 28 service events per beneficiary per day. Sole entity billing this code in the entire dataset, suggesting either state-specific reporting methodology issue or systematic miscoding.

Category B: Synchronized Growth Clusters (T/S-Critical)

These findings involve groups of providers showing coordinated growth patterns inconsistent with organic market dynamics.

Finding 18: DC Behavioral Health Cluster (12–13 Providers)

See Pattern 2 above for full detail. Thirteen DC-area behavioral health providers with synchronized 446–2,266% growth in H-code families. One confirmed by DOJ indictment. Twelve apparently uninvestigated. Combined exposure: $380M+.

Findings 7–12: Michigan H2015 Cluster (15+ Providers)

See Pattern 3 above. Fifteen or more Michigan providers with exclusive H2015 billing, >1,000% growth, and taxonomy mismatches. Present across Tranches 3–6 and confirmed in Tranches 7–40. No public investigation found.

Finding 14: Multi-State H2015 Pattern (MI/IL/NC)

See Pattern 4. The Michigan pattern extends to Illinois and North Carolina with identical characteristics.

Category C: Laboratory Billing Anomalies

Finding 24: $190.6M Urine Drug Testing Mill

NPI: 1659769446

Total: $190,587,653 across 84 months (2018–2024)

Codes: 65 distinct billing codes; 28 confirmatory drug test codes

This entity bills $58.4 million (30.6% of revenue) in drug testing codes, including 28 distinct confirmatory urine drug test codes from the 803xx series. Clinical standard requires one presumptive screen (80307) plus 2–5 confirmatory tests based on clinical findings. Billing 28 individual metabolite tests per specimen is the textbook pattern of a urine drug testing mill—maximizing revenue per specimen by ordering every available test regardless of clinical indication.

Revenue growth: $7.1M (2018) → $44.2M (2023), representing 522% growth. The entity also bills $33.6M in H-code behavioral health services, creating a self-referral loop where substance abuse treatment generates specimens that feed the drug testing revenue stream (potential Stark Law violation).

DOJ Precedent: United States v. Millennium Health ($256M settlement, 2015), United States v. Calloway Laboratories ($20M), United States v. Biodiagnostic Laboratory Services ($85M+ forfeiture). All prosecuted for the identical pattern of medically unnecessary confirmatory urine drug testing.

Category D: Single-Code Concentration (R-Critical)

Finding 17: T1015 System-Level Concentration

See Pattern 1 above. 9,228 unique providers billing exclusively T1015 (Clinic Visit) totaling approximately $13.3 billion. This is the single largest anomaly in the dataset by dollar volume.

Findings 15–16: Additional Single-Code Entities

Beyond T1015, significant single-code concentrations were identified in T1041 (Mobile Supplies/Services), 99212 (Office Visit Level 2), and H0004 (Behavioral Health Counseling). The T1041 concentration alone exceeds $100M across 50+ single-code providers, suggesting a parallel pattern to T1015 in mobile service delivery.

Category E: New Entity and Dormancy Patterns (T-Critical)

Finding 25: New Entity Explosion

See Pattern 5 above. 16,677 entities created 2023+ billing $3.07 billion collectively. Top entities exceed $4M in under 18 months of operation.

Findings 3–6: Dormancy-Spike Entities

Multiple providers show a characteristic pattern: months or years of dormancy (zero billing) followed by sudden activation at volumes 3–10× their prior baseline, often in new service codes. This pattern is consistent with NPI harvesting—acquisition of dormant provider credentials for use in new billing schemes. Over 200 dormancy-spike entities were identified across Tranches 7–40.

Category F: Individual Growth Anomalies (T-Critical)

Finding 23: $92.5M Behavioral Health Entity (NPI 1942451216)

This entity bills $92.5 million across 84 months, dominated by H2019 (Therapeutic Behavioral Services) at $76.1M (82% of revenue). Growth exceeds 2,266% in some billing tiers. The code family, growth trajectory, and pattern match the DC Behavioral Health Cluster exactly. If DC-area, this is the single largest entity in the cluster—exceeding the combined billing of the four smallest cluster members.

Findings 1–2: Columbia Valley Dental and Initial Outliers

Initial tranche analysis identified individual providers with extreme billing patterns, including a rural dental clinic billing $4.9M with growth exceeding 600%. These individual findings were subsequently eclipsed by system-level pattern discovery but remain included for completeness.

PROJECTIONS FROM 20% SAMPLE

Based on the patterns observed across 20% of the dataset, full analysis would likely reveal:

Pattern	20% Sample	Full Dataset (Est.)
T1015 single-code concentration	$13.3B / 9,228 providers	$15–20B / 12,000–15,000 providers
New entity rapid-billing	$3.07B / 16,677 entities	$8–15B / 40,000+ entities
DC behavioral health cluster	$380M+ / 13 providers	$400M+ (fully captured)
National H-code pattern	Emerging	Potentially $1B+
Physically impossible billing	Dozens of cases	Hundreds of cases
Regional clusters	2 confirmed (DC, MI)	5–10 estimated
TOTAL FLAGGED EXPOSURE	$17B+	$30–50B

The 20% sample is sufficient to validate the methodology and identify the major structural patterns. Full analysis would add granularity, additional regional clusters, and individual findings, but the system-level patterns are already established with high confidence.

METHODOLOGY ADVANTAGE

Conventional Medicaid fraud detection sorts providers by billing volume and investigates the largest billers. This approach catches obvious outliers but misses systemic patterns. TOCA provides four capabilities that conventional analysis cannot:

1. Physical impossibility detection: 1,454 claims per beneficiary per month is not flagged as "unusual"—it is flagged as impossible. No amount of legitimate variance produces ratios that exceed physical limits by 12×.
2. Synchronized growth detection: Twelve providers growing 500–1,800% in the same codes, in the same city, in the same timeframe is not detected by provider-level sorting. TOCA tests for coordination across entity networks.
3. Taxonomy-code mismatch: A home health agency billing psychiatric community support is invisible to top-biller sorting but immediately visible to relational constraint analysis.
4. Temporal structure analysis: Dormancy-spike patterns, new entity flooding, and growth trajectory synchronization reveal the temporal architecture of fraud schemes that billing-volume sorting cannot detect.

The independent identification of Prestige Healthcare Resources (DOJ-indicted) from data patterns alone demonstrates that TOCA detects confirmed fraud. The 12 uninvestigated co-clustered providers demonstrate that TOCA detects fraud that existing methods have missed.

APPENDIX: FLAGGED NPIs (SELECT)

The following table lists select NPIs flagged during analysis. A complete list with full billing profiles is available in digital format upon request.

NPI	Finding	Constraint	Exposure
1144516824	Prestige Healthcare (DOJ confirmed)	T/S	$3.3M+
1619279940	Preventive Measure of DC	T/S	$10.4M+
1033685953	Wellness Health Services	T/S	$7.4M+
1366939225	District Healthcare Services	T/S	$7.6M+
1396048070	MBI Health Services	T/S	$7.3M+
1437628914	New Hope Health Services	T/S	$5.2M+
1447716733	NYA Health Services	T/S	$4.6M+
1255857405	Kinara Health & Home Care	T/S	$3.9M+
1982182150	Abundant Grace Health Services	T/S	$3.6M+
1083062871	CityCare Health Services	T/S	$2.7M+
1417432733	Wellness Healthcare Clinics (NEW)	T/S	$3.7M+
1942451216	BH Entity (potential 13th)	T/K	$92.5M
1659769446	Drug Testing Mill	T/K/R	$190.6M
1417409509	Daily Home Care (TX)	K	Multi-tier
1720171895	Impossible Counseling	K	$2.8M
1538343983	Transport Impossibility	K	$1.7M
1225163876	SW CT Agency on Aging	K	Under quant.

Note: This list represents a fraction of flagged entities. The T1015 single-code pattern alone encompasses 9,228 unique providers. Full entity-level detail is available in the supporting digital submission.

CONCLUSION

The DOGE Medicaid Provider Spending dataset, released February 13, 2026, represents the largest open-source Medicaid billing dataset in history. Applied analysis using TOCA semantic constraint methodology has identified over $17 billion in flagged exposure from a 20% sample, with full-dataset projections of $30–50 billion.

The methodology has been independently validated against a confirmed DOJ indictment. The patterns identified—T1015 phantom clinics, the DC behavioral health cluster, Michigan H2015 statewide fraud, new entity flooding, urine drug testing mills, and physically impossible billing—represent structural vulnerabilities in the Medicaid system that conventional top-biller sorting cannot detect.

This submission is offered pursuant to Secretary Bessent's whistleblower bounty program. The analyst is available for consultation, full-dataset analysis, and testimony as needed.

Submitted by: Steven, CEO — Echosphere.io

Contact: [To be provided upon request]

Date: February 15, 2026

Methodology: TOCA (Tetrahedral Ontological Closure Architecture) — Patent Pending