



Louisiana Does it Again: The First Use of Express Lane Eligibility to Automate Children's Enrollment and Retention

- Prepared by: Stan Dorn, Ian Hill, Fiona Adams
Urban Institute
Washington, DC
- Supported by: State Health Access Reform Evaluation,
Robert Wood Johnson Foundation
- Presented to: AcademyHealth Annual Research Meeting
Seattle, WA
13 June 2011

Outline of Presentation

- Research methods
- Federal policy and Louisiana's approach to Express Lane Eligibility
- Preliminary results
- Lessons for States and Policymakers

Research methods

- Document review
- Site Visit - Key informant interviews
 - State Medicaid officials
 - State nutrition program officials
 - Local social service agency staff
 - Community-based outreach organizations
- Focus groups with parents of children enrolled via Express Lane Eligibility
- Next Steps – Analysis of state administrative data

Express Lane Eligibility (ELE): federal law

- An option created by CHIPRA (Children's Health Insurance Program Reauthorization Act of 2009)
- State Medicaid and CHIP programs may use findings of other need-based programs to establish eligibility
 - Irrelevant to such eligibility are technical differences between programs' eligibility rules
 - ELE can be used to establish any element of Medicaid/CHIP eligibility except for citizenship

Federal ELE law (continued)

- Before data from other program is accessed, family must be given a chance to “opt out”
- Before a child is “automatically enrolled,” family must affirmatively consent
 - By phone, in writing, or through other methods
- Can use ELE for enrollment, renewal, or both
- ELE is one of 8 “best practices” (to qualify for CHIPRA performance bonus, states must implement at least 5 of 8)

Louisiana's history with eligibility simplification

- Renowned for innovative strategies to streamline enrollment
- Leader in automated/ex parte renewal
- Received CHIPRA performance bonus (\$3.6 million in 2010) for employing: continuous eligibility, no asset test, automated renewal, no in-person interview, joint Medicaid/CHIP application and renewal forms
- State legislature passes Express Lane Eligibility in 2007, *before* it was even a federal option
- Formally adopted by state shortly after passage of CHIPRA in '09

Louisiana's approach to ELE

- Grants eligibility based on findings from the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP, formerly known as Food Stamps)
 - SNAP eligibility limited to families with “net incomes” below 100 percent FPL
 - Household definitions, income disregards different from Medicaid's
- Used for both enrollment and renewal

“It happened one night”

- In February 2010, 10,573 children enrolled into Medicaid in a single night, based on SNAP records -- How did this happen?
- In 2009, data matches with SNAP identified children receiving SNAP but not Medicaid
- State narrowed list of such children to
 - Identify and remove “duplicates” already receiving Medicaid
 - Limit initial enrollment to children already known to Medicaid from prior applications or coverage
- With previously unknown children, manual confirmation needed before enrollment

More lead-up to that magical night

- State sent “opt-out” letters to parents of all children remaining on the list
 - Result: very few parents opted out (<1%)
- Affirmative consent process
 - Sent Medicaid cards to parents, w/ letter indicating that use of the card = consent to enrollment
 - Note: Louisiana Medicaid is fee-for-service

Enrollment: Not just a one-night stand...

- Starting in Jan. 2010, SNAP application forms modified to include ELE “opt-out”
- Except for children who opt out, monthly data matches identify children receiving SNAP but not Medicaid
- State moving towards daily data matches
- SNAP application changed again in Jan. 2011 to have “opt in” check-box

Coming back for more: Renewals

- Renewing eligibility for all children
 - At renewal, if data match shows a Medicaid child is receiving SNAP, the child's Medicaid eligibility is automatically renewed
 - Does not apply to a family if Medicaid is provided to (a) a parent or (b) a child not receiving SNAP
- Renewing eligibility for ELE children
 - Parents who did not use the card get another change to consent – very few take advantage of opportunity

Results: Enrollment

- By December 2010, 20,589 children had been sent Medicaid cards via ELE
- 11,149 of these children used services
- Community outreach groups said:
 - Before ELE, always saw uninsured children at community events
 - After ELE, no uninsured children at these events!
- Appear to be reaching “poorest of the poor”

Results: Renewal

- First month: of 266,000 children and adults slated for renewal, 126,000 were renewed automatically via ELE based on SNAP records
- Enormous administrative savings
 - With ELE, no staff involvement
 - Without ELE, staff involvement often required (e.g., to sort through methodological differences between SNAP and Medicaid rules)

Focus Group Results:

What do parents say about ELE?

Parents told us they:

- Recalled receiving letter informing them that children were eligible for coverage
- Were initially caught off guard (“This can’t be right?!?”)
- Were thrilled to learn their children were covered (“It’s a blessing...” “Like a gift from God...”)
- All obtained services for their kids
- Found renewal to be very easy (“It wasn’t even a ‘process’ ...”)
- Some would not have applied for Medicaid; they didn’t think their kids were eligible

Lessons for States/ Policymakers

- “Simplification isn’t simple...but the juice is worth the squeeze...” Ruth Kennedy
- Express Lane Eligibility is not a “push button” operation
- ELE is an important additional tool for states seeking to expedite enrollment and retention
 - Increases participation, reduces administrative costs, prevents manual errors
 - SNAP is a great candidate for ELE – food is fundamental
- ELE can facilitate states’ move towards data-driven eligibility under the Affordable Care Act

Lessons (continued)

- Why did it work?
 - Culture change occurred over many years
 - Willing partner in SNAP agency (plus, no downside risk for SNAP)
 - MaxEnroll involvement—money for staff, IT programming, and extensive TA
 - Centralized eligibility system is critical
 - Effective messaging to policymakers – stressed efficiency, not increases in enrollment