

## AHCA Analysis of APD Significant Additional Need (SAN) Data

DRAFT for discussion 4/4/1955

As a follow-up to the meeting between AHCA and APD on March 15, 2019, APD provided a listing of all recipients that requested an increase in service through the Significant Additional Need (SAN) process. Based on this information, the Agency's Bureau of Medicaid Data Analytics analyzed this information and noted the following:

### Table 1: Percent of SANs Approved/Denied

The percentage of SANs denied has decreased from 4% in SFY 2016-17 to 1% in SFY 2018-19 (to date).

### Table 2: Analysis of "Approve" and "Partial Approve" SANs

The total amount of SANs approved increased from \$39.6M in 2016-17 to \$74M in 2017-18. In 2017-18, while the number of recipients with an approved SAN decreased, the average SAN amount per recipient increased from \$4,767 in 2016-17 to \$13,759 in 2017-18, an increase of 189%. For 2018-19, while the number of recipients with a SAN is lower (likely due to a partial year), the average SAN amount, while slightly lower than 2017-18, is consistent with the higher 2017-18 amounts.

### Table 3: Average Cost Per Recipient (SAN, Non-SAN, and iBudget)

The Agency defined the "SAN population" as any individual that had a SAN at any time during SFY 2015-16 through 2017-18. The individuals in the SAN population experienced a 20% increase in the average cost per recipient from 2015-16 to 2017-18, while the Non-SAN population experienced a 4% increase. The average cost per recipient for the iBudget overall increased 11.7% during this same time period, driven largely by the SAN population. This analysis is based on claims data for the applicable populations.

### Tables 4, 5, and 6: Analysis of Approved SAN Budgets

To analyze SAN approved amounts by the Region and State, the Agency identified approved or partially approved SANs that had both a Region amount and a State amount. Of these, the Agency identified SANs in which the State amount did not equal the Region amount, and then calculated the difference between the State SAN amount and the Region SAN amount. As noted in Table 4, the number of SANs that met this criteria was a subset of the entire population.

Table 4: For both 2017-18 and 2018-19 (to date), the State amount was less than the Region amount in 67% of the instances, which was an increase from 57% in 2016-17. This means that the State was reducing the amount of the SAN in more cases.

Table 5: The dollar amount by which the State decreased SANs, however, declined, meaning that the State level review is resulting in less of a dollar reduction. The decreases were (\$8.1M) in 2016-17, (\$5.9M) in 2017-18, and (\$930K) so far in 2018-19.

Table 6: From 2016-17 to 2018-19, the average amount per recipient that the State decreased a SAN (from the Region amount) declined from an average of \$11,521 to \$7,573. While the amount per recipient in instances when the State was less than the Region declined over this period, the average amount per recipient in instances in which the State amount was more than the Region amount increased, from an average of \$6,145 in 2016-17 to \$9,740 in 2018-19 (to date). Over this two-year time period, the average amount per recipient for instances in which the State amount was lower than the Region amount decreased 34%, while the average amount per recipient for instances in which the State amount was higher than the Region amount increased 58%, which appears to contribute to the net decrease for SANs when there is both a Region and State amount, as noted in Table 5.

Table 7: Age Group Analysis

The Age Group Analysis previously prepared on the total iBudget population was split between the SAN and Non-SAN populations, using the methodology previously described. Overall, the SAN population costs are higher across all age groups as compared to the Non-SAN population.

Table 8: Comparison of SAN to iBudget

For purposes of this analysis, claims data was used to identify the amounts for the SAN population and total iBudget population. As noted in Table 7, the percentage of recipients and amounts that comprise the SAN population is increasing over time. By SFY 2017-18, 42% of recipients were identified as the SAN population comprising 48% of the total cost, which is an increase from 41% of recipients and 45% of the total amount for SFY 2016-17.