

## NORTH CAROLINA GENERAL ASSEMBLY

#### Session 2019

# **Legislative Actuarial Note**

# **Health Benefits**

**Short Title:** Study State Health Plan Design. House Bill 184 (Second Edition)

**Sponsor(s):** Representatives Dobson, Howard, Brisson, and Adcock

# **SUMMARY TABLE**

#### **ACTUARIAL IMPACT OF H.B. 184, V.2 (\$ in millions)**

NET STATE IMPACT	\$63 to \$86	\$172 to \$182	\$0 to \$241
State Health Plan Net Loss	63 to 86	172 to 182	0 to 241
State Impact	FY 2019-20	FY 2020-21	FY 2021-22

The State Health Plan's Net Loss is projected to increase by the amount shown above, decreasing the cash reserves of the Plan. Any deterioration in Plan financials does not directly translate to an increase in State appropriations in the short-run, but is likely to increase appropriations in the long-run. Roughly 57% of premiums paid to the Plan are derived from the General Fund.

#### ACTUARIAL IMPACT SUMMARY

House Bill 184 (Second Edition) creates a study committee to recommend a design for the State Health Plan (Plan) and submit its final report no later than December 15, 2019. The bill also requires the Plan to continue to use the Blue Cross Blue Shield of North Carolina Blue Options provider network and to reimburse participating network providers in accordance with 100% of the applicable fee schedule through December 31, 2020. This requirement does not apply to the Medicare Advantage plans.

The State Treasurer has announced his intention to move the Plan to a reference-based pricing approach effective January 2020 that would tie most medical provider prices to a multiple of the prices set by Medicare for the same services.

The Segal Company, the actuary for the Plan, and Hartman & Associates, the actuary for the General Assembly, estimate that the bill will increase the Plan's claims expenses by the following amounts by preventing the reference-based pricing approach until at least 2021:

	FY 2019-20	FY 2020-21	FY 2021-22
The Segal Company	\$63 million	\$182 million	\$241 million
Hartman & Associates	\$86 million	\$172 million	\$0 million

Both actuaries relied on the Plan's estimated claims savings and did not attempt to duplicate the savings calculation. Both actuaries' estimates reflect the adjustment in the proposed rates announced on March 13, 2019 to an average of 182% of Medicare prices. The Segal Company assumed that the delay in implementation of the reference-based pricing approach will continue indefinitely, but notes that the FY 2020-21 impact would be reduced by approximately 33% and the FY 2021-22 impact by approximately 75% if the approach is implemented in January 2021 with similar discounts. In contrast, Hartman & Associates assumed that the savings from the reference-based pricing approach would still be realized starting in 2021 and thus that the impact of the bill in FY 2021-22 and following years would be \$0. Hartman & Associates also noted that their estimate assumes a broad provider network could be maintained at the Plan's proposed reference-based pricing rates.

The bill would also impact the Other Postemployment Benefit (OPEB) liability of the State and related governmental units. The Segal Company states that if the bill passes, the ability to reflect the reference-based pricing approach in the June 30, 2019 valuation would be hampered and subject to auditor scrutiny. The Segal Company estimates that without reflecting the reference-based pricing approach, the Total OPEB Liability will increase by \$1.1 billion and the Actuarially Determined Contribution (ADC) will increase by 0.4% of payroll, relative to the Liability and ADC reflecting the reference-based pricing approach.

Hartman & Associates estimates that the Total OPEB Liability calculated without the reference-based pricing approach would be roughly \$1.0 billion higher than the Liability calculated with the reference-based pricing approach. Hartman & Associates estimates that the Total OPEB Liability would increase by \$42 million if the Liability calculation assumes the reference-based pricing approach is implemented in 2021, but notes that we do not know what the committee will recommend and that the Liability is expected to be calculated without reflecting the reference-based pricing approach until a new model is implemented.

#### ASSUMPTIONS AND METHODOLOGY

The actuarial analyses used by each respective consulting actuary are on file with the Fiscal Research Division. Copies of each respective consulting actuary's analysis, including assumptions, are also attached to the original copy of this Legislative Actuarial note.

## Summary Information and Data about the State Health Plan (Plan)

The Plan administers health benefit coverage for active employees from employing units of State agencies and departments, universities, local public schools, and local community colleges. Eligible retired employees of authorized employing units may also access health benefit coverage under the Plan. Eligible dependents of active and retired employees are authorized to participate in the Plan provided they meet certain requirements. Employees and retired employees of selected local governments and charter schools may also participate in the Plan under certain conditions.

The State finances the Plan on a self-funded basis and administers benefit coverage under a Preferred Provider Option (PPO) arrangement, with the exception of many Medicare-eligible retirees who are in fully-insured Medicare Advantage plans. The Plan's receipts are derived through premium contributions, investment earnings and other receipts. Premiums for health benefit coverage are paid by (1) employing agencies for active employees, (2) the Retiree Health Benefit Fund for retired employees, and (3) employees and retirees who participate in a plan with a non-zero premium or who elect dependent coverage. Benefit and premium changes are typically effective at January 1. The Plan's PPO benefit design includes two alternative benefit levels listed below:

- 1) The 70/30 Plan that offers higher out-of-pocket requirements in return for lower employee and retiree premiums, and
- 2) The 80/20 Plan that offers lower out-of-pocket requirements with higher employee and retiree premiums.

Medicare-eligible retirees are offered three alternative plans:

- 1) The 70/30 Plan as coverage secondary to Medicare for medical services plus a pharmacy benefit plan,
- 2) "Base" Medicare Advantage Prescription Drug Plan (MA-PDP) from United Healthcare, that is actuarially equivalent to the 80/20 Plan and applies in-network out-of-pocket requirements at out-of-network providers
- 3) "Enhanced" MA-PDP, identical to the "Base" MA-PDP, except with lower co-pays and higher retiree premiums

The following tables provide a summary of the most common monthly premium rates for the Plan in 2019:

# Active Employees and Non-Medicare Retirees (if Fully Subsidized)

		Employee/R	etiree Share
	Employer	Complete	Do Not
	Share	Tobacco	Complete
		Attestation	Attestation
70/30 Plan	\$519	\$25 *	\$85 *
80/20 Plan	\$159	\$50	\$110

<sup>\* \$0</sup> for Non-Medicare Retirees

## Medicare Retirees (if Fully Subsidized)

Medicare Advantage Plans		
	Employer	Employee/Retiree Share
	Share	
MA-PDP Base Plan	\$403	\$0
MA-PDP Enhanced Plan	\$403	\$63
Alternate Plan		
	Employer	Employee/Retiree Share
	Share	
Traditional 70/30 Plan	\$403	\$0

## Dependents (paid by employee/retiree in addition to premiums above)

	_	nts are Non- icare	One or Mo	re Medicare D	ependents
	70/30 Plan	80/20 Plan	MA-PDP	MA-PDP	70/30
			Base	Enhanced	Plan
Employee/Retiree +	\$193	\$255	\$89	\$152	\$155
Children					
Employee/Retiree +	\$565	\$650	\$89	\$152	\$425
Spouse					
Employee/Retiree +	\$573	\$670	\$178	\$304	\$444
Family					

The employer share of premiums for retirees is paid from the Retiree Health Benefit Fund. During FY 2018-19, employers contribute 6.27% of active employee payroll into the Fund. Total contributions for the year are projected to be approximately \$1,096 million.

### **Financial Condition**

Projected Results for CY 2019 and CY 2020 – The following summarizes projected financial results for 2019 and 2020, based on financial experience through September 2018. The projection assumes a 7.0% annual claims growth trend for medical claims, a 9.5% trend for pharmacy claims, benefit provisions and member-paid premiums as adopted by the Board for 2019, Medicare-based provider pricing beginning in 2020, and 4% employer premium increases in 2020.

	(\$ m	illions)
	Projected	Projected
	CY 2019	CY 2020
	¢1.056.5	¢1.070.0
Beginning Cash Balance	\$1,056.7	\$1,079.0
Receipts:		
Net Premium Collections	\$3,690.6	\$3,841.9
Medicare Subsidies	\$10.3	\$10.4
Investment Earnings	\$9.3	\$9.4
Total	\$3,710.1	\$3,861.7
Disbursements:		
Net Medical Claim Payment Expenses	\$2,533.7	\$2,530.9
Net Pharmacy Claim Payment Expenses	\$767.7	\$842.9
Medicare Advantage Premiums	\$171.4	\$239.2
Administration and Claims-Processing Expenses	\$215.0	\$207.1
Total	\$3,687.8	\$3,820.1
Net Operating Income (Loss)	\$22.3	\$41.6

Of the premiums paid in CY 2019, an estimated \$2.4 billion is derived from General Fund sources and an estimated \$0.1 billion is derived from Highway Fund sources.

#### Other Information

Additional assumptions include Medicare benefit "carve-outs," cost containment strategies including prior approval for certain medical services, utilization of the "Blue Options" provider network in 2019 and Medicare-based pricing in 2020 and beyond, case and disease management for selected medical conditions, mental health case management, coordination of benefits with other payers, a prescription drug benefit manager with manufacturer rebates from formularies, fraud detection, and other authorized actions by the State Treasurer, Executive Administrator, and Board of Trustees to manage the Plan to maintain and improve the Plan's operation and financial condition where possible. Medical claim costs are expected to increase at a rate of 7.0% annually and pharmacy claim costs are expected to increase at a rate of 9.5% annually according to assumptions adopted by the Board of Trustees. The active population is projected to remain unchanged, the pre-Medicare retiree population is projected to decrease by 1% per year and the Medicare-eligible retiree population is projected to increase by 3% per year.

# Enrollment as of January 1, 2019

]	No. of Participants	Traditional 70/30	Enhanced 80/20	Medicare Advantage	Total	Percent of Total
	Actives	-,	,			
4	Employees	112,490	192,987		305,477	41.6%
	Dependents	77,656	99,369	-	177,025	24.1%
	_			<del></del>		
	Sub-total	190,146	292,356	-	482,502	65.8%
]	<u>Retired</u>					
	Employees	44,013	23,411	140,834	208,258	28.4%
	Dependents	7,674	5,346	11,855	24,875	3.4%
	Sub-total	51,687	28,757	152,689	233,133	31.8%
(	<u>Other</u>					
	Employees	3,670	8,195	=	11,865	1.6%
	Dependents	2,327	3,704	-	6,031	0.8%
	Sub-total	5,997	11,899	-	17,896	2.4%
,	Total					
	Employees	160,173	224,593	140,834	525,600	71.7%
	Dependents	87,657	108,419	11,855	207,931	28.3%
(	Grand Total	247,830	333,012	152,689	733,531	100%
	D	33.8%	45.4%	20.8%	100.0%	
	Enrollment by Contract	Traditional	Enhanced	<b>MA</b> 128 979	<b>Total</b>	
]	<b>Enrollment by Contract</b> Employee Only Employee Child(ren) Employee Spouse	<b>Traditional</b> 118,022 25,632 4,913	170,537 35,239 6,366	<b>MA</b> 128,979 215 11,640	417,538 61,086 22,919	
]	<b>Enrollment by Contract</b> Employee Only Employee Child(ren)	<b>Traditional</b> 118,022 25,632	170,537 35,239	128,979 215	417,538 61,086	
	Enrollment by Contract Employee Only Employee Child(ren) Employee Spouse Employee Family Total	Traditional 118,022 25,632 4,913 11,606 160,173	170,537 35,239 6,366 12,451 <b>224,593</b>	128,979 215 11,640 <b>140,834</b>	417,538 61,086 22,919 24,057 <b>525,600</b>	
	Enrollment by Contract Employee Only Employee Child(ren) Employee Spouse Employee Family Total  Percent Enrollment by Contract	Traditional 118,022 25,632 4,913 11,606 160,173  Traditional	170,537 35,239 6,366 12,451 224,593 Enhanced	128,979 215 11,640 140,834 MA	417,538 61,086 22,919 24,057 525,600	
	Enrollment by Contract Employee Only Employee Child(ren) Employee Spouse Employee Family Total  Percent Enrollment by Contract Employee Only	Traditional 118,022 25,632 4,913 11,606 160,173  Traditional 73.7%	170,537 35,239 6,366 12,451 <b>224,593</b> <b>Enhanced</b> 75.9%	128,979 215 11,640 <b>140,834</b> <b>MA</b> 91.6%	417,538 61,086 22,919 24,057 <b>525,600</b> <b>Total</b> 79.4%	
	Enrollment by Contract Employee Only Employee Child(ren) Employee Spouse Employee Family Total  Percent Enrollment by Contract Employee Only Employee Child(ren)	Traditional 118,022 25,632 4,913 11,606 160,173  Traditional 73.7% 16.0%	170,537 35,239 6,366 12,451 <b>224,593</b> <b>Enhanced</b> 75.9% 15.7%	128,979 215 11,640 140,834 MA 91.6% 0.2%	417,538 61,086 22,919 24,057 <b>525,600</b> <b>Total</b> 79.4% 11.6%	
	Enrollment by Contract Employee Only Employee Child(ren) Employee Spouse Employee Family Total  Percent Enrollment by Contract Employee Only Employee Child(ren) Employee Spouse	Traditional 118,022 25,632 4,913 11,606 160,173  Traditional 73.7% 16.0% 3.1%	170,537 35,239 6,366 12,451 <b>224,593</b> <b>Enhanced</b> 75.9% 15.7% 2.8%	128,979 215 11,640 140,834 MA 91.6% 0.2% 8.3%	417,538 61,086 22,919 24,057 <b>525,600</b> <b>Total</b> 79.4% 11.6% 4.4%	
	Enrollment by Contract Employee Only Employee Child(ren) Employee Spouse Employee Family Total  Percent Enrollment by Contract Employee Only Employee Child(ren)	Traditional 118,022 25,632 4,913 11,606 160,173  Traditional 73.7% 16.0%	170,537 35,239 6,366 12,451 <b>224,593</b> <b>Enhanced</b> 75.9% 15.7%	128,979 215 11,640 140,834 MA 91.6% 0.2%	417,538 61,086 22,919 24,057 <b>525,600</b> <b>Total</b> 79.4% 11.6%	
	Enrollment by Contract Employee Only Employee Child(ren) Employee Spouse Employee Family Total  Percent Enrollment by Contract Employee Only Employee Child(ren) Employee Spouse Employee Family	Traditional 118,022 25,632 4,913 11,606 160,173  Traditional 73.7% 16.0% 3.1% 7.2%	170,537 35,239 6,366 12,451 <b>224,593</b> <b>Enhanced</b> 75.9% 15.7% 2.8% 5.5%	128,979 215 11,640 140,834 MA 91.6% 0.2% 8.3% 0.0%	417,538 61,086 22,919 24,057 <b>525,600</b> <b>Total</b> 79.4% 11.6% 4.4% 4.6%	
	Enrollment by Contract Employee Only Employee Child(ren) Employee Spouse Employee Family Total  Percent Enrollment by Contract Employee Only Employee Child(ren) Employee Spouse Employee Family Total  Enrollment by Sex	Traditional 118,022 25,632 4,913 11,606 160,173  Traditional 73.7% 16.0% 3.1% 7.2% 100.0%  Traditional	170,537 35,239 6,366 12,451 <b>224,593</b> <b>Enhanced</b> 75.9% 15.7% 2.8% 5.5% <b>100.0%</b>	128,979 215 11,640 140,834 MA 91.6% 0.2% 8.3% 0.0% 100.0%	417,538 61,086 22,919 24,057 <b>525,600</b> <b>Total</b> 79.4% 11.6% 4.4% 4.6% <b>100.0%</b>	
	Enrollment by Contract Employee Only Employee Child(ren) Employee Spouse Employee Family Total  Percent Enrollment by Contract Employee Only Employee Child(ren) Employee Spouse Employee Family Total  Enrollment by Sex Female	Traditional 118,022 25,632 4,913 11,606 160,173  Traditional 73.7% 16.0% 3.1% 7.2% 100.0%  Traditional 141,753	170,537 35,239 6,366 12,451 <b>224,593</b> <b>Enhanced</b> 75.9% 15.7% 2.8% 5.5% <b>100.0%</b>	128,979 215 11,640  140,834  MA 91.6% 0.2% 8.3% 0.0% 100.0%  MA 101,689	417,538 61,086 22,919 24,057 525,600  Total 79.4% 11.6% 4.4% 4.6% 100.0%  Total 456,006	
	Enrollment by Contract Employee Only Employee Child(ren) Employee Spouse Employee Family Total  Percent Enrollment by Contract Employee Only Employee Child(ren) Employee Spouse Employee Family Total  Enrollment by Sex	Traditional 118,022 25,632 4,913 11,606 160,173  Traditional 73.7% 16.0% 3.1% 7.2% 100.0%  Traditional	170,537 35,239 6,366 12,451 224,593  Enhanced 75.9% 15.7% 2.8% 5.5% 100.0%  Enhanced 212,564 120,448	128,979 215 11,640  140,834  MA 91.6% 0.2% 8.3% 0.0% 100.0%  MA 101,689 51,000	417,538 61,086 22,919 24,057 525,600  Total 79.4% 11.6% 4.4% 4.6% 100.0%  Total 456,006 277,525	
	Enrollment by Contract Employee Only Employee Child(ren) Employee Spouse Employee Family Total  Percent Enrollment by Contract Employee Only Employee Child(ren) Employee Spouse Employee Family Total  Enrollment by Sex Female	Traditional 118,022 25,632 4,913 11,606 160,173  Traditional 73.7% 16.0% 3.1% 7.2% 100.0%  Traditional 141,753	170,537 35,239 6,366 12,451 <b>224,593</b> <b>Enhanced</b> 75.9% 15.7% 2.8% 5.5% <b>100.0%</b>	128,979 215 11,640  140,834  MA 91.6% 0.2% 8.3% 0.0% 100.0%  MA 101,689	417,538 61,086 22,919 24,057 525,600  Total 79.4% 11.6% 4.4% 4.6% 100.0%  Total 456,006	
	Enrollment by Contract Employee Only Employee Child(ren) Employee Spouse Employee Family Total  Percent Enrollment by Contract Employee Only Employee Child(ren) Employee Family Total  Employee Family Total  Enrollment by Sex Female Male	Traditional 118,022 25,632 4,913 11,606 160,173  Traditional 73.7% 16.0% 3.1% 7.2% 100.0%  Traditional 141,753 106,077	170,537 35,239 6,366 12,451 224,593  Enhanced 75.9% 15.7% 2.8% 5.5% 100.0%  Enhanced 212,564 120,448	128,979 215 11,640  140,834  MA 91.6% 0.2% 8.3% 0.0% 100.0%  MA 101,689 51,000	417,538 61,086 22,919 24,057 525,600  Total 79.4% 11.6% 4.4% 4.6% 100.0%  Total 456,006 277,525	
	Enrollment by Contract Employee Only Employee Child(ren) Employee Spouse Employee Family Total  Percent Enrollment by Contract Employee Only Employee Child(ren) Employee Spouse Employee Family Total  Enrollment by Sex Female Male Total	Traditional 118,022 25,632 4,913 11,606 160,173  Traditional 73.7% 16.0% 3.1% 7.2% 100.0%  Traditional 141,753 106,077 247,830	170,537 35,239 6,366 12,451 224,593  Enhanced 75.9% 15.7% 2.8% 5.5% 100.0%  Enhanced 212,564 120,448 333,012	128,979 215 11,640  140,834  MA 91.6% 0.2% 8.3% 0.0% 100.0%  MA 101,689 51,000 152,689	417,538 61,086 22,919 24,057 525,600  Total 79.4% 11.6% 4.4% 4.6% 100.0%  Total 456,006 277,525 733,531	
	Enrollment by Contract Employee Only Employee Spouse Employee Family Total  Percent Enrollment by Contract Employee Only Employee Child(ren) Employee Spouse Employee Family Total  Enrollment by Sex Female Male Total  Percent Enrollment by Sex	Traditional 118,022 25,632 4,913 11,606 160,173  Traditional 73.7% 16.0% 3.1% 7.2% 100.0%  Traditional 141,753 106,077 247,830  Traditional	170,537 35,239 6,366 12,451 224,593  Enhanced 75.9% 15.7% 2.8% 5.5% 100.0%  Enhanced 212,564 120,448 333,012  Enhanced	128,979 215 11,640  140,834  MA 91.6% 0.2% 8.3% 0.0% 100.0%  MA 101,689 51,000 152,689  MA	417,538 61,086 22,919 24,057 525,600  Total 79.4% 11.6% 4.4% 4.6% 100.0%  Total 456,006 277,525 733,531  Total	

	Enrollment by Age	Traditional	Enhanced	MA	Total
	25 & Under	74,779	94,476	15	169,270
	26 to 45	64,448	92,523	294	157,265
	46 to 55	42,687	68,051	1,182	111,920
	56 to 65	44,009	71,768	13,155	128,932
	66 & Over	21,907	6,194	138,043	166,144
	Total	247,830	333,012	152,689	733,531
	Developed Francisco Land Area	man distance	Pul d	24.4	m - 4 - 1
	Percent Enrollment by Age	Traditional	Enhanced	MA	Total
	25 & Under	30.2%	28.4%	0.0%	23.1%
	26 to 45	26.0%	27.8%	0.2%	21.4%
	46 to 55	17.2%	20.4%	0.8%	15.3%
	56 to 65	17.8%	21.6%	8.6%	17.6%
	66 & Over	8.8%	1.9%	90.4%	22.6%
	Total	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Retiree Enrollment by Category		Employee	Dependents	Total
	Non-Medicare Eligible		45,030	12,353	57,383
	Medicare Eligible in Traditional 70/30		22,394	667	23,061
	Medicare Eligible in Base MA Plan		121,521	9,094	130,615
	Medicare Eligible in Enhanced MA Plan		19,313	2,761	22,074
	Total		208,258	24,875	233,133
	Percent Enrollment by Category (Retiree)		Employee	Dependents	Total
	Non-Medicare Eligible		21.6%	49.7%	24.6%
	Medicare Eligible in Traditional 70/30		10.8%	2.7%	9.9%
	Medicare Eligible in Base MA Plan		58.4%	36.6%	56.0%
	Medicare Eligible in Enhanced MA Plan		9.3%	11.1%	9.5%
	Total		100.0%	100.0%	100.0%
	Enrollment By Major Employer Groups		<b>Employees</b>	Dependents	Total
	State Agencies		65,979	32,602	98,581
	UNC System		54,857	36,678	91,535
	Local Public Schools		164,529	95,091	259,620
	Charter Schools (94 entities)		4,875	3,356	8,231
	Local Community Colleges Other		15,237	9,298	24,535
	Local Governments (129 entities)		11,040	5,380	16,420
	COBRA		825	651	1,476
	Retirement System		208,258	24,875	233,133
•	Total		525,600	207,931	733,531
	Percent Enrollment by Major Employer Gro	oups	Employees	Dependents	Total
	State Agencies		12.6%	15.7%	13.4%
	UNC System		10.4%	17.6%	12.5%
	Local Public Schools		31.3%	45.7%	35.4%
	Charter Schools		0.9%	1.6%	1.1%
	Local Community Colleges Other		2.9%	4.5%	3.3%
	Local Governments		2.1%	2.6%	2.2%
	COBRA		0.2%	0.3%	0.2%
	LATINA		0.470	0.5%	0.2%
	Retirement System		39.6%	12.0%	31.8%

## **TECHNICAL CONSIDERATIONS**

N/A.

### **DATA SOURCES**

The Segal Company; baseline financial projections updated through Q3 CY2018; dated January 9, 2019. Filename "CY18 Q3 - Baseline - Final v2.pdf"

-Actuarial Note, Hartman & Associates, "House Bill 184 Committee Substitute Favorable 3/26/19: An Act to Study the State Health Plan Design", March 27, 2019, original of which is on file in the General Assembly's Fiscal Research Division.

-Actuarial Note, The Segal Company, "House Bill 184, Committee Substitute Favorable 3/26/19, Study State Health Plan Design", March 29, 2019, original of which is on file with the State Health Plan for Teachers and State Employees and the General Assembly's Fiscal Research Division.

#### LEGISLATIVE ACTUARIAL NOTE - PURPOSE AND LIMITATIONS

This document is an official actuarial analysis prepared pursuant to Chapter 120 of the General Statutes and rules adopted by the Senate and House of Representatives. The estimates in this analysis are based on the data, assumptions, and methodology described above. This document only addresses sections of the bill that have projected direct actuarial impacts on State employee health benefit programs and does not address sections that have no projected actuarial impacts.

## **CONTACT INFORMATION**

Questions on this analysis should be directed to the Fiscal Research Division at (919) 733-4910.

## **ESTIMATE PREPARED BY**

David Vanderweide

#### ESTIMATE APPROVED BY

Mark Trogdon, Director of Fiscal Research Fiscal Research Division April 1, 2019



Signed copy located in the NCGA Principal Clerk's Offices

April 1, 2019