

Subsidy Study - Stakeholder Feedback

- June 24 Meeting -

Below is a summary of written feedback from stakeholders following the second round of discussions of the Health Benefit Exchange's Subsidy Study model at the June 24th Cascade Care Workgroup meeting. Feedback has been aggregated so as not to identify the comments of specific stakeholders.

Do you agree with assumptions being used? Are there additional factors that Wakley should consider?

While stakeholders did not express strong concerns with any of Wakely's underlying assumptions, there is a desire to review the formulas underpinning the model to validate the model assumptions. Additionally, stakeholders would like to better understand whether the model assumptions accounted for increases in the uninsured population related to COVID-19 and the economic recession. There was also a desire to better understand whether assumptions considered the effect of subsidies on movement between metal tiers and take-up by age, and the effects those changes might have on average premiums and the morbidity of the risk pool.

Are there additional Washington specific factors/data/inputs that you would like Wakely to consider?

There is a desire for Wakely to model the effects of a subsidy on different age-brackets and the effect of purchasing behavior if Washington were to enact an individual mandate in combination with a state subsidy program.

Is the method Wakley used to generate the initial outputs clear/transparent? Are the assumptions and outputs consistent with actuarial modeling, data, and research you are familiar with?

There are some concerns remaining from the first round of review about the boundary limits in the model when setting subsidies to extreme levels. An example was provided, that when setting a 0% state income limit for all FPL-bands, the model portrays *paying* certain individuals to purchase coverage.

Are there outputs not shown that you would like to see included? Are there specific summary tables/cross-sections/roll-ups of data you would like to see?

Stakeholders noted several additional outputs that are desired, including:

- Pre/Post-wrap uninsured rates by income/age/race/sex.
- Analysis of subsidy impact on disenrollment rates.
- Modelling on how future market disruptions impact consumers.
- Impact of subsidies on purchasing by metal level.
- Tying subsidies to silver plans.
- Summary tables displayed by county level.
- Metal-level and age-level premium *ranges*, in addition to averages by FPL-band.
- Display of multiple scenarios side-by-side to compare data outputs.

- Total estimated cost by FPL-band (total of subsidized/non-subsidized).
- Display of uninsured *rates* by rating area for each FPL, pre/post-subsidy.

Does the model clearly illustrate the impact of the scenario on: Uninsured Rate/Enrollment; Consumer Premiums/Risk Pool; and State Costs?

There is a desire for the uninsured *rate* to be better highlighted in the model summary tables as an output for the model scenarios. The rate would be portrayed as a percentage rate change in addition to the current display by total individuals.

Will this type of model be useful to inform policymakers?

Stakeholders generally believe that the model will be useful for informing policymakers. There was a desire for the model to include information on deductibles, especially for Bronze and Silver plans, to add context to the subsidy's effects on premiums and affordability. There is also a belief that showing the ranges of premiums within each FPL-band would provide beneficial detail for stakeholders and policymakers alike.