

LEGISLATIVE FISCAL OFFICE **Fiscal Note**

HB **537** HLS 22RS Fiscal Note On: 648

Bill Text Version: REENGROSSED

Opp. Chamb. Action:

Proposed Amd.: Sub. Bill For .:

Date: May 31, 2022 9:20 AM **Author: DAVIS**

Dept./Agy.: Dept of Insurance

Subject: Mandates Coverage for Infertility Diagnosis and Treatment **Analyst:** Patrice Thomas

INSURANCE/HEALTH RE INCREASE GF EX See Note Requires health insurance coverage for infertility treatments

Page 1 of

Proposed law requires health insurance plans to provide coverage for standard fertility preservation services. Proposed law provides coverage including hospital, medical, or surgical benefits to cover medically necessary expenses of standard fertility preservation services. Proposed law provides that an individual must have a medical condition that may cause infertility, or medication therapy, surgery, radiation, chemotherapy, or other medical treatments directly or indirectly cause infertility. Proposed law has a religious exemption. Proposed law effective January 1, 2023 (new health coverage plans) and January 1, 2024 (existing health coverage plans). Proposed law shall be known as "The Medically Necessary Fertility Preservation Act".

EXPENDITURES	2022-23	2023-24	2024-25	2025-26	2026-27	5 -YEAR TOTAL
State Gen. Fd.	\$0	INCREASE	INCREASE	INCREASE	INCREASE	\$0
Agy. Self-Gen.	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Ded./Other	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Federal Funds	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Local Funds	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>
Annual Total	\$0					\$0
REVENUES	2022-23	2023-24	2024-25	2025-26	2026-27	5 -YEAR TOTAL
State Gen. Fd.	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Agy. Self-Gen.	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Ded./Other	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Federal Funds	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Lasal Euroda	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>	<u>\$0</u>
Local Funds	<u>40</u>	4				

EXPENDITURE EXPLANATION

Proposed law may increase State General Fund expenditures associated with a mandate to health insurance policies issued under the insurance exchanges beginning in FY 24 and subsequent fiscal years (see narrative below). Furthermore, the proposed law will increase claims expenditures for the private health insurance industry by an estimated \$9 M - \$27.8 M and premiums by an estimated \$10.6 M -\$32.8 M, which represents a 0.17% - 0.52% total premium increase in FY 24 (see Expenditure Explanation on Page 2).

Insurance Exchanges Impact (State General Fund Impact)

Proposed law may increase SGF expenditures beginning in FY 24 and subsequent fiscal years according to an analysis provided by the health actuary for LDI. The state would be required to fund health claims expenditures associated with infertility treatment coverage in the proposed law for policies issued by qualified health plans through the health insurance exchange beginning in FY 24 with estimated costs totaling \$1.4 M to \$4.3 M SGF and a potential phase-up to over \$1.6 M to \$5 M SGF by FY 27 and beyond. Claims expenses associated with the proposed law would be paid out by the State Treasury Department. LDI bases this analysis on the following assumptions: the calculations are on a fiscal year basis; the exchange population is approximately 100,000 and the insured population is assumed to be stationary; medical cost inflation is 5%; the premium loss ratio is 85%; and the estimated cost is between \$1.10 PMPM and \$3.40 PMPM over the entire insured population. Based upon the aforementioned assumptions, the estimated annual cost increases for insurance providers associated with claims are as follows:

Aggregate Cost Determination

Aggregate cost = exchange population x PMPM cost x 12 months Base Cost (Low) $-100,000 \times \$1.70 \text{ PMPM} \times 12 \text{ months} = \$1,320,000$ Base Cost (High) - $100,000 \times $4.10 \text{ PMPM} \times 12 \text{ months} = $4,080,000$

FY 24 (Low) $-$1,320,000 \times 5\% MI = $1,386,000$ FY 24 (High) - $$4,080,000 \times 5\% MI = $4,284,000$

FY 25 (Low) $- $1,386,000 \times 5\% MI = $1.455.300$ FY 25 (High) - $$4,284,000 \times 5\% MI = $4,498,200$ FY 26 (Low) $- $1,455,300 \times 5\% MI = $1,528,065$

FY 26 (High) - $$4,498,200 \times 5\% MI = $4,723,110$

FY 27 (Low) $- $1.528.065 \times 5\% MI = $1.604.468$

FY 27 (High) - $$4,723,110 \times 5\% MI = $4,959,266$

See EXPENDITURE EXPLANATION on Page 2

REVENUE EXPLANATION

There is no anticipated direct material effect on governmental revenues as a result of this measure.

Dual Referral Rules Senate \mathbf{X} 6.8(F)(1) >= \$100,000 SGF Fiscal Cost {H & S} **x** 13.5.1 >= \$100,000 Annual Fiscal Cost {S & H}

13.5.2 >= \$500,000 Annual Tax or FeeChange {S & H}

<u>House</u>

6.8(G) >= \$500,000 Tax or Fee Increaseor a Net Fee Decrease {S}

Evan Brasseaux

Evan Brasseaux Interim Deputy Fiscal Officer



LEGISLATIVE FISCAL OFFICE Fiscal Note

Fiscal Note On: **HB** 537 HLS 22RS 648

Bill Text Version: REENGROSSED

Opp. Chamb. Action:

Proposed Amd.: Sub. Bill For.:

Date: May 31, 2022 9:20 AM **Author:** DAVIS

Dept./Agy.: Dept of Insurance

Subject: Mandates Coverage for Infertility Diagnosis and Treatment

Analyst: Patrice Thomas

CONTINUED EXPLANATION from page one:

Page 2 of 2

EXPENDITURE EXPLANATION Continued from Page 1

PRIVATE INSURANCE IMPACT

Pursuant to R.S. 24:603.1, the information below is the projected private insurance impact of the proposed law. Based upon an actuarial analysis prepared by LDI, the proposed law is anticipated to increase expenditures associated with claims by \$13.9 M - \$33.6 M and premium increases by \$16.4 M - \$39.5 M for private insurers and the insured in FY 24 with phase-up costs of an estimated \$16.1 M -\$38.9 M claims and \$19 M - \$45.7 M premiums by FY 27. LDI bases this analysis on the following assumptions: the calculations are on a fiscal year basis; the exchange population is approximately 650,000 and the insured population is assumed to be stationary; medical cost inflation is 5%; the premium loss ratio is 85%; and the **estimated cost is between \$1.10 PMPM and \$3.40 PMPM over the entire insured population, which represents a 0.17% to 0.52% annual premium increase**. Based upon the aforementioned assumptions, the estimated annual cost increases for insurance providers associated with claims are as follows:

Aggregate Cost Determination

(exchange population x PMPM cost x 12 months)

Base Cost (Low) $-650,000 \times \$1.10$ PMPM $\times 12$ months = \$8,580,000 Base Cost (High) $-650,000 \times \$3.40$ PMPM $\times 12$ months = \$26,520,000

FY 24 (Low) - $$8,580,000 \times 5\% MI = $9,009,000$

FY 24 (High) - $$26,520,000 \times 5\% MI = $27,846,000$

FY 25 (Low) - \$ 9,009,000 x 5% MI = \$ 9,459,450 FY 25 (High) - \$27,846,000 x 5% MI = \$29,238,300

FY 26 (Low) - \$ 9,459,450 x 5% MI = \$ 9,932,423

FY 26 (High) - \$29,238,300 x 5% MI = \$30,700,215

FY 27 (Low) - $$9,932,423 \times 5\% MI = $10,429,044$

FY 27 (High) - \$30,700,215 x 5% MI = \$32,235,226

Aggregate Extra Premium Determination

(PMPM cost x 12 months)/medical loss ratio

Base Cost (Low) - ($$1.10 \text{ PMPM} \times 12 \text{ months}$)/85% = \$15.53 (0.17% annual increase)Base Cost (High) - ($$3.40 \text{ PMPM} \times 12 \text{ months}$)/85% = \$48.00 (0.52% annual increase)

FY 24 (Low) $- $15.53 \times 5\% MI = 16.31

FY 24 (High) - $$48.00 \times 5\% MI = 50.40

FY 25 (Low) - \$16.31 x 5% MI = \$17.13

FY 25 (High) - \$50.40 x 5% MI = \$52.92

FY 26 (Low) - \$17.13 x 5% MI = \$17.99 FY 26 (High) - \$52.92 x 5% MI = \$55.57

FY 27 (Low) $- $17.99 \times 5\% MI = 18.89

FY 27 (Low) - \$17.99 x 5% MI = \$18.89 FY 27 (High) - \$55.57 x 5% MI = \$58.35

Senate <u>Dual Referral Rules</u>

| 13.5.1 >= \$100,000 Annual Fiscal Cost {S & H}

13.5.2 >= \$500,000 Annual Tax or Fee Change {S & H} House

 $\boxed{\mathbf{x}}$ 6.8(F)(1) >= \$100,000 SGF Fiscal Cost {H & S}

6.8(G) >= \$500,000 Tax or Fee Increase or a Net Fee Decrease {S}

Evan Brasseaux

Evan Brasseaux

Interim Deputy Fiscal Officer