

Full Expansion Subgroup Report

- Meeting, Mondays at Voices for Utah Children a 7:30 AM
 - We've had 3 meetings
- Attendance has been good, public participation is welcome and has been appreciated—we welcome anyone in the room and others to participate
- We hit the ground running and already have a strong draft matrix for the full expansion. We chose to build the matrix of the benchmark benefits plan as this seems the best option given funding considerations and bang for the buck. Benchmark package should be sufficient for consumers considering the EHB standard and better for budgetary impact.
- Many of us have taken a look at some of the national level studies and are encouraged by their reporting on promising results of the Medicaid expansion. We of course looked at the Oregon study, the Rand Corporation's report on the matter, a study done by the American actuarial association study on premiums, and the Jackson Hewitt look at shared responsibility payments.
- I think we have been very honest, forthright and deliberative about describing both the pros and the cons.
 - Quickly some of the pros:
 - Insurance coverage to 123000
 - Easy, more straightforward—no need for waiver
 - Leverages billions of dollars of federal resources
 - Economic development
 - Optional expansion pays for mandatory expansion
 - Quickly some of the cons:
 - Will be some cost to the state
 - Still be uninsured, thus a need for charity care—one that note it is important to look at ways to enhance charity care to make sure everyone has access to care
- We've also given some thoughts about how fund the expansion.
 - Under full expansion scenario, the Utah stands to save significant amounts of money at the state and county level. If those savings are put in a protected fund, they can be pegged to go towards expansion related costs borne by the state in the out years.

- We are also interested in looking at ways to harness some of the tax revenue that is generated by expansion related spending and have that money offset these same out year costs. Income tax revenues fund education. The Medicaid expansion could really be a boon to the education fund.
- If we are still short on money we've considered pursuing a variety of other ways to come up with a supportive funding stream.
- The full expansion group is keeping a close eye on what is happening in Arkansas and other states that are pursuing hybrid expansion models. It's key to always compare the full expansion costs, coverage, simplicity to any hybrids proposed. I think this will help us put things in perspective. There are questions as to whether such alternative meet federal cost neutrality requirements and perhaps more importantly whether they eventually cost states more money in the long run. We think it is necessary to make the expansion uniquely Utah and will start digging in on how to tailor the expansion for Utah