NOTE: As provided in LFC policy, this report is intended only for use by the standing finance committees of the legislature. The Legislative Finance Committee does not assume responsibility for the accuracy of the information in this report when used for other purposes.

The most recent FIR version (in HTML & Adobe PDF formats) is available on the Legislative Website. The Adobe PDF version includes all attachments, whereas the HTML version does not. Previously issued FIRs and attachments may be obtained from the LFC in Suite 101 of the State Capitol Building North.

FISCAL IMPACT REPORT

SPONSOR:	Ko	madina	DATE TYPED:	02/06/03	HB	
SHORT TITL	E:	Retiree Health Care F	Premium Calculation	18	SB	367
	•			ANA	LYST:	Geisler

REVENUE

Estimate	ed Revenue	Subsequent Years Impact	Recurring or Non-Rec	Fund Affected
FY03	FY04	-		
	(Significant)		Recurring	Retiree Health Care Fund

(Parenthesis () Indicate Revenue Decreases)

SOURCES OF INFORMATION

Retiree Health Care Authority (RHCA)

SUMMARY

Synopsis of Bill

SB367 amends the retiree health care act to provide that retirees who have contributed to the fund continuously from 7/1/90 to retirement shall be deemed to have 25 years of credited service.

Significant Issues

Long-term solvency of the Retiree Health Care Fund would be jeopardized by this proposal.

FISCAL IMPLICATIONS

Pursuant to Section 10-7C-13(D) NMSA 1978 (delegating authority to the NMRHCA's board of directors to determine premiums based on credited service), the NMRHCA board adopted a "normal retirement" service-to-subsidy ratio in 2 NMAC 81.11.8, as follows:

Senate Bill 367 -- Page 2

Years of	
credited service	% of subsidy
5	6.52
6	12.50
7	18.75
8	25.00
9	31.25
10	37.50
11	43.75
12	50.00
13	56.25
14	62.50
15	68.75
16	75.00
17	81.50
18	87.50
19	93.75
20	100.00

Essentially, this bill would modify the service-to-subsidy legislation to grandfather in (make them not subject to the service-to-subsidy ratio) all retirees who were contributing to the fund continuously from 1990 to retirement. Some examples of the effect follow.

Example #1: A retiree began work for a participating employer on July 1, 1990 and retired January 1, 2003.

<u>Under current law and rule</u> – He/she would be credited with 12 full years of service and given 50% of the NMRHCA subsidy level established by the board each year.

<u>Under SB367</u> – He/she would be credited with 25 years of service and given 100% of the subsidy level established by the board each year.

Example #2: A retiree began work for a participating employer on January 1, 1978 and retired January 1, 2003.

<u>Under current law and rule</u> – He/she would be credited with 25 full years of service and given 100% of the NMRHCA subsidy level established by the board each year.

<u>Under SB367</u> – He/she would be credited with 25 years of service and given 100% of the subsidy level established by the board each year. The retiree in Example #1 above with 12 years of service would receive the same benefit as the retiree in this example with 25 years of service, and this retiree (with 25 years of service) would have to pay higher premiums than he does under current law and rule to help cover the additional subsidy for the retiree with only 12 years of service.

Please note that a retiree with 25 years of credited service (as proposed by SB367) receives no greater subsidy than a retiree with 20 years of credited service.

The RHCA actuary has projected that granting full subsidy to this group of retirees completing

Senate Bill 367 -- Page 3

less than 20 years of service and making employee contributions to the retiree health care fund for less than 20 years would eliminate approximately 6 years of long-term solvency. The total cost to the fund of approximately \$80,000.0 would run out over that reduced solvency period, from July 1, 2003 through June 30, 2012 (9 years). Currently, the actuarial valuation shows a balance of \$83,639.6 remaining on June 30, 2012; but in reducing the solvency period, from 2018 to 2012, the modification in SB367 would cost us the balance.

Fund solvency could only be maintained by increasing employer and employee contributions, retiree premiums, and income taxes paid on state pension income.

GGG/yr:sb