Oliver Wyman
Two Alliance Center
3560 Lenox Road, Suite 2400
Atlanta, GA 30326
www.oliverwyman.com

Ms. Susan Bernard
Deputy Commissioner, Financial Surveillance Branch
California Department of Insurance
300 Capitol Mall
Sacramento, CA 95814

December 14, 2022

California Assembly Bill 567 Feasibility Report

Dear Ms. Bernard:

Oliver Wyman Actuarial Consulting, Inc. was retained by the California Department of Insurance to provide support with Assembly Bill ("AB") 567, which established the Long Term Care Insurance Task Force ("Task Force") to assess the feasibility of developing and implementing a culturally competent statewide insurance program for long-term care services and supports in California ("Program").

This Feasibility Report summarizes the Program recommendations made by the AB 567 Task Force and outlines financial, administrative, and political feasibility considerations. To ensure the Program offers both a basic benefit while remaining solvent, a separate Actuarial Report that assesses the cost and viability of each recommended Program design will be completed in 2023.

The primary audience for this Feasibility Report includes stakeholders from the California Department of Insurance (including the Insurance Commissioner), members of the AB 567 Task Force, the Governor of California, the California Legislative Assembly, and members of the general public within the state of California.

This Feasibility Report is not considered a Statement of Actuarial Opinion under the guidelines promulgated by the American Academy of Actuaries, as it does not contain actuarial advice or actuarial opinions by the report's authors. The recommendations contained in this report are those of the AB 567 Task Force.

Oliver Wyman shall not have any liability to any third party in respect of this report or any actions taken or decisions made as a consequence of the results, advice or recommendations set forth herein.

Yours sincerely,

Dustin Plotkin, FSA, MAAA
Principal

Stephanie Moench, FSA, MAAA
Principal

OliverWyman

CALIFORNIA ASSEMBLY BILL 567: OLIVER WYMAN FEASIBILITY REPORT

Commissioned by the California Department of Insurance

Note: An Actuarial Report containing more specifics on cost and financial viability will be completed in 2023

14 December 2022

CONFIDENTIALITY

Our clients' industries are extremely competitive, and the maintenance of confidentiality with respect to our clients' plans and data is critical. Oliver Wyman rigorously applies internal confidentiality practices to protect the confidentiality of all client information.

Similarly, our industry is very competitive. We view our approaches and insights as proprietary and therefore look to our clients to protect our interests in our proposals, presentations, methodologies, and analytical techniques. Under no circumstances should this material be shared with any third party without the prior written consent of Oliver Wyman.

© 2022 Oliver Wyman

Contents

Overview ... 1

1. AB 567 background ... 2
1.1. Task Force ... 2
1.2. Plan of Action ... 4

2. Overview of Program design recommendations ... 6
2.1. Key Program design features ... 7
2.2. Design trade-offs and priorities ... 12
2.3. Program design recommendations ... 13

3. Overview of recommended next steps ... 15

4. Feasibility analysis ... 20
4.1. Overview ... 20
4.2. Structure ... 21
4.2.1. Structure recommendations ... 21
4.2.2. Structure feasibility assessment ... 21
4.2.3. Structure considerations ... 22
4.3. Coordination and interaction ... 28
4.3.1. Coordination and interaction recommendations ... 28
4.3.2. Coordination and interaction feasibility assessment ... 32
4.3.3. Coordination and interaction considerations ... 32
4.4. Eligibility and enrollment ... 39
4.4.1. Eligibility and enrollment recommendations ... 39
4.4.2. Eligibility and enrollment feasibility assessment ... 44
4.4.3. Eligibility and enrollment considerations ... 45
4.5. Benefits and services ... 50
4.5.1. Benefits and services recommendations ... 50
4.5.2. Benefits and services feasibility assessment ... 54
4.5.3. Benefits and services considerations ... 55
4.6. Administration ... 63
4.6.1. Administration recommendations ... 63
4.6.2. Administration feasibility assessment ... 64
4.6.3. Administration considerations ... 64
4.7. Financing ... 71
4.7.1. Financing recommendations ... 71
4.7.2. Financing feasibility assessment ... 76

© 2022 Oliver Wyman

4.7.3. Financing considerations 77
4.8. LTSS workforce 89
4.8.1. LTSS workforce recommendations and considerations 89
4.8.2. LTSS workforce feasibility assessment 93
4.9. Access and regulation 94
4.9.1. Access and regulation recommendations and considerations 94
4.9.2. Access and regulation feasibility assessment 95

5. Interaction with California's Master Plan for Aging 96

6. Distribution and use 97

7. Reliances and limitations 98

Appendix A. Glossary of terms 99

Appendix B. Program design "straw man" 101

Appendix C. Task Force questionnaire results 104

Appendix D. LTSS programs and services administered by the California Department of Aging 114

© 2022 Oliver Wyman

Overview

This report summarizes the recommendations made by the Assembly Bill ("**AB**") 567 (Calderon, Chapter 746, Statutes of 2019) Long Term Care Insurance Task Force ("**Task Force**") for establishing a culturally competent[1] statewide long-term care ("**LTC**") insurance program in California ("**Program**"). In addition, the respective degrees of feasibility for each recommended Program design are discussed, and the process by which the Task Force arrived at its recommendations is outlined. Policymaker and general public support, administrative feasibility, and financial feasibility were considered as part of this analysis[2]

A team from Oliver Wyman Actuarial Consulting, Inc. ("Oliver Wyman" or "we") facilitated Task Force discussions and authored this Feasibility Report based on Task Force recommendations. However, we are neither members of the Task Force nor allowed to vote on issues associated with AB 567.

This report is organized into five sections that overview key considerations and outcomes of the Task Force's feasibility analysis, as follows:

1. **AB 567 background**: This section provides an overview of the Task Force and scope of AB 567
2. **Overview of Program design recommendations**: This section summarizes five Program designs recommended by the Task Force and identifies which design is preferred by each Task Force member
3. **Overview of recommended next steps**: This section outlines the Task Force's recommended next steps following the publication of this Feasibility Report
4. **Feasibility analysis**: This section details the feasibility analysis and provides considerations and recommendations for each Program design element discussed by the Task Force
5. **Interaction with California's Master Plan for Aging**: This section identifies how the Program aligns with the goals and strategies set forth by California's Master Plan for Aging

Abbreviations and defined terms used throughout this report are bolded the first time they appear and are defined in the glossary of terms in Appendix A.

To ensure the Program offers a basic benefit while remaining solvent, a separate Actuarial Report that assesses the cost and viability of each recommended Program design will be completed in 2023.

[1] Cultural competence may be defined as the integration and transformation of knowledge about individuals and groups of people into specific standards, policies, practices, and attitudes used in appropriate cultural settings to increase the quality of services; thereby producing better outcomes.

[2] Financial feasibility was assessed on a relative basis in this report and as part of the Task Force discussions leading up to this report. A separate Actuarial Report containing more specifics on cost and financial viability will be completed in 2023.

© 2022 Oliver Wyman

1. AB 567 background

In recognition of California's aging population, AB 567 (Calderon, Chapter 746, Statutes of 2019) was passed by California's Legislative Assembly and Senate, and approved by Governor Newsom in October 2019. AB 567[3] established the Task Force in the California Department of Insurance ("**CDI**") to explore the feasibility of developing and implementing a culturally competent statewide insurance program for long-term care services and supports ("**LTSS**")[4].

1.1. Task Force

The Task Force is comprised of 15 members (volunteers and government agency representatives) with expertise spanning many facets of the LTC industry. The Task Force includes representation from a health policy expert, LTC providers, family caregivers, health professionals, a senior/consumer organization, actuaries, the LTC insurance industry, an LTC workers organization, and California government agencies (Department of Aging, Department of Health Care Services ("**DHCS**"), and Department of Insurance). Task Force members were appointed by various California authorities, including the Insurance Commissioner, the Governor, the Speaker of the Assembly, and the Senate Committee on Rules.

The individuals from Oliver Wyman who facilitated the Task Force discussions are not members of the Task Force, nor are they permitted to vote on the issues associated with AB 567.

Task Force members, as of the publication of this report, and their roles are presented in Exhibit 1.1.

Exhibit 1.1: Current AB 567 Task Force members and roles

Task Force member	Task Force role
Aron Alexander	Representative of residential care facilities for the elderly
Jamala Arland	Representative from the LTC insurance industry
Susan Bernard (chair)	California Insurance Commissioner Ricardo Lara designee
Dean Chalios	Representative of hospice and palliative care providers
Anastasia Dodson	California Department of Health Care Services Director Michelle Baass designee
Becky Duffey[5]	Representative of adult day services providers
Joe Garbanzos	Representative of a senior/consumer organization

[3] Text in blue font signifies a hyperlink to additional information (external to this report).

[4] LTC (long-term care) is typically used in the context of private insurance (i.e., LTC insurance), whereas LTSS (long-term services and supports) is typically used in the context of academia and government programs. These terms are used interchangeably in this report.

[5] Becky Duffey resigned from the Task Force effective December 2022.

© 2022 Oliver Wyman

Task Force member	Task Force role
Eileen Kunz	Representative of an LTC provider association
Laurel Lucia	Representative of a nongovernment health policy expert
Doug Moore	Representative of independent providers of in-home personal care services
Parag Shah	Certified actuary with expertise in LTC insurance
Sarah Steenhausen	California Department of Aging Director Susan DeMarois designee
Dr. Karl Steinberg	Representative of LTC health professionals
Tiffany Whiten	Representative of family caregivers
Brandi Wolf	Representative of an employee organization that represents LTC workers

The views expressed in this report are those of both current and former Task Force members, except for the Task Force members from the California Department of Health Care Services and the California Department of Aging, whose roles were to provide technical assistance.

Former Task Force members and their roles are listed in Exhibit 1.2.

Exhibit 1.2: Former AB 567 Task Force members and roles

Task Force member	Task Force role
Dr. Lucy Andrews	Representative of hospice and palliative care providers
Blanca Castro	Representative of a senior/consumer organization
Grace Cheng Braun	Representative of adult day services providers
Sutep Laohavanich	California Department of Aging Director Susan DeMarois designee
Kim McCoy Wade	Former California Department of Aging Director
Michael Mejia	Representative of residential care facilities for the elderly

The Task Force's mandate, as outlined in AB 567, included the following activities:

1. Explore how a Program could be designed and implemented to expand the options for people who are interested in insuring themselves against the risk of costs associated with functional or cognitive disability, and require LTSS.
2. Explore options for the design of the Program, including eligibility, enrollment, benefits, financing, administration, and interaction with the Medi-Cal program and other publicly funded resources. In exploring these options, the Task Force shall consider all of the following:
    a. Whether and how a Program could be included as a benefit in the state disability insurance program structure, possibly through a nominal increase in the payroll tax, and whether the Program could be structured in the same manner as California's Paid Family Leave ("**PFL**") benefits.

© 2022 Oliver Wyman

b. Allowing for enrollment in the Program of working adults who would make voluntary premium contributions either directly or through payroll deductions through their employer.

c. To the extent feasible, requiring a mandatory enrollment with a voluntary opt-out option.

d. Giving working adults the opportunity to plan for future LTC needs by providing a basic insurance benefit to those who meet work requirements and have developed functional or equivalent cognitive limitations.

e. Helping individuals with functional or cognitive limitations remain in their communities by purchasing nonmedical services and supports, including home health care and adult daycare.

f. Helping offset the costs incurred by adults with chronic and disabling conditions. The Program need not be designed to cover the entire cost associated with an individual's LTC needs.

3. Evaluate how benefits under the Program would be coordinated with existing private health care coverage benefits.
4. Evaluate the demands on the LTC workforce as the need for LTC in California grows, and how the LTC workforce can be prepared to meet those demands.
5. Consider the establishment of a joint public and private system to make LTC accessible to as many individuals within California as possible.
6. Make recommendations related to key regulatory provisions necessary for the public to access existing LTC insurance programs and participate in future LTC insurance programs, whether those programs are recommended by the Task Force or otherwise.

The Task Force's recommended Program designs associated with the above mandate, along with analysis on the respective degrees of feasibility, are described in this Feasibility Report. In addition, to ensure an adequate benefit within a solvent Program, a separate Actuarial Report will be submitted by Oliver Wyman to the Task Force for approval and, subsequently, to the Legislature on or before January 1, 2024. The Actuarial Report will include an actuarial analysis of the Task Force's recommended Program designs.

1.2. Plan of Action

During the inaugural Task Force meeting in March 2021, seven key Program design elements were identified for consideration and discussion, which became the Task Force Work Plan. The seven elements are as follows:

1. Structure options
2. Financing

3. Administrative considerations
4. Workforce
5. Services
6. Coordination and interaction
7. Access

Using the Task Force Work Plan as a guide, we followed a three-step process involving Task Force member education, discussion, and consensus to converge on the Program designs included in this report. A total of 18 Task Force meetings were held throughout 2021 and 2022, with many iterations of this three-step process, to cover each of the Work Plan elements and Program interdependency considerations. Task Force meetings were subject to the Bagley-Keene Open Meeting Act and as such were open to, and encouraged, public observation and participation.

To ensure a common baseline of knowledge and information among Task Force members, the first step of this process included sharing educational presentations spanning the seven elements of the Task Force Work Plan during Task Force meetings. Educational materials related to California's population demographics and the need for LTSS (including LTSS age data and information on the potential cost and duration of LTSS) were also shared to establish a better understanding of the issues that AB 567 was looking to address. We then commissioned questionnaires (i.e., surveys) related to each Work Plan element to independently collect Task Force and public recommendations. The questionnaires were followed by group discussions between the Task Force and public to align on preliminary results, recommendations, and next steps.

Task Force discussions primarily focused on comparing and contrasting different Program design provisions (generally, evaluating the pros and cons of various options). However, we provided quantitative support, including relative cost impacts and benchmarks, to facilitate Task Force decision-making. The comprehensive pricing and analysis of the Program designs included in this report will be completed in 2023 as part of the Actuarial Report. Recognizing that we asked the Task Force to make Program recommendations without knowing their full financial implications, we guided the Task Force towards developing a set of Program design options that span a range of anticipated costs.

The Program designs included in this report are based on the Task Force's most prevalent views, but it is important to note that unanimous consensus was not achieved for all Program design elements—that is, more than one view often received strong support from the Task Force.

© 2022 Oliver Wyman

2. Overview of Program design recommendations

During the Task Force meetings, Program design elements (including the relative feasibility of each element) were deliberated by the Task Force and the general public. The views shared at the Task Force meetings, coupled with discussions related to establishing priorities and design trade-offs, formed the foundation of a Program design "straw man". The "straw man" outlined several Program designs for consideration by the Task Force and was narrowed down to the five design recommendations described in this report.

Exhibit 2.1 summarizes the five recommended Program designs, which are generally ordered from lowest anticipated cost (Design 1) to highest anticipated cost (Design 5)[6]. These five designs reflect the Task Force's submission to the Insurance Commissioner, Governor, and Legislative Assembly for consideration in response to AB 567.

The Task Force also recommended exploring several alternative scenarios (i.e., financial sensitivities) to understand the financial impact of certain design choices. Upon completion of the Actuarial Report in 2023, the alternative scenarios may inform targeted refinements to the Task Force's recommended designs with Program affordability and sustainability in mind.

Exhibit 2.1: Description and overview of the recommended Program designs

Design	Description	Overview
1	Supportive LTC benefits	• $36,000 over two years in supportive LTC benefits for California's adult population (ages 18+) • Examples of supportive benefits include caregiver support, adult day care ("**ADC**"), meal delivery, transportation, durable medical equipment, home assessment, and minor home modifications – Home and facility care are not covered
2	Home care and residential care facility ("**RCF**") benefits for older adults	• $110,400 over two years in targeted benefits for California's older adult population (ages 65+) • Covered services are the same as Design 1, along with home care and care in an RCF • This design attempts to limit duplication with Medi-Cal by not having lower-income individuals contribute to the Program or receive vesting credits – Lower-income individuals may be eligible for LTSS benefits from Medi-Cal

[6] Design 2 has evolved over time and is now anticipated to be higher cost than Design 3.

© 2022 Oliver Wyman

Design	Description	Overview
		– Individuals who are below the income limit in some years will still vest if they accumulate enough vesting credits over their working lifetime
3	Lower-range comprehensive LTSS benefits	• $36,000 over one year in comprehensive benefits for California's adult population (ages 18+) • Covered services are the same as Design 2 • Inspired by the WA Cares Fund design with select updates
4	Mid-range comprehensive LTSS benefits	• $81,000 over 18 months in comprehensive benefits for California's adult population (ages 18+) • Covered services include those covered in Design 3, along with care in a skilled nursing facility ("**SNF**")
5	Higher-range comprehensive LTSS benefits	• $144,000 over two years in comprehensive benefits for California's adult population (ages 18+) • Covered services are the same as Design 4

The remainder of this section expands on each design and lists the preferred and supported design(s) for each Task Force member. Considerations and rationale supporting the Task Force's recommendations are provided in Section 4 of this report.

2.1. Key Program design features

Several Program design elements received broad support from the Task Force and were thus reflected in all five Program designs included in this Feasibility Report. These elements are summarized in Exhibit 2.2.

Exhibit 2.2: Common Program design elements

Design element	Common design recommendations
Program structure	• Front-end coverage (i.e., benefits generally payable near the beginning of an individual's LTSS need) • Vested social insurance with pro-rated benefits (with variation by design option)

© 2022 Oliver Wyman

Design element	Common design recommendations
Benefit eligibility criteria	• Unable to perform 2 of 6 activities of daily living ("**ADLs**") for at least 90 days or severe cognitive impairment – Consistent with the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996 ("**HIPAA**") benefit eligibility trigger[7]
Portability	• Benefits available outside of California (with variation by design option)
Benefit type	• Reimbursement benefits (three design options include a reduced cash benefit alternative)
Family caregiver support	• Reimbursement to informal or family caregivers subject to completion of certified caregiver training[8]
Contribution rate structure	• Progressive payroll tax split between employees and employers • Income-based tax for self-employed individuals • Level contribution rate structure (i.e., the contribution rate should not vary by age or other characteristics besides income) • Contributions begin at age 18, with no maximum age
Benefit inflation	• Benefit increases based on Consumer Price Index ("**CPI**") • Benefit increases evaluated annually but not automatically applied (except for Design 5)
Investment strategy	• Invest Program revenue in U.S. treasuries, bonds, stocks, and other equities (state constitution currently only allows for investment in U.S. treasuries, so a constitutional amendment would be required to facilitate this recommendation)
Coordination and interaction	• Private insurance[9] pays before the Program

[7] The six standard ADLs established by HIPAA (Section 7702B) include bathing, dressing, toileting, transferring, continence, and eating (these are also described in California Insurance Code 10232.8). The benefit eligibility trigger defined in HIPAA requires that an individual be certified by a licensed health care practitioner as (i) being unable to perform (without substantial assistance from another individual) at least 2 ADLs for a period of at least 90 days due to a loss of functional capacity or (ii) requiring substantial supervision to protect such individual from threats to health and safety due to severe cognitive impairment.

[8] Minimum training requirements that do not discourage benefit utilization must be defined in a culturally competent manner.

[9] Supplemental private insurance products providing LTSS benefits that are developed after the Program's effective date would not be eligible for reduced Program contributions and may be subject to different interaction criteria than private insurance products providing substitutive LTSS benefits. The Task Force recommended establishing a separate working group to explore Program coordination and interaction with substitutive and supplemental private insurance in more detail.

© 2022 Oliver Wyman

Design element	Common design recommendations
	• Considerations for individuals with (eligible) private insurance: – Opt-out provision if purchased before Program's effective date – Reduced Program contributions if purchased after Program's effective date • Program pays before Medi-Cal and should not influence Medi-Cal eligibility

Aside from the common elements outlined above, the five Program designs included in this Feasibility Report vary considerably. Exhibit 2.3 summarizes the benefits, services, eligibility, enrollment, and financing elements of each Program design. The comprehensive Program design "straw man" is provided in Appendix B.

In addition, Appendix C summarizes other design elements that were discussed by the Task Force but did not receive broad support and thus may not be reflected in the five Program designs included in this Feasibility Report.

Exhibit 2.3: Summary of Program designs

Design element	1: Supportive LTC benefits	2: Home care and RCF benefits for older adults	3: Lower-range comprehensive LTSS benefits	4: Mid-range comprehensive LTSS benefits	5: Higher-range comprehensive LTSS benefits
Benefits	• Maximum $36,000 ($1,500 per month for two years) • No elimination period ("**EP**") • Individual coverage	• Maximum $110,400 ($4,600 per month for two years) • 50% cash benefit alternative • 90-day EP • Individual coverage	• Maximum $36,000 ($3,000 per month for one year) • No EP • Individual coverage	• Maximum $81,000 ($4,500 per month for 18 months) • 50% cash benefit alternative • No EP • Shared benefit pool with spouses or domestic partners	• Maximum $144,000 ($6,000 per month for 2 years) • 50% cash benefit alternative • No EP • Shared benefit pool with spouses or domestic partners
Services	• Supportive LTC benefits[10], including: – Caregiver support – ADC – Meal delivery – Transportation – Durable medical equipment	• Home and community-based services ("**HCBS**") and RCF • Limited/contingent preventative benefits[11] (e.g., wellness programs)	• HCBS and RCF • Limited/contingent preventative benefits[11] (e.g., wellness programs) • Coverage for California's Program for All-Inclusive Care for the Elderly ("**PACE**")	• HCBS and facility care (i.e., RCF and SNF) • Preventative benefits[11] • Coverage for PACE	• HCBS and facility care (i.e., RCF and SNF) • Preventative benefits[11] • Coverage for PACE

[10] HCBS and facility care are not covered under Design 1. Caregiver support benefits include (but may not be limited to) training, respite care, and financial support.

[11] Preventative benefits and services would be available to vested individuals before satisfying benefit eligibility criteria. The specific preventative benefits and services that will be covered have yet to be defined.

© 2022 Oliver Wyman

Design element	1: Supportive LTC benefits	2: Home care and RCF benefits for older adults	3: Lower-range comprehensive LTSS benefits	4: Mid-range comprehensive LTSS benefits	5: Higher-range comprehensive LTSS benefits
	– Home assessments and minor home modifications				
Eligibility and enrollment	• Benefits available at ages 18+ • 5-year vesting period with pro-rating of benefits • Full domestic portability	• Benefits available at ages 65+ • 5-year vesting period with pro-rating of benefits • Partial portability (grade to 50% over 5 years within U.S.) • Grade up benefits over the first 20 years for inter-generational equity	• Benefits available at ages 18+ • 10-year vesting period with pro-rating of benefits • Partial portability (grade to 50% over 5 years within U.S.) • Grade up benefits over the first 20 years for inter-generational equity	• Benefits available at ages 18+ • 10-year vesting period with pro-rating of benefits • Full domestic portability • Grade up benefits over the first 20 years for inter-generational equity	• Benefits available at ages 18+ • 5-year vesting period with pro-rating of benefit and a voluntary option to top-up benefits if unable to fully vest • Full international portability • Grade up benefits over the first 20 years for inter-generational equity
Financing	• Contribution cap • Contribution waiver for lower-income individuals • Consider alternative funding beyond payroll tax and income tax	• Contribution cap • Lower-income individuals will not contribute or receive vesting credits[12]	• Contribution cap • Contribution waiver for lower-income individuals	• No contribution cap • Contribution waiver for lower-income individuals	• Contribution cap • Contribution waiver for lower-income individuals

[12] These individuals may still vest in the Program if they meet the vesting requirement over their working lifetime.

© 2022 Oliver Wyman

2.2. Design trade-offs and priorities

A Program that is affordable, widely accessible, and inclusive of comprehensive benefits may not be feasible. Further, the relative importance of these attributes varies among the range of stakeholders affected by the Program (e.g., policymakers, general public, LTSS providers, LTSS workforce, associations, corporations, private insurers, and other organizations and individuals).

Through AB 567, California's Legislative Assembly and Senate requested that the Task Force make design decisions that required trade-offs between affordability (of Program contributions), Program accessibility, and comprehensiveness of Program benefits, which culminated in the five designs included in this report. The designs are generally listed in increasing order of anticipated cost, with Design 1 expected to be the lowest cost and Design 5 expected to be the highest cost[13].

Design 5 aggregates the Task Force's most prevalent views for each design element (e.g., benefits, services, financing). Recognizing potential feasibility concerns with the anticipated cost of Design 5, we asked the Task Force to provide recommendations for lower-cost design options, which evolved into Design 1 and Design 2[13]. Finally, we asked the Task Force to consider priorities and trade-offs, which informed initial iterations of Design 3 and Design 4. A summary of the key trade-offs associated with each design is provided below.

- **Design 1** (supportive LTC benefits) emphasizes affordability of Program contributions and accessibility while offering a more limited selection of benefits relative to the other designs.
- **Design 2** (home care and RCF benefits for older adults) focuses on limiting duplication with Medi-Cal while emphasizing affordability of Program contributions. It offers more comprehensive benefits relative to Design 1 and a higher total benefit amount relative to Design 3 and Design 4 by targeting HCBS (including RCF) for California's older adult population (65+) and excluding lower-income individuals who may have access to LTSS benefits from other programs such as Medi-Cal.
- **Designs 3, 4, and 5** offer benefits that are widely accessible, but each design incrementally trades affordability of Program contributions for more comprehensive benefits, ratcheting up from Design 3 (lower-range comprehensive LTSS benefits) to Design 4 (mid-range comprehensive LTSS benefits) and ultimately to Design 5 (higher-range comprehensive benefits).

The Task Force's top priorities were a Program that provides coverage for a broad range of services and supports while addressing LTSS needs for the older adult population. It was also important to the Task Force that the Program be relatively easy to understand and simple to administer, that Program benefits be reasonable in relation to Program contributions, and that the Program provides a safety net to the poor. These priorities are reflected in one or more of the five designs outlined in this report.

---

[13] Design 2 has evolved over time and is now anticipated to be higher cost than Design 3.

© 2022 Oliver Wyman

2.3. Program design recommendations

After considering all relevant Program design elements (including the relative feasibility of each element), identifying Task Force priorities and trade-offs, and compiling a "straw man" of five design options, we asked the Task Force to select their most preferred Program design and other designs they support[14]. The results are summarized in Exhibits 2.4.

Exhibit 2.4: Task Force Program design recommendations[15]

Design	Description	Preferred design count (vote count)	Supported design count (vote count)[16]	Total vote count[17]
1	Supportive LTC benefits	**0**	**4**	**4**
2	Home care and RCF benefits for older adults	**3**	**2**	**5**
3	Lower-range comprehensive LTSS benefits	**1**	**5**	**6**
4	Mid-range comprehensive LTSS benefits	**5**	**3**	**8**
5	Higher-range comprehensive LTSS benefits	**3**	**6**	**9**

In addition to the Task Force, numerous members of the public participated in the feasibility process by sharing their perspectives at Task Force meetings, responding to the Program design questionnaires, and providing written commentary to the CDI and Task Force.

As acknowledgment and appreciation for the public's participation, we asked members of the public to select their most preferred and supported Program designs, similar to our ask of the Task Force. We received 12 responses from the public, which are summarized in Exhibit 2.5 below.

[14] Task Force members will have an opportunity to amend their recommendations based on the actuarial analysis that will be performed in 2023 in support of the Actuarial Report.
[15] Counts do not add up to 15 because Task Force members from the California Department of Aging ("**CDA**"), CDI, and DHCS were absolved from providing a recommendation.
[16] The "supported design count" does not include any Task Force members who selected the design as their preferred option.
[17] Total vote count is out of a maximum possible vote count of 12.

© 2022 Oliver Wyman

Exhibit 2.5: General public Program design recommendations

Design	Description	Preferred design count (vote count)	Supported design count (vote count)[18]	Total vote count
1	Supportive LTC benefits	**0**	**0**	**0**
2	Home care and RCF benefits for older adults	**0**	**0**	**0**
3	Lower-range comprehensive LTSS benefits	**1**	**0**	**1**
4	Mid-range comprehensive LTSS benefits	**0**	**11**	**11**
5	Higher-range comprehensive LTSS benefits	**11**	**0**	**11**

[18] The “supported design count” does not include any public members who selected the design as their preferred option.

© 2022 Oliver Wyman

3. Overview of recommended next steps

In conjunction with the recommended Program designs, the Task Force recommended several additional next steps regarding open items to be addressed following the publication of this Feasibility Report. Certain items will be addressed as part of the forthcoming Actuarial Report, as noted below, while the timeline for completing the other open items has yet to be determined.

1. **Financial analysis**. The Task Force expressed particular interest in exploring several alternative scenarios (i.e., financial sensitivities) for the following aspects of Program financing to inform potential changes to the recommended Program designs. This analysis will be performed by Oliver Wyman as part of the Actuarial Report.

    a. **Program opt-out provision transition date**. Assess the financial impact of changing the deadline for the purchase of opt-out eligible private insurance policies from the Program effective date to the beginning of the year preceding the Program effective date.

    b. **Benefit eligibility age**. Assess the financial impact of a range of Program benefit eligibility ages (e.g., no minimum age, 18+, 30+, 40+, 50+, 65+).

    c. **Vesting criteria**. Assess the financial impact of increasing the Design 5 vesting criteria from 5 years to 10 years.

    d. **Portability and divesting criteria**. Assess the financial impact of including full or partial international portability for all Program designs.

    e. **Benefit maximum**. Assess the financial impact of reducing the Design 1 benefit maximum from $1,500 to $1,000 per month.

    f. **Elimination period**. Assess the financial impact of reducing the Design 2 EP from 90 days to 30 days or 0 days.

    g. **Approved care settings**. Assess the financial impact of revising Design 2 to cover HCBS only.

    h. **Revenue source(s)**. Assess the financial impact of a range for the employer-paid portion of the Program contribution rate (e.g., 0% employer paid or fully employee paid, 25% employer paid, 50% employer paid). For scenarios that include an employer paid portion of the Program contribution rate, assess the financial impact of exempting small businesses (e.g., business with fewer than 50 employees).

    i. **Contribution limits**. Assess the financial impact of a range of contribution caps (e.g., various multiples of the Social Security contribution limit), including the impact of not having a contribution cap.

    j. **Investment strategy**. Assess the financial impact of an investment strategy that includes bonds, stocks, and other equities versus one that only includes U.S. Treasuries (i.e., if an amendment to Article XVI, Section 17 of the California Constitution is not obtained).

© 2022 Oliver Wyman

2. **Separate working groups**. The Task Force recommended the establishment of six separate working groups to examine a range of topics that could influence certain aspects of the Program. These working groups would be comprised of individuals with expertise pertaining to the specific topic and should include a diverse range of perspectives. The timing and membership for each working group have not yet been determined—next steps for each working group will be assessed at a later date. Given potential resource constraints and competing priorities, the Task Force recommends prioritizing the working groups as follows, with working groups 1 and 2 established as early as possible:

    a. **Working group 1**: Program outreach and education, including outreach to sovereign tribal communities to ensure they are aware of the Program and their choice of opting into the Program.

    b. **Working group 2**: Program coordination with substitutive and supplemental (complementary or wrap-around) private insurance.

    c. **Working group 3**: Assessment of LTSS needs for individuals with developmental and acquired disabilities in early adulthood.

    d. **Working group 4**: Program coordination with PACE.

    e. **Working group 5**: Program coordination with existing LTSS programs and resources in California (beyond Medi-Cal), including potential integration with existing outreach, care coordination, and care access programs, such as Aging and Disability Resource Connections ("**ADRCs**"), the Health Insurance Counseling and Advocacy Program ("**HICAP**"), and the No Wrong Door System administered by CDA.

    f. **Working group 6**: Program coordination with Medicare Advantage plans.

3. **Coordination and interaction**. A quantitative assessment of the current and future impact of the Program on Medi-Cal (including IHSS) will be performed for the forthcoming Actuarial Report. Other aspects of the Program coordination and interaction that require additional exploration subsequent to this Feasibility Report are as follows:

    a. A federal demonstration waiver from the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services ("**CMS**") should be pursued to allow the state to retain federal Medicaid savings (and Medicare savings, if applicable) attributable to the Program. If approved, any funds received from the waiver should be held in a trust fund to benefit the Program's members.

    b. The Program's coordination and interaction with LTSS benefits provided by the United States Department of Veterans Affairs ("**VA**") should be further explored. Program provisions should be refined, as needed, based on new findings.

    c. Further assessments need to be performed to determine how best the Program can coordinate with California's In-Home Supportive Services ("**IHSS**") program, within the federal requirement of Medicaid as the payer of last resort.

© 2022 Oliver Wyman

   d. Further assessments need to be performed to determine how best the Program can coordinate with Medicare.

   e. For the proposed Program opt-out provisions, a definition of the insurance products eligible for either opt out or reduced Program contributions (e.g., type of insurance, minimum benefits, etc.) is yet to be determined. Further, a recurring recertification process needs to be established for individuals that opt out of the Program or qualify for reduced contributions, including defining the frequency at which individuals will be required to demonstrate that they continue to be covered by eligible private insurance.

   f. Developments in other states related to public LTSS financing should be monitored, particularly in relation to the development of any supplemental private insurance products, to ensure uniformity across states to the extent practicable.

4. **Eligibility and enrollment**. Certain elements of Program eligibility and enrollment require additional exploration subsequent to this Feasibility Report, as follows:

   a. Further exploration is required regarding potential Program variances for sovereign tribal communities that opt into the Program (e.g., allowing Program contributions for tribal communities to be covered by alternative revenue sources that are only available to tribes).

   b. The number of Californians that could be covered under each of the five Program designs included in this Feasibility Report should be assessed and any groups of Californians that would not be covered under each design should be identified. Oliver Wyman will perform this analysis as part of the Actuarial Report.

5. **Benefits and services**. The Task Force recommended that the Program offer preventative measures (with variation by design option), but the specific preventative benefits and services that the Program will cover have yet to be defined. Additionally, the Task Force has not yet aligned on whether preventative measures will be covered under a separate (limited) benefit (e.g., $5,000) or deducted from the same benefit pool as other Program services.

6. **Administration**. The required administrative functions will need to be confirmed based on the ultimate Program design, which may include identifying staff and resource needs, determining whether existing infrastructure in California could be expanded upon to support the Program, and deciding if a new board, department, or agency is required to administer the Program. Expanding current infrastructure or creating a new board, department, or agency would require legislation. As part of this effort, it may be prudent to assess whether there are opportunities to leverage the administrative framework in the private insurance industry to execute certain administrative functions for the Program.

© 2022 Oliver Wyman

7. **Financing**. The Task Force identified several aspects of the Program financing that require additional exploration subsequent to this Feasibility Report.

    a. To allow Program funds to be invested in bonds, stocks, and other equities, an amendment to the California Constitution is required (specifically Article XVI, Section 17 of the California Constitution). Exploration of the potential avenues by which this constitutional amendment could be achieved is required.

    b. The Task Force recommended that certain Program designs waive contributions for lower-income individuals, but the specifics of any contribution waiver have yet to be defined.

    c. Further exploration of taxation considerations for Program benefits is required. It is anticipated that reimbursement benefits paid to Program beneficiaries would not be subject to state or federal personal income tax. However, payment to Program service providers, including informal or family caregivers who receive income from the Program, would be subject to personal or corporate income taxes. Additional discussions with taxation subject matter experts are required to confirm tax treatment for Program benefits, particularly for any cash benefits provided under the Program.

    d. Implications of California's Gann Limit[19] on the Program and its financing mechanisms should be evaluated.

    e. Further exploration is needed to consider alternative revenue sources that could allow existing retirees (as of Program launch) to contribute to (and receive benefits from) the Program.

8. **LTSS Workforce**. The Task Force identified several aspects related to the Program workforce that require additional exploration subsequent to this Feasibility Report.

    a. The Task Force recommended that the Program establish minimum training requirements for informal or family caregivers to become certified caregivers. While the specifics of the training requirements have yet to be defined, the Task Force recommended that the minimum standards be established in a culturally competent manner that does not discourage benefit utilization.

    b. The Task Force recommended that the Program provide financial support for family caregivers through certified caregiver reimbursement, but further research is needed to develop a family caregiver reimbursement model for the Program.

    c. The Task Force made several recommendations related to the LTSS workforce that are tangential to the core Program design but paramount to the Program's successful rollout and viability. This included identifying ways that the Program could positively

[19] The Gann Limit is a constitutional spending cap approved by voters via Proposition 4 in a 1979 special election. The limit applies to both state spending and spending by local governments. At the state level, the limit is tied to California's 1978-79 spending level, adjusted for changes in population and per capita personal income.

© 2022 Oliver Wyman

influence or improve caregiver wages and benefits, investing in caregiver training programs, supporting caregiver career progression, promoting career opportunities (e.g., community college programs), and expanding the LTSS workforce. Further, the Task Force recommended that the Program explore opportunities to leverage automation and technology to supplement the workforce. Finally, as part of the Program's administration, the Task Force recommended establishing LTSS workforce governance and oversight processes, and ensuring that caregivers have access to unions and other forms of workforce representation.

© 2022 Oliver Wyman

4. Feasibility analysis

4.1. Overview

In assessing the potential support from policymakers and the general public, administrative feasibility, and financial feasibility of implementing a statewide LTC program in California, we followed a three-step process involving Task Force member education, discussion, and consensus[20]. To facilitate holistic discussions and provide the Task Force with relevant data points for each Program design element, we analyzed existing programs and frameworks in California, the United States, and abroad, including:

1. Private LTC insurance[21]
2. California's Medicaid program, Medi-Cal (including the IHSS program)
3. California's State Disability Insurance ("**SDI**") and PFL programs
4. Hawaii's Kapuna Caregivers Program
5. Washington State's LTSS program (WA Cares Fund)
6. Germany's LTSS program
7. France's LTSS program

In particular, considering the public LTSS programs in Washington State, France, and Germany allowed us to draw inspiration and insights while being mindful of potential political, economic, and social differences relative to California.

Program design elements have significant interdependence, which we addressed by continuously revisiting certain design elements and recommendations throughout the Task Force meeting process. Program interdependencies were also the focus of the Task Force Meeting #14 discussion in July 2022.

The remainder of Section 4 details the recommendations and considerations for each design element outlined in the Task Force Work Plan.

[20] The Program designs included in this report are based on the Task Force's most prevalent views, but it is important to note that unanimous consensus was not achieved for all Program design elements—that is, more than one view often received strong support from the Task Force.

[21] We focused on traditional LTC products and combination LTC products (i.e., products that combine traditional LTC coverage with life insurance or annuity products). Other private insurance products also cover LTSS benefits, including chronic illness riders and short-term care insurance. Short-term care insurance is not sold in California as it is not differentiated from LTC.

© 2022 Oliver Wyman

4.2. Structure

There are two primary components to Program structure—Program design and Program coverage. The following overarching structure options were discussed with the Task Force:

1. **Program design**: Public benefits, public support for private benefits, and hybrid public-private benefits
2. **Program coverage**: Front-end coverage, back-end (or catastrophic) coverage, and comprehensive coverage

4.2.1. Structure recommendations

The Task Force recommended a Program that provides front-end public benefits for Californians and viewed a vested social insurance program as the most feasible design for the Program. This structure is reflected in all five Program designs included in this Feasibility Report. Key considerations for this recommendation include the following:

- A front-end design provides individuals access to benefits earlier in their need for LTSS, which might result in improved health outcomes.
- Social insurance could benefit the middle class (as opposed to means-tested public assistance) and a front-end design might address the needs of those who do not immediately qualify for Medi-Cal.
- A vesting requirement (as a trade-off) is anticipated to increase Program sustainability.

The Task Force also expressed support for a targeted Program design, which some Task Force members felt might be more feasible to implement, particularly if it was lower cost. This recommendation is reflected in Design 1 and Design 2, which target specific services (e.g., supportive services) and populations (e.g., older adults).

Additional recommendations and next steps outlined by the Task Force include:

1. The Program's vesting requirements should be designed with equity in mind while remaining financially viable (refer to Section 4.4 for further detail about vesting criteria).
2. A working group should be established to explore coordination between the Program and substitutive and supplemental private insurance.

4.2.2. Structure feasibility assessment

The Task Force recommendations contained in Section 4.2.1 were developed based on an assessment of potential support from policymakers and the general public, administrative feasibility, and financial feasibility. The Task Force discussed the following feasibility considerations regarding the Program's structure:

- A front-end design may be the most feasible construct for a state government as the design maximizes the likelihood that an individual who contributes to the Program will receive

© 2022 Oliver Wyman

benefits from the Program (in contrast with a back-end design), which is expected to increase support from policymakers and the general public. Additionally, front-end coverage is anticipated to be less costly than back-end and comprehensive coverage, as front-end designs typically provide coverage for a shorter benefit duration, and therefore may be more financially feasible.

- Program beneficiaries may still require support from Medi-Cal if their LTSS needs exceed the front-end public benefit. This would limit Medi-Cal savings generated by the Program and may reduce support from policymakers (if a key objective is to reduce financial strain on Medi-Cal).
- A front-end design may increase coordination and interaction complexity with private insurance relative to a back-end design, but this administrative complexity may be offset if there is reduced overlap (and thus less intensive coordination) with Medi-Cal.
- Although establishing a new statewide vested social insurance program poses more administrative challenges than other alternatives (e.g., public support for private benefits), precedent of administrative feasibility exists (e.g., California's SDI program).
- Limiting the Program's reach to vested workers (and potentially their spouses or domestic partners under Design 5) may present a challenge to the extent it reduces public support, especially by those unable to participate in the Program. To that end, Program designs that offer broader coverage may receive more support from policymakers and the general public but may also decrease financial feasibility to the extent Program costs are substantially higher.
- All designs include a vesting requirement, which is expected to increase the financial feasibility of the Program. Relatedly, a targeted Program design (such as Design 1 and Design 2) may improve financial feasibility if it lowers the Program cost.

4.2.3. Structure considerations

Design considerations for the Program's structure were discussed with the Task Force at Task Force Meeting #3 in August 2021.

Relevant educational materials on this topic included:

- Program design and program coverage concepts
- Social insurance versus public assistance overview

Key concepts and takeaways from this discussion are summarized below.

4.2.3.1. Program design

4.2.3.1.1. Public benefits

Programs that provide public benefits are typically constructed as social insurance or public assistance. Social insurance programs generally involve pooling risks among participants, while public assistance programs aim to provide basic economic security (e.g., health care, housing, etc.) to lower-

© 2022 Oliver Wyman

income individuals. Both social insurance and public assistance could vary in comprehensiveness—from universal to targeted coverage.

The pros and cons of three public benefit constructs were assessed, as summarized in Exhibit 4.1.

Potential overlap with existing programs (such as Medi-Cal) varies for each of these public benefit constructs. Considerations related to the Program's coordination and interaction with existing programs are provided in Section 4.3 below.

Exhibit 4.1: Public benefits – design considerations

Design option	Pros	Cons
Universal social insurance (e.g., Germany's LTSS program)	• All Californians would be covered • May be able to negotiate and/or regulate LTSS costs • Potentially lower administrative costs per Program participant • Mechanism(s) established for SDI may be leverageable for employee payroll tax collection	• High cost • Benefit modification for social insurance programs could be challenging post-implementation
Vested social insurance (e.g., Washington State's WA Cares Fund)	• Less costly than universal coverage • Mechanism(s) established for SDI may be leverageable for employee payroll tax collection	• Only covers vested workers (and potentially their family members) • Generally higher cost than targeted social assistance • Benefit modification for social insurance programs could be challenging post-implementation
Targeted social assistance (e.g., Hawaii's Kapuna Caregivers Program)	• Less costly than either of the above designs • May be easier to design and implement • May be easier to reduce benefit levels (compared to a social insurance program), if needed, for financial viability	• Will not solve larger LTSS needs (demographic and funding) • A new eligibility record system may need to be constructed and maintained

4.2.3.1.2. Public support for private benefits

Programs that provide public support for private market solutions often involve government actions to support or incentivize the purchase of private insurance.

The pros and cons of four such design constructs were assessed, as summarized in Exhibit 4.2.

Potential overlap with existing programs (such as Medi-Cal) varies for each of these design constructs, though the overlap is expected to be more limited than a public benefit program design. Considerations related to the Program's coordination and interaction with existing programs are provided in Section 4.3 below.

Exhibit 4.2: Public support for private benefits – design considerations

Design option	Pros	Cons
Public-private reinsurance or risk-sharing for private insurance (e.g., public financial support to reimburse private insurer costs for catastrophic LTC claims)	• Largely maintains status quo • Would provide insurers more certainty when estimating insurance premiums • Could be relatively low cost • Comparatively simple	• May not materially reduce private LTC premiums • May not improve private insurance sales or motivate new market entrants • Any insurer costs associated with the Program may be passed on to consumers • Could be viewed as a subsidy for private insurers, which the public may not support • Potential for individuals who do not have private insurance to indirectly subsidize individuals who do have private insurance (e.g., if the reinsurance solution repurposes assets from California's General Fund)
Promote and incentivize new LTC products (e.g., Minnesota's support of a LifeStages product)	• Largely maintains status quo • Very low cost • Comparatively simple	• New products may not be more affordable • May not improve private insurance sales or motivate new market entrants • Will not solve the broader need for accessible and affordable LTSS solutions

© 2022 Oliver Wyman

Design option	Pros	Cons
Require Medicare Supplement health plans to include limited LTSS benefits (e.g., proposal in Minnesota)	• Largely maintains status quo • Very low cost • Comparatively simple	• Any material benefit will likely increase plan costs for consumers • May drive insurers from the market • May not be actuarially viable, due to adverse selection • Will not solve the broader need for accessible and affordable LTSS solutions • Impact may be limited given the low number of Medicare beneficiaries currently enrolled in a Medicare Supplement program
Expand California's LTC Partnership Program (e.g., more affordable policies and/or higher program participation)	• Largely maintains status quo • Very low cost • Comparatively simple	• May not materially reduce private LTC premiums • May not improve private insurance sales or motivate new market entrants • Will not solve the broader need for accessible and affordable LTSS solutions • Elimination of the Medi-Cal eligibility asset limit in 2024 will lessen the attractiveness of this solution

4.2.3.1.3. Hybrid public/private solution

Programs that offer hybrid public/private solutions often provide some public benefits supplemented by private coverage. Private benefits may be supplemental (e.g., additional coverage or services above those offered by public benefit) or complementary (e.g., covering any copays, deductibles, or share-of-cost required for the public benefit). Supplemental and complementary private insurance options covering LTSS benefits exist in most countries with social LTC insurance programs.

Some benefits associated with a hybrid Program design are that the private options could help fill gaps in public benefits and may allow for lower public costs. Additionally, this Program design would give consumers more freedom of choice in terms of the level of coverage they prefer. However, private options designed as part of a hybrid Program solution may not be affordable for all

© 2022 Oliver Wyman

Californians. Further, it may not be feasible for private insurers to design and file unique insurance solutions in each state with a public LTC program, particularly if public program designs differ from state to state.

4.2.3.2. Program coverage

There are three primary program coverage types, as follows:

1. **Front-end coverage**: Provides benefits at or near the beginning of an individual's eligibility for LTSS
2. **Back-end (or catastrophic) coverage**: Provides benefits after an individual with LTSS needs has waited for a specified period (e.g., two years) or paid a specified dollar amount (deductible) for LTSS (e.g., $50,000)
3. **Comprehensive coverage**: Provides benefits throughout an individual's eligibility for LTSS (i.e., at both the front and back end), though benefits may still be subject to an individual satisfying a specified EP or deductible

The pros and cons associated with these three coverage types were assessed, as summarized in Exhibit 4.3.

Potential overlap with existing programs (such as Medi-Cal) varies for each of these coverage types. Considerations related to the Program's coordination and interaction with existing programs are provided in Section 4.3 below.

Exhibit 4.3: Program coverage– design considerations

Design option	Pros	Cons
Front-end coverage (e.g., Washington State's WA Cares Fund)	• Will likely benefit a greater proportion of Californians (relative to back-end coverage) as all individuals who meet the Program's qualification requirements (e.g., vesting period) will receive benefits • Front-end coverage is typically less costly than back-end and comprehensive coverage as it tends to provide LTSS benefits for a more limited duration • Comparatively more predictable Program costs	• Could pay far less per claim than back-end or comprehensive coverage • Benefits may be inadequate to cover all costs associated with an individual's LTSS needs; however, the intent of AB 567 is to consider a basic insurance benefit (rather than one that addresses all LTSS needs) • Increased coordination and interaction complexity with private insurance

Design option	Pros	Cons
Back-end coverage (e.g., federally proposed Well-Being Insurance for Seniors to be at Home ("**WISH**") Act)	• Coverage could pay more per claim than front-end coverage • For those with significant LTSS needs, back-end coverage is likely more beneficial than front-end • May allow for easier coordination and interaction with private insurance	• Back-end coverage is typically more costly than front-end coverage as it tends to provide LTSS benefits for a longer duration • Provides benefits to fewer individuals • Comparatively less predictable Program costs relative to front-end coverage • Individuals may be impoverished during the waiting period
Comprehensive coverage (e.g., Germany's LTSS program, private insurance)	• Will likely benefit a greater proportion of Californians (relative to back-end coverage) as all individuals who meet the Program's qualification requirements (e.g., vesting period) will receive benefits • Potential for cost control through the ability to negotiate and regulate service prices as the state would be a primary financer of LTSS • Potentially lower administrative complexity and costs (e.g., simplified coordination and interaction with other public programs and private insurance)	• Highest Program cost • Comparatively less predictable Program costs relative to front-end coverage

© 2022 Oliver Wyman

4.3. Coordination and interaction

Coordination of payers could have significant financial implications. Therefore, an assessment of how the Program could interact and coordinate with private insurance and existing public programs is necessary to delineate the order of payers and avoid duplication of coverage across financing sources.

Task Force recommendations focused on the Program's coordination and interaction with the following LTSS financing sources:

1. Private insurance
2. Medi-Cal (California's state Medicaid program, which provides health and LTSS coverage for low-income individuals)
3. Medicare (national health coverage program for older adults and people with disabilities)
4. Other LTSS programs and services (e.g., supportive services administered by CDA)

A brief primer on the home and community-based programs and services administered by CDA is included in Appendix D. In addition, an assessment of the Program's impact on existing state programs, including Medi-Cal, IHSS, and Medicare, will be included in the Actuarial Report.

Additionally, the Task Force received a briefing on several LTSS-related programs and initiatives proposed at the federal level (e.g., the WISH Act). As these programs and initiatives remain under review by the United States Congress, they are subject to change or may fail to pass. As such, we did not ask the Task Force to provide recommendations related to the Program's coordination and interaction with federal programs that have yet to be enacted.

4.3.1. Coordination and interaction recommendations

The Program coordination and interaction recommendations and next steps outlined by the Task Force are summarized below. While not unanimous, the following recommendations represent the most prevalent views among the Task Force.

Private insurance:

1. The Task Force recommended that substitutive private insurance (e.g., private insurance designed before Program enactment that provides similar LTSS coverage as the Program) should pay benefits for LTSS before the Program pays benefits because the premiums paid by policyholders were determined in the absence of the Program. Further, if substitutive private insurance were to pay benefits for LTSS after the Program, California Insurance Code

© 2022 Oliver Wyman

10235.91[22] would likely apply, which the Task Force deemed administratively challenging. This recommendation is interdependent with the Task Force's private insurance exemption recommendation, which is discussed in more detail below.

2. Coordination of benefits between the Program and private insurance should allow for concurrent benefits if they are non-duplicative. That is, if an individual's LTSS costs exceed their maximum private insurance benefits, an individual should be permitted to claim the excess portion of the costs through the Program, subject to Program eligibility requirements. There may also be situations where certain services are covered by the Program but not by an individual's private insurance, in which case an individual should be permitted to claim these costs through the Program.
3. Individuals who own eligible substitutive private insurance as of the Program's effective date should be permitted to opt out of the Program. Any new private insurance policies sold after this deadline (which should be explicitly established in the enacting legislation) would be ineligible for Program opt out. This recommendation offers individuals motivated to opt out of the Program a narrow window between the Governor's approval and Program's effective date to purchase eligible private insurance. While this allows consumers flexibility, it could also lead to a disproportionate share of higher-income residents deciding to opt out of the Program given that they would be contributing more to the Program than low- and middle-income residents for the same benefits, and they can more easily afford private insurance.
4. Individuals who purchase eligible substitutive private insurance after the Program's effective date should qualify for reduced Program contributions. These individuals would still be able to receive LTSS benefits under the Program as a second payer. Offering reduced Program contributions to individuals that purchase substitutive private insurance incentivizes individuals to plan for their future LTC needs holistically. This benefits the individual because private insurance may provide more comprehensive coverage than the Program. It also benefits the Program, as substitutive insurance would be the first payer, thus reducing the costs borne by the Program. The determination of the reduced contribution would be subject to an actuarial evaluation.
5. To inform potential changes to the recommended Program designs, the Task Force recommended that an alternative scenario (i.e., financial sensitivity) be explored where individuals who purchase eligible substitutive private insurance on or before the beginning of the year preceding the Program effective date are permitted to opt out of the Program, while individuals who purchase eligible private insurance after this date are eligible for reduced

[22] California Insurance Code 10235.91 stipulates that "in the event a non-Medicaid national or state long-term care program is created through public funding that substantially duplicates benefits covered by the policy or certificate, the policyholder or certificate holder will be entitled to select either a reduction in future premiums or an increase in future benefits. An actuarial method for determining the premium reductions and increases in future benefits will be mutually agreed upon by the department and insurers. The amount of the premium reductions and future benefit increases to be made by each insurer will be based on the extent of the duplication of covered benefits, the amount of past premium payments, and claims experience. Each insurer's premium reduction and benefit increase plans shall be filed and approved by the department."

© 2022 Oliver Wyman

Program contributions (rather than an opt-out). That is, the triggering event to transition from an opt-out to reduced Program contributions is set to the beginning of the year preceding the Program effective date.

6. The definition of eligible insurance products that qualify for either opt out or reduced Program contributions has not yet been determined. A proposed definition should be determined by the CDI and include collaboration from the private insurance industry.
7. A recurring recertification process should be established for individuals who opted out of the Program or qualified for reduced contributions to demonstrate that they continue to own eligible private insurance. The frequency of this recertification has yet to be determined. If the individual no longer owns an eligible policy due to cancellation or lapse, the individual would be required to participate in the Program and begin payment of Program contributions.
8. The Task Force recommended establishing a separate working group to examine how the Program could best coordinate with supplemental (or "wrap-around") private insurance products developed after the Program's legislative enactment. These supplemental insurance products would pay for an individual's LTSS costs after an individual has exhausted their Program benefits. The California Insurance Code would need to be updated to include standards for supplemental insurance products, including product labeling, suitability criteria, benefits triggers, and interaction with Program benefits.
9. The Task Force recognized the importance of having uniformity in public LTC program designs among states to promote a viable supplemental private insurance market (i.e., designing and filing unique supplemental insurance products for each state with a public LTC program might not be practicable). However, the only immediate actionable step is to monitor developments in other states.
10. While further exploration is needed for the Program's coordination and interaction with medical services and insurance (e.g., employer sponsored coverage or individual coverage through Covered California, distinct from private LTC insurance), it is anticipated to be more practical for Californians and more cost-effective for the Program if it is designed to minimize duplicative coverage with medical insurance, and for private medical insurance to pay before the Program when overlapping coverage exists.

Medi-Cal:

1. The Task Force recommended that the Program should pay before Medi-Cal, because Medi-Cal is the payer of last resort by federal law.
2. Coordination of benefits between the Program and Medi-Cal should allow for concurrent benefits if they are non-duplicative. That is, if an individual's LTSS needs exceed the Program's maximum benefit, the remaining services for a Medi-Cal eligible individual could be covered by Medi-Cal, subject to Medi-Cal eligibility rules, provider enrollment requirements, and reimbursement rates. There may also be situations where certain services are covered by Medi-Cal but not by the Program, or where the individual is eligible to receive benefits under

© 2022 Oliver Wyman

Medi-Cal but not the Program, in which case the individual would receive these services through Medi-Cal.

3. The Program should not influence the Medi-Cal eligibility determination process (e.g., benefits received from the Program should not be deemed income when determining Medi-Cal eligibility).
4. The Program should not exclude individuals on the basis that they are eligible for Medi-Cal (whether in the past, present, or future). Said differently, the Program should not be designed with the intent of carving out individuals who may be eligible for Medi-Cal[23].
5. A federal demonstration waiver should be pursued to allow the state to receive federal Medicaid savings attributable to the Program, to partially offset the costs of providing LTSS under the Program to individuals that would otherwise receive those LTSS through Medi-Cal (including IHSS). If approved, funds received from the waiver should be held in a trust fund to benefit the Program's members.
6. Further analysis is needed to understand how the Program could best coordinate with IHSS, within the federal requirement of Medicaid as the payer of last resort.
7. A quantitative assessment of the current and future impact of the Program on Medi-Cal (including IHSS) will be performed for the forthcoming Actuarial Report.

Medicare:

1. Coverage for LTSS under Medicare is limited and includes short stays in a nursing facility following an inpatient admission and some home health care services. Thus, it is anticipated to be more practical for Californians and more cost-effective for the Program if it is designed to minimize duplicative coverage with Medicare, and for Medicare to pay before the Program when overlapping coverage exists. Further analysis and stakeholder interviews are needed to assess the feasibility of having the Program pay second to Medicare for LTSS covered by both programs.
2. The Task Force also recommended establishing separate working groups to assess how the Program could coordinate with (i) PACE and (ii) Medicare Advantage plans.

Other LTSS programs or services:

1. To the extent feasible, the Task Force recommended that the Program integrate with existing outreach and information resources available in California (such as ADRCs and HICAP) as part of the state's emerging No Wrong Door system.
2. Due to the complex nature of the existing LTSS programs and services available in California, the Task Force recommended establishing a separate working group to assess how the

[23] Design 2 is an exception to this recommendation because it intentionally targets individuals who are less likely to qualify for Medi-Cal as a means of limiting duplication with Medi-Cal and reducing Program costs.

© 2022 Oliver Wyman

Program could best coordinate with all available LTSS resources in the state (beyond Medi-Cal).

3. California's veteran population has access to certain LTSS benefits through the VA. Further exploration of the Program's coordination and interaction with the VA is needed.

4.3.2. Coordination and interaction feasibility assessment

The Task Force recommendations contained in Section 4.3.1 were developed based on an assessment of potential support from policymakers and the general public, administrative feasibility, and financial feasibility. The Task Force discussed the following feasibility considerations regarding the Program's coordination and interaction:

- Having the Program pay after substitutive private insurance may increase coordination and interaction complexity with private insurance but alleviates the potential administrative complexity associated with California Insurance Code 10235.91 (which may apply if the Program pays before substitutive private insurance). This may also increase financial feasibility if Program benefit usage is reduced.
- Including a private insurance opt-out provision in the Program may reduce Program opposition (e.g., from individuals who already own private insurance) thereby increasing potential support from policymakers. However, adverse selection associated with the opt-out provision could reduce the financial feasibility of the Program. Additionally, private insurance industry support for the Program may be reduced if the re-certification requirements for the opt-out provision are overly burdensome or complex to administer. Relatedly, expanding the opt-out provision to encompass individuals who have access to adequate LTSS coverage through means other than private insurance (e.g., through the VA; subject to further exploration as noted in Section 4.3.1) should increase support from policymakers and the general public but may present financial and administrative feasibility challenges.
- Targeting coverage to individuals who may not be eligible for Medi-Cal (as under Design 2) may increase financial feasibility by reducing Program costs but could reduce administrative feasibility due to added complexity (e.g., keeping track of individuals who are not required to contribute or receive vesting credits in a given year). Further, it may reduce support from policymakers (e.g., if a key objective is to reduce financial strain on Medi-Cal or if public support for the Program is impacted by this design element).

4.3.3. Coordination and interaction considerations

Design considerations for the Program's coordination and interaction with other public LTSS programs and private insurance were primarily discussed with the Task Force at Task Force Meeting #4 in October 2021 and Task Force Meeting #6 in January 2022.

© 2022 Oliver Wyman

Relevant educational materials on this topic included:

- California Department of Aging long-term services and supports
- California's No Wrong Door System infrastructure and planning
- California Department of Health Care Services Medi-Cal and Medicare programs
- Coordination and interaction with Medi-Cal
- Medicaid and related federal waivers for LTSS
- Potential integration with Medicare Advantage
- Overview of PACE
- Coordination and interaction with private LTC insurance
- Partnering a statewide LTC program with private LTC insurance
- Actuarial considerations of program design
- Private LTC insurance and PACE coordination illustrative examples
- Coordination and interaction with current federal proposals

Key concepts and takeaways from these discussions are summarized below.

4.3.3.1. Coordination with private insurance

4.3.3.1.1. Partnering with private insurance

An overarching objective of AB 567 is to expand the availability of LTSS coverage for Californians. To achieve this goal, the Program must coordinate with the private insurance market. Key considerations regarding how the Program could optimally partner with private insurance include:

1. Public programs that provide some level of LTSS coverage may be able to build on the existing framework in the private LTC market instead of seeking to replace it. For example:
    a. It may be possible to utilize administrative capabilities in the private sector to readily and efficiently deliver LTC services under public programs.
    b. Insurance agents could be leveraged to support and execute public education initiatives (e.g., in conjunction with the sale of supplemental insurance products).
2. A public program that integrates with a variety of insurance options could result in more consumers having access to the coverage they need and would promote overall Medi-Cal savings. To that end, it may be beneficial to consider ways to build on and enhance existing programs like the Partnership program (though the elimination of the Medi-Cal eligibility asset limit in 2024 will likely reduce the attractiveness of this program).

© 2022 Oliver Wyman

3. The private insurance market could develop and offer innovative supplemental insurance products that cover LTSS benefits, likely at more widely affordable price points, which could potentially lessen the financial burden on other public programs such as Medi-Cal. It is crucial for states to work collaboratively with the private industry to set standards for supplemental insurance products prior to Program implementation and ensure that such private insurance options can reach the marketplace in a timely manner.

4.3.3.1.2. Private insurance opt-out considerations

An opt-out provision would allow individuals with eligible private insurance to be exempt from the Program—they would not be required to contribute, nor would they have access to Program benefits. However, care must be taken to minimize opt-out adverse selection, as any adverse selection could jeopardize the Program's sustainability. An example of how adverse selection may arise is if the value proposition (benefits relative to premiums) of private insurance far outweighs the value proposition under the Program, which may incentivize individuals to purchase private insurance and opt out of the Program, thereby significantly reducing Program revenues. This scenario is more likely to occur among higher-income individuals under a progressive tax construct (e.g., absent a maximum contribution limit).

The pros and cons associated with the three primary opt-out provisions discussed by the Task Force are summarized in Exhibit 4.4.

Exhibit 4.4: Private insurance opt-out considerations

Design option	Pros	Cons
Opt-out provision (unrestricted or time-limited)	• More equitable for individuals who purchased private insurance before the enactment of the Program • Provides individuals with more choice	• May negatively impact Program viability as wealthier individuals are more likely to opt out • May receive limited public support (particularly in light of circumstances leading up to the WA Cares opt-out deadline)
Reduced Program contributions	• Rewards individuals for purchasing private insurance, which may provide more comprehensive LTSS protection while enhancing Program sustainability	• May negatively impact Program viability as wealthier individuals are more likely to purchase private insurance
No opt-out provision	• May positively impact Program viability as more	• Takes choices away from the individual

Design option	Pros	Cons
	individuals will participate in the Program	• Less equitable for individuals who have already purchased private insurance and increases complexity of benefit coordination between the Program and private insurance • May receive less public support, particularly from those with existing insurance policies

Additional considerations related to opt-out provisions include:

1. A clear definition of what constitutes "eligible" private insurance for the purposes of an opt-out provision must be established. The definition should be broad-based to cover a range of insurance products that provide LTSS coverage (e.g., inclusive of both standalone LTC insurance and life or annuity insurance products with riders providing LTSS coverage). The definition may also consider establishing a minimum level of benefits requirement. Further discussion is required on this topic, as noted above.

2. The circumstances and motivations underlying an individual's decision to purchase private insurance likely differ depending on whether the insurance is issued before or after the legislative enactment of the Program. The potential for adverse selection substantially increases if an opt-out provision is extended post-Program enactment. If an opt-out provision is included, the least risky provision would be to allow only individuals with legacy private insurance policies the ability to opt out. For this provision, a legacy policy would be defined as an eligible private insurance policy issued before a specified date preceding Program enactment (e.g., January 2022). Capturing only legacy policies in the opt-out provision significantly reduces the risk of adverse selection as it generally encompasses fewer individuals who were motivated to purchase private insurance because of the Program.

3. While including a time-limited opt-out window would increase flexibility for prospective private insurance consumers, a surge in private insurance applications would likely occur in the months leading up to the deadline, similar to what happened with the WA Cares Fund. To mitigate this outcome, legislation enacting the Program should set a deadline (e.g., the date the Governor signs the legislation), which would make any new LTC policy sales ineligible for Program opt out after the deadline. The Task Force discussed a range of limited-window opt-out deadline options, as illustrated by the following **hypothetical** example (ordered from longest to shortest opt-out window).

    a. Program effective date: January 1, 2025

    b. Governor approval date: October 1, 2024

© 2022 Oliver Wyman

c. Senate pass date: September 1, 2024
d. Assembly pass date: August 1, 2024
e. Beginning of the year preceding the Program effective date: January 1, 2024

4. Periodic verification that an individual has maintained their private insurance coverage post opt out is essential. While a one-time certification would be simpler to administer than a recurring recertification process, allowing a one-time certification could be fraught with misuse (e.g., individuals opt out of the Program and subsequently lapse their private insurance coverage).
5. Outreach and education could support individuals in holistically planning for, and financing, their future LTSS needs.

4.3.3.2. Coordination with Medi-Cal

California's Medi-Cal program provides health coverage for children and adults with limited income at no cost (or low cost) to the covered individual. With regard to LTSS, the program offers a broad array of facility and HCBS coverage. For facility coverage, Medi-Cal provider types include SNFs, intermediate care facilities and related providers, sub-acute facilities, and pediatric sub-acute facilities. Two-thirds of California's nursing facility residents rely on Medi-Cal to pay for their care. For HCBS, a variety of Medi-Cal waiver and State Plan programs provide services such as personal care services, care coordination, chore services, protective supervision, and respite care.

Medi-Cal HCBS programs include IHSS, Community Based Adult Services ("**CBAS**"), the Assisted Living Waiver, the Home and Community Based Alternatives Waiver, the Multipurpose Senior Services Program ("**MSSP**"), the Medi-Cal Waiver Program, and the California Community Transitions Project. Other HCBS programs include Medi-Cal Home Health benefits, and the Medicaid funded programs administered by the Department of Developmental Services. IHSS is the largest HCBS program in California, with close to 700,000 authorized recipients in 2022. IHSS provides personal care services to Medi-Cal eligible individuals who meet IHSS program eligibility criteria. Under IHSS, county social workers assess the beneficiary's need for assistance with ADLs and authorize a specific number of IHSS provider hours each month for that beneficiary.[24]

Key considerations for how the Program could coordinate and interact with Medi-Cal facility and HCBS coverage include:

1. **Medi-Cal savings**: Medi-Cal is authorized and funded through a federal-state partnership. Including the Medi-Cal eligible population in the Program will affect Medi-Cal expenditures. If the Program diverts costs from Medi-Cal, federal Medicaid funds will be reduced. A federal waiver could be requested for the state to retain federal savings. Washington state is seeking a federal waiver for the state to capture anticipated federal savings generated by the WA Cares Fund. California could also pursue a federal waiver, recognizing that one is not

[24] Additional information on the IHSS eligibility requirements and benefits can be found at https://www.cdss.ca.gov/in-home-supportive-services.

© 2022 Oliver Wyman

guaranteed. The estimated Program savings to Medi-Cal, and additional Program costs without a federal waiver, will be assessed as part of the Actuarial Report to be released on or before January 1, 2024.

B. **Medi-Cal eligibility**: Medi-Cal eligibility for LTSS is currently based on income, assets, physician approval, and medical necessity, though the Medi-Cal eligibility asset limit will be eliminated in 2024, which is expected to increase Medi-Cal enrollment. Excluding the Medi-Cal eligible population from the Program may not be administratively feasible, given that Medi-Cal eligibility may change for individuals over time due to shifts in their income, need for LTSS, and other eligibility factors. Further, such an exclusion may not be equitable as this may result in lower-income individuals not having access to the same range of services as higher-income individuals to the extent Program coverage differs from Medi-Cal.

C. **Coordination of benefits**: Coordination of benefits between the Program and Medi-Cal is possible with well-defined Program benefits, as demonstrated by the existing coordination with Medicare and other health coverages. By federal law, Medi-Cal is the payer of last resort, so Program benefits need to be paid before or concurrent with Medi-Cal (so long as benefits are not duplicative, as described above).

A quantitative assessment of the current and future impact of the Program on Medi-Cal (including IHSS) will be performed for the forthcoming Actuarial Report.

4.3.3.3. Coordination with Medicare

Medicare is a federal health care program for individuals age 65 and older, younger individuals with qualifying disabilities, and individuals with End Stage Renal Disease. Medicare helps cover a variety of services, such as hospital stays, doctor visits, medical supplies, and prescription drug coverage.

While Medicare covers select LTSS benefits, including short-term stays in an SNF and home health services (such as part-time skilled nursing care, physical therapy, part-time home health aide, and durable medical equipment), more comprehensive LTSS benefits, such as those offered by private insurance or Medi-Cal, are not covered[25]. Medicare covers custodial care in nursing facilities under certain conditions for up to 100 days immediately following a hospital-related medical condition but does not cover long-term custodial care.

Given that the scope of Medicare's LTSS benefits is narrow, it is anticipated to be more practical for Californians and more cost-effective for the Program if it is designed to minimize duplicative coverage with Medicare, and for Medicare to pay before the Program when overlapping coverage exists.

If the Program were to provide similar services to those covered by Medicare, members eligible for both programs might forfeit some or all of the nursing facility and home health care benefits available under Medicare if the Program pays before Medicare. Further, home health care benefits provided by Medicare often begin immediately following an in-patient stay and are typically initiated via a referral

[25] Additional information on the home health services covered by Medicare can be found at https://www.medicare.gov/coverage/home-health-services

from a doctor within the hospital. If the Program pays before Medicare, access to home health care services could be delayed.

Having Medicare pay first would also negate the potential need to pursue a federal demonstration waiver to retain federal Medicare savings attributable to the Program.

Further analysis and stakeholder interviews are needed to assess the feasibility of having the Program pay second to Medicare for LTSS covered by both programs.

4.3.3.4. Coordination with other LTSS programs and services

Helping older adults and people with disabilities access information and assistance is a critical component to making informed choices for LTSS. Several resources are available in California, including, but not limited to:

1. **ADRCs**: These resource connections are administered by CDA and aim to streamline access to information. ADRCs provide person-centered information, care planning, and care coordination to all ages, incomes, and disabilities. This program is on a path to statewide expansion as part of the No Wrong Door system.
2. **HICAP**: This program is administered by CDA and provides free, unbiased, one-on-one counseling, education, and assistance to individuals and their families on Medicare, LTC insurance, other health insurance-related issues, and planning for LTC needs.

A summary of additional programs administered by CDA is summarized in Appendix D.

Lastly, individuals who have served in the active military may be eligible for health benefits through the VA. The health benefits provided by the VA include a comprehensive range of HCBS (such as ADC, respite care, personal care and homemaker services, and home health aide). Assisted living and nursing home care is available through State Veterans Homes, but is subject to limited availability and significant cost sharing. Nursing home care is also provided by VA-run and VA-contracted nursing homes for veterans who are enrolled in the VA health care program and have a clinical need, but admission is subject to availability. Nursing home admission is guaranteed only for veterans with a service-connected disability rating of 70% or higher or a disability rating of 60% or higher if the veteran is determined to be unemployable or permanently and totally disabled.

Due to the complex nature of the existing LTSS programs and services described above, the Task Force recommended establishing a separate group to assess how the Program could best coordinate with all available LTSS resources in the state (beyond Medi-Cal and Medicare).

© 2022 Oliver Wyman

4.4. Eligibility and enrollment

The Program's eligibility and enrollment provisions establish guidelines for participation in the Program and criteria that must be satisfied by Program participants to receive benefits. Task Force discussions focused on the following eligibility and enrollment provisions:

1. Benefit eligibility criteria
2. Benefit eligibility age
3. Vesting criteria
4. Portability and divesting criteria
5. Enrollment type
6. Opt-in and buy-in provisions

4.4.1. Eligibility and enrollment recommendations

The Program eligibility and enrollment provisions recommended by the Task Force are outlined in Exhibit 4.5, along with key considerations and rationale for these recommendations. While not unanimous, the recommendations in this exhibit represent the most prevalent views among the Task Force and have informed the recommended Program designs.

Exhibit 4.5: Program eligibility and enrollment – design recommendations

Design element	Recommendation[26]	Considerations and rationale
Benefit eligibility criteria	• HIPAA benefit eligibility trigger[27] (i.e., 2 of 6 ADLs for at least 90 days or severe cognitive impairment)	• Establishing a benefit eligibility trigger consistent with private insurance products facilitates coordination with existing and future supplemental private insurance • The primary drawback of this recommendation is that vested individuals may satisfy Medi-Cal eligibility criteria

[26] Recommendation represents the most prevalent views expressed by the Task Force based on Task Force member questionnaire results and Task Force meeting discussions. Design 5 reflects these recommendations while the remaining designs reflect trade-offs to increase the affordability of Program contributions.

[27] The six standard ADLs established by HIPAA (Section 7702B) include bathing, dressing, toileting, transferring, continence, and eating. The benefit eligibility trigger defined in HIPAA requires that an individual be certified by a licensed health care practitioner as (i) being unable to perform (without substantial assistance from another individual) at least 2 ADLs for a period of at least 90 days due to a loss of functional capacity or (ii) requiring substantial supervision to protect such individual from threats to health and safety due to severe cognitive impairment.

© 2022 Oliver Wyman

Design element	Recommendation[26]	Considerations and rationale
		prior to meeting the Program criteria and would thus have to rely on Medi-Cal at the onset of their LTSS need • The Task Force assessed a triaged benefit eligibility criteria[28] design with varying tiers of benefits but deemed it too complex. The Task Force was also concerned that individuals might face challenges moving between benefit tiers due to delays in benefit eligibility assessments
Benefit eligibility age	• Offer benefits to individuals aged 18 and older (subject to the satisfaction of vesting requirements)[29] • Benefit eligibility age should not depend on when an individual becomes disabled. Individuals who become disabled prior to the benefit eligibility age would be eligible to receive benefits upon reaching the benefit eligibility age as long as they satisfy vesting requirements	• A benefit eligibility age of 18 aligns with the minimum Program contribution age of 18 (refer to Section 4.7 for further detail on the Program's contribution requirements) • Having a lower minimum benefit eligibility age than 18 (e.g., no minimum age) would not increase access to benefits for individuals below age 18, given the Program vesting requirement and minimum Program contribution age (age 18) • Establishing an older benefit eligibility age (e.g., age 65 and older under Design 2) would

[28] The triaged benefit eligibility criteria would have included three tiers, with more comprehensive benefits available if an individual's condition worsens. In particular, "Tier 1" would have provided preventative benefits after satisfying the Program vesting requirement, "Tier 2" would have provided ancillary LTSS benefits after satisfying benefit eligibility triggers based on instrumental activities of daily living (e.g., cooking, cleaning, transportation, etc.), and "Tier 3" would have provided full LTSS benefits after satisfying the HIPAA (ADL-based) benefit eligibility trigger.

[29] To increase affordability of Program contributions, Design 2 targets the aging population and has a minimum benefit eligibility age of 65.

© 2022 Oliver Wyman

Design element	Recommendation[26]	Considerations and rationale
		focus the Program on the aging population while reducing anticipated Program costs – An older benefit eligibility age also aligns with the Program benefit maximum amount, which would likely be insufficient for a younger individual with ongoing LTSS needs (refer to Section 4.5 for further detail on the Program benefit maximum amount)
Vesting criteria	• Individuals become fully vested after contributing for a specific number of years (5 years or 10 years, depending on the Program design)[30] • Offer pro-rated (partial) benefits to those unable to satisfy the full vesting requirement • 5-year vesting period design: – No benefits for individuals who contribute for less than 3 years – 50% of benefits for individuals who contribute between 3 and 5 years – 100% of benefits for individuals who contribute for 5 or more years • 10-year vesting period design:	• The Task Force acknowledged that including a vesting requirement in the Program design is critical to ensuring that the Program remains financially viable • The shorter the duration of the vesting period, the higher the likelihood that an individual will become eligible for Program benefits – A shorter vesting period is significant for individuals nearing retirement upon Program implementation but may increase intergenerational inequity (refer to Section 4.7 for further detail on intergenerational inequity) – Another trade-off to a shorter vesting period is an increase in Program cost

[30] Vesting credit would be contingent on an individual working a minimum number of hours in a given year. The minimum worked hours requirement has yet to be determined.

© 2022 Oliver Wyman

Design element	Recommendation[26]	Considerations and rationale
	– No benefits for individuals who contribute for less than 5 years – 50% of benefits for individuals who contribute for 5 years, grading up by 10% each year to 100% of benefits in year 10	(i.e., the requisite Program contribution rate will increase as the vesting requirement decreases)
Portability and divesting criteria	• Allow benefits to be used outside the state of California • Allow international portability • Consider design options with both full and partial portability • For partial portability designs, grade linearly to 50% of benefits over 5 years	• The Task Force acknowledged that a portability provision is a vital step toward a culturally competent Program (e.g., individuals of certain cultures may prefer to receive care in their home country or from a family member residing outside of California) • Task Force members felt that requiring individuals who contributed to the Program to remain in California to receive benefits is inequitable – This consideration also applies to individuals who live out of state but work in California (in person or remotely) and would therefore contribute to the Program
Enrollment type	• Mandatory Program with select exemptions and opt-out provisions (refer to Section 4.3 for further details on private insurance opt outs)	• The Task Force acknowledged that broader Program participation would increase Program sustainability. Further, a voluntary (or partially voluntary) Program is not financially sustainable
Opt-in and buy-in provisions	• No opt-in or buy-in provision with few exceptions:	• Minimizing voluntary elements will increase Program sustainability

Design element	Recommendation[26]	Considerations and rationale
	– As states do not have the authority to require sovereign tribal communities to participate in social insurance programs, sovereign tribal communities should be offered the choice of opting into the Program as a group[31]	

Additional recommendations and next steps outlined by the Task Force with regard to the Program's eligibility and enrollment provisions include:

1. A separate working group should be established to assess LTSS needs for individuals with developmental and acquired disabilities in early adulthood. The type of care and duration of need is expected to differ significantly for these individuals relative to individuals who require LTSS as a result of aging.
2. Further exploration is required regarding potential Program variances for sovereign tribal communities that opt into the Program (e.g., allowing Program contributions for tribal communities to be covered by alternative revenue sources that are only available to tribes).
3. As part of the Actuarial Report, Oliver Wyman will estimate the number of Californians that could be covered under each of the five Program designs included in this Feasibility Report and identify groups of Californians that would not be covered.
4. The Task Force expressed particular interest in exploring several alternative scenarios (i.e., financial sensitivities) for the following aspects of Program eligibility and enrollment to inform potential changes to the recommended Program designs:
    a. **Benefit eligibility age**. Assess the financial impact of a range of Program benefit eligibility ages (e.g., no minimum age, 18+, 30+, 40+, 50+, 65+)
    b. **Vesting criteria**. Assess the financial impact of increasing the Design 5 vesting criteria from 5 years to 10 years.
    c. **Portability and divesting criteria**. Assess the financial impact of including full or partial international portability for all Program designs

[31] States do not have the authority to require participation from members of a federally recognized tribe who reside in the tribal territory if Program contributions are derived from activities that take place in the tribal territory.

4.4.2. Eligibility and enrollment feasibility assessment

The Task Force recommendations contained in Section 4.4.1 were developed based on an assessment of potential support from policymakers and the general public, administrative feasibility, and financial feasibility. The Task Force discussed the following feasibility considerations regarding the Program's eligibility and enrollment:

- Having a Program benefit eligibility trigger that is generally consistent with private insurance products that provide coverage for LTSS will facilitate coordination and increase the administrative feasibility of the Program. This will also reduce the likelihood of a gap in coverage between the Program and an individual's private insurance, if applicable.
- Support from policymakers and the general public may be reduced if individuals who are vested in the Program are able to satisfy Medi-Cal eligibility requirements but not the Program's eligibility requirements (i.e., if the Program's benefit eligibility trigger is more restrictive than Medi-Cal's eligibility requirements).
- A younger benefit eligibility age (as under Design 1, Design 3, Design 4, and Design 5) would allow vested individuals that meet the benefit eligibility criteria to access Program benefits sooner, which could increase Program support from policymakers and the general public. However, establishing an older benefit eligibility age (as under Design 2) would increase financial feasibility by reducing anticipated Program costs.
- Including a vesting requirement increases the financial feasibility of the Program but also increases administrative complexity. A longer vesting period (as under Design 3 and Design 4) will have a larger impact on Program costs and financial feasibility. A shorter vesting period (as under Design 1, Design 2, and Design 5) may generate higher public support because it increases the likelihood that an individual will become eligible for Program benefits.
- While it may increase administrative complexity, offering pro-rated (partial) benefits to those unable to satisfy the full vesting requirement will increase support for the Program from policymakers and the general public by limiting situations where an individual is required to contribute to the Program but is unable to access benefits. Under Design 5, Program participants will also be given a choice to 'top-up" benefits via an alternative Program contribution if they cannot fully vest. While this option may increase public support, including voluntary elements could significantly reduce the financial feasibility of the Program due to adverse selection (i.e., individuals who elect the "top-up" are more likely to access benefits).
- All recommended Program designs include some degree of benefit portability. While portability increases administrative complexity, allowing vested individuals to access Program benefits outside of California or the United States increases equity and will enhance support from policymakers and the general public. More expansive portability criteria (as under Design 1, Design 4, and Design 5) may increase support from policymakers and the general public, but will also increase Program cost, which reduces financial feasibility.

© 2022 Oliver Wyman

4.4.3. Eligibility and enrollment considerations

Design considerations for the Program's eligibility and enrollment provisions were primarily discussed with the Task Force at Task Force Meeting #5 in December 2021.

Relevant educational materials on this topic included:

- Eligibility and enrollment
- International portability considerations
- Benefit eligibility age considerations

Key concepts and takeaways from this discussion are summarized below.

There are six primary program eligibility and enrollment provisions, as follows:

1. **Benefit eligibility criteria:** Defines the minimum disablement or financial criteria an individual must meet to qualify for benefits under the Program. The disablement criteria are generally based on an individual's need for assistance in performing ADLs or requiring support for cognitive impairment. Financial criteria are generally based on an individual's income (such as the case for Medi-Cal) or asset levels.
2. **Benefit eligibility age:** Defines the minimum age at which individuals could become eligible to receive benefits from the Program (subject to the satisfaction of the vesting criteria).
3. **Vesting criteria:** Defines the minimum requirements that an individual must satisfy before becoming eligible to receive benefits from the Program (subject to the satisfaction of the benefit eligibility age). The vesting criteria could be defined based on a specified number of years of Program contributions or a cumulative amount of Program contributions.
4. **Portability and divesting criteria:** Defines whether or not an individual could access Program benefits outside the state of California and the amount of benefits available.
5. **Enrollment type:** Defines whether or not the Program is mandatory for the entire population, a subset of the population, or not mandatory at all (i.e., a voluntary program).
6. **Opt-in and buy-in provisions:** Defines whether certain groups of individuals who are excluded from the Program or unable to meet the Program's vesting requirements could enter the Program by either opting in or buying in (i.e., paying a specified amount to bypass the vesting requirements).

To facilitate the assessment of each of these eligibility and enrollment provisions, we arbitrarily defined an illustrative 'baseline assumption' prior to acquiring Task Force recommendations. Baseline assumptions included in this report should not be viewed as recommendations by the Task Force or Oliver Wyman and may not align with the recommended Program designs.

The pros and cons of the baseline assumption for each eligibility and enrollment provision were assessed, as summarized in Exhibit 4.6.

Exhibit 4.6: Program eligibility and enrollment – design considerations

Design element	Baseline Assumption[32]	Pros	Cons
Benefit eligibility criteria	HIPAA benefit eligibility trigger[33] (2 of 6 ADLs for at least 90 days or severe cognitive impairment)	• Consistent with private LTC insurance benefit triggers (HIPAA), which may: – Facilitate coordination and interaction with existing private insurance – Promote the development of supplemental (or wrap-around) private insurance coverages that coordinate with public benefits	• More restrictive than Medi-Cal benefit triggers[34] – Individuals may qualify for Medi-Cal benefits without being eligible for the Program
Benefit eligibility age	Benefits are available for those aged 18 and older (irrespective of when an individual became disabled)	• Benefits available to a greater proportion of the California population	• Does not cover intellectually and developmentally disabled ("**IDD**") individuals until age 18 – IDD individuals are those born with a disability or who develop a disability before age 18

[32] Baseline assumptions are illustrative and intended to facilitate pros and cons considerations and cost benchmarking; baseline assumptions do not represent a recommendation by the Task Force or Oliver Wyman

[33] The six standard ADLs established by HIPAA (Section 7702B) include bathing, dressing, toileting, transferring, continence, and eating. The benefit eligibility trigger defined in HIPAA requires that an individual be certified by a licensed health care practitioner as (i) being unable to perform (without substantial assistance from another individual) at least 2 ADLs for a period of at least 90 days due to a loss of functional capacity or (ii) requiring substantial supervision to protect such individual from threats to health and safety due to severe cognitive impairment.

[34] Medi-Cal LTSS eligibility is based on income, assets, physician approval, and medical necessity. A service is defined as a "medical necessity" when it is reasonable and necessary to protect life, prevent significant illness or disability, or to alleviate severe pain. The IHSS program requires Medi-Cal eligible individuals to undergo a social worker assessment, which will authorize them to receive help with housework, meals, laundry, shopping, personal care services, paramedical services, accompaniment services, or teaching and demonstration.

© 2022 Oliver Wyman

Design element	Baseline Assumption[32]	Pros	Cons
			– These individuals typically receive benefits from other state-funded programs (e.g., Medi-Cal) • Encompassing a wider range of ages is more costly than aligning the benefit eligibility age with an aging population (e.g., age 65 and older) because it increases the number of individuals expected to require benefits • Program benefits (if limited) are more likely to be insufficient for younger individuals with ongoing LTSS needs (relative to older individuals)
Vesting criteria	Uniform vesting requirement defined as a specified number of contribution years	• Allows for pre-funding of the Program prior to benefits being paid • Lower cost relative to limited or no vesting requirements	• Certain individuals that pay into the Program may not be able to fully vest and thus may not receive benefits – Potential examples include individuals that become permanently disabled, retire, or move out of California before fully vesting – Alternative vesting criteria may need to be defined if these individuals are

© 2022 Oliver Wyman

Design element	Baseline Assumption[32]	Pros	Cons
			required to contribute to the Program
Portability and divesting criteria	Full portability (individuals that leave California retain vesting indefinitely)	• Increases flexibility and may limit need for exemptions • Limits potential inequity for individuals that pay into the Program but move out of California before needing to use Program benefits (i.e., excluding an individual who has contributed to the Program and satisfied the vesting requirement from the Program due to their geographical location may not be viewed as fair) • Costs may be lower for care received outside of California or outside of the U.S. • May avoid potential litigation (the lack of portability may be viewed as a violation of certain clauses of the U.S. Constitution)	• Will increase anticipated costs as it increases the number of individuals that could receive benefits • May limit cost control mechanisms as California may have less influence on provider rates in other states • Reduces incentive for individuals to stay in California and invest Program dollars into California's economy • More complicated administration – Need to track individuals who move out of California and establish provider networks outside of California
Enrollment type	Mandatory with no opt-out provisions	• May mitigate risk of adverse selection and improve sustainability of the Program (e.g., because healthier individuals or those who may potentially have higher contribution requirements do not	• Individuals with existing private insurance may be required to pay for a public benefit that they do not need • Depending on other Program provisions, individuals may be

© 2022 Oliver Wyman

Design element	Baseline Assumption[32]	Pros	Cons
		have the option to opt out) • Mitigates rate setting challenges that may be associated with opt-out provisions (such as difficulty estimating the number of individuals that elect to opt out of the Program)	required to contribute to the Program but will not have an opportunity to receive (full) benefits • Reduces consumer flexibility and choice • Inconsistent with SDI (employers can opt out of SDI if they provide a private plan for short-term disability insurance and family leave, known as a Voluntary Plan)
Opt-in and buy-in provisions	No opt-in or buy-in provisions (require participation by self-employed, retirees, etc.)	• May mitigate risk of adverse selection • Avoids a voluntary aspect to participation that would increase uncertainty related to participation rates • May simplify administrative functions related to tracking opt-in elections • Program would expand access to a larger portion of Californians (and alleviate potential future out-of-pocket LTSS costs)	• May increase risk of litigation (e.g., if participation is required by individuals not able to receive benefits) • May allow older generations to contribute less than future generations • May increase administrative complexity of collecting contributions as different contribution collection mechanisms would likely be required for those not on payroll • Reduces consumer flexibility and choice • Retirees may have financial limitations due to fixed income that could be impacted by required Program participation

4.5. Benefits and services

Central to developing the Program is determining the benefits and services to be covered. Task Force discussions focused on the following LTSS benefit and service components:

1. Benefit type
2. Benefit maximum amounts
3. Benefit inflation
4. Elimination period
5. Family and spousal benefits
6. Approved care settings
7. Covered services
8. Preventative benefits and measures

4.5.1. Benefits and services recommendations

The Program benefits and services recommended by the Task Force are outlined in Exhibit 4.7, along with key considerations and rationale for these recommendations. While not unanimous, the recommendations in this exhibit represent the most prevalent views among the Task Force and have informed the recommended Program designs.

Exhibit 4.7: Program benefits and services – design recommendations

Design element	Recommendation[35]	Considerations and rationale
Benefit type	• Reimbursement benefit type • Consider designs with and without reduced cash benefit options	• Task Force members noted that a reimbursement design facilitates tracking of benefits to ensure individuals use benefits for covered services • Offering (reduced) cash benefits would provide an alternative mechanism for informal or family caregivers to receive financial support from the Program without

[35] Recommendation represents the most prevalent views expressed by the Task Force based on Task Force member questionnaire results and Task Force meeting discussions. Design 5 reflects these recommendations while the remaining designs reflect trade-offs to increase the affordability of Program contributions.

Design element	Recommendation[35]	Considerations and rationale
		requiring them to become certified caregivers • Cash benefits are considered to be more subject to fraud
Benefit maximum amounts	• Monthly maximum benefit amount between $3,000 and $6,000 • Two-year benefit period • The combination of the above benefits results in an upper-bound for the maximum lifetime benefit amount of $144,000	• A monthly maximum offers beneficiaries more flexibility than a daily maximum • Task Force members generally preferred a higher monthly maximum given the high cost of LTSS in California but acknowledged that it might not be feasible for the Program to cover the full monthly cost for certain services (which is not mandated by AB 567) • Task Force members generally preferred a 2-year benefit period and noted that this benefit period length is slightly below the average duration of an individual's LTSS need[36] • Task Force members acknowledged that it might be cost-prohibitive for the Program to provide a higher benefit amount based on a 2-year benefit period
Benefit inflation	• Benefit inflation indexed to CPI (exact index or indices to be determined) or cost of care trends • Review inflation annually, if not automatically applied	• Inflation indexed to CPI will likely be less expensive than indexing inflation to cost of care trends • Task Force members generally viewed the CPI as a reasonable inflation index, recognizing

[36] On average, males will need 2.2 years of LTSS while females will need 3.7 years (https://acl.gov/ltc/basic-needs/how-much-care-will-you-need).

© 2022 Oliver Wyman

Design element	Recommendation[35]	Considerations and rationale
		that it may be lower than cost of care trends • Task Force members felt it was essential to include inflation to ensure benefits keep up with costs over time
Elimination period	• No EP[37]	• Task Force members noted that an EP might serve as a barrier to individuals being able to access LTSS benefits
Family and spousal benefits	• Consider a design that allows an eligible individual to extend Program benefits to their spouse or domestic partner via a shared benefit pool if their spouse or domestic partner is not otherwise eligible for Program benefits	• A shared pool design could allow the Program to benefit married people or individuals in a recognized partnership who stay home (e.g., to care for children or other family members) and are not able to contribute via the Program's financing mechanism • A shared benefit may be more costly due to an increased likelihood of use; that is, if two individuals have access to a shared benefit pool, it is more likely that at least one of the individuals will use the benefits
Approved care settings	• Comprehensive coverage (i.e., including both home and community-based care as well as facility care)	• A broad range of approved care settings increases individual choice and offers flexibility • Task Force members emphasized the importance of helping individuals remain safely in their homes and promoting lower levels of care where possible, but noted that

[37] Design 2 includes a 90-day EP to increase affordability of Program contributions.

© 2022 Oliver Wyman

Design element	Recommendation[35]	Considerations and rationale
		home care might not be the best option for all individuals and facility care should also be available to those who need it
Covered services	• Cover a broad range of services, including care provided by a family caregiver, respite care, and services provided by PACE	• A broad range of covered services increases individual choice and offers flexibility • The Task Force felt that PACE's holistic approach to care delivery aligned well with the objectives of AB 567 • Including benefits to cover services provided by family caregivers was viewed as a crucial element in addressing broader LTSS workforce shortages
Preventative benefits and measures	• Preventative benefits should be available after an individual has satisfied Program vesting requirements but before an individual satisfies Program benefit eligibility criteria	• Offering certain preventative benefits could improve beneficiaries' quality of life and may delay their need for additional services • At least one Task Force member noted that culture and language should be reflected in the Program's preventative benefits

Additional recommendations and next steps outlined by the Task Force with regard to the Program's benefits and services include:

1. The specific preventative services to be covered under the Program still need to be determined; there was not an attempt to compile a comprehensive list of potential measures and services that could be covered for this Feasibility Report.
2. The Task Force recommended that the Program require informal or family caregivers to satisfy minimum caregiver training requirements to be eligible for service reimbursement under the Program. These training requirements should be defined in a manner that is culturally competent and does not discourage benefit utilization. Caregiver training recommendations are covered in more detail in Section 4.8 below.

© 2022 Oliver Wyman

3. The Task Force expressed particular interest in exploring several alternative scenarios (i.e., financial sensitivities) for the following aspect of Program benefits and services to inform potential changes to the recommended Program designs:
    a. **Benefit maximum**. Assess the financial impact of reducing the Design 1 benefit maximum from $1,500 to $1,000 per month.
    b. **Elimination period**. Assess the financial impact of reducing the Design 2 EP from 90 days to 30 days or 0 days.
    c. **Approved care settings.** Assess the financial impact of revising Design 2 to cover HCBS only.

4.5.2. Benefits and services feasibility assessment

The Task Force recommendations contained in Section 4.5.1 were developed based on an assessment of potential support from policymakers and the general public, administrative feasibility, and financial feasibility. The Task Force discussed the following feasibility considerations regarding the Program's benefits and services:

- All recommended Program designs provide benefits on a reimbursement basis, which may be more complex to administer, but is expected to be less prone to fraud (relative to a cash benefit), thereby increasing financial feasibility. Offering a reduced cash benefit option (as under Design 2, Design 4, and Design 5) will increase flexibility, which may garner increased public support. Administration of a reduced cash benefit option is also expected to be more complicated if Program beneficiaries are allowed to transition between cash and reimbursement benefits.
- Providing higher benefit maximum amounts (as under Design 2 and Design 5) would likely increase public support but also reduce financial feasibility.
- Including a provision that inflates benefits over time will help maintain the relative value of the Program benefits for future generations as the cost of LTSS increases over time. This is expected to increase Program support from policymakers and the general public but with trade-offs of higher Program costs and reduced financial feasibility. Indexing benefit inflation to CPI (as opposed to a level amount) and not automatically applying inflation each year may increase administrative complexity and impede the private insurance industry's ability to develop supplemental products that coordinate with Program benefits.
- Not requiring individuals to satisfy an EP before receiving Program benefits may increase Program support from policymakers and the general public but is also expected to increase Program costs. In contrast, having a non-zero day EP (as under Design 2) may increase the financial feasibility of the Program but also increases administrative complexity (additional tracking is required, and interaction and coordination with private insurance may be more challenging).

© 2022 Oliver Wyman

- Allowing an individual to share their Program benefits with their spouse or domestic partner (as under Design 4 and Design 5) may increase public support for the Program by expanding coverage to a greater proportion of Californians. However, this design element is expected to be more costly due to an increased usage of Program benefits, which may reduce the financial feasibility of the Program.
- The range of approved care settings and services increases under each recommended design, with Design 1 providing the most targeted coverage and Design 4 and Design 5 providing the broadest coverage. While establishing a Program that covers a broad range of approved care settings and services may receive more support from policymakers and the general public, doing so will also increase the Program's cost and administrative complexity.

4.5.3. Benefits and services considerations

Design considerations for the Program's benefits and services were discussed with the Task Force at Task Force Meeting #6 in January 2022.

Relevant educational materials on this topic included:

- Benefits and services
- Social determinants of health primer

Key concepts and takeaways from this discussion are summarized below.

4.5.3.1. Benefits

There are five primary components to program benefits, as follows:

1. **Benefit type**: Defines how benefits are provided to eligible individuals. Common benefit types include reimbursement, indemnity, cash, or a combination of benefit types[38].
2. **Benefit maximum amounts**: Defines the maximum daily, monthly, and lifetime benefit amount available to eligible individuals.
3. **Benefit inflation**: Defines the amount and frequency of increases to Program benefits. Benefit inflation may be level or tied to a specified index and may be applied annually or at a less frequent interval.

[38] As an illustrative example, assume there is a specified maximum daily benefit and that the individual in question meets the benefit eligibility criteria. Under a reimbursement design, benefits equal to actual charges incurred up to the daily maximum amount are paid each day that qualified services are received. Under an indemnity design, benefits equal to the daily maximum amount are paid each day that qualified services are received (regardless of actual charges incurred). Under a cash design, benefits equal to the daily maximum amount are paid each day that the individual is benefit eligible (regardless of whether qualified services are received).

© 2022 Oliver Wyman

4. **Elimination period**: Defines how long an individual must wait (after satisfying benefit eligibility criteria) before Program benefits are payable. An EP may be defined in terms of a length of time (e.g., 90 days) or a dollar amount (e.g., $5,000).
5. **Family and spousal benefits**: Defines whether Program benefits could be used by an eligible individual's spouse, domestic partner, or other family members (as opposed to benefits only being available to the eligible individual).

To facilitate the assessment of each of these program benefit components, we arbitrarily defined an illustrative 'baseline assumption' prior to acquiring Task Force recommendations. Baseline assumptions included in this report should not be viewed as recommendations by the Task Force or Oliver Wyman and may not align with the recommended Program designs.

The pros and cons of the baseline assumption for each program benefit component were assessed, as summarized in Exhibit 4.8.

Exhibit 4.8: Program benefits – design considerations

Design element	Baseline Assumption[39]	Pros	Cons
Benefit type	Reimbursement with reduced cash benefit	• Multiple benefit options increase flexibility and choice • Cash option could be used to pay for informal or family care, which may reduce supply strain on formal caregiver workforce • Cash option promotes equity for low-income individuals and individuals in areas of California where formal services may not be as readily accessible • Offering a cash benefit option may enable management of out-of-state care options	• Reimbursement benefits may only be used on specific covered services • Cash option may increase risk of fraud, abuse, and exploitation; promote stereotypical gender roles; lead to substandard care; and/or create substandard working conditions • Cash option may induce higher benefit utilization and therefore increase Program cost (relative to a reimbursement-only option)

[39] Baseline assumptions are illustrative and intended to facilitate pros and cons considerations and cost benchmarking; baseline assumptions do not represent a recommendation by the Task Force or Oliver Wyman

Design element	Baseline Assumption[39]	Pros	Cons
		• Reimbursement benefits may be less costly if individuals do not utilize full benefit amount each day/month	• Additional administrative complexities: – Additional processes/resources required for fraud detection (relative to a reimbursement-only option) – If benefits are portable, additional processes may be required to handle out-of-state reimbursement claims (relative to a cash-only option) – Verification of providers, services, and expense receipts (relative to a cash-only option)
Benefit maximum amounts	Monthly benefit amount of $4,600 (about $150/day) Lifetime maximum amount of $110,400 (based on a 2-year benefit period)	• Monthly benefit amount aligns with average monthly cost of home care in California[40] • Monthly benefit amount consistent with average benefit sold on private stand-alone LTC insurance policies (2020), which may be perceived as high value by the public (vs. offering a lower benefit than typical private insurance)	• More costly relative to a lower monthly and/or lifetime maximum (such as the WA Cares Fund) • Individuals may face material out-of-pocket costs if facility care benefits are provided under the Program, as the average semi-private nursing home cost is about $9,000 per month in California • Individuals with lower income/assets or higher

[40] Genworth 2020 Cost of Care Survey.

© 2022 Oliver Wyman

Design element	Baseline Assumption[39]	Pros	Cons
		• Offering a monthly benefit provides individuals more flexibility relative to a daily benefit • Initial maximum lifetime benefit amount will cover formal LTSS costs for over 70% of the population[41] • 2-year benefit period aligns with preliminary Task Force recommendation for a front-end benefit design • Complementary to active federal LTSS proposals (e.g., WISH Act, Medicare LTSS Act)	care needs may be less able to afford necessary services (relative to a Program with non-uniform maximums)
Benefit inflation	Annual inflation indexed to care cost trends, capped at 4%	• Inflation level aligns with cost of care trends, which ensures benefits remain adequate for future generations of beneficiaries	• Likely more costly than if inflation were linked to CPI (specific index or indices to be determined) because LTSS cost trends have outpaced the CPI over the last 16 years[42] • May increase administrative complexity as annual cost of care analysis would be required

[41] Formal Costs of Long-Term Care Services, PwC, 2021; captures the estimate cited in the 2018 version of the PwC study that at least 50% of persons reaching age 65 will receive formal long-term care.
[42] Genworth 2020 Cost of Care Survey and US Bureau of Labor Statistics for relevant CPI indices.

Design element	Baseline Assumption[39]	Pros	Cons

Elimination period	Zero-day EP	• Simpler (and potentially less costly as a result) to administer than a non-zero or varied EP
		• Culturally competent by being mindful of potential burden of initial self-funding on lower-income Californians
		  – Helps mitigate risk that individuals will not be able to fund early LTSS costs
		• Aligns with preliminary Task Force recommendation for a front-end benefit design
		• Having no (or a short) EP is consistent with typical benefit design for private short-term care insurance[43]
			• More costly than a non-zero-day EP
			  – A longer EP reduces costs by only providing benefits to individuals with longer-term LTSS needs (vs. short-term needs)
			• May result in a larger number of claims and potentially higher administration costs as a result
			• May create complexities for coordination with private insurance as a first payer (private insurance typically has a non-zero EP)
			• Could be subject to abuse, especially if a cash benefit option is provided and/or there are no age restrictions in Program eligibility

Family and spousal benefits	No family and spousal benefits (i.e., individual coverage only)	• Most cost effective • May simplify administration	• Dependent family members may not be able to meet vesting requirements, if applicable, on their own and thus would not be eligible for coverage by the Program

[43] Short-term care insurance covers similar services as LTC insurance but with a benefit period of no more than 360 days.

© 2022 Oliver Wyman

4.5.3.2. Services

There are three primary components to program services, as follows:

1. **Approved care settings**: Defines the care settings where the Program's covered LTSS services could be received. Care settings are typically categorized as home and community-based care or facility care. Home and community-based care encompass LTSS received in an eligible individual's home or community (e.g., at an ADC). In contrast, facility care encompasses LTSS received in a facility such as an SNF or RCF.
2. **Covered services**: Defines the services that qualify for payment under the Program, including but not limited to care provided by family caregivers and enrollment in PACE.
3. **Preventative benefits and measures**: Defines any benefits or measures covered under the Program that intend to minimize the likelihood of an individual needing support from the Program's covered services. For example, preventative benefits and measures could include fall prevention, home inspections and modifications, and pre-claim wellness programs.

To facilitate the assessment of each of these program service components, we arbitrarily defined an illustrative 'baseline assumption' prior to acquiring Task Force recommendations. Baseline assumptions included in this report should not be viewed as recommendations by the Task Force or Oliver Wyman and may not align with the recommended Program designs.

The pros and cons of the baseline assumption for each program service component were assessed, as summarized in Exhibit 4.9.

Exhibit 4.9: Program services – design considerations

Design element	Baseline Assumption[44]	Pros	Cons
Approved care settings	HCBS only	• Aligns with individuals' preference (and in some cases their need) to stay at home and promotes independence • Less costly as HCBS is typically less expensive than facility care – Multiple state initiatives to reduce Medicaid costs have demonstrated that	• Certain Program-eligible individuals may not have a home – Consideration will need to be given to the definition of "home" and how care will be provided to these individuals • Individuals that need facility care would need to rely on self-funding,

[44] Baseline assumptions are illustrative and intended to facilitate pros and cons considerations and cost benchmarking; baseline assumptions do not represent a recommendation by the Task Force or Oliver Wyman.

Design element	Baseline Assumption[44]	Pros	Cons
		shifting care from facility settings to HCBS is a significant driver of savings • Facilitates use of informal caregiving and may reduce supply strain on formal caregivers • May promote private insurance industry to offer supplemental products focused on facility care (i.e., clear delineation of coverage between the Program and supplemental private insurance) • May alleviate demand for Medi-Cal IHSS program • Aligns with Task Force preliminary recommendation for a front-end benefit design (as HCBS is typically used before facility care) • Aligns with AB 567 goal of "[h]elping individuals with functional or cognitive limitations remain in their communities" • HCBS may be more accessible to individuals across California, which promotes equity	private insurance, or other programs • May be duplicative with upcoming expansion of HCBS coverage under Medi-Cal (for Medi-Cal eligible individuals) • Does not mitigate risk that individuals will impoverish themselves due to higher costs associated with facility care • May promote stereotypical gender roles • Reduced flexibility and individual choice due to a narrower range of care settings being covered

Design element	Baseline Assumption[44]	Pros	Cons
Covered services	No restrictions on covered services so long as they could be provided in a home or community-based setting Provide benefits for informal care received in the home, respite care, caregiver training, home modifications, etc.	• Increases flexibility and choice • Culturally competent and more equitable – Recognizes that different facets of the California population may have different care preferences – Offering a more comprehensive range of approved services increases the likelihood that there will be something for everyone • Offers significant perceived value for a minimal additional cost under the Program	• May increase complexity of Program administration – Need to establish broader provider networks – Approval of informal caregivers – Adjudication of claims for informal care • May exacerbate potential LTSS workforce supply issues
Preventative benefits and measures	Provide a maximum lifetime benefit of $1,000 (separate from other benefit maximums) for preventative measures and services that could be used any time following satisfaction of Program vesting requirements, if applicable	• Providing ancillary preventative benefits earlier may reduce anticipated costs under the Program – May lessen claim severity and delay deterioration in an individual's ability to perform ADLs – May facilitate an individual living at home independently for a longer time before needing formal LTSS	• May result in a limited increase in costs (and potential for fraud) – Potentially offset by delay or reduction in claims • May increase coordination complexity with private insurance and other programs that cover preventative benefits • May create (or exacerbate) workforce supply issues for LTSS related services (e.g., the workforce qualified

Design element	Baseline Assumption[44]	Pros	Cons
			to perform home assessments)

4.6. Administration

To understand the potential scope of the Program's administration, we assessed existing infrastructure for similar established programs in California and elsewhere (e.g., WA Cares Fund) to identify key administrative functions that will be needed. These key administrative functions were grouped into five broad categories, as follows:

1. Oversight, management, and actuarial analysis
2. Processing and tracking
3. Benefits and claims
4. Support and customer service
5. Coordination and accessibility

4.6.1. Administration recommendations

The Task Force recommended the Program be kept as simple as possible to reduce administrative complexity and cost. Key considerations for this recommendation include the following:

1. A simpler Program is expected to have lower administrative costs, which means a larger proportion of the Program revenue could be paid as benefits.
2. A simpler Program may also be easier for the public to understand, leading to increased public awareness and support.
3. Implementation may be expedited for a Program with less administrative complexity relative to a more complex Program, which may require a longer timeline for implementation.

The Task Force acknowledged that a key trade-off associated with simplicity is a higher potential for perceived Program gaps, inequities, fraud, and waste (e.g., if there is limited oversight). For example, a program that only includes individuals who are on payroll or self-employed may be easier to administer but creates a "gap" for those who do not meet this definition. Further, having uniform benefits is easier to administer but may be less equitable than benefits that vary by attributes such as income level or amount of Program contributions made.

The Task Force's recommendations regarding Program administration were intentionally non-prescriptive, given that administrative needs are highly dependent on the ultimate Program design. Additional recommendations and next steps outlined by the Task Force with regard to the Program's administration include:

© 2022 Oliver Wyman

1. Prior to Program enactment, confirm the administrative functions needed, identify staff and resource needs, determine whether existing infrastructure (including automation systems) in California could be expanded to support the Program, and decide if a new board, department, or agency is required to administer the Program. Expanding current infrastructure or creating a new board, department, or agency would require legislation and funding.
2. Determine whether or not there are opportunities to leverage the administrative framework in the private insurance industry to execute certain administrative functions required for the Program.

4.6.2. Administration feasibility assessment

The Task Force recommendations contained in Section 4.6.1 were developed based on an assessment of potential support from policymakers and the general public, administrative feasibility, and financial feasibility. The Task Force discussed the following feasibility considerations regarding the Program's administration:

- A simpler Program design is expected to be easier to understand and quicker to launch, which should increase support from policymakers and the general public. However, this support could be offset if the public perceives gaps or inequities in the Program, which may be a side effect of keeping the Program simple.
- The administrative feasibility of the Program will increase if there is existing infrastructure in California that could be readily expanded to support the administration of the Program.
- A simpler Program design is generally expected to be less costly to administer, which increases the financial feasibility of the Program. Additionally, lower administrative costs mean that a higher percentage of the Program revenue will be available to pay benefits, which should generate more support from policymakers and the general public. Administrative cost savings associated with a simpler Program design could be offset if there is higher fraud and waste.

4.6.3. Administration considerations

Design considerations for the Program's administration were discussed with the Task Force at Task Force Meeting #5 in December 2021.

Relevant educational materials on this topic included:

- Program administration
- California's State Disability Insurance Program

Key concepts and takeaways from this discussion are summarized below.

© 2022 Oliver Wyman

4.6.3.1. Key administrative functions

The five primary categories of program administration identified are as follows:

1. **Oversight, management, and actuarial analysis**. Administrative functions in this category are primarily related to the high-level implementation and operation of the Program. They involve Program oversight, public reporting, managing care providers, managing investments and allocation of Program funds, managing IT systems, and actuarial analyses of the Program to ensure long-term solvency and sustainability.
2. **Processing and tracking**. Administrative functions in this category are primarily related to Program enrollment and premium collection. They involve processing Program revenue, approving exemption and opt-in requests, determining vesting status, and tracking individuals who move in or out of the state.
3. **Benefits and claims**. Administrative functions in this category are primarily related to Program benefit payment. They involve determining benefit eligibility; processing, adjudicating, and paying claims; tracking benefit usage relative to Program maximums; and ensuring approved services are provided.
4. **Program administration support and customer service**. Administrative functions in this category are primarily related to supporting and providing notifications to Program participants. They involve providing customer service; addressing questions and complaints from the public; detecting fraud, waste, and abuse; managing appeals; and providing general administrative support to the Program (e.g., human resources, facilities, contract management).
5. **Coordination and accessibility**. Administrative functions in this category are primarily related to coordination with other existing LTSS programs (including private insurance and Medi-Cal), accessibility of Program benefits and services, and Program outreach and communication.

Exhibit 4.10 expands on each of these key administrative functions. Based on discussions with the CDI and the California Health and Human Services Agency, several agencies or third parties in California that could potentially perform each administrative function were identified. These agencies (or third parties) perform parallel functions for other programs in California. At a minimum, the Program may be able to leverage learnings or infrastructure from these agencies to establish an effective and efficient administration system.

In addition to the agencies listed in Exhibit 4.10, other potential reference points for certain Program administrative functions (e.g., managing care providers, overseeing accessibility, awareness and communication strategy) may include ADRCs, Medi-Cal HCBS Community Based Organizations, and HICAP.

© 2022 Oliver Wyman

Exhibit 4.10: Program administration – potential agencies to perform key administrative functions

Category	Administrative function	Description	Agencies (or third parties) that could potentially perform this function for the Program or provide technical direction
Oversight, management, and actuarial analysis	Program oversight	• Oversee Program implementation, administration, and operation • Provide recommendations and decisions to maintain benefit adequacy, fund solvency, and sustainability	• Employment Development Department ("**EDD**") • DHCS • California Department of Social Services ("**CDSS**") • California Health Benefit Exchange (Covered California) • New board or agency to oversee or administer the Program
	Manage care providers	• Manage providers, including approving and credentialing prospective providers (formal and informal) • Enforce different requirements, if any, for formal and informal providers	• EDD • DHCS • CDSS • Covered California • ADRCs • New board or agency

© 2022 Oliver Wyman

Category	Administrative function	Description	Agencies (or third parties) that could potentially perform this function for the Program or provide technical direction
	Manage investment and allocation of program funds	• Establish an investment policy for funds collected under the Program, if applicable • Provide guidance and advice on investment strategies and allowed assets • Active management (invest, reinvest, manage, contract, sell, or exchange investment money) by in-house or external money managers • Authorize disbursements	• State Controller's Office • State Treasurer's Office • New board or agency
	Perform actuarial analysis	• Provide ongoing actuarial analysis and valuations to assess funded status of the Program • Make recommendations to maintain solvency (e.g., adjust contributions, redesign benefits)	• CDI • Department of Managed Health Care • Establish a state actuary • New board or agency
Processing and tracking	Process revenue	• Process revenue (e.g., payroll tax, income tax, etc.) • Collect premiums, if applicable	• EDD • Franchise Tax Board • State Controller's Office • California Department of Public Health • New board or agency
	Process exemptions and opt-in requests	• Process and approve Program exemptions (e.g., opt-out requests), if applicable • Process and approve Program opt-in requests, if applicable	• EDD • DHCS • CDSS • Covered California • New board or agency

© 2022 Oliver Wyman

Category	Administrative function	Description	Agencies (or third parties) that could potentially perform this function for the Program or provide technical direction
	Determine vesting status	• Determine vesting status, if applicable	• EDD • DHCS • CDSS • Covered California • New board or agency
	Track individuals who move in or out of the state	• Keep track of address changes for individuals who move into or out of the state • Keep track of divesting status, if applicable	
Benefits and claims	Determine benefit eligibility	• Process and approve benefit applications • Perform care need assessments • Determine benefit eligibility (e.g., confirm individual meets criteria to receive benefits)	• EDD • DHCS • CDSS • Covered California • Private insurance industry • New board or agency
	Process, adjudicate, and pay claims	• Approve services eligible for payments • Process payments to providers • Reimburse expenses paid by (or on behalf of) benefit-eligible individuals	• EDD • DHCS • CDSS • Covered California • Private insurance industry • New board or agency
	Track benefit usage	• Track individual's benefit usage relative to maximum benefits allowable, if applicable	• EDD • DHCS • CDSS • Covered California • Private insurance industry • New board or agency

© 2022 Oliver Wyman

Category	Administrative function	Description	Agencies (or third parties) that could potentially perform this function for the Program or provide technical direction
	Oversee benefit payments	• Establish and enforce criteria for benefit payments to approved providers • Ensure approved services are provided through audits or service verification processes, recoup any inappropriate payments	• EDD • DHCS • CDSS • Covered California • Private insurance industry • New board or agency
Support and customer service	Customer service	• Provide customer service • Address questions and complaints from public (e.g., related to premiums, benefits, eligibility, services, etc.) • Refer individuals to other appropriate agencies	• EDD • DHCS • CDSS • Covered California • LTC Ombudsman (CDA) • New board or agency
	General administration	• Provide administrative and operational support to the Program • Track data useful in monitoring and informing the Program	• EDD • DHCS • CDSS • Covered California • New board or agency
	Fraud, waste, and abuse detection	• Identify potential cases of fraud, waste, and abuse • Impose sanctions, as appropriate • Establish procedures for administrative appeal and criminal prosecution	• EDD • DHCS • CDSS • California State Auditor • State Controller’s Office • CDI • Private insurance industry • New board or agency

© 2022 Oliver Wyman

Category	Administrative function	Description	Agencies (or third parties) that could potentially perform this function for the Program or provide technical direction
	Appeals	• Manage beneficiary grievance and appeals process, related to eligibility and benefit decisions, as well as provider appeals process	• EDD • DHCS • CDSS • Covered California • New board or agency
Coordination and accessibility	Coordinate with other programs	• Establish rules and procedures for benefit coordination when the eligible beneficiary is also eligible for Medi-Cal and other LTSS	• EDD • DHCS • CDSS • Covered California • New board or agency
	Oversee program accessibility	• Oversee care navigation and ensure Program benefits are accessible to all eligible individuals	• EDD • DHCS • CDSS • Covered California • LTC Ombudsman (CDA) • New board or agency
	Program roll-out awareness and communication strategy	• Develop and execute a communication strategy for the Program that could reach all stakeholders, including the broader California population that may be eligible for the Program	• CDA • CDI • Covered California • AARP • New board or agency
	Coordination with private insurance	• Establish connection with private insurance products (regulation and perhaps facilitation of new product development)	• CDI • DHCS – Partnership Program • New board or agency

© 2022 Oliver Wyman

4.7. Financing

Program financing encompasses a range of considerations related to how the Program could be funded to ensure adequate revenue is available to pay out benefits in the future. Task Force discussions focused on the following financing components:

1. Revenue source(s)
2. Contribution age
3. Contribution limits
4. Contribution rate structure
5. Funding approach
6. Investment strategy
7. Intergenerational equity

4.7.1. Financing recommendations

The Program financing provisions recommended by the Task Force are outlined in Exhibit 4.11, along with key considerations and rationale for these recommendations. While not unanimous, the recommendations in this exhibit represent the most prevalent views among the Task Force and have informed the recommended Program designs.

Exhibit 4.11: Program financing – design recommendations

Design element	Recommendation[45]	Considerations and rationale
Revenue source(s)	• Finance via a progressive payroll tax split between employees and employers • Require non-voluntary premium contributions via an income-based tax for self-employed individuals • Consider designs that utilize multiple revenue sources	• Although the Task Force recommended a payroll tax with an employer-paid portion, there was recognition that it would be challenging to garner support for an employer-paid tax from the business community. Thus, the Task Force recommended assessing the financial impact of various employer-paid portions of the Program contribution rate (e.g., 0% employer paid or fully

[45] Recommendation represents the most prevalent views expressed by the Task Force based on Task Force member questionnaire results and Task Force meeting discussions. Design 5 reflects these recommendations while the remaining designs reflect trade-offs to increase the affordability of Program contributions.

© 2022 Oliver Wyman

Design element	Recommendation[45]	Considerations and rationale
		employee paid, 25% employer paid, 50% employer paid) as well as the impact of exempting small businesses from any employer-paid portion of a payroll tax – Because the employer-paid portion of a payroll tax would not be subject to Program contribution waivers for individuals below a specified poverty level (as described in the "Contribution limits" section of this table), the total combined employer-paid and employee-paid contribution rate could differ depending on the percentage funded by employers – As it relates to a potential exemption, the definition of a small business has yet to be determined, but generally would encompass employers with fewer than a certain number of employees (e.g., 50) • If Program contributions are deposited into a trust fund for the exclusive use of paying Program benefits to individuals who have contributed, such funds are not anticipated to be impacted by California's Gann Limit[46] – California's Gann Limit may apply if Program contributions are waived for lower-income

[46] The Gann Limit is a constitutional spending cap approved by voters via Proposition 4 in a 1979 special election. The limit applies to both state spending and spending by local governments. At the state level, the limit is tied to California's 1978-79 spending level, adjusted for changes in population and per capita personal income.

Design element	Recommendation[45]	Considerations and rationale
		individuals (unless, for example, a constitutional amendment is pursued to exempt the Program from the Gann Limit)
Contribution age	• Require contributions from non-juvenile individuals (i.e., contributions from individuals aged 18+)	• The Task Force acknowledged that the Program should include contributions beginning at younger adult ages (e.g., 18+) rather than deferring contributions to older adult ages to allow for the pre-funding of benefits
Contribution limits	• Vary contributions by level of wages or income, with higher contributions required from higher-income individuals and lower or zero contributions required from lower-income individuals (i.e., a progressive tax structure) • Waive contributions for individuals below a specified poverty level (e.g., 138% of the Federal Poverty Level) but allow these individuals to receive benefits[47] • Establish a contribution cap (i.e., limit the amount of payroll subject to the Program's tax). Contribution caps above the Social Security cap should be considered (e.g., two times the Social Security contribution limit)	• As noted above, California's Gann Limit may apply if Program contributions are waived for lower-income individuals (unless, for example, a constitutional amendment is pursued to exempt the Program from the Gann Limit) • While the Task Force initially recommended a progressive tax structure, they ultimately recognized that including some form of contribution cap could improve the reasonableness of Program benefits in relation to Program contributions and ensure that higher earners perceive value in the Program, thereby incentivizing their participation (especially if the Program includes opt-out provisions) and garnering their support – The specific level of the contribution cap has yet to be

[47] Vesting credit would be contingent on an individual working a minimum number of hours in a given year. The minimum worked hours requirement has yet to be determined.

© 2022 Oliver Wyman

Design element	Recommendation[45]	Considerations and rationale
		defined, but the Task Force recommended that it exceed the Social Security cap. The Social Security cap is currently $160,200 (2023) – While the contribution cap introduces a regressive element to the tax structure, it is relevant to note that the waiver of contributions for lower earners introduces a corresponding progressive element (though these may not be offsetting)
Contribution rate structure	• Level contribution rate (the contribution rate should not vary by age or other characteristics besides income)	• The Task Force recommended that explicit guidelines be established up front stipulating how the Program contribution rate could change in the future if needed – Program contribution rates would be determined such that the Program is expected to be financially sustainable. However, Program contribution rates would not be guaranteed and could change if Program revenue or expenditures materially differ from expectations
Funding approach	• The Task Force recommended a hybrid funding approach, including both pay-as-you-go ("**PAYGO**") and pre-funding elements	• The need for a PAYGO element during the Program's earlier years is mitigated because of the intergenerational equity recommendations noted later in this table (i.e., the grading up of benefits as the Program matures) • The Program could transition from pre-funding to PAYGO in the

Design element	Recommendation[45]	Considerations and rationale
		future if an inflection point is reached where Program revenue and investment income stabilize at a level that is equal to (or above) Program disbursements and expenses
Investment strategy	• Invest Program revenue in U.S. treasuries, bonds, stocks, and other equities	• An amendment to the California Constitution is required to invest in bonds, stocks, and other equities (specifically Article XVI, Section 17 of the California Constitution)
Inter-generational equity[48]	• Include provision(s) to reduce intergenerational inequity (e.g., grade up Program benefits during the Program's early years)	• As noted above, grading up benefits in the years following the establishment of the Program facilitates pre-funding and may lessen the need for a PAYGO element in the early years of the Program

Additional recommendations and next steps outlined by the Task Force with regard to the Program's financing include:

1. The Task Force expressed particular interest in exploring several alternative scenarios (i.e., financial sensitivities) for the following aspects of Program financing to inform potential changes to the recommended Program designs:
    a. **Revenue source(s)**. Assess the financial impact of a range of employer-paid portions of the Program contribution rate (e.g., 0% employer paid or fully employee paid, 25% employer paid, 50% employer paid). For scenarios that include an employer paid portion of the Program contribution rate, assess the financial impact of exempting small businesses (e.g., business with fewer than 50 employees).
    b. **Contribution limits**. Assess the financial impact of a range of contribution caps (e.g., various multiples of the Social Security contribution limit), including the impact of not having a contribution cap.
    c. **Investment strategy**. Assess the financial impact of an investment strategy that includes bonds, stocks, and other equities versus one that only includes U.S. Treasuries

[48] Upon Program inception, older individuals are likely to contribute less to the Program over their lifetime relative to younger individuals; this "intergenerational inequity" wanes as the Program matures.

© 2022 Oliver Wyman

(i.e., if an amendment to Article XVI, Section 17 of the California Constitution is not obtained).

2. The income level below which contributions would be waived for lower-income individuals under certain Program designs has yet to be determined.
3. Further exploration of taxation considerations for Program benefits is required. It is anticipated that reimbursement benefits paid to Program beneficiaries would not be subject to state or federal personal income tax. However, payment to Program service providers, including informal or family caregivers who receive income from the Program, would be subject to personal or corporate income taxes. Additional discussions with taxation subject matter experts are required to confirm tax treatment for Program benefits, particularly for any cash benefits provided under the Program.
4. Implications of California's Gann Limit on the Program and its financing mechanisms should be evaluated.
5. Further exploration is needed to consider alternative revenue sources that could allow existing retirees (as of Program launch) to contribute to (and receive benefits from) the Program.

4.7.2. Financing feasibility assessment

The Task Force recommendations contained in Section 4.7.1 were developed based on an assessment of potential support from policymakers and the general public, administrative feasibility, and financial feasibility. The Task Force discussed the following feasibility considerations regarding the Program's financing:

- Financing via a payroll tax (and an income-based tax for the self-employed) is expected to increase support from policymakers and the general public (relative to other financing mechanisms) as benefits would generally be funded by the same individuals who have access to Program benefits. A payroll tax may also be more administratively feasible (relative to other financing mechanisms), given that processes established for California's SDI program may be leverageable for tax collection. However, requiring employers to pay a portion of the payroll tax may generate opposition from the business community and could incentivize large employers to leave California. Further, an employer-paid tax may disproportionately burden small businesses.

- A financing mechanism that triggers California's Gann Limit may reduce financial feasibility as a portion of the Program's revenue may be diverted to non-Program purposes (e.g., K-14 education). This potential diversion may also impact Program support from policymakers and the general public.

- All recommended Program designs require contributions from individuals aged 18 and older, which is expected to increase the financial feasibility of the Program (relative to a narrower Program contribution age range).

- Including a Program contribution cap introduces a regressive financing element and will increase the overall Program contribution rate and administrative complexity. However, not including a contribution cap (as under Design 4) could reduce financial feasibility and hinder support from policymakers and the general public (particularly, higher-income individuals who may oppose the Program absent a contribution cap). For example, if high-income Californians do not perceive value in the Program, it could increase Program opposition and incentivize these individuals to opt out of the Program or leave California to avoid paying Program contributions.
- Offering a contribution waiver for low-income individuals may increase public support for the Program as it introduces an additional progressive element to the Program's financing design. However, contribution waivers will increase the overall Program contribution rate and administrative complexity. Design 2 does not include a contribution waiver, since low-income individuals would not be required to contribute under this design, nor would they receive vesting credits. While this design feature is expected to limit overlap with existing LTSS programs and reduce Program costs, it may also present a challenge if Program support from policymakers and the public is also reduced (e.g., if a key objective is to reduce financial strain on Medi-Cal).
- Investing Program revenues in a broad range of financial instruments, including bonds, stocks, and other equities, is vital to the financial feasibility of the Program. A challenge associated with this recommendation is that it would require an amendment to the California Constitution.
- Provisions that increase intergenerational equity may promote Program support from policymakers and the general public, particularly among younger individuals, and improve the financial feasibility of the Program. However, the intergenerational equity provisions are likely to increase administrative complexity.

4.7.3. Financing considerations

Design considerations for the Program's financing were primarily discussed with the Task Force at Task Force Meeting #8 in February 2022.

Relevant educational materials on this topic included:

- Affordability considerations
- Long-term care insurance financing options and considerations
- Other financing and sustainability considerations
- Program contribution limits and intergenerational (in)equity illustrative examples

Key concepts and takeaways from this discussion are summarized below.

There are seven primary program financing elements, as follows:

1. **Revenue source(s):** Defines the source(s) from which revenue should be collected to fund the Program.
2. **Contribution age:** Defines the ages at which contributions should be collected to fund the Program.
3. **Contribution limits:** Defines limitations imposed on the Program's contribution structure, including the waiver of contributions for lower-income individuals and the capping of contributions for higher-income individuals.
4. **Contribution rate structure:** Defines whether the Program's contribution rates should be established with the expectation that they would remain level over time or be step-rated (i.e., with *planned* increments to the contribution rate over time).
5. **Funding approach:** Defines whether the Program should be pre-funded, financed on a PAYGO basis, or a hybrid of the two.
6. **Investment strategy:** Defines the financial instruments in which Program revenue should be invested when not needed to fund immediate Program disbursements.
7. **Intergenerational equity:** Upon Program inception, older individuals are likely to contribute less to the Program over their lifetime relative to younger individuals. This inequity wanes as the Program matures. Intergenerational equity considerations define whether explicit provisions should be introduced to mitigate this inequity in the years following the establishment of the Program.

4.7.3.1. Revenue sources

The pros and cons of eight potential revenue sources, along with several hybrid financing options, were assessed, as summarized in Exhibits 4.12 and 4.13.

© 2022 Oliver Wyman

Exhibit 4.12: Revenue sources – design considerations

Design option[49]	Pros	Cons
Payroll tax • Generally set as a percentage of a worker's wage • Could be paid by an employee, employer, or both • Could be applied to wages above or below a certain threshold • Total wages and salaries in California have ranged from about $1 trillion to $1.5 trillion since 2015	• Social insurance benefits are generally financed with payroll taxes • This structure helps with buy-in and long-term support as the Program would generally be funded by the same population who would have access to benefits • Mechanism(s) established for SDI may be leverageable for employee payroll tax collection	• A payroll tax could be regressive as it would only apply to wage income – The regressive nature of a payroll tax could be mitigated by applying the tax to only wages above a certain level • Business groups would likely oppose a payroll tax on employers • An employer-paid tax may disproportionately burden small businesses; however, allowing an exemption for small businesses may incentivize employers to keep employee counts under the "small business" threshold
Personal income tax • Current rates range from 1% to 13.3% • Could be across-the-board or a surtax on high incomes • 2019 taxable income of California tax filers was $1.4 trillion	• Could be highly progressive • Comparatively low volatility • Applies to types of income not covered by payroll taxes, including investment and business income	• May be challenging to implement as California's personal income tax rates are among the highest in the country. An increase may result in people leaving the state, particularly higher earners
Corporate income tax • Current rate for general	• Generally progressive as wealthy shareholders pay a	• May be challenging to implement as business

[49] Several of the tax options included in this table may be impacted by California's Gann Limit, which requires certain tax revenue in excess of the limit to be split between taxpayer refunds and K-14 education. The Gann Limit is a constitutional spending cap approved by voters via Proposition 4 in a 1979 special election. The limit applies to both state spending and spending by local governments. At the state level, the limit is tied to California's 1978-79 spending level, adjusted for changes in population and per capita personal income. If Program contributions are deposited into a trust fund for the exclusive use of paying Program benefits to individuals who have contributed, such funds are not anticipated to be impacted by the Gann Limit.

© 2022 Oliver Wyman

Design option[49]	Pros	Cons
corporations is 8.84% • Could be across-the-board or a surtax on corporate income above certain levels • 2019 taxable income of corporations was about $284 billion	significant portion of corporate income tax	communities would likely mobilize against tax rate increases • Relatively limited revenue potential
Sales or excise tax • Sales tax is a tax on the sale or use of tangible goods • Excise tax is a tax on the sale of a specific good • Total California taxable sales in 2019 were about $733 billion	• Comparatively large tax base for sales tax, especially if expanded to include some services	• Both taxes are regressive, falling disproportionately on households with lower incomes • Generally levied on products that have adverse societal consequences. Revenues are often used for mitigating those consequences or related purposes
Estate or inheritance tax • An estate tax applies to the value of a decedent's estate and generally only applies to high-value estates • An inheritance tax applies to a portion of the estate inherited by each heir • California currently has neither type of tax • Revenue potential from various proposals ranges from $300 million to $3 billion	• Progressive, especially if targeted to high-value estates • Could help narrow wealth inequality in the state	• Need voter approval since voters previously approved a prohibition on these types of taxes • Comparatively limited revenue potential
General Fund revenue and premium taxes • General Fund revenue refers to revenues	• Provides policymakers flexibility to respond to changing circumstances	• Competition with other funding priorities • Potential instability due to legislative changes or

Design option[49]	Pros	Cons
accruing to the state from taxes, fees, interest earnings, and other sources for the general operation of the state government • Insurance premium tax revenue is allocated to California's General Fund		insufficiencies in California's General Fund revenue • If the Program offers a guaranteed benefit, it could crowd out funding for other essential services
Provider tax • In California, provider taxes are imposed on SNFs, inpatient hospitals, dentists, HCBS, and managed care organizations	• A process is already in place in California (and across most other states) to collect provider taxes – The provider tax rates would need to be increased (subject to federal limits), or new taxes may need to be imposed on providers not currently subject to a provider tax	• Comparatively limited revenue potential
Premium contributions	• Could apply to a broad portion of the population • Could be combined with other revenue sources (e.g., a payroll tax for wage earners coupled with premium contributions for the self-employed)	• A premium could be regressive (unless it is structured to vary based on an individual's income) • A new process would need to be established to administer premium collection

© 2022 Oliver Wyman

Exhibit 4.13: Hybrid financing options – design considerations

Design option	Pros	Cons
Tax applied to all income, potentially up to a limit, with offsets for payroll tax collections	• Could allow eligibility for individuals unable to vest via payroll tax contributions (e.g., spouses of employees) • Tax revenue automatically increases with inflation in income • Tax base captures non-wage income such as pensions, investment returns, business income, capital gains, residuals, and royalties	• Contributions for high-income individuals may exceed Program benefits (partially mitigated if a contribution cap is imposed) • Increases administration complexity, especially if a contribution cap is imposed • Individuals may leave California to go to a state with lower state income taxes, particularly if they could collect income while living outside California
Insurance premiums for persons aged 65+ with offsets for individuals still working and paying payroll taxes	• Could allow eligibility for individuals unable to vest via payroll tax contributions (e.g., near-retirees)	• Difficult to collect unless structured as withholding from pension (like an income tax)
Voluntary premiums for individuals not subject to payroll or income taxes	• Could allow eligibility for individuals who could not otherwise vest	• Participation may be limited due to overlap with Medi-Cal • High risk of adverse selection as those who choose to pay premiums are more likely to need LTC
No payroll tax (or a reduced payroll tax) before a certain age (e.g., age 40)	• May improve affordability as other expenses (e.g., childcare) may decrease over time while wages may increase with age and workforce experience • More aligned with timing of LTC need, which is not typically top-of-mind for younger individuals	• Contribution rate would need to be higher for those paying the full amount • Increases administrative complexity • Individuals who need LTC at a younger age than average may not be able to vest

© 2022 Oliver Wyman

Design option	Pros	Cons
Payroll tax that increases at a certain age (e.g., age 55)	• May improve affordability as other expenses (e.g., childcare) may decrease over time while wages may increase with age and workforce experience	• Increases administrative complexity
Stacking multiple taxes	• Multiple stacked taxes already exist (e.g., multiple sales taxes)	• May increase administrative complexity (e.g., if stacked taxes feed into a trust) • Stacking a new tax on top of an existing tax could harm beneficiaries of the existing structure as higher tax rates on an activity tend to reduce demand for that activity

4.7.3.2. Contribution age

The Program's contribution age requirement defines the ages at which contributions should be collected to fund the Program. The Task Force assessed which age groups should be required to contribute to the Program (e.g., juveniles, younger adults, pre-retirement age older adults, and retirement age adults). The primary considerations discussed with the Task Force included:

1. The broader the age base contributing to the Program, the lower the overall contribution rate.
2. For the Program to remain viable, there likely needs to be a level of pre-funding from individuals long before the need for benefits arises.
3. Requiring contributions in an individual's later years may include a degree of inequity based on the conjecture that lower-income individuals are more likely to retire from the workforce at older ages compared to higher-income individuals.
4. Limiting contributions to older ages (e.g., age 40+) could mitigate intergeneration inequity issues (intergeneration inequity considerations are discussed further below).

4.7.3.3. Contribution limits

Contribution limits define limitations imposed on the Program's contribution structure, including the waiver of contributions for lower-income individuals and the capping of contributions for higher-income individuals.

The concept of waiving contributions for lower-income individuals was developed through a discussion with the Task Force around designing a Program that is affordable and accessible to as

© 2022 Oliver Wyman

many Californians as possible. The concept of capping contributions for higher-income individuals was developed through a discussion of Program equity and the perceived value proposition, especially in conjunction with an opt-out provision.

Introducing design elements that increase the Program's affordability (e.g., through contribution waivers for lower-income individuals) and design elements that promote the Program's value proposition (particularly for higher-income individuals) could help achieve a more equitable Program design that caters to the needs of many Californians.

4.7.3.3.1. Program affordability

The pros and cons of three affordability levers, including the waiver of contributions for lower-income individuals, were assessed, as summarized in Exhibit 4.14.

Exhibit 4.14: Affordability levers – design considerations

Affordability lever	Pros	Cons
Reduced/subsidized tax contributions based on income Examples: • Vary contributions by income (e.g., waive contributions for lower-income individuals) • Exempt first $x,000 of income from tax • Provide a tax rebate for lower-income individuals through the income tax system	• Reduced hardship for Californians that are struggling to pay for basic household expenses	• Increased administrative complexity compared to a uniform tax rate, with complexities varying based on the type of tax and which agency administers the tax • May garner reduced public support for the Program due to subsidization from those who do not benefit from the reduced contributions • Individuals who benefit from this affordability lever are more likely to satisfy Medi-Cal's income-based eligibility requirements and, would thus have access to similar LTSS benefits through existing programs

© 2022 Oliver Wyman

Affordability lever	Pros	Cons
Limit out-of-pocket costs incurred when accessing services Examples: • Minimize EP • Increase monthly benefit amount	• Increased affordability when accessing benefits	• Increased Program cost relative to a design with a longer EP or lower benefit amount
Lower out-of-pocket costs based on income Examples: • Vary monthly benefit amounts or length of EP based on income or assets	• Improved affordability for those with low income • Improved equity in access to LTSS	• Increased Program cost • Increased administrative complexity relative to a flat benefit amount

4.7.3.3.2. Contribution caps

Establishing a contribution cap for higher-income individuals may help balance the Program's value proposition for these individuals and minimize instances where benefits offered by the Program are significantly lower than the Program's required contributions. A contribution cap increases the value that higher-income individuals might perceive in the Program, which could incentivize their participation and enhance their support for the Program.

4.7.3.4. Contribution rate structure

The contribution rate structure defines whether the Program's contribution rates should be established with the expectation that they would remain level over time or be step-rated (i.e., with *planned* increments over time).

It is important to note that the Program's contribution rates may need to be adjusted if the Program's expenditures emerge unfavorably relative to expectations, regardless of whether the Program utilizes a level or step-rated contribution structure. The distinguishing factor between these options is that a level contribution rate is designed without planned increments over time. In contrast, a step-rated contribution rate is designed with planned increments over time.

The pros and cons of the level and step-rated contribution rate strictures were assessed, as summarized in Exhibit 4.15.

Exhibit 4.15: Contribution rate structure – design considerations

Design option	Pros	Cons
Level (i.e., contribution rates are not intended to increase as the Program ages)	• Simpler design • Promotes pre-funding as a level contribution rate would be higher than an actuarially equivalent step-rated rate in the early years of the Program	• Program members may be more sensitized to contribution rate increases in the event of an unplanned contribution rate increase (e.g., if claims experience emerges unfavorably relative to expectations)
Step-rated (i.e., contribution rates are intended to increase or decrease at planned increments as the Program ages)	• Could facilitate easing into Program contributions upon launch (which may make the Program more feasible) • Program members would be more de-sensitized to contribution rate increases in the event of an unplanned contribution rate increase (e.g., if claims experience emerges unfavorably relative to expectations)	• More complex design • Planned contribution rate increases may be perceived negatively by individuals who are unaware of the intended design

4.7.3.5. Funding approach

The funding approach defines whether the Program should be pre-funded, financed on a PAYGO basis, or a hybrid of the two.

The pros and cons of three funding approaches were assessed, as summarized in Exhibit 4.16.

Exhibit 4.16: Funding approach – design considerations

Design option	Pros	Cons
Pre-funding (e.g., private insurance)	• Potentially significant investment income • Allows for lower contribution rate • Allows for more time to adjust for changes in	• Requires vesting to establish funds necessary to pay out benefits • May receive less public support if certain cohorts (e.g., current seniors) are

Design option	Pros	Cons
	demographics and claims experience	not eligible for benefits due to vesting requirements
PAYGO (e.g., Medi-Cal)	• Does not require vesting • Covering everyone immediately may make the Program more feasible as it is likely to receive more public support	• Limited investment income • Higher contribution rate required • Increased volatility as PAYGO is dependent on the number of contributors and beneficiaries at any given point in time • Sustainability is more challenging with an aging population • Increased intergenerational inequity without a vesting requirement
Hybrid pre-funding and pay-as-you-go (e.g., Germany's LTSS program, WA Cares Fund)	• PAYGO component could provide immediate coverage for those who currently need LTSS • Pre-funding component could provide more generous benefits for those requiring LTSS in the future	• May be more complex to administer

4.7.3.6. Investment strategy

The investment strategy defines the financial instruments for which Program revenue should be invested when not needed to fund immediate Program disbursements.

A Program that includes an extended period of pre-funding could achieve significant investment income, reducing the Program's required contribution rate. However, to maximize potential investment income, Program revenues would need to be invested in a broad range of financial instruments such as U.S. treasuries, bonds, stocks, and other equities. California's current Constitution (Article XVI, Section 17) states that "the State shall not in any manner loan its credit, nor shall it subscribe to, or be interested in the stock of any company, association, or corporation…". Thus, an amendment to the California Constitution would be required before the Program could access higher-yielding financial instruments such as bonds and stocks. A constitutional amendment would have to be approved by a majority of California voters. For the amendment to come before voters would require either an initiative measure involving signatures equal to 8% of the votes cast in

the last election for Governor (currently 997, 139), or a legislative referral that requires a two-thirds vote in both chambers of the state Legislature.

4.7.3.7. Intergenerational equity

4.7.3.7.1. Initial inequity

Upon Program inception, older individuals are likely to contribute less to the Program over their lifetime relative to younger individuals. This inequity wanes as the Program matures. Intergenerational equity should be assessed to determine if explicit provisions should be introduced to mitigate this inequity in the years following the establishment of the Program.

The Task Force discussed three primary approaches for addressing the initial intergenerational inequity.

1. Grade-up Program benefits (i.e., launch the Program with a base level of coverage and increase benefits over time to a target level of coverage).
2. Increased Program contributions (i.e., require higher "catch-up" contributions during the earlier years of Program rollout).
3. Adjust Program benefits to mitigate inequity (e.g., lower portability, greater vesting requirement, or longer EP).

The recommended Program designs reflect the grade-up Program benefits methodology. This approach would not require additional contributions in earlier years, which may alleviate certain feasibility challenges, particularly if the long-term contribution rates are on the higher end of what is considered feasible. Further, the grade-up construct would likely be more straightforward for the public to understand and less administratively complex relative to temporarily adjusting individual benefit provisions such as reducing portability or increasing the EP.

4.7.3.7.2. Coverage for current retirees

Depending on the Program revenue source(s), current retirees may not be able to contribute to the Program. In particular, if the Program is financed via a payroll tax or income-based tax for the self-employed, per the Task Force recommendation, current retirees would not be able to receive vesting credits and therefore would not be eligible for benefits under the Program.

Program benefits could be extended to existing retirees upon Program launch using multiple additional revenue sources, including:

1. **Personal income tax**. If Program contributions are based on total personal income (i.e., inclusive of payroll earnings, investment income, and any other income), existing retirees could satisfy the Program vesting requirement through non-payroll income.
2. **Premium contributions**. Current retirees could contribute to the Program via fixed premiums assessed on a recurring basis (e.g., annually).
3. **Lump sum buy-in**. Upon Program launch, current retirees could pay a one-time assessment (potentially in installments over a handful of years) to participate in the Program.

4. **California's General Fund revenue**. In lieu of having current retirees contribute directly to the Program, funding for current retirees could be sourced from California's General Fund revenue.

Program participation by current retirees should be mandatory (i.e., non-voluntary) under the personal income tax and premium contribution approaches to mitigate potential adverse selection (Program opt-out provisions, however, would also apply to current retirees). Potential adverse selection associated with the lump sum buy-in approach could be partially mitigated by establishing a limited one-time enrollment period (e.g., six months) following Program launch, during which current retirees could elect to participate in the Program. If California's current retirees (who likely represent an older age population) are required to participate in the Program, care must be taken to ensure equitable treatment—e.g., a vesting period based on age could be established for current retirees to increase the likelihood that individuals who contribute to the Program will be able to access Program benefits.

Using one of the first three revenue sources listed above could significantly increase the cost of the Program because current retirees are likely to need LTSS sooner than non-retirees while also contributing to the Program for a shorter period of time compared to those who are not retired. Furthermore, current retiree contribution levels may be meaningfully lower under the first two approaches relative to the level of payroll or income-based contributions from individuals in the workforce. With the lump sum buy-in approach, it may be challenging to develop a buy-in amount that is both affordable to retirees and financially viable for the Program.

The fourth above-listed approach of funding Program participation for current retirees via California's General Fund revenue is analogous to Title I of the Social Security Act ("Grants to States for Old-Age Assistance for the Aged"). Under this approach, Program benefits for current retirees could be financed separately from those for individuals contributing to the Program via payroll taxes or income-based taxes. The primary hurdles for this approach are policy change-related (e.g., competing with other funding priorities, potential instability from legislative changes) and financial-based (i.e., insufficient California General Fund revenues).

4.8. LTSS workforce

Establishing a Program that could expand LTSS access to millions of Californians could significantly impact the demand for LTSS providers and caregivers. For the Program to be operationally viable, it is paramount that the supply of adequately trained providers and caregivers increase in lockstep with the establishment of the Program. Task Force discussions focused on understanding existing challenges facing the LTSS workforce and making recommendations that could help address some of these challenges. Perspectives were shared by formal providers (who are paid for their services) and family caregivers (who are often not paid for their services).

4.8.1. LTSS workforce recommendations and considerations

Considerations related to the Program's impact on the LTSS workforce were discussed at Task Force Meeting #10 in April 2022.

© 2022 Oliver Wyman

An in-depth analysis of LTSS workforce issues and specific actions that could be taken to remedy these issues are outside the scope of this report. That said, representatives from CDA provided the Task Force with an overview of investments currently being made in California to address the LTSS workforce crisis.

Other relevant educational materials on this topic included:

- LTSS workforce considerations: supply, demand, and costs
- LTSS workforce considerations: the programs and solutions
- Home care and ADC considerations (verbal presentation)
- Financial support considerations for family caregivers

Given the extent and complexity of issues faced by the LTSS workforce, we asked the Task Force to focus their recommendations within the confines of AB 567, which specifies that the Task Force should evaluate the demands on the LTSS workforce as the need for LTC in California grows, and how the LTC workforce can be prepared to meet those demands.

Exhibit 4.17 outlines the Task Force's recommendations related to the LTSS workforce along with associated considerations, which reflect high-level perspectives provided by members of the Task Force.

These recommendations are not associated with the specific Program designs recommended by the Task Force; rather, they reflect overarching recommendations necessary for the Program to operate effectively, irrespective of the selected design.

Exhibit 4.17: LTSS workforce recommendations and considerations

Recommendation	Recommendation detail	Considerations and rationale
Improve caregiver wages and benefits	• Establish minimum wages for caregivers • Increase wage equity among caregivers • Expand benefits offered to caregivers (e.g., health insurance)	• Wages for direct care workers have experienced limited growth in recent history, particularly before the COVID-19 pandemic • Direct care worker wages have not remained competitive relative to many other careers (e.g., the average direct care worker wage is less than that of a short-order cook, a housekeeper, and a gardener) • Increasing the wage floor (and offering benefits) could have a profound positive impact on addressing LTSS labor shortages (through increased retention) and

Recommendation	Recommendation detail	Considerations and rationale
		improving care quality (through reduced turnover) • Increasing wages is far from simple as there are many interdependent factors (e.g., existing provider reimbursement rates, economic interdependencies with other industries)
Improve caregiver training and career progression	• Provide career ladders and lattices • Increase investment in caregiver training programs	• Improving career ladders and latices could promote direct care workers in developing competencies and skills and allowing them to access advanced or alternative caregiving opportunities
Promote and incentivize expansion of caregiver workforce	• Promote career opportunities (e.g., community college programs) • Draw from the 'grey market' workforce (e.g., caregivers unrelated to the beneficiary who do not work for a formal care provider)	• CDA estimates that the shortage of direct care workers in California will be between 600,000 and 3.2 million by 2030 • Broadening the pipeline of potential future caregivers could help address the shortage
Improve governance, oversight, and representation of the caregiver workforce	• Establish a Department of Caregivers • Establish an LTSS labor standards board • Establish a system to monitor caregiver workforce supply, demand, pay, and benefits • Provide access to unions	• A labor standards board could set minimum standards for wages, benefits, and working conditions for caregivers
Support for informal caregivers	• Provide financial support (e.g., lost wages, expense reimbursement)	• The Task Force recommended that the Program establish minimum training requirements for informal or family caregivers to become certified caregivers

© 2022 Oliver Wyman

Recommendation	Recommendation detail	Considerations and rationale
	• Provide access to training programs • Offer respite programs • Consider solutions similar to Germany and Hawaii (Kapuna Caregivers Program)	• While the specifics of the training requirements have yet to be defined, the Task Force recommended that the minimum standards be established in a culturally competent manner and be widely accessible to avoid discouraging potential family caregivers from completing required training or Program beneficiaries from using Program benefits • California's IHSS program offers financial support for informal caregivers, and lessons learned in regard to the IHSS program's informal caregiver support benefits should be evaluated to inform how the Program can most effectively support informal caregivers – Administration of a reimbursement benefit for certified family caregiver could be modeled after IHSS (e.g., caregivers could be reimbursed at an hourly rate, which currently ranges from $15 to $18.75 per hour for IHSS caregivers) – Further research to develop a family caregiver reimbursement model for the Program is needed • The Task Force discussed that cultural differences should be examined in designing a Program that provides financial support for informal caregivers • Providing support for informal caregivers could reduce the existing and projected shortage of formal caregivers

© 2022 Oliver Wyman

Recommendation	Recommendation detail	Considerations and rationale
Other recommendations	• Embrace automation technology • Identify ways in which the undocumented workforce could be leveraged	• The shortage of LTSS workers could be partially alleviated by leveraging the undocumented workforce, to the extent possible, and using automation and technology – Leveraging automation and technology to perform tasks customarily provided by caregivers could allow caregivers to focus on performing tasks that requires human interaction – Certain technology may improve health outcomes for individuals, thus reducing their need for LTSS

4.8.2. LTSS workforce feasibility assessment

The Task Force recommendations contained in Section 4.8.1 were developed based on an assessment of potential support from policymakers and the general public, administrative feasibility, and financial feasibility. The Task Force discussed the following feasibility considerations regarding the Program's workforce:

- Addressing some of the existing challenges faced by the LTSS workforce may generate a more sustainable supply of adequately trained providers and caregivers, which is vital to the Program's overall feasibility. That said, certain Task Force recommendations may be more challenging to implement given interdependencies with other industries, etc.
- Providing financial support to informal or family caregivers provides flexibility of choice to Program beneficiaries and is therefore expected to increase support from policymakers and the general public despite increasing administrative complexity.

4.9. Access and regulation

In terms of Program access, Task Force discussions focused on effective Program outreach and education to ensure that the Program is widely accessible and understood by Californians. In terms of regulatory considerations for the Program, Task Force discussions largely focused on coordination and interaction as well as financing.

4.9.1. Access and regulation recommendations and considerations

Considerations related to Program access and regulation were primarily discussed with the Task Force at Task Force Meeting #12 in June 2022.

Relevant educational materials on these topics included:

- AARP California outreach and education
- LTSS access and care preferences in California
- Recommendations on access to LTC programs

Key concepts and takeaways from this discussion are summarized below.

4.9.1.1. Access

Beyond ensuring that the Program is widely accessible and understood by Californians, robust Program outreach and education could support individuals in holistically planning for, and financing, their future LTSS needs. Key considerations to ensure that outreach and education are culturally competent include:

- Use multiple communication platforms to reach individuals where they are (e.g., in-person, online, TV, radio) and in the languages that they speak
- Communication should be peer to peer, grassroots to grassroots
- Work with trusted community partners with experience and connection to the community
- Voices, imagery, and materials should resonate with each community
- Expert advisors from the community should inform the Program's outreach plan (including outreach with sovereign tribal communities)

The Task Force recommended that a separate working group be established to develop a plan for Program outreach and education. The establishment of this working group received the highest degree of consensus among the various working groups proposed by the Task Force.

4.9.1.2. Regulation

Regulatory considerations related to Program coordination include (but are not limited to) the coordination of benefits, data collection, and benefit eligibility determination. Given the complexity of California's existing LTSS programs and services, an in-depth assessment of the regulation

© 2022 Oliver Wyman

associated with these existing programs is needed to ensure effective and efficient coordination. This regulatory assessment should consider Medi-Cal, IHSS, Medicare, Medicare Advantage, PACE, home and community-based programs and services administered by CDA, the VA, and private insurance. Additional (non-regulatory) considerations related to the Program's interaction with these programs and services is included in Section 4.3.

To allow Program contributions to be invested in a broad range of financial instruments such as bonds, stocks, and other equities, as recommended by the Task Force, an amendment to the California Constitution would be required, as outlined in Section 4.7.

Other regulatory obstacles that may be faced by the Program at the state and federal levels were beyond the scope of this report.

4.9.2. Access and regulation feasibility assessment

The Task Force recommendations contained in Section 4.9.1 were developed based on an assessment of potential support from policymakers and the general public, administrative feasibility, and financial feasibility. The Task Force discussed the following feasibility considerations regarding Program access and regulation:

- A Program that is widely accessible and understood by Californians (which could be promoted via Program outreach and education) will likely increase support from policymakers and the general public. Further, a widely accessible Program may increase financial feasibility to the extent it achieves higher Program participation.
- Establishing regulation that promotes effective and efficient coordination with existing LTSS programs will increase the administrative feasibility of the Program.
- Pursuing an amendment to the California Constitution to allow Program contributions to be invested in a broad range of financial instruments will increase the financial feasibility of the Program.

5. Interaction with California's Master Plan for Aging

In recognition of California's aging population, Governor Gavin Newsom issued an Executive Order in 2019 calling for the creation of a Master Plan for Aging ("Master Plan"). The Master Plan aims to prioritize the health and well-being of older Californians, as well as policies that promote healthy aging. The Master Plan identifies five goals and 23 strategies to build a California for all ages by 2030. The Master Plan's five major goals are outlined below:

1. **Housing for All Ages and Stages**: promote communities for older Californians that are age-, disability-, and dementia-friendly, and climate- and disaster-ready
2. **Health Reimagined:** provide the services necessary for individuals to live at home in their communities and to optimize their health and quality of life
3. **Inclusion and Equity, not Isolation:** provide lifelong opportunities for work, volunteering, engagement, and leadership, and protect all aging and disabled Californians from isolation, discrimination, abuse, neglect, and exploitation
4. **Caregiving that Works:** provide high-quality direct caregiving jobs to support aging and disabled Californians
5. **Affording Aging**: provide affordable access to LTSS and promote economic security for aging Californians

Establishing a statewide LTSS program, as outlined in this Feasibility Report, would closely align with the second goal of the Master Plan (i.e., Health Reimagined), which includes sub-initiatives aimed at advocating for a universal LTSS benefit and assessing opportunities for federal and state partnerships. In addition, the Program's focus on cultural competency aligns with the Master Plan's overarching goal to provide equitable opportunities for all Californians to age how they choose. Further, Task Force recommendations for the Program illustrate a similar commitment to caregiver support and affordable access to LTSS as the Master Plan.

The Program could also help advance progress on the fifth goal of the Master Plan (i.e., Affording Aging), which aims to improve economic security for Californians. Specifically, implementing one of the five program designs recommended by the Task Force could help alleviate some of the financial burdens for aging individuals who cannot afford private insurance. Finally, the Program is complementary to the other three Master Plan goals (i.e., housing, inclusions and equity, and caregiving) as they each aim to improve the quality of life for all Californians as they age, which is ultimately the goal of the Program as well.

© 2022 Oliver Wyman

6. Distribution and use

Oliver Wyman was commissioned by the CDI to provide support associated with assessing the feasibility of developing and implementing a culturally competent statewide insurance program for LTSS. The primary audience for this report includes stakeholders from the CDI (including the Insurance Commissioner), members of the Long Term Care Insurance Task Force, the Governor of California, the California Legislative Assembly, and members of the general public within the state of California.

Oliver Wyman shall not have any liability to any third party in respect of this report or any actions taken or decisions made as a consequence of the results, advice or recommendations set forth herein.

© 2022 Oliver Wyman

7. Reliances and limitations

The opinions expressed herein are valid only for the purpose stated herein and as of the date hereof. Information furnished by others, upon which all or portions of this report are based, is believed to be reliable but has not been verified. No warranty is given as to the accuracy of such information. Public information and industry and statistical data are from sources Oliver Wyman deems to be reliable; however, Oliver Wyman makes no representation as to the accuracy or completeness of such information and has accepted the information without further verification. No responsibility is taken for changes in market conditions or laws or regulations and no obligation is assumed to revise this report to reflect changes, events or conditions, which occur subsequent to the date hereof.

As between Oliver Wyman and the CDI, all decisions in connection with the implementation or use of advice or recommendations contained in this report are the sole responsibility of the CDI. This report does not represent investment advice, nor does it provide an opinion regarding the fairness of any transaction to any and all parties.

The findings contained in this report contain predictions based on current data and historical trends. Any such predictions are subject to inherent risks and uncertainties. Oliver Wyman accepts no responsibility for actual results or future events.

The opinions expressed in this report are valid only for the purpose stated herein and as of the date of this report. No obligation is assumed to revise this report to reflect changes, events or conditions, which occur subsequent to the date hereof.

This report is not considered a Statement of Actuarial Opinion under the guidelines promulgated by the American Academy of Actuaries, as it does not contain actuarial advice or actuarial opinions by the report’s authors. The recommendations contained in this report are those of the AB 567 Task Force (including both current and past members).

© 2022 Oliver Wyman

Appendix A. Glossary of terms

The following list contains the definition of all abbreviations contained in this report:

AB: Assembly bill

ADC: Adult day care

ADLs: Activities of daily living

ADRCs: Aging and Disability Resource Connections

CBAS: Community-Based Adult Services

CDA: California Department of Aging

CDI: California Department of Insurance

CDSS: California Department of Social Services

CMS: Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services

CPI: Consumer Price Index

DHCS: California Department of Health Care Services

EDD: Employment Development Department

EP: Elimination period

HCBS: Home and community-based services

HICAP: Health Insurance Counseling and Advocacy Program

HIPAA: Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act of 1996

IDD: Intellectually and developmentally disabled

IHSS: California's In-Home Supportive Services Program

LTC: Long-term care

LTSS: Long-term services and supports

MSSP: Multipurpose Senior Services Program

PACE: California's Program for All-Inclusive Care for the Elderly

PAYGO: Pay-as-you-go

PFL: California's Paid Family Leave Program

© 2022 Oliver Wyman

Program: Culturally competent statewide long-term care insurance program in California that is being explored per AB 567

RCF: Residential care facility

SDI: California's State Disability Insurance Program

SNF: Skilled nursing facility

Task Force: 15-member Long Term Care Insurance Task Force established by AB 567 to explore the feasibility of developing and implementing a culturally competent statewide insurance program for long-term care services and supports in California.

VA: United States Department of Veterans Affairs

WISH: Well-Being Insurance for Seniors to be at Home

© 2022 Oliver Wyman

Appendix B. Program design "straw man"

AB 567 - Program Design "Straw Man"

Legend
- **[√]** indicates a plan design element that is consistent with preliminary Task Force recommendations
- **Yellow** shading represents a less generous plan design element relative to Design 3
- **Green** shading represents a more generous plan design element relative to Design 3
- **Grey** shading represents a different (not necessarily more or less generous) plan design element relative to Design 3

Lower Cost ⟵⟶ Higher Cost

Plan design element						*Relat ve cost benchmarks [1] (high level estimates for reference only; actual Program cost relativities will d ffer)*
Indicative Program cost ($ $$$$$)	$	$$$	$$ (Estimated payro tax range: 0.40% to 0.60%[1])	$$$$	$$$$$	
Design phi osophy						
Program benefit richness	$36,000 in supportive LTC benefits	$110,400 in targeted benefits	$36,000 in comprehensive benefits (lower-range)	$81,000 in comprehensive benefits (mid-range)	$144,000 in comprehensive benefits (higher-range) [√]	
California population coverage	Adult population covered (18+) [√]	Older adult population covered (65+)	Adult population covered (18+) [√]	Adult population covered (18+) [√]	Adult population covered (18+) [√]	
Taxation progressivity	Progressive tax with a contribution cap and a contribution waiver for lower-income individuals [√]	Progressive tax with a contribution cap	Progressive tax with a contribution cap and a contribution waiver for lower-income individuals [√]	Progressive tax with a contribution waiver for lower-income individuals[√]	Progressive tax with a contribution cap and a contribution waiver for lower-income individuals [√]	
Structure (coverage and des gn)						
Program structure	Front-end coverage [√] Vested social insurance [√]	Front-end coverage [√] Vested social insurance [√]	Front-end coverage [√] Vested social insurance [√]	Front-end coverage [√] Vested social insurance [√]	Front-end coverage [√] Vested social insurance [√]	
Program benefits and services						
Benefit type	Reimbursement for all covered benefits (actual benefit amount reimbursed, subject to limitations)	Reimbursement for all covered benefits (actual benefit amount reimbursed, subject to limitations) with reduced (50%) cash benefit alternative [√]	Reimbursement for all covered benefits (actual benefit amount reimbursed, subject to limitations)	Reimbursement for all covered benefits (actual benefit amount reimbursed, subject to limitations) with reduced (50%) cash benefit alternative [√]	Reimbursement for all covered benefits (actual benefit amount reimbursed, subject to limitations) with reduced (50%) cash benefit alternative [√]	N/A
Benefit period	2 years [√]	2 years [√]	1 year	18 months	2 years [√]	- Decrease benefit period from 2 years to 18 months: **22% savings** - Decrease benefit period from 2 years to 1 year: **45% savings**
Benefit maximum	$1,500 per month [Alternative scenario: $1,000 per month]	$4,600 per month [√]	$3,000 per month [√]	$4,500 per month [√]	$6,000 per month [√]	- Decrease monthly benefit maximum from $6,000 to $4,500: **27% savings** - Decrease monthly benefit maximum from $6,000 to $3,000: **50% savings** - Decrease monthly benefit maximum from $6,000 to $1,500: **75% savings**
Benefit inflation	Inflation as a function of CPI; assessed annually (not automatically applied)	Inflation as a function of CPI; assessed annually (not automatically applied)	Inflation as a function of CPI; assessed annually (not automatically applied)	Inflation as a function of CPI; assessed annually (not automatically applied)	Inflation as a function of CPI; applied annually [√]	N/A
Elimination period	No elimination period [√]	90-day elimination period [Alternative scenarios: 0-day and 30-day elimination periods]	No elimination period [√]	No elimination period [√]	No elimination period [√]	- Increase elimination period from 0 days to 30 days: **4% savings** - Increase elimination period form 0 days to 90 days: **8% savings**
Approved care settings	Supportive LTC (e.g., caregiver support, adult day care, meal delivery, transportation, durable medical equipment, home assessment, and minor home modifications) Caregiver support includes: training, respite care, and financial support via certified provider reimbursement	Home and community-based care (including all approved care settings reflected in Design 1) along with residential care facility [Alternative scenario: Home and community-based care only]	Home and community-based care (including all approved care settings reflected in Design 1) along with residential care facility	Comprehensive (i.e., facility care and home and community-based care). Includes all approved care settings reflected in Design 2, along with skilled nursing facility [√]	Comprehensive (i.e., facility care and home and community-based care). Includes all approved care settings reflected in Design 2, along with skilled nursing facility [√]	- Change approved care settings from comprehensive to home care only: **39% savings**
PACE coverage	N/A	N/A	Covered service; certified provider reimbursement [√]	Covered service; certified provider reimbursement [√]	Covered service; certified provider reimbursement [√]	N/A
Informal / family caregivers	Covered service; reimbursement to caregivers (subject to completion of certified caregiver training; minimum requirements that do not discourage benefit utilization to be defined in a culturally competent manner) [√]	Covered service; reimbursement to caregivers (subject to completion of certified caregiver training; minimum requirements that do not discourage benefit utilization to be defined in a culturally competent manner) [√]	Covered service; reimbursement to caregivers (subject to completion of certified caregiver training; minimum requirements that do not discourage benefit utilization to be defined in a culturally competent manner) [√]	Covered service; reimbursement to caregivers (subject to completion of certified caregiver training; minimum requirements that do not discourage benefit utilization to be defined in a culturally competent manner) [√]	Covered service; reimbursement to caregivers (subject to completion of certified caregiver training; minimum requirements that do not discourage benefit utilization to be defined in a culturally competent manner) [√]	N/A
Preventative benefits	N/A	Limited/contingent preventative benefits (e.g., partake in wellness program)	Limited/contingent preventative benefits (e.g., partake in wellness program)	Preventative benefits before satisfying the benefit eligibility criteria but only after becoming fully vested in the Program [√]	Preventative benefits before satisfying the benefit eligibility criteria but only after becoming fully vested in the Program [√]	N/A
Family / spousal coverage	Individual coverage only	Individual coverage only	Individual coverage only	Coverage can be extended to a spouse or domestic partner through a shared benefit pool	Coverage can be extended to a spouse or domestic partner through a shared benefit pool	N/A
Program eligibility and enro ment						
Benefit eligibility age	Age 18+ (subject to vesting requirements) [√]	Age 65+ (subject to vesting requirements)	Age 18+ (subject to vesting requirements) [√]	Age 18+ (subject to vesting requirements) [√]	Age 18+ (subject to vesting requirements) [√]	- Increase benefit eligibility age from 18+ to 65+: **12% savings**
Benefit eligibility criteria	HIPAA benefit eligibility (2 of 6 ADLs for 90 days or severe cognitive impairment) [√]	HIPAA benefit eligibility (2 of 6 ADLs for 90 days or severe cognitive impairment) [√]	HIPAA benefit eligibility (2 of 6 ADLs for 90 days or severe cognitive impairment) [√]	HIPAA benefit eligibility (2 of 6 ADLs for 90 days or severe cognitive impairment) [√]	HIPAA benefit eligibility (2 of 6 ADLs for 90 days or severe cognitive impairment) [√]	N/A
Vesting criteria	5 years of contributions [√]	5 years of contributions [√]	10 years of contribution	10 years of contribution	5 years of contributions [√] [alternative scenario: 10 years of contribution]	- Increase vesting criteria from 5 years to 10 years: **13% savings**
Flexibility for those unable to vest	Pro-rated benefits (no benefits for individuals who contribute for less than 3 years, 50% of the benefits for individuals who contribute between 3 and 5 years, 100% of the benefits for individuals who contribute for 5 or more years)	Pro-rated benefits (no benefits for individuals who contribute for less than 3 years, 50% of the benefits for individuals who contribute between 3 and 5 years, 100% of the benefits for individuals who contribute for 5 or more years)	Pro-rated benefits (no benefits for individuals who contribute for less than 5 years, 50% of the benefits for individuals who contribute for 5 years, grading up by 10% each year up to 100% of benefits in year 10)	Pro-rated benefits (no benefits for individuals who contribute for less than 5 years, 50% of the benefits for individuals who contribute for 5 years, grading up by 10% each year up to 100% of benefits in year 10)	Pro-rated benefits (no benefits for individuals who contribute for less than 3 years, 50% of the benefits for individuals who contribute between 3 and 5 years, 100% of the benefits for individuals who contribute for 5 or more years) and voluntary alternative Program contribution option to "top up" benefits [√]	- Remove partial vesting (10 year vesting criteria): **14% savings**
Portability	Domestic portability; full benefits [Alternative scenario: international portability; full benefits]	Domestic portability; partial benefits outside of California (grade to 50% over 5 years) [Alternative scenario: international portability; partial benefits outside of the U.S. (grade to 50% over 5 years)]	Domestic portability; partial benefits outside of California (grade to 50% over 5 years) [Alternative scenario: international portability; partial benefits outside of the U.S. (grade to 50% over 5 years)]	Domestic portability; full benefits [Alternative scenario: international portability; full benefits]	International portability; full benefits [√]	- Change from full domestic portability to partial domestic portability (grade to 50% over 5 years): **17% savings**
Private insurance considerations: on or before Program enactment	N/A	Individuals with eligible private insurance[2] may opt out of the Program. They would be exempt from making Program contributions and will not be eligible to receive Program benefits [√]	Individuals with eligible private insurance[2] may opt out of the Program. They would be exempt from making Program contributions and will not be eligible to receive Program benefits [√]	Individuals with eligible private insurance[2] may opt out of the Program. They would be exempt from making Program contributions and will not be eligible to receive Program benefits [√]	Individuals with eligible private insurance[2] may opt out of the Program. They would be exempt from making Program contributions and will not be eligible to receive Program benefits [√]	N/A
Private insurance considerations: after Program enactment[3]	N/A	Individuals with eligible substitutive (i.e., non-supplemental) private insurance[2] would be subject to reduced Program contributions (and will remain eligible to receive Program benefits as a secondary payor to their private insurance) [√]	Individuals with eligible substitutive (i.e., non-supplemental) private insurance[2] would be subject to reduced Program contributions (and will remain eligible to receive Program benefits as a secondary payor to their private insurance) [√]	Individuals with eligible substitutive (i.e., non-supplemental) private insurance[2] would be subject to reduced Program contributions (and will remain eligible to receive Program benefits as a secondary payor to their private insurance) [√]	Individuals with eligible substitutive (i.e., non-supplemental) private insurance[2] would be subject to reduced Program contributions (and will remain eligible to receive Program benefits as a secondary payor to their private insurance) [√]	N/A
Program opt-out provision transition date[4]	N/A	Program effective date [Alternative scenario: beginning of the year preceding the Program effective date]	Program effective date [Alternative scenario: beginning of the year preceding the Program effective date]	Program effective date [Alternative scenario: beginning of the year preceding the Program effective date]	Program effective date [Alternative scenario: beginning of the year preceding the Program effective date]	N/A

[1] Estimates are based on the 2020 Milliman CA LTSS Feasibility Study

[2] The criteria for private insurance to be considered eligible under the opt-out provision are TBD (and will be determined at a later date)

[3] Supplemental insurance products covering LTSS that are designed after Program enactment would not qualify for reduced Program contributions (e.g., private insurance with a 2-year elimination period)

[4] Individuals who purchase eligible private insurance as of this date would be permitted to opt out of the Program while individuals who purchase eligible private insurance after this date would be eligible for reduced Program contributions. Separate timelines will be established for (i) when individuals would be required to demonstrate that they have eligible private insurance and (ii) when they would need to notify their employer (or, if self-employed, the associated California administrative body) of their decision to opt out of the Program.

© 2022 Oliver Wyman

AB 567 - Program Design "Straw Man"

Legend
- **[✓]** indicates a plan design element that is consistent with preliminary Task Force recommendations
- Yellow shading represents a less generous plan design element relative to Design 3
- Green shading represents a more generous plan design element relative to Design 3
- Grey shading represents a different (not necessarily more or less generous) plan design element relative to Design 3

Lower Cost ⟵⟶ **Higher Cost**

Plan design element						*Relat ve cost benchmarks [1] (high level estimates for reference only; actual Program cost relativities will d ffer)*
Program financing						
Revenue source	Progressive payroll tax (split between employees and employers); non-voluntary premium contributions via an income tax for the self-employed; alternative funding sources beyond payroll/income tax may also be considered [✓] [Alternative scenario: reduce/eliminate employer portion of the program contributions; allow exemption for small businesses (i.e., those with fewer than a yet-to-be-determined number of employees)]	Progressive payroll tax (split between employees and employers); non-voluntary premium contributions via an income tax for the self-employed [✓] [Alternative scenario: reduce/eliminate employer portion of the program contributions; allow exemption for small businesses (i.e., those with fewer than a yet-to-be-determined number of employees)]	Progressive payroll tax (split between employees and employers); non-voluntary premium contributions via an income tax for the self-employed [✓] [Alternative scenario: reduce/eliminate employer portion of the program contributions; allow exemption for small businesses (i.e., those with fewer than a yet-to-be-determined number of employees)]	Progressive payroll tax (split between employees and employers); non-voluntary premium contributions via an income tax for the self-employed [✓] [Alternative scenario: reduce/eliminate employer portion of the program contributions; allow exemption for small businesses (i.e., those with fewer than a yet-to-be-determined number of employees)]	Progressive payroll tax (split between employees and employers); non-voluntary premium contributions via an income tax for the self-employed [✓] [Alternative scenario: reduce/eliminate employer portion of the program contributions; allow exemption for small businesses (i.e., those with fewer than a yet-to-be-determined number of employees)]	N/A
Program contribution age: minimum	Age 18 [✓]	Age 18 [✓]	Age 18 [✓]	Age 18 [✓]	Age 18 [✓]	N/A
Program contribution age: maximum	No maximum (contributions dependent on being on payroll or self-employed) [✓]	No maximum (contributions dependent on being on payroll or self-employed) [✓]	No maximum (contributions dependent on being on payroll or self-employed) [✓]	No maximum (contributions dependent on being on payroll or self-employed) [✓]	No maximum (contributions dependent on being on payroll or self-employed) [✓]	N/A
Program contribution limits: taxable earnings waiver	Waive contributions for individuals below a specified poverty level (e.g., 138% of FPL) [✓]	Individuals below a specified poverty level will not contribute or receive vesting credits (the individual may still vest in the Program if they meet the vesting requirement over their working lifetime). Such individuals could receive LTSS benefits from Medi-Cal (subject to Medi-Cal eligibility requirements)	Waive contributions for individuals below a specified poverty level (e.g., 138% of FPL) [✓]	Waive contributions for individuals below a specified poverty level (e.g., 138% of FPL) [✓]	Waive contributions for individuals below a specified poverty level (e.g., 138% of FPL) [✓]	- Do not waive Program contributions for individuals below 138% of FPL (but still receive benefits): **3% savings** - Do not waive Program contributions for individuals below 138% of FPL (but do not receive benefits): **22% savings**
Program contribution limits: taxable earnings maximum	Apply a contribution cap. Consider contribution caps in excess of Social Security (e.g., 2x Social Security cap) [✓] [Alternative scenario: no maximum contribution limitation]	Apply a contribution cap. Consider contribution caps in excess of Social Security (e.g., 2x Social Security cap) [✓] [Alternative scenario: no maximum contribution limitation]	Apply a contribution cap. Consider contribution caps in excess of Social Security (e.g., 2x Social Security cap) [✓] [Alternative scenario: no maximum contribution limitation]	No maximum contribution limitations	Apply a contribution cap. Consider contribution caps in excess of Social Security (e.g., 2x Social Security cap) [✓] [Alternative scenario: no maximum contribution limitation]	N/A
Contribution rate structure	Level tax rate (with guidelines stipulating the process to amend the tax rate); no variability by age or other characteristics besides income level [✓]	Level tax rate (with guidelines stipulating the process to amend the tax rate); no variability by age or other characteristics besides income level [✓]	Level tax rate (with guidelines stipulating the process to amend the tax rate); no variability by age or other characteristics besides income level [✓]	Level tax rate (with guidelines stipulating the process to amend the tax rate); no variability by age or other characteristics besides income level [✓]	Level tax rate (with guidelines stipulating the process to amend the tax rate); no variability by age or other characteristics besides income level [✓]	N/A
Investment strategy	Invest Program contributions in U.S. treasuries, bonds, stocks, and other equities (California constitutional amendment required) [Alternative scenario: consider the financial implications of not obtaining a constitutional amendment][✓]	Invest Program contributions in U.S. treasuries, bonds, stocks, and other equities (California constitutional amendment required) [Alternative scenario: consider the financial implications of not obtaining a constitutional amendment][✓]	Invest Program contributions in U.S. treasuries, bonds, stocks, and other equities (California constitutional amendment required) [Alternative scenario: consider the financial implications of not obtaining a constitutional amendment][✓]	Invest Program contributions in U.S. treasuries, bonds, stocks, and other equities (California constitutional amendment required) [Alternative scenario: consider the financial implications of not obtaining a constitutional amendment][✓]	Invest Program contributions in U.S. treasuries, bonds, stocks, and other equities (California constitutional amendment required) [Alternative scenario: consider the financial implications of not obtaining a constitutional amendment][✓]	- Restrict investment strategy to U.S. treasuries: **20% cost increase**[5]
Intergenerational consideration (i.e., upon Program inception, older individuals are likely to contribute less to the Program over their lifetime relative to younger individuals; this inequity wanes as the Program matures)	None	Grade-up benefits over first 20 years [✓]	Grade-up benefits over first 20 years [✓]	Grade-up benefits over first 20 years [✓]	Grade-up benefits over first 20 years [✓]	N/A

[5] Estimate is based on the 2020 Milliman WA Cares LTSS Actuarial Study, so it does not reflect California demographics

Plan design element						Relative cost benchmarks
Coordination and interaction (with other LTSS financing sources)						
Coordination: private LTC	Private LTC pays before Program; concurrent, non-duplicative payments permitted [✓]	Private LTC pays before Program; concurrent, non-duplicative payments permitted [✓]	Private LTC pays before Program; concurrent, non-duplicative payments permitted [✓]	Private LTC pays before Program; concurrent, non-duplicative payments permitted [✓]	Private LTC pays before Program; concurrent, non-duplicative payments permitted [✓]	N/A
Coordination: Medi-Cal	Program pays before Medi-Cal; concurrent, non-duplicative payments permitted. Program benefits should not influence Medi-Cal eligibility. The Program should not exclude contributions or benefits for individuals eligible for Medi-Cal in the past, present, or future. Pursue a CMS federal demonstration waiver to retain federal Medicaid savings from the program [✓]	Program pays before Medi-Cal; concurrent, non-duplicative payments permitted. Program benefits should not influence Medi-Cal eligibility. The Program should not exclude contributions or benefits for individuals eligible for Medi-Cal in the past, present, or future. Pursue a CMS federal demonstration waiver to retain federal Medicaid savings from the program [✓]	Program pays before Medi-Cal; concurrent, non-duplicative payments permitted. Program benefits should not influence Medi-Cal eligibility. The Program should not exclude contributions or benefits for individuals eligible for Medi-Cal in the past, present, or future. Pursue a CMS federal demonstration waiver to retain federal Medicaid savings from the program [✓]	Program pays before Medi-Cal; concurrent, non-duplicative payments permitted. Program benefits should not influence Medi-Cal eligibility. The Program should not exclude contributions or benefits for individuals eligible for Medi-Cal in the past, present, or future. Pursue a CMS federal demonstration waiver to retain federal Medicaid savings from the program [✓]	Program pays before Medi-Cal; concurrent, non-duplicative payments permitted. Program benefits should not influence Medi-Cal eligibility. The Program should not exclude contributions or benefits for individuals eligible for Medi-Cal in the past, present, or future. Pursue a CMS federal demonstration waiver to retain federal Medicaid savings from the program [✓]	N/A
Coordination: Medicare	Assess the feasibility of having Program pay after Medicare.	Assess the feasibility of having Program pay after Medicare.	Assess the feasibility of having Program pay after Medicare.	Assess the feasibility of having Program pay after Medicare.	Assess the feasibility of having Program pay after Medicare.	N/A

Oliver Wyman was commissioned by the California Department of Insurance (CDI) to provide support associated with assessing the feasibility of developing and implementing a culturally competent statewide insurance program for long-term care services and supports. The primary audience for this report includes stakeholders from the California Department of Insurance, members of the Long-Term Care Insurance Task Force, and members of the general public within the state of California.

Oliver Wyman shall not have any liability to any third party in respect of this report or any actions taken or decisions made as a consequence of the results, advice or recommendations set forth herein.

The opinions expressed herein are valid only for the purpose stated herein and as of the date hereof. Information furnished by others, upon which all or portions of this report are based, is believed to be reliable but has not been verified. No warranty is given as to the accuracy of such information. Public information and industry and statistical data are from sources Oliver Wyman deems to be reliable; however, Oliver Wyman makes no representation as to the accuracy or completeness of such information and has accepted the information without further verification. No responsibility is taken for changes in market conditions or laws or regulations and no obligation is assumed to revise this report to reflect changes, events or conditions, which occur subsequent to the date hereof.

Appendix C. Task Force questionnaire results

Oliver Wyman commissioned 12 questionnaires (i.e., surveys) related to each Work Plan element to independently collect Task Force and public recommendations. The questionnaires were followed by group discussions between the Task Force and public to align on preliminary results, recommendations, and next steps.

Questionnaire results were considered preliminary and subject to change, recognizing that Task Force member views could evolve as detailed discussions progressed across the seven Work Plan elements. In addition, there were instances where a question (or a variation of a question) was asked multiple times to address additional information and recommendations brought forth by the Task Force.

Exhibit C.1 contains an inventory of the 12 questionnaires. The remaining exhibits in this appendix summarize questionnaire results related to each Program design element contained in the Program design “straw man” (provided in Appendix B). The percentage of Task Force votes may not add to 100% due to rounding.

Where a question (or a variation of a question) was asked more than once, the exhibits reflect the most recent result. We applied a scoring system for questions where the Task Force was asked to rank their preferences for a specific Program design element. In such cases, the percentages shown in the following exhibits reflect the total score for a specific response, divided by the total points awarded for the question.

Design 5 reflects an aggregation of the Task Force’s most prevalent views for each Program design element (e.g., benefits, services, financing), which are denoted by bold font in the exhibits below. Recognizing potential cost feasibility concerns with Design 5, we asked the Task Force to identify priorities and trade-offs, which informed the other designs included in this report.

Exhibit C.1: Inventory of questionnaires

Relevant Task Force Meeting	Questionnaire topic
3	• Preliminary questionnaire • Program and benefit design • Social insurance vs. public assistance • LTSS in other countries
4	• Coordination and interaction
9	• Program administration, eligibility, enrollment, benefits, and services • Financing
11	• Workforce
13	• Access and regulation
15	• Program interdependencies

© 2022 Oliver Wyman

Relevant Task Force Meeting	Questionnaire topic
16	• Priorities and tradeoffs
17	• Draft Feasibility Report amendments

Exhibit C.2: Program philosophy/structure

Element	Potential Program design [% of Task Force vote]
Program coverage	**1. Front-end coverage [44%]** 2. Back-end coverage [22%] 3. Comprehensive coverage [17%] 4. Other [17%][50]
Program design[51]	**1. Targeted social assistance [24%]** 1. Vested social insurance [23%] 2. Universal social insurance or assistance [17%] 3. Public benefit supplemented by private insurance [16%] 4. Expanded Partnership options [10%] 5. Require Medicare Supplement plans to include limited LTSS benefit [5%] 6. Incentivize new products [3%] 7. Public-private reinsurance or risk-sharing for private LTC insurance [1%]
	1. Social insurance [78%] 2. Public assistance [22%]
Taxation progressivity	**1. Progressive tax [60%]** 2. Proportional tax [40%]
	1. Vary program contribution rates by an individual's wage or income [67%] 2. Do not vary program contribution rates by an individual's wage or income [33%]

[50] Refer to the "program and benefit design" questionnaire in Exhibit C.1 for more detail on "other" recommendation(s).

[51] Design 5 was structured as a vested social insurance Program based on the Task Force's preference for social insurance (78%) and including a vesting criteria (91%). The Task Force was given the opportunity to revisit Program structure as part of the "access and regulation" questionnaire (question 1). Several targeted Program designs were considered, culminating in Design 1 (which targets supportive LTC benefits) and Design 2 (which targets HCBS and RCF for older Californians).

© 2022 Oliver Wyman

Exhibit C.3: Program benefits and services

Element	Potential Program design [% of Task Force vote]
Benefit type	**1. Reimbursement for all covered benefits with a reduced cash benefit alternative [37%]** 2. Reimbursement for all covered benefits (actual benefit amount reimbursed, subject to limitations) [35%] 3. Indemnity for all covered benefits (fixed amount reimbursed each period services are received) [21%] 4. Cash for all covered benefits (fixed cash amount provided each period as long as an individual meets the benefit eligibility criteria, regardless of whether services are received in each period) [6%] 5. Other [2%][52]
Benefit period	**1. 2 years [38%]** 2. 5 years [16%] 3. 4 years [14%] 4. 6 years [10%] 5. Other [10%][52] 6. 3 years [6%] 7. 1 year [6%]
Benefit maximum	**1. Monthly benefit frequency [71%]**[53] 2. Daily benefit frequency [28%] 3. Other [2%][52]
Benefit inflation	**1. Benefit inflation as a function of the CPI (or a variation of CPI) [37%]** 2. Benefit inflation as a function of cost of care trend(s) [35%] 3. Benefit inflation as a fixed percentage [24%] 4. Benefit inflation as a function of California wage growth [3%] 5. No inflation [1%]
	1. Apply inflation annually [44%] 2. Assess inflation annually but do not automatically apply [33%] 3. Apply inflation every 2 years [22%]

[52] Refer to the "program administration, eligibility, enrollment, benefits, and services" questionnaire in Exhibit C.1 for more detail on "other" recommendation(s).

[53] The Task Force recommended monthly benefit maximums ranging from $3,000 to $6,000 per month.

© 2022 Oliver Wyman

Element	Potential Program design [% of Task Force vote]
Elimination period	**1. No EP [54%]** 2. 30-day EP [17%] 3. 45-day EP [11%] 4. 60-day EP [11%] 5. 90-day EP [4%] 6. Other [1%][54]
Approved care settings	**1. Comprehensive care (i.e., facility and home and community-based care) [43%]** 2. Home and community-based care and select facility care services [34%] 3. Home and community-based care only [18%] 4. Facility care only [4%]
PACE coverage	**1. Covered service through certified provider reimbursement [64%]** 2. Covered service through cash benefits [27%] 3. Not a covered service [9%]
Informal/family caregivers	**1. Covered service through certified provider reimbursement [73%]** 2. Covered service through cash benefits [27%]
	1. Establish minimum training requirements for informal/family caregivers to be eligible for financial support [69%] 2. Do not establish minimum training requirements for informal/family coverages to be eligible for financial support [31%]
Preventative benefits	**1. Offer preventative benefits before satisfying the benefit eligibility criteria but only after becoming fully vested in the program [50%]** 2. Offer preventative benefits after satisfying the benefit eligibility criteria but only after becoming fully vested in the program [20%] 3. Do not offer preventative benefits [10%] 4. Other [10%][54] 5. Unsure/no opinion [10%]
Portability	**1. Full domestic portability [40%]** 2. Partial domestic portability: grade from 100% of benefits to [X]% of benefits over [Y] years [37%] 3. Partial domestic portability: divesting grace period of [X] years [10%] 4. No domestic portability [10%] 5. Other [3%][54]

[54] Refer to the “program administration, eligibility, enrollment, benefits, and services” questionnaire in Exhibit C.1 for more detail on "other" recommendation(s).

© 2022 Oliver Wyman

Element	Potential Program design [% of Task Force vote]
	Related question from a follow-up questionnaire: 1. **International portability [54%]** – At the same level as portable benefits used within the U.S. [27%] – At a reduced level compared to portable benefits used within the U.S. [27%] 2. Domestic portability only [46%][55]
Family/spousal coverage	1. **A spousal benefit that extends coverage to a spouse or a domestic partner [29%]** 2. Individual coverage only [28%] 3. An extended family benefit that extends coverage to all family members [28%] 4. An immediate family benefit that extends coverage to a spouse or a domestic partner and any dependent children [15%]
	1. **Extend family/spousal coverage through a shared benefit pool [46%]** 2. Extend family/spousal coverage through a separate benefit pool [18%] 3. Other [18%][56] 4. Individual coverage only [18%]

Exhibit C.4: Program eligibility and enrollment

Element	Potential Program design [% of Task Force vote]
Benefit eligibility age	Design 1[57] 1. **Age 18+ [54%]** 2. No minimum age [23%] 3. Age 65+ [15%] 4. Age 50+ [8%]

[55] Although domestic portability received the highest individual score, the two variations of international portability achieved a higher combined score than domestic portability (54% vs. 46%). In conjunction with the "draft Feasibility Report amendments" questionnaire, the Task Force recommended that international portability be assessed as an alternative scenario for Design 1 through Design 4.

[56] Refer to the "workforce" questionnaire in Exhibit C.1 for more detail on "other" recommendation(s).

[57] This questionnaire was published when the Program design "straw man" was comprised of six designs. Former Design 2 was replaced with the current iteration of Design 2 subsequent to this question being asked of the Task Force, so the Design 2 results for this question are not applicable. The current iteration of Design 2 was explicitly defined as having a benefit eligibility age of 65+.

Element	Potential Program design [% of Task Force vote]
	Designs 3-4[58] **1. Age 18+ [39%]** 2. Age 65+ [31%] 3. No minimum age [23%] 4. Age 60+ [8%] Design 5 **1. Age 18+ [54%]** 2. No minimum age [23%] 3. Age 60+ [15%] 4. Age 65+ [8%]
Benefit eligibility criteria	**1. HIPAA benefit eligibility trigger (2 of 6 ADLs for at least 90 days or severe cognitive impairment) [28%]** 2. Medi-Cal IHSS benefit eligibility [23%] 3. 3 of 10 ADLs [19%] 4. 3 of 6 ADLs for at least 90 days or severe cognitive impairment [15%] 5. Medical Necessity, where a service is defined as a "Medical Necessity" when it is reasonable and necessary to protect life, prevent significant illness or disability, or alleviate severe pain [8%] 6. Severe cognitive impairment [6%] 7. Instrumental activities of daily living based criteria [2%]
	1. Do not apply a tiered/triaged approach to benefit eligibility with varying tiers [54%][59] 2. Apply a tiered/triaged approach to benefit eligibility with varying tiers [46%]
Vesting criteria	**1. Fully vested after contributing for [X] years with partial vesting allowed [43%]** – A vesting period of 5 or 10 years were the most common recommendations[60] 2. Fully vested after contributing for [X] years with no partial vesting allowed [38%]

[58] This questionnaire was published when the Program design "straw man" was comprised of six designs (former Designs 4 and 5 were ultimately collapsed into the current iteration of Design 4). Task Force responses to this question did not vary between former Designs 4 and 5. Thus the above table reflects the current Design numbers for improved clarity.

[59] "Tier 1" would have provided preventative benefits after satisfying the Program vesting requirement, "Tier 2" would have provided ancillary LTSS benefits after satisfying benefit eligibility triggers based on instrumental activities of daily living (e.g., cooking, cleaning, transportation, etc.), and "Tier 3" would have provided full LTSS benefits after satisfying the HIPAA (ADL-based) benefit eligibility trigger.

[60] The Task Force was given an opportunity to revisit the vesting criteria for each Program design included in the Program design "straw man" as part of the "program interdependencies" questionnaire (question 4a). Although results varied by design, the vast majority of the Task Force recommended maintaining the status quo (i.e., 5 years or 10 years, depending on the design).

© 2022 Oliver Wyman

<table>
<tr><th>Element</th><th>Potential Program design [% of Task Force vote]</th></tr>
<tr><td></td><td>3. Fully vested after contributing for [X] of the last [Y] years with partial vesting allowed [10%]
4. No vesting requirement [5%]
5. Other [5%][61]</td></tr>
<tr><td rowspan="2">Flexibility for those unable to vest</td><td>1. Offer pro-rated benefits and a voluntary alternative program contribution option (e.g., premiums) to “top up” their benefits for those unable to fully vest via the primary financing mechanism [64%]
– The most prevalent pro-rating (partial vesting) methodology was:
• 5-year vesting period design:
– No benefits for individuals who contribute for less than 3 years
– 50% of benefits for individuals who contribute between 3 and 5 years
– 100% of benefits for individuals who contribute for 5 or more years
• 10-year vesting period design:
– No benefits for individuals who contribute for less than 5 years
– 50% of benefits for individuals who contribute for 5 years, grading up by 10% each year to 100% of benefits in year 10
2. Offer pro-rated benefits to those unable to fully vest via the primary financing mechanism [18%]
3. Offer a non-voluntary alternative program contribution option (e.g., premiums) for those unable to fully vest via the primary financing mechanism [9%]
4. Other [9%][62]</td></tr>
<tr><td>1. Institute a “non-voluntary program contribution provision” for individuals who are not subject to payroll tax (e.g., income tax for individuals who are self-employed) [85%][63]
2. Do not institute a “non-voluntary program contribution provision” [15%]</td></tr>
<tr><td>Private insurance considerations: on or before Program enactment</td><td>1. Include an opt-out provision [55%]
2. Offer reduced program contributions [36%]
3. Do not include special provisions [9%]</td></tr>
</table>

[61] Refer to the “program administration, eligibility, enrollment, benefits, and services” questionnaire in Exhibit C.1 for more detail on "other" recommendation(s).

[62] Refer to the “workforce” questionnaire in Exhibit C.1 for more detail on "other" recommendation(s).

[63] This questionnaire was published when the Program design “straw man” was comprised of six designs. The question focused on current Designs 3 and 4 only (the provision in question was and remains applicable to current Design 5). Subsequent to the questionnaire, the provision was expanded to apply to current Designs 1 and 2 as well.

© 2022 Oliver Wyman

Element	Potential Program design [% of Task Force vote]
Private insurance considerations: after Program enactment	**1. Offer reduced program contributions [73%]** 2. Include an opt-out provision [18%] 3. Do not include special provisions [9%]
Triggering event to transition from opt out to reduced contributions	**1. Program effective date trigger [50%]** 2. Governor approval trigger date [33%] 3. Beginning of the year preceding Governor approval trigger date [8%] 4. Other trigger date [8%][64]

Exhibit C.5: Program financing

Element	Potential Program design [% of Task Force vote]
Revenue source	**1. Payroll tax: split X% funded by employees and Y% funded by employers [35%]** – The most common recommendations were a 50/50 or 75/25 employee/employer split 2. Hybrid financing option [21%] – Task Force members suggested hybrid options that combined a payroll tax with the following other taxes: • Corporate income tax • Premium contributions • General revenue and excise taxes 3. Personal income tax [13%] 4. Sales tax [12%] 5. Corporate income tax [7%] 6. General revenue funding (including an insurance premium tax increase) [3%] 7. Excise tax [2%] 8. Estate tax [2%] 9. Provider tax [2%] 10. Premium contributions [2%] 11. Inheritance tax [1%]

[64] Refer to the “draft Feasibility Report” questionnaire in Exhibit C.1 for more detail on "other" recommendation(s).

© 2022 Oliver Wyman

Element	Potential Program design [% of Task Force vote]
Program contribution ages	**1. Older adults; pre-retirement age (e.g., 40-64) [100%]** **2. Younger adults (e.g., 18-39) [90%]** **3. Retirement age adults (e.g., 65+) [80%]** 4. Juveniles (e.g., before 18) [20%] 5. Other [20%][65]
Program contribution age: maximum	**1. Do not incorporate a maximum contribution age [77%]** 2. Incorporate a maximum contribution age [23%]
Program contribution limits: taxable earnings waiver	**1. Waive contributions for individuals below a specified poverty level; allow them to receive benefits from the program [52%]** 2. No exclusion provisions [30%] 3. Waive contributions for individuals below a specified poverty level; do not allow them to receive benefits from the program [18%]
Program contribution limits: taxable earnings maximum[66]	**1. Annual contribution cap that exceeds the Social Security annual wage cap [46%]** 2. Lifetime program contribution maximum [23%] 3. Annual contribution cap similar to Social Security [15%] 4. No contribution cap [8%] 5. Other [8%][67]
Contribution rate structure	**1. Level program contributions (i.e., the program contribution rate is not intended to increase as the statewide LTC insurance program ages) [55%]** 2. Step-rated program contributions (i.e., the program contribution rate will increase in planned increments as the statewide LTC insurance program ages) [46%]
	1. Program contribution rates should not vary with an individual's age [64%] 2. Program contribution rates should decrease with an individual's age [27%] 3. Program contribution rates should increase with an individual's age [9%]
Investment strategy	**1. Program contributions should be invested in stocks, bonds, and U.S. Treasuries [60%]** 2. Program contributions should be invested in U.S. Treasuries only [30%] 3. Other [10%][65]

[65] Refer to the "financing" questionnaire in Exhibit C.1 for more detail on "other" recommendation(s).
[66] Results are reflective of post-questionnaire discussion, during which several Task Force members changed their vote.
[67] Refer to the "program interdependencies" questionnaire in Exhibit C.1 for more detail on "other" recommendation(s).

© 2022 Oliver Wyman

Element	Potential Program design [% of Task Force vote]
Inter-generational consideration	**1. Include provisions to mitigate or reduce the initial intergenerational inequity [64%]** 2. Do not include any provisions to mitigate or reduce the initial intergenerational inequity [36%]

Exhibit C.6: Program coordination and interaction

Element	Potential Program design [% of Task Force vote]
Coordination: private insurance	**1. Private LTC insurance pays for benefits before the statewide LTC insurance program. Concurrent payments permitted [58%]** 2. The statewide LTC insurance program pays for benefits before private LTC insurance. Concurrent payments permitted [33%] 3. The statewide LTC insurance program pays for benefits before private LTC insurance. Concurrent payments not permitted [8%]
	1. Do not offer reduced program contributions to individuals who purchase supplemental (i.e., non-substitutive) private LTC insurance after program enactment [69%] 2. Offer reduced program contributions to individuals who purchase supplemental (i.e., non-substitutive) private LTC insurance after program enactment [31%]
Coordination: Medi-Cal	**1. Program pays before Medi-Cal; concurrent, non-duplicative payments permitted [58%]** 2. Unsure/no opinion [25%] 3. The statewide LTC insurance program pays for benefits before Medi-Cal. Concurrent payments not permitted [8%] 4. Other [8%][68]
	1. Program benefits should not influence Medi-Cal eligibility [50%] 2. Allow individuals receiving benefits under the statewide LTC insurance program to retain an amount of assets equal to the sum of qualifying payments made under the program for purpose of determining eligibility for other state or federal means-tested programs, including Medi-Cal [21%][69] 3. Unsure/no opinion [14%] 4. Consider benefits paid under the statewide LTC insurance program as income for purpose of determining eligibility for other state or federal means-tested programs, including Medi-Cal [7%] 5. Other [7%][68]

[68] Refer to the “coordination and interaction” questionnaire in Exhibit C.1 for more detail on "other" recommendation(s).
[69] The Medi-Cal eligibility asset limit will be eliminated in 2024.

© 2022 Oliver Wyman

Appendix D. LTSS programs and services administered by the California Department of Aging

CDA administers several home and community-based programs that serve older adults, people with disabilities, and family caregivers. CDA contracts with a network of 33 Area Agencies on Aging, which manage an array of federal and state-funded services, such as supportive services, caregiver support, information and assistance, employment, and volunteerism.

Select LTSS and related programs and services administered by CDA are summarized in Exhibit D.1 below.

Exhibit D.1: Overview of CDA LTSS programs and services

Program/service	Description
Community-Based Adult Services	• Available to eligible Medi-Cal beneficiaries enrolled in Medi-Cal Managed Care • Offers services to eligible older adults and adults with disabilities to restore or maintain their optimal capacity for self-care and delay or prevent institutionalization • Services offered include (but are not limited to): – Professional nursing services – Mental health services – Personal (i.e., custodial) care – Nutritional counseling – Transportation assistance
Multipurpose Senior Services Program	• HCBS and care coordination to Medi-Cal eligible individuals who are 65 years and older and disabled • Alternative to nursing facility placement
Aging and Disability Resource Connections	• Provides older adults, people with disabilities, and family caregivers with information and referrals, LTC options counseling, transition assistance, and care coordination • ADRC serve anyone needing information and support, regardless of age, income, or disability status • A list of ADRCs in California is available at this link
Long-Term Care Ombudsman Program	• Investigates and endeavors to resolve complaints made by, or on behalf of, residents in LTC facilities including nursing homes and assisted living facilities

Program/service	Description
Nutrition Services	• Provides nutrition services in group and home-based settings (i.e., meal delivery) • Preference given to those in greatest economic or social need
Senior Community Service Employment Program	• Provides part-time work-based training opportunities for older workers • To be eligible, individuals must be at least 55 years of age, with an income not exceeding 125 percent of the federal poverty level
Health Insurance Counseling and Advocacy Program	• California's State Health Insurance Assistance Program • Provides consumer counseling on Medicare, Medicare supplement policies, Health Maintenance Organizations and LTC insurance
Family Caregiver Support Program	• Provided across 33 local Area Agencies on Aging • Services include caregiving information, access to services and supports, and temporary respite care

© 2022 Oliver Wyman