

Fiscal impact reports (FIRs) are prepared by the Legislative Finance Committee (LFC) for standing finance committees of the Legislature. LFC does not assume responsibility for the accuracy of these reports if they are used for other purposes.

## FISCAL IMPACT REPORT

<b>SPONSOR</b>	Senate Health and Public Affairs	<b>LAST UPDATED</b>	3/4/2025
	Committee	<b>ORIGINAL DATE</b>	2/23/2025
<b>SHORT TITLE</b>	No Behavioral Health Cost Sharing	<b>BILL</b>	CS/Senate Bill
		<b>NUMBER</b>	120/SHPACS
		<b>ANALYST</b>	Hernandez/Sallee

### ESTIMATED ADDITIONAL OPERATING BUDGET IMPACT\*

(dollars in thousands)

Agency/Program	FY25	FY26	FY27	3 Year Total Cost	Recurring or Nonrecurring	Fund Affected
RHCA	See Fiscal Implications				Recurring	RHCA Benefits Fund
HCA	See Fiscal Implications				Recurring	State Health Benefits Fund
NMPSIA	See Fiscal Implications				Recurring	NMPSIA Benefits Fund

Parentheses ( ) indicate expenditure decreases.

\*Amounts reflect most recent analysis of this legislation.

### Sources of Information

LFC Files

#### Agency Analysis Received From

Department of Health (DOH)

Health Care Authority (HCA)

Office of Superintendent of Insurance (OSI)

University of New Mexico (UNM)

Public School Insurance Authority (NMPSIA)

Retiree Health Care Authority (RHCA)

## SUMMARY

### Synopsis of SHPAC Substitute for Senate Bill 120

The Senate Health and Public Affairs Committee substitute for Senate Bill 120 (SB120) amends parts of the Health Care Purchasing Act and New Mexico Insurance Code to permanently eliminate behavioral health services cost sharing by striking the 2027 sunset date. Cost sharing is defined in existing statute as a copayment, coinsurance, deductible or any form of financial obligation on an enrollee in a group health plan, outside of the premium. The SHPAC substitute makes clear that SB120 applies only to health insurance plans and not supplemental plans designed to supplement medical plans or high-deductible plans.

This bill does not contain an effective date and, as a result, would go into effect 90 days after the Legislature adjourns if enacted, or June 20, 2025.

## FISCAL IMPLICATIONS

SB120 eliminates the sunset currently established to automatically end the program in January 2027, which means baseline costs for FY26 and half of FY27 are unaffected. Should the sunset remain, health plan enrollees would resume paying their share of the costs in January 2027 and group plans would see a drop in behavioral healthcare costs. However, SB120 would eliminate the sunset and health plans would continue to cover the full cost of behavioral health services; thus, costs would initially be higher under SB120 starting in FY28, although the cost of behavioral healthcare likely would decline over time as enrollees turn away from higher cost emergency behavioral health programs.

Agency analyses for cost estimates start assuming increased costs in FY26, in conflict with when cost sharing will sunset. Agencies did not provide additional information on how they determined their costs or analysis on whether they could realize savings on other areas of health spending as a result of potentially better access to behavioral health.

The Health Care Authority (HCA) states the agency built the cost of fully covering behavioral health services into the baseline rates of the group health benefit for the state and local government employees covered by the State Health Benefit (SHB) plan, meaning permanently eliminating cost sharing would not increase their costs. In addition, the department states, “Even if the law were to sunset, SHB would likely maintain the policy because of its positive impacts on patients, providers, and the health system as a whole.” As a result, the department SB120 would have no additional financial impact for the Health Care Authority.

However, both the Public School Insurance Authority (NMPSIA), which provides a healthcare coverage plan for most school districts, and the Retiree Health Care Authority (RHCA), which covers state retirees, list additional operating costs associated with the permanent elimination of behavioral health cost sharing.

RHCA states, if SB120 includes coverage for out-of-network providers, costs would go up. Ultimately, within the next three fiscal years, RHCA estimates it would face costs between \$5.1 million and \$14 million:

The agency review includes projected industry cost trends for behavioral health services and medications as well as available resources for behavioral health prevalence, treatment rates, and provider access. In addition, without networks being clearly defined in [SB120], the group experience and industry references regarding the relative cost for out-of-network compared to in-network cost differentials were utilized to estimate the impact of including out-of-network providers at 100 percent plan coverage levels.

NMPSIA raises similar concerns and states its “estimated impact reflects the additional plan spend due to SB120 and preceding legislation compared to expected plan spend absent any of this legislation.” The authority estimates increased costs for the next three fiscal years to be between \$29.1 million and \$48.3 million.

## SIGNIFICANT ISSUES

A study published in *JAMA*, a respected, peer-reviewed publication of the American Medical Association, examined New Mexico’s no-cost behavioral health program instituted in 2021 and

found there was a \$6.37 reduction in average out-of-pocket spending for patients who used mental health or substance use disorder (SUD) medications. The second major finding was that there was not an increase in the volume of prescriptions dispensed—meaning that more New Mexicans did not seek mental health or SUD medications as a result of the no-cost behavioral health program.

Plans likely had near-term increased cost when cost-sharing was initially eliminated because patients no longer paid for part of the costs through co-pays or other cost-sharing. For example, if a behavioral health prescription cost \$1,000 and the patient would normally be responsible for \$200 then the plan would have experienced an increase by paying for the patients' portion. However, the premise of eliminating cost-sharing is that the \$200 patient cost was resulting in a patient not seeking care and possibly ending up using other high-cost health services, such as the emergency room. Without the financial barrier, patients would be more likely to pursue less expensive treatment, saving the health plan the costs of more expensive care. Whether a plan experiences the savings in the same year remains unclear, and it is not uncommon for plans to raise concerns over whether prevention programs actually pay for themselves. However, no data was provided in agency analyses to support either viewpoint.

OSI has not found cost savings or overall net neutral costs because its analysis was early in the program. SB120 would continue to benefit patients by lowering their costs but could impact overall plan cost.

The Office of Superintendent of Insurance (OSI) notes it required carriers to provide details on the impact on rates when behavioral health cost sharing was eliminated and only one carrier indicated a minimal rate impact for 2025. All other carriers indicated that behavioral health cost sharing elimination had no impact on rates: "Members who received behavioral health services avoided spending \$7,156,200 in FY23 and \$8,163,602 in FY24."

AEH/hg/hg/sgs/hg/sgs