



**CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE
PAY-AS-YOU-GO ESTIMATE**

August 17, 2000

**H.R. 4040
Long-Term Care Security Act
and
Federal Erroneous Retirement Coverage Corrections Act**

As cleared by the Congress on July 27, 2000

SUMMARY

H.R. 4040 has two major components. Title I of the act, the Long-Term Care Security Act, would require the Office of Personnel Management (OPM) to develop and administer a long-term care insurance program for federal employees, members of the uniformed services, retirees from federal or military service, and specified relatives of the primary eligible groups. Because the federal government would not contribute to the enrollees' premiums, and the insurer or insurers would be required to reimburse OPM for its expenses in setting up and administering the plan, net federal outlays would be zero over the long run. However, the government would initially incur some start-up costs that are scored as direct spending, which would ultimately be reimbursed by the insurers.

Title II, the Federal Erroneous Retirement Coverage Corrections Act, would alter the procedures for correcting situations where federal employees have been mistakenly placed in the wrong retirement system. Many of those retirement coverage errors occurred between 1984, when the Civil Service Retirement System (CSRS) was closed to new entrants, and 1987, when the Federal Employees' Retirement System (FERS) was created.

CBO estimates that this act would increase direct spending by \$20 million over the 2001-2005 period, primarily because of lower payments by the Postal Service to the Civil Service Retirement and Disability Fund (CSRDF).

Table 1 summarizes the act's effects on direct spending that are subject to pay-as-you-go procedures. (Some of the title II effects are changes in off-budget direct spending, which is not subject to those procedures.) For pay-as-you-go purposes, only the effects in the current year, the budget year, and the subsequent four years are counted.

TABLE 1. SUMMARY OF H.R. 4040's ESTIMATED EFFECTS THAT ARE SUBJECT TO PAY-AS-YOU-GO PROCEDURES

| | By Fiscal Year, in Millions of Dollars | | | | | | | | | | |
|---------------------|--|------|------|------|------|----------------|------|------|------|------|------|
| | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 | 2006 | 2007 | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 |
| Changes in outlays | 0 | 3 | 23 | -16 | 5 | 5 | 6 | 6 | 7 | 7 | 8 |
| Changes in receipts | | | | | | Not applicable | | | | | |

ESTIMATED DIRECT SPENDING EFFECTS

The estimated impact of H.R. 4040 on direct spending is detailed in Table 2. The costs of this legislation fall within budget functions 600 (income security) and 950 (undistributed offsetting receipts).

BASIS OF ESTIMATE

Title I: Long-Term Care Security Act

H.R. 4040 specifies that eligible individuals who opt to purchase long-term care insurance would be responsible for 100 percent of the cost of the premiums, so that the federal government would not incur net costs over the long term. However, because OPM would expend funds for start-up costs and administrative expenses before enrollees' premiums are received, the agency would incur outlays in 2001 and 2002, which would be direct spending from the Employees' Life Insurance Fund. The federal government would not contribute to the enrollees' premiums, and the insurer or insurers would be required to reimburse OPM for the agency's expenses in setting up and administering the plan during the first year of the program.

The act specifies that the long-term care insurance program should commence as of the first fiscal year beginning 18 months after enactment, or 2003. CBO assumes OPM would negotiate with one or more insurance carriers to establish the benefits provided under the plan and the premiums charged in 2001. Marketing the chosen plan or plans would begin in 2002, so that coverage and premium deductions from salaries or retirement payments could begin in 2003.

TABLE 2. ESTIMATED EFFECTS OF H.R. 4040 ON DIRECT SPENDING

| | Outlays by Fiscal Year, in Millions of Dollars | | | | |
|--|--|------------|----------|----------|----------|
| | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 | 2004 | 2005 |
| CHANGES IN DIRECT SPENDING | | | | | |
| Title I | | | | | |
| OPM Administrative Expenses | 3 | 18 | - 21 | 0 | 0 |
| Title II | | | | | |
| OPM Administrative Expenses | 1 | 1 | a | a | a |
| Federal Retirement Benefits | a | 2 | a | a | a |
| Transfers from CSRDF to Social Security Trust Funds | - 3 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Postal Service Contributions to the CSRDF | 1 | - a | 4 | 5 | 5 |
| Postal Service Outlays (off-budget) | - 2 | 6 | - 4 | 0 | 0 |
| Postal Service Contributions to Social Security Trust Funds (off-budget) | a | - a | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Receipt of Transfers by Social Security Trust Funds (off-budget) | <u>- 3</u> | <u>- 3</u> | <u>0</u> | <u>0</u> | <u>0</u> |
| Subtotal - Title II | 1 | 9 | a | 5 | 5 |
| Total - On-Budget Direct Spending | 3 | 23 | - 16 | 5 | 5 |
| Total - Off-Budget Direct Spending | 1 | 3 | - 4 | 0 | 0 |

a. Less than \$500,000.

NOTE: Components may not sum to totals because of rounding.

Based on information from OPM and the costs of administering other benefit programs, CBO estimates that start-up costs over three fiscal years would be about \$23 million. A significant portion of the costs would be for education and outreach—especially for printing and mailing brochures to inform potential participants of their eligibility and options under the plan. About 10 percent of the estimated costs represents expenses for drafting specifications for the plan, evaluating contract proposals, negotiating with contractors, and setting up systems for tracking enrollment and premium deductions.

Expenditures for education and outreach would be significant because long-term care insurance is a new benefit for many employees, unlike pensions and health insurance, which are already established and familiar. Furthermore, OPM would contact active and retired

military personnel, whose benefits are ordinarily administered by the Department of Defense. Intensive outreach efforts can help attract a larger pool of participants, which would help to assure the plan's financial solvency by broadening the distribution of people who pay premiums and including more enrollees with a low risk of needing services.

Expenses of \$3 million in 2001 would be primarily for developing the long-term care insurance plan and negotiating with insurers, while education and outreach expenses are projected to increase outlays to \$18 million in 2002. Start-up expenses for administrative costs and processing enrollment in the first year of the plan's operation are estimated to amount to \$2 million in 2003. Once the insurance program is established, CBO expects that, beginning in 2003, OPM would incur costs of about \$1 million annually to administer it. Reimbursement of the estimated \$23 million in start-up costs incurred from 2001 through 2003, as well as for the first-year administrative expenses of \$1 million, would occur in 2003, so that receipts would exceed outlays by OPM by about \$21 million in 2003.

Those ongoing expenses are expected to remain steady unless another open season is held. The act directs OPM to conduct open enrollment seasons periodically, during which administrative expenses would be expected to increase. However, frequent open seasons would create greater opportunities for risk selection, as low-risk individuals could defer joining the plan until they perceive that their risk of needing long-term care has changed. The act would make it harder for people to elect coverage only when their risk changes by authorizing the insurance plans to apply underwriting standards for individuals who defer joining at their first opportunity. Nevertheless, CBO expects that OPM would allow open seasons infrequently. If open seasons occur at the same intervals as the length of the contract specified in the act, or once every seven years, the next increase in outlays for a new open season would occur in 2010.

H.R. 4040 specifies that the government collect premiums from most enrollees by withholding a portion of their pay and, in turn, transfer those amounts to the insurance companies. These transactions would also be direct spending but would have no significant net effect on the budget.

Title II: Federal Erroneous Retirement Coverage Corrections Act

There are two main retirement programs for full-time regular federal employees. Most full-time employees hired before 1984 are in the Civil Service Retirement System, a defined benefit plan. Those hired after 1983 are generally covered by the Federal Employees' Retirement System, which features a more limited defined benefit than CSRS and the defined contribution Thrift Savings Plan (TSP) with matching contributions by the government. Employees in CSRS are not covered by Social Security, while those in FERS are.

Employees who return to government service after 1987 and have five years of prior service under CSRS may be covered by a hybrid plan known as CSRS Offset, which features a combination of CSRS and Social Security benefits.

FERS employees may contribute up to 10 percent of their pay to the TSP. They receive an automatic contribution from their employing agency equal to 1 percent of their pay and may also receive an additional 4 percent in matching contributions. CSRS and CSRS Offset employees may also participate in the TSP, but they may only contribute up to 5 percent of their pay and do not receive any government contributions.

Assumptions about Retirement Coverage Errors. CBO estimated the number of retirement coverage errors that have been made based on discussions with personnel officials in a number of large government agencies, including the Postal Service and the Departments of Defense, Veterans Affairs, and Agriculture. Those agencies comprise approximately 70 percent of the federal civilian workforce. On the basis of those discussions, CBO estimates that approximately 18,000 coverage errors have occurred throughout the government, of which approximately 12,000 have already been corrected. The two most common types of coverage errors appear to involve employees who should be in FERS but were accidentally put in CSRS and employees with prior service who returned to government service and were misplaced in either FERS or CSRS Offset.

Under prior law, coverage errors were usually corrected by converting the employee to the proper retirement system, retroactive to the original date of the error. However, some employees who were accidentally placed in FERS were able to remain in FERS by making a retroactive election of FERS coverage.

H.R. 4040 would allow most employees affected by coverage errors to choose whether they would like to be placed in the proper retirement system or make their incorrect coverage permanent. Employees who have been incorrectly covered by CSRS could elect only CSRS Offset or FERS. Employees whose coverage errors have not been corrected would have 180 days after the discovery of the error to make an election; employees whose coverage errors have already been fixed would have 18 months after the issuance of final implementing regulations to make their election. All elections would be irrevocable, and employees who did not make an election would remain in their current coverage. Coverage errors lasting less than three years would not be covered by the act. CBO assumed that under the act agencies would stop correcting coverage errors for the remainder of 2000 and the first six months of 2001 pending the issuance of final regulations to implement the act, and that they would finish processing the resulting backlog by the end of 2002.

Under prior law, when an individual's coverage was corrected to FERS, the employing agency made a lump-sum deposit into his or her TSP account based on the employee's prior

TSP contributions. That deposit was equal to the contributions the government would have made and earnings that they would have generated under FERS rules. If the employee did not have a TSP account, only a deposit for the automatic 1-percent contributions was made. Earnings were calculated using the individual's own fund allocation decisions (if he or she had a TSP account) or the G Fund rate (otherwise). Employees could provide makeup contributions to their TSP accounts out of future pay. These makeup contributions received agency matching contributions (up to the 5-percent FERS maximum) and related earnings as if the contributions had been made at the proper time. However, back earnings were paid only on the agency's matching funds, not on the employee's makeup contributions.

For employees who elect FERS coverage, H.R. 4040 would add to prior law by also requiring agencies to pay lost earnings on the employees' makeup contributions to the TSP. (Employees whose coverage had been corrected to FERS before the enactment of H.R. 4040 would receive makeup earnings on any makeup contributions that had already been made.)

CBO assumed that these employees' choice of retirement coverage would be strongly influenced by whether or not they had made significant contributions to the TSP while they were incorrectly covered by CSRS or CSRS Offset. Most employees with little or no prior TSP contributions would need to make retroactive contributions for a substantial amount of time—as much as eight or nine years—in order to make up the contributions they would have made under FERS. For these employees, CSRS Offset coverage would be relatively attractive. In contrast, employees with significant prior TSP contributions might need only two to three years to catch up. As a result, many of these employees would still choose to have their coverage corrected to FERS.

Most employees covered by CSRS have not made regular contributions to the TSP. According to the Federal Retirement Thrift Investment Board, only 22 percent of CSRS employees made contributions to the TSP in 1989 (the earliest year of data available). This percentage has since risen but did not exceed 50 percent until 1996. CBO estimates that only a third of employees erroneously placed in CSRS or CSRS Offset have made significant contributions to the TSP, and assumed that 80 percent of those employees would elect FERS coverage. Two-thirds of the employees incorrectly placed in CSRS or CSRS Offset have made little or no TSP contributions, and CBO assumed that 80 percent of those employees would elect CSRS Offset coverage. Overall, we assumed that 60 percent of those employees would elect CSRS Offset coverage and 40 percent would elect FERS.

OPM Administrative Expenses. H.R. 4040 would allow OPM to pay the costs of implementing title II directly from the CSRDF. CBO anticipates that OPM would incur most of these costs in 2001 and 2002, when it would issue implementing regulations and process elections made by employees with coverage errors that were corrected prior to enactment.

CBO estimates that these administrative costs would total about \$1 million in both 2001 and 2002, and about \$100,000 annually after that.

Federal Retirement Benefits. Since the employees affected by retirement coverage errors are generally still in the middle of their careers, CBO anticipates that H.R. 4040 would not have a significant impact on federal retirement benefits over the 2001-2005 period. However, a small number of disabled retirees and survivors would be eligible to make an election under the act, and CBO assumes that some of them would receive higher benefits by changing their retirement coverage. (Individuals who change their retirement coverage would also receive retroactive benefits.) CBO estimates that annual spending on retirement benefits would rise by negligible amounts over the 2001-2005 period, except in 2002, when most elections would be processed and outlays, mostly for retroactive benefits, would rise by \$2 million.

Transfers from the CSRDF to Social Security. Employees who have been mistakenly covered by CSRS when they should have been in CSRS Offset or FERS have been contributing 7 percent of their basic pay to the CSRDF, instead of contributing 0.8 percent to the CSRDF and 6.2 percent to Social Security. When the coverage error is corrected under current law, the 6.2 percent in erroneous CSRS contributions (up to the Social Security taxable maximum) is generally transferred to the Social Security trust funds. H.R. 4040 would continue this practice, but transfers from the CSRDF to Social Security would decrease by \$3 million in 2001 and rise by \$3 million in 2002 due to timing effects.

Postal Service Contributions to the CSRDF. Agency contributions to the CSRDF equal 8.51 percent of basic pay for most employees covered by CSRS or CSRS Offset and 10.7 percent of basic pay for most employees under FERS. Agencies thus make additional contributions for employees whose coverage is changed from CSRS or CSRS Offset to FERS, and lower contributions for employees whose coverage is changed from FERS to CSRS or CSRS Offset. Since most employees affected by H.R. 4040 would fall into the latter category, CBO estimates that the act would reduce offsetting receipts to the CSRDF by \$15 million over the 2001-2005 period. (CBO's estimate includes only the change in contributions for the Postal Service; effects on contributions from other agencies are not scored because they depend on the future level of appropriations.)

Postal Service Outlays. CBO estimates that H.R. 4040 would increase outlays for the Postal Service, which is off-budget, by a total of \$4 million in 2001 and 2002. CBO assumes that the Postal Service would offset these higher costs in 2003 by raising postage rates.

Postal Service Contributions to Social Security. Postal Service contributions to the Social Security trust funds, which are off-budget, would be slightly lower in 2001 and slightly

higher in 2002 due to the effects that H.R.4040 would have on when coverage errors are corrected.

Receipt of Transfers by Social Security. The timing shift in payments from the CSRDF to Social Security would reduce offsetting receipts to the Social Security trust funds by \$3 million in 2001 and increase such receipts by \$3 million in 2002.

PREVIOUS CBO ESTIMATES

On July 12, 2000, CBO estimated that S. 2420, as ordered reported by the Senate Committee on Governmental Affairs on June 14, 2000, would increase direct spending by \$20 million over the 2001-2005 period. The provisions of S. 2420 are the same as those in H.R. 4040 as cleared by the Congress, except for minor technical changes, and CBO's estimates for the two bills are identical.

In March 2000, the House Committee on Government Reform approved a version of H.R. 4040 that dealt only with the long-term care insurance benefit. CBO estimated that OPM's outlays for establishing and administering the benefit would be the same as for the version of H.R. 4040 cleared by the Congress. The estimates for the two bills differ in one regard. The estimate for the earlier version of H.R. 4040 assumed that insurers would be allowed to spread their reimbursement of administrative and start-up expenses over the duration of the seven-year contract, while the act specifies that reimbursement for incurred expenses be paid during the first year.

ESTIMATE PREPARED BY: Charles Betley (title I) and Eric Rollins (title II)

ESTIMATE APPROVED BY:

Peter H. Fontaine
Deputy Assistant Director for Budget Analysis